

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN;

A MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE FAITH PREACHED
BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRISTENDOM,
WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

“The nations were angry and Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that Thou shouldest give reward to Thy servants the prophets, and to the saints and to them that fear Thy name, small and great, and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth.”—Rev. xi. 18.

VOLUME XIII.

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

MDCCLXXVI.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIII.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
ARTICLES BY DR. THOMAS—		THE ALLEGED DESCENT OF MAN ... 250	
The Spirit of God and the Baptism thereof 1, 49,	97	Inspiration of the Bible 251,	303
Spiritualism	145	Theology and Science	302
Everlasting Punishment	193	God's Existence	345
Restoration of Israel	198	Miracles 346, 440,	506
Wilt Thou at this Time restore the Kingdom	241	The Four Gospels	349
Is the Soul Matter or Spirit?	246	Historical Veracity of Old Testament	445
The Kingdom and Modern Spiritology	289	Assyrian Discoveries	504
The True Hope of the Gospel	296	The Bible and Pre-historic Man	505
The Gospel and the Eastern Question	338	Acts of the Apostles	507
Who will rise from the Dead?	342	The Epistles 305,	508
Why Divines do not understand the Apocalypse	343	The Existence of Evil and the Goodness of God	553
Ecclesiastical Phrases	344	“J.M.'s” Objections to the Bible	554
Sacrifice in the Future Age 385,	434	THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS:—	
The Truth <i>v.</i> Sectarianism	391	The Jews in Egypt	27
Dr. Thomas and the Jewish Boy	394	The Jews in Judea	27
Dr. Thomas on Soldiering	481	The Jews at Zurich	28
The 1,260 Years: are they Lunar or Solar?	482	The Jews in Germany 28,	266
The New Covenant	484	The Ten Tribes	28
Baptism in Relation to Justification	530	The Colonization of Palestine, 29, 129, 174, 176, 223, 270, 332, 513, 516,	559
THINGS NEW AND OLD—		The Jews in Portugal	29
Type and Antitype	7	The Jews in Vienna 129,	174
Spray from the Water of Life, 8, 103, 172, 312, 403,	464	The Jews in Europe 27,	129
Death	9	Jewish Restoration, 132, 368, 513,	516
Selections	10	The Jews in France	173
Testimonials	10	The Jews in the Papal States	173
Our Reasonable Service	101	The Jews in Switzerland	173
Bible Summaries 102, 311,	461	The Jews in Roumania	174
Self in English and Hebrew	103	The Jews in Russia	221
Numerals for Bible Marking	103	The Jews in Hungary 221,	266
Differences	104	The Jews in Norway	221
The Standard	169	The Jews in Persia	221
Exhortation	170	The Jews in Turkey	222
Appropriate	170	Palestine Exploration 173, 222,	512
Messiah	171	Land in Palestine	224
Importance	257	The Jews of Salonica	266
Consequences	258	The Jews in Rome	267
Manifold Wisdom	258	The Jews in Tunis	267
Wild Honey 259,	404	The Present and Past of the Jews	267
Maxims of Men	310	The Jews as a Power in Europe	268
War and Arms-bearing	401	The Jews in Britain	332
Text Elucidations	403	The Jewish Race	368
Beauties of the Bible	404	The Jews in Servia	475
Goodly Resolutions	463	Canaan	476
Gospel Prayers	463	The Jews and the Eastern Question,	476, 515
Satan	464	The Deadness of Israel	514
Angels	463	The Jews in Bosnia	514
The Devil	463	The Jews and Fermented Wine	275
Sonship	464	Lecture on the Holy Land and its Prospects 487,	573
The East	464	Eastern Affairs and “the Light of Prophecy”	560
Forty Shots from a Norman Cross-bow	11	A Jew's View of the future of Palestine	560
Sunday Morning at the Christadelphian Ecclesia, Birmingham, 12, 81, 162, 200, 363, 499,	549	Extraordinary Prospect for the Occupation of the Holy Land	560
THE BIBLE TRUE:—		A Jewish Sketch of Jesus	561
Darwin and Huxley refuted, 18, 105,	156	Revive the Organic Centre of Jewish Nationality	562
The Bible its own proof 20,	73	EDITORIAL:—	
The Truth of the Bible 25, 76,	107	General, 30, 37, 85, 133, 177, 225,	276, 329, 369, 421, 467,
Last Hours of an ex-Infidel	69	Signs of the Times, 31, 86, 134, 179,	227, 276, 330, 374, 422, 470, 517, 564,
Authenticity of the New Testament, 159, 252, 305, 348, 447, 507,	556	The Eastern Question 31, 137, 179, 374,	470
God manifest in Nature	249		

	PAGE.
Turkey, 31, 35, 136, 180, 277, 278, 374, 422, 423, 473, 522, 523,	564
Britain, 31, 33, 38, 89, 90, 131, 137, 282, 284, 376, 377, 425, 470, 518,	565
Egypt 33, 90, 282, 523,	284
Disraeli Government 83	83
Suez Canal 34, 89, 131, 181,	182
Jewish Colonization 34	34
Mr. Disraeli's Day Dream 35	35
Russia, 36, 88, 182, 183, 184, 279, 280, 282, 376, 377, 470, 472, 474, 517, 520, 521, 522, 565,	566
General Prospect 37, 89	89
False Prophets 133	133
Austria 180	180
Persia 183, 522	183, 522
Constantinople 184	184
European Armaments 226	226
The Drying Euphrates 39, 230, 422	39, 230, 422
The Old Lesson 370	370
The Papacy 173, 372	173, 372
France 284	284
Spiritualism 372	372
Religion and War 372	372
Belief in a Personal Devil 373	373
Turkish Atrocities 375, 423	375, 423
Servia 375, 423, 474	375, 423, 474
Indignation of British Public 425, 518	425, 518
The Future 426	426
Freemasonry 468	468
Clerical Theology 468	468
Hell and the Devil 469	469
Rome and the No. of the Beast 469	469
The Present Situation 473	473
The Holy Land 475	475
Alarming Prospect 522	522
Prospect of Christ's Re-appearance 523	523
ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS:—	
Christ's Righteousness 39	39
Prayer for Authorities 39	39
Drying of the Euphrates 39	39
Baptism 40	40
Blood and Things Strangled 40, 185	40, 185
Alleged Contradictions 42	42
Mr. Gladstone and the Truth 43	43
Matters that are too high 44	44
Christ's Work a willing one 138	138
The Divine Glory in the Coming Age 139	139
The Son of Man 139	139
The Only-begotten 139	139
The 430 Years 184	184
The Rich Man and Lazarus 184	184
Are the Jews to believe before Christ comes? 184	184
The Lord's Supper 185	185
The Angels that fell 185	185
The Antediluvian Sons of God 185	185
Identity 186	186
Partial Obedience 187	187
The Virgin's Son 283	283
The Baptism of Fire 283	283
The Disobedient in the Resurrection 283	283
Politics and the Gospel 283	283
The Frog Sign 284	284
British Occupation of Egypt 284	284
When was Jesus 30 years of Age 285, 330	285, 330
The Parable of the Labourers 378	378
Paid Preaching 378	378
Parable of the Marriage Feast 378	378
Jesus not Immortal in the Days of his Flesh 379	379
Money Saving 380	380

	PAGE.
Who are the Called? 568	568
Why did Christ Pray... .. 569	569
Sin; its Origin, &c. 570	570
Smoking Unbecoming 570	570
INTELLIGENCE:—	
Aberdeen 381, 427,	476
Altrincham	285
Bewdley	427
Birmingham, 45, 91, 140, 190, 236, 285, 283, 381, 428, 476,	525
Birkenhead	571
Brighouse	571
Bristol, 91, 236, 285, 334, 381, 428, 525,	571
Brierley Hill	525
Cannock	334
Cardiff	45
Cleobury Mortimer	572
Cheltenham	571
Codnor Park	477
Coleshill	140
Crewe	190, 427
Dalkeith	572
Derby	285
Dudley	91, 140, 285
Dundee, 45, 91, 140, 190, 236, 334,	428
Doncaster	523
Edinburgh, 45, 92, 237, 287, 334, 382, 525,	572
Enfield Lock	140
Exeter	429
Frome	45, 140, 237
Galashiels	190
Glasgow, 45, 92, 140, 190, 237, 287, 334, 382, 477,	525
Grantham	46, 191, 238, 334
Grantown	429, 477
Great Bridge	572
Great Grimsby	141
Great Yarmouth, 46, 92, 141, 192, 238, 287, 334, 429, 477, 526,	572
Halifax	92, 140, 572
Huddersfield	46, 287, 429
Keighley	46, 92, 382, 429, 477
Kidsgrove	93
King's Brompton	477
Leeds, 46, 140, 238, 287, 429, 478,	526
Leicester, 92, 140, 191, 238, 287, 429, 478, 526,	572
Liverpool	142, 478
London, 46, 93, 140, 191, 287, 334, 383, 430, 526,	573
Manchester	46, 191, 430
Middlesborough	142, 383
Mumbles	383, 478
Newtonshaw	430
Nedderton	93, 192
Newburgh	238
Nottingham, 47, 142, 191, 285, 383, 430, 527,	573
Newark	335
New Pitsligo	335
Oldham	239
Peterborough	142, 192, 383, 430
Ripley	47, 431, 527
Rock Ferry	335, 383, 431, 478, 527
Stathearn	47
Stockport, 94, 143, 288, 335,	528
Sale	93, 335
Scarborough	93, 479, 573
Sheffield, 93, 143, 239, 288, 335, 384, 431,	573
Swansea, 47, 192, 239, 430, 478, 527,	573
Tamworth	429
Tewkesbury	384

	PAGE.
Taunton	94, 479, 528
Walkerburn	192
Walsall	239
Wick	335
Watchet	384
Whitby	480, 528
York	335
Australia:—	
Beechworth	48, 288
Newtown	573
Warrnambool	48
Victoria	94
Wandiligong	528
Canada:—	
Toronto	95, 143, 239, 288, 574
Walkerton	143, 528, 574
Hamilton	480, 574
Peterborough	480, 528
Coburg	528
China:—	
Hong Kong	335, 384
New Zealand:—	
Invercargill	431
Caversham	574
United States:—	
Eagle Creek	48, 336
Baltimore	95, 192
Carrol	574
Flatonia	95
Lanesville	96, 432, 575
Rochester	96, 192, 336
Seneca Falls	96
Shenandoah	96
West Hoboken	96, 144, 432
Centre Point	192, 240, 336, 480
Bucyrus	240
Jefferson	240
Adeline	336
Burnet	336, 432, 574
Elmira	336, 432, 480
Waterloo	336
Campbeltown	384
Harvard	480
MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES:—	
Adam's Sin and Condemnation	57
Letter from Troy	64
List of 57 Subjects	65
The War Cloud	66
Difficult Passages	110
Adam and Christ: a parallel	114
The Obedience of Christ in relation to the Manifestation of God in Him	117, 271
Turkish Insolency and the Holy Land	130
Aids to Memory: the Books of the Bible	144
Trine Immersion	202
Winds of Doctrine	220
The Bradlaugh Discussion	231
Military Electric Lights	260
Austrian Bishop's Opinon of His Clergy	260
The Pillar of King Mesa	223
Milton's Friend and the Sabbath	275
A Congregationalist Minister becomes obedient to the Truth	313
Sin: its origin, effects, and destruction	352, 410, 451
Is it permissible to bear arms?	405
Index to <i>Eureka</i>	465
Deity Manifest in the Flesh	494
Acceptable Encouragement	39

	PAGE.
POETRY:—	
My Dead Companions	395
A Christadelphian's Dream	492, 546
PASSAGES EXPLAINED:—	
Gen. iii. 24	138
Ex. iii. 21, 22	403
" xxx. 54	259
" xxxii. 32, 33	10
Lev. xii. 28	451
Josh. xxiv.	312
1 Sam. ii.	461
2 Sam. xii. 31	463
Job xviii. 41	404
Ps. xxxvii. 5	10
" lxxii.	404
" cxxxiii.	311
Prov. viii.	462
" xi.	102
" xxv. 11	403
" xxxi. 10-31	404
" xxxi. 1-9	404
Ecc. vii.	311
Isa. vii. 14-16	283
" ix.	404
" xxxv.	404
" xxxv. 10	10
" xl.	404
Dan. xi.	284
Matt. ix. 36	403
" xxii. 11	378
" xx. 2	378
" vi. 24	378
" v. 7	404
" v. 1-12	102
" xix. 28	10
" viii. 12	10
Luke i. 35	139
" xii. 35	10
" iii. 23	285
John v. 26	370
" xiv. 2	403
" xiv.-xvii.	404
" v. 7-8	138
" vi. 62	138
" vi. 51	139
" xiv. 5	10
" xix. 23	10
Acts xxi. 15	403
" xv. 20-29	40
" xx.	462
Rom. v. 12-19	57
Eph. iv. 22	403
Phil. ii. 8	138
" iii. 7	403
Col. ii. 14	403
1 Tim. xxiv. 39	39
Heb. vi. 20	259
" vi. 19	259
" ix. 26	410
" vii. 12	434
" x. 38	10
" v. 1-10	102
" viii. 23	139
1 Pet. iv. 18	283
" i. 18	10
2 Pet. iii. 10	283
1 John iii. 8	352
Rev. i. 1	343
" xvi. 13, 14	284

The Christadelphian.

“He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.”—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 139.

JANUARY, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD AND THE BAPTISM THEREOF.

BY DR. THOMAS.

(Continued from page 537, vol. xii.)

“SPIRITS,” then, is a word apostolically used to designate the gifts of the Spirit of God; and those who undertook to teach by the Spirit. Of the former, there were “diversities;” and of the latter, two classes. The diversities in the aggregate made up the baptism of Holy Spirit, which was given for administrations and operations. These exhibitions of power were styled collectively, “The manifestation of the Spirit.” The powers were not given to any one for his own private benefit, but for the general use and benefit of the body of Christ; as it is written, “to every one is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the collective good”—*προς το συμμερον*. This is an important feature in the case. People who pretend to be the subject of Spirit-baptism can adduce

nothing else but their feelings, which all terminate in themselves. No one is profited by anything they pretend to have received. Not a single scriptural idea do they possess more than before their pretended baptism, nor have they a single power they had not before. They are as ignorant and perverse as ever, and as hostile to the truth, when laid before them, as Pagans. Not so with the apostolic believer. When he was baptized with Holy Spirit, he acquired wisdom and knowledge which was advantageous to all who lacked them; he had the gift of faith by which he could remove mountains, if the good of the body collectively required it; he could heal the sick; inwork powers; speak to the brethren to edification, exhortation, and comfort, no mean

accomplishment in an apostolic community. He could discern spirits, and so protect and warn the unlearned against the imposition of the false apostles that would certainly arise. He could speak the languages of the nations without previous study, and in them make known the wonderful works of the Deity: all these things the spiritually baptised could do for the benefit of those who were not so baptised, and of the Jews and heathen round about. Such a baptism as this nowhere exists upon earth in these times, yet every congregation of believers could glory in such an indwelling of the Deity among them by His Spirit in the days of Paul.—(Eph. ii. 22.) The want of this baptism is practically acknowledged by all “the names and denominations” of Babylon, in the establishment and endowment of theological factories for the preparation of juvenile pietists “for the work of the ministry,” which in their hands consists in manufacturing zig-zag manuscripts for the gallery critics—the grinding up of stale divinity into a new form—the reading or repeating from memory what pleases the money-power that sustains them, figuratively styled “preaching;” in uttering vain repetitions as the mouth of their flocks, who think heaven hears them for their much speaking, noisy and intoned; in giving out hymns; in administering ordinances subversive of the institutions of Christ; in platform exhibitions of cheap and sounding pietisms; holding spiritual sinecures at fat salaries; in leading the blind into the ditch; in ministering lying consolations to the dying on death beds and gallows; in exhorting, as military chaplains and so forth, disciples of the same creeds, names, and denominations to destroy one another with deadliest engines of slaughter; in burying the dead, marrying the living, and rhan-tizing babes, with impious formulas for a fee. They become “merchants in those things, and are made rich by them”—traders in “bodies and souls of men.”—(Rev. xviii. 11-15.) Such is the work of the ministry for which

they are prepared, not by baptism of Holy Spirit as in the days of old, but by storing their bewildered brains with heathen lumber from the classics and “bodies of divinity,” authorised by Rome, Oxford, Geneva, and all other divinity mills whose grinding is of like brand to these. The Spirit having spewed them out of his mouth (Rev. iii. 16) some fifteen centuries ago, because they were wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked, and would not repent, they have had no baptism of Spirit since. The Spirit has had nothing to do with them but to “fight against them with the sword of His mouth,” which, in the absence of Jesus, is “*the word*” from the mouths and pens of “faithful men who are able to teach others.” Finding themselves thus forsaken and repudiated, they have had recourse to what they call a “theological education” as a substitute.

But this factory system as a practical substitute for Spirit-baptism had no existence in the days of the apostles, and that it is utterly superfluous and unnecessary now, is proved by its failing to qualify men scripturally “for the work of the ministry” in the apostolic sense of the phrase, and in the fact that the most efficient teachers “of the truth as in Jesus” are, and have ever been, those who have never been milled in the factories of the Gentiles. In the days of the apostles, the belief and obedience of the truth, simply, constituted believers “saints,” but did not perfect them for “the edifying of the body of Christ.” The saints in general “occupied the room of the private” *ιδιωτων* (1 Cor. xiv. 16) until certain of them came to occupy the room of the public men by the gift of the Holy Spirit. This division of class resulted from baptism of spirit, which all were not permitted to receive. The case of Simon Magus proves this. We are told that “*through the laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Spirit was given,*” and that Simon, who had been baptised in water, saw this, but not having received the gift himself, he offered

to purchase it of Peter and John. They, however, not being clergymen nor bishops of the apostacy, refused to sell the baptismal gifts for money, and consequently he never obtained them, the moral pre-requisites being deficient.

The case of the Samaritan brethren clearly shows the pre-requisites to a baptism of spirit in all cases save that of the apostles and the house of Cornelius. Before receiving the Spirit it was necessary for the candidate

1. To believe the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.—(Acts viii. 12.)

2. To be buried with Christ by baptism into death (*Ibid.*); and

3. That the apostles, or some in-worker of powers like them, pray for the believer that he may receive it, and lay their hands on them.—(Verse 15, 17; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. 1-6.)

On the day of Pentecost the gift of Holy Spirit was promised to those who were added to the name of Jesus Christ by baptism. As they were about to return to remote places, where they would carry the gospel to Israel there, it is probable all the visitors to Jerusalem so returning would receive it, that through them God might confirm the Word when they preached it. But though promised to all such, the cases of the seven chosen to serve tables (Acts vi. 6) of the Samaritans, of Saul (Acts ix. 17), and of the twelve at Ephesus (Acts xix. 6), show that the divine appointment for imparting the Spirit was prayer and the imposition of the hands of the apostles, or of a presbytery of inspired men, or of an inspired individual believer, as Timothy. These elements of the appointment do not now exist among men. We have no apostles but false ones; and all the presbyteries, or elderships, are uninspired, and there is no individual on earth the imposition of whose hands is of any value in the premisses. A man must be a saint and must have the gifts with himself before he can impart them; and then even if he had

gifts, if among them he was deficient of the "*inworking of powers*," he could not transmit what he possessed to others. Philip could expel unclean spirits and heal the palsied and the lame, but he could not impart spirit-gifts to the baptised. The apostles had to be sent for to accomplish this.

Baptism of spirit, then, was only partially bestowed even upon the saints in the apostolic age. It was an outpouring of divine power upon certain of the saints having natural and moral qualifications fitting them for the administrative use of it. They were not only to be "faithful men," but "apt to teach," "able to teach others," "holding firmly according to the teaching of the faithful Word, that by sound instruction they might be able both to exhort and to convince opponents," and good rulers of their own houses.—(1 Tim. iii. 2, 4; 2 Ep. ii; Tit. i. 9.) Having these and certain other qualifications, they were considered eligible for baptism of Spirit by prayer and imposition of hands. They must be saints first, for no apostle nor presbytery, nor in-worker of powers, would lay hands upon sinners to impart divine power to them "for the work of the ministry." When the Laodicean apostasy, which now fills all "Christendom," as the heathen call their Babylonish system, came to be established, sinners laid hands upon sinners, as at this day, but notwithstanding all their prayers for the gifts and graces of the Spirit, no other spirit comes into manifestation but "the spirit of error" which strongly works in all "the children of disobedience"—the spirit of their own nature, "sin's flesh," in which "dwells no good thing," and which is, therefore, the devil-nature. It is with the spirit of this nature the false prophets of the apostasy are imbued. It is the devil-spirit kindled into ecclesiastical manifestation by the spiritual system of the world's own. Episcopal sinners of the Harlot "by law established" in England, "blasphemously styled "Right reverend fathers in God," or bishops, undertake to impart Holy Spirit to Oxford and

other theologically-bred juveniles by prayer and the imposition of their ungodly hands. That they are sinners and not saints is evident from the printed and stereotyped confessions they have read for centuries, called by themselves Common Prayer. Common enough it is, and as impious and valueless as it is common. In this very common prayer they remind the Lord every Sunday that they are miserable sinners. He knows that well, and that they have been such for ages, and are no better now; no nearer being saints than they were when they rallied round the royal adulterer and murderer, Henry VIII., when he rebelled against the Pope, because this arch-knave favoured the family interests of his Spanish wife rather than her husband's. These "miserable sinners," decorated with pompous titles as incense to the pride of life, undertake, we say, to impart God's Holy Spirit to Oxonian Bachelors and Masters of Arts according to the following printed formula: "Receive thou the Holy Ghost by the imposition of my hands for the work of a priest in the house of God: whosoever sins you remit they are remitted, and whosoever sins you retain they are retained; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

No; saints, and saints only, whose hearts have been prepared by faith are eligible to the baptism of Spirit. Christ ascended to the right hand of power that he might receive the gifts for his own brethren to whom alone he promised them. Paul, addressing the saints thus spiritually endowed, says, concerning the gifts, "unto every one of us is given the grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." The grace which John says came by Jesus Christ. "The law was given through Moses, the grace and the truth came through Jesus Christ." In Paul's quotation from the sixty-eighth Psalm, he shows that by "grace" he has reference to the gifts of the Spirit; for in the next sentence to that above quoted, he says, "wherefore he saith, ascending into heaven

he led captive captivity, and bestowed gifts upon men." He then indicates the "grace" or gifts bestowed by designating the saints who had received them by the official names they then bore. He styles these saints apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers; and referring to these well-known *spiritual*, or spiritually-endowed official brethren, found in all the assemblies of the saints, he says that the ascended and glorified Jesus "gave indeed the apostles, and the prophets, and the evangelists, and the pastors and the teachers:" that is, he gave to these who were first saints the gifts he had received from the Father on his ascension to glory, called in Acts i. 4, "the promise of the Father," which he had said he would send the apostles while they waited for it in Jerusalem (ver. 5; Jno. xvi. 7); he gave these gifts, I say, to qualify them for apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers.

Now, were all apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers? Did all the saints sustain these offices in the body of Christ? No person intelligent in the Word will affirm that they did. It is then certain that all the saints were not baptised with Holy Spirit, for Paul teaches that the grace was given "for the perfecting of the saints for a work of service for a building of the body of the Christ." The saints thus qualified were the builders Paul refers to in 1 Cor. iii. 10. In this place he styles himself "a wise architect," who had laid the foundation for an edifice upon which others were building: to whom he saith, "let every one take heed how he buildeth thereon." The saints in the aggregate were the building—the temple built for the Deity to dwell in through or by Spirit. The spirituals among the saints were the builders of this holy temple; nevertheless the temple was "a building of God," "a house not made with hands," because all the power of these spirituals for the work of building was from the Deity, and consisted in the truth they taught, which was from God, and which He

confirmed through the gifts He had bestowed upon them, so that they "were labourers together with God."

We may remark here, by the way, that the holy temple these co-labourers with the Deity were engaged in building in the apostolic age, has its holy and its most holy, after the pattern of the tabernacle in the wilderness, which was "a house made with hands." The building of "*the holy*" resulted in the body of Christ as manifested in Paul's day. This was "*the heavenly*," constituted of the holy ones, or saints, collectively. But "*the most holy*" is not yet manifested, nor will it be until the apocalypse of Jesus Christ in his glory. This most holy is "a house not made with hands, *aionion* in the heavens." *Aionion, αιωνιον*, that is, *belonging to the course* to which the things which are not seen pertain. When this house is built (and the builder of all things is God), it will be constituted of those saints only who in the "present evil world" walk in the truth. Those saints, who since they became saints, "walk after the flesh," will be purged out of the flock, and never be reckoned among "the most holy." Concerning these the apostle says, "if ye walk after the flesh ye shall die." This is the death they shall be subject to after their resurrection. They shall die out from among the most holy, and be swallowed up of mortality, being found naked. These are "the wood, hay and stubble" which builders even in Paul's day built upon the foundation he had laid. The saints who shall constitute the most holy are "the gold, and silver, and the precious stones" of Zion, who, when the kingdom comes to her, shall be her foundations, windows and borders.—(Isa. liv. 11-13; Mic. iv. 8.) The present house not made with hands is a mingled people, in which the faithful "groan, being burdened; not for that they would be unclothed," or reduced to dust and ashes, "but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

But "the day shall declare it." The day when the manifestation of

the work of the builders shall be made. "The spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets."—(1 Cor. xiv. 32.) That is, the gifts called "spirits" could be used or abused by those on whom they were bestowed. If they were abused, or misused, in disorder and the confirmation of error, the Holy Spirit would be grieved. Therefore, because of this property, Paul exhorted the spirituals, saying, "grieve not the Holy Spirit of the Deity by which ye are sealed for a day of redemption."—(Eph. iv. 30.) But some did greatly grieve it, and went out from the apostolic community, and became "false prophets," or spirits. These became builders of wood, hay and stubble upon the foundation, while other builders, whose teaching was scriptural, sometimes unwittingly placed on the foundation "false brethren," who crept in at unawares. All this building work is unprofitable for the Master's use, who, when the day of declaration shall arrive, will be "as a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap:" for the prophet saith, "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and who may abide the day of his coming? And who shall stand when he appeareth? This day, now near at hand, will declare the work of all, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every one's work of what sort it is. If any one's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any one's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Builders and the built will all be subjected to the fiery ordeal of the divine scrutiny, and those only who can stand the searching examination will be saved. If a spiritual, or teacher endowed with the gifts, have built a thousand upon the foundation, and seven hundred and fifty of them turn out to be mere wood, hay and stubble, he will only receive a reward for the two hundred and fifty jewels fit for the Master's use in the most holy "*in the heavens*" of the millennial age. This loss of his work, however, will not affect his

salvation, if he be found to have held fast the name and not to have denied the faith of Jesus; holding on to the truth, and walking in it, in the love of it, "He shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

"The grace" designed for the saints, purposed to come through Jesus Christ, was not intended to be revealed all at one time. The grace, or gift of Holy Spirit, was to be rained upon the saints at two different periods. The Spirit in Joel shows this. "Be glad," saith He, "ye children of Zion, and rejoice in Yahweh your Elohim, for He hath given you the former rain moderately, and He will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain, and the latter rain the first month." The original of this text is quite remarkable. The Hebrew reads, "For he hath given to you the Teacher of Righteousness, and he shall cause to descend for you a rain; a teacher and a latter rain in the first month."—(Chap. ii. 23.) This Teacher hath been given in the person of Jesus, and the Father who gave him caused to descend upon the children of Zion, the saints, "a rain," when on Pentecost He poured out His Spirit upon the apostles and their brethren. This, as the substitute for Jesus, guided them into all the truth and showed them things to come. Christ is "the Lord the Spirit," "a quickening Spirit;" and from him Holy Spirit-rain came in the third month, or fifty days after the passover and crucifixion. But there is to be "a teacher and a latter rain in the first month." That is in the month Nisan, or when the passover shall be fulfilled in the kingdom of God—(Ezek. xlv. 21; Luke xxii. 15-18.) The result of the appearing of this teacher in the time of the latter rain will be that the sons of Zion will "eat in plenty and be satisfied, and praise the name of Yahweh, and hear Elohim that hath dealt wondrously with them; and *His people shall never be ashamed.* And they shall know that I am in the midst of Israel; and that I—the Spirit made flesh and glorified, and so both Lord and Christ, personal and mystical

—am Yahweh your Elohim, and none else; and *my people shall never be ashamed.*" But the people of Yahweh, political and spiritual, are now put to shame. Israel after the flesh is a byword and a proverb; and so is Israel after the spirit, or the saints, who have been, are, and will be prevailed against by the enemy until the Ancient of Days shall be revealed in power and great glory. Joel's prediction, then, has not yet been fulfilled, and the latter rain of the spirit in the first month is yet in the future.

Now, when it shall have come to pass that Israel and the saints are no more put to shame by their enemies, "the latter rain in the first month" will descend. For immediately after predicting that His people shall never be put to shame, the Spirit in Joel saith, "and it shall come to pass *afterward* I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Peter referred to this prophecy of the baptism of Spirit, and said of the outpouring on Pentecost, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." It was "the earnest of the Spirit," not the full measure of it; "the earnest of the inheritance," not the inheritance itself. Thus Paul saith to the spirituals, "He that hath anointed us (or christened us with spirit) is the Deity, who hath also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (2 Cor. i. 21); and again, "in Christ also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance for a redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of His glory."—(Eph. i. 13.) The remarks of Peter by no means limited Joel's prophecy to the third month of the year of the ascension of Jesus. Peter referred more especially to the Teacher or the Comforter, not to "the latter rain in the first month." Joel's prophecy covers the whole ground in saying, "he will cause to come down for you a rain;" not a continuing rain for eighteen hundred or more years from the descent on Pentecost to the second advent of Christ; but a copious shower in the Apostolic age, followed by a long, dry

time, in which everything is parched up; and then, when this drought shall end, "the latter rain in the first month."

The spirit-rain of the Pentecostian era was bestowed upon certain of the saints to qualify them officially, that they might exercise the gifts for the public benefit—"for the building up of the body of the Christ." Paul tells us how long this arrangement was to continue. "Till," says he, "we shall come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God—into a perfect man; into a measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ." This limits the gifts to the above apostolic saints; that is to those con-

temporary with the apostles, but who may have nevertheless outlived them many years. He testifies to this effect very plainly in 1 Cor. xiii. 8, where he speaks of the cessation of the baptismal gifts of prophesying, of tongues, and of the word of knowledge; "prophecies," says he, "shall be brought to an end; tongues shall be caused to cease; knowledge shall pass away." This was finally accomplished when the Spirit spewed the Laodicean community out of His mouth. The Spirit-baptism was withheld because its gifts were abused, as every other good has been that has been committed to the guardianship of flesh and blood.

(To be continued.)

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

By F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

[The statement in November that Saul reigned 40 years was an error.]

REFERENCE TABLET NO. 113.

TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

Christ is the true life-giving bread sent down from heaven, and the antitype of the hidden manna laid up in the ark of the testimony.—(John vi.; Col. iii. 3; Rev. ii. 17.)

Christ is the true propitiatory and antitypical mercy seat for our offences.—(1 John ii. 2.)

Christ is the antitypical sheaf of first-fruits (1 Cor. xv. 20), and afterwards, "in their own order," his brethren, at his coming.—(1 Cor. xv. 23; Rev. xiv. 4.)

Christ is the antitype of the veil of the temple which is his flesh.—(Heb. x. 20.)

Christ is the true circumcision, (which is of the heart and without hands), of which his brethren are partakers in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh.—(Col. ii. 11; Phil. iii. 3.)

Christ is the true Melchizedek, being both King of Righteousness and King of Peace, and also Priest of the Most High God, having neither priestly pedigree nor change of priesthood.—(Heb. vii. 1-3.)

Christ as the tabernacle of the indwelling Deity and Father, was the anti-Mosaic temple.—(John ii. 19-22.)

Christ was the true Paschal Lamb for the taking away of sin, slain in shadowy

prefiguration from the foundation of the world.—(1 Cor. v. 7; John i. 29.)

As the child of promise and Spirit-begettal, Christ was the antitype of Isaac.

As eaten up with the zeal of Jehovah's house, and as a shepherd feeding Israel his flock, and as a "man of war," subjugating their enemies, Christ is the true "beloved" after God's own heart, David second and David's Lord.

Christ as the man of rest and peace, who is to build the temple of Jehovah, is the antitype of Solomon.

As the antitype is greater than the type, so we have mention made of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle," the "greater than Solomon," the "true bread," the "figures of the true," the "true tabernacle," the "more excellent ministry," a "better covenant," "better promises," a "better hope," the "glory that excelleth," the "better thing."—(Heb. xi. 40-7, 19; viii. 6; ix. 24; 2 Cor. iii. 11.)

Christ is the "spiritual meat," the "spiritual drink," and the "spiritual rock;" of which the "corn of heaven" and the Horeb waters were the type.—(1 Cor. x. 3, 4.)

Adam was the "figure (Greek *typos*, type) of him that was to come" (Christ) in that he was "Son of God," the beginning of a race, and crowned with glory, honour, and dominion over all the works of Jehovah's hands.—(Psalm viii. 6-8; Rom. v. 14.)

The "eight souls saved by water" was a like figure (Greek, *antitupon*, antitype) to baptism, which doth now also save us.—(1 Pet. iii. 21.)

Timothy was a type of the speech, conduct, love, spirit, faith and purity, to which believers are required to conform. This is a good type to study, as it is calculated to enlarge the heart as well as expand the mind.—(1 Tim. iv. 12.)

The lusting, murmuring, and God-tempting by the children of Israel, and the evil that befel them as a punishment for their idolatry and unbelief, is a type of the temptations and judgment to which the believers stand related: the first for the trial of their faith, and the second for the destruction of the disobedient.—(1 Cor. x. 5-12.)

Titus was a pattern or type of the uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, and sound speech which becomes all those who are the called by the gospel to God's kingdom and glory.—(Tit. ii. 6-8.)

For the counterpart of the "garments of glory and beauty" worn by Aaron, we have the "beauty for ashes" (uncorruptibility) of Isaiah, the priests "clothed with salvation" of David, and the "fashioned like to his glorious body" of Paul, as the habiliments of splendour in which the Christ-body will officiate as "priests unto God" in the age to come.—(Rev. v. 10.)

As the correspondent 'o the "ark of the testimony," we have Jesus, in whom is magnified the law of Jehovah, and in whom it is Yea and Amen; and in whom "our life is hid," and in whom began the first buddings of abiding spring and ever-green immortality.

The non-muzzling of the ox which trod out the corn, and the partaking of the things of the temple by those who ministered thereat under the law, had a teaching beyond itself, to the effect that he who plougheth should plough in hope, and he that thrasheth in hope should be a partaker of his hope; or, in other words, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.—(1 Cor. ix. 7-14.)

Those whom God filled with the Spirit of wisdom, understanding and knowledge, to devise cunning works in gold and silver, and brass, and precious stones, and timber, and all the furniture of the tabernacle, have their counterpart in those whom God endowed with the Spirit in the first century for the upbuilding and beautifying of the true tabernacle.—(Ex. xxxi. 1-11; 1 Cor. xii.)

The correspondent to the anointings with oil is the anointing with the truth and the Spirit, by which those who believe are Christed and sanctified, and made one with the Son and the Father.—(1 John ii. 27.)

The analogy to the baptism of the children of Israel into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, is suggested by the baptism of water and spirit which the believers received in the days of the apostles, or the being born out of water and out of the Spirit, by which the true Israel are first inducted into Christ, and afterwards perfected in him at the resurrection.

Christ was the antitype of the Mosaic altar of sacrifice.—(Heb. xiii. 10.)

The burning of the bodies of the beasts outside the camp was counterparted in Christ's "suffering without the gate," and again in the fellowship of his reproach by his Jewish disciples, who for the truth's sake, became, as it were, outlawed from the community.—(Heb. xiii. 11-13.)

REFERENCE TABLET No. 114.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF LIFE.

Jehovah is styled the "Living God," in contrast to the idols of the heathen, which have mouths but speak not; eyes, but see not; ears, but hear not; and neither have they any breath in their nostrils.—(Psalm cxxxv. 15-18.)

Man is called a "living soul," in contrast to what Moses elsewhere calls a "dead soul." *i. e.* a dead body.

God is spoken of as "the King eternal, immortal and invisible," in contrast to "mortal man," whose life is a "vapour," and whose "foundation is the dust."

The Deity is spoken of as the "uncorruptible God," in contrast to "corruptible man."—(Rom. i. 23.)

A little error spoken or written unwittingly for once, is not nearly so dangerous and mischievous as a great truth continually and unremittently served up in undue proportion to the rest of the works of God.

The coming of the Lord bears the same destructive relation to the Gentile world as the coming of Titus against Jerusalem did to the Mosaic Kosmos

God's judgments often overtake men in

this life; if they despise or abuse His goodness, or trifle with precious privileges, or turn goatish in their attitude towards any of His chosen, they need not be surprised if He turn their blessings into curses."

No community of men on earth have a greater or more important work in hand than the saints; they may only neglect it at their peril.

Those who serve the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth cannot be moved away from the hope of the gospel; while such as serve themselves and their own interests are easily torn up by the roots.

Those will be strong when the wind blows who have attended daily to the process of "grounding and settling;" while those who have attended only to the claims of business, will stand the best chance of being blown off the ground.

Those who are after the flesh, cannot read those who are after the Spirit if they try ever so; but such as walk in the Spirit have large insight into the springs of action which create the phenomena which characterizes a mere professor of the truth.

As a tree is known by its fruit; and as men do not gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles so in the truth, you need not look for the fruits of the Spirit on a thorn bush.

The fruits of the spirit are such things as are prompted directly by the truth, and purely in its interests; the growing of such fruit requires the application of a very diligent and competent husbandry.

From amongst the professors of the truth the Lord will search out such as, like David, have had an affection for the house of God, or who, like himself, have had a zeal for the truth equal to being eaten up of it. None who are otherwise-minded need seriously hope for recognition.

There are divine angels (Acts vii. 30) and human angels (Rev. ii. 1), as there are also gods mortal (Psalm lxxxii. 6, 7) and gods immortal (Psalm xcvi. 7); so there are terrestrial bodies and celestial bodies; and, as well, there is man flesh, and beast flesh, and fish flesh, and bird flesh: all what they are by the will of the Creator, in whom they all equally live and move and have their being.—(1 Cor. xv. 39.)

They shall have no stumbling-block that love Jehovah's law.—(Ps. cxix. 165.)

They only shall prosper finally who love Jerusalem.—(Psalm cxxii. 6.)

REFERENCE TABLET No. 115.

DEATH.

Death is the legacy which Adam left in the world as the inheritance of all his posterity.

Death came by sin and after sin; and both came by one man as the penalty of disobedience.—(Rom. v. 12, 13.)

Death is an enemy; the very last foe that is to be destroyed from off the face of the earth. Its dominion is the whole world; its king is sin; its appointment is divine; its duration is contemporary with flesh and blood; its successful rival is Christ, the Prince of Life, who holds the keys of all its dismal chambers, and who himself escaped its grim grasp, as the pledge of final victory to all who tread in his steps.—(1 Cor. xv. 26.)

Death returns men to the earth as they were before they had any being, and the spirit or breath in their nostrils to Him "in whose hand is the breath of all mankind." When thus resolved, they are "as though they had not been," and, apart from resurrection, indeed, they will never be any more.—(Eccles. xii. 7.)

To those who by the belief and obedience of the gospel have made to themselves a friend in Christ, death is but the unconscious interval which divides them from His presence.—(1 Thess. iv. 13-18.)

The symbol of sin and death is the subtle lying serpent which was contemporary with our first parents' habitation of Eden. Christ has, as it were, taken the sting out of it so that it cannot do permanent harm to those who are his; it can only, as it were, bruise them in the heel, or trip them up for a temporary period, whereas itself is destined to be bruised in the head and finally destroyed.—(Heb. ii. 14.)

The portals of death once entered and the doors barred, there is no way out until Christ comes with the keys.—(Rev. i. 18.)

The "good warfare" behind and the "blessed hope" before, are the only real and solid comfort in the hour of dissolution.—(1 Thess. iv. 18.)

Death and resurrection are mutually explanatory the one of the other; the one represents going into the grave, the other, coming out of it. Both are equally divine institutions, and related to and governed by the statutes revealed in the Scriptures.—(1 Cor. xv. 21.)

To live is to stand; to die, is to fall or

fail; to be resurrected is to stand again; while the condition intervening between the one and the other, is a state as utterly unconscious as that which preceded man's first creation from the ground.—(Eccles. ix. 5.)

Men need to prepare for the coming of the Lord rather than death, because the first event may happen first; and if not so, death decides nothing, and introduces us to nothing, but rather turns us into nothing until the Lord come to judge his house.

The conditions upon which renewed permanent existence is predicated are a faithfulness to Christ and the brotherhood, which only stops short with death or the coming of the Lord.—(1 Ev. ii. 10.)

REFERENCE TABLET No. 116.

SELECTIONS.

"Blot out of thy book."—(Ex. xxxii. 32, 33.) The families of each tribe were written in the public registers. This was the book of life, and when anyone died, his name was considered as blotted out.—(Rev. xx. 12, 15; xxi. 27; xxii. 19.)

Coat "without seam."—(John xix. 23.) Josephus says of the garment or coat of the high priest, "that this vesture was not composed of two pieces, nor was it sewed together upon the shoulder and the sides, but it was one long vestment, so woven as to have an aperture for the neck. It was also parted where the hands were to come out." It seems that the Lord Jesus had also a coat made in a similar manner.—(Ex. xxxix. 22.)

Redeemed "not with silver and gold."—(1 Pet. i. 18.) The allusion is to the redemption of the people of Israel, and of the first-born by shekels.—(Ex. xxx. 12, 18; Num. iii. 46, 48.)

Thrones.—"Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones."—(Matt. xix. 28.) The ancient heads of the tribes sat near the throne, and assisted the king in his judgments.

"Commit thy way."—(Psalm xxxvii. 5.) Literally, "roll thy way" upon the Lord. The camel lies down till his load is rolled upon him.

"Outer darkness." Nuptial banquets were usually made in the night, and celebrated with many torches and various lights: hence the expression for those who were excluded being in "outer darkness"—(Matt. viii. 12.)

"Many mansions."—(John xiv. 2.) An allusion to the numerous apartments in royal palaces.

"Lights burning." It was the common custom of servants to sit up to wait their master's return when absent at night.—(Luke xii. 35.)

"Joy upon their heads."—(Isaiah xxxv. 10.) It was the custom among the ancients to wear a wreath or chaplet of flowers in times of festivity and in triumphal processions.

"Draw back."—(Heb. x. 38.) The original is very expressive: "to sneak or slink away."

REFERENCE TABLET No. 117.

TESTIMONIALS

To the veracity and faithfulness of God and the excellence of His Word.

"I love Thy commandments above gold, yea, above fine gold; therefore, I esteem all Thy precepts concerning all things to be right."—(DAVID.)

"The ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them; but the transgressors shall fall therein."—(HOSEA.)

"The Lord will be the hope of His people, and the strength of the children of Israel."—(JOEL.)

The Lord is the true God; He is the living God, and an everlasting king; at His wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide His indignation.—(JEREMIAH.)

To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgiveness.—(DANIEL.)

Now, therefore, I pray Thee, if I have found grace in Thy sight, shew me now Thy way that I may know Thee that I may find grace in Thy sight; and consider that this nation is Thy people.—(MOSES.)

Let all Thine enemies perish, O Lord; but let them that love Thee be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might.—(DEBORAH.)

"The Lord God is my strength, and He will make my feet like hind's feet, and He will make me to walk upon mine high places."—(HABAKKUK.)

"When my soul fainted within me, I remembered the Lord, and my prayer came in unto Thee, into Thine holy temple. They who observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy. But I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving. Salvation is of the Lord."—(JONAH.)

"The Lord is my portion, saith my soul, therefore, I will hope in Him. The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him. It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord."—(JEREMIAH.)

"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."—(JOB.)

"Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe His prophets, so shall ye prosper."—(JEHOSHAPHAT.)

"I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day."—(PAUL.)

All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever."—(PETER.)

"This is the message which we have heard of Him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all."—(JOHN.)

"The Lord giveth wisdom; out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He layeth up sound wisdom for

the righteous; He is a buckler to them who walk uprightly. He keepeth the path of judgments and preserveth the way of His saints."—(SOLOMON.)

"I will look unto the Lord; I will wait for the God of my salvation. My God will hear me."—(MICAH.)

"Thou art the Lord God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham, and foundest his heart faithful before Thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites to his seed, and hast performed Thy words; for Thou art righteous."—(NEHEMIAH.)

"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."—(JESUS.)

"Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? Behold now I have taken it upon me to speak unto the Lord who am but dust and ashes."—(ABRAHAM.)

"The Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regardeth not persons nor taketh reward. He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger in giving him food and raiment."—(MOSES.)

FORTY STRAY-SHOTS FROM A NORMAN CROSS-BOW.

- 1.—If thou givest, men will love thee; if thou lendest, men will shun thee.
- 2.—Art thou covetous, buy Turkish, and thou shalt impoverish thine house.
- 3.—The stentorian burly priest, who can fill a cathedral or drain a tankard, doth command the ear of fools.
- 4.—If thou wilt rule in the age, rule well in thine house.
- 5.—Judge thyself rather than others.
- 6.—Let thine ear be opened to wisdom, but closed to folly.
- 7.—Let thy mouth be closed rather than thine eyes when thou walkest.
- 8.—My son, if thou be tempted, dally not, for hesitation will carry thee to consent.
- 9.—They who speak much oft say little, and they who speak little, much.
- 10.—To curse is easy, to overcome is hard.
- 11.—If thou thinkest well, solitude will suit thee, but if others do thy thinking, thou art ill alone.
- 12.—Courtly lying and diplomacy are twins.
- 13.—Let thy speech rather than thine head be pithy.
- 14.—A wise man knoweth more than he hath forgotten, a fool hath forgotten more than he knoweth.

-
- 15.—Youth's contour must be lost in the decrepitude of age.
 16.—Canst benefit thy race, benefit it.
 17.—Look for wisdom under silver roofs, in tenements of clay, and thou shalt not always find her.
 18.—Ink and blood, oft liquid devils.
 19.—A man's heart inclined to covetousness becometh spiritually ossified.
 20.—Justice overridden by mercy is a feeble jade.
 21.—He who speaks should teach; he who listens should learn.
 22.—Wisdom inclines her ear and folly runs open-mouthed.
 23.—In the stream of death, thou canst not paddle thy coffin to the ocean of life.
 24.—In the battle for life, take not the sword by the blade.
 25.—Yesterday is gone, to-day is barely ours, to-morrow is no one's.
 26.—Better till than cudgel thy brains.
 27.—Be heart-strong rather than head-strong.
 28.—Let thy tongue be well harnessed and discreetly driven.
 29.—Oh folly! thy name is death.
 30.—If thou wouldest stand well in judgment, walk well in life.
 31.—Eccentricity courts attention; weds folly, and breeds suspicion.
 32.—A sharp retort for the chemist, a clear head for the sophist, but a soft answer to parry wrath.
 33.—The vein of conceit crieth for the lancet of dissection.
 34.—Wisdom armed with a shovel will bury a fool with a sceptre.
 35.—Bound to the grave, man needs no pilot, for shipwreck is impossible.
 36.—Bound for the kingdom, man needs a pilot, for shipwreck is probable.
 37.—Be not righteous overmuch; a long visage is but the imperfect sin-cloak of the sycophant.
 38.—Immortality needs no physician.
 39.—As the shoe of the horse is smitten into shape by the hammer, so must affliction shape the soul of man.
 40.—Write a proverb and thou shalt value Solomon's.
-

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN
 ECCLESIA, No. 73.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

"So much the more as ye see the day approaching:" these are words that increase in their emphasis as each month rolls by. The signs of the approaching end multiply as the end approaches. The Eastern Question, spread out on the political sky, tells us, above all other signs, that the Lord is near. That ques-

tion is entering upon a transformation phase, which is likely to see England in her appointed position in Egypt and the Holy Land. When this happens, we may expect the long knocking at the door to cease, and the door itself to open and the Lord to appear; for England, in that position, forms part of the adventual tableaux.

The long talk of the Lord's coming will end in the event itself, and that end is close upon us, though how close we cannot exactly say. The great prophetic periods are nearly all elapsed; and the tokens are visible on every hand to the eyes able to see, but the exact place in the latter-day programme at which the Lord appears to his house is unknown. We are like a ship at the end of a long voyage. We have traversed the great ocean for many months, letting the months stand for the centuries that have passed since Christ's departure. We know by the general reckonings that we are not far from land; and our conclusion on this head is confirmed by the altered appearance of the sea, the shallowness of the soundings, the land-mists on the horizon, and certain other tokens in the shape of birds, sea-weed, &c ; but exactly how many miles we are from port, we do not know. We know we are sufficiently near that the pilots may come in sight at any moment.

Such a situation is full of an interest almost painful. The effect of it is to make us look more earnestly than ever in the face of the great principles that affect our relation to the Coming Deliverer. These are always brought before us in the symbols once more before us on the table; and generally in a more or less direct way in the Scripture portions read. Let us look at those a little on the present occasion for comfort; for the Word of God is intended for comfort as well as reproof. For everything there has a season and a time: all things by turns. Yet in looking for the comfort, let us never forget that the comfort is for them only who are in a position to lay hold of it, in having humbled themselves entirely before the God of all comfort in His crucified Son, and given themselves freely to him a living sacrifice, and in being of those who do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to the Father by him in everything; and who run in

the way of His commandments. Assuming this foundation to exist, as proclaimed by our participation of the emblems of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord, let us look at the consolation there is for those who have fled for refuge to the hope set before us in the gospel.

It is brought before us in a certain form in the words of the psalm: "The Lord God is a sun and shield: the Lord will give grace and glory: no good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly." Here we have a most encouraging picture of the kindness of Him with whom we have to do. This character is the central glory of revelation. We fail, perhaps, at all times to remember it sufficiently. Many things help to cloud it from our view. Our weakness, our shortcomings, our pre-occupations in other directions, the weariness of the constant fight of faith, and other things, prevent us from realising as constantly as we might, that the Eternal Father, who invites us to Himself by Christ, is full of tenderness and compassion, and overflowing with lovingkindness to such as keep His covenant, and even abounding in long-suffering and goodness towards those who are far from Him. Our failure in this respect is part of the weakness of our present nature; but our failure to apprehend the fact does not interfere with the fact. God is love, even if we faint and fail. The everlasting hills are not endangered when we grow tired and sleepy. The strength of God is in no way diminished when we die. So His lovingkindness is none the less because we forget. Yea, it operates sometimes in the inverse ratio of our weakness. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them who fear Him; for He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are but dust." He loved us while we were yet enemies. He provided His Son to die while death and darkness reigned throughout the

world; He raised him when none comprehended the loving mystery. He established this propitiatory—this meeting point of reconciliation—while we yet wandered far from Him in disregard and alienation; not that He required to be propitiated; not that he needed reconciliation. The kindness was with Him; the advance was from Him; it was our reconciliation that was sought by “God who was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.” In Christ crucified He gave us the declaration of His righteousness, that bowing down before this, and identifying ourselves with it in baptism, we might exalt His holiness and remember His forgiveness and friendship. All this was arranged before we knew anything about it; and the goodness that contrived this kindness is as great to-day as before it was announced by the apostolic ministration to the world. “His mercy endureth for ever.” Its reality and its greatness will be fully manifest when we attain unto the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.” We shall then see the full meaning of Paul’s words: “He hath raised us up together and made us sit together in heavenly places, that *in the ages to come* he might shew *the exceeding riches of His grace, in His kindness toward us* through Christ Jesus.”—(Eph. ii. 6, 7.) Well might the apostles, to whom the ministry of reconciliation was entrusted, entreat men to be reconciled to God. The mode of the reconciliation is contrived on such a principle as that His glory is the upshot of it in the mouth of everyone reconciled; but individual well-being (in the most exquisite form it is possible to conceive of it) is none the less the result to them on this account. In fact, their individual well-being is all the more glorious because realised on the foundation of God’s exaltation. It has been well said that the highest glory of God is the supremest good of man. We

see it in measure even now, but in the day of the consummated purpose, we shall see it in a manner that hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive.

It is profitable to let the mind rest thus in the contemplation of what God has revealed concerning His goodness. It is a stay and a comfort and a defence in the present time of evil. It is a star of hope in the midnight sky, a great uplifting power in the present depressing animal state of existence. It acts with the mighty influence of well-founded hope, purifying and ennobling the mental man, and saving us from the slavery of petty temporal life. It is a soothing balm and a stimulating cordial. It comes closer even than hope; it gives faith in a present beneficence. It is a pledge of present goodness. God is a sun and a shield even now. It is to the present time peculiarly that these same words apply. They were written concerning those who walk uprightly in a time of evil; in the ages to come, there will be no evil to be protected from. It is now, when the wicked walk on every side, and when snares through all our way are strewn, that righteous men most need the comfort of the fact that the Lord God is a sun and shield. What an expressive figure it is! How cheerless and gloomy and unwholesome is the earth without the sun. Let the sun arise, and what a change takes place! He seems to fill the expanse with an ocean of light and life, in which we bathe with sensations of exquisite delight. There is healing and joy and beauty in his beams. Such is God, and more: a shield also. In the finest sunlight, violence might assail or the beast of prey devour. Defence is needed, therefore, to complete the picture. If God defend, no evil can befall. Jesus teaches us to pray for this: “Deliver us from evil.” But let us judge wisely in the matter. A father who defends his child continually from mortal calamity may himself inflict upon him pain by the

rod, or assign him for his good a part to fulfil which will be irksome or even painful; the child would judge a wrong judgment if he were to say his father did not act a beneficent part because he subjected him to chastisement and hard tasks. So we must not say that because God is a sun and a shield to those who walk uprightly, nothing but prosperity will be their lot. True blessing may require them to be put through sharp adversity. Every case must be judged by its issue. A man flourishing in this life to the loss of life eternal, is not blessed. If in order to guide a man into the kingdom of God a crooked path is needed, then God shows Himself a sun and shield in twisting his path for him: a sun in shining upon him unto life; a shield in fencing him from those circumstances that would be fatal to his steps. This is a most important discrimination. Apart from it, many mistakes will be made. The psalmist himself gives us an illustration of this. He says "My feet were almost gone; my steps had well-nigh slipped; for I was envious at the foolish when I saw the prosperity of the wicked, . . . until I went into the sanctuary of God: then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places." It is very natural to argue that prosperity is an evidence of divine favour and adversity the reverse; but it is often far from correct. God does sometimes prosper the righteous, as in the case of Joseph in Egypt; and, in the final sense, there is nothing but prosperity in reserve for Joseph's class, and nothing but adversity and ruin for the accursed of God; but in the present provisional and preliminary state, trouble is more frequently the portion of the chosen of God than the reverse—the explanation being that trouble is a necessary part of the process by which they are developed for the endless ages of blessedness to come after. It is in this relation of things that we comprehend Paul's doctrine of

chastisement: "What son is he whom the Father chasteneth not? If ye be without chastisement, whereof all (the sons) are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons." "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." The practical application of all these principles lies here: "ALL things (good things and evil things) work together for good to them who love God; who are the called according to His purpose." God knows when the good things are safe and when the evil things are needed; and the scriptural attitude is to accept, with a reverential submission, whatever comes; if good, with thanksgiving; if evil, with resignation. It would be altogether a mistake to assume that goodness only will be our lot, or that God regards us not if He suffer evil to happen.

Job is ever a helpful illustration on this point. A man of the thoroughly approved stamp, God overthrew him in all his affairs without letting him know that he was being subjected to a test. Job, while asserting his integrity, took it all in submission, on the ground that God was supreme and did as He willed, and that man, as a created being, had no room to murmur if evil as well as good were his lot. In this Job took the right ground; for his judgment of the case was divinely endorsed as against that of his three friends, who argued that because Job had fallen into evil, therefore, he must have been unrighteous. Now, why was Job's case recorded? Like all the other ancient examples, it was "written for our instruction; 'it happened to them for ensamples (to us.)'—(1 Cor. x. 11.) If so, it follows that we may sometimes be put to a similar proof if we are worthy of the test. Consequently, we shall argue wrongly if we say God has forsaken us when something has gone wrong, or that things will always and necessarily go well with us. Can we expect to be better off in these things than the

servants of God who have gone before? And what is their history? One and all, they came through sore trouble. The Lord himself was the greatest sufferer of all, and is it not written, "We must suffer with him?" Nay is it not the very characteristic of the great assembly of which we hope to form a part that they came out of "great tribulation?" Paul told the disciples that "we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." We do not live in the days of their tribulation, but we must not marvel if we have our share, peculiar to our own times. It is a necessity if we are ever to be worth anything in the Master's service. What preparation is a bed of roses for the great muster of those who have been tried and purified and made white?

There is one form of suffering with Christ which is in every man's reach—nay, in his very bosom—who has the root of the matter within him. It is referred to in the very psalm that tells us that "the Lord God is a sun and a shield." It is expressed in these words: "My soul longeth, yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord My heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." "How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts." There are no literal "tabernacles" of divine institution towards which we can set our hearts in strong desire as David did; but the feeling that led David in that channel dwells deeply in every mind that is kin with David. It is a craving for the manifestation of God and the delights of his worship. It is a hunger and a thirst after righteousness, as Jesus expresses it. Hunger and thirst are due to the absence of the objects of their desire. This is just the present condition of things spiritual. Famine prevails. The world is without God, whether we regard the vulgar masses or the high places of refined society. They are very busy, most of them, and tolerably honest and neighbourly (though

not too much of that), but "God is not in all their thoughts." "They desire not the knowledge of His ways." They, therefore, "lie" in wickedness according to the scriptural standard, which is the only standard in vogue with spiritual men. Even wickedness, in the grosser sense, is in the ascendant. Human aims, in all the walks of life, are governed by the lowest instincts. To selfish objects every high principle and noble consideration is sacrificed. Men everywhere labour with a diligence, unscrupulous as to means (so as they keep out of the clutches of the law), for their own selfish behoof, and millions are trampled in the gutter, with blasphemy against God and the execration of man on their lips. The world is a great wilderness: a dry and parched land, wherein there is no water. There is a day coming when it will be said, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." Of this tabernacle of glory in the future age, the tabernacle of Mosaic pitching was typical. David's heart on the type—ours or the antitype—join together from the same feeling, and say "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts:" and from the same sense of present desolation we groan together, heart and flesh crying out for the living God. This made up the principal part of the sufferings of Christ. In the midst of much people, he was as a sparrow on the house-top—a pelican in the wilderness—alone in the surrounding desolation. This is an experience that continues for every son of God. There are plenty of people and plenty of activity going on, but neither the people nor what they are doing has any interest for those who are Christ's. In this respect we suffer with him, even if we are not the objects of direct persecution. We are not at liberty to unite with the present world as regards its aims and principles and pleasures. We do not belong to it if we belong to Christ;

for he expressly said "I am not of this world," and he affirmed the same fact of his disciples, saying, "Ye are not of this world." There are some who say "That was all very well for Christ and his apostles, but we are not Christ nor his apostles." Those who speak in this style give evidence that they are yet strangers and foreigners, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; for the house of God is one, and the principle appertaining to one part belongs to all. John says "He that saith he abideth in him, *ought himself so to walk EVEN AS HE WALKED;*" and Paul tells us as concerning his own case, that he obtained mercy that Christ might set him forth "for a pattern to them that should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting."—(1 Tim. i. 16.) He also plainly commands us to be followers of him as he was of Christ.—(1 Cor. xi. 1.) From this it will appear how unscriptural and dangerous is that style of talk which would seek to excuse modern believers from aiming at the standard exhibited in Christ and the apostles. There is no other saving standard. If we fail of this, we fail altogether: for it is by this we are to be tried. The standard men set up for themselves and one another, will be nowhere in the great day of judgment. They will vanish as the snow does before the heat. Men may comfort themselves now in measuring themselves by themselves and by the wicked world outside; but where will be their consolation when Christ refuses to try men by any rule but his own?

Therefore it remains that the saints are not of this world. Their sentiment is the one expressed in the psalm read: "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." The world as at present constituted is, in its aggregate, "the tents of wickedness." It is founded on "the lust of the eye, and the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life." It is,

therefore, impossible that a man of God can be a dweller among them or even be content to enjoy their recognition. The saints cannot be friends with the world. The world hated Christ and it will hate his friends if they are so in deed and in truth. The world's friendship is a dangerous thing. Its countenance is almost certain death. A man may say "I like it," but it is the old man that says that. The new man, who counts all things but dung that he may win Christ, would feel he was betraying Christ if he accepted recognition at the hands of those who despise God. What the old man likes is something to be on our guard against. The new man should be allowed to rule in all things. Nay, he will rule in the elect of God, for where he rules not, God's choice does not lie. Christ's words on this point are plain: "If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be." It is not sufficient that a man enrol himself as a servant; he must be a servant in more than name if he is to be of any acceptance with the Father who sent Christ as one who served. He must "follow" Christ, and, following him, is doing as he did, in all the particulars he has indicated for our guidance. Preaching true doctrine is a part, but only a part of this service: it largely includes righteous and benevolent deeds performed in the glory of Him from whom comes all power to perform deeds of any kind, and to whom, therefore, all glory belongs.

The way to life is narrow, because the life to be entered is glorious, and glorious by reason of the things that constitute the way narrow; for where would be the glory of the future age if it were not for the righteousness that will be at its foundation, and the glory to God in the highest that will form its topstone of renown? Immortality would be a creature delight, no doubt; but divorced from its appointed co-ordinate of spotless

righteousness, it would be like a precious stone in the dark. And in the wisdom of God, the foundation of all this righteousness and glory is being laid in these times of evil, when the way of obedience is a way of self-mortification. Let us recognise the situation and act the part of wise men. The present order of things will not endure for ever. The trials we endure in the weakness of flesh and blood are but for a moment. They began only yesterday, and they will be all over to-morrow: and what a morrow will that be, if we successfully fight this no uncertain fight, pressing towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus! The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. Endowed with the immortal vigour of a new and imperishable body, and clad in the joyous vesture of cloudless wisdom and irrepressible thanksgiving and praise, we shall be invited to go forth on the

work of reformation and blessing amongst millions of benighted men. First, the sword will clear the path, bringing down the power and abolishing the authority of kings in all the kingdoms of the world; then the pouring wealth of the nations will come to the feet of Jehovah's kings and priests; then the willing ears of countless multitudes will listen while the New Order of Governors teach them everywhere new laws, and uprear for them new and righteous institutions, by which all nations will be blessed and the glory of Abraham's God set on high. Thenceforth in glory and honour and wealth and greatness and joy and renown, the righteous will shine forth in the kingdom of their Father, a glorious galaxy of deathless benefactors, prepared in former days of trial and humiliation, but now exalted as the resplendent stars of the new heavens, and shining therein to the glory of him who created them.

EDITOR.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God"—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

DARWIN AND HUXLEY REFUTED.
A pamphlet entitled *Science and Reve-*

lation is published by William Mullan of Belfast. It is by Dr. Porter, the

Professor of Biblical Criticism in one of the Belfast Colleges. It reviews and answers "the theories of Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, and Herbert Spencer." It is a decidedly able and conclusive treatise in its particular department: a department which has become prominent and important in these days of scientific opposition to revelation. A few extracts will be profitable to the more observant and thoughtful reader.

"The teachings of scientists on matter and the material universe are not uniform; were they so they would have much greater weight. Nearly every scientific man has a theory of his own, which he propounds with all authority, not to say dogmatism; and it so happens that these theories are, for the most part, inconsistent with each other—and indeed, in some cases, mutually destructive. Democritus, a Greek sage, who lived about B.C. 400, propounded a theory of the structure and origin of the material universe, which he appears to have derived from Leucippus, its founder. It was substantially adopted by the Latin poet Lucretius, whose prime object in adopting it was thereby to banish from the mind of man all idea of a creating and superintending Deity. It has received its latest development or exposition in the address of Professor Tyndall before the meeting of the British Association in Belfast.

As this theory is now put forward in the name of science, we naturally ask—What are its scientific proofs? We cannot admit theories. They have no weight in our present critical investigation. And first—What proof is advanced that matter is eternal? There is none; and from the nature of the case there can be none. All that science can prove is that matter has existed so long as man has existed to observe it. We all admit this: and farther science cannot possibly go. To affirm that it is eternal is a pure assumption, which has

no logical connection with observed facts. Herbert Spencer rightly says that the eternity, or self-existence, of matter is unthinkable; and he argues, with true philosophic instinct, that 'the assertion that the universe is self-existent does not really carry us a step beyond the cognition of its present existence; and so leaves us with a mere re-statement of the mystery.' And, besides, while science cannot advance one step towards the proof of the eternity of the matter, some of the most eminent scientific men of the present age affirm that this atomic theory affords the strongest proof of the existence of a Creator. At the meeting of the British Association in 1873, Professor Clerk Maxwell said, 'We are unable to ascribe either the existence of the molecules or any of their properties to the operation of any of the causes which we call natural.'

I do not profess to reconcile the discordant theories (of philosophers); nor is it necessary for my purpose, even were it possible. My sole object is to submit them to the test of scientific proof. As to the atoms themselves, they have never as yet been discovered. Scientists have searched for them; the highest powers of the microscope and the utmost skill of the chemist have been tried in vain. 'Loschmidt, Stoney, and Sir William Thompson have sought to determine the size of the atoms, or rather to fix the limits between which their sizes lie,' and they have failed. Their very existence, then, is a theory—a theory, too, which has no logical connection with any observed fact. And besides, the idea of an atom is inconceivable, or, as Herbert Spencer would say, it is unthinkable. To conceive of a piece of matter having necessarily, because it is matter, length and breadth, and yet being indivisible, is an absurdity. And if we adopt the view of Faraday, that atoms are "centres

of force," the difficulty remains. A centre of force must be either material or immaterial; if material, the absurdity is as before; if immaterial, then no aggregate of the immaterial could form the material universe. Science is thus completely at fault regarding these imaginary atoms.

And when we proceed to test the atomic theory in its development, difficulties and absurdities accumulate at every stage. It is held that atoms, whether eternal or "manufactured articles," whether inert or gifted with love and hate, or possessing inherent potency, have arranged themselves by chance friction and spontaneous interaction, throughout the infinite past, into those forms of wondrous beauty and delicate and complicated mechanism which we now see in every part of the universe, and which appear to be guided by wise laws and adapted to wise ends. What is the scientific proof of this theory? There is none, and there can be none. No scientist professes to have seen atoms building up worlds. The nature of the theory places it beyond the range of science away in the infinite past. And farther, the theory of matter arranging itself spontaneously into systems governed by exact law, and organisms exhibiting the most exquisite design, is not only unsupported by scientific observation, but is opposed to the whole analogy of scientific observation. Spontaneous action is, as Huxley rightly says, action without a cause, which is unscientific and impossible. It is impossible to conceive of a change taking place without a cause, and action necessarily involves change, so that spontaneity in matter is an absurdity.

Tyndall himself is, in the end, forced to admit that the structure of the universe around us is an 'insoluble mystery;' and Huxley, after placing the dogma of atheistic materialism in its strongest light, says 'The materialistic

position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas.' This with him is, of course, the acme of incredibility and absurdity. So I am content to leave the theory of atomic materialism in the position thus assigned to it.

Here again we see that the solution of the grand problem of the origin of the universe is beyond the range of science. And besides, the inferential teaching of science is not exhausted in this negative result. It reveals in nature everywhere the existence of *force*. However far its observations extend back, that force cannot be eliminated. It is involved in the movement of a grain of sand as fully as in the circling of the spheres; and if science here attempt to pass beyond the range of sense, and to theorise about force existing in atoms, we follow it and say—You are but shifting the mystery; and we press the natural question—What put the force in the atoms? Whence came it? Thus we drive the scientist back and back through every province of his own legitimate domain; we drive him back, too, through those regions of hazy theory and dim speculation, in which he loves to expatiate until, at last, by an inexorable logic, we compel him to admit an author of force—the Great First Cause."

THE BIBLE THE PROOF OF ITS OWN DIVINE ORIGIN.

"Every thoughtful believer must have hailed with pleasure the determination to devote a portion of the *Christadelphian* to the proofs of the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible. The effort must prove highly interesting and instructive to many who have neither leisure nor opportunity for the careful study of the evidences themselves. One very important advantage to the reader

is that the proofs will be presented apart from the errors with which many of the standard works upon the evidences abound. The value of this is beyond calculation.

"There are many earnest and thoughtful men in the world who doubt the divine origin of the Bible, because they believe that it teaches such dogmas as "eternal torment," "the natural immortality of man," &c. These views are founded upon the expositions of the clergy, and must, therefore, be as false as the source from whence they are derived. As no amount of "external" evidence can prove a false doctrine to be true, it is almost out of place to present external evidence to such enquirers, and we can scarcely blame them for refusing credence to a book that they have been taught, erroneously, to regard as the source of these pernicious dogmas, which have held Christendom in abject mental and moral slavery for many centuries, and which are as revolting to their better feelings as they are opposed to all the deductions of their reason and experience. We can only regret that they have been so cruelly deceived, and strive to disseminate the truth more widely than ever, in the hope that it may catch the attention of sincere truth-seekers.

"In the search for truth, too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the necessity for honesty in the enquirer. It was into the "honest and good heart" (Luke viii. 15) that the seed sown by the Great Teacher himself, fell, and in which it fructified. If we place this fact side by side with another statement made by Jesus to the Jews (John vii. 17), "my doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me; if any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself"—we are shut up to the conclusion that it is impossible for a sincere and moral man, unless he be bewildered by the

distracting clamour of the orthodox Babel, to search carefully and candidly through the Scriptures, without becoming convinced of their supernatural origin. The constant reading of the Bible is essential even to the believer. By that only can he keep ever vigorous within him the conviction of its divine authority, and, day by day, it will speak to him in tones of encouragement or reproof. Some have had short seasons of doubt, arising partly from forgetfulness of what they had learned (Heb. ii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 2); and partly from distracting questions raised by some of their own brethren in the faith. But renewed application to the Word brought a sweet renewal of the hope that Paul describes (Heb. vi. 19) as "an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast."

"The strongest proofs for the divine origin of the Bible are those furnished in its own pages, and it was very happily urged in the introduction to this topic in the *Christadelphian* for January twelve months, that "The best way of attaining a thorough conviction of the authenticity and genuineness of the Scriptures, and of the divine character of their origin, is to read them constantly." This is fortunate for the poor working man, whose limited means and leisure make it impossible for him to read the varied and extensive historical and critical works necessary to the successful study of the subject. He need be grateful to those whose abilities and opportunities enable them to condense and present, in a simple form, the results of such a course of study, as auxiliary evidence to that afforded by the book itself in the course of his daily reading; but the latter is sufficient of itself to inspire him with a calm assurance of the divine origin of the Scriptures, so that he may become more and more "grounded and settled," and not easily "moved away from the hope of the gospel."—(Col. i. 23.)

"As an illustration of this kind of proof, we have but to note the uniformity of testimony by the various books composing the Bible, to one grand scheme for the righteous government of the world by a divinely-appointed king, viz., Jesus Christ. This theme, like a golden thread, runs through and links together, in a manner altogether beyond human sagacity and skill, the various books from Genesis to Revelation, present in all, but shining out more brilliantly in some than in others. In the limits of this paper we can but mark the general outline of the subject, and leave the interested reader to fill it in at his own leisure.

"Genesis supplies the beginning of the thread in chap. iii. 15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." This remarkable passage predicts a desperate struggle between a descendant of the woman and certain opposing forces prefigured by the "serpent," the struggle ending in the destruction of the latter. We pass on to chap. xii. 1, 2, 3: "Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation; and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The last clause in this prophecy is a step in advance of chap. iii. 15. We perceive now that the destroyer of the serpent-power was to descend from Abraham, for the prediction had special reference to an individual and not merely to the immediate descendants of the patriarch. This is evident from Gal. iii. 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of

many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." This promise is repeated most emphatically in chap. xiii. 14, 17; xv. throughout; xvii. 4, 8, 19, 21; xviii. 18; xxii. 16-18. It is renewed to Isaac in chap. xxvi. 2-5, and, through him, to Jacob, xxviii. 3, 4, 13-15, and again to Jacob himself—(xxxv. 10-12).

"And now that we are fairly embarked and gliding down the stream of time, how rapidly the historic testimonies pass before us.

"Starting from the triple Fatherhood, we come to the initial and partial realisation of the promises in the rise and eventful career of the Jewish people, whose unparalleled history assign them a most important place in the grand scheme unfolding before our eyes. When groaning under the galling Egyptian yoke, they are delivered by Moses, himself a living prophecy of the future prophet and deliverer.—(Acts iii. 22.) Then, by a series of triumphs, they establish themselves a powerful nation in Palestine for a time, under a theocracy, and a symbolic ritual, pointing, in almost every particular, to a great anti-typical deliverer. They bind themselves by solemn covenant to obey the voice of God, and, then, with a fickleness that characterises the whole of their subsequent career, turn their backs upon Him and cry out madly for a king from among themselves, after the fashion of the heathen nations by whom they were surrounded. They are allowed to have their own way. The permission was provisional merely, and never designed by the Deity to be an abdication of His kingly right. Doubtless, one great object was to teach the great lesson that men have been learning ever since, viz., that no merely human being can efficiently govern his fellows.

"We must allow many interesting particulars of this history to pass unnoticed as we move along—such as the fickleness

and frequent backslidings of Israel; the misfortunes brought upon them by their own folly and wickedness, and not unfrequently by the wickedness of the men under whose rule they had voluntarily placed themselves; the long-suffering and forbearance of God towards them; and their ultimate fall as a nation and dispersion among the heathen. But we must linger over a few of the conspicuous facts and predictions which, like meteors gleaming across the gloom of Israel's calamities, discover to us the unbroken thread of testimony that we are pursuing. Joshua, Judges, and Ruth—each a link in the historical chain—bring us to the books of Samuel. In Book I., chap. viii. 7, Jehovah, speaking to Samuel, says of His people: "They have rejected me that I should not reign over them," and, further (verse 9) bids the prophet "Protest solemnly unto them and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." The tender solicitude shewn in these words is the more striking when viewed in the light of the subsequent history of Israel. Samuel denounces their ingratitude, and makes this remarkable appeal to their past experience of theocratic rule (chap. xii. 11, 12): "And the Lord sent Zerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and delivered you out of the hand of your enemies on every side, and ye dwelled safe. And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay, but a king shall reign over us, when the Lord your God was your King." It is evident from the rest of this deeply interesting chapter, that in spite of the atrocious ingratitude of the Jews, Jehovah could not be turned from His purpose of using them as the instruments of blessing to the world. See especially verse 22: "For the Lord will not forsake His people for His great name's sake, because it hath pleased the

Lord to make you His people."

In the second book of Samuel a very remarkable prophecy is delivered.—(vii. 12-16.) It was spoken to David, King of Israel: "And when thy days shall be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever; I will be His father and he shall be my son." Although this prediction was partially realised in Solomon, it pointed beyond him to the "greater than Solomon," "the Son of David," who should occupy the throne of his Father for ever. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews applies the passage: "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" to Jesus.—(chap. i. 5.) In the first book of Kings, the kingdom of Israel, under a human sovereign, is seen in the zenith of its glory, and was, doubtless, then a grand type of the glorious reign of "The Branch," the ruler whom Solomon himself, in certain respects, so nobly prefigured. The second brings the narrative down to the disastrous reign of Zedekiah, when the throne of David was overturned by the Babylonians. Ezekiel foretels that great calamity (chap. xxi. 25-27), and adds a splendid prophecy of the future restoration of the monarchy in the person of one who shall claim the throne as his right. The books of Chronicles, termed in the Septuagint "Paraleipomena," the things that were left or omitted, while supplying many things omitted in prior narratives, corroborate the testimony already given. Thus, the throne of Israel is clearly defined to be "the throne of the Lord."—(1 Chron. xxviii. 5; xxix. 11, 23; 2 Chron. xiii. 8.) In 2 Chron. vii. 17-22, another striking prediction occurs, and is now in course of fulfilment before our

very eyes. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah add their weight to the previously-cited testimonies, by giving some very interesting particulars in Jewish history. "Job" treats of other matters than the kingdom, yet the sovereignty of Jehovah is clearly recognised in chap. v. 8-27; ix. 4-13. Important truths, intimately bound up with the grand scheme before us, are clearly enunciated in this sublime work, but do not strictly come within the scope of this paper. And now the prospect widens, and passages bearing upon the kingship of Christ and the astounding results of his reign, crowd upon the vision. The whole of the second Psalm is a graphic description of events in the career of the future king of Israel, beginning with the conspiracy against his life by the Roman and Jewish authorities, and going forward until he sits as universal monarch upon Zion. Psalm ix. expatiates upon the glorious results which flow from the ruling of the world in righteousness by Jehovah in the person of His Son. So also Psalm xxii. 27, 28 : "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's, and He is the governor among the nations."

"In Psalm xlvi. 1, 2, Jerusalem is recognised as the royal city; in the words used by Christ (Matt. v. 35), "it is the city of the Great King"

"The fulfilment of the promises made to the patriarchs is thus referred to in Psalm lxxii. 17 : "His (Messiah's) name shall be continued as long as the sun, and men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him blessed." See also Psalm lxxxix. 26, 27, 28, 29 : "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also, I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my

covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven." Psalm cx. entire. But space will not allow further reference to this wonderful book. Proverbs is a collection of aphorisms, yet it corroborates the testimony to the reign of Christ in such a statement as that of chap. xi. 31 : "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." Ecclesiastes confirms, indirectly, what has gone before, by its recognition of man's mortality and a future judgment, subjects closely related to the reign of Christ, but we must not stay to enlarge upon them here. The Song of Solomon is considered by many to be a figurative poem upon the Great King and his Bride. Others suppose it to be an oriental love song. The latter view does not contradict the general testimony, but the former harmonises beautifully with the entire Scriptures. We leave the discussion of this point to abler critics, and pass onward.

And now where shall we begin in our selections from the sublime writings of Isaiah. The profusion of testimonies to the reign of Jesus is absolutely bewildering. The rhetorical and poetical splendours of this book dazzle the mental vision, and the amazing revelations it unfolds enchants the reader, rendering it an unwelcome task to mar the massive harmony of the whole by making isolated selections. The glorious results of Messiah's reign are thus depicted : "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye 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, and we will walk in his paths, for out of

Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."—(chap. ii. 2, 3, 4.) Messiah's regal character is clearly announced: "The government shall be upon his shoulder." "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."—(chap. ix. 6, 7.) "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness and princes shall rule in judgment, and a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land."—(chap. xxxii. 1, 2.) See also chaps. xi. and xii. entire; xxiv. 23; xxxiii. 22: "For, the Lord is our judge; the Lord is our lawgiver; the Lord is our king—he will save us."

E. CORKILL.

(To be continued.)

THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE:

LECTURE BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from page 553, vol. XII.)

Another thing is this: the Bible gives a certain history of things concerning remote times. In many points, that history has been questioned from time to time by those who wanted to get rid of the Scriptures, such as Paine, Voltaire, &c. But the progress of discovery and invention has, item after item, gone to show that the historical sketches contained in these writings are actually true. Just let me briefly run over a few instances of this. At the beginning of this century, the infidels under the

leadership referred to, denied that there ever was such a man as Christ. Their theory was that the history of Christ was a priestly fable, concocted in the monasteries in the dark centuries; that Christ was not an historic character at all. In our day, the infidels have retreated from this ground: they have been beaten off it. They admit Christ was an historic reality. They don't believe in him any the more for that. Still, they have abandoned their old position, which is something. They now say, "Christ was a real character, who appeared in the days of Tiberius Cæsar, and he was a wonderful man, but, on the whole, he was a madman, though of a very inoffensive and useful sort." They admit he was crucified, but deny that he rose. I will not combat the new theory at present. I merely point to the suggestive fact that within seventy years as the result of searching investigation and criticism, the infidel community have abandoned one position to take another, which is still more indefensible when it comes to be thoroughly considered.

But I was about to refer to something else. They have held that there was no such places as Nineveh and Babylon. Their argument was this: according to the Bible, these cities were very great and extensive, and important and populous, containing architectural structures of a very solid character, and sustaining a very material political and commercial relation to the rest of the world. This being so, our infidel friends contended it was a matter of impossibility that such cities should so entirely disappear from the annals of human history and from their place in human affairs, as these have done. Therefore, argued they, such cities never existed: they are the fanciful creations of a mythical book. "Where is Nineveh?" asked they, "Where is Babylon? Where are any traces or indications of them?" Unconsciously, they were supporting the

Bible, for the Bible which tells us of their past greatness, also foretels their disappearance in the vortex of one complete ruin. But since then both Babylon and Nineveh have been discovered, as you know, by Layard and other excavators, who have exhumed these ancient places from the rubbish of centuries, and shut the mouths of infidels.

Well, then, they used something of the same sort of argument with regard to the Mosaic account of the flood. They said it could not be a true historical account, or we should have found some traces of it in the archives of other nations. What has happened with regard to that? About a year ago, Mr. Smith of the British Museum, who was sent by the *Daily Telegraph* upon a special mission to the Assyrian ruins discovered by Layard, has discovered and has translated tablets from amongst those ruins containing an account of the flood. "Ay, but then," say these men, "the account of the flood that is on these ruined monuments is not the Mosaic account: there are a lot of things there that would not be accepted by a Bible believer." Quite true—there is a lot of nonsense in it, but the flood is there: that is the great fact of the case. Here is evidence brought before our eyes of the knowledge of the flood amongst other nations besides the Jews; and, therefore, it is a conclusive answer to the argument about the silence of other nations which infidels have used against it. The discrepancies between the two accounts does not weaken the force of the evidence in the least. Surely it is nothing new or unusual for very different versions of the same true story to exist in different quarters. But the variations in the accounts does not disprove but rather proves that there is a correct version somewhere. And where do you expect to find the true story of any matter? Why at the official source

with those who know all about it, and are commissioned to publish it. You are not surprised to find some altogether glossed, inaccurate, and absurd version of it away in some country village. Upon the same principle, it is no wonder that the Assyrians should have corrupted the simple facts given by Moses and mixed them up with their own mythology.

So with regard to the history of the Jews. It was contended that there was no contemporary verification, such as might reasonably be expected to exist with regard to the proceedings of the Jewish nation as recorded in the Bible. The argument did not go for much, because the times of the history in question are so remote, and the Jews were at the time so nearly the only literary nation (for the Greeks came to the front long afterwards), that the fact that nobody was noticing and nobody writing about the doings of the Jews is not a great wonder. But although that is a good answer of itself, we have a better one. You have heard about the Moabite stone, discovered by a Frenchman of the name of Ganneau about a year ago; that stone is a local native record of events in the history of the Moabitish nation, though there is no nation there now; for it is written in the prophets that the nation should be blotted out and the land be waste. This stone is a record of what went on amongst the Moabites when they were a nation, and it is an exact confirmation of the account given us in the Kings. It is written by authority of Mesha, King of Moab, and gives an account of the various Israelitish kings with whom Mesha was in correspondence.

There are various other illustrations of the same sort, but these perhaps are sufficient on that one point, as showing that the history of the Scriptures has been corroborated from many sources that did not exist at the time that opposition to the Bible began. I mean

particularly at the beginning of the present century. These confirmations are multiplying every month almost. The last discovery by that same Mr. Smith is an account—truly a very absurd

one, but nevertheless an account—of the creation and of the fall of man, of which you may have seen some account in the newspapers a very short time ago.

(To be continued.)

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13. 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

ACCORDING to the *Neue Freie Presse*, Vienna contains 50,000 Jews.

A superior commercial school has lately been opened at Warsaw at the sole cost of a Jew.

About ten per cent. of the scholars in the higher schools of Prussia are Jews, while the proportion of the Jews in the general population is only one to 70.

The ancient office of Judge of the Cinque Ports has been conferred by Lord Granville, as Lord Warden, upon a Jew—Mr. Arthur Cohen, Q.C.

Among the coins presented by Captain Warren to the University of Oxford, collected while he was in command of the Survey of Palestine, are several Jewish coins.

Mr. Holman Hunt has left England for Jerusalem, where he proposes to remain long enough for the completion of another large picture. Jerusalem in many ways comes into notice.

THE JEWS IN EGYPT.—The Jewish community at Cairo possess a school in which 300 pupils receive education. The institution owes its origin to the exertions of Dr. Albert Cohn, and now proves of great advantage to the Jewish congregation.

THE JEWS AT DUSSELDORF.—A new synagogue was lately consecrated amidst great pomp. The ceremony was attended by all the authorities of the town, as well as by the clergy of the several Christian denominations. The congregation is composed of about 200 families.

A LAW ANNULLED IN FAVOUR OF THE JEWS.—It will be remembered that in several

Cantons the local authorities forbade the Jews to kill animals for food in accordance with Jewish rites, under the plea of cruelty. The Jews appealed to the Federal authorities at Berne, who have decided in favour of the Jews, and annulled the existing local prohibitory decrees.

THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION.—The Grand Lodge of Freemasons at a recent meeting had to consider the following proposal by the Rev. R. J. Simpson, of St. Clement Danes: "That the sum of one hundred guineas be granted by this Grand Lodge in aid of the Palestine Fund, with the view of promoting the continued prosecution of the interesting and important work of exploring the ancient landmarks of the Holy Land."

ANOTHER JEWISH INSTITUTION AT FRANKFORT.—At Frankfort-on-the-Maine, a hospital for girls, founded by Baroness Louise de Rothschild has just been opened. From a description given of it by the *Israelit*, it appears that it is one of the finest institutions of the kind. It is provided with every imaginable appliance for the cure, relief, or solace of the sufferers.

JEWS AND JEWS AT EPIRUS.—A Jew, Dr. Judas S. Horowitz, was elected Professor of Roman Law in the Evangelical Juridical Academy. In the same city, as well as in several others, the high schools are numerously attended by Jews. On the other hand there are public schools founded by, and for Jews, which are also attended by Jews.

ROYAL VISIT TO A JEWISH HOUSEHOLD IN INDIA.—Among the many pleasing items

of intelligence connected with the Prince of Wales's visit to India, which reach us by telegram from day to day, few will be more interesting to our readers, says the *Jewish Chronicle*, than the Prince's visit to Lady Sassoon, the wife of Sir Albert Sassoon, at her residence, Sans Souci. The Prince and his suite were entertained at luncheon by Lady Sassoon, and His Royal Highness on taking leave expressed himself much pleased with his reception.

IMPORTANT POLITICAL MISSION CONFIDED TO A JEW.—The gentleman to whom the Italian government has entrusted the task of negotiating fresh treaties of commerce with France, Austria, and Switzerland, is Signor Luzzato, a Jew, and one of the youngest deputies in the chambers. He is described as possessing a vast acquaintance with political economy, and ranks among the first in this branch of knowledge. He has under him two assistants, one of whom is likewise a Jew, and who is head of one of the divisions in the ministry of foreign affairs.

A JEW ELECTED AT MUNICH.—The merits of Herr Gugenheimer (a Jew), who was recently re-elected president of the municipality of Munich, are so generally acknowledged that even the Ultramontanes voted for him. Great, therefore, is the outcry of the clerical press against those of its own party who voted in favour of the Jew.

THE JEWS AT ZURICH.—There is now a Jewish Russian young lady at the University of this city who pursues medical studies. She is considered a rather promising student. There is a good chance of the Jewish people soon possessing another Rebecca of the healing art. There are about sixty Jewish families in the city. But they are without a rabbi although they possess a synagogue. They are principally merchants and shopkeepers, and seem to be prosperous.

RIISING POSITION OF THE JEWS IN GERMANY.—In all the German Universities, in the summer session of 1875, there were fewer medical students than during the previous year. A German paper explains that this is due to the number of Jews who are turning to the profession of the law. Formerly the law was practically closed to the Jews, and they chiefly went for a medical career. As a fact, the student-roll of the University of Berlin includes a considerable number of Jews.

It may be added, as an indication of the enormous social influence of the Jews of Berlin, that half the municipal representatives of the city are Jews, while the relative proportion in the total population is not one-twentieth.

PROBABLE DESCENDANTS OF THE TEN TRIBES.—There is in India a considerable number of Jews, consisting of two classes, one the wealthier and better educated, composed of new comers or their descendants, generally Asiatics mostly immigrants from Bagdad,

and in sympathy and inter-communion with their brethren elsewhere. The other, more numerous, are in every respect, religion excepted, assimilated to the rest of their countrymen long established in India, so as to be reckoned among the natives. They are called Bene Israel (children of Israel), and have through their isolation and remoteness from the chief seats of their brethren in faith, been cut off from them for centuries, and even their existence was hardly known to the earlier Jewish historians. Surrounded by dense masses of worshippers of strange gods, and exposed for long, long generations to temptations and trials unknown in Europe, they have yet in all times, and under all circumstances, says the *Jewish Chronicle*, steadily held aloft the banner of Israel, and known how by their simple-mindedness and fidelity to conciliate the good-will and even regard of their betters. They are probably descendants of the ten tribes who were carried away by Shalmanezar at a time when they were not distinguished by "holding aloft the banner of Israel."

"A CONTRAST TO FORMER DAYS."—A correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle* writing from the British Consulate at Kertch, gives an account of the opening of a magnificent synagogue in that city. He says, "it was opened with great ceremony in the presence of His Excellency the Governor, and all the leading authorities. The committee very kindly sent me an invitation, and I was thankful thus to have the opportunity of witnessing a most interesting ceremony, and one in which, you are well aware, I above most others—even Israelites—felt a deep and hearty interest. When I looked around me, standing as I did under the magnificent crystal chandelier, with its numerous wax candles, and saw around me the Governor of the town in full uniform, the Prefect of Police, and all other authorities in full uniform, my heart warmed within me when I contrasted the pleasing scene with those of former days, when I saw the Israelites in a corner of a town in Morocco performing their devotions by sufferance in a wretched hovel, with piles driven in the ground to support a small olive oil lamp, and never certain that their devotion would not be disturbed by fierce Arabs coming to ask for money. Here, I am happy to say, the Israelites enjoy all the privileges common to all. They, like others, can live in any part of the city they please where people of every nation are collected."

JEWS IN PORTUGAL.—The *Jewish Record* gives the following account of the origin of Jewish emancipation in Portugal: "In 1852 or 1853, the young King Pedro of Portugal, then under the guardianship of his uncle, visited Holland *incognito*. A dispatch was received at the Portuguese synagogue that Don Pedro V., with attendants, would pay a visit to the

synagogue at 3 p.m. of the same day. When everything was shown to the illustrious visitors, they were conducted to the Mahamad or meeting-room of the congregation. The Rev. A. M. Chumaceiro, solicited by the president, addressed the king in the Portuguese language. From there they went to Beth Hanimedrash, and after reading the names of the donors to that institution for the last two hundred and fifty years, the king recognised the family names of most of his nobility, and, furthermore, said that he imagined himself that moment to be in the large halls of learning in Portugal. He spoke of the tolerance our people enjoyed in Amsterdam, of the wealth and industry they had brought to that city, and of which Portugal was now deprived. He promised that on his return to Portugal he would make proper use of these impressions, so that on an early day the Jews might return to that country which had suffered so much from their expulsion. The king's brother Alphonso, was among the visitors. On their return to Portugal he honestly carried out his liberal intentions, but unfortunately died after a short reign, with other members of the family, from a malignant disease then prevalent in the royal palace. His brother Alphonso succeeded him to the throne, and married, I believe, a daughter of the tolerant and popular King Victor Emanuel. Alphonso, present king of Portugal, has faithfully complied with the desire of his lamented brother, and nowhere in Europe do the Jews at present enjoy greater protection than in Portugal.

THE MONTEFIORE HOLY LAND COLONIZATION SCHEME.

The expected report from Sir Moses Montefiore, of the results of his visit to the Holy Land, has not yet made its appearance. No explanation has been given of the delay. It is not at all improbable that the reason is traceable to two or three Jews who are prominently before the world at the present time in connection with the Eastern Question, which is now agitating the world from end to end. Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Rothschild may have given their kinsman good reasons for a little patience at a time when the extinction of the Ottoman empire will necessitate a transfer of the Holy Land to other masters than the Turk, who has held it in his desolating grasp so long.

The *Monetary Gazette* alludes again to a report in connection with Mr. Rothschild, which has long been current in the world, and has never, so far as is known, been contradicted. It says: "It has often been

affirmed that Rothschild has in his safe the title-deeds of the Holy Land. What this may mean when reduced to its proper significance we cannot say. Probably it is at best but a metaphorical hyperbole. But if there be any truth in it at all, it may be that the illustrious financier has made loans to the improvident Turk, the penalty of default being such material and political concessions as would restore Palestine to the scattered race, longing to return to the grand home of their forefathers. The exodus from every quarter of the globe supposed in this return would radically change the financial relations of the whole world. The Jews would convert their property—which is always convertible—into the bonds and securities of the most substantial nations of the earth; preferably into our own, and, taking these back to their country, would attract thither the annual tribute of gold payable on the securities. In such a case, the alliance of their co-religionist Rothschild with the Bank of England might prove a serious embarrassment. We may be a long way off such a crisis. It may, indeed, never overtake us, but minor complications may arise earlier than we suppose. Then the nation at large would revolt against the indignity and danger involved in the lightest encroachment on the absolute independence of the Bank of England."

The following extract from the account published by the Shah of Persia of his recent visit to Europe has a certain interest in this direction. The Shah writes: "When I was in Paris I was waited upon by the distinguished Jew, Rothschild, who is very wealthy. We talked together, when he requested me earnestly to treat with kindness the Jews of Persia. I replied: I have been told that thy property and that of thy kinsmen amounts to five hundred millions. Therefore I think it would be well if thou and thy kinsmen were to purchase of one of the governments some large tract of land for five and twenty millions, in which all Jews of the globe might settle and you might be their chiefs, and govern them with justice and gentleness, so that they should no longer be dispersed in different countries for want of a country of their own." In how many ways the idea of the reconstruction of the Israelitish nationality is being mooted. They are so many streaks of the coming dawn.

The *Monetary Gazette* speaks in terms of deprecation, of the influence being acquired by the Rothschilds over the Bank of England. It says :

“The growing influence of the Rothschilds in the Bank of England since the appointment of Mr. A. C. de Rothschild as a director, is also the subject of much comment, and notwithstanding the high personal esteem in which that gentleman, as well as the whole of the family which he represents there, is held, it is felt that the growth of that influence cannot be recorded with unqualified public favour. And yet the misgivings do not arise from any distrust in the personal character and integrity of the illustrious house of Rothschild. If tradition teaches us faithfully, its founder laid the basis of its then unsuspected greatness in acts of rare and scrupulous honesty, which attracted royal notice, and led to the enlargement of royal favour and confidence. From that day to this the name of Rothschild has been a synonym of integrity as well as of financial power, and it is a marvellous fact which cannot be too well remembered in these times, when default is fashionable, and may become still more so, that there never yet has been the slightest default in any one of the loans with the introduction of which this house has been associated. But the whole family has always shown itself unsurpassingly keen in its instincts of money making, and it owes its fabulous wealth as much to this aggressive activity as to its scrupulous honour. It is now asserted that the great financial house has acquired undue influence over the Bank of England, and can almost lead it whichever way it will, and does so lead it for the sake of its assistance in the many large undertakings which it operates. Far be it from us to impeach the motives of a house that stands so proudly on its honourable antecedents, but complications

may arise when the interests of the Bank of England and of the Rothschilds may be hostile to each other. It would not be unfair to distrust the ‘bias’ in such a crisis.”

The article is interesting as an illustration of the extraordinary situation of things which gives the Jews such a preponderating influence in the affairs of the nations. It is unquestionably the work of God in preparation for the great crisis at the door, when “the ships of Tarshish first,” shall bring Israel’s sons “from far, their silver and their gold with them.” That the financial power of the world should be concentrated in the hands of a Jewish family, is a remarkable sign of the times.

What an astounding illustration of the same subject the world has witnessed within the last few days. The English government (headed by a Jew) decides to buy the Egyptian interest in the Suez Canal, but lacks the ready money which the negotiation requires. What does it do? It applies to another Jew—Rothschild, who furnishes the money, and makes £250,000 by the transaction.

Meanwhile, it is interesting to learn that “The Turkish government has issued a firman permitting the construction of a port at Jaffa, and a railway from that town to Jerusalem.” Also that the German colonists at Jerusalem have exerted themselves to render access to Jerusalem easier and less exposed to danger and uncertainty by forming, in concert with several Russian settlers, an association for supplying means of transport and conveyance between Jaffa and Jerusalem. They have already put twenty-five carriages and fifty horses on the road, which is thus rendered perfectly safe for travellers. Everything points one way, viz., the rapidly approaching realization of the hope of Israel. God speed His glorious work, for which a goodly number are intently watching and praying.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren. — (Heb. ii. 11.)

JANUARY, 1876.

THE past year has been an eventful one, as regards the development of the signs of the times. What may we not see during 1876?

On the very first day of 1875, the bethren were made glad by the restoration of the Spanish monarchy for which they had been looking, but of which there appeared no immediate symptoms until the very occur-

rence of the event itself. (They are now looking for the restoration of the French monarchy, however unlikely that event may appear at the present moment: the reason in this case being the same as in the case of Spain: that according to the Apocalypse the ten leading monarchies of the Roman system are in existence at the appearing of Christ and unite in their antagonism to him.)

Next came the launching of the Montefiore memorial scheme for the regeneration of Jerusalem, and the Holy Land in general: a scheme which though not yet greatly advanced, is an organic thing, and not a suggestion: a great fact in the hands of a

responsible committee of London Jews, and not merely a proposal for debate. It is like a plant actually put in the ground: it is small at present, but its roots are in the soil, and it is being tended and guarded, and must in the nature of things grow and develop. Its existence has acquired a fresh significance from the events that have since transpired in relation to the Power that as yet holds the country to which the scheme has reference. It looks like the preparation of Providence against the hour close upon us, when Turkey will have crumbled to pieces, and when a Jewish not a Gentile occupation of the long-desolate land of Israel, is the prophetic necessity of the situation.

Next in order, while the Montefiore scheme was slowly engaging the attention of the Jews throughout the world, came the insurrection on the north-western provinces of Turkey: then the declaration of Turkish insolvency: then the re-opening of the Eastern Question by Russia, Austria, and Germany: and finally, the advance (peaceable though it is) of Britain upon Egypt, to secure her Indian communications against the perils involved in the breaking up of the Turkish empire, and the possible seizure of Egypt by the powerful neighbour on Turkey's northern borders.

All these events are so signally in the channel of our expectations (entertained for many years past on the strength of the sure word of the prophecy), that we cannot but feel, on entering the new year, both thanksgiving for the almost visible operations of the hand of God in the affairs of the nations during the past twelve months; and strong hopes that a much longer period will not elapse without the great occurrence to which they all point, and on which many hearts in various parts of the world are set with strong desire: the re-appearance of him to whom is appointed the great work of breaking up the system of the present evil world, and establishing a new order of things, in which, after a transition period of terrible experiences of judgment, all the nations of the earth will be blessed. Christ's own heart is much more intently on the situation than ours can ever be: and while he saith, "Surely, I come quickly," doth not every true heart fervently respond, "Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE EASTERN QUESTION — THE POLITICAL EUPHRATES NEARLY DRY—BRITAIN TAKES HER POSITION IN EGYPT.

WITH a rapidity almost startling, events hurry after one another in the development of the Eastern Question. The declaration of Turkish insolvency and the unveiling of Russian designs, have been followed by a movement on the part of England which in the field of politics, amounts to the occupation of Egypt by the English Government. The British Government has purchased the Egyptian Government's share in the Suez Canal for four millions sterling. On the face of it, it is a commercial transaction, and it is decried as such by the opponents of the Disraeli Cabinet, no doubt with good reason, if it were merely such; for it is an unheard-of and unconstitutional thing for a government to employ the public money in speculating in shares. But the answer of the papers who support the government action, is, that it is only commercial on the surface; that underneath, it is a great political movement, having for its object the protection of England's communication with India from the peril involved in the breaking up of the Turkish Empire, and the passing of that Empire into northern hands. And this is, of course, its character; for apart from a political object, a government would never buy shares, especially without consulting Parliament, with whom exclusively the authority for such a transaction would lie.

In conjunction with the acquisition of the Suez Canal, a British political "mission" has been despatched to Egypt to assist in the administration of the country. The mission consists of Mr. Stephen Cave, Her Majesty's Paymaster General, and a number of military and other officers whose names are duly gazetted in the public prints. This mission goes to Egypt at the request of the Viceroy, whose finances are in disorder, and who prefers, in the impending ruin of the Turkish Empire, to place himself in English hands. Egypt is, in fact, virtually annexed to England; for though the political form of things remains for the moment as it was, the foundation is laid for that British

protectorate which will spring into a political fact before the rising Eastern Storm. The *Financier* well says "We have at last the distinct intimation sent forth, as may be said, to the nations of the earth that the British ægis is spread over Egypt and the high road to our Indian Empire."

The knowledge of these facts caused a great sensation everywhere. On the Continent, the effect might be described as consternation. The Continental Powers have been so accustomed to the passiveness which has characterised the foreign policy of England under Liberal rule, that they were unprepared for the boldness and promptitude implied in the secret acquisition of a territorial footing in Egypt at a time when Egypt, as a constituent part of the Turkish Empire, was in danger from the manœuvring of the northern military powers. As the *Times* says: "There is an audacity about it which we do not generally associate with the acts of a British Ministry. We seem to trace in it the hand of Mr. Disraeli. While people are looking towards the East in doubt and apprehension, the Queen's Government resolves on an act which will at once fix the regards of the world. No waiting for Parliament, no feeling of public opinion, no mysterious hints to prepare the city and the country for something remarkable. The nation awakes to find that it has acquired a heavy stake in the security and well-being of another distant land, and that it will be held by all the world to have entered on a new phase of Eastern policy. This important act of the British Government will be regarded as a demonstration, and something more—a declaration of intentions and a commencement of action upon them."

As regards the English view of the case, which no doubt represents the sober facts of the case from a human point of view, the *Daily Telegraph* well says:

"The British public are delighted with what has been done, because they understand how this opportunity unites advantages which could scarcely have come together in any other form. It gives us a footing that can offend no friendly Powers, with rights good and useful against an enemy; it peacefully makes that flag paramount over the Canal which covers seven-tenths of the shipping passing through; it quietly constitutes the Empress of India trustee of the high road leading thither; it secures to the

world the sustentation of a work indispensable to modern intercourse which could have been assured by no other event; it links the interests of England and Egypt in a manner free of provocation to any Power; while, finally, it does announce to Europe, but in a method absolutely the most pacific and inoffensive which could be conceived, that England has a policy, and a firm one, and stands between the Continents, without menace and without fear, prepared to defend those rights which no one disputes, but something may endanger. No doubt this last and least announced meaning of the recent purchase is that which lies at the bottom of the public satisfaction."

Foreigners have been quick to see the meaning of this movement of England's in Egypt. No better illustration of this can be given than the following extract from the *Moscow Gazette*, which shows what Russians think of it:—

"There can be no doubt as to the political importance of the event. England's ancient preponderance has been immensely increased by the acquisition of property rights—that is, territorial rights in Egypt. England most unceremoniously has taken the lead in partitioning Turkey. The English have long been accustomed to have everything their own way in Asia, Africa, and Australia, to do what they please in all parts of the world, and to rule the seas without fearing or, indeed, expecting opposition. They now no longer content themselves with seizing distant lands, but pocket the key to the whole of Southern and Eastern Europe, constituting themselves the sole and absolute judges of what is good and profitable for the other countries concerned. We all know the jealousy and supercilious *hauteur* marking British policy towards other countries. We have not forgotten the furious rage excited by the Khiva campaign; we remember the envious intrigue by which England endeavoured to tie Russia's hands and place a horde of Central Asiatic nomads under the protection of International law. Now that England has seized the Suez Canal, is there any one so *naïve* as to anticipate that other countries' interests will be impartially protected by Great Britain."

The *Nord*, of Brussels, (usually the mouthpiece of Russian policy) says:—

"The step taken by England affects the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, especially France, and it seems impossible for the affair to be completed without an international arrangement. The management of the Suez Canal by England, should such be undertaken, would amount to a sheer act of confiscation. Unless it be desired that the civilising work of the canal become a mere instrument of trade, arrangements

must be made to render this radical change compatible with the interest of the whole world by means of solid guarantees."

Agreeably with this suggestion, we hear from Berlin that Russia will probably propose an International Conference on the Suez Canal question, and that if England does not consent, Russia will claim the liberty to do as she likes in the Eastern question. A later report states the idea of an international conference about the Suez Canal has been abandoned, presumably on account of the scorn with which the suggestion has been received in England.

In Turkey, the effect has been peculiar. The correspondent of the *Standard* at Vienna, telegraphs that the purchase by Great Britain of the Khedive's interest in the Suez Canal has caused the greatest consternation. The Sultan has ordered a committee to be appointed for the inspection of the army, and to make preparations for war. The forts on the Bosphorus and the forts and harbour batteries at Crete are being armed with Krupp guns.

ENGLAND AND EGYPT INDISSOLUBLY ASSOCIATED.

One thing certain and satisfactory is that England having taken the step she has, she cannot recede; and her interests are henceforward indissolubly connected with Egypt. This is very forcibly pointed out by the *Liverpool Mercury*, in an article in which dissatisfaction is expressed at the act of the government. The article contains this passage:—

"The only thing we can see is that Mr. Disraeli, by his precipitate action has tied the hands of all future governments. Up to now everybody was free to do as he listed. Henceforward any government having to deal with the Eastern Question must perforce begin with a protectorate of Egypt. We do not like to be tied in this way. We would rather be in the position of doing the best we could for the nation at large, without letting personal influences creep in. Furthermore, England, through the action of her Government, has, so to speak, 'thrown down the gauntlet.' We all know in general, though we cannot get at the detail, how Russia and Austria are hungering for a war with Turkey. No man who is not an absolute fool can suppose

that what is, by a misapplication of terms, called the 'Turkish Empire,' can live very long. Russia is arming; Austria is arming. Germany is arming for the purpose of looking after Russian movements. France is arming for the sake of looking after German movements. Italy is arming. Even England is arming. What can all this arming mean, if not a general war? And if a general war, who are to be involved in it? Clearly England, now that she is committed by Mr. Disraeli to the protectorate of Egypt."

THE RELATION OF DISRAELI'S GOVERNMENT TO THE MATTER.

The *Times* remarks: "It is well in this phase of our history to have a government to whom the forming of decisive resolutions is more congenial than it is to the earnest champions of domestic reform." This is an allusion to the change of government that took place some two years ago, and shows retrospectively how important and necessary was that change of government which had been pointed out as a necessity by Dr. Thomas, but which seemed on all human grounds utterly improbable, and astonished equally Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli himself. There can be little doubt that the Government of Mr. Gladstone, having a totally different foreign policy, would have acted differently from Mr. Disraeli on the present occasion. In a letter to the *Times* on the Suez Canal purchase, Lord Sandhurst gives the readers of that paper to understand that several years ago, the very interest now acquired by England in the Suez Canal was proposed to be acquired by "an influential capitalist" on the simple condition of "a declaration of British support," but "that declaration was denied for reasons of political prudence, and the project fell through in consequence." Lord Sandhurst adds: "It seems to me that Mr. Gladstone's Government was sufficiently justified in guarding itself against an undue assumption of responsibility in a matter so grave as an important, and perhaps a hasty, resolution affecting the Eastern Question. On the other hand, times have changed. The Eastern Question has advanced and is advancing. A financial operation such as that to which Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby have now committed themselves cannot wait if it is to be carried through. Under these circumstances, without hazarding the slightest insinuation that Mr. Gladstone's

Government was weak or wanting in initiation in this great matter, it is very probable that Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby are right now."

The substitution of a Tory for a Liberal government in preparation for the present crisis is therefore manifestly exhibited in the light of an act of God, by that invisible ministrations of the angels usually styled "providence." It was brought about by confusing the counsels of the Liberal party. The Liberal strength exceeded the Tory strength. The number of Liberal votes polled exceeded the Tory votes by something over a million, speaking from memory; but an overplus of Liberal candidates, originating in many localities in personal animosities, (providentially manipulated without doubt), divided the Liberal strength, and in many cases, almost allowed the Tory candidate to get to the head of the poll with a smaller number of votes than their Liberal rivals mustered between them. In this way, contrary to all human expectations, the Tory British Lion war-party found itself in power with a large majority for the first time in forty years; and now stands at the front as a potent agency in the development of the latter-day situation.

THE SUEZ CANAL AND THE ANGLO-JEWISH COLONIZATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

A similar manifestation of providential manipulation is visible in the matter of the Suez Canal. It was to be the means of bringing England into her right relation to Jehovah's land. Dr. Thomas saw this distinctly at the time, and as most of our readers recollect, wrote to Earl Granville, advising him to take possession of it. But England was opposed to it, even from the first hour of its projection. Her view was that a canal across the isthmus of Suez would give France undue influence in Egypt, and therefore the power, in an emergency, of seriously embarrassing England in her relations with the East. She also shared the view entertained by most countries that such a canal would be a blow at England's supremacy on the sea, in so far as it would open a path to Eastern trade for the ports of the Mediterranean, and divert that trade, in some degree at least, from British hands. She therefore opposed the construction of

the canal in the days of Lord Palmerston, and interposed every obstacle to the carrying-out of the enterprise when decided on.

And lo, the canal which was to hurt England, is found to be the vital artery of English commerce, and the canal which she tried to prevent the construction of in the days of Palmerston, she becomes proprietor of in the days of Disraeli.

And what is involved in this extraordinary change in affairs? It has always been seen that the English possession of the Suez Canal would involve the establishment of jurisdiction in the Holy Land, on the ground that as the possession of the canal is essential to her Indian communications, so the possession of Palestine was necessary for the protection of the canal, as any one may see by a glance at the map. With Palestine in the hands of Russia (when Turkey shall go finally to pieces), the canal would be at the mercy of that power, who could easily stop the use of it in case of war. It has therefore always been argued that when Britain should make her final move on Egypt, she must establish herself in the Holy Land; in which event the return of the Jews would be both a natural result and a political necessity, as no other race could be induced to occupy the country. This very idea is now being ventilated in the public press. A paragraph appears in the *Standard* with the heading:

"RETURN OF THE JEWS TO PALESTINE."

(It is refreshing, and characteristic of the latter days in which we live to see such a heading in the papers). The paragraph is as follows:

"There is a curious theory abroad in connection with the recent purchase of the Suez Canal shares—a theory which, though no importance may be attached to it, is curious as showing the direction in which people's thoughts have a tendency to drift. According to this the acquisition of a strong influence in Egypt, towards which the purchase of these shares is a considerable step, will involve further action of a most remarkable kind. Should the collapse of the Ottoman Empire come about, as seems now inevitable; and should Russia claim a large share of the spoil, as seems only too probable, the English position in Egypt—so runs the tale—would be strategically weak on the side of Syria and Palestine. It would then

become a matter of necessity for England to acquire a position in these countries, if not absolutely to undertake their protection. But let England once be the paramount Power in Palestine, and the signal is given for the return of the Jews to their own land. That this should come about under English auspices is said to be the hope of Mr. Disraeli himself. Whether that be so or not, it would be a most worthy ambition for any English statesman that his country should have the great honour of aiding the fulfilment of the old promises, and helping to restore the chosen people to the land which is certainly to be theirs again."

MR. DISRAELI'S "DAY DREAM."

It will be observed in the foregoing paragraph, that allusion is made to "the hope of Mr. Disraeli himself," concerning the revival of Jewish nationality under English auspices. Another interesting reference of the same sort occurs in a recent issue of the *Rock*. That paper says "A late noble lord used to tell that, when congratulating our present Premier on his accession to high office, the right honourable gentleman spoke of the possibility of his being permitted to aid in some such movement as "the day-dream of his life!" But who can say that if his life be spared for only a few more years, this "day-dream" may not be realized? The Crimean war, if bootless in other respects, at least had the effect of extorting from the Sultan the repeal of the cruel law which forbade the purchase of land by the Jews in his dominions. They are, therefore, now free to acquire possession, or re-possession, of 'the glorious land' (Dan. xi. 40), whenever other circumstances may seem propitious for the move. And, looking at the rapidity with which great events now succeed each other, and remembering that 'the time to favour Zion' is evidently near at hand, we may expect to see the last stumbling-blocks speedily taken out of the way."

The *Rock* further remarks as follows concerning the fact of one Jew (Mr. Disraeli) projecting the purchase of the Canal, and another Jew (Rothschild) finding the money:—

"Late on last Friday afternoon—it was the day of the great Egyptian surprise—Baron Rothschild's carriage stood for a

considerable time at the Premier's door. How the twain must have talked! How they must have clucked over the success of a move which required the courage of a Disraeli to devise and the purse of a Rothschild to carry out! Both in its conception and its execution the *coup* was perfect. It changed in a moment the political situation. It shows that England will not again embroil herself in the affairs of 'the Sick Man,' and will therefore leave the course clear for the accomplishment of the mighty changes which all prophecy bids us expect as preparatory to the return of Israel and Judah to the land of their fathers."

PROGRESS OF THE INSURRECTION AND THE STEADY DECLINE OF TURKEY.

The insurrection in the Herzegovina is both alive and makes headway, notwithstanding the prevalence of winter; and the prospects of the Turkish Empire become more and more gloomy. The following items illustrative of these points will be read with interest:—

"The news from Eastern Europe becomes more serious. There appears to be every probability that the Candiotes (the inhabitants of Crete) whose long struggle with the Turkish Government is still fresh in memory, will rise once more. In fact, if the insurrection in Western Turkey continues through the winter, there is no telling how far it will spread, nor when it will stop; and there is not the smallest chance of its being suppressed. In connection with this matter the letter from the special correspondent of the *Times* at Pera is especially worth reading. He says, "Let the revolt only go through the winter, as it is most likely to do, and competent persons assure me July will see the holders of Ottoman Stock disappointed of the whole of their dividends, as they will be in January of half of them." The same writer plainly states what the intentions of Russia are, and they have been set forth to the correspondent by no less a person than General Ignatieff himself. Turkey is told she must reform, but to reform is impossible, and the result must be disintegration. For that result Russia can calmly wait. In fact, the conviction of St. Petersburg statesmen is the same that it was twenty-two years ago. Turkey is a sick man—sick unto death; but the policy of St. Petersburg is a little altered. Russia's present game is a waiting game.—*Several Papers*.

"But as the military power of the Turks has waned, and as a bureaucracy has grown up with all the faults and none of the energy and vigour of that institution in

civilised countries, the conditions of the Christians in Turkey has deteriorated from year to year. They have not even gained by the successes of some among their own number. The emancipation of the Greeks has merely given freedom to a race of plunderers by profession, who are avenging themselves for long years of servitude by fleecing alike their ancient masters and their former comrades in slavery. Nor have the Christian peasants profited by the rise of many Armenians to power; for these wolves in sheep's clothing are to the full as grasping, as luxurious, and as unscrupulous as the most overbearing and sensual of the Turks, and they have introduced into the Empire, and into the palaces of its rulers, an extravagance and a reckless profusion of which the older Turks knew nothing, and out of which the Armenians have known very well how to make enormous profits at the expense of the suffering thousands who have long groaned under a taxation which is now intolerable.

The condition of the empire is indeed most serious; and if its ruler possessed the vigour and genius of even his boldest and wisest ancestor, he might well be appalled at the task which lies before him and his successors. As it is, being neither vigorous nor wise, being fenced round by bad advisers who conceal the truth from him, and lapped in a luxury which would enervate a Hercules, he calmly lets the days go by which, by slow and sure degrees, are leading up to the destruction of his power."—*Constantinople Correspondent of the Daily Telegraph.*

"The telegraph has informed you how the government of the Sublime Porte, in consequence of the large number of Montenegrins who are daily joining the insurgents in Herzegovina, has addressed some complaints to the ambassadors of Austria and Russia, urging them to remonstrate with the Prince of Montenegro and prevail upon him to exercise a more vigilant control over his people. The representatives of these two Great Powers have shown no unwillingness to comply with the request of the Sultan's Ministers; but it is difficult to see what results may be expected from their admonitions. The condition to which the disturbances of the Provinces adjoining Montenegro have brought that little Principality, deprive Prince Danilo of all power to act in the matter. Swarms of terrorized fugitives from the insurgent districts are daily invading his little territory. The means of subsistence which his bare mountains afford—hardly sufficient for their native inhabitants in ordinary times, are almost entirely exhausted by the influx of so many destitute strangers. Actual famine begins to reign in Montenegro, and the cattle which those helpless refugees are driving along with them in their flight have caused serious apprehension of the spread of the foot and mouth disease. Under

such circumstances the migration of the able-bodied men whom sympathy for the cause of their Herzegovinian brethren induces to go forth as volunteers to the scene of strife, brings a most welcome relief to the many mouths that there are to be fed, and the Prince of Montenegro may with good reason observe that his frontier could be more efficiently guarded were not the savage character which the Sultan's troops have given to the internecine warfare in Herzegovina driving the helpless population of that district across the borders in such overwhelming numbers. For of all the conflicting reports which reach us day by day of the encounters in which both parties with emphasis claim the victory, and of which flaming accounts circulate through every organ of the European press, this only may be accepted as truth, that there is but little stand-up, decisive fighting, and much cold-blooded massacreing of the unresisting multitude.

"On the whole, one can see nothing encouraging in the prospects of the forthcoming winter—no chance either of a pacific solution or of a warlike issue of the contest; nothing to be hoped from the schemes of well-meaning mediators for a reorganization of the disturbed provinces on terms insuring equality between the Christian and Mussulman subjects of the Porte, by the admission of the Christians into mixed Provisional Councils and Courts of Law. The experiment of such institutions has been tried.

The failure of a first attempt might be no argument against a new and better contrived arrangement, if,—1st, the trial could be made in a season of comparative order and quiescence of popular passions; 2nd, if Turkey were a thoroughly isolated state, and not surrounded by countries whose government or people deem themselves interested in prolonging and aggravating her disorders; and 3rd, if remedy could be found for the corruption and utter demoralisation of the functionaries, great and small, to whose hands the reforms in the administration would have to be entrusted. In other words, the thing would be possible if it were not impossible.—*The Times Correspondent at Pera.*

THE RUSSIAN ATTITUDE.

Meanwhile, it is evident that Russia is preparing for emergencies. The British correspondent of the *Daily News* telegraphs that "Russia insists on a joint intervention in Turkey with Austria: but if the latter declines the part assigned to her, Russia will, if expedient, interfere alone." Russian troops are on the move in large masses. A telegram from St. Petersburg says: "In accordance with special orders received here from Livadia, three divisions of troops,

stationed in the military district of St. Petersburg, are to be placed in readiness for service by the 13th inst. All the troops stationed in the south of Russia are said to be in readiness for active service." The Vienna correspondent of the *Daily News* writes: "In official, and especially in military circles, it has been well known that not only at the present time, but for five months past, Russia has been busy at work moving a considerable mass of troops towards her western and southern borders. These proceedings have not caused any uneasiness here, nor lead to the slightest military preparation on this side of the Polish border. This can only be explained by the existence of some understanding, Austria and Russia being on the most friendly footing."

The same correspondent telegraphs: "Russian advices from Moscow state that two of the railway companies in Russia have resolved to send an address to the Government, complaining of the inconvenience, loss of traffic, and interference with rolling stock, through the continuous transport of troops and military stores for several months." A later telegram states that the Russian Government had resolved to indemnify the company.

THE GENERAL PROSPECT.

The *Liverpool Mercury* under the heading of "War Rumours," says:

"Once more the Eastern breezes come laden with rumours of war. It is true they are but fitful—sighing along in under currents to-day, a mere capful of wind to-morrow a stiff breeze the next day, falling to a whisper the day following. A sudden stroke of policy on the part of our own Government, as unexpected as it has for years past been unprecedented, has raised the breeze to half a gale. In purchasing the Suez Canal shares held by the Khedive of Egypt, the British Cabinet has rolled another tar barrel into the middle of a most inflammable question, for use in case the great European bonfire should break out at last.

"Whether we are actually on the eve of a great War in Europe we do not pretend to decide; but that all the elements necessary to the bringing about and prosecuting such a war are in actual and active existence, no one with eyes to see and ears to hear, can for a moment doubt. It is all very well for great military potentates to go about visiting each other and instructing semi-official organs to report that their only object is to

'cement peace.' The question is, does what they are doing all the time justify what they profess to be talking about? If the result of the Emperor Alexander's visit to the German Emperor had been a reduction of workmen in the Russian naval yards, and a partial disbandment, however small, of the German army, the mind of Europe would probably have been reassured. The same may be said of the interchange of visits between the Emperor of Austria, the Emperor of Germany, and the King of Italy. Everywhere the commanders of legions are strengthening themselves for the battle, while pretending that no battle is forthcoming. Even this country is driven by the prevailing example to join in the race for power in preference to proposing a partial disarmament. In the first place, therefore, we pay little heed to peaceable professions accompanied by warlike preparation."

Another paper says:

"While there is peace there is hope, and this, probably, is all the negative comfort to be extracted from the present situation. The portents are ominous enough. The Sick Man is sick almost unto death. His troubles grow complicated. The wretched insurrection in the Herzegovina, which would have been suppressed by any vigorous nation in a couple of weeks, still drags its slow length along, and becomes serious, not on account of its direct importance, but the pretext it affords for foreign countries to meddle with the internal affairs of the Turkish Empire. There will be a large heritage to divide if the sublime Porte is extinguished in Europe, and Austria and Russia no doubt expect to be substantial gainers in the partition. Germany, too, for some hidden reason, seems to make common cause with these aggressive states, and thus the three Eastern Powers are in league against the Turkish Empire. For that effete and scandalous nation we have no apology to offer; it would be a gain to civilization and propriety that the Mahomedan dynasty were driven across the Bosphorus into Asia; and no European people are concerned to maintain the present *status quo* out of sympathy with Ottoman misrule. But if there is to be a division of the territory—if the equilibrium of nations is to be disturbed, and the strong to be still stronger—it is indispensable that we should be careful that these new arrangements are not inimical to our interests or threatening to our safety. We cannot be indifferent spectators of the solution of the Turkish question. It is not likely that we, or any other nation, will take up arms for the maintenance of the political anachronism in the East. It is impossible to prop up that which is utterly rotten. It must crumble to pieces sooner or later, and the catastrophe seems to be near at hand. The internecine strife, the unfriendly pressure

from without, the financial embarrassments, and the general disrepute of the Turkish Government—all point to a tremendous crash impending.”

The *Birmingham Daily Mail* says:

“There is undoubtedly a return of the serious ‘sickness’ which threatened the dissolution of the Turkish Empire in 1854. Whether there has been any considerable improvement in the health of the invalid is indeed open to question, but stimulants, in the shape of foreign loans, have kept him alive. The revolt in Herzegovina, followed immediately by the financial crash, has revealed the true state of affairs. Again, therefore, we see gathered round the patient the group of anxious statesmen, all of them with the profession of physicians, many with the hope of becoming executors. The most serious aspect of the affair as regards Turkey herself. There is no such feeling in this country as existed in 1854, that the integrity of the Ottoman Empire is to be maintained by English help. If, then, the remonstrances of Russia are intended to partake of the character of threats, there will not stand between the word and the blow the same protecting power on which Turkey previously relied. England has no longer the desire, and France has not the same power to arrest the Russian march into the Danubian provinces.”

BRITISH PREPARATIONS:

The British army has been “mobilised” or placed on a footing admitting of rapid movement in case of need. It is not large compared with the military hordes of the Continent, as to which the *St. Petersburg Golos*, having enumerated the various corps composing it, remarks: “And this, then, is the mighty force which causes the *Times* newspaper to assume so menacing and supercilious a tone. The brief abstract we have received of the *Times*’ article does not as yet give us a clear idea with what object this article has been written, and what is the meaning of the very strange mobilisation measures attributed to the British War Office.”

The principal point of interest to the brethren in Britain, in connection with this matter, is the absence of any immediate idea at all events, of reaching to conscription. The *Daily News*, referring to the subject, says, “We have no fear that the regular army will ever be recruited in that manner. Conscription is out of harmony with the institutions of this country. Parliament could not be induced to grant

it, nor could any government enforce it if it became law. We must continue to recruit our army by voluntary enlistment; and if we find that the process is attended with new difficulties, we must adapt the terms of service to the character and habits of our people.”

On the same subject, the Duke of Cambridge, Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces, expressed himself as follows at a banquet in London, in the beginning of December:—

“When they saw the enormous exertions which were being made by other countries to place their military establishments on a greatly enlarged footing, compared with what they had been heretofore, it would be, he thought, the height of folly—to use a strong term—if we did not try to go as far as we could, at all events, in our military reforms. Peace should be the order of things throughout the world. (Cheers.) But he could not help coming to the conclusion that we have not arrived at that happy period when all thoughts of warlike operations will be put on one side. (Cheers.) Look at the state of the world in general; look at what all the great empires were doing, and would any man tell him that under those circumstances the mere wish for peace which they entertained ought to make us think that there was no possibility of a warlike state arising? It might be before they were many years older. It was really so serious a matter that it was impossible for a man in his position to dwell too strongly upon it, or to refrain from inducing his fellow-countrymen, if possible, to agree with him in that view. If they were right in that view, they ought to put the navy and army in the most efficient position. (Loud cheers.) He would, of course, say, in reference to the large establishments of other countries, that he did not for a moment ask them to maintain anything so large; and, for this simple reason, they could not do it. They had not the means; they had not the area from which men could be got; they were not so numerous; but there was another and more serious reason—they had not conscription. His own idea was that it was absurd to imagine that conscription could ever be made to ‘go down’ in this country. (Cheers.) The only question is whether it might not be under certain circumstances not only allowable but desirable for the militia.”

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J.H.S.—1 Cor. iii. 12-15, you will find explained in the *Christadelphian* for April,

1875, p. 186; the other passage (1 Cor. vii. 36-37) is explained in the same number, p. 185, in answer to F.W. The third question (relating to matrimony) you will find answered in the *Christadelphian* for November, 1875, p. 517.

W.A.—“*If the righteousness of Christ can save others from death (that is, from dying at all, as in the case of Enoch, Elijah, and those alive at his coming), would not that righteousness have the same or even more powerful effect on himself?*”

Part of the righteousness of Christ was his death; which was the necessary declaration of the righteousness of God.—(Rom. iii. 25.) With this part of his righteousness, Enoch and Elijah identified themselves by sacrifice, and latter-day believers, by baptism into his death; and, therefore, there is no absolute need for their death. But Christ could not escape it: his death, as their representative, was the necessary foundation of the release of the others, and of himself (by resurrection) as one of them. Without it none of them could have escaped. If the righteousness of Christ include his death, how can we speak of that righteousness exempting him from death?

ACCEPTABLE ENCOURAGEMENT.—The following anonymous communication is neat, unique, exemplary, scriptural and encouraging in the true sense. It will do good to let it see the light. There are many such expressions at this time of the year, but few so complete and finished:—“Please accept of the enclosed small but willingly-offered mite from a brother and sister who have enough and to spare, thanks to our gracious and merciful heavenly Father, for the purpose of enabling anyone of our number to get a copy of that ever-welcome monthly visitor (the *Christadelphian*) for next year, who are unable to get one for themselves, and who are thus prevented from tasting of the many sweet, precious, strengthening, and what is best of all, lasting things of which it is composed, and who pray and long for the time when those poor—and yet rich—but despised people shall be exalted even to that of kings and priests unto Him who is the former and the upholder of all things: to whom be the glory both now and for the age. Amen.”

PRAYER FOR THE AUTHORITIES.

A.A. (Y.)—Paul commanded that in the assemblies of the saints, there should be, “first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving thanks for all men, for kings, and for all who are in authority.” You ask why this is not done at the meetings of the brethren in our day. As a matter of fact, it is occasionally done, but is not a prominent feature, owing to the absence of the circumstances which led Paul to enjoin

it in his day. The brethren in the first century were exposed to peril at the hands of the authorities. Persecution of a violent kind was a frequent occurrence. Not only their meetings, but the tenor of their individual lives were liable to violent interference. It was therefore an urgent matter of petition that “kings and all in authority” should be so restrained and guided that the saints might be allowed to lead quiet and peaceable lives. This is the object Paul connects with his injunction to pray for the authorities. In our day the times are different. We live in an age when the hands of the civil power have been tied in a religious direction. We are in no danger of interference or persecution. The absence of the danger accounts for the absence of prayer for protection from it. Certainly, in so far as the well-being of the community affects the well-being of the house of God, and in so far as the well-being of the community depends on the measures of those in power, it is still a matter of reasonable public petition that “kings and all who are in authority” may be divinely superintended, yea, that perchance that they may be brought to the truth, as Paul wished concerning Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 29), and as God is willing that all men should do.—(1 Tim. ii. 4.)

THE DRYING OF THE EUPHRATES AND THE APPEARING OF CHRIST.

From Rev. xvi. 12, we may be led to believe that just before the appearing of Christ, Turkey or the Euphratean power will be in a shrivelled or dried-up state. Is it not therefore necessary that the Lord appear to his household before Constantinople is overthrown and taken by the king of the north?—S.D.

ANSWER.—The language of the verse in question is, “And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.” This points to more than a “shrivelled” state of Turkey; it points to a disappearance of that power by exhaustion. Turkey is rapidly advancing to this catastrophe. For fifty years she has been sinking from internal causes, or “drying up,” and she is now on the point of complete collapse, politically as well as financially. But it does not follow that the Lord must come before Russia takes possession. The river is dried that Christ and the saints might have an open “way” for the commencement of their great work at his coming; but the drying-up which prepares their way, opens the way for any one else who may wish to take advantage of it. When a river is dried, people can cross and recross throughout the entire length. The drying-up which prepares the way of the kings of the east, opens also the path of the king of the north, in so far as the exhaustion

of Turkey makes her northern territories an easy prey for Russia. Therefore Russia may be in possession before the Lord appears to his household. The appearance of the Lord to his house is just before he smites the assembled hosts of Gog on the mountains of Israel. How long before is not revealed, except that it is not long, as shewn by the association of the resurrection in Dan. xii. 2, with the Gogian crisis. Now Gog does not come down upon the mountains of Israel till the establishment of Israel in a hasty, recent, unvalled way, under the protectorate of Britain; and this establishment of Israel cannot take place till the Euphrates is finally dry, and the "way" for it thus prepared. While Russia enters the dried northern bed of the political Euphrates, Britain takes up her position in the southern section, under whose protection Israel quickly returns. We seem now on the eve of this development. Britain taking fright at the secret plots and conspiracies of the northern neighbours of the Sick Man, has made a forward move, and planted herself in Egypt. This will, doubtless, precipitate the crisis, and bring on a partition of Turkey. The "way" thus opened, there will probably be a peaceful interval, during which the colonization of the Holy Land rapidly proceeds for the strengthening of England's position. Jealousy of this position brings on a renewal of the Russian advance, in how long a time we must wait and see—probably a few years. It is during this peaceful interval that the Lord comes privately to his house, but not necessarily "before" Constantinople is in the hands of the King of the North.

BAPTISM IN THE ABSENCE OF A BROTHER TO BAPTIZE.

QUESTION.—"I have lately been striving to understand the things concerning the gospel of the kingdom of God, as preached by Jesus Christ and all his apostles, in a knowledge of which I have been greatly assisted by studying *Elpis Israel* and *Twelve Lectures*, and have become thoroughly convinced that without that knowledge, true repentance, and baptism into the saving name, there can be no salvation. I am very anxious to add myself to the number who await the coming of the Lord, hoping to be found worthy to reign with him for ever. But how to do this I am at a loss to know, for I am a long distance from any of the true believers, and I cannot do it for myself. By any means give me some information how to act. I should be very grateful; and I think it would be of service to others as well as myself, for there are several more in this place who are much interested in the truth, and although they do not say so, I believe

are kept back by the same motives as myself."—JOHN ERREY, Queensland.

ANSWER.—It is a matter of little consequence who performs the mechanical part of the process of burying a man in the likeness of Christ. This is shewn by the fact that though "Jesus made and baptised more disciples than John, *Jesus himself baptised not, but his disciples*" (John iv. 1); also by Paul's statement, that Christ sent him not to baptise, lest any should say he baptised in his own name.—(1 Cor. i. 1.) It is better to have a believer, who being himself in Christ, is in full sympathy with the act; but in the absence of such an one, any sober friend, having some respect for religious conviction, may be invited to perform the part of baptiser. Anybody can bury a dead man, which is the significance of baptism. The efficacy of the act in no way depends upon the administrator; it is the enlightenment and obedience of the subject that is the saving element in the case: these are counted to him for righteousness, even if the baptiser should turn out a reprobate. No doubt Judas took part with the other disciples in baptising the multitudes; but his unworthiness would not invalidate the baptism of those who passed under his hands. The circumstances of our day are exceptional. We live at the end of a long night, during which God has said nothing additional to what was committed to the apostles. Coming to a knowledge of the truth at such a time, and amid unbelievers, what can be done as to baptism but to obtain the assistance of the best disposed of our neighbours, in the absence of brethren. In the case of a number interested, the best way is to baptise one another. Dr. Thomas's case illustrates the point. In 1847, after fifteen years' study, he had attained to a full knowledge of the faith that justifies; and having no brother in the faith to assist him in baptism, the Dr. asked a friend to accompany him to the water. Arrived there, he said to him, "I desire you to immerse me. All I ask of you is to put me under the water and pronounce the words over me: 'Upon confession of your faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, I baptise you into the name of the Father and of the Son and Holy Spirit.' I don't ask you for any ceremony. All that is necessary I will do for myself, except the mechanical part of putting me under the water, and your utterance of these words." With this understanding, the Dr.'s friend immersed him.

"ARE BROTHERN AT LIBERTY TO EAT BLOOD AND THINGS STRANGLED?"

W.U.—There can be no question that the Gentile believers, while exempt from all obligation to keep the law of Moses, were

commanded (Acts xv. 20, 29), to abstain from the eating of blood and things strangled, and the latter because of the former; that is things strangled were things with blood retained in them and therefore unfit for those forbidden to eat blood. There can also be no question that the black pudding of modern use, and many fowls and rabbits that are sold in the market would be excluded by the apostolic prohibition if it is binding on believers of our age. Any doubt that may exist on the question of whether it is binding now or not, arises from the fact that the prohibition seems to have been a concession to the Jewish section of the brotherhood in the first century, based upon the principle of not using liberty to the hurt of others. Thus James, on whose recommendation the prohibition seems to have been enjoined by the council of the apostles and elders, who "came together to consider this matter," gave as his reason for recommending it: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day." If this was the object of the commandment—to avoid needless offence to the Jews who were all zealous of Moses and to whom it seemed that Moses was set at nought by Gentile believers, if besides neglecting circumcision of the flesh, they ate things offered in sacrifice to idols, and blood, and things strangled, then the force of it would be gone in a day like ours, when there is no Jewish element in the brotherhood to consider. Paul's argument on the subject would seem to show that this was the position of the case. On the subject of eating things that had been offered in sacrifice to idols, for instance, Paul argues that an idol is nothing (1 Cor. viii. 4), and that the flesh consecrated to an idol, and afterwards exposed for sale in the shambles, was none the worse for the performance, and could be eaten with thanksgiving by an intelligent believer (1 Cor. x. 27-30), except where the eating was likely to be construed into a participation in idolatry. His words on the last point place the matter in a clear light: "Whatsoever is set before you (that is, at a feast) eat, asking no questions for conscience sake. But if any man say unto you, *This is offered in sacrifice to idols*, EAT NOT."—(1 Cor. x. 27.) This shows that in Paul's estimation it was a matter of indifference as to the eating of animals that had been offered in the idol worship so long as the fact of that offering was not the reason of the eating. So long as the matter was out of sight, believers were at liberty to eat even things offered in sacrifice to idols; but when the fact was brought forward, they were to desist, "for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake . . . conscience I say, *not thine own*, but of the other"—(verse 29). Nevertheless, he recommends great caution in the use of this liberty.

"Howbeit," says he (chap. viii. 7) "there is not in every man that knowledge; for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour, eat it as a thing offered unto an idol, and their conscience being weak, is defiled. But meat commendeth us not to God, for neither if we eat are we better, neither if we eat not are we the worse. But take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak. For if any man see thee, which has knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him that is weak be emboldened to eat those things that are offered unto idols. And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died." From this it is evident that Paul considered a brother at liberty to eat that which the letter of the Council at Jerusalem had forbidden, provided it could be done without hurting others who were weak; that is, those who could not see their way to such a liberty. At first sight it may seem strange how the doing of a thing not wrong in itself could hurt anyone however weak. Paul has given the answer: the liberty of the strong-minded brother, misunderstood by the weak-minded brother, encourages the weak-minded brother to do that which in *that weak-minded brother's opinion* is wrong. Therefore, that which is not wrong-doing in the other, becomes wrong-doing in him, because he does it thinking it wrong. Thus his conscience is defiled: for so far as his relation to the matter is concerned, he has been as distinctly guilty of wrong-doing as if they had been actually wrong; that is, to him, the eating of the flesh has been an *act of fellowship with idolatry*, and, therefore, as distinctly sin as if he had worshipped the idol. Paul lays down the principle, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," therefore, "he that doubteth is damned if he eat."—(Rom. xiv. 23.) The rule is of easy application to every matter, involving the question of right and wrong. If there is a doubt, be on the safe side. If liberty is clear, use it, only not to the detriment of another. "One believeth that he may eat *all things* . . . I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean in itself, but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died . . . For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth or is offended, or is made weak."—(Rom. xiv. 2, 14, 15, 20, 21.) It is evident from the whole of the evidence that the commandment not to eat blood and things strangled

was of the character suggested in the beginning of these remarks; and that, therefore, if things in themselves be good, and the use of them is unattended with spiritual harm to others, they are to be eaten with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer."—(1 Tim. iv. 5.) When doubts exist, let the parties concerned act on the advice of Paul: "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth."—(Rom. xiv. 3.)

ALLEGED "CONTRADICTION."

W.A. asks us to "reconcile" the following statements which he alleges to be in contradiction of one another.

FIRST STATEMENT (*Christadelphian*, Oct. 1873, p. 442.)

"If there had been a Jew who kept the law in all things, having done the will of the Father from the beginning of life, he would have been in the very same position as the Lord Jesus himself; it would then have been in his power by dying to cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, and his righteousness would have caused his resurrection from the dead. . . . Death purifies him from hereditary condemnation."

SECOND STATEMENT (*Christadelphian*, Nov. 1875, p. 520.)

"Though redeemed by the first (the moral), we are by the second (the physical), under the actual dominion of death until incorruptibility is conferred, and if a man before then died twenty times, he would no more be paying 'the claims of sin' twenty times over than in the case of twenty attacks of toothache. *The claims of the case exist as long as we are mortal, and we shall continue mortal until the time arrives for God to seal His grace to us in the great change, and when that time arrives, it matters not whether we are living or dead.*"

The contradiction supposed to exist between these two extracts is thus expressed by our correspondent. "Some time ago you had been learning I presume, as well as 'watching' for twenty-one years, and had learnt that a man by dying would cleanse himself from the Adamic condemnation, but when you have been learning for twenty-three years, you have learnt that death will not cleanse him, but that he remains unchanged until God shall do the work by bringing about the great change after the judgment."³

It is an unpleasant thing for a writer to discuss whether he has contradicted himself or not, and an unprofitable thing for those who may read. But when the cry of "contradiction" is raised to the detriment

of the truth, it may be necessary to take notice of it.

We allege then that there is no contradiction in the case, and that the phrase "reconcile" is inappropriate to the process of demonstrating this. The two propositions, as any one may see at a glance, relate to two different cases; the first, to a suppositious case of a man not sinning; the second to those who have sinned, but are forgiven through Christ. That which might be true in the first case is not necessarily true in the second.

But even if the propositions both applied to the same case, there is an absence of contradiction when the terms are properly understood. That they are not understood by W.A. is evident from his implied paraphrase of "cleanse" as used in the first extract by the word "change" (physical). We did not use the word with this meaning. Doubtless, the word cleanse, as a figurative expression, is a little ambiguous, and gives room for misunderstanding on the part of those who do not candidly and patiently consider all the explanations that have been given, which any one is bound to do, who so confidently and scornfully alleges the existence of contradiction. The word "cleanse" was used in the sense of being delivered from the defiling sentence in the way God's honour required, viz., by being carried out. It was not used in the sense of the removal of physical blemish in the living person: in that sense, death would be a strange mode of cleansing: *cure a mortal man of his mortality by killing him!* Immortalization is the physical cleansing; but there is a cleansing which can only be effected by death, and this "cleansing" is defined in the very paragraph which is supposed to contradict it. The language is this: (*Christadelphian*, Nov. 1875, p. 520.) "In the moral sense—that is, so far as the requirements of God's authority are concerned, *one occurrence of death completes the vindication of the law in question*, or is all that is necessary for it." To put the matter briefly, we hold at the end of twenty-three years as we held at the end of twenty-one, first, that apart from Christ, a perfectly righteous man, (if there had been such a man) could not have been cleansed or delivered from the condemnation that has passed upon all men, without dying; secondly, that Christ having died and risen, those who have identified themselves with the condemnation that has been accomplished in him (in being baptized into his death,) do not need to die so far as the mind of God towards them is required, but die only because the time has not arrived for the change of their physical constitution.

The cry of "contradiction" is usually due to a misunderstanding of what is written, or to an only partial acquaintance with a subject having many bearings, and

requiring long thought and deep reverential study towards God. It is of course a trial of patience that it should be freely alleged; but we endure it in the knowledge that the accusation has no foundation in truth, and that on the contrary, what has been written is in harmony one part with another, notwithstanding an occasional appearance to the contrary.

The matters explained above have often, in one form or other, been the subject of explanation within the last two years. On this ground we stated last month that the question (though relating to a recent appearance of "contradiction") had been answered many times. This statement we repeat in the sense in which we made a similar observation to a correspondent in the *Christadelphian* for April, 1875, page 186; and we do not consider that in making this statement we lay ourselves open to the insinuation of partial falsehood at the hands of reasonable men.

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE TRUTH.

DEAR SIR.—I had the boldness to send a letter to Mr. W. E. Gladstone, asking his opinion on the *Christadelphian* and *Bible Echo* doctrine; and among several Christadelphian works, I mentioned in particular your *Twelve Lectures*, when I received a letter from him, of which the following is a part of its contents:—"I do not know the works to which you refer, and cannot therefore, give an opinion. I would, however, say, be slow to rely on plausible citations which are constantly used by men, themselves ignorant, to deceive others. Have some regard in these great points to the universal and perpetual belief of the Christian Society or Church where known. Above all, keep an unshaken absolute confidence in the perfect justice and inexhaustible goodness of the Great Being in whose hand we stand, and whose wisdom, it is reasonable to hope, will hereafter solve our problems in a manner far beyond the best we can conceive."

It was indeed great kindness and condescension in such a high personage as Mr. Gladstone, answering such an illiterate and poor person as I am. Now I would be very glad indeed to have *your opinion* on the above letter. I may mention that I wrote him again, desiring him to read, at least, your *Twelve Lectures*, and that I did not think that you and several others could be called ignorant. I have got no reply as yet to my last letter.—GEO. T. BOYD.

REMARKS.—All that can be said is that Mr. Gladstone's is about the only advice that could be given in ignorance of the matters to which his attention was invited. In a general way, plausible citations are misleading, particularly when, as Mr. Gladstone expresses it, "constantly used" by ignorant men. The caution applies to

all subjects, and may be safely received as a piece of abstract wisdom on all general occasions; but when the question is whether a given literature is of the character described, the caution becomes a mere generality of no value to an enquirer, who, in the absence of further guidance, must judge for himself so far as he is able.

The argument for the truth, as contained in *Elpis Israel*, *Eureka*, and other works, is no matter of "plausible citation." It does not rest exclusively on "citations" of any kind, but stands broadly on a basement of undoubted historical fact and unquestionable scientific truth. One has only to look into the matter to see how multiform, complex, yet simple in its massive bulk, is the evidence on which the Christadelphian position is established—evidence which an ignorant man could not understand, let alone elaborate, as it has been elaborated in the works in question. But, of course, Mr. Gladstone did not know to what his correspondent referred. Christadelphian works are not known in the field of general literature, and Mr. Gladstone, who is pretty well acquainted with that field, would naturally assume that books that he did not know that were revolutionary in theology must be of an empirical and dangerous character. Consequently he gave the only advice which a wise man in his circumstances could give. His favourable allusion to "the universal and perpetual belief of the Christian Society or Church" is also perfectly natural. Mr. Gladstone is no theologian. He has been a politician all his life. He has written much recently on ecclesiastical affairs; but it is from a political rather than a religious point of view that he discusses them. It may be safely assumed that he is not particularly learned in the Scriptures. For such a man it is the most natural thing in the world, in the discussion of radical Christian doctrines, to turn his eye and direct the eyes of others, to "the universal and perpetual belief of the Christian Church." Having been engrossed for the most part of his life in political affairs, he feels incompetent to judge of theological questions, and falls back on "the universal and perpetual belief of the Christian Church" as a thing on which he must rely. It is as if he said, "Well, I am no judge of such matters myself; but the Church has for ages entertained certain beliefs; and as it is the function of the Church to study such matters, I must assume that the Church's belief is entitled to respect, and therefore I rely on that belief as some guide to my own convictions." Which, again, is a very natural, and, in a certain sense, commendable, attitude to assume. But when we look at it critically, it appears in a different light. The "Christian Church" turns out to be an aggregation of men who

have inherited theological opinions, which they passively endorse, and have every reason for professing, and the vast mass of which, Mr. Gladstone, as a Protestant himself, rejects. The "Christian Church" is not what it was in primitive times—Mr. Gladstone himself being witness. Its doctrines, as well as its institutions, have changed; and even as it now exists, the Church is divided as to both. Neither "universality" nor "perpetualness" can be alleged of any of the prevalent forms of belief. Mr. Gladstone's remark is terse but inapplicable to the facts. We are driven to the apostolic documents in our search for the original apostolic faith. It comes to this—that if we would know the truth we must try "the Christian Society or Church" by the foundation on which it professedly stands—the word of the apostles; and if the two are found discrepant, there can be no reasonable hesitation as to which we are to have the most "regard" for. These conclusions acquire an unspeakable increase of force, from the fact that while the apostles were yet on the scene, a departure from the faith had commenced (2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 John iv. 1) and that they foretold this departure would advance to the point at which the truth would become obliterated, and fables received as true religion.—(2 Tim. iv. 3-4; 2 Thess. ii. 11.)

Mr. Gladstone's allusion to "the perfect justice and inexhaustible goodness of the great Being in whose hand we stand," is beautiful and pathetic; but as affording guidance to a perplexed soul in quest of the right way, it is valueless. It is apt to be worse than this. Its soothing effect is apt to deter the enquirer from further research, under a vague impression that all will come right. It is like giving an opiate to a benighted traveller instead of definite directions how to find his way. God is just and God is good, nevertheless, Jesus (an authority to whom Mr. Gladstone makes reverence) tells us that "many" traverse the broad road leading to destruction, and furthermore that the way leading to life is narrow, and that few find it, and even that many striving to enter are not able.—(Luke xiii. 24; Matt. vii. 13.) To what purpose is it to tell men anxiously asking "Where is the narrow way?" that God is just and God is good.

We live in a day when the question "what is truth?" must be pursued with as little reference as possible to what the "Christian church" believes on the subject. Ignorant men are snares, but "the church" is a precipice over which a man is pretty certain to be dashed to destruction. It is a matter of investigation, the result of which stands unaffected by the mere opinion of any man, high or low.

MATTERS THAT ARE TOO HIGH.

Brother R. Paterson writes: "I cannot

refrain from expressing my hearty concurrence in the sentiments of the 'Sunday Morning' address in the November *Christadelphian*. I allude in particular to what you say regarding the controversy as to whether Christ could or could not sin, and whether he had or had not a will of his own. I hope that the brethren everywhere will carefully ponder your remarks and pause before they entangle themselves in this or any similar barren strife. Let us by all means fight for the truth and sacrifice everything if need be, on its behalf. But let us be sure that it is the truth and not profitless abstractions we are fighting for.

Bewildering discussions as to what free-will is, and as to how the fixed purpose of the Eternal in relation to an individual can co-exist with the exercise of that individual's own will, do not necessarily belong to the truth. Such matters are too high for us. We may talk about them, using big words, and appearing very profound, but we can neither understand or settle them. As you well point out, both the eternal purpose of the Father concerning the Son, and the Son's willing and loving subjection to the Father are clearly revealed to us: and it is the duty of all to accept these in their plainness and simplicity, and not to tear the flock in pieces with bootless jangling. In expounding the Scriptures in the various ecclesias there will, of course, be very many differences manifested by the brethren; still, provided the elementary principles of the truth are held in common, there is nothing to prevent harmony, and unity, and love prevailing. It is utterly wrong for any brother who holds a strong view upon any abstract point to attempt to force his brethren to speak and think precisely as he does.

There is no doctrine which more demands the exercise of forbearance on the part of the brethren one towards another than that of God-manifestation. As you pointed out to the brethren in Birmingham, Jesus is presented to us in two aspects—as the manifestation of the Eternal Father by the Spirit and as the Son of Man, made in all points like unto his brethren, and perfected by obedience through suffering. Both aspects are equally important and true, and if we hold one of them in such a way as to deny the other, we forsake the truth. But in entering on the details of the subject, an infinite variety of thoughts and expressions infallibly arises. Some brethren, while not denying the human are naturally inclined to dwell almost exclusively on the divine side of the Christ; while others again, while without doubt believing that Jesus was the manifestation of the Father, incline towards an extreme the other way. Where a right spirit prevails such brethren bear with each other, and endeavour with mutual, kindly persuasion to attain unto greater oneness. But what is the result when the ecclesia is

converted into an arena where each side attempts to force, by regular stand-up fighting, its way of thinking on its neighbour. Nothing but confusion and the raking-up of all the evil passions and feelings of our nature, instead of righteousness, peace and joy.

The enemy, both in connection with the truth and outside of it has surely had enough in this direction already to cause him to

rejoice without such wanton playing into his hands. Avoiding crochets and hobbies, let us patiently continue in the work of spreading the knowledge of the truth and the building up the brethren. I have not seen anything recently which is better calculated to give them a healthy stimulus in this direction than your address to the Birmingham ecclesia, as contained in the November *Christadelphian*."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the past month the following additions have been made to the ecclesia: on Nov. 27th, by immersion, JOHN TAYLOR (29), brassfounder, brother in the flesh to brother W. Taylor; on December 11th, by immersion, CHARLES HENRY HUXLEY (19), jeweller. Also by removal from London, brother and sister J. C. Phillips.

The Sunday Evening Meetings have been occupied as follows: *Nov. 28th.*—Answering of written questions. (Brother Roberts.) *Dec. 5th.*—"Restoration of Israel." (Brother Hodginson.) *December 12th.*—"Popular fallacies concerning the Holy Spirit, the soul, and the devil." (Brother Shuttleworth.) *December 19th.*—"The work of Christ in relation to heaven, earth and hell." (Brother Shuttleworth.)

CARDIFF.—The removal to this place of brother G. A. Birkenhead from Sale, may result in the introduction of the truth to it, if the Lord delay his coming. Brother Birkenhead is doing his best so far as his abilities allow.

DUNDEE.—Brother Mortimer writes:—"We have commenced a course of lectures for the winter. The first subject was, *Nov. 7th*, 'The return of Christ to reign on the earth the great event of this generation;' *14th*, 'The Signs of the Times—what is coming.' We had fair audiences both nights."

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Smith reports the obedience of MARY KIRKWOOD, sister in the flesh to the brothers Kirkwood, on Nov. 16th. She previously gave satisfactory evidence of her intelligence in the faith. The evening lectures for the past few months have been well attended, and several are interested.

During December, commencing Wednesday the 8th, a course of eight lectures (embracing two Sundays) was delivered by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, in the Literary Institute, South Clerk Street. The brethren had made pecuniary preparation for the lecture many months beforehand. The Sunday lectures were given in the large hall of the Institute; the others, in one of the minor rooms. The attendance

throughout was satisfactory, especially on the Sundays, and the last of these in particular. Brethren were present from various parts of Scotland, and broke bread on Sundays in the morning. When the lectures were over, a tea-meeting was held in the meeting-place of the brethren, at which sundry edifying addresses were delivered. The subjects of the lectures were, in brief, as follows: 1, "The Bible True;" 2, "Christendom Apostate;" 3, "The Gospel;" 4, "Modern Revivals;" 5, "The Coming of Christ;" 6, "Christ's Work at his coming;" 7, "Christ near;" 8, "Signs of the Times."

FROME.—Brother Sutton reports the obedience in baptism of EPHRAIM STOCKWELL (43), wire card maker, formerly neutral, but for many years having some knowledge of the truth.

GLASGOW.—Brother William Owler, writing on the 17th inst., reports the immersion of ANNIE NAIRN, who was assisted to put on the covering name on the 14th inst. The ecclesia now numbers 51. A two nights' discussion took place the previous week in Govan, about 2½ miles from Glasgow, between a Mr. Mitchell (Free Churchman) and brother Thomas Nisbet. The subject was, "Does the Bible teach the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul?" Mr. Mitchell to affirm and brother Nisbet to deny. The "Rev." Alexander Jamieson occupied the chair the first night, and brother Charles Smith the second. The hall was crowded on both occasions, there being an average attendance of 250 persons each night. Space does not admit of a report of the discussion itself. The lectures delivered in Glasgow since last communication have been: *Oct. 24th.*—"Mr. Moody's published Discourse on Heaven." (Brother James Nisbet.) *Oct. 31st.*—"The New Heavens and the New Earth." (Brother T. Nisbet.) *Nov. 7th.*—"The Second Coming of Jesus." (Brother Alexander, of Stow.) *Nov. 14th.*—"The Sentence passed upon our First Parents in the Garden of Eden and God's way of deliverance from its consequences." (Brother Mulholland.)

Writing again on the 14th December, brother Owlter records the obedience of Mrs. KENNEDY (wife of brother Kennedy), and Mr. THOMAS BROWN, who after a confession of their faith in the promises made to Abraham, were baptised into the saving name on the 29th Nov. He also mentions that brother Robert Carruthers, sen., died on the 9th inst., aged 63 years. He was interred in Sight Hill Cemetery, in presence of the brethren and friends, brother Geo. Dick delivering an address on the occasion in our deceased brother's house. In connection with the effort which is being made by the Glasgow brethren to create an interest for the truth in the Govan district, I may state that they have met with opposition which will do good. Brethren Robertson, Mulholland, David Smith (Edinburgh) and Common have each delivered one lecture. The "Rev." Alex. Jamieson gave a lecture in another hall—which was crowded—on the same night that brother Mulholland spoke. Mr. Jamieson reviewed the lectures of brethren Nisbet and Robertson, both of whom were present, and spoke for fifteen minutes each at the close."

GRANTHAM.—Bro. Hawkins writes (Dec. 11): "I have to report the public appearance of brother Hodgkinson at a lecture on Sunday week. We had a large hail, and mustered perhaps one hundred hearers. Considering all things, and the subject, "What must I do to be saved? What must I be saved from?" we conceive it was a true success as the audience was a patient and an attentive one. Brother Hodgkinson was much pleased. We have awakened curiosity, and, we hope enquiry, as brother Buckler's lecture on Sunday night last was listened to by a fair audience, upon 'The Dead Unconscious until the Resurrection, therefore the consequent error of popular belief.' We purpose, God willing, to have one lecture per month in the large hall. These in addition to our weekly ministrations, will we hope, lead some out of the gross darkness of Gentile midnight, to seek for light before the bridegroom comes."

Brother Buckler also writes on the subject and says, "We are trying to arrange for a lecture in the Exchange Hall every four weeks, but find it difficult to get speakers. The remaining days of labour are perhaps but very few. May we use them wisely and well."

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother J. W. Diboll, jun., reports that the following lectures have been delivered since last report: *Sunday, Nov. 21st.*—"The Gospel of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. Will it save you?"—(Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.) *Sunday, Nov. 28th.*—"Religion, unenlightened and enlightened."—(Brother A. Harwood.) *Sunday, Dec. 5th.*—"Man, his Nature and Destiny."—(Bro. D. Spinney.) *Sunday, Dec. 12th.*—"God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and Angels."—(Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.)

HUDDERSFIELD.—Brother Sykes reports the obedience of C. H. EASTWOOD (21), of Almondsbury Bank, Huddersfield, formerly a Wesleyan; and brother Saunderson the immersion of his wife.

KEIGHLEY.—Two immersions taking place here sometime ago were, it seems, omitted, though reported: CLARA A. SILVERWOOD and BETSY WATSON, two young females. A mistake in figures in last report makes sister S. A. Smith 26 instead of 29.

LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew reports: "On Aug. 31st, we had another addition, by immersion, in the person of GEORGE CAYGILL, formerly neutral, but who has always been a great Bible reader, and could not agree with some of the doctrines popularly taught. On Sunday, November 7th, we had a visit from brother William Birkenhead, of Sale, who lectured for us both morning and evening to good audiences. His subjects were 'The Perverted Parable;' 'The Rich Man and Lazarus;' and 'The Great Necessity of the Age: one Government to suit all nations soon to be established under one Ruler.' For the present the morning lectures are discontinued."

LEICESTER.—Brother Armstrong reports an improved attendance at the lectures, of which the subjects have been as follow: *Nov. 7th,* "The Son of God." (Brother Roberts, of Birmingham.) *Nov. 14th,* "Christ and him crucified." (Brother Burton.) *Nov. 21st.*—"The Rock on which the Church is built." (Brother Waite.) *Nov. 28th.*—"The True Church." (Brother Yardley.)

LONDON.—Saving that the truth is proclaimed to those in darkness, I have no intelligence to communicate, nevertheless that this is being done is cheering, when we remember the state of things here but a few years back. The lectures for the past four weeks were as follow: *Sunday, Nov. 21st.*—"Some of the definite things to be done by those who would share the salvation of God." (Bro. Boshier.) *Sunday, Nov. 28th.*—"State of the Dead." (Bro. Phillips.) *Sunday, Dec. 5th.*—"The Wicked: will they live for ever?" (Bro. J. J. Andrew.) *Sunday, Dec. 12th.*—"The Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, 'weighed in the balances' of Scripture testimony, and 'found wanting.'" (Brother Andrew.) The lectures at 64, St. George's Road, Southwark, were as follow: *Sunday, December 5th.*—"The Church not the Kingdom." (Bro. A. Andrew.) *Sunday, Dec. 12th.* "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." (Bro. J. J. Andrew.) *Sunday, Dec. 19th.*—"Death; its cause and cure." (Bro. W. Atkins.) *Sunday, Dec. 26th.*—"The four great beasts seen by the prophet Daniel; the events symbolised by them, and the fulfilment thereof." (Bro. M. Wheeler.)

MANCHESTER.—Brother Trueblood reports (Dec. 12th):—"It is my pleasing duty to report the addition of five to our

number during the past month, viz., Nov. 14th, MARY BIRTLES (14); Nov. 17th, MARGARET STANLEY (27), formerly Methodist New Connection; MARY DAVIES (18), formerly Congregationalist; WILLIAM FULWOOD ROCHE (28), formerly Wesleyan; and, Nov. 28th, FREDERICK WHELLER (23), neutral. Sister Birtles, though very young in years, made a very clear and intelligent confession, which may be attributable to the untiring efforts of brother and sister Holland with whom she resides. Sister Stanley is a daughter of sister Taylor, whose heart is brimful of gratitude to our Father in heaven for His goodness to her. Sister Mary Davies is the fruit of the patient endurance and care of brother and sister Davies, who removed from the Swansea ecclesia to Manchester in February last, and with whom she resides, but bears no relation to them in the flesh. Brethren Roche and Wheller are the fruit of our lectures here. May they with us have the unspeakable joy of participating in the kingdom which our Lord is about to establish. The brethren here continue to cast forth the seed to good and intelligent audiences twice every Sunday, and occasionally during the week; and this report is proof that their labours are not altogether in vain. The lectures for the month have been by brethren Holland, Dixon, Wareham, Hatton, and Davies; subjects—1, "The Fruits of Immortal-soulism." 2, "Eternal Life." 3, "Clerical Theology." 4, "The Church of Rome." 5, "Trinitarianism and Unitarianism." 6, "Man Mortal." 7, "The Angelic Message to the Shepherds on the Plains of Bethlehem." 8, "The One Faith and Hope." 9, "The Birth of the Heir."

Mr. H. S. Sherwood, whose suspension of fellowship with the Manchester ecclesia, in connection with the Renunciationist schism, was reported twelve months ago, requests it to be made clear that he does not deny that the Lord Jesus "came in the flesh;" but suspends his judgment on the question raised by the schism in question, believing the Scriptures afford no answer to it.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports: "After several months' patient perseverance in the proclamation of the truth in this place, without any apparent results, it is my pleasing duty to report two additions by immersion, namely, WALTER HOLDER (38), who, after giving evidence of a clear understanding of the truth, was immersed in the name of Christ, November 23rd. Brother Holder was formerly a Congregationalist, and was under the 'Rev.' Mr. Clemance about two years. He is brother in the flesh to brother O. C. Holder, of London. Also ELIZABETH CASTLEDINE (18), who is baptised this evening (December 4th). She has been residing with brother Sulley, as servant, for the past twelve months, and

was formerly connected with the Primitive Methodists, (her father being a local preacher in that body). As usual, when the truth is obeyed, sister Castledine suffers loss of friends and relatives as the consequence of her submission to the commands of Christ.

Our lectures have been as follow: *Sunday, Oct. 17th.*—"Current public events in the light of Scripture. (Bro. Roberts of Birmingham.)" *Sunday, Oct. 24th.*—"The Heaven of popular belief compared with the Paradise of Scriptures. (Bro. Richards.)" *Sunday, Oct. 31st.*—"The restitution of all things at the appearing of Christ." (Bro. Boshier.)" *Sunday, November 7th.*—"The Kingdom of Heaven; is it now in existence?" (Bro. Sulley.)" *Sunday, Nov. 14th.*—"Infant Salvation: who are the little children that are to inherit the Kingdom of Heaven?" (Bro. Sulley.)" *Sunday, Nov. 21st.*—"David's Throne: Past and Future." (Bro. Hodgkinson, of Peterborough.)" *Sunday, Nov. 28th.*—"Israel in Egypt, their deliverance therefrom, and settlement in the Land of Canaan, a type of their future 'Exodus' from amongst the Nations by the hands of 'the Prophet like unto Moses.'" (Brother Burton.)" *Sunday, Dec. 5th.*—"The Eastern Question, viewed in the light of Scripture." (Bro. Richards.)" *Sunday, December 12th.*—"Missions, ancient and modern; a comparison and contrast." (Brother Sulley.)

RIPLEY.—Bro. Kirkland, of Nottingham, reports another immersion in connection with the work at Ripley, namely, JOB KING (26), who was baptised December 4th, after having given full proof of his understanding the truth. Brother Kirkland says "he never saw the hand of God more clearly than in this work at Ripley," a remark which he illustrates by some interesting details.

STATHERN.—Brother Oliver reports that on Nov. 15th, 16th and 17th, brother Sulley of Nottingham, lectured three times in the Club Room, Stather, "On the Coming of Christ, the Gospel and the state of Christendom." The attendance was excellent, notwithstanding the bad state of the weather. The lectures appear to have made a deep impression. "The usual libel," says brother Oliver, "that we are infidels has received its death blow here. Several will now listen to my conversation and ask questions that formerly turned a deaf ear. Many tracts were distributed at the lecture. Two of them coming into the hands of a local clergyman, threw that gentleman into a state of excitement which resulted in his giving four lectures by way of antidote: subjects: 1, 'The Kingdom of God.' 2, 'Everlasting Punishment.' 3, 'Eternal Life;' and 4, 'The Millennium.'" It would be well for the truth if all the clergy adopted this mode of opposing it.

SWANSEA.—Brother Baker reports:—"On Oct. 28th, SUSAN PETERS (18), formerly

neutral, daughter of brother Peters, and on Nov. 5th, MARY ANNA MESSENGER, wife of brother Messenger, formerly Church of England, after making the good confession, were immersed into the saving name of Jesus Christ. Their obedience has been the means of cheering and encouraging the brethren in the work, and has given great joy to those so closely related in the flesh. We are also glad to report the return of brother Slocombe, of Cardiff, to our midst, having found employment here. These additions make up for the loss we sustained through the removal of brother and sister Bailey to Aberystwith, and from thence to South America. Brother Goldie, sen., has delivered a course of lectures on Sunday evenings, but although they were widely published, very few came to hear the good news of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. We are, however, not discouraged by it, and are to put forth another effort soon."

AUSTRALIA.

BEECHWORTH.—Brother A. Ladson writes, Sep. 26th, "A few words as to our doings in this far-off place may be acceptable. We are, as you know, but very few in number, six, meeting in this place, although four more have come to a knowledge of the 'one faith' through the instrumentality of two of our brethren, but they reside about forty miles from us, and many miles from each other. The immersion of one of them, bro. Kirk was reported at the time; but, since then his mother has been enabled, by his means, to cast off the trammels of orthodoxy, see the plain way of salvation, and yield the required act of obedience, so that they now sustain the relationship of mother and sister and brother. Brother K. formerly took an active part in the Church (Wesleyan) to which he belonged, but now that he absents himself, and avows his disbelief of their unscriptural dogmas, he has, of course, hopelessly lowered himself in the estimation of his former associates. I will now quote a few lines from brother K.'s last letter to me, it will show the hollow, time-serving character of many of the 'shepherds:' 'We had a visit from the New Church of England minister; he asked my brother what he was; he replied, 'Wesleyan.' My mother said we were Christadelphians; he wanted to know what they believed, so I told him the leading points of our faith. He said that *he* did not believe in the immortality of the soul, nor in eternal torments; and that he did believe in the personal reign of Christ on earth. I told him 'I never heard these things preached.'

He replied, 'No; because Wesleyans are not allowed to preach them, and that some had left that body in consequence.' The other additions were Mrs. DAVIDSON (sister-in-law to brother Mc Auley,) and her husband, who were immersed on the same day by brother Mc Auley. We never fail in assembling ourselves together to keep the commandments of our Lord 'until he come,' which the signs of the times betoken is an event at no great distance."

WARNAMBOOL.—Brother John Betts, who emigrated from England some time ago, writes for the first time (Oct. 1st) since his arrival. He says it has been a day of trouble with him ever since leaving England. On the way out, he lost both of his children, and was brought to the door of death himself, while his wife also was down with illness while the children were dying. He was led on deck to see his dear boy (a promising child of three years) cast into the ocean. In course of time, he and his wife got well again; but on landing at New Zealand, there was no work to be had in his own line. He had to turn to heavy brush work, and herded with navvies in the most degrading manner for about five months. At the end of that time, he fell into the engine wheel and got crushed. This laid him up for a time. On recovering, he determined to return to England, but could not get the money owing to him. While waiting, he received a letter from the brethren in Warnambool, Australia, asking him to try that neighbourhood, which he decided on doing, and had been there eleven weeks at the time of writing. The kind treatment of the brethren had comforted brother and sister Betts much, whose adversities while almost crushing, had taught them more than ever the evil of the present state and the great need for the promised deliverer to establish peace on earth and goodwill among men.

UNITED STATES.

EAGLE CREEK (Ark.)—A communication from this place states that there is a little ecclesia in it, composed partly of young people, who would be glad for any earnest brethren and sisters to come and settle among them, especially such as could lecture and lay the truth before their neighbours, which they are anxious to do but cannot. Land ranges from 2 to 5 dollars per acre; the climate is mild; fruits and grain grow well. Cotton is the staple produce. The people are well-to-do temporarily, but in need of help spiritually. The letter is signed "A. Lister."

The Christadelphian.

"He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 140.

FEBRUARY, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD AND THE BAPTISM THEREOF.

BY DR. THOMAS.

(Continued from page 7.)

THE body of Christ, whether considered under the figure of a man or a house, belongs to two states; to that before the resurrection, and to that after it. In its former state it has its infancy and manhood. In the days of the apostles the institution was in its infancy, childhood, and, in the time of John's old age and exile, manhood, being three score years and ten. During these years, its administrations were in part, that part consisting of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers; so that the knowledge and prophesyings were in part and not distributed to every member of the body. But in process of time that perfection came by which the body could sustain itself without the baptismal gifts; and then "that which was in part was done away." The manifestation of the Spirit being withheld, all that remained to the body was "faith, hope and love," as defined by Paul in 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7. There was a manhood when the baptismal gifts ceased, and there shall be a manhood

when we shall know experimentally even as we have known theoretically. This is the post-resurrectional maturity of the "perfect man," or body of Christ, every member of which will see him "face to face." That which is perfect will have come in the full sense, and the members of the body will be none of them any more "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." They will all then be baptismally imbued with "the latter rain in the first month." They will be the spirit, and filled with spirit—a God-manifestation of eternal power; and thus they will have "grown up into him in all things, who is the head, even unto the Christ."

The baptism of the Spirit, then, is peculiar to certain seasons or epochs, and not common to all times from the first to the second advent. These epochs are,

1. The apostolic age;

2. The resurrection era.

Between these two periods is a long interval occupied by "the times of the Gentiles," during which the Laodicean apostacy prevails to the almost entire suppression of "the faith." These constitute a DRY TIME—a time of drought, in which spirit is withheld. In all this long series of ages and generations there are no gifts and no other baptism than that of water. The gifts answered their purpose, and then ceased; and nothing remained but "faith, hope and love," the product of the word read and studied by the honest and good-hearted. Baptism of spirit was for confirmation of the word preached by the apostles; and for the perfecting of the saints who were to do public service. It was only promised to genuine believers, and they only received it; though afterwards some, turning out to be like Demas, betrayed their trust and misused it.

When a believer was baptized with Spirit he did not necessarily possess all the gifts. There were diversities of gifts which were bestowed distributively. That is, one might speak foreign languages by inspiration, but he could not therefore work miracles; still another might be able to work miracles, but could not therefore speak other tongues than his own. The grace was distributed according to the will of the Deity, who worked or operated the all (all the gifts) in all who received them; while those saints to whom no gifts were distributed were benefitted by the labours of those who possessed them. Thus "prophesying served for them who believed;" for "he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort," and "he that prophesieth edifieth the church." Therefore, in another place Paul saith, "despise not prophesying."

Baptismal grace seems to have been distributed into nine gifts.

1. The word of wisdom.
2. The word of knowledge.
3. Faith that removes mountains.
4. The gifts of healing.
5. The inworking of powers.

6. Prophecy, or the gift of prophesying.

7. Discerning of spirits.

8. Kinds of tongues.

9.—The interpretation of tongues.

"All these worked that one and the self-same Spirit, distributing to everyone severally as he would." The body was one thing, the members or organs of the body, another. To the organs of the body these nine gifts were distributed for the benefit of all the atoms of the body. The number of the organs in each ecclesia would depend on the size and necessities of it. The organs of a congregation of saints constituted, collectively, "the presbytery" or "eldership." They might be relatively many or few. By way of example, one congregation might have an eldership of nine, another of eighteen, and a third of twenty-seven. If the last, three saints might be endowed with the same gift; and three others with another; and so on. Or in another case, one saint might have a plurality of gifts, and thus fewer organs would suffice for a small church. Each of the thirteen apostles probably possessed all the gifts.

Baptism of Spirit, then, developed the elderships of the churches in the apostolic age, so that Paul could, with great propriety, address those who were constituents of them, and say, "Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the ecclesia of the Deity which He purchased with His own blood." The Spirit made them elders through baptism of Spirit, and distributed them into orders according to the following ranks:—

1. Apostles.
2. Prophets.
3. Teachers.
4. Powers.
5. Healers.
6. Helps.
7. Governors.
8. Linguists.
9. Interpreters.

These were those who had the rule by the divine authority, and to whom

the private saints, *οἱ ἰδιῶται*, were exhorted to yield obedience, as to those who watched for their souls and would have to give an account. These were they to whom Paul wrote in Gal. iv. 1, saying, "If any man be overtaken in a fault, *ye who are the spirituals, οἱ πνευματικοί*, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness." These also, were they who taught the brethren in the Word, and were by them to be supplied with all good things—"Let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." And concerning them he says in another place, "We beseech you, brethren, to acknowledge them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and teaching. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And the labourer is worthy of his reward." They were not to be lightly accused, nor rebuked. No accusation was to be received against them but under two or three witnesses. They were not to be rebuked by their brethren, but entreated as fathers; but if they sinned, and the offence was proved, they were to be rebuked before all by the proper authority, and not by every one that chose to be impertinent.

Collectively, these orders were the light-stand of a congregation, through which the Holy Spirit shone into the surrounding darkness of Judaism and Gentilism. They are, therefore, apocalyptically symbolized by "a star," the angel or messenger star, whose mission was to illuminate by making known the manifold wisdom of the Deity.

Such were the members, or official organs, of the body of which Christ was the head in the apostolic age, styled by Paul, or rather likened to the foot, the hand, the ear, and the organ of smell, in the body natural. He asks concerning these holy orders of the ministry, "if they were all ONE

MEMBER where were the body? But now are they many members, but yet only one body." As if Paul had a forecast of the ecclesiastical system now in vogue! We may truly enquire with him, "*where is the body?*" For, instead of these holy orders baptismally qualified with the gifts of the grace that came through Jesus Christ, when we look into a congregation of any of the names and denominations, we see them all merged into one member, or ecclesiastical factotum, ironically styled, we might suppose, in view of the reality he practically burlesques, a "clergyman," "reverend," or "divine." This curiosity that would adorn Barnum's Museum—his, who is styled by his contemporaries, "the prince of humbugs"—is at once the five senses of "his people"—*e pluribus unum*. The holy apostolic orders are indeed a divine man and clergy. They were "divine" of a genuine sort, being the receptacles and depositories of spirit which "guided them into all the truth, and showed them things to come." These, the truth and the things shown, were the "divinity" they taught so long as they continued faithful to their trust. They were collectively a *clergy*, though not alone the *clergy*. Israel were Yahweh's inheritance, or *κληρος*, *cleros*, in a general sense, but the tribe of Levi, in a special one; so all the congregations of the saints were *οἱ κληροί*, the *clergies*, or heritages of the Lord, but these holy orders especially so; for they were *in the Spirit's mouth*, and so continued to be, until He "*spued them out*" for their apostacy. To those "dignities" of the body, of whom some even in the apostolic age "spoke evil," Peter says, "the elders that are among you, and elect (1 Epist. i. 2) I exhort, who am also an elder . . .

. . . feed the flock of the Deity, which is with you, overseeing it, not constrainedly, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over THE HERITAGES, but being examples of the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."—(Chap. v. 1-4.)

The flock was composed of "the heritages," each congregation being a *heritage* or clergy. The holy orders were forbidden to usurp lordship over these clergies; but when the apostles passed away, they disregarded their interdict, reduced the clergies to abject vassalage, and arrogated to themselves the title of the "clergy, or heritage of God."

From these premisses, then, it is manifest, that the only real clergy of the Deity among the Gentiles extant at present, are those possessed of "*the more excellent way*," than the best of baptismal gifts—(1 Cor. xii. 31);—those in whom "now abideth faith, hope and love." Those who being in Christ walk in the truth, are the only clergy among men recognised of heaven. All others are usurpers, impostors, and deceivers of the people; and to be stripped of the woollen garment they have stolen to conceal their wolfishness, by all who are loyal to the throne of the Spirit of God. If the reader comprehend the spiritual constitution of the One Body in the apostolic age, he will scarcely be astonished at what he beholds in anti-christendom. The Laodicean apostacy of the third and fourth centuries was familiar with, and almost an eye witness of, the apostolic constitution of the body of Christ. The gifts and the orders which went together, were as household words with its leaders. When the Spirit "spued them out of his mouth" by withdrawing spirit-baptism, they still retained the Scripture-phraseology in speaking of them, and claimed to be as much the holy orders as ever. But this is characteristic of apostacy and superstition. They retain and glorify the sign when the thing signified has passed away; talk glibly of spirit, and of its baptism, and of the gifts, and of the imposition of hands, and of the ministry, and of its holy orders, and of grace, and so forth; their mouths are full of these words, professionally and sanctimoniously intoned with grimace and uplifted hands in the utterances before the people; but the scriptural ideas the words represent they are wholly desti-

tute of; their system is the rotten carcase of a once living man, who has been "prevailed against" by the treachery and violence of the satan. The Roman mother is the closest approximation to the original, being in its organization, the craftiest counterfeit of all her harlot-daughters and abominations, commonly called "the names and denominations of Christendom." The holy order of Jezebel and her children are a lifeless skeleton; and differ from the genuine originals in this, that

1. They are not saints; but according to their own confession, "miserable sinners."

2. They are destitute of holy spirit; though full to overflowing of "the spirit that works in the children of disobedience."

3. They have neither divine wisdom nor knowledge; but they have substituted for these the thinking, and philosophy, and theological speculation of the flesh.

4. They have no gifts but what are common to all men who devote themselves to the study of the "imaginings and high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of the Deity."

5. They can neither remove mountains, heal diseases, inwork powers, prophesy, discern spirits, nor speak with and interpret tongues by inspiration; and consequently

6. They are neither apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, nor teachers; but ignorant pretenders to all these, and therefore children of Barnum their friend, and not of God.

Then from the premisses before us the reader may perceive the utter impossibility of an apostolic organization of the saints at this time. There are no *spirituals* among them as in the beginning. By "spirituals" is meant true believers distinguished from other believers by being baptized with Holy Spirit as proved by its manifestations. In a certain sense, all the saints are spiritual as opposed to carnal, in so far as the word dwells in them with all wisdom. What we would express may be comprehended by comparing a saint with an unen-

lightened sinner. The former understands the truth, loves it, rejoices in it, walks in it, and thinks in harmony with it, and is therefore spiritual, or spiritually minded. The unlightened sinner, be he "divine," "supervisor," "inventor," or "patentee," of human systems, crotchets, or institutions, is the reverse of all this. He is carnal, or carnally-minded—which is death; a mere "natural man who receives not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him. Neither can he know, for they are spiritually discerned." A congregation of saints may exist as the result of the word intellectually believed and obeyed. Such is a "perfect man," relatively to this imperfect state. There is no need of baptizing him with Holy Spirit for the confirmation of the word of reconciliation which was sufficiently confirmed for the purpose of God when He co-operated with the apostles. Neither is there any necessity for holy orders for his edification, exhortation, and comfort. This any saint intelligent in Moses and the prophets can now do. All that he needs in this sphere is order, not orders. A few unpretending, wise, and intelligent brethren, who have no by-ends and interests to promote other than the truth, are sufficient for the preservation of order, and the conducting of his affairs in the church. These are his five senses, which it does not require any special Spirit baptism to develop. As to those without, as he is presumed to be intelligent in all his elements, these are entitled all of them according to the rules and regulations, to say "come," and to show men *how to come* to repentance and remission of sins, and to immortality in the kingdom of God. Thus, the means in existence are adequate for all the necessities congregationally; and for the taking out of those who remain yet unadded to the name designed to be for a people who shall execute judgment and establish righteousness in the earth.

ARE CHRISTIANS OF THE PRESENT DAY BAPTISED WITH THE SPIRIT ?

This is the second question propounded by Mr. Malcolm. Considering the place where it first appeared in print, namely, in the *Advento-Methodistic Examiner of the Bible*, edited by the "Rev." George Storrs, it is necessary to ascertain in what sense the word "Christian" is used, for our answer to the question will be materially affected by the sense in which we understand the term.

In his answer to Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Storrs says: "It seems impossible for a man to be a 'Christian' who has *not received* the Spirit." Upon this principle none of the apostles were Christians till the day of Pentecost, for they had not received the Spirit till it was "fully come." Mr. Storrs quotes John vii. 36-39 to prove that the Spirit was not received till after Jesus was glorified. "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink. *He that believeth into me*, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake Jesus of the Spirit, which they that believe into him shall receive; for as yet Holy Spirit was not, because Jesus was not yet glorified." This certainly proves what Mr. Storrs aimed to prove by it, namely, that Holy Spirit was not received till at, or after, the glorification of Jesus; but it also proves, according to his premisses, that there were no Christians till the day of Pentecost; for, says he, "it seems impossible for a man to be a 'Christian' who has *not received* the Spirit."

But, we know that the apostles were "Christians" before the glorification of Jesus—as much as they were afterwards. They had recognised and believed the "voice crying in the wilderness;" John the Immerser had dipped them in water into that mind and disposition created in them by "THE VOICE;" they were looking out for the manifestation of the Son of God and King of Israel; when Jesus appeared they saluted him as Christ the King; they believed the

Word he preached; were cleansed by it; and were shod with the preparation of the gospel in the consummating action of washing their feet by the Lord himself, upon which notable occasion he said, "Now ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me and I in you. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done for you." If men thus clean and in Christ, and he in them, are not Christians, then there are not, and have never been, any Christians upon earth.

The apostles, then, were Christians before the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, although, as they testify against themselves, they did not understand "the mystery of the gospel" nor its "fellowship." Now, this being irrefutable, Mr. Storrs' dogma, which is also a tradition generally received by the Apostasy, is annihilated, for we find that *men can be Christians who have not received the Spirit in its baptismal outpouring.*

A Christian is one who believeth into Jesus Christ, and it is to such only that Holy Spirit is promised. *Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ*—that man believeth into me, is the formula indicating the person who should receive it. There is no promise of Spirit, or any other good gift, to a single person "out of Christ," and to get into him is to put him on. There is but one way to do this. If it be inquired, *What way is this?* we direct special attention to the words of Jesus and of Paul: of whom the former says, "Enter ye in at the strait gate. For strait is the the gate, and narrow the way which leadeth into life, and few there be that find it." "I, Jesus Christ, am the door: if any one enter in through me he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." After this he said, "He having believed and been dipped, shall be saved; but he having not believed, shall be condemned." He also tells us what is to be believed, namely, the gospel of the kingdom he preached before his crucifixion, and the gospel the apostles

preached after it, both of which are the same. Hence, we enter into the pasture field through Jesus by believing the gospel of the kingdom and being dipped in water. Such are they who believe into Jesus, and are the heirs of all the promises. They are Christians of the original apostolic mould, provided their faith "works by love and purifies the heart;" otherwise not.

Now, concerning this way, Paul says, that it is the way of the kingdom of God, which "divers who were hardened, and believed not, spake evil of." This way has been spoken evil of to the present time. Mr. Storrs, and, indeed, all "the clergy," or "Reverends," as they style themselves, and all in whom their hard and unbelieving spirit reigns—these all spake evil of this way. They all, that is to say, all the baby-sprinklers and Quakers, have hydrophobia, and all the others *pistophobia*, or fear of the faith; so that between the two classes, the water and the faith are both ignored, and the way of the kingdom is blotted out.

There is, then, but one way, the way of the kingdom; and this way it is that leads unto life. The way is entered on through Christ, into whom true believers are introduced by being dipped in water. Though all who are dipped are neither in Christ nor Christians, believers of the truth are known and proved to be in Christ, and, therefore, Christians by being dipped. This is evinced by Paul in Gal. vii. 27, in which he says to the churches in Galatia: "Ye are all sons of Deity in Christ *through the faith*: for as many of you as have been dipped into Christ have put on Christ." No statement can be plainer than this. As many of the Galatians as were possessed of faith and had been dipped were in Christ, and, therefore, sons of the Deity and Christians: or, as he saith in verse 29, "being Christ's they were Abraham's seed," or "*Israelites indeed*," and "heirs according to the promise" made to Abraham. There were others in Galatia, doubtless, who had acquired

a theoretical knowledge of "the faith," but who were only speculative believers. Their faith had not led into Christ. They had not been dipped. They perhaps intended to be, but from divers causes and considerations delayed. When Paul's letter arrived in their province they would, no doubt, hear it read in the churches and private circles. Now, when the undipped heard the words, "Ye are all sons of Deity in Jesus Christ through the faith," they might have come to Mr. Storrs' conclusion, and fancied that they were included among the sons of the Deity in Christ, although they had not been into the water. To prevent them playing off the fatal delusion upon themselves, he gave the reason why men who believed were in Christ; and in so doing limited the Christians to those believers who had been dipped in water, saying, "*as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ.*" Let the reader consider what the baptismal outpouring of spirit, called "the Promise of the Father," was to effect upon those who received it, and he will be thoroughly convinced that there is not a reverend on earth, nor any of their disciples, that have an atom of Spirit more than the beasts that perish. Mark this! The Spirit is styled "*the Spirit of truth.*" Jesus said he would send this Spirit to the disciples, and that "when he was come, *he would guide them into all the truth;*" and secondly, he would "*show them things to come.*" Hence, the reception of such a Spirit as this constituted the recipients *inspired men* — inspired with wisdom and knowledge which could not otherwise be known. Men thus filled with Spirit became apostles and prophets, able to teach and speak infallibly. It constituted them "workmen that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Being guided into all the truth by unerring spirit, they were enabled to guide others without guiding them into the ditch. They could also show the *idioti*, or private brethren, things to come, whereof many instances are on

record in the Word.

Now, the reverends and their apostles all earnestly assert that they are baptised with the same Spirit! But how is it possible that the assertion can be true? The Spirit is "the Spirit of truth," which, when received, caused the recipients to be of one mind and one judgment. Now, in view of this fact, look at all the pretenders to the Spirit. Every vital principle of the Word is a matter of doubtful disputation among them, arraiging parson against parson of the same denomination, and sect against sect, yet all claiming to have the Spirit. Show them what the truth is in the plainest possible terms, and if not according to their man-made creeds and confessions, they reject it with indignation and contempt, and call it dogmatism and abuse. Of "things to come" they know nothing, and discourage all inquiry into them. This proves them to be carnal, sensual, not having the Spirit. In short, there is no view can be taken of the question that would justify an answer to it affirmatively.

Approved Christians of the apostolic age, and the Christians called "orthodox" of ours, are not the same class of Christians. The former were the genuine coin, and the latter only a miserable counterfeit. We admit things of the genuine sort, which we utterly deny and repudiate of the counterfeit. Thus we admit that "*by one Spirit all the saints were baptised into one body,*" and that they were "*all taught of God.*" We admit this, too, in regard to genuine Christians in all ages and generations since. But we admit it no further. We are thoroughly satisfied that the Spirit of Christ has had nothing to do with friend Storrs, because he has not been led into the truth, nor hath he the disposition which the Spirit creates in a man, because he gets excited when the obedience of faith in baptism is required of him. We cite him as an example because he pretends to be wiser in his generation than the parsonocracy in general; and

if the wiser are taken in their own craftiness, we need not trouble ourselves so much about them who are less so.

If we take the Laodicean Apostasy as a body, and denominate it THE BODY OF ANTI-CHRIST, we hesitate not to admit that it has a *spirit*, and to affirm that this is what John styles "*the Spirit of Error*;" and Paul, "*another spirit*." This spirit, other than the Spirit of God, is what Paul also terms "the Prince of the Power of the Air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Of this spirit there is a baptism. It is a flood that has overflowed and submerged the world religious. It is the spirit of the flesh—the spirit of disobedience and strong delusion. With this spirit clergy and laity are all filled and intoxicated, and by this one they are all baptised and rhantised in the body of anti-Christ.

Now, the reader may readily distinguish between these two spirits if he himself be intelligent in the truth; otherwise not. The Spirit of Christ is the spirit of truth, and the spirit of anti-Christ is the spirit of error, and the two may be distinguished from one another by the following infallible rule. Speaking of the apostles, John says: "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error." Now, by this rule, we know that our friend Storrs and his fraternity have *not received* the Spirit of Truth; and, therefore, according to his own declaration, "it is impossible that he can be a Christian." He does not hear the apostles, but sets up for a wiser man than Paul, and condemns him for commanding Cornelius to be baptised in water "as being clearly without divine

authority." Thus, instead of hearing the apostles, he exalts himself into a judge who arbitrates against them upon the basis of his own ignorance. Seeing, then, that he doth not hear or hearken to the apostles, but condemns them, John's rule denounces him as "*not knowing God*," and consequently as "*not of God*;" and of such Paul saith, "the Lord Jesus in his apocalypse shall take vengeance on them that *know not God* and that *obey not the gospel*, who shall be punished with *anon*-destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified with his saints." It is most extraordinary that men with the Scriptures in their possession can allow themselves to be cajoled by such a pretender to Bible-knowledge as the editor of the *Examiner*! The idea of being hoodwinked by a man who sits in judgment upon Peter, filled as he was by the Spirit of Truth, is preposterous. We see clearly where Mr. Storrs would have been had he been contemporary with the apostles. He would have been with those who disputed with them, and counted them for enemies for telling him the truth. Paul was weary and sick at heart with the Storrses of his day, and concerning them said: "If any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant." And so say we.

It is to be hoped that some of the few who travel the narrow way that leadeth unto life may be extant in our day and generation; though the longer and more intimately we become acquainted with-it, the scantier is the number we supposed. But be that less or more, they are as much baptised into the one body by the one Spirit as the approved of the apostolic age.

(To be continued.)

ADAM'S SIN AND CONDEMNATION AS AFFECTING HIS POSTERITY.

THE consideration of this subject necessitates a contrast between the respective conditions of man, before and after the fall. When first created, man was a "living soul," formed of the "dust of the ground" and sustained by the "breath of life;" and he was part of the creation which, in the sight of God was "very good." He was, therefore, at that time uncontaminated by anything obnoxious to his Creator; and he was equally devoid of obedience tested by the trial. To put him to the proof he was placed after providing for his physical requirements, under a law adapted to this moral nature. The animals around him were not placed under this law, because they had not a moral capacity fitted for it.

The command given to Adam was merely that he should abstain from eating the fruit of the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil." In the circumstances in which he was placed, this was the simplest way of testing his obedience. If he failed he was told he should "surely die;" a statement which proves two things:—1st. That he was not, when created, destined to die; and 2nd. That he was not created with the power of living for ever. To affirm the former, would be to represent God as endeavouring to influence him by a superfluous and frivolous threat; to affirm the latter would be to make God a liar. Therefore the inevitable conclusion is, that at creation he was strictly speaking neither mortal nor immortal. The word "mortal" is undoubtedly sometimes applied to Adam, but in that case it is only used in the sense of a corruptible, or natural body, as opposed to the incorruptible or spiritual nature. It has, however, another meaning, that of being destined to die. On this account its application to Adam at his creation should be avoided, to prevent its being misunderstood. To speak accurately Adam was a living creature, capable, if disobedient, of being subjected to death; and if obedient, of being exalted to endless life. It was evidently designed that he should not die unless he manifested disobedience. He did so, and the threatened penalty of death was in due time carried out. "Unto dust shalt thou return," were the words spoken and applied to him.

As the head and father of a race the effect of Adam's misconduct was not confined to himself. If he had had descendants previous to his transgression, they could doubtless be looked at independent of his actions. But he had none. Not until after his ignominious expulsion from Eden did he become a parent. Therefore the position of his descendants must be viewed in connection with his sin and its retribution. We are not informed in the Mosaic narrative what the effect would be upon Adam's progeny; but we have a record of many of them following him into the grave. This fact of itself would indicate that they were affected to some extent by his guilt. To what extent must be determined by subsequent revelation. It is a significant fact that as the generations of our race increased, the length of human life decreased. From living 900 years men were reduced to the present term of three score years and ten. How came this except by the gradually increasing degeneracy of the children of Adam? And inasmuch as this degeneracy began with Adam himself, the decrease of life must be traced to him as the first cause. If then he be responsible for that which led to the shortening of men's lives, he must be the primary cause of their death.

It is a universally recognised law of nature that parents cannot give to their offspring a life of nature superior to their own. A nature free from the power of death is certainly superior to a nature *destined* to come under its power. Both natures may be composed of precisely the same elements, but the one is under the operation of a law from which the other is free. A guiltless Adam might have given birth to sons free from death, but a guilty Adam certainly could not.

Coming to the direct testimony on the point, we find it very explicit. In the 5th of Romans there occur several very plain passages:—

1st.—"By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin,"—(v. 12.)

The term "world" evidently means here that arrangement of things bounded by the human race. If Adam and Eve had had no descendants, sin and death would have ended with them; they would have been the beginning and end of the "world" or order of things defiled by

their sin. In like manner, if the race had been cut off at the time of the Flood, the generations from Adam to Noah would have comprehended the whole of the "world" into which the first man introduced sin. But inasmuch as the race has yet above a thousand years to live, the evil effects of Edenic disobedience will not be abolished until the end of that age, when the "last enemy," death, is "destroyed."

As if to show that the death resulting from Adam's sin was not confined to himself and wife, but extended to the whole of the descendants, the apostle adds: "And so, death passed upon all men, for that (or, in whom—*i.e.* Adam) all have sinned." The words "And so" mean *thus*, or *in this way*,* and are designed to show that the death which has passed upon all men is the result of, or is traceable to, Adam's sin. The original word translated "man" does not mean men as distinguished from women, neither does it mean adults in opposition to children; it means manhood in general; it comprehends human nature as a whole without reference to sex or age. Therefore the death of all classes of mankind is attributable to the sin of that one man who introduced it into the world.

The expression "in whom all have sinned," means that all have sinned in Adam, and is of similar import to the statement that "Levi paid tithes in Abraham." In paying tithes to Melchizedec, Abraham performed a righteous act, for which he is worthy of commendation. But the same virtue cannot be attributed to the Levites, neither can they receive any praise for it; Abraham manifested humility and reverence toward the Melchizedec priesthood, but the Levitical priesthood exhibited none, because not then in existence. All that Abraham's virtuous act did for Levi and his priestly descendants was to define their position as inferior to the Melchizedec priesthood.

In like manner, though Adam committed an unrighteous act deserving of moral reprobation, it is not necessary that his descendants be charged, on that account, with moral guilt. They were in Adam's loins when he sinned, as Levi was in the loins of Abraham when paying tithes. Adam's sin defined their position in the sight of God; it did not attribute to them his moral guilt; otherwise they would all be called to account, as he was, at the bar of God, for partaking of the forbidden fruit. It simply transmitted to

them those consequences which it had brought upon himself, *viz.*, knowledge of good and evil, disease, toil, sorrow and death. Previous to his sin death was no barrier between him and immortality; but afterwards it was a barrier to both himself and children. By his conduct they were placed under a law which, without divine intervention on their behalf, would have brought them all under the power of endless death. He and they must be viewed, not as so many units originating in different sources, and having no consecutive link or connection, but as ONE BODY, of which he is the *head*, and they the various *members*. As, therefore, the head covers the body and is the fountain of all its thought and action, so Adam overshadows all who are born of woman; he was the first to act according to the thinking of the flesh, and his progeny have followed in his steps. But some who have done this have not been under any moral law to God, and as "Sin is not imputed where there is no law" (v. 13), they are not amenable to punishment for such conduct. "Nevertheless," continues the apostle, "death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."—(v. 14) If, then, from Adam to Moses there were some who were not under a law by which their sinful acts could be imputed to them, and who were not guilty of imitating Adam's disobedience, for what reason did they die? It could not have been for their own conduct; it must therefore, have been on account of Adam's. Thus death came to them through his sin; and if to them, it must have been sufficiently operative to bring all the rest of the human race into the same condition.

After a passing reference to Adam as "The figure of him that was to come," the apostle proceeds to contrast the respective results which flow from the transgression of Adam and the righteousness of Jesus Christ. In so doing, he repeats the same truth several times, but in different forms of phraseology. Whatever indefiniteness may be attributed to some of these expressions, there can be no doubt as to their individual and combined meaning when collected together and compared with each other.

2nd.—"If through the offence of one many may be dead."—(v. 15.)

3rd.—"The judgment was by one to condemnation."—(v. 16.)

* The original word translated "so" is *οὕτως* which has the meaning stated above.

4th.—“By one man's offence death reigned by one.”—(v. 17.)

5th.—“By the offence of one (or ‘by one offence,’ *marg.*) judgment came upon all men to condemnation.”—(v. 18.)

6.—“By one man's disobedience many were made sinners.”—(v. 19.)

Three different words are here used to describe Adam's conduct in eating the forbidden fruit, viz., “offence,” “disobedience” and “sin,” which are substantially the same in meaning. The marginal rendering in one case (v. 18) is “one offence” instead of “the offence of one.” The former is correct. So that there can be no doubt that the “sin” or “disobedience” was the single action of partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden. The persons affected by that act are spoken of as “many” and “all men.” The term “many” does not exclude any portion of the human race, and the term “all men” includes every member of the race: therefore the terms “many” and “all men” are intended to be synonymous. If the word “many” had been qualified as in Dan. xii. 2, “*Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,*” by saying, “If through the offence of one many of the descendants of Adam be dead,” there would have been some ground for concluding that some portion of the human race were excluded from the effects of Adam's offence. But, inasmuch as there is no such qualification, and as the number of the “many” is defined to be “all,” it is incontestible that the whole race is intended.

The effect of the Adamic offence is defined to be, in the first place, a “judgment,” the original of which (*κρίμα*) means a “judgment, decision, decree, sentence, a matter for judgment, an accusation, charge” (Liddell & Scott), and is the basis of our English word crime. The word rendered “condemnation” (*κατακρίμα*) is the same word in another but stronger form, and is derived from a verb (*κατακρίνω*), which means “to give judgment against, condemn, sentence,” (Liddell & Scott); “To pronounce sentence against, condemn, adjudge to punishment” (Parkhurst). It is used in Matt. xx. 18, “They (i.e. the chief priests and scribes shall condemn him (Jesus) to death,” and in Rom. viii. 3, God “condemned sin in the flesh.” In neither of these cases is actual moral guilt implied by the word condemn; from

other passages we know there was nothing of the kind; therefore its use does not necessarily convey any such imputation; it may or may not, according to circumstances. Jesus was not guilty of any crime against the Mosaic Law, and yet he was condemned by its administrators; he was not guilty of any transgression toward God, and yet the Father condemned sin in his flesh. In like manner the descendants of Adam are not guilty of eating the actual tree of which their first parent partook, and many of them never even commit any sin at all,* and yet they are all condemned on account of what he did. To this extent, but no farther, there is a parallel between the human and divine condemnation which Jesus was under, and the divine condemnation passed upon all mankind. It is just sufficient to show that the descendants of Adam are under condemnation on account of Adam's offence, independent of their own moral guilt. True, all but one who have attained to the age of responsibility have transgressed, but that took place after the sentence was passed upon them. God did not subject them to condemnation on account of what they would do—for He does not pre-judge anyone—but on account of what Adam had done. God condemns men for their own transgressions when they have actually sinned, not before. The statements in Rom. v, although written over four thousand years after the fall, must be viewed as having relation to what was pronounced at the time of the Edenic ejection.

The nature of the “judgment,” “condemnation,” or sentence which came upon “all men” is described as their being “dead,” being “made sinners,” and “death reigning.” In saying that they were all “dead,” the apostle evidently means that they are doomed to die, on the principle that a man whose term of life is fixed, is spoken of as a dead man. The statement that “many,” or to use the interchangeable term, “all men,” “were made sinners” cannot mean that by Adam's transgression all his descendants were made into actual transgressors, because such is not in accordance with fact. It can, therefore, only mean that they are “sinners” in the sense of suffering the effects of sin; or, in other words that they are “sinners” in a physical or constitutional sense.

In harmony with these statements the same apostle affirms in 1 Cor. xv. 21 that “By man came death;” and, as if to

* Those who die in infancy, for instance.

prevent any doubt as to who that man is, he adds in the next verse (22) "In Adam all die." This passage coupled with Rom. v., leaves no doubt that Adam is the cause of death to the whole human race. It is nothing to the point to attempt to refute this conclusion by simply saying that it is unjust, unreasonable, or that it cannot be believed. All such replies as these are the mere emanations of the carnal mind, the thinking of the flesh in opposition to the thinking of the Spirit; and are very appropriately rebuked by the words of the apostle Paul in Rom. ix. 20: "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why hast Thou formed me thus?" It was not incumbent on the Creator to bring the first human pair into existence, neither was He compelled to permit them to have any descendants; He might if He had so chosen, have cut them off when they rebelled against His law. But, in His mercy, He permitted them to live on, for the purpose of evolving good out of the evil which they had introduced. All who came into existence after the expulsion from Eden were necessarily subject to the new conditions and circumstances which had led to that expulsion. They could not possibly occupy the same position as the first human pair at the creation. Adam and Eve commenced life unfettered by the trammels of sin or the bondage of death; and by the position in which they were placed, they received from God a right to that life so long as they obeyed Him. But their descendants have commenced life with no such privilege as this; it has been their lot to inherit a life which was doomed to terminate some day or other. Even if God had given them no opportunity of attaining to an endless life, they could have no just right to complain of their condition; they were not in existence when Adam sinned, and had, therefore, no rights whatever anterior to the fall; neither have they any rights now to demand anything from their Creator. In subjecting them to death on account of Adam's sin, God did not punish them instead of him, and so make them innocent substitutes; He simply caused them to share with him, by descent, the death which his disobedience had brought upon himself; and with this He combined an act of mercy; He offered to them, on certain conditions, the privilege of attaining to a life superior to that possessed by Adam. By this means God has placed within

their reach the opportunity of obtaining a title to a destiny incomparably higher than that which Adam brought upon himself and them. There is a great tendency among mankind to recriminate their first parent, and to assume that if they had been placed in the same position they would have acted in quite a different manner. The conditional offer of immortality which God has made shuts the mouth of all such boastful conceit. He offered immortality to Adam on the condition of perfect obedience in one thing only, and that the abstaining from an evil act; but this simple command he failed to keep; anyone of his descendants if placed in precisely the same position would have acted as he did; for notwithstanding the warning contained in his example they have invariably, more or less walked in his footsteps. In this way the fetters which they have inherited from him have been more firmly rivetted. One exception shines out of this moral darkness; that of One who manifested perfect obedience to God. But even he was indebted to his heavenly Father for aid in developing an acceptable righteousness. By this fact the Deity has demonstrated that it is utterly impossible for human nature, whether "very good" or "sinful," when left to itself, to obey His commands. And to those who are willing to recognise this truth and to act upon it, He offers everlasting life through His Son. Hence the apostle Paul is able to exhibit a beautiful contrast to the dismal picture presented in the extracts already given from his writings:—

1.—"The gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."—(Rom. v. 15.)

2.—"The free gift is of many offences unto justification."—(v. 16.)

3.—"They which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign by One, Jesus Christ."—(v. 17.)

4.—"By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—(v. 18.)

5.—"By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."—(v. 19.)

6.—1 Cor. xv. 21.—"By man came the resurrection of the dead."

7.—Verse 22.—"In Christ shall all be made alive."

The benefit which is offered to the human race is defined in these passages as a "gift," a "free gift," and "grace" or favour; and Jesus Christ is the medium through whom it is offered. It is, there-

fore, a privilege to which no human being has a shadow of a *claim*.

The present result of the "gift" is the "justification," or the making "righteous" of those to whom it comes. In view of the fact that all but the medium of its bestowal have sinned, these words cannot be understood in their absolute sense; they must be relative. Those who are made "righteous" through Jesus Christ are not made so in the perfect sense until their change into spirit nature; but they are even now accounted righteous through his sin-destroying mission and their own faith and imperfect obedience. In this there is a parallel to the making of all men sinners through Adam. They are not accounted actual transgressors through his sin; but by birth they are simply "made" constitutional "sinners" through him. True his sin has given those of them who attain to an age of responsibility an impetus to sin; but in this also we have a parallel in regard to believers, for in like manner the obedience of Christ is a powerful lever to evolve obedience from those who are in him.

The "free gift" has come upon "all men" in the sense that it is sufficient to prove efficacious for all if they but comply with the conditions imposed: but, as all have not from various causes so complied, the gift hath only "abounded unto many" of the human race. To this portion the ultimate benefit will be to be "made alive" after death, to partake of the "resurrection of the dead," and to receive "life" or "eternal life."

Thus the evil effects of the fall are to be more than repaired by Jesus Christ, to whom has been given "the keys of *hades* and of death."—(Rev. i. 18.) Until these keys are used death is an "enemy" and the grave a conqueror to all those confined in the bowels of the earth. But when released they will be able to say to their former "enemy," "O death where is thy sting?" and to their former conqueror, "O grave where is thy victory?"—(1 Cor. xv. 55.) The fact that death is to man an "enemy" precludes its being at the same time a friend. Moreover this appellation proves that it could not have been an element of his nature when fresh from the hands of his Creator and destitute of all evil. It is an "enemy" brought into existence by his own conduct, and that conduct being bad, it cannot be otherwise than a punishment to all those who, through him, come under its sway. A merciful punishment undoubtedly it is,

but nevertheless a punishment after all. To some it is a misfortune to be born into this evil world where sin reigns unto death; but to others it is an advantage. It is a misfortune to those whose lives are cut off at an early age, or without coming within the scope of God's favour; but inasmuch as no crime is imputed to them they simply pass away and return to whence they came: they undergo death in consequence of Adam's sin, but receive no punishment for any conduct of their own; they were offered nothing, and, therefore, they lose nothing; they enjoyed the privilege of a brief life to which they had no right, and which God was at full liberty at any time to take away.

On the other hand it is a positive advantage to be born into this evil world in the case of those who participate in the present benefits of God's favour. By this means they have the opportunity of receiving a life superior to that which was given to Adam at his creation. If they use that privilege aright they will receive that good which God has designed to evolve out of evil; if they misuse it, whatever they may have undergone as the result of Adam's sin, they will in addition realise the terrors of that "second death" which is reserved for those who know the revealed will of God and do it not.

To summarise the Mosaic and apostolic teaching on Adamic condemnation, the following conclusions may appropriately be appended to the foregoing exposition thereof:—

I.—That Adam was created capable of dying, but free from the power of death;

II.—That when he disobeyed in Eden he was condemned to death for that disobedience, and that he came under the power of death solely on account of his sin;

III.—That in consequence of this offence all his descendants have been condemned to death, but without the moral guilt of his transgression attaching to them, and that those who are not actual transgressors die under the condemnation they inherit from their first parents.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

In answer to the foregoing demonstrated conclusions, it is affirmed,

1.—That condemnation, or sentence to

death involves the guilt of those condemned;

2.—That God never condemns men for things done before they were born, and never punishes one human being for the sins of another; and

3.—That consequently Adam's descendants are not condemned to death for his sin.

These statements, if assumed to be correct, present serious obstacles to the conclusions which they antagonise; but, of course, their weight depends entirely on the nature of the evidence by which they are supported. To some minds they will be acceptable; but those who are grounded in the Scriptures will have no difficulty in rejecting them, and demonstrating their fallacy.

To weaken the force of Rom. v. 12, it is said that the expression, "So death passed upon all men," means that death passes upon Adam's descendants in precisely the same way as it passed upon him; that as he committed actual transgression and was in consequence thereof condemned to death, so other men become the subjects of such condemnation only by their own sinful acts. This interpretation ignores the previous statement that "By one man sin entered into the world," and the subsequent one that "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." These generations, no doubt, did things which, in relation to God, were sinful, but as "Sin is not imputed when there is no law," and as they were not under law, they were not condemned to death for those acts. For what then did death reign over them? For Adam's sin only. Before death could reign over them for that cause a decree to that effect must have been passed by their Creator; therefore the apostle proceeds to announce that such a decree, sentence, or judgment, was passed upon all men on account of Adam's sin. The parallel expressions in verses 17 and 18, "By one man's offence death reigned by one," and "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation," unmistakably show that the death which reigns over men on account of Adam's sin is a sentence of condemnation for his offence. In verse 19, they are said to have been "made sinners," an expression which indicates that they become such not actively but passively; that is not by their own acts but by the act of another. This indeed is what the apostle affirms: they

were "made sinners" "by one man's disobedience." Sinners of this class are not necessarily accounted as individual transgressors; they only become such when they come under divine law, and disobey that law.

The way in which "many" are "made sinners," finds a parallel in that by which "many" are "made righteous." As the former is "by one man's disobedience" so the latter is "by the obedience of one;" and as the former are "sinners" without necessarily being like their disobedient progenitor, actual transgressors, so the latter are accounted "righteous" without having that perfection of righteousness in this life which was seen in him who was obedient in all things. If, then, to be "made righteous" does not necessitate sinlessness such as was found in Jesus Christ, on the same principle, to be "made sinners" does not necessitate actual transgression such as was manifested by Adam, neither does it imply guilt. The fact that faith and baptism are required from those who are "made righteous" does not at all weaken the force of this parallel. These elements are altogether subordinate to the paramount truth that Adam's children can only become righteous in God's sight "by the obedience of one," with whose existence and righteousness they have had nothing to do. Without this "one," any amount of faith and obedience on their part would be utterly valueless:

To support the doctrine that condemnation necessitates the guilt of those condemned, the following passage in John iii. 17-19 is quoted: "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."

This passage appears to be quoted on the same principle that a certain bishop, when asked to prove "confirmation" from the Scriptures, quoted all the passages containing the word "confirm." It is true that it speaks of condemnation, as does Rom. v.; but with a very different object. Rom. v. relates to the whole race, both Jews and Gentiles; John iii. has reference only to Jews. Rom. v. traces the condemnation of mankind to their first parent; John iii. attributes the condemnation of

unbelieving Jews to their individual rejection of divine "light." Romans v. refers to the condemnation of both children and adults; John iii. to that of such only as had attained to years of discretion. The condemnation spoken of in Rom. v. is racial; that in John iii. individual, or at most national. The former is realized individually, as each unjustified son of Adam passes into the grave; but the latter was fulfilled when the wrath of God was poured out at the destruction of Jerusalem on the forty-second generation of Israel, which, by its rejection of the Messiah, exceeded in wickedness all the generations which had preceded it.

For these reasons the passage in John iii. cannot possibly weaken the force of the apostolic teaching in Rom. v., that all Adam's descendants are condemned to death on account of his sin.

To show that condemnation does not necessitate guilt, reference has been made to Matt. xx. 18. where Jesus says, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the Scribes, and they shall condemn him to death." It will not be denied that this prediction was fulfilled by the "chief priests" and "scribes" condemning Jesus to death for blasphemy. (Of that charge he was innocent; therefore his condemnation did not necessitate his guilt.)

Should exception be taken to this passage on the ground that it refers to human not to divine condemnation, we may appropriately quote 2 Pet. ii. 6, which states that God, "turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that should after live ungodly." There can be little doubt that when the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed, they contained many children who could not possibly be guilty of the sins with which the adult population were charged. And yet all were "condemned" to perish in the "overthrow." Here there is an instance of God condemning both guilty and guiltless to the same punishment. Thus divine condemnation does not necessarily involve the individual guilt of those condemned.

Other illustrations of a similar kind will readily occur to those familiar with Bible history, such as the destruction of human beings of all ages when God's condemnation was manifested by the flood, the plagues of Egypt, or the destruction of Jerusalem. In each of

these cases many must have suffered the effects of Jehovah's wrath who were not personally guilty of the crimes which led to these divine judgments. These guiltless ones had the misfortune of being associated with the guilty ones by fleshly ties; and inasmuch as they were not possessed of righteousness of their own, neither were covered by the righteousness of another, they were utterly devoid of anything which could commend them to God. They had already been condemned to death on account of Adam's sin, and as it was not in any way incumbent on their Creator even to offer them a means of salvation, there was not a tittle of injustice on His part in leaving them to participate in the doom so richly merited by their more intelligent and responsible kinsmen.

Only by a recognition of these truths can we rightly estimate the divine action in authorising the Israelites to slaughter innocent children as well as adults in the following, among other instances:—

"We took all his (Sihon's) cities at that time, and utterly destroyed the men and the women, and the *little ones*, of every city, we left none to remain."—(Deut. ii. 34.) "And we utterly destroyed them, as we did unto Sihon king of Heshbon, utterly destroying the men, women and *children of every city*," (belonging to Og, king of Bashan)—(Deut. iii. 6.) "Now, therefore, kill every male among the *little ones*" (in Midian)—(Num. xxxi. 17.) "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, *infant and suckling*, ox and sheep, camel and ass."—(1 Sam. xv. 3.)

The principle underlying the divine conduct on these occasions is precisely the same as that which condemns the whole human race on account of Adam's sin, viz., that when the head or heads of a community transgress, the whole of the community partakes more or less of the condemnation which that transgression incurs. In authorising the slaughter of both guilty and guiltless Midianites, Amalekites, &c., God acted in complete harmony with His previous conduct in condemning to death both Adam and his posterity for the offence in Eden, and vice versa. These illustrations effectually dispose of the objection that the principle embodied in the condemnation of the Adamic race finds no place in the Old Testament, and that the world had to wait 4,000 years for its enunciation. Although it was left for the apostle Paul

to set it forth in an abstract form, it had been in practical operation for ages previous. The apostle simply stated a fact and enunciated a principle to those who were instructed in the history of the human race, and God's dealings with mankind.

To say that human beings who have committed no transgression die, not through Adamic condemnation, but because of a natural law of mortality, is to introduce between two truths an antagonism which does not exist. True, death occurs through such a law; but what is its origin? The decree by which the Almighty has condemned to death the Adamic race. The hereditary law of

mortality under which mankind die is simply the appointed means for carrying out God's condemning decree. No such law existed in relation to mankind before Adam sinned; it came into existence solely through sin, as is clearly shown by the apostolic statement, which represents the redeemed when possessors of the divine nature, as "having escaped the CORRUPTION *that is in the world THROUGH LUST.*"—(2 Pet. i. 4.) God, as the author of the decree, is the judge, and the hereditary law of mortality is, so to speak, His executioner for carrying out His sentence.

London.

J. J. ANDREW.

INTERESTING LETTER FROM TROY.

TROY (N.Y.), *November 6th, 1875.*

BROTHER ROBERTS,

Please find enclosed an article inserted by the writer in the local newspaper of this city, setting forth in a general way the prophetic status of the great powers of Europe.

This article was not intended to treat the subject in extenso, but rather to present it in a form least objectionable to a general newspaper, and best calculated to catch the eyes of some earnest honest-hearted seeker after the truth.

You will also find enclosed what you may view as almost an anomaly, a programme or circular, issued by a Bible class, organized under the auspices of a leading orthodox church, offering the freest opportunities of investigating a wide range of scriptural subjects.

This class has been in operation over two years, and has at present every prospect of a continuance.

The truth has been continuously presented here during this time in a Christ-like spirit, avoiding expressions which might arouse personal antipathies and so act disadvantageously to God's cause. The effort has rather been to sink the individual, and elevate without compromise, the invincible truth of God.

Since this door had been opened, it was determined that a rejection of the truth should be the result of a dislike to it, and not of the manner in which it was presented.

Wise as serpents, harmless as doves

are the words of Jesus, which should guide the preacher of the truth, remembering the dignity and honour bestowed upon him, an honour withheld from angels in being entrusted with it.

In attaining human ends where temporal interests are alone concerned, men observe great caution and practice profound discretion, and it is reasonable to believe that in matters of immeasurably higher value where the character, designs and purposes of Jehovah are concerned, that the same rule of action should be followed.

The great apostle to the Gentiles, Paul, in his second letter to Timothy, (ii. 24, 25), thus writes: "The servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose them."

The sublime discourse of the apostle Paul upon Mars' Hill in the presence of the philosophers of Greece, clearly illustrates his manner of presenting the truth.

The marked features of this discourse are its freedom from personal irritating allusions, its attack only on principles, not individuals, and its condescension in the work of conciliation and in the effort to catch their ears, of quoting an acknowledged poetical authority, the pride and glory of their age.

I send the above, hoping that they may in some degree assure and encourage the lovers of God's immutable and invincible word, and strengthen them in their determination to hold fast this precious

deposit, reclaimed from the rubbish and superstition of past ages unto the end.

It may be well to add that the few in *Sardis* here, have had no scriptural occasion to change their belief in the cardinal principle of the gospel that Jesus in the days of the flesh was an inheritor of the Adamic nature, and subject to its condemnation and penalties.

The truth is receiving great aid by the open avowal of distinguished scientists that the nature of man, subjected to all the tests of an extended acquaintance with the laws of matter, reveals no foundation for the popular belief in inherent immortality.

Professor Tyndal in his world-famous address before the British Association for the advancement of science, delivered at Belfast, August 19th, 1874, thus speaks of the arguments by which Bishop Butler, the author of *Butler's Analogy*, a received text book upon man's inherent immortality:

"Long previous to his day the nature of the soul had been so favourite and general a topic of discussion, that when the students of the University of Paris wished to know the leanings of a new Professor, they at once requested him to lecture upon the soul. About the time of Bishop Butler the question was not only agitated but extended. It was seen by the clear-witted men who entered this arena, that many of their best arguments applied equally to brutes and men. The Bishop's arguments were of this character. He saw it, admitted it, accepted the consequence, and boldly embraced the whole animal world in his scheme of immortality."

So falls to the ground in ruin and confusion one of the grandest superstructures which man has raised in his presumption, and in defiance of the express words of his Creator, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."

Professor Tyndal further affirms that from well-chosen data man has no other hope of immortality than the living in after ages of the impress he makes upon his age and generation.

But where science is dark and rayless, there the glorious revelation of God shines in all its glory and effulgence, dissipating the doubts and uncertainties of the human mind, and placing man's hope of immortality in the promises of God.—Your brother in Christ Jesus,
GEORGE H. ENNIS.

THE PROGRAMME REFERRED TO.

Bible Study at the Parlour of the Second Presbyterian Church, Fifth Street, every Sunday afternoon, at 1.45 o'clock. David Beattie, Director.

The object in view is a candid examination of the events and doctrines contained in the Scripture records.

The discussions are free for the expression of opinions, to all who are desirous of learning the *truth* about the subjects under consideration.

Mere disputations, or efforts to secure logical triumph at the *expense* of truth, are not desired.

It is expected that no speaker will indulge in discorteous personal allusions, nor use unnecessarily harsh expressions in characterizing the cherished beliefs of others; for such a course can only lead to disintegration, and the ultimate defeat of the end proposed.

We therefore cordially invite all who will sincerely abide by the conditions, to unite in this study.

LIST OF SUBJECTS.

1. How shall we interpret the Bible?
2. Creation.
3. The Blood of Christ: how and when does it cleanse us?
4. Reprobation; or, does God make men to damn them?
5. Is there any Salvation without a knowledge of Christ?
6. The responsibility of the Jews for rejecting Christ.
7. The God of Nature and the God of the Bible identical.
8. The Accountability of Man considered as a Free Agent.
9. The Trinity: is it reconcilable with Human Reason?
10. Christian Charity in matters of Religious Belief.
11. What are the *essential* doctrines of the Christian Religion?
12. The nature of Rewards and Punishments in the other world.
13. The Peace of Christ: in what does it consist?
14. The Assurance of Answers to Prayer: how obtained.
15. God as a Moral Government of the Universe.
16. Woman's part in the Public Exercises of the Church.

17. Sectarianism in Religion: is it desirable or necessary; if not, is its abolition practicable?
18. Christianity superior to any religion?
19. The Church of Christ: its identity.
20. The Priesthood of Christ.
21. The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Four Gospels.
22. Prophecies respecting Nationalities and Kings.
23. Prophecies respecting Christ.
24. How do we become Partakers of Christ's Righteousness?
25. The character of Moses.
26. The character of Joseph.
27. The character of David.
28. The character of Solomon.
29. The Unity of the Scriptures.
30. The Divine treatment of Jacob and Esau.
31. God's Relation to man progressive.
32. History of the Doctrine of the Incarnation of Deity.
33. The Millennium.
34. The Paradoxes of Scripture.
35. Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart, &c.
36. The Second Death: what is it?
37. Human Characteristics applied to Deity.
38. Could a Literal Follower of Christ conform to modern Christian Usages?
39. Did Christ teach a life of Celibacy?
40. What are the Evidences of Divine Revelation?
41. The Immortality of the Soul.
42. The Atonement.
43. Regeneration.
44. Repentance: or "What shall I do to be saved?"
45. The Prosperity of the Wicked and the Tribulations of the Righteous?
46. The Character and Claims of Christ.
47. The Sabbath and its Duties.
48. The Translation of Enoch and Elijah.
49. Are the Tendencies of Man's Nature towards Evil?
50. Perseverance of the Saints.
51. The Abrahamic Covenant.
52. The Old Testament Basis of Salvation.
53. The Scriptural Doctrine concerning Hell.
54. The Doctrine of Christian Perfection.
55. The Unity of the Race.
56. The Divine Name.
57. The Second Coming of the Lord.

The Article referred to.

THE IMPENDING WAR CLOUD OF EUROPE AND THE PLACE OF ITS DESCENT.

To the Editor of the *Troy Morning Whig*.—There has recently appeared in your editorial columns several articles speculating upon what portion of the European Continent the impending war cloud, dark and portentous of ruin and disaster, would descend. That such a situation really exists, is admitted by the wise and astute English statesman, Disraeli, in several of his recent public speeches. It is well known that the powerful nations of Europe, under the pressure of severe conscription laws, are forcing into their armies all the available fighting material of their dominions, and arming these levies with the deadliest and most effective weapons which the ingenuity of man can produce.

Your query, then, as to what portion of Europe would be cursed with the horrors of war is worthy of careful attention. To throw light upon this intricate question, baffling the deepest researches of man, the writer would respectfully direct your attention to an infallible source of truth, the sure word of prophecy as contained in the holy Scriptures.

For over 200 years, the expositors of the prophetic text have understood the words of Revelations xvi. 12, as indicating the extinction of the Turkish power. Says Tillinghast, a writer of over 200 years ago: "By the river Euphrates we are to understand the Ottoman or Turkish empire. It is called the great river because of the multitude of people and nations therein. The people who at the present time are of all others accounted the greatest, are the Turks, who therefore, and no other are here to be understood. Especially as the Euphrates in Revelations, 9th chapter, under the sounding of the sixth trumpet by general consent of expositors has reference to the Turkish power." Since 1820 the Turkish power has been in a state of decline, until now the cognomen of sick man fully declares its weak and decrepid condition. Its prolongation of existence is due simply to the jealousies of the great powers, and their total inability to agree upon the distribution of the sick man's effects. Here lies the bone of contention.

But to reach the main point of this article, without unduly burdening your

columns, we will epitomise the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of the prophecy of Ezekiel.

Our attention is directed by the prophet to the following points: An invasion of the Holy Land in the latter days by a power styled Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal. That confederate with this power are the nations of Persia, Ethiopia, Lybia, Gomer, and the house of Togarmah of the north quarters. The north is said to be the direction from whence this mighty confederated power issues in its invasion of the "mountains of Israel which have always been waste." This invasion of the Holy Land, results in the signal discomfiture of the invading power. Jehovah for the first time in many centuries, openly and terribly vindicating the cause of His ancient people. Lastly, the restoration of Israel to their own land, and the favour of God, after the long and terrible night of sorrow and persecution, of over eighteen centuries' duration.

The first point to be learned is whether the history of the invasions of the Holy Land from the times of Ezekiel to the present time, contains any account of an invasion in which such a terrible destruction was poured out upon the invader as the language of the prophet depicts will be. Ezekiel lived according to the accepted chronology between the years 595—536 B.C. From these times to the present time the history of Jerusalem has been as follows: Thrice taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the years 607, 597, and 586, in the last of which it was utterly destroyed. Restored by Ezra and Nehemiah 457 and 445, under the edicts of Cyrus and Artaxerxes. Captured by Alexander the Great 332 B.C. Sacked by Antiochus Epiphanes 170 B.C. Captured by the Romans under Pompey, 63 B.C. Utterly destroyed by the the Romans under Vespasian and Titus 70 A.D. Captured by the Persians 614 A.D. Surrendered to Khalif Omar 637 A.D., and finally passed into the hands of the Ottoman Empire 1517. In whose possession, except for a short period, it has remained up to the present day. It will thus be seen that the prophecy of Ezekiel remains unfulfilled to the present day, as Jerusalem instead of being the victor has always felt the iron heel of the oppressor and invader.

The next point of importance is the identification of the historical character of the prophecy. Expositors generally

agree that the term Gog is not a proper name, but means more properly a chief or prince. The learned writer Bochart about the year 1640, in his elaborate researches into sacred geography, observed that Ros or Rosh is the most ancient form under which history makes mention of the name *Russia*; and he contended that Rosh and Meshekh properly denote the nations of Muscovy and Russia. It is credible, says he, that from Rosh and Meshekh, of whom Ezekiel speaks, descended the Russians and Muscovites, nations of the greatest celebrity in European Scythia. We have indeed ample and positive testimony that the Russian nation was called Ros by the Greeks in the earliest period in which we find it mentioned in the words: "The Rosh are a Scythian nation bordering on the Northern Taurus." And their own historian says: "It is related that the Russians (whom the Greeks called Ros and sometime Rosos) derived their name from Ros, a valiant man, who delivered his nation from the yoke of their tyrants." Tubal is readily recognised in its modern dress of Tobolski the capital of the extensive Russian possession of Siberia, lying east of Muscovy.

Dr. Hales, the accurate chronologer, says of Gog and Magog, they are the general names of the northern nations of Europe and Asia, or the districts north of Caucasus or Mount Taurus, colonized by Gog or Magog, another of the sons of Japhet, and Ezekiel foretelling a future invasion of the land of Israel by these northern nations, Meshech, Tubal and Togarmah, styles Gog their chief prince, and describes their host precisely as Scythian, or Tartarian, coming out of the north, all of them riding on horses, "bows and arrows" their weapons, covering the land like a cloud and coming like a storm in the latter days.

The following additional evidences respecting the identification of the historical characters will be found in an atlas of Scripture geography, by Edward Weller, F.R.G.S., recently published by G. P. Putnam & Sons: in a map of the "ancient world, showing the probable settlements of the descendants of Noah." Meshech and Tubal are represented as lying north of the Caspian Sea, and embraced in what is now called Siberia and Russia in Europe. It will be thus seen from the trustworthy evidences adduced, that the words of the prophecy point with unerring accuracy to the present Russian

empire as the representative of the ancient "Gog of the land of the Magog and chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and Togarmah of the north quarters."

In reference to the identification of *Gomer* among the modern nations of Europe, we learn from the sacred writings that Gomer and Magog were the names of two of the sons of Japhet. Josephus, the Jewish historian, also writes as follows, book 1, chap. 6, of his *Antiquities of the Jews*: "Japhet the son of Noah, had seven sons; they inhabited so, that beginning at the mountains Taurus and Amanus, they proceeded along Asia as far as the river Tauaius and along Europe to Cadiz, and settling themselves on the lands which they lighted upon, which none had inhabited before, they called the nations by their own names. For Gomer founded those whom the Greeks now call Galatians (Galli), but were then called Gomerites. Magog founded those that from him were named Magogites, but who by the Greeks are called Scythians.

There are no absolute evidences upon which to base the identification among the nations of modern Europe, of the Gomer of prophecy. The Romans spoke of these northern nations under the general appellation of Galatæ or Galli, while the Greeks called the northern nations Scythia and the southern Galatia. Strabo says the ancient Greeks at first called the northern nations by the general name of Scythians, but when they became acquainted with the nations in the west, they began to call them by the different names of Celts and Celto-Scythæ. It has been conjectured that modern France is the Gomer of prophecy, from reasons which cannot be stated here at length. A recent German writer traces the name Germany from the Gomer of the Holy Scriptures. In the map above alluded to, in speaking of the identification of Mesh-ech and Tubal, central and western Europe is said to have been settled by the descendants of Gomer.

From the above evidences it will be apparent that the view which has been long held by students of prophecy, of erudition and large acquaintance with the Scriptures, of the invasion of the Holy Land in the latter times by the allied forces of Russia, probably France,

Persia, Lybia and Ethiopia is well founded.

We may here probably inquire what motives would naturally bring Russia into the Holy Land. To which inquiry reply may be made that it has been the ambition of Russia for several centuries to overthrow the Turkish power, sustained at present mainly by British gold and influence, and incorporate these conquered possessions with her own. Also to re-establish in the cathedral of Saint Sophia, the ancient Greek religion of which Russia is the head. The covetous eye of Russia is upon India; her well known and recent operations in Khiva have no doubt, as their chief end, the destruction of British power and influence in the east, and the possession of this rich prize. The effort to carry out these designs on the part of Russia would naturally arouse England, and compel her to defend the apple of her eye—India. Around these two great powers as centres, governed by motives of interest or jealousy, would the remaining powers arrange themselves.

Taking the events of the last few years as a basis, we may hypothesize as follows: France, if true to the desires which of late years she has displayed, of extending her trade and commerce in the east, of which the construction of the Suez canal is a direct evidence, would gravitate to the side of Russia. Germany's chief concern being at present the unification of the clashing interests of her subjects, and their reduction to a mighty and powerful unit, might for the material aid and moral support of Russia remain neutral. The remaining powers, alarmed at the ascendancy of Russia in European affairs, would naturally seek the side of England.

The above statement is an attempt to describe in terms of our times, the events of this remarkable prophecy of Ezekiel. It is to be hoped that out of this mighty conflict of nations will arise a situation of affairs which will ensure to mankind a permanent immunity from war and its desolations, and the security of great blessings. In other words, that which too many Christians look upon as a Utopian fancy, the inauguration of the millennium.

G.H.E.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERN-
ING A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Job. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 18.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

THE LAST HOURS OF AN EX-INFIDEL AGITATOR.

THE Bible is true apart from any man or any man's views and feelings on the subject. Yet the views and feelings of men in special circumstances may help some minds to realise the fact more vividly than if they have to rely solely on the impersonal and intrinsic evidences of the case. On this principle, it is profitable to publish the fact that a notable enemy of the Bible, recently dead, changed his mind before he died, and was careful to leave the evidence of the change behind him. The case is that of Mr. Joseph Barker, who, first a Methodist parson, then a Unitarian minister, then a Deist, finally became an avowed Atheist, and took part with Bradlaugh in disseminating infidel principles in this country. He shook the faith of many in Yorkshire sixteen years ago, and generally did much mischief throughout England, being a man of

some eloquence and ability. After a time, he began to veer again in a religious direction, and passing through the stages of Spiritualism and Deism, he finally returned to the ranks of orthodox religion. He died on the 15th of September last, at Nebraska. The papers publish the following account of his last hours:—"A few days before his death he made a final arrangement of his affairs, and feeling that paralysis was approaching, he called his eldest son, Mr. Gilbert, his lawyer, and Mr. Kellom, one of his trustees, to his bedside, and said: 'I feel that I am approaching my end, and desire that you should receive my last words and be witness to them; I wish you to witness that I am in my right mind and fully understand what I have just been doing; and dying, that I die in the firm and full belief in Jesus Christ, and in the faith and love of his religion as revealed in his life and works, as described in the New Testament; that

I have an abiding faith in and love of God, as God is revealed to us by his Son Jesus Christ, and I die trusting in God's infinite love and mercy, and in full faith of a future and better life. I am sorry for my past errors, but during the last years of my life I have striven to undo the harm I did by doing all I was able, to serve God by shewing the beauty and wisdom of the religion of His Son Jesus Christ. I wish you to write down and witness this my last confession of faith, that there may be no doubt about it."

DARWIN AND HUXLEY REFUTED.

(Continued from page 20.)

Dr. Potter quotes the following extract from Huxley, with the view of exposing the scientific inaccuracy of his reasoning:—"Examine the recently-laid egg of some common animal, such as a salamander or a newt. It is a minute spheroid in which the best microscope will reveal nothing but a structureless sac, enclosing a glairy fluid, holding granules in suspension. But strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid, and yet so steady and purpose-like in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel, the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And then it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body; pinching up the head at one end and the tail at the other, and fashioning flank and limb into due salamandrine proportions, in so artistic a way, that, after watching the process hour by hour,

one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skilful manipulation to perfect his work." And then, to sum up the entire results of his scientific observations, he (Huxley) adds:—"What is true of the newt is true of every animal and of every plant; the acorn tends to build itself up again into a woodland giant such as that from whose twig it fell; the spore of the humblest lichen reproduces the green or brown incrustation which gave it birth; and at the other end of the scale of life, the child that resembled neither the paternal nor the maternal side of the house would be regarded as a monster. . . .

It is the first great law of reproduction that the offspring tends to resemble its parent or parents."

But what light, says Dr. Potter, does all this throw upon the origin of life? None. Quite true, Huxley adds, "Science will some day show us how this law is a necessary consequence of the more general laws which govern matter." But this is just a gratuitous theory, a prophecy, in fact, springing from Mr. Huxley's foregone opinion, and having no logical connection with his scientific observations. The fact is, his observations tend to a widely different conclusion. They show us the guiding power which that mysterious entity we call life exercises upon matter, moulding it at will into forms of exquisite beauty and wide diversity; they show us that life cannot be a unit, that is, a thing of one essence and type, emanating from matter; for, were it so, then its operations upon matter would be uniform, and there would but be one class of organisms in the universe. Or, suppose we admit, with Herbert Spencer, that the life-principle is modified to meet the requirements of its environments, then the nature of the full-grown animal could never be predicted, as that would depend

on the environments, which accident might entirely change. On the contrary, Huxley's researches prove that there are essentially distinct types of life, though they all seem to have the same elementary basis; and that each type operates upon matter—the very same matter—with such irresistible guiding potency as to build it up into forms exactly corresponding to the parent stock. Science cannot in this respect control it, it can only observe it. Matter—all life's visible environment—can do nothing except supply what may be called the raw material. Life guides the moulding and building in entire independence alike of man and of matter; and all scientific observation proves that life—pre-existing life—is absolutely necessary to the building up of animal organism.

But scientists have tried to go deeper, and we must follow them. The material germ or *protoplasm*, as it is now technically termed, has been subjected to the keen scrutiny of the microscope, and the searching analysis of the chemist. Its constituent elements have been discovered and described. Huxley says, "All the forms of protoplasm which have yet been examined contain the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, in very complex union." In whatever form it appears, "whether fungus or oak, worm or man," its elements are the same; and when life in it becomes extinct, it "is resolved into its mineral and lifeless constituents." It is admitted that carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen are lifeless bodies; and that they all exist previous to their union; "but when they are brought together," says Huxley, "under certain conditions they give rise to protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life." Would it not, at first sight, appear from these words as if science had at length succeeded in solving the grand mystery of the origin of life? It knows all the elements of protoplasm; and there is no lack of

them in nature. They exist everywhere around us. So, then, the elements are known, and are at hand; science can put them together; and Professor Huxley says, "I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm"—that is, of course life—"result from the nature and disposition of its molecules." Yet he cannot produce life from those materials. Science here utterly fails. Its field, alike of potency and of knowledge, is at this point shut in by an impassable barrier: Huxley confesses that *pre-existing living matter* is absolutely requisite to the development of the phenomena of life, and he admits that its influence "is something quite unintelligible:" while Pritchard affirms that "no chemist, with all his wonderful art, has ever yet witnessed the evolution of a living thing from those lifeless molecules of matter and force."

So far, then, as science is concerned, we are as remote as ever from the solution of the problem of the origin of life. Scientists have tried to produce life from its so-called physical basis, but every trial has been a failure. They have tried also to trace it to its origin; but they have only been able to observe its phenomena—they cannot reach its source, nor can they reveal its nature. They see motion and development in the living protoplasm; but these are the effects of a life already existing, not the essence or principle of life itself. Herbert Spencer describes life as "a continuous adjustment of internal to external relations;" but this Delphian utterance, if it have any meaning at all, can only refer to the phenomena of life; it does not touch its essence, nor does it throw one ray of light upon its origin. That the life is inherent in, or evolved by matter, is inconceivable, for the living protoplasm often dies, and then, though all the material elements are still there, development ceases at once; the power which moulds and builds has gone mysteriously as it came, and no

human agency can again vitalise the dead mass, which now obeys the ordinary laws of matter, and is resolved into its mineral constituents. "The living body resists the chemical agencies that are ready to attack it; the dead body at once succumbs to these agencies." Life is the power which moulds and builds up organisms, and preserves the matter of which they are composed from the dissolving force of the ordinary laws to which mere matter is subject. The teaching of science, therefore, is that life is something apart from matter; but what it is—whence it comes and whither it goes—science cannot tell. Its operation on matter is wonderful. It guides the chemical forces already existing, so as to arrange inert matter into shapes of the most exquisite proportions, and organisms of the most delicate and complicated mechanism—all of which are entirely distinct from those normal forms which the constituent elements would assume, if uncontrolled by the life-principle. And then again, when the life departs, the very matter in which it existed, and which it moulded with such mystic power into bodies of matchless grace and beauty, speedily become a mass of loathsome rotteness, and dissolves into its original elements. Professor Huxley is, in the end, forced to admit all this, when he speaks of the "living protoplasm" which preserves and builds up organic forms, and the "dead protoplasm" which is resolved into its mineral constituents; but he tries to save his favourite theory by affirming—not in accordance with, but in spite of logical sequence—that the phenomena presented by protoplasm, living or dead, are its properties; and that all vital action may be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. How, I ask, can vital action be the result of molecular forces alone, when, according to the Professor's own admission, the influence of pre-existing living matter is shown by scientific

observation to be necessary to vital action? The vital action is clearly the result, not of molecular forces, but of the life-principle operating on the protoplasm. In denying this, Huxley sacrifices his logic to his theory; and he would do well thoughtfully to read Tyndall's striking words:—"There is in the true man of science a wish stronger than the wish to have his beliefs upheld—namely, the wish to have them true. And the stronger wish causes him to reject the most plausible support, if he has reason to suspect that it is vitiated by error. Those to whom I refer as having studied this question, believing the evidence offered in favour of spontaneous generation to be thus vitiated, cannot accept it. They know full well that the chemist now prepares from inorganic matter a vast array of substances which were some time ago regarded as the sole products of vitality. They are intimately acquainted with the structural power of matter, as evidenced in the phenomena of crystallisation; they can justify, scientifically, their belief in its potency, under the proper conditions, to produce organisms; but in reply to your question they will frankly admit their inability to point to any satisfactory experimental proof that life can be developed save from demonstrable antecedent life." Tyndall's final conclusion is contained in these words:—"In fact, the whole process of evolution is the manifestation of a Power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man. As little in our days as in the days of Job can man by searching find this Power out. Considered fundamentally, then, it is by the operation of an insoluble mystery that life on earth is evolved."

This is enough for my purpose. The limits of the province of science are here drawn definitely by the President of the British Association. Science shows that life is an entity, a power, apart from and above matter, but that in its essence it eludes the keen eye of the philosopher;

that it cannot be discovered by the researches of the physiologist; that it will not emanate from the retort of the chemist, however skilfully he arrange and manipulate the elements of its physical basis; that, in fact, it lies hid among those sublime mysteries of nature which human wisdom utterly fails to penetrate, and which the Infinite Wisdom of the Great Creator can alone reveal to the yearning spirit of His faithful creatures. The whole teachings of science are, so far as they can go, in harmony with that simple but sublime record—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

THE BIBLE ITS OWN PROOF OF ITS
DIVINE ORIGIN.

(Continued from page 25.)

Jeremiah, while mourning the downfall of his people, is very explicit as to their restoration: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely."—(xxiii. 5, 6.) "Thus saith the Lord: If ye can break my covenant of the day and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne." (xxxiii. 20, 21.) Ezekiel, in a passage already cited, predicts the overturning of David's throne, but asserts its re-establishment under his descendant, Christ. "And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David, he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them ;

I the Lord have spoken it."—xxxiv. 23-24.) "And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."—(xxxvii. 22.)

The testimony in Daniel is very remarkable. The future deliverer is represented (chap. ii. 34-35) by a stone cut without hands, which smites the feet of the great image and becomes a great mountain, filling the whole earth. The end of human sovereignty is thus declared (verse 44): "And in the days of these kings (of the iron and clay dominion) shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break to pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Again in chap. vii. 13, 14: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (See also verse 27.)

Hosea is in harmony with the rest. Chap. iii. 4, 5: "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim. Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days."

Joel declares the future restoration of Israel under a divine ruler, chap. iii. 16-17: "The Lord also shall roar out of Zion,

and utter his voice from Jerusalem, and the heavens and the earth shall shake, but the Lord will be the hope of his people and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more." See also verses 20, 21.

In Amos the rebuilding of David's kingdom is thus described—chap. ix. 11-15: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this," &c. Obadiah supplies a striking passage, verse 21: "And Saviours shall come up on Mount Zion, to judge the mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's."

Jonah, as a history of past events, may be passed by. Micah contains some strikingly plain references to the future kingdom of Christ (chap. iv. 8): "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion: the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Chap. v. 2: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old from everlasting." The last verse of this book takes us back to the point from whence we started: "Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old." All the glorious things spoken by Micah are thus seen to be but an amplification of the promises made to the fathers. Passing by Nahum, we come to

Habakkuk, who predicts (chap. ii. 14) that "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Christ will then be reigning in Zion (verse 20), "But the Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before him." Thus Zephaniah also (chap. iii. 14, 15): "Sing, O daughter of Zion, shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments; he hath cast out thine enemy; the king of Israel, even the Lord, is in the midst of thee; thou shalt not see evil any more." Several portions of the second chapter of Haggai confirm all that has been advanced.

Some of the most remarkable testimonies to the reign of Christ are to be found in Zechariah. We shall cite but two. Chap. vi. 12, 13: "Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold, the man whose name is the branch, and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord. Even he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne." Chap. xiv. 9, 16: "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one." "And it shall come to pass that everyone that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the king, the Lord of Hosts." Malachi, chaps. iii. and iv. may be read through at leisure.

The beginning of the New Testament introduces our subject at once in the enquiry of the wise men, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" (Matt. ii. 2), and the explanation of Micah v. 2, by the chief priests and scribes, summoned by Herod, in his jealous fear of the approaching claimant to Israel's throne, then a helpless babe at Bethle-

hem. As we proceed we learn how the child grows up to manhood, and from his immersion to his death, ceased not to press his regal claims. He preached the good news about the kingdom.—(Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 14.) He declared it to be his special mission to proclaim that kingdom. Luke iv. 43: "I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I sent." (See also Luke viii. 1.) He commissioned the twelve to preach the same. Luke ix. 2: "And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal the sick." He promised to confer honours upon his faithful followers when he attained the throne. Matt. xix. 28: "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xxii. 28, 29, 30: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me. That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." In Matt. v. 35, while discoursing to his disciples, he prohibits swearing by Jerusalem, assigning as the reason that "it is the city of the Great King." With the previously cited testimonies before us, and the then degraded condition of Israel, how significant are these words. In Matt. xxi. 5, the prediction of Zechariah (ix. 9) is expressly applied to Jesus. "Tell ye the daughter of Zion: Behold thy king cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass." It is interesting to note how the parallel narratives of Mark and Luke elucidate each other, and how the people who took part in the demonstration narrated, understood the words they used. "And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna! Blessed is he that

cometh in the name of the Lord. Blessed be the kingdom of our father David that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest."—(Mark xi. 9, 10.) "Blessed be the king that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven, and glory in the highest."—(Luke xix. 38.) The great crime charged against Jesus by the elders, chief priests, and scribes, was that of claiming regal dignity. "And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ—a king." Further than that, he claimed to be King of the Jews (verses 3, 4): and this they could not brook from one who fearlessly denounced their wickedness, and declared that the kingdom should be taken from them and given to his own despised followers.—(Matt. xxi. 43, compared with Luke xii. 32.) In spite of the fierce anger of his rebellious subjects, he never ceased to press his claims. How could he, as a true man, with a sacred mission in his keeping!—(Luke iv. 43.) Not even the fear of death itself could disturb the calm conviction, written by the divine finger upon his noble heart, as in characters of fire, and which could not but flash out in burning words. When he stood before Pilate, charged with treason, he flinched not, but made "the good confession."—(1 Tim. vi. 13-15.) For this, as far as the Jews were concerned actually, he suffered death. "He came to his own, and his own received him not" (John i. 11); and while he hung upon the cross, they exclaimed, ironically, "Let Christ, the king of Israel, descend from the cross, that we may see and believe."—(Mark xv. 32.) Nor would they allow the superscription, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," to be placed upon the cross, without uttering a protest. "Write not," said the chief priests to Pilate, "The King of the Jews, but that

he said I am King of the Jews.”—(John xix. 19, 20, 21.)

Leaving the gospels, we meet, in the first chapter of the Acts, with an important passage. In verse 3, Luke says that Jesus “shewed himself alive after his Passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.” What the Lord meant by the term “kingdom of God” may easily be seen from verses 6, 7: “When they, therefore, came together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power.” The kingdom of Israel restored is thus seen to be identical with “the kingdom of God,” and the only difficulty left in the minds of the disciples after the Lord’s teaching during the forty days, had reference to the time of its restoration. After the apostles had been endued with power from on high, they boldly proclaimed the kingdom of God.—(See Acts ii. 30-36; iii 19, 20, 21; xv. 13-17; xvii. 31; xix. 8; xxviii. 23-31.)

It would take too much space to go through the epistles *seriatim*. They abound with allusions to the reign of Christ. Thus Paul: “If we suffer we shall also reign with him.”—(2 Tim. ii. 12.) “I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.”—(2 Tim. iv. 1.) James (ii. 5): “Hearken, my beloved brethren; hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him.” Peter (1 Pet. iv. 13): “But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings, that when his glory shall be revealed ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.” “For so an entrance

shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”—(2 Pet. i. 11.)

In the Apocalypse our subject culminates splendidly. Genesis describes the origin of the sin-power, and predicted its destruction by the seed of the woman. The Apocalypse pictures the fulfilment of that prediction. “That old serpent” is again brought into prominence, but only that its head may be finally bruised by the “King of kings.” We have reached the end of the golden thread that we have been following so hastily, and now we hear the grand song of the redeemed: “Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof; for 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.”—(chap. v. 10.) We see Jesus in his royal character, “King of kings and Lord of lords.”—(chap. xix. 16.) And the glorious results of his reign are thus forcibly summed up: “And there shall be no more curse, but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him.”—(chap. xxii. 3.)

It is scarcely necessary to sum up the whole matter in the form of an argument. The premisses are plain and the conclusion is obvious. The various books from which the foregoing quotations have been taken were not all written by one and the same hand. Some were written at periods far remote from the date of others: many centuries, in some cases, intervening. Variety of style argues variety of authorship. Isaiah could not have written the Lamentations of the weeping prophet, nor could the latter have risen to the sublime heights of Isaiah. It was not possible, then, that all the testimonies cited could be the result of collusion. If not, how did they

originate? Whence their astonishing agreement upon the great theme that has passed under review? Every careful and candid investigator must acquiesce in the Bible's own explanation of the matter: "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."—(Heb. i. 1.) "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

And now the believing reader must take leave of this deeply interesting subject with mingled feelings of wonder and gratitude—wonder at the marvellous plan revealed; gratitude for the love of the Deity shown in devising and accomplishing such a scheme for the benefit of his faithful children. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope."—(Rom. xv. 4.)

EDMUND CORKILL,

Feb., 1875. York, Penn., U.S.A.

THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE:

LECTURE BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from page 27.)

Next to its history we come to a most important department, which of itself yields conclusive evidence of the truthfulness of the Bible, and that is the fulfilment of its prophecies. Let any man try to prophesy. Let any man who thinks that Moses and the prophets were only astute men, who by a large discernment of human affairs prophesied what should happen centuries afterwards; let those who try to get over the difficulty in that way try themselves to prophesy; or let them go to any of the learned men and get them to try and prophesy. There are plenty of things for them to try their hands at. There are the Mormons; let

any man prophesy where they will be a hundred years from this, and what will be their position. There is Germany just risen to a position of great military eminence: let any one predict where she will be in 20 years. The simplest matter taken in hand will convince any man of the utter inability of the mind to penetrate the future. The future is a dead wall to the human eye. If any man is prepared to controvert that, let him give us his reasons; let him produce one prophet; let him give us the man who can even forecast the markets for a day ahead. He cannot, and therefore the proposition must be accepted that we know not a day ahead what will certainly come to pass.

Now in view of that, how are we to understand a few things to which I will now call attention. First let me read you what Moses said concerning the Jews three thousand years ago: "Because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with joyfulness and gladness of heart for the abundance of all things, therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the Lord shall send against thee in hunger and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things, and He shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck until He has destroyed thee. The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth, a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, who shall not regard the person of the old nor show favour to the young. And he shall eat the fruit of thy cattle and the fruit of thy land until thou be destroyed, which shall also not leave thee corn, wine, or oil, or the increase of thy kine or flocks of thy sheep, until he hath destroyed thee. And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst throughout all thy land; and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land which the Lord thy God hath given thee. And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own

body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege and in the straits wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth unto the other, &c."—(Deut. xxviii. 47-53, 64.)

Presuming every one to be acquainted with the history of the Jews, it does not require many words to force home the argument arising upon that prophecy. These words were written three thousand years ago; no scholar will deny that; Colenzo does not deny that. All that Colenzo says (though his argument is not the conclusive affair that the majority of readers delight to think it,) is that Moses did not write this. Even granting that this were so (which cannot be granted for many cogent reasons), you have got the fact that three thousand years ago, someone—and it does not matter for the present argument who—foretold the dispersion of the Jewish nation throughout the world, consequent on the Roman invasion, during which all their fortified places would be reduced, and the nation brought to terrible extremities. And even a matter of detail like this is detailed; "The Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again in ships by the way whereof I spake unto thee, thou shalt see it no more again; and ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bond women, and no man shall buy you." When Titus had levelled Jerusalem with the ground, what did he do with the inhabitants who still remained alive? He reserved ten thousand for his triumphal entry into Rome, and for amusing the people at the public games; and the residue he sent to the slave markets of Egypt, and the markets were glutted that people would not buy them. Thousands of poor emaciated Jews had this prophecy fulfilled in their own persons. This is a matter of record; Josephus tells us about it.

Whatever explanation people may have to give of this fulfilled prophecy of Jewish dispersion at the present day, they are bound to admit that in that item the Bible has proved true against all probabilities. For what was the natural probability? Why that the Jews as soon as their nationality was broken up, as soon as their institutions were blown to the winds and themselves scattered as disconnected units, they would become assimilated among the nations and disappear. Instead of that they are just as distinctly national in Birmingham in 1875 as they were in Jerusalem at the beginning of the present era.

Take another prophecy: one concerning Babylon, the great rival of Jerusalem. In the days of Isaiah, Babylon was a flourishing place and likely to continue so, as much as Rome; and what does Isaiah say as to its destiny? Eight hundred years before Christ, and something like 300 years before Babylon's overthrow, Isaiah said (chap. xiii. 19), "And Babylon the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall the shepherds make their folds there; but wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and all their houses shall be full of doleful creatures, and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there." And how has this turned out? Exactly as foretold. Babylon is a desolation, literally deserted except of the lower kinds of noisome creatures such as are enumerated in the passage quoted. So completely has that prophecy been fulfilled that it gave the infidels at the beginning of our century a peg on which to hang an argument in the opposite direction, and to contend that there never had been such a place as the Babylon of Scripture. Now thanks be to God, we

have Babylon before our eyes, in the works of modern explorers, though I do not say that the recovery of Babylon was necessary to give us confidence in the truth of the Scriptures.

I could occupy not one but twenty evenings if it were necessary, in bringing forward arguments and evidences which go to show that the Bible is the book of God. I think there is a sort of widespread popular intuition that it is so; for notwithstanding all the clever artifices of shallow writers, and some who do not appear to be shallow, there is solid strength in the book which speaks for itself from generation to generation; and every now and then re-asserts itself, as if to blow away the cobwebs which some minds would try to weave over it.

What is true of Babylon you will find on reference to numerous places is true of Tyre, Nineveh, and Egypt. Concerning Egypt we read (Ezek. xxix. 12-15), "I will make the land of Egypt desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate, and her cities among the cities that are laid waste shall be desolate forty years, and I will scatter the Egyptians through the nations and disperse them through the countries. Yet, thus saith the Lord God, at the end of forty years will I gather the Egyptians from the people whither they were scattered, and will bring again the captivity of Egypt, and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation, and they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations; for I will diminish them, and they shall no more rule over the nations." Here is a practical prophecy which I should like to hear any man venture concerning any other power in the world. Who could be sure that Egypt would not re-assert her supremacy, as she came very near doing under Mehemet Ali, 35 years ago? Who could have foretold ten years ago

that Germany would be the military master of the world? Here is a declaration that Egypt should be a base kingdom, and it has been a base kingdom since then, a kingdom of no account in the roll of nations. It is now a mere dependency of the tottering Turkish empire.

Then let us take Tyre. Look at the 28th chapter of Ezekiel, 6th verse: "Therefore saith the Lord God, because thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God: behold, therefore, I will bring strangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations; and they shall draw their swords against the beauty of thy wisdom, and they shall defile thy brightness." Tyre was the London of ancient days; the Phœnicia of the profane historians—the market of all nations, at the time of this prophecy. It goes on to say, "They shall bring thee down to the pit, and thou shalt die the death of them that are slain in the midst of the seas." In the last part of the 18th verse: "I will bring forth fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee: thou shalt be a terror and never shalt thou be any more." Tyre never regained her maritime supremacy or even a maritime place, but became what as it was prophesied (Ezek. xxvi. 14.) like the top of a rock, a place to spread nets upon. You may go there and see how the prophecy has been fulfilled.

Then there are many other prophecies of a striking nature. Consider the prophecy of Daniel, who while Babylon was yet in her glory under Nebuchadnezzar, foretold the uprise of the Medo-Persian power to overthrow Babylon, and predicted that the Medo-Persian power would be succeeded by the Grecian goat, and that the Greek dynasty would break up into four, and be succeeded by the Roman, which would prevail over all the earth, establishing an empire, would before

long be divided into many parts. All of that has been fulfilled in the most singularly accurate manner, in order to get away from the force of which, the infidel has to suggest that Daniel was written after the events. The suggestion cannot be sustained; all the principles of literary criticism and common sense are against it, for Daniel was a book well known in the days of Christ and referred to by him, as when he says, "When ye see what was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, then go ye to the mountains." In the Sannhedrim (the council of the Jewish nation), among scribes and pharisees, the learned classes of the day, the book of Daniel was current and accepted as the undoubted prediction of the Jewish captive Daniel, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, and their knowledge and verdict in such a case would be conclusive, apart from the evidence (of a very conclusive character) furnished by the characteristics of the book. It shows how hard pressed the adversaries of the Bible are with the mighty evidence before them, that they should have to suggest the spuriousness of the book of Daniel. The argument has been very thoroughly refuted in a recent pamphlet in which the authenticity and age of the book of the prophet Daniel have been demonstrated.

Here then is a fact to be considered; here is a broad and in some respects a detailed delineation of the history of the world for many centuries, which has been fulfilled. How is it to be explained? It cannot be explained upon any principles recognized by the infidels. They have no prophet amongst them, neither is there a prophet anywhere else. They cannot say that prophecy belongs to the Jews, for there has been no prophet amongst the Jews since God has left them, when Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jewish race scattered. Where are their prophets now? The Jews are not a bit better than the Gentile. The only thing is this, they are the nation of whom God has made choice as the pivot

of His operations upon this planet, in working out His ultimate purpose of goodness, and the Gentiles are not. The Gentiles have nothing to do with God's purposes, unless they become grafted upon the stock of Abraham by adoption through Christ, the seed of Abraham.

Then take the case of Christ himself, as regards this matter of prophecy. You remember all the particulars foretold concerning him: that he was to be born in Bethlehem, that he was to be a poor man, that he was to be a rejected and a despised man, that his hands and his feet were to be pierced, and that he was to be withdrawn into the presence of God. All these particulars are set forth in various places to which I might refer you if there were time, and they were all of them realized; realised too, not by any design on the part of those who co-operated in the production of their fulfilment, for those who were instrumental in their fulfilment were ignorant of what they were doing. Take an example: the unexpected decree that came forth in the days of Augustus Cæsar that all the world should be taxed, was the occasion of the fulfilment of the first part of these prophecies, namely, that Christ should be born in Bethlehem. But for that apparently inconsiderable event, Christ would have been born in Nazareth, since Mary was in Nazareth when the angel came to tell her that she should bring forth the Messiah by the power of the Holy Spirit; and if it had not been for this imperial edict requiring her husband to go to Jerusalem to be enrolled there as the place to which he belonged, that prophecy would not have been fulfilled. And so it is with all the other items of the fulfilment; friendly co-operators had nothing to do with them. The fulfilment was brought about by circumstances altogether beyond human control, including the crucifixion of Christ at last. How is it to be explained? If what Paul says is true, that "God at sundry times

and in divers manners in times past spake unto the fathers by the prophets," then

there is an explanation, and if that is not true, then there is no explanation.

(To be continued.)

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN
ECOLESIA, No. 74.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

WE much need this weekly reminder of Christ. Increasing experience will show every thoughtful mind the entire wisdom of the appointment by which Christ has made it a matter of duty to break bread each first day of the week in remembrance of him. Without it, we should drift into forgetfulness and death. The appointment was founded upon a knowledge of what man is and how he is affected by his surroundings. In this it differs from human institutions. Human appointments are liable to be founded on false theories, and therefore, to work mischief instead of benefit. It is a false theory that we have "light within;" it is a false theory that we have intrinsic memory of divine things; it is a false theory that knowledge once introduced into the mind is a permanent fixture there; and any line of action based upon these assumptions is certain to lead away from the path of life. Most men are more or less influenced by a false theory of this sort, and the effect is seen in the neglect of Bible reading, the neglect of meetings, the neglect of "the ordinances" as delivered by Paul at the command of Christ: and the effect of this neglect is spiritual death.

The Bible representation of human nature is found experimentally to be true—that man is dark left to his native resources; that there is no good in him by nature; that light comes from without; that there is no light but Christ; that this light, by the gospel, heard,

understood, believed and obeyed, shines into the inner man, and constitutes the recipients children of light; yet that the reception of this light does not save him unless it remain with him; that there is danger of its not remaining; that man is weak; that he is liable to "let slip" the "things which he has heard;" that he is in danger of being hardened through the *deceitfulness* of sin, and departing from the living God; drawing back into perdition, after having run well for a while. Nothing is more plainly revealed than that it is he that endureth to the end that is to be saved; that it is they who hold fast the beginning of the confidence and rejoicing of the hope, steadfast unto the end, that are to be made partakers of Christ; that the man not keeping in memory the gospel; not remaining grounded and settled, but being moved away from the hope of the gospel, will fail in entering into the kingdom of God.

These testimonies (for all these things are testified: Matt. xxiv. 13; Heb. iii. 6, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 2; Collos. i. 23; Heb. ii. 3; iii. 13) point to a danger to which it is very easy to become oblivious. The human mind easily gives in to present facts, or rather, the impression they make, and these impressions are generally in the contrary direction to wisdom and well-being. Youth would eat unwholesome things and walk in hurtful ways, because they are pleasant for the time being, and do not, in their first impressions, show him the mischief. Knowledge,

parentally enforced where there is wisdom, steps in and says "Don't." The child either has loving confidence in the restriction, and submits willingly to the disagreeable denial to find out afterwards the sweetness of wisdom; or dislikes the "don't," and yields only to compulsion, but afterwards to discover the same lesson. Youth grown up, *i.e.* men and women, old and young, shows the same tendency to be led by the appearance of things, but lacks, in the absence of the kingdom of God, the guidance which is the privilege of some children. In most things, they judge by proximate sensations, and, consequently, go astray. It is pleasant to be free from restraint, and, therefore, they go, "every one to his own way," to find at last that the pleasant ways of the natural man incline to darkness and death. It is irksome to watch daily at the gates of wisdom, waiting at the posts of her door; therefore, wisdom is made to lie on the library or shelf, or under the table, or behind the door, or in the yard outside—anywhere—to wait the convenience of the man who prefers to find engagement in attending to the wants and pleasures, business and concerns of the present animal existence: which being interpreted, means that the Bible, which is to us the voice of Eternal Wisdom, is by some attended to in an only occasional and indifferent way, instead of being read and studied daily; and this because other things are sweeter to the taste or esteemed more important to be attended to. The result is that a man, at last, when he has lost the zest of human enjoyments—nay, when perhaps the possession of them is gone for ever, finds himself barren of that most precious of all treasures, to find which is to find life, the favour of the Lord and riches for evermore; but to find which requires, in the divine arrangements, that it be sought after with all the industry and energy implied in the figure of digging as for hid treasure. It is pleasant to have the

smile and countenance of neighbours; it is pleasant to have plenty in hand; it is pleasant to have the friendship and honour of the world; and, therefore, men are liable to be insensibly governed by these things in the ordering of their lives, and to yield but a cold response to the demands of wisdom—demands which, in many cases, are inconsistent with these pleasures, and mortifying to the natural man in general. The result of listening to these seductions will certainly be shame and death. This is revealed; and though men in prosperity may disregard the still small voice of wisdom, they will be compelled to listen at another time, when their surroundings will be those of desolation and consternation. Profane talkers speak of the Nemesis that follows in the wake of human action. There is no Nemesis like the Word of God, spoken now in quietness and love. It will yet rend the foundations of wickedness with destructive earthquake. It will subvert all the kingdoms of the world with a violence before which fleets and armies will be as nothing, and which will cause even the children of pride to lament with a pitiful wail when they see their houses in ruins before the hurricane of divine vengeance.

Not that which is pleasant to be done but that which is wise to be done, will be the motto of every true member of the house of Christ. And that which is wise to be done is that which God has commanded; because obedience to His commandments only, will bring honour and life at the last. And what He has commanded is that which is written in the Scriptures of truth. Our anxiety, therefore, is to know, and remember, and hold fast, and honour, and constantly meditate upon and do the things that are written therein. There is no other path of wisdom but this. In any other track, vanity is the vexatious accompaniment, and death the end of the journey.

The world passeth away and the

fashion thereof. This is a fact which everyone will admit; but how many allow to the fact its practical effect in their lives? Most men are under the power of illusion contrary to their perceptions on this subject. They know that human existence is a transient affair; they know that Christ has already appeared in the earth, and laid the foundation of the only concern of lasting consequence among men; and that in the purpose of God, Christ will, in due course, appear again and judge every man's work in the light of what He has required of them by the hands of His apostles. They know all this, and yet their feelings are contrary to their knowledge. They feel as if human life were not transient, but as if they had always been and as if they would always exist. They feel as if Christ were merely a matter of history and dispute, and his future coming an ideal theme for poesy. Consequently they are liable to be swayed by that which seems the only reality: the maxims of men and the exigencies of the present evil world. This is a dangerous spiritual glamour, to be thrown off with the utmost determination. It is the power of the devil upon us—not the mythical devil of orthodox phrase, but the dangerous devil of actual experience, the devil that lurks in every man's bosom—the devil of natural stupidity, which is pouring endless lies into the ear—the devil of ignorance and carnal affinity which bind in strong delusion the masses of mankind, and who can only be kept at bay in the children of light by unceasing vigilance in the warfare to which they have been called.

What literally is the mode of warfare to be adopted in the contest with this dangerous foe? Paul indicates it in saying to the Ephesian elders, "We commend you to God and the word of His grace, which is able to build you up and give you an inheritance among all them who are sanctified."—(Acts xx. 32.)

Also Jesus in his prayer. "Sanctify them through thy truth."—(John xvii. 17.) What is the essence of the idea here but this, that the false impression of the senses is to be combatted by the implantation of knowledge which is beyond the reach of the senses? Christ is not within reach of the senses because he is absent from the earth. If we trusted to our senses, we should believe that he was nothing—past, present, or to come. God's communications with Israel and his deeds on their behalf are beyond reach of the senses, because we live not in the day of their occurrence, but in the interregnum of the divine work on earth. If we listened to our senses, we should never know that such communications had occurred, and consequently should be influenced by the supposition that there never had been and never could be any work of God on the earth beyond what we see in the natural ordinances of creation. Our senses would tell us lies on these and many other particulars; and thus our natural selves are to ourselves the devil, whose impositions and temptations are to be continually resisted by the weapon of knowledge provided in the Word. This applied to the mind creates, and constantly applied, maintains the right impression with regard to all these things; and this right impression, sedulously cultivated and obeyed, gives us the victory: for what is the victory that overcometh the world? Even our faith (1 John v. 4); and what is faith? "The confidence of things *hoped for*, the conviction of things *not seen*."—(Heb. xi. 1.) And how cometh this faith? "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing, by the Word of God" (Rom. x 17); and the Word of God was spoken by the Spirit.—(2 Pet. i. 20, 21.)

Here is what you may call the philosophy of spiritual strength. It is here where the vital importance of the Bible and all the institutions connected with it is to be seen, and the importance also of

avoiding all things, however "lawful" in themselves, which being calculated to foster the false impressions of life or to interfere with the nurture of the true, are most inexpedient and dangerous. A man giving himself to the pursuit of a scientific hobby or a political enterprise engaging the enthusiasm of ungodly crowds, or to the cultivation of friendships on the basis of the present evil world, burdens himself with heavy weights which are almost certain to sink him into perdition in an elegant style. One thing *is* needful; with others we can dispense. We *must* have the knowledge of God in the power thereof sufficient to transform the natural man into the likeness of the divine moral image. We *must* be spiritually-minded, for any other state means death. We *must* walk as friends of God; and as such we cannot have friendship with the world which is revealed as His enemy, and friendship with whom He counts enmity to Himself. We *must* be filled with wisdom—the wisdom which is from above—the wisdom that comes from and relates to God; for the absence of it ensures our repudiation of Him in the day when he makes up His jewels. And to secure this wisdom, we must apply ourselves continually to its acquisition; for the acquisition thereof is difficult and a work of time. Like the precious things of nature, God has made wisdom a hidden thing, requiring search, and which the hand of the diligent only at last obtains. There is, therefore, no time for the occupations of folly. True saints recognise the necessity for working out their own salvation. To them Peter's exhortation is no meaningless one, that they be diligent to make their calling and election sure. They recognise the immense dangers to which they are exposed. They resist, as the most diabolical of devilish delusions, either the theory of light within, on the one hand, or the Calvinistic fatalistic no-will-of-your-own doctrine on the other—doctrines which

both alike seduce from the path of earnest heedfulness to the means of our salvation, which God has provided for us in His Word.

And by constant meditation on all they see around them, they aim to realise to themselves the evanescent character of the present life, and so to be helped in the diligent pursuit of that which is truly real and important. History and general knowledge are here a help. They assist the understanding to cope with and put to flight the delusion of the senses. They enable us to see and to feel, in spite of the constant, importunate, and plausible appeals of the natural man, *alias* the devil, to the contrary, that our present existence is in itself no more real than the vapour to which James compares it; and thus numbering our days, we are taught to apply our hearts to wisdom. Looking back, we see busy generations struggling up life's rugged hill, all with the same hopeful eagerness, all with the same ardent anxieties, all with the same idea of the importance of the affairs in hand; and as we see them gain the top and descend the other side, we notice the same toning down, the same disappointment, the same vanity and vexation of spirit, and the same quiet grave at the bottom. As we contemplate the scene, we say with Isaiah, "Surely the people is grass;" and with another prophet, "Lord, we are no better than our fathers;" and with another, "Wherefore hast Thou made all men in vain? What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?" (Psalm lxxxix. 47, 48); and with a fourth we pray, "Return, O Lord. How long? . . . Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil. Let Thy word appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish Thou the work of our hands

upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it." We hear the answer as we read, "Thy dead men shall live; awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust."—(Isaiah xxvi. 18, 19.) "I will ransom them from the power of the grave I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction."—(Hos. xiii. 14.) "O Jacob, I will restore health unto thee, and will heal thee of thy wounds, saith the Lord; because they called thee an outcast, saying, this is Zion whom no man seeketh after."—(Jer. xxx. 17.) In this mountain, the Lord of Hosts will make unto all people a feast of fat things, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And He will destroy the face of the covering that is cast over

all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. And He will swallow up death in victory. And the Lord God shall wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of His people shall He take away from all the earth, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day: Lo this is our God; we have waited for Him. We will be glad and rejoice in His salvation." "The tabernacle of God shall be with men, and He shall be their God, and they shall be His people. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away."—(Rev. xxi. 3, 4.)

EDITOR.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

FEBRUARY, 1876.

We do not expect to please everyone in the conduct of the *Christadelphian*. We know it is impossible, in view of the endless variety of tastes and peculiarities resulting from diversity of organisation and education. We are also not insensible to the fact that there is room for criticism, since the *Christadelphian* is not all we would make it if we had more strength and less occupation with other duties. Therefore, we do not look for, and indeed do not aim at, unqualified approval on the part of all readers. Consequently, unfavourable criticism is not unduly depressing.

Nevertheless, it is encouraging to see readers exercise their reason, recognise facts, and give the right interpretation to appearances. In fact, as a rule, from readers who do this, we have no trouble. They do not look for perfection, and they do not

expect the Editor to be incessantly harping on one subject, nor suspect him of having changed his mind on some phase of truth, because some other phase requires greater prominence through a change in the tactics of error. They do not complain because their favourite point happens to rest a little. In fact, they have no favourite points; for with them the truth is a great and massive whole, in which they delight to preserve the equilibrium of all its parts, having no preference to talk particularly on one "point" above another; but estimating and holding and speaking of the truth as the apostles did, as a complete and symmetrical system of faith, come by Christ for the sanctification and salvation of men. Hobbies are as distasteful to them as they are unreasonable and destructive. They delight in the faith and hope and practical principles and consolations of the gospel, in their noble breadth and beauty.

Neither do such object to a due assignment of space to matter illustrative of the signs of the times. They allow for and rejoice in the truth in all its aspects and requirements by turns. And when there is an honest struggle to maintain the things that are Christ's in the present evil world, they are too anxious to identify themselves with such a struggle to suffer themselves to

act the part of carpers and obstructors. Rather do they prefer to help with word and deed, than weaken and discourage. What is done in weakness is for the best. As for those who are otherwise minded we make due deference to their scruples and their judgments; but not the harsh condemnation of palpitating friends, nor the malignant slanders of mortal enemies can turn us from a course which, (their surmises and assertions to the contrary, notwithstanding) is dictated by the fear of God and the love of Christ, the sentiment of duty in all its present and disagreeable relations.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The course of events during the last month has been described by some as "a lull." This is not a strictly correct description. A lull is a cessation, however temporary; and there has been no cessation in the political activities inaugurated in the channel of the signs of the times by the striking events that distinguished the closing months of the year just ended. There is a little more quietness in the general situation; but it is only the kind of quietness that comes between the firing of a gun and the striking of a distant object by the ball. The political ball is on its flight, though the noise of the political explosion has subsided for the moment. The fitness of this parable will be seen on a glance at the facts.

The Turkish insurrection and insolvency have resulted in negotiations between the leading European powers and the government of the Turco-Euphratean empire. These negotiations are now in progress. Their ostensible object is to induce Turkey to accept a scheme of reform which the powers think or profess to think will satisfy the Christian subjects in the revolted provinces. The ultimate issue of these negotiations is a matter about which all politicians are anxious; for practically speaking, Turkey is invited to commit political suicide, which she exhibits no symptoms of being anxious to do: on the contrary, to save herself from the necessity of having to accept the partial scheme of reform which Russia, Austria and Germany have concocted among themselves,

she has hurriedly got out a much more comprehensive scheme of her own before the other was ready. This however has not had the effect of getting rid of her importunate advisers. Russia, Austria and Germany, disregarding the Turkish scheme, have served notice upon Turkey of their own proposal, of which they are said to demand the acceptance under guarantee.

What do these schemes of reform and the discussions of them really mean? This question is well answered in the *Daily News* of January 15th. That paper says: "It may well be doubted whether this fruitfulness in producing schemes of reform will inspire wide and sincere confidence, or silence the tongues of the prophets of evil. This bustle and haste are no new phenomena. When was there greater legislative activity, and when had reformers more truly *carte blanche* to administer their nostrums, than when the French Monarchy had sunk into the sere and yellow leaf? The readiness with which death-bed promises are made is known of old; and the Sultan's advisers cannot be so wanting in astuteness as not to perceive that this rain of philanthropic measures is calculated rather to fill the outside world with a suspicion that the end is at hand, than that the country is about to renew her youth, and that the reign of Saturn is about to return.

Russia, Austria and Germany have invited Britain and the other powers to approve of the reforms they are pressing on Turkey. The following comments on this point from the same paper exhibit the situation in its true light: "The question for the governments invited to express approval of that note is whether they are ready to support an intervention, however mild, in the internal affairs of Turkey. . . . It is not for us to concur in measures which, however well devised, might have the effect of precipitating the dissolution of the Turkish power, nor is it for us to profess ourselves in possession of any secret for the regeneration of that country. Nothing that occurred, or is occurring, no local successes in the disturbed provinces, no half-payments of dividends by means of funds painfully collected from every quarter and by every means, can change the broad features of the condition of Turkey. We may regret the

failure of hopes long indulged, and promises so often renewed, but the time has come for recognising irreversible facts. The course of the British government seems therefore clear. It is to keep us free from combinations in which we have no duty to perform."

The *Liverpool Mercury*, on the same subject says as follows:—

"It is said that the imperial governments are so fully convinced of the vanity of all pledges, so long as power is confined to the Mahometans, that they now claim equal rights for Christians and Turks, insist that Christians shall be admitted to the highest posts in the empire, and stipulate that the ambassadors of the powers are granted an opportunity of acquainting themselves with the more important measures of the Turkish government in time to offer advice and to influence its ultimate decisions. The question, however, then arises, whether the Turkish people will allow their own government to submit to this direct control of the European powers without trying their strength in the field. These conditions, however necessary, entirely destroy the dignity and independence on which that government has hitherto prided itself; and we can scarcely believe that they will be acceded to and carried out without an insurrection either against the Sultan himself, or hostilities against the governments which seek to reduce him to the position of a mere delegate. We are apparently on the edge of important events in the European provinces of the Turkish empire, and next year can scarcely fail to witness either the complete prostration of that empire, or the advance of Russia and Austria towards Constantinople and the Dardanelles. It remains to be seen what course our own government will adopt if the occupation of Constantinople should be seriously threatened."

As the *Daily News* truly observes, "This note is merely the opening, by the Northern Powers which have approved of it, of their case against the Ottoman Government, or so much of that case as they think well to prefer for the moment. It contains too much to please that Government, and too little to save it; but, however much the Powers may desire to limit their efforts, they are beginning an intervention to which it will not be in their power to set bounds, and the effects of which will certainly not be the regeneration of the Turkish power."

The same paper, a few days later writes:—

"The telegrams which we publish this

morning, show that the Turkish Government is appealing by its diplomatic representatives to the Powers of Western Europe against the proposals contained in Count Andrassy's note. . . . There are some topics which the Porte cannot consent to discuss, and its own independence is one of them. The Turks have been weighed in the balance of Europe and found wanting; their conceptions of government are of the most rudimentary kind, but they have always understood their position among the races of the world. They have felt that they were the masters, and nothing more, of the Christians inhabiting their provinces. Force was their original title as rulers, and they have not cared to acquire any other. A Turk without his pride of imperial power has not a single qualification to command the obedience of those who reject the mission of the Prophet. When, therefore, Count Zichy intimated to the Grand Vizier that the European Powers were thinking of laying down a new plan of government for one of the Sultan's provinces, that high officer, instead of promising to take the matter into his most dispassionate consideration, replied that the Porte could not admit any idea of foreign mediation, but would itself give the population of Herzegovina the most complete guarantees of reform. . . . The note, having become simultaneously a European document and an occasion of protest on the part of Turkey, has acquired an importance which is more likely to increase than diminish. The question to be decided is whether the Turks are to be left to rule Turkey. . . . The people of this country have no interest in upholding Turkish misgovernment, and it is impossible not to take notice of the immense change that has taken place in the prospects of the Ottoman Empire since it was resolved twenty years ago to give its rulers one more trial."

The *Birmingham Daily Post*, on the same subject, remarks as follows:—

"Whatever happens in Turkey, the Powers will gain something; and, therefore, they interfere, and are not sorry to have a pretext to justify interference. But England has only one interest—that of keeping up her communication with India, and preventing other Powers from so establishing themselves as to threaten us in this direction. To effect this object we may at some time have to take up a decided course, and even to strike a blow in self-defence; but our present policy is to keep clear of complications, and consequently to abstain from adhering to a policy which is not ours, upon which we have not been consulted, and which may land us in difficulties of a very serious nature. Suppose, for instance, that Turkey should resist foreign dictation,

and should prefer conflict to submission? The Turks are strong enough and numerous enough to make a stand on their own behalf. The population of the Empire is thirty millions, and of these seventeen millions are Mahometans. If the Sultan were a capable man—or if he can find a suitable leader for his armies—it would be easy to provoke a religious war of the fiercest description; and this would tell directly upon English interests, for with fifty million Mahometans in India, we also are a great Mahometan Power. With capacity to direct, and with passion to inflame, it would be easy once more to raise the standard of war in Egypt, along the shores of the Red Sea, in Persia, and in India itself. People who talk about driving the Turks out of Europe, or of exacting guarantees, and establishing foreign intervention, forget that the Sultan is a Pope as well as a sovereign; the head of a religion as well as the ruler of a race. They forget, too, that in the tranquillity of the members of his religion and his race, this country is deeply interested, because he could, almost by an order, provoke rebellion in India, interrupt our communications with the East, and compel us to take the extremely-hazardous step of seizing upon Egypt as the only chance of escaping a terrible disaster.”

The object of the scheme of reform which Turkey herself has put forward is well described in the *Liverpool Mercury* of Jan. 12th, as follows:

“The plan recently put forward by the Turkish government, so full of specious promises, is no doubt chiefly intended to gain the support of England in opposition to the other powers. We cannot believe, however, that this attempt will be successful, for our government, which has done more for Turkey than any other of the European powers, must by this time be thoroughly disgusted with the state of affairs at Constantinople; and the English people will certainly not be disposed to take the responsibility of upholding a system which all the governments of Europe declare to be incurably corrupt and tyrannical.”

RUSSIAN RULE DESIRED BY THE TURKS.

Extraordinary as it may seem, a feeling

in favour of Russian sovereignty is growing up in Turkey itself. The correspondent of the *Standard*, writes as follows from Constantinople:—

“There is, just now, a strong leaning towards Russia in many circles of this city. I do not allude to the affection of certain journals, which savours too much of cupboard love to be worth notice, but I refer to the openly avowed sentiments of many influential men, who do not hesitate to say that if England and France do not abandon their present policy of inaction, Turkey must and ought without delay to fall into the hands of Russia, and that her only chance for happiness and prosperity lies in the prospect of her speedy absorption by the Czar. It is only natural that this should be so. The Turks throughout the empire are groaning under a weight of taxation which is intolerable; the land is rapidly going out of cultivation; the Government cannot recover the revenue from the farmer of the taxes, and is in debt to every class of its subjects; the credit of the empire is utterly destroyed—even the long-established reputation of the Turks for honesty is imperilled; and Turkish statesmen seem unable to win from their sovereign the reforms by which alone its resources can be developed and its future secured. Under these circumstances it is not remarkable that a longing eye is turned towards the powerful neighbour whose fleets and armies are at its very door. England and France are far distant; the blood shed by their sons for Turkey has long since sunk into the ground, and is forgotten; Greeks and Levantines laugh and sneer when they read about the survivors of the Balacava Charge; even Turks begin to wonder whether the victories gained in the Crimea were not in reality defeats for them. Unless there be some show of activity on the part of England and France you may be sure that the death of the ‘sick man’ cannot long be averted, and that the fields which have been guarded by French and English courage, and the ironclads which have been purchased with English and French gold, and the palaces on which the last ruler of the house of Othman has squandered untold wealth, will pass into possession of the monarch who is so well represented here

by the most energetic, the most wily, and the least scrupulous of ambassadors."

STORMY POLITICAL PROSPECT.

The Strasburg correspondent of the Aberdeen *Free Press*, writes as follows:

"Some three months ago, I wrote to you that time would show whether the little cloud, not bigger than a man's hand, then gathering in European Turkey, might indicate simply the coming bubbling of a small tempest in a teapot, or the rise of a world-shaking hurricane. A few weeks after, I added that the signs were more and more portentously pointing in the latter direction, and that the ultimate downfall of the Turkish power in Europe might soon be a question of months merely. Events have ever since marched with increased rapidity, and, although to all outward appearance there would seem to be no cause for apprehension, yet I cannot dissimulate that I believe there is only too much and too good reason to fear that, at this very time, when the world is being authoritatively assured from the highest political quarter in Europe that peace has never for the last twenty years past been so secure as it is at present, when all official and officious voices join harmoniously in the same song to the same tune, and when amiable enthusiasts and crazy Utopists babble of universal disarmament and international parliaments, a fresh war-storm is ominously gathering over Europe, such as has not been witnessed since the monstrous heave of the French revolution—a storm which all the boasted skill of diplomacy may fail to disperse, and which even the most pacific intentions and resolutions of the Emperor William—granting them to be perfectly sincere—will be powerless to lay; for the all-compelling force of events is stronger than the most potent potentates.

I should think that the conviction must have forced itself by this time upon even the blindest political bungler that the Turk, that barbarian Asiatic intruder, who has for longer than four centuries been permitted to act as an alien disturbing force in the already sufficiently complicated wheelwork of the great European polity, has no further business this side the Bosphorus, and had better be sent back as speedily as practicable to the place whence he originally came.

The experience of the last few months has demonstrated to evidence that there remains neither patent nor latent vitality in the Ottoman empire; and even the most obstinate Turkophite must, however reluctantly, admit that an unpayable debt, and the most hopeless and helpless disorganisation in every branch of the public service, are the only two things real in the phantasmagory of Grand-Vizierial government, and that the ruling race in the Peninsula of the Balkan could barely hold its own, except, perhaps, in Roum Ili, against a serious rising of its Christian subjects.

So, you see, the present outlook on the political horizon is by no means satisfactory or re-assuring in my opinion—an opinion which I can assure you, however, is shared by a great many people in an excellent position to read the true signs of the times and to interpret them correctly. I may add also, from personal observation, that the pacific assurances of the Emperor have had apparently rather a stimulating effect than otherwise upon the incessant preparations in every branch of the military and of the *transport* service. I saw a high railway official from Berlin a few days ago, who told me that a superabundance of cars and wagons for the conveyance of men, horses, cattle, and heavy artillery was ready to the last plank and to the last ring."

BRITAIN'S PURCHASE OF THE SUEZ CANAL.

This interesting event has been the subject of discussion more or less during the past month, and the discussion shows it has laid the foundation for other events of a still more interesting character. A Berlin telegram to the *Times* says:

"It would really appear, as though Oriental developments will be accelerated by the Suez Canal transaction." On this *The Leeds Mercury* remarks as follows:—

"Under these swelling and seemingly innocent words, a very disagreeable hint is conveyed to this country. The phrase implies that Russia, with the consent, we presume, of Germany and Austria, is about to make an inventory of the Sick Man's effects, and probably to instal herself in his sick chamber, in order that she may be the party in possession at the time of his actual death. It may even mean something more than this; for it is not impossible that the Northern power may feel that the Suez Canal purchase has given her right to enter into possession, by fair means or foul, of that portion of the Turkish empire which she most earnestly covets. The same tele-

gram from which we have already quoted, also states that 'the highest personages are asking themselves whether they had not better imitate the example set by England.' Now, how can they imitate that example? Not, certainly, by buying sovereign rights over the principalities, for that would be a transaction having nothing in common with our purchase of the Canal shares. Russia may, however, address us in these words: 'You have bought for yourselves a preponderating influence over a great highway to the East, the importance of which to you is, we admit, considerable: there is another water-way which is just as important to us as the Suez Canal is to you, and that is the Bosphorus, by which alone our ships can pass from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. We have allowed you to do as you pleased with the Canal, and you cannot object to our doing as we choose with the Straits. We shall 'imitate' your example, and gain a preponderating influence on the Bosphorus by purchase if possible; if not by some other means.' Everybody, of course, can see the fallacy of the argument which would thus be addressed to us. But unfortunately, it would just have that superficial appearance of soundness which is all that a power like Russia desires in any argument it may address to another country. Thus it may be possible for the Czar, without saying a disagreeable word to this country, and whilst even congratulating it upon the step it has taken with regard to the Canal, to make our recent purchase a pretext for the occupation of Constantinople. This would no doubt be a very alarming 'acceleration of Oriental developments,' but few persons will be so confident as to declare that it is not at this moment one of the moves 'upon the table.'

ENGLAND IN EGYPT.

An article in the *Edinburgh Review* condemns the purchase on commercial grounds, and because, as the reviewer alleges, England acquires no control in Egypt which she did not possess before. On this the *Daily News* well observes: "It may be quite true, too, as the Reviewer with almost needless elaboration argues, that in the view of international law our purchase gives no new rights over Egyptian territory, and does not diminish the Khedive's political or legisla-

tive authority. The discussion is not, however, ended by these admissions. The transaction must be looked at in another light. Egypt and her fortunes are henceforth separated, so far as we are concerned, from those of the crumbling empire to which she has been linked. We show in a distinct and unmistakeable manner our notion of the true centre of our interest in the East."

Meanwhile, Mr. Cave, Her Majesty's Commissioner to Egypt, has arrived in that country, with his staff, and the first result is seen in the fall of Nubar Pacha, who objected to Mr. Cave's recommendation that the financial department of the state should be separated from the foreign office. Mr. Cave and Colonel Storckes have been inspecting the Canal. The London correspondent of the *Glasgow Herald* says that the selection of Colonel Storckes to accompany Mr. Cave, has a double object. While aiding Mr. Cave in providing the Disraeli government with the fullest possible details as to the maintenance and improvement of the Canal, before the meeting of Parliament, he will also report privately as to the best available means of defending the Canal in case of such a step being necessary. Any measures in this direction would, of course, mean chiefly a multiplication of forts in the Mediterranean. The correspondent remarks: "This last step on the part of the government in connection with the Eastern question, though simple enough in itself, and the inevitable corollary, so to speak, of the first, is not altogether viewed without uneasiness in political circles. It is becoming plainer every day that we are gradually being plunged deeper and deeper into a policy, the visible consequence of which seems to be the ultimate occupation of Egypt."

ENGLAND IN THE EAST.

The *Pester Lloyd*, referring to the alleged acquisition by England of the harbour of Mohammerah, at the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates, says that this is probably the first step towards the construction of the Euphrates Valley Railway, and the continuation of the policy which lead to the purchase of the Suez Canal shares. "England has now one foot in the stirrup at Suez, and the other at Mohammerah. Russia will have to lower her flag; she has neither the

material power nor the spirit to beat England out of the field. . . . Was it to be expected that while Russia was advancing towards India, the statesmen of the richest and most cultivated nation of the world should look on with folded arms? The truth is that England is now as strong, and her policy is as great as ever, as in the time of William III. or of Wellington. She does not make any show of military strength, but she will get that

when she wants it. A country which has so much money and resources, whose people are inspired with so grand a patriotism, and whose government acts with such masterly policy, does not meet with the difficulties of Continental nations in raising an army. Let the English people only be convinced that their army requires developing, as seems to be the case since the Duke of Cambridge's last speech, and the thing is as good as done."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, obedience has been rendered to the truth by CHARLES DOE (37), printer, of Yeovil, formerly connected with the Plymouth Brethren, whose unscriptural and unreasonable sentiments he is slowly learning to unlearn. Brother Doe had previously been immersed in ignorance of a great part of the truth. Also GEORGE GORLE (35), house decorator, son-in-law to brother Waite. The age of John Taylor should last month have been 20, and not 29.

The quarterly business meeting of the ecclesia was held Jan. 5th, when the reports were of an immensely satisfactory character as regards the contributions of the brethren to the various branches of activity in operation. Owing to this and to a brother and sister's contribution of £12 to the Masonic Hall lectures, the brethren had been enabled, without exhausting the balance in hand, to do various things not usually within their reach. It was resolved to appoint two additional presiding brethren. A proposal was also introduced to enable the ecclesia to make the annual elections a merely formal affair when there is no need of change. The idea was to reduce to a minimum the spiritual inconvenience of the process, without surrendering the power of congregational control, which the present circumstances of the truth required to be preserved; or, in other words, to approximate, as nearly as possible, to the permanence of the apostolic institutions, while preserving the liberty of change which our non-apostolic circumstances make necessary. The discussion of the matter was reserved for another occasion.

A tea meeting was held on Tuesday, Dec. 28th, to which interested strangers were invited. It was said to be the largest of the kind yet held. After tea, one of the abovementioned immersions took place, after which, a series of appropriate addresses were given. Brother J. J. Andrew being present from London, exhibited and explained a series of diagrams illustrative of

pictures and inscriptions found in the ancient catacombs of Rome. The diagrams threw some light on the sentiments and practices of the early Christians, and were felt to be an interesting feature of the evening's proceedings.

On Friday, December 31st, the usual Christmas meeting of the Sunday School was held in the Athenæum, when, after tea, prizes were distributed to the most deserving of the scholars, and a series of dissolving views exhibited. The school now numbers about 200 scholars on the books.

The lectures and lecturers for the month have been as follow:—*Dec. 26th.*—The answering of written questions. (Brother Roberts.) *Jan. 2nd.*—“Satan.” (Bro. Roberts.) *Jan. 9th.*—“Paradise.” (Brother Shuttleworth.) *Jan. 16th.*—“Salvation.” (Brother Hodgkinson, of Peterboro.) *Jan. 23rd.*—“The Kingdom.” (Brother Roberts.)

BRISTOL.—Brother Cort reports lectures having been delivered in the Odd Fellows' Hall, by brother Veysey, of Taunton, on Dec. 19th. He adds that several are deeply interested. (Brother Cort will find his questions on the genealogy of Christ answered in the *Christadelphian* for Dec. 1867, page 308: “Who was the Father of Christ?”)

DUDLEY.—Brother Blount reports the obedience of Mrs. ELLEN PICKIN (46), of Wolverhampton, who had been a member of the Congregationalists for seventeen years. She was immersed into the saving name on Dec. 22nd, and will meet with the Dudley brethren as often as she can.

DUNDEE.—Brother Mortimer reports the immersion of ALEXANDER RENNIE (24), and his WIFE (20). He was formerly an attendant of the Established Church, but has attended the meetings regularly for the last year. Sister Rennie was formerly a Roman Catholic. The brethren are in hope of further fruit. The lectures (by brother Gill) have been as follow:—*Sunday, Nov. 21st.*—“Waiting for the appearing of Christ.” *Sunday, Nov. 28th.*—“How to prepare for the appearing of Christ.” *Sunday, Dec.*

5th.—“Preparations for the appearing of Christ.” *Sunday, Dec. 12th.*—“Sin and its penalty.” The lectures have been well attended throughout.

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Smith reports that on Tuesday, Jan. 4th, Mrs. HUME, the wife of brother Hume, was introduced into the covering name of the Christ, after having given a satisfactory statement of her faith. He adds that since brother Roberts’ visit, the lectures have been very well attended, and several seem interested.

LEICESTER.—Brother Armstrong reports: “On Thursday, the 30th ult., the quarterly tea meeting was held, when an agreeable and profitable evening was spent. Remarks of an edifying and exhortative character were made by nearly all the brethren present, including brother Lewis, of Mumbles. The nearness of the day of Christ was a principal topic, and the few friends who had accepted invitations to the meeting were earnestly exhorted to run into the name of the Lord, which is as a strong tower, before it shall be too late. The lectures during December were as follow:—*Dec. 5th.*—“Israel in Egypt.” (Brother J. Burton.) *Dec. 12th.*—“What must I do to be saved?” (Brother T. Weston.) *Dec. 19th.*—“Eternal Torments.” (Brother Collyer.) *Dec. 26th.*—“Jeremiah viii. 20.” (Brother Yardley.)

GLASGOW.—Writing on the 14th inst., brother Owlser says.—“Other two have been drawn from the darkness of error to the glorious light of the truth. WILLIAM CAMPBELL was immersed on Dec. 25th; on the 26th, JOSEPH CARRUTHERS, youngest son of the late brother Robert Carruthers, and brother in the flesh to brother Robert Carruthers. The Govan lectures have been discontinued, but there is no doubt that an effort will be made to bring the truth before the inhabitants of the suburbs. The last lecture at Govan on “The Old Paths,” by brother T. Nisbet, succeeded in drawing a good audience. Discussion on the Socratic principle was allowed at the close, but only the ‘Rev.’ Mr. Jamieson accepted the challenge. Whenever he felt discomfited, he took refuge in what ‘popular opinion’ considered to be the truth. The lectures during the month were as follow:—*Dec. 19th.*—“The second Coming of the Lord.” (Brother Robertson.) *Dec. 26th.*—“Deathbed and Prison Repentances.” (Brother Mulholland.) *Jan. 2nd.*—“The Judge of the Quick and Dead.” (Brother J. Ritchie.) *Jan. 8th.*—“When and where will the Righteous be rewarded?” (Brother J. Nisbet.) On the afternoon of New Year’s Day, about 50 brethren and friends held a social meeting together of a very successful character.”

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother J. W. Diboll reports that during the past month lectures have been delivered on the following sub-

jects:—*Dec. 19th.*—“Immortality.” (Bro. A. Harwood.) *Dec. 26th.*—“The First and Second Adam.” (Brother D. Spinney.) *Jan. 2nd, 1876.*—“The Birth of Water and the Birth of Spirit.” (Brother J. W. Diboll.) *Jan. 9th.*—“The Gospel.” (Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.) Our little company has just sustained a loss by the removal of brother Harwood to Great Grimsby, whither he will shortly be followed by sister Harwood and family.”

HALIFAX.—Brother C. Firth reports that four others have, “through the foolishness of preaching,” been brought to renounce fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, through the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, viz., WILLIAM DARLOW (23), coach maker; ELIZABETH DARLOW (24), his wife; JAMES FIRTH (50), waste dealer, and GRACE FIRTH, his wife (father and mother to brother Firth.) The two former put on the sin-covering name on Dec. 25th; the latter, Jan. 2nd. The Annual Tea Meeting was held in the Assembly Rooms, Harrison Road, on Dec. 25th, when the meeting was stimulated and strengthened in the Word by several brethren from the surrounding district, giving short addresses from the only book calculated to edify and build up the brethren and sisters in the truth as it is in Jesus. The lectures for the month have been as follow:—*Dec. 5th.*—“The Hope of Israel.” (R. Whitworth.) *Dec. 12th.*—“New Jerusalem.” (R. Smith.) *Dec. 19th.*—“Salvation.” (S. Goggins.) *Dec. 26th.*—“Human Nature.” (F. Dunn.)

KEIGHLEY.—Brother Shuttleworth reports that the brethren here had a tea meeting on New Year’s Day, when several brethren were present from Leeds. After tea, anthems were sung and addresses delivered. On the Sunday evening, brother Paterson lectured to a fair audience on “Christmas, the so-called Christmas Festival: does it honour or dishonour Christ?” Brother Shuttleworth has the following good remarks on a subject that is needlessly agitating some. The unqualified assertion that Christ could not sin, or the extreme the opposite way, “seems to me more disastrous than the free-life theory when pushed to its logical result. Take either side: suppose I say Christ could not sin, do I not to some extent destroy the force of his trial? Do I not nullify the teaching of Paul that he was ‘perfected through suffering?’ Christ had a human side; and if human, was he not subjected to the same ordeal of endurance that we are? Had he not to bring his human inclinations into subjection to the divine will? It seems to me to follow that apart from the assistance and protection of the Father, he could have sinned; but the divine purpose in him steps in, so to speak, and makes that certain which, apart from it, was uncertain; and in

this sense, he could not sin or fall when the divine purpose is considered. It seems to me right to say that, from the human side alone he could sin, or that from the divine side alone he could not sin; but where is the bridge that unites these two? Is it not in the divine tutoring of which Jesus the Son of God was the subject, by which the will or inclination of the flesh was kept in subjection? As you point out clearly, in the November number, the two aspects are set for us to receive—1st, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself; and 2nd, that God's work in Christ was first done by the voluntary obedience of Christ himself, who was tempted in all points like as we are, but whose victory laid the foundation of that righteousness which is our covering from sin. Abstractions are out of the way of instruction in Christ, and cause a man to turn aside to human philosophy which, saith the Spirit, is foolishness."

KIDSGROVE.—Brother Thirtle reports as follows:—"On Sunday, January 2nd, a meeting took place at the house of brother Atkinson, Kidsgrove, when, numbering eight in the truth, we showed forth the Lord's death in the appointed way. Those present were brother and sister Atkinson, brother Dawes and the three sisters Dawes (Hanley), brother Barber (Sandbach) and myself. Brother Barber, who has been connected with the ecclesia at Stockport since its formation, has recently left that town for Sandbach, which is a short distance from Kidsgrove, and so far as is at present known, he will remain there. His coming amongst us in this barren district is highly acceptable, and it is intended at once to make such arrangements as are necessary to form an ecclesia. The immersions in December, at Stockport, of sister Atkinson and brother Dawes, which had for some time been in anticipation, gave much joy to us all. I cannot say I know of any in this neighbourhood that are deeply interested in the truth. There are some few who give more or less attention to the investigation of the different elements of the 'whole counsel,' and I hope such may be led to so study the Word that they may become wise unto salvation. In future communications (if the Lord tarry) I hope to state what steps we may take and what progress we may make."

LONDON.—Brother Elliott records the following additions, by immersion, viz., Dec. 26th, CAROLINE AMELIA JANNAWAY (mother of the brethren Jannaway), formerly a member of the Church of England; Dec. 29th, JULIA LOUISA and KATE EUGENIE JANNAWAY (daughters of the above), who likewise were attendants at the Church of England; also on Jan. 6th, Mrs. STROCK, formerly meeting with the Congregationalists. The subjects of the lectures for

January were as follow:—*Jan. 2nd.*—"The New Jerusalem." (Brother A. Andrew.) *Jan. 9th.*—"Nebuchadnezzar's Dream," illustrated by a diagram. (Brother J. J. Andrew.) *Jan. 16th.*—"The Kingdom of God." (Brother J. J. Andrew.) *Jan. 23rd.*—"Signs of the Times." (Brother Phillips.) *Jan. 30th.*—"The Lord's Prayer." (Brother Bosher.)

NEDDERTON.—Brother S. Briggs writes: "I often think of an expression of yours to my daughter in Leeds: 'Your father may yet be thankful that you have become a Christadelphian.' I confess I was anything but thankful at the time she became one; but since, through her coming to nurse me in my affliction, which she did, both bodily and spiritually, I now rejoice exceedingly that I am a Christadelphian, and rejoice in that truth which makes free indeed. I have now great joy in being able to state that my youngest daughter MARIA (21), formerly Campbellite, was, on the 1st of December, baptized into the saving name."

SCARBOROUGH.—Brother Kidd reports the obedience of W. H. WHITE (34), grocer, formerly United Methodist Free Church local preacher. He put on the saving name in the appointed way, in the presence of four or five brethren, and an interested half American, standing about six feet 2 inches in his stockings, on Monday the 27th of December, twenty friends took tea in the Meeting Room, King Street, to celebrate the event. The Sunday meetings are better attended. A Debating Society meets in the Rooms every Tuesday evening. Bro. Wallis opened a debate on the "Immortality of the Soul," which lasted three weeks, and has proved effectual in removing prejudice from the minds of certain who attended. Bro. Kidd says: "The enemies mustered to outvote the Christadelphians, which they did by two or three votes, the room being very full. We advertise every week in two local papers short pithy subjects, and we are sanguine should the Master tarry, that Scarborough will yet show some fruits by and bye for the labour of love many years bestowed."

SALE.—Brother Bellamy reports the death of brother Sutherland, on Dec. 18th, aged 35 years, "who," says brother Bellamy, "so far as we are able to judge, was one of those described as blessed, dying in the Lord." He also reports the obedience of HENRY WARD (48), formerly Wesleyan, who was baptized into the saving name on December 29th: also on December 31st, (thirteen days after her husband's death,) JANE SUTHERLAND (36), wife of deceased bro. Sutherland. The lectures have been re-commenced at Altrincham.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports that brother J. Unwin, sister Jane Unwin and brother Ellis Hall, have returned to fellowship after a season of uncertainty, caused

by the cloud thrown by some over the obedience of Christ.

STOCKPORT.—Bro. Waite writes: "Although I have no addition to announce from this immediate vicinity, it gives me great pleasure to report the immersion of two from other parts, viz., JOSEPH DAWES (53), of Etruria; and MARY ATKINSON (33), of Kidsgrove, which took place on Saturday the 19th ult. Brother Dawes was formerly a Baptist, and is the father of sisters Polly and Nelly Dawes. Their mother is also in the truth, but I think her immersion was not reported in the *Christadelphian*. Sister Atkinson is the wife of brother Atkinson, formerly a Wesleyan. Our new brother and sister came over to Stockport with brother Thirtle and Atkinson for the purpose of undergoing the necessary examination prior to immersion, and they rendered an intelligent confession of "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," and were accordingly immersed. It is, I believe, their intention to form an ecclesia at Kidsgrove, but of this you will be duly apprised by brother Thirtle. I may add that we continue to hold forth the truth at Stockport. Our lectures are advertised in three local papers. The attendance of the stranger is on the whole encouraging. The seed of the kingdom is germinating in several hearts, and we hope to see them shortly "born of water." A correspondence has taken place in the local paper, arising out of the visit of a hostile critic to one of the meetings.

TAUNTON.—Bro. Veysey writes: "About two months since, special efforts were made by means of advertised weekly lectures, to interest the people in the truth. Many appeared much pleased, but few repeated their visits. Our sister SMITH, formerly neutral, put on the Lord Jesus a few weeks since."

— AUSTRALIA. —

VICTORIA.—"You will please to continue to supply me as before with three copies of the *Christadelphian* for next year. I want also a few more works, but feel quite discouraged as to results. After disposing of most of the works I have had from you, and distributing many thousands of tracts, the result is *nil*. I have sent to many places in this colony, and also the neighbouring colonies. A clergyman in New South Wales has fallen in with some of these works, and has just written me for more. The truth has evidently convicted him of his erroneous doctrines, and if he is faithful to his convictions, he must 'come out of her.' I have received two communications from him, and in the last he says, in reply to some of my remarks: 'Do not be discouraged; be patient and continue in well doing. I can give you a better account. My labours have been so far

blessed that they have drawn upon me already a violent persecution. I have for some time past been the object of letters in the local papers. I have been preached against by at least three denominations in this district, and I have a number of lay readers, and these have preached against me. Letters have been sent to the bishop, and during the last week he has been to my district. One of my readers here has brought all the grievances of certain of my parishioners before the bishop; but the good old bishop formed his own opinion. He did not attempt many arguments, because he found one passage of Scripture after another put before him which he could not, dare not deny. In fact, I think the bishop sees a good deal more than he would like to say openly.' In another part of his very interesting letter, he says: 'I have a wife and six children unprovided for: were it not for their sakes, I would have placed my resignation in the hands of the bishop. I care not for myself, but I do care for them too much to cast them on to the world while they are unable to provide for themselves.' [We are not at liberty to consider wife or child in the determination of the great question of what is right towards God.—EDITOR.] I think, brother Roberts, if there is one class of persons who need our sympathy more than others it is those who have received the truth but have families and other matters dependent on them. They are willing to make any personal sacrifice, but their near and dear ones they cannot give up for the truth: and yet our blessed Lord declares that they who cannot give up all for the kingdom of God cannot be his disciples. What we want in Australia at the present time is an able man, able to set forth the truth as a public lecturer. I do think our colony is ripe for an effort. Many here know the truth; and I believe would openly acknowledge it under an able leader. Have you not got a man of that stamp among you? I believe such an one would find the means requisite for his support forthcoming. There are Christadelphians in all the Australian colonies, and I believe there would be found in Melbourne suburbs a permanent work; and I would undertake to see that all his needs were well supplied while in this district. It is remarkable that in this new world there is not a man in all the colonies competent to go forth to proclaim the truth. While I acknowledge my firm belief in the providence of God, I, at the same time, believe that as a rule our heavenly Father only helps those who help themselves. I believe the few scattered ones in these colonies have not done their part in providing the means for such a movement. I wish you, therefore, to understand that I am willing to bear a heavy share of the responsibility."

CANADA.

TORONTO. — Brother Evans announces, with sorrow, the death of sister Grady, sen., who fell asleep on the 25th of November. "We are happy, in believing, however," says brother Evans, "that her sleep will be but for a very little time, for surely the nations are now angry, and the time of the dead is at hand to be judged and rewarded.— (Rev. xi. 18.)" Brother Foster has left for Belleville, brother Hamilton for the West Indies on a visit, and sister Burton for Coleraine, which, with four others living or partially living in the country, reduces our number of names actually in Toronto, including brother Gruit, who we are happy to say now meets in fellowship with us, to 36. I presume you have received a copy of the book which brother Gunn, of Walkerton, assisted by brother Coombe, has been compiling: *The Bible Vindicated Against Modern Theology*. It consists of a large amount of testimony and evidence extracted from various sources, and will, doubtless, prove a valuable witness for the truth in addition to those we have extant in this our day."

UNITED STATES.

BALTIMORE (Ind.)—Brother A. Packie writes: "At the conclusion of another year, I again express my hearty satisfaction at the able manner in which you have conducted the *Christadelphian*. It is a most welcome visitor, whose arrival presents a feast of good things, refreshing and strengthening to those who live not on 'bread alone.' May God bless and help you in your efforts to make known His glorious truth, and to support and build up the household of faith. Certainly such labours will not be 'in vain,' but will reap a rich reward. You have my confidence; and let me here say that I cannot express this but of very few. It is sad to think of; but the leeks and onions of Egypt have been too seductive. Beloved brother Thomas's death was the door for all kinds of 'isms' and crotchets to creep in. Too many want to be leaders. Patent theories and ideas are the stepping stones to notoriety. How eagerly such things are sought after you know too well. You have done your duty in your efforts to crush them out. May the Lord Jesus soon come and put a final check to their further ravages. The flock of Christ have need of that 'Great Shepherd' who shall lead them into green pastures, and protect them finally and for ever from the ravages of all who would hurt or offend. The signs of the times are truly ominous. The end is surely near at hand. May we be prepared to meet Israel's King, and be among those who have kept them-

selves unspotted from the world, holding the beginning of their confidence steadfast unto the end, and receive the welcome plaudit, 'Well done, good and faithful servants; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Remember me in Christian love to brother Bosher."

Bro. M. Knight writes: "Our brethren are walking in the truth, watching and waiting the coming of the Lord, for we are convinced by the signs of the times that it is near. What if the love of many has waxed cold? Thank the Lord, we are enjoying peace, harmony and brotherly love. Our speaking brethren are growing in the knowledge, and the power of the truth. We had our brother Dr. Reeves, of Springfield, Ohio, with us in June; he delivered us six eloquent discourses on the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ. We also had our brother M. P. Ensey, of Halifax Court House, Virginia, with us in May. He delivered us three very interesting lectures on the things of the kingdom and the exceeding great and precious promises. He edified the brethren very much. Bro. Ensey's mother went last winter and paid him a visit, and while she was there he preached unto her the gospel of the kingdom, which she had never heard before, although she had been a member in good standing in the Methodist Episcopal church for fifty years. She came to Baltimore. And on the 6th of June Mrs. REBECCA ENSEY put on Christ in baptism, and became one of Abraham's seed, and an heir of the promise of the eternal inheritance of the land. Sister Ensey is now a member of our ecclesia. We lost one of our brethren (by death from consumption), Edwin John Miller, son of our brother Matthew Miller. He was aged about twenty-five years. He knew the holy Scriptures from a child, for he and his father and his only sister read and studied the Bible together daily for years. Brother Miller fell asleep in the truth on the 15th of July, in the confident hope of eternal life in the kingdom of God."

FLATONIA (Texas).—Bro. S. H. Oatman writes: "In July, bro. G. W. Banta made arrangements to have a meeting held where he resides, about four miles from the above-named place, to begin October 3rd. Bro. C. Oatman, myself, and three other brethren arrived at brother Banta's on September 27, after having travelled one hundred and twenty miles. At brother Banta's we found a little flock of five, rejoicing in the hope of a speedy gathering together unto Christ. Owing to the inclement weather, the meeting did not begin until the 5th of October. Brother C. Oatman delivered two lectures each day for ten days, and brother Banta and myself spoke twice at night. The audiences were generally small, and the people manifested indifference towards the exposition of the word. Five received the testimony concerning the kingdom of God,

and the name Jesus Christ as little children, and put on the saving name at the close of the meeting. Their names are as follow:—Z. McDONALD (76), husband of sister E. McDonald; A. SELLERS (28), husband of sister E. Sellers; W. H. LAMBRIGHT; MRS. E. L. HALL and Miss S. M. HALL (16)."

Brother S. H. Oatman also writes: "Since the close of the lectures in October, brother G. W. Banta and I have expounded the first principles of the oracles of God to the people in this vicinity whenever an opportunity presented itself. The good seed sown by brother C. Oatman and ourselves bids fair to produce some fruit. Three have already signified their intention to obey as soon as they become sufficiently enlightened in the Scriptures. The members of a family in this vicinity have become considerably interested in the truth, from reading *Elpis Israel* and *Twelve Lectures*. We were invited to speak to them and their neighbours, which we have done. The subjects of our lectures were as follow: 'The two everlasting Covenants of Promise,' 'The Gospel,' and 'The Kingdom of God the medium through which all nations will be blessed.' Audiences were small, but attentive. Other lectures have been delivered at brother Banta's."

LANESVILLE (Va.)—Brother L. Edwards writes as follows: "I could wish I had something to write for the *Christadelphian* which would be encouraging to the brotherhood, but the great odds we have against us in the conflict for the truth in its entirety and purity, and the individual duties of every day life, in what seems unavoidable circumstances, taxes to the fullest extent the feeble talents I possess for good, and limits my labours to the narrow circle of a home vicinity."

We have in contemplation just now, the building of a Christadelphian synagogue in our little village, Lanesville, trusting it may prove, under the blessing of God, a better nucleus for the efficient exhibition of *His truth* in its doctrinal and practical purity, than any location we could select. I am working now in the hope of its accomplishment awhile, and in the meantime, should our Lord come, I know he will not despise the motive or the work."

ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—Brother J. D. Tomlin writes: "The ecclesia of Rochester is in a healthy state as far as numbers are concerned. We re-organised about a year ago with five members, and now we number thirty-two members. Twenty of this number were identified with Renunciationism, but upon investigation, they discarded that new doctrine. We are now working together for the building of each other up in the one faith, and also to spread a knowledge

of the gospel among aliens. We are having public advertised meetings in our Room, 16, second floor, Gould's Block, State Street, (should any one be desirous to find it), and in addition to this we are also publicly and privately labouring wherever an opportunity affords. Brother Sintzenich has delivered a goodly number of lectures in country school houses, on various topics on the first principles of the faith, during the summer and fall, to fair audiences, who gave good and respectful attention, but some influential ones who are greatly engrossed in politics, think the gospel to be *hard sayings*. Dr. W. H. Reeves, of Springfield, Ohio, arrived here September 27th, and remained over two first days, and delivered seven lectures, which were well attended by attentive and what appeared at the time to be appreciative audiences; but so far as we are able to learn they were wayside hearers. The Dr. has a very clear and forcible manner in speaking, and very well calculated to leave a good impression upon the minds of his hearers, and more especially those enquiring after truth. Oh, dear brother, how our hearts leaped with joy as the news flashed across the cable that the Suez Canal was under the control of the British Lion. Surely the Signs of the Times are ominous, and Israel's long dark night is fast giving place to the dawning of the day the sun of which will never set. Oh may all Christadelphians, as they see the signs of the times being fulfilled, set their houses in order and be prepared to meet the Lord at his coming."

SENECA FALLS (N.Y.)—Brother A. Short writes that there are a few in this place firmly believing in the promises made by God to the fathers of the Hebrew nation. "There are eight of us, who have met for nearly two years every first day at our house, for the purpose of reading the Scriptures and the breaking of bread. We would say we would be glad to have any brother make us a visit, and will get him a place to lecture in if he be a public speaker; but we want none that are tainted with the destroying crotchets and 'isms' that are at work."

SHENANDOAH (Pa.)—Bro. Brittle reports the growth of knowledge and love among the newly-formed company of believers at this place, who after various fluctuations number twelve. The aliens are increasing in attendance, and some are deeply interested.

WEST HOBOKEN (N.Y.)—Sister Lasius reports: "On Sunday, December 5th, the brethren and sisters, meeting in West Hoboken, assisted MRS. YATES and DAUGHTER, formerly among the Baptists, to render the obedience of faith, in being baptized into the name of Christ, after receiving the truth intelligently."

The Christadelphian.

“He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.”—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 141.

MARCH, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD AND THE BAPTISM THEREOF.

BY DR. THOMAS.

(Concluded from page 56.)

JOHN the apostle says, “*the Spirit is the truth.*” He had learned this from Jesus, who said, “It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life;” and because the apostles believed this, Peter declared that the words he delivered were “the words of eternal life.” Paul’s testimony upon this point is equally forcible: “the word of God,” saith he, “is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” This word was developed by the Spirit moving holy men of old to write the purposes, promises, and teaching of God in a book, called the Scriptures. Hence

the truth revealed in these is styled “Spirit,” because it came by spirit, and is quickening. He that is quickened by the truth, then, is quickened by spirit; and he that is not quickened by the truth, is not quickened by spirit. Hence, Paul declares the converting power to be in Scripture given by inspiration of God, in testifying that it is able to make wise to salvation, through the faith which is in Jesus Christ. When we consider what he states the Scripture is able to do, we must be satisfied that no other agency in conversion is needed than the Scripture in the mouth of faithful men who are able to teach others. He says, “it is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God

may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Our proposition, then, is this: *He that is taught of the written word is taught of God; and that a man hath just so much of the Spirit of God in him, as he hath of the truth in him, intelligently and affectionately believed.* With us this simplifies the matter exceedingly. This proposition proved, and all the Babylonish jargon of the schools is expunged. In the matter of salvation God teaches men in no other way since the one body arrived at "the unity" and "the knowledge." A man of honest and good heart who is taught of the Scriptures, is taught of the spirit; and as the result of the teaching, he is baptized in water into the one body. He is "by the one Spirit baptized into the one body;" for without the spirit there could have been no testimony: and without the testimony, and the Divine confirmation of the testimony "by signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of Holy Spirit, according to the will of God," there would have been no faith; and without faith no justification; so that it may all be said to be of the Spirit, that is, of God.

But, as we have seen in the case of the Apostles, men may be Christians taught of God, and yet not be recipients of Spirit in the sense of its baptismal outpouring. Our exposition of this being admitted, all the facts in the case show that there is no baptism of Holy Spirit now for any one. Where is the professor that has any understanding of the truth which he has not derived from a diligent study of the Scriptures? If he have any idea that came not from this source, the idea is of the flesh, "which profits nothing." Where is the true believer that can infallibly discern spirits, speak foreign tongues, interpret them and work miracles? None such exist, because *there is no rain of spirit in the dry time that intervenes between the removal of the golden lightstands from the churches and the approaching glorious apocalypse of Christ and the Saints.* And if there be no baptismal

outpouring of Spirit upon the believers who are in "*the narrow way leading into life,*" shall we entertain the idea for a moment that the class of professors represented by Messrs. Storrs and company have received Holy Spirit in any sense?

In treating of *baptisma* we affirmed on classical authority, that one of its meanings was *drawing water*. Hence, *baptidzo*, from which it comes, signifies *to draw water*. We remarked also, that the reason why this remarkable sense was expressed by the word was, because to draw the water the bucket was dipped, or plunged down, into the well-water. But these words deduce from *bapto* the idea of FILLING. Hence, a person *baptized* with Holy Spirit is one who is *filled with spirit*, and so characterized in the New Testament. Now *bapto*, *baptidzo*, and *baptisma*, derive the signification of *filling* from the fact, that when a bucket is overwhelmed or sunk in water, it is therefore *filled*. Hence, the Lexicon gives us a sense of the word, "*to fill by dipping in, draw.*" Not, to fill by pouring in, as one would fill a font or pint basin, for baby-sprinkling; but to fill by dipping in, as a bucket is filled in drawing from a well. Hence, when Jehovah says, "I will *pour out* of my Spirit upon all flesh;" the *pouring out* is no part of *baptism* as expressed by the word. The pouring out only leads to the baptism as a result. The pouring out in spirit-rain is only the emanation of spirit from the celestial reservoir, in order to place the subject in a submerged state in which he is filled—*filled by being in*.

Thus, when we read in the New Testament of the genuine believers being *filled*, we may know that they are *in spirit*, and therefore in baptism of spirit. One purpose to be accomplished in the ascent of the Christ to the right hand of power, was that he might *fill* certain with spirit that they might become qualified as "*the spirit als*" of the churches for all purposes whatsoever. "He ascended," says Paul, "far above all the heavens that he might *fill* all things."

And, as the spirit in David says, "*he received gifts for THE MAN*"—The "Perfect Man" of Eph. iv. 13;—and having received them, "He gave indeed the apostles also the prophets, and the evangelists; also the pastors and teachers."

As the result of the Pentecostian baptism, the hundred and twenty are said to have been *filled of the Holy Spirit*. Paul is also said to have been *filled of the same*; and so of the Gentiles "ordained to eternal life," it is written, "they were *filled with joy and Holy Spirit*." Hence, in writing to them in different places, he says to "*the spirituals*;" "because I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, I bow my knees unto the Father that He would grant you to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man; and that ye might be *filled* (with spirit, i.e.) *into all the fulness of the Deity*." And again, "Be not drunk with wine, but *be filled with spirit*, speaking to yourselves with psalms and hymns and spiritual odes, singing and melodizing in your heart to the Lord: giving thanks always for all things to the Deity and Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Anointed; submitting to one another in God's fear."

The church is styled "*the fulness*," or that which is filled "of him who *filleth all things*"—all spirit-gifts—"in all the spirituals." That which was not the church, but the synagogue of Satan, instead of being filled, was emptied. The church was transformed into this synagogue by apostacy. The spirit-filling was then withdrawn; and as the synagogue has not been transformed into the church, nor will it be, there has been, and is, no filling of its "spirituals" with the fulness of God.

The saints constituting the church in Corinth were Paul's epistle written on his heart. They were such, he says, because they were "*the Epistle of Christ* ministered by him." He was the amanuensis—the penholder and writer. The characters written upon the flesh tables of their hearts, he says, "were written in with the spirit of the living God." This he

calls "the Ministration of the Spirit," or briefly "the Spirit," as opposed to "the ministration of death," or the letter—the Mosaic Law inscribed upon stone.

The ministration of the Spirit, as a whole, was a service composed of elementary parts. It was made up of the testimony of the prophets, the testimony of the apostles, the reasoning of enlightened preachers, and the confirmation of the testimony by miracles; all of which put together made what Peter terms "the preaching of the gospel with Holy Spirit sent down from heaven;" which is the same as Paul's expression, "preaching in demonstration of spirit and power." This was the sort of preaching that convinced and saved them that believed in the first century. All who at that time said, understandingly of course, that Jesus was Lord, did so only by Holy Spirit; for the testimony, the enlightened reasoning, and the confirmation, were all of Holy Spirit. The convictions of every believer were therefore primarily of the spirit; and secondarily, his actions resulting from his convictions were therefore spiritual results, or, "*the fruit of the spirit*," for if he had not been subjected to the ministration he would have had no convictions, no results in the premises.

But there are many in this century of ours who "*say* Jesus is Lord," and who are dipped in water; do they say it by the Spirit; and doth that Spirit baptize them into the one body? The answer is, *by no means*. What they say and do is the result of mere impulse, excitement, or blind obedience to custom and tradition. The Pope and his priests say Jesus is Lord, but they are mere babblers, and know not what they say; and like priests like people. Ignorance of the testimony is to be without the spirit in every sense. A man ignorant of the testimony is "not in the Spirit;" he cannot "walk after the spirit;" he has not "the Spirit of Christ;" the Spirit of God does not "dwell in him;" he is not "led by the Spirit of God;" but being ignorant, "*he walks in the vanity of his mind, having the under-*

standing darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in him." Piety is no substitute for scriptural intelligence; for piety of some sort is common to all flesh; and all flesh is guilty before God. The pious of the religious world are mere babblers about spirit, knowing not what they say, nor whereof they affirm; mistaking the mesmeric excitation of their nervous systems for the Spirit of the living God!

The ministration of the Spirit is still the service in operation for the development of epistles of Christ. The service is operated through the Holy Scriptures and enlightened interpreters. The gospel, however, is not "preached with Holy Spirit sent down from heaven;" for the reason that there is no confirmation now "by signs, wonders, miracles, and distributions of Holy Spirit." This impairs the power of the proclamation in arresting the attention of people; and in not proving who, of all the multitudes called "preachers," are they whom God approves. The absence of "the demonstration of power" does not impair the testimony. The power of this is undiminished; for the gospel is the same as in the days of the apostles, when it was "the power of God for salvation to every one that believes." It is so now; and will continue so till the door is shut by the personal advent of Christ.

In conclusion, we may remark that the facts and expressions of the New Testament afford a basis for ignorance to construct hypotheses upon in regard to the Spirit and its operations. There was a physical operation of Spirit, and there were gifts. This is undeniable. We have admitted it, and explained it: and we trust intelligibly and satisfactorily. But "the spirituals" of Satan's synagogue lost the sense while they retained the *form* of words which they transmitted to their successors with a *perverted sense*. Now, they tell their dupes, that what the apostles styled "the living word" is a dead letter, which

only kills them. But how a letter that is powerless can kill, we may leave to Satan's magicians to solve as they best can! Well, having killed their hearers with a dead letter, they then tell them they must be made alive by the outpouring of the Holy Ghost into their souls "in answer to their prayers." If any of their hearers commence shouting, and clapping hands, and bawling "glory hallelujah!" and profess that "they have got through," and that they have joy and peace in believing—although they are as ignorant of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus as Baal's worshippers, the Spirit is said to have given them religion; or, in other words to have converted their "immortal souls." This is termed "experiencing a hope," or being "hopefully converted," so that according to this process, what they absurdly enough call "faith," and "religion in the soul," come by an abstract operation of the Holy Ghost of their system, invoked alike, by papist, puritan, and Mormon! This abstraction has practically nullified and abolished the word. Hence, there is nothing the parsons and their parishioners are so restless and impatient under as the operation of the testimony. They are never so hurried as when they get entangled in a conversation about Moses and the prophets. Time is sure to be very precious with them at that particular crisis. They will chat small talk by the hour; but on the word of the living God, they will hear you at a more convenient season.

Such is the atmosphere of spirituality in which society lives, and moves, and has its being. It is a fog generated by the thinking of the flesh—a mist that obfuscates alike the brains of "philosophers" and "divines." The absurdities of spiritualism and Mormonism are all traceable to a spurious theology, dignified in the estimation of the ignorant by the name of "orthodoxy." Under mesmeric excitation a person sees a phantasma; or nervo-electrical irritability assumes the form of shocks

and sounds. Immediately, in his ignorance, he flies to his theology, which is ghostology, for an explanation, and it tells him, it is the immortal disembodied soul of some dead acquaintance. He is taught also that his pious feelings are the workings of the Holy Ghost. Under this impression, every thing he feels is the Spirit. He feels that he is one of the elect; and he becomes a Presbyterian; or he feels that he is a saint, and that this is the latter day; and that he is called to preach, and to found the New Jerusalem, and he becomes a Mormon or Swedenborgian. Thus the difference between a Presbyterian and a Mormon, or between professors of any other sects,

is more imaginary than real; it is all feeling working off in different directions, according to the circumstances of the times and seasons. But, here we must leave what has been said to the judgment of the reader. He has the Scriptures, and the facts of the case are around him on every side. If the teaching of the clergy be in harmony with the law and the prophets and with facts, then receive it; but if not, and our exposition be found according to the truth, then receive it; or otherwise, not. For ourselves, we believe it is correct, and therefore we publish it, without any anxiety for the result further than that the truth may prevail. And, so let it be!

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

By F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 118.

OUR REASONABLE SERVICE.

It is not an unreasonable thing which is asked of us when we are enjoined to return blessing for cursing, and good for evil, if we remember that we are called ourselves to inherit a blessing.—(1 Pet. iii. 9.)

That Christ, our hope and example, refrained from inflicting merited punishment in return for reviling, and even forbore threatening, is surely a sufficient ground for asking us to do the same.—(1 Pet. ii. 12.)

When we consider the object to be served, it is not too much to require that sister wives should be in subjection even to unbelieving husbands, that so they may be won by their godly conduct.—(1 Pet. iii. 1.)

It is a most reasonable thing that we should be holy, seeing that he who hath called us is holy.—(1 Pet. i. 16.)

A very good reason why we should be sober-minded, watchful and prayerful is because we believe the end of all things is at hand.—(1 Pet. iv. 7.)

An excellent reason why we should minister grace to others is certainly to be

found in the fact that we also are debtors to favour for all we have received.—(1 Pet. iv. 10.)

Seeing that God is the author of our abilities, it is but reasonable that we should recogniss it, so that in all things He may be glorified.—(1 Pet. iv. 11.)

The reason why we ought to re-clothe ourselves with humility, and be subject one to another, is so that God may exalt us in due time.—(1 Pet. v. 5, 6.)

One reason why a brother-husband should give honour unto his sister-wife is, "that their prayers be not hindered."—(1 Pet. iii. 7.)

A good reason why a brother should eschew evil and do good is, because it is necessary to secure life and good days. —(1 Pet. iii. 10.)

One reason why we should exemplify well-doing is, that so we may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.—(1 Pet. ii. 15.)

The object for which we are enjoined to give forth the reason of our hope with meekness and reverence is, that so those who would accuse us falsely may be ashamed.—(1 Pet. iii. 15.)

One reason why the Father raised Christ from the dead and gave him glory was, that our faith and hope might be in God.—(1 Pet. i. 21.)

One reason why Christ suffered was, that he might bring us to God.—(1 Pet. iii 18.)

The reason why a brother or sister servant should be subject to froward masters as well as to the good and gentle is, because it is thankworthy to suffer wrongfully.—(1 Pet. ii. 19.)

REFERENCE TABLET NO. 119.

BIBLE SUMMARIES.

Matt. v. 1-12.—The teaching of these verses may be summarised as follows:

1.—That the honour of inheriting the kingdom will only be extended to those who, during the days of their probation, have been characterized by meekness of behaviour, mercifulness of disposition, lowliness of mind, purity of motive, and a thirst after righteousness as men thirst for gold.

2.—That the appointments for the kingdom will be made upon the principle which allows of opposite experiences; thus: the humble will be exalted; the meek will rule with a rod of iron; the mourner will receive comfort; the merciful will obtain mercy for himself; the pure will see God; the persecuted will be honoured; and the peacemakers will be invited to taste the pure joy of reconciled children; those who suffer with Christ will reign with him.

3.—That it is a blessed thing to suffer persecution, when it is endured patiently for Christ's sake: in which also we have sweet companionship of experience with the prophets.

4.—That righteousness, mercy, peace, purity, comfort, gladness, blessing, and the fear of God will prevail amongst men as the glorious result of the kingdom established.

Heb. v. 1-10.—In these verses we have the following things taught:

1.—That Christ came in the flesh, on the occasion of his first advent on the earth.

2.—That he was compassed with infirmity; that so he might have compassion on the ignorant and those who are out of the way.

3.—That by reason of his being "tortured with a feeling of our infirmity," it was necessary he should offer for sins as well for himself as for the people.

4.—That he feared God; prayed to God;

and that his prayers were answered on the ground of his filial fear.

5.—That having died, he was raised from the dead by the power of the Father.

6.—That though he were a Son, yet he "learned obedience by the things which he suffered:" or in other words "was made perfect through suffering."—(Ch. ii. 10.)

7.—That being further perfected a priest after the order of Melchizedec, by a resurrection from the dead, and the power of an endless life, he became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey him.

Prov. xi.—The following is a summary of principles illustrated in this chapter.

1.—That a deceitful balance and a froward man are abominable things in the sight of God: while on the other hand He is delighted with a just weight and an upright person.

2.—That integrity, righteousness, and knowledge are self-directing principles, powerful to deliver from trouble and death, and having in the end a sure reward.

3.—That naughtiness is a net in which transgressors are caught.

4.—That the expectation of a wicked man is a perishable commodity.

5.—That an hypocrite is a destructive creature.

6.—That he who despiseth his neighbour exhibits a lack of wisdom.

7.—That uprightness brings exaltation, and wickedness is followed by overthrow.

8.—That riches will avail nothing in the day of wrath, and those who trust therein will come to naught.

9.—That both the righteous and the sinner will be recompensed in the earth.

10.—That mere beauty without discretion, is comparable to a golden jewel in a swine's snout.

11.—That a truly liberal soul is one whose meat and drink it is to water others with blessing, and that it is the ultimate destiny of such to thrive and flourish as trees of life in the Paradise of God.

12.—That shame is appointed the successor of pride, and that the dwelling place of wisdom is with the lowly.

13.—That he who becomes surety for a stranger is sure to smart for it, and that the only sure way of escaping this is to eschew suretyship.

14.—That the principle illustrated in divine economics is that increase cometh by scattering.

15.—That it is a part of faithfulness not to reveal secrets but to conceal them.

16.—That the peculiarity which prevents men oftentimes discerning wickedness is that it is deceitful.

17.—That to be merciful redounds to the good of a man's own soul; while a cruel man chastens his own flesh.

18.—That safety cometh of much counsel, and that for the lack of it people fall.

19.—That the prosperity of righteous men and the perishing of wicked men bringeth rejoicing and shouting to the city.

20.—That as strength retaineth riches, so graciousness retaineth honour.

21.—That as corn withholden bringeth cursing and poverty, so bread dispensed with equity yieldeth blessing.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 119.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF LIFE.

The things to be laid aside as weights and hindrances to the gospel race, are malice, guile, hypocrisies, envies, evil speaking, and the sin that doth most easily beset us.—(1 Pet. ii. 1.)

As in the matter of a club or provident society, if a man gives up membership, he loses all he may have paid in, so with the truth, if we do not hold on to the end, what we may have already done will count for nothing in the day of salvation.

Jesus as a precious foundation cornerstone, was first to be a tried stone, and afterwards a laid stone; the former was fulfilled at his first advent; the latter will be at his second.—(Isa. xxviii. 16.)

The principles of the world were first illustrated in the Edenic transgression thus: 1st, the lust of the flesh: the tree seemed good for food. 2nd, the lust of the eye: it was pleasant to the eye. 3rd, the pride of life: it was desirable to make one wise.

When the tempter suggested to Jesus the conversion of stones into bread, it was an appeal to the lust of the flesh; when he showed him the kingdoms, it was an appeal to the lust of the eye; and when he bade him throw himself from the pinnacle of the temple, he appealed to the pride of life.

One of the "things of the world" is the care of a married brother "how he may please his wife," and the care of a

married sister "how she may please her husband." In this, as in buying and selling, we are permitted to "use the world;" but there is need of great watchfulness, lest we "abuse" our liberty. Paul's desire was that the saints should be "without carefulness," and that they should "attend upon the Lord without distraction."—(1 Cor. vii. 31-34.)

The man who serves Christ in all the ways of life, and continually impoverishes himself for the truth's sake, stands small chance of comparison, in this present time, with his more careful and provident neighbour, who, shutting his eyes to the claims of Christ's work among men, lays up only for himself against what is called a "rainy day." But it is only the old Babel-building idea of thinking to thwart God. The day will declare it.

The principle but too generally illustrated in any good work whatever, is "most sacrifice where least able."

REFERENCE TABLET No. 120.

MEMORANDA.

Self in English is equivalent to soul in Hebrew: thus the words myself, himself, yourselves, thyself, themselves, in the Common Version, is, in the literal Hebrew, my soul, his soul, your souls, their souls, in the following passages: Lev. xi. 43, 44; 1 Kings xix. 4; Esther iv. 13; ix. 31; Job xviii. 4; xxxii. 2; Psalm cxxxi. 2; Isa. v. 14; xlv. 2; xlvii. 14; Jer. iii. 11; xvii. 21; xxxvii. 9; li. 14; Amos ii. 14, 15; vi. 8; Jonah iv. 8. This is also indicated in the root of the self, which comes from *sik*, one's own, and *lip*, body, life—one's own body or life.

How numerals may be used as doctrinal synonyms is illustrated as follows:—

- 1.—Unity. From *unus*, one.
- 2.—Truth. "The witness of two men is true."
2nd.—Christ's return. "He shall appear the second time."
- 3.—Resurrection. "The third day he rose again."
- 4.—*Yahweh Elohim*. "The multi'ndinous and glorified Christ."—(*Eureka* I 83)
- 5.—Christ the bread of life. "Five barley loaves."
- 6.—Works "Six days shalt thou work."
- 7.—Rest and perfection. "God rested the seventh day."
- 8.—Baptism. "Eight souls saved by water."

9.—Prayer. "The hour of prayer, being the ninth hour."

10.—Ten Commandments.

11.—Ecclesial.—"The eleven gathered together."

12.—Kingdom. Twelve Tribes of Israel.

13.—Rebellion. "In the thirteenth year they rebelled."—(Gen. xiv. 4.)

14.—Passover. (14th day.) Type and antitype.

15.—Sin. "The wilderness of sin."

16.—Soul. "Zilpah bare to Jacob sixteen souls."

17.—Restoration of Israel. Jeremiah bought a field for seventeen shekels, which was a sign of Israel's return from captivity.—(Jer. xxxii.)

18.—Perish. Eighteen perished by the fall of the Tower of Siloam.

19.—Gehenna. The house of the Lord was burnt in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar.

20.—Oppression. "Jabin mightily oppressed Israel twenty years."

21.—Angels.—"The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one-and-twenty days."

22.—Evil-doing. "And Ahab reigned over Israel twenty-two years, and he did evil in the sight of the Lord."

23.—The Jews and their affairs.—(Esther viii. 9.)

24.—Priesthood. (*Eureka* II. 27.)

25.—Well-doing. Jehoshaphat, who did right in the eyes of the Lord, reigned twenty-five years.

30.—Satan.—"They covenanted with Judas for thirty pieces of silver."

40.—Trial, probation. The forty years in the wilderness. The temptation of Christ.

50.—Holy Spirit. Pentecost.

60.—Saints executing judgments. (*Eureka* I. 393.)

70.—The gospel. The Lord appointed seventy to preach the gospel.

80.—Mortality.—(Psalm xc. 10.)

99.—Circumcision. Abraham was ninety-nine when he was circumcised.

100.—Longevity of the kingdom.—(Isaiah lxxv. 20.)

490.—Sin offering. Daniel's seventy weeks to Messiah's cutting off.

1,000.—The millennium.

1,260.—Papal domination.

10,000.—Christ the King of Glory. "The chief among ten thousand."

REFERENCE TABLET NO. 122.

DIFFERENCES.

As there was difference of spirit-gifts in the days of the apostles, so there will be differences of glory, and differences in the number of cities given to the saints in the kingdom of God.

The results of the judgment-seat inspection will yield the difference of life and death to the approved and the rejected.

The different results obtained at the tribunal of Christ will be determined by the difference of present attitude and action towards Christ and his work, on the part of those who are now candidates for the kingdom and glory.

One result of the judgment will be to distinguish the "ten cities" brother from the "five cities" brother, and the two cities from the no-city inheritor, who had been found barren and unfruitful in all spiritual enterprise.

It is as easy to find reasons for the different degrees of reward in present facts, as it is easy to discern from a similar comparison the reason why some will be rejected altogether, for example:—

Some are liberal-souled while others are conservative, selfish and narrow minded.

Some are zealous and enterprising, while others are sluggish and hard to move at all in spiritual directions.

Some are punctual and regular in their attendance upon all the meetings, others are uniformly late, and often absent.

Some would sacrifice their health, where others would hardly forego their comforts.

Some will attend four or six meetings a week at a considerable sacrifice of health and temporal concerns, while others are not perhaps to be seen as many times in a month.

Some will cast into the treasury, like the poor widow, all they have, while others may cast in of their abundance.

Some make daily and habitual sacrifices in almost every direction to serve the truth, while others do not feel called upon to do anything of the sort.

Some discern Christ in the least opportunities, while others can only see him on state occasions.

Some will go to meeting almost if they were alive at all, while others unduly consider their health and stay at home.

Some will give the whole first-day to Christ's work, however tired they may be with the daily strain, while others after attending to six days' toil in their own

behoof, will make "hospital Sunday" of the meeting day, and recuperate impaired strength at the fireside, against the early morn of next working-day.

Some will fall into the ranks and jointly fight with their brethren in arms, while others prefer to look on like alien spectators.

Some will strain every nerve and sinew to uphold every department of the truth, while others will act the part of mere critics and go-betweens, between the

encamped hosts of the Lord and the besieging foe without.

Some will turn every opportunity to the advantage of Christ, while others will occupy precious time in profitless discourse, in which the hero of the tale is themselves.

Some will be careful to maintain good works, and others while very punctilious and particular about such things as "mint and cummin," neglect as a whole the weightier matters of the law.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 18.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

DARWIN AND HUXLEY REFUTED.

!(Continued from page 73.)

DR. PORTER'S excellent answer to Darwin and Huxley continues:—"Darwin's theory is, that all forms of life, from the humblest zoophyte up to man, have been evolved from one primordial germ. His theory, while it may admit a primal act of creation, yet sets aside the Bible narrative, and assigns to man a common parentage with the monkey and the worm. The line of proof is, that species may be originated by selection; and that

the most remarkable phenomena exhibited by the distribution, development and mutual relations of species, can be shown to be deducible from the general doctrine of their origin, combined with the known facts of geological change; 'and that, even if all these phenomena are not at present explicable by it, none are necessarily inconsistent with it.'

It will be easily seen that the crucial point is the first. We naturally ask—What are the proofs of this startling assertion that species may be originated by selection? Does it rest on any sound

scientific basis? Have we evidence that any distinct species has been originated? I have not space to examine Darwin's observed facts. I admit their accuracy; but I deny that any or all of them satisfy the requirements of logic, as proofs of the truth of his theory. The facts which Darwin's own observations establish are insignificant modifications of race, most of them under man's guiding skill, and which confessedly tend to disappear again when man withdraws and nature resumes its sway. In fact, it appears to me that the fundamental error in Darwin's reasoning is, his accepting slight variations of race as a proof of transmutation of species.

Darwin draws largely upon an infinite past. Countless ages form the basis of his theory. Without these, development could not have reached its present stage. But Sir Wm. Thompson, one of the greatest of our natural philosophers, 'has dissipated all speculation regarding an infinite series of life-forms, by proving that they could not extend over millions of millions of years; because, assuming that heat has been uniformly conducted out of the earth, as it is now, it must have been so intense within a comparatively limited period as to be capable of melting a mass of rock equal to the bulk of the whole earth.' What would have become of Darwin's half-developed animals under such circumstances?

Professor Huxley says:—'After much consideration, and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our conviction that, as the evidence stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characteristics exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural.' This is clear, and ought to be conclusive. I could say nothing more damaging to Mr. Darwin's theory.

The essence of the theory is, that all the wonderful adaptations which we find

in the physical structure of the various species of animals, to the conditions in which they are placed, to the work they have to do, to the wants they have to supply, have sprung from a long and fortuitous sequence of natural events, to which Mr. Darwin gives the scientific name, Natural Selection. If this be true, then the most beautiful and complex organs of animals—the heart and veins, the nervous system, the human hand, the eye, the mind itself, with all its wondrous faculties—have been constructed, not by the infinite wisdom of an Almighty Creator, adapting every part and organ and faculty, with requisite skill, to the office it was designed to fill; but from a medley of blind chance, countless blunders, and innumerable minute accidental modifications which occurred in the struggle for existence during myriads of past ages. The fish was not designed for the water; the bird was not designed to fly; the ear was not designed for hearing; the eye was not designed for seeing: all these, says Darwin, are just the fortuitous products of organised matter, pushing its way at random, and after incalculable instances of trial and failure, during incalculable ages, at last hitting on what was best.

And what is the evidence on which he bases this theory, which to every thoughtful man must, at first sight, appear incredible? Nothing short of actual observation of the whole alleged process could, in such a case, satisfy the requirements of science or make the theory even credible. There has been no such observation, and no such observation is possible, because the process of development is supposed to have extended over an 'almost infinite series of generations.' It thus lies outside the province of science, and has therefore no claim upon the belief of scientific men.

Design in nature can be seen by every unprejudiced man who observes nature, or who thoughtfully studies the recorded

observations of others. Every fresh discovery in physiology; every searching glance of the scientist into the wonderful mechanism of the animal frame; every minute inspection of the marvellous adaptation of insect organisms to the complicated structure of flowers; in a word, every new achievement of the scientific mind in exploring the vast domain of nature, reveals more clearly, and establishes more firmly, the presence everywhere, and in everything, of an infinitely powerful and infinitely wise designing Mind. Unseen by human eye, undiscoverable by scientific observation in the mystery of its working, we yet discern the impress and recognise the beneficent control of that Infinite Mind in earth and sea and sky."

THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE:

LECTURE BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from page 81.)

But we get a closer view of the divine character of the Bible in looking at the nature of the Bible itself. We discover peculiarities which show that it is a matter of impossibility that it could be of human origin. I will give one or two slight illustrations of this great point, which might be illustrated by hundreds of cases. I refer now to one illustration of the sentiment which pervades the whole book, and which is totally foreign to all human tastes and all human conceptions. In the 9th chapter of Jeremiah, and 23rd verse, we read thus: "Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth." The universal principle of human nature illustrated in all history and among all nations, in every human circle and in

all kinds of society, is that the wise man glories in his wisdom, and is complimented for it; the mighty man glories in his might, and has a monument put up to him when he dies; and the rich man glories in his riches and is universally deferred to on account of it. Throughout the whole of the Scriptures this credit to man is denied. In this, the Bible differs from all human books; and in this, it is more philosophical than human books; for what credit has a horse in that it has legs and strength? The glory of its strength is obviously due to the origin of that strength, but you don't find men recognise that fact. You don't find the races of mankind in any part of the world saying "Oh, don't give us the credit," "Not unto us, O Lord; but unto Thy name be the glory."—(Ps. cxv. 1.) On the contrary they say, "we are entitled to the credit." In every speech made upon every platform, whether it be a political gathering or a corporation meeting, or a trades demonstration, men glory in their own town and in their own party, and in their own leaders: whereas the scheme which centres in Christ has this for its intrinsic and essential feature, that human glory is excluded.—(1 Cor. i. 26.) "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but 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." I say that it is a matter of impossibility from our knowledge of human nature, in every nation and in every age, as reflected in books that such a sentiment can

be of human invention. It is self-evidently divine. The consideration of this single point apart from the mighty mass of evidence there is on every hand, is sufficient to convince any competent mind—any mind capable of comparing things that differ, that this Bible is the book of God, and no human invention.

Let me give you one further illustration of this point in a practical form. You know what patriotism is universally, and more particularly in its manifestation towards historic characters. People may not be always very enthusiastic and appreciative towards living people, but when a man dies who has rendered any service at all to the nation to which he belongs, you know what the style is. It is said, "his remarkable genius," "his large heart," "his powerful arm," and this and that, "entitle him to the eternal gratitude of posterity." Now let me give you a specimen of the kind of patriotism that belongs to the literature of the Bible—Psalm. xlv. 1-3: "We have heard with our ears, O God; our fathers have told us what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of old. How thou didst drive out the heathen with Thy hand, and plantedst them; how Thou didst afflict the people and cast them out. For THEY GOT NOT THE LAND IN POSSESSION BY THEIR OWN SWORD, *neither did their own arm save them*; but **THY RIGHT HAND** and **THINE ARM**, and the light of Thy countenance, because Thou hadst a favour unto them." That is no human patriotism. It is not the patriotism of the Jews. The patriotism of the Jews does not differ from that among other nations elsewhere. The Jews always praise the Jews. They never ascribe the glory to God. You never find Jews complimenting this book; you don't find Jews in our day approving sentiments like that just read. Read the writings of Disraeli or the *Jewish Chronicle*, and

what do you see? Just a soaping over of the Jewish nation and the Jewish stock, in precisely the same style as is common amongst the Gentiles. Anything they have done is attributed to the fine energetic force of the Caucasian organization. It is said that the Jewish blood is rich in genius; that the Jewish race is of immortal vigour, and so on. You find the Jews taking up with the Talmud and not with the Bible. Why? For the same reason that they loved the false prophets and put the true prophets to death. The prophets of the Bible speak like Moses. In what respect do they resemble him? Look at his farewell speech, and just compare it with the farewell speech of any other patriot, and then try and suppose for a moment that Moses is speaking only as a human leader, aiming at popularity. If Moses did not act as he did because God sent him, he acted out of his own head and for his own objects. Assume for a moment that that was the case. Imagine him for a moment speaking in the style which you find in the 31st chapter of Deuteronomy. In the 16th verse it is written: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers; and this people will rise up, and go a whoring after the gods of the strangers of the land, whither they go to be among them, and will forsake me, and break my covenant which I have made with them." Having been apprised of his approaching decease, he makes a few remarks which I will read, that you may try and realise them on the supposition that his case was a merely human case.—(verse 25.) "Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee. For *I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck*: Behold, while I am yet alive with you this day; ye have

been rebellious against the Lord; and HOW MUCH MORE AFTER MY DEATH? Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers, that I may speak these words in their ears, and call heaven and earth to *record against them*. For I know that *after my death YE WILL UTTERLY CORRUPT YOURSELVES, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you*; and evil will befall you in the latter days; because ye do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke Him to anger through the work of your hands." How did Moses know that? It came to pass most strictly. No wonder the Jews did not like Moses and the prophets. They all spoke in this same strain. The nation is not complimented. There are no human principles of action inculcated or recognised throughout these writings.

This is an argument that might be very extensively elaborated with great force to the mind of those who have any experience of human nature and any discernment of the principles of human action. It perhaps requires considerable experience and knowledge of human nature to appreciate the value of this argument, but it is an argument of crushing force to the minds of those who possess the necessary knowledge which may be gained by general observation.

Well, there is another argument requiring far more time than we have, and also requiring far more ability than could be brought to bear to elaborate it. What is that? The portrait of the man Christ Jesus. Such a character is inexplicable upon all human principles, but is intelligible upon the principle on which he is introduced to our notice in the Bible; for he is introduced as the manifestation of God in the flesh. If God by his Spirit photographed, so to speak, His own moral and intellectual likeness upon the fruit of Mary's womb, there is an explanation. But I should have liked to place before you the thing to be explained, though even if

there were time, I feel that the matter is one which can only be apprehended by close and constant reading of the narrative of Christ's life and sayings and the letters of Christ's friends, while it also requires some amount of discernment to compare the picture there displayed with the picture presented in universal human nature. Christ is the corner-stone of the house of God in the age to come, and he is the corner-stone of the argument to prove that the Bible is true. This is particularly shown when we come to that crowning event in his life, his resurrection, which is demonstrable by every kind of evidence by which any past historical occurrence can be demonstrated. The facts now before our eyes, the nations now existing, and their political institutions are evidences, when properly worked out, of Christ having risen.

The process of the proof may be very simply indicated. I might suppose myself an utter stranger, looking on all the nations of Europe, crowded with churches and priests, and Bibles, and religious faith, with the name of Christ written on it, and knowing that this state of things did not come yesterday nor in a hundred years, the question would occur, how came it that Christ has been universally received amongst the powerful nations of Europe? There must be something in the beginning of the matter adequate to the production of that general conviction, and when I come back to the beginning, what do I see? I see a little obscure band of illiterate men, whom the Jews sought to exterminate by persecution, imprisonment and death, and against whom the powers of Pagan Rome were all arrayed in many bloody persecutions; but in spite of all these, their testimony spread and spread until the rising tide reached the throne itself, and shows us, in a little while, a military champion of Christ upon that throne.

What is the explanation of it? If you

tell me Christ did not rise, you ask me to believe a something which is without explanation. If Christ rose and sent power upon his apostles, enabling them to raise the dead, cleanse lepers, and do many mighty works in confirmation of the testimony that he had risen and that they had seen him, I can understand the success of the apostolic testimony; but if you tell me the apostles were mad enthusiasts, labouring under the power of delusion, you present to me a view which is more utterly incredible than the one presented in the New Testament.

The case is complete, the evidence is conclusive. There is no breach in the wall anywhere. Why is it that so many refuse to believe? It is because they are too busy with other things to become sufficiently acquainted with the facts of the case to be able to come to a conclusion; for a man cannot be convinced without evidence. If the evidence be not before his mind, it is no wonder if the conviction is not there. But perhaps it ought to be

said in this matter as in the case of the Jews: "the leaders of this people cause them to err," as said Isaiah; for in the first place, if the ministers and clergymen were at all up to their work, there would not be the amount of scepticism that there is. The fact is, they are not; they are hirelings, "dumb dogs that cannot bark;" they do not know the ground on which they stand, and are ignorant of the teachings of the book of which they profess to be the expositors. No wonder that there is a leavening through all society, of this curse of unbelief which is eating the life out of the people, and sending them in innumerable droves down the inclined plane of an objectless life.

But the Bible is true. Christ rose, Christ is in heaven. Christ will be here by and bye, and Christ will have a people alive looking for him, and we are busy trying to develop that people by the agency which He has placed in our hands; with the belief that this is the book of God, which for that reason we submit for your most attentive consideration.

DIFFICULT PASSAGES.—No. 8.

Obscurities and apparent contradictions elucidated by the help of emendations and various readings.

THE BLOOD OF JESUS.

Heb. x. 19. Having, therefore, brethren, freedom to the entrance of the holies by the blood of Jesus, 20, which new and living way, through the vail, that is his flesh, he ratified for us: 21, and *having* a mighty priest over the house of God: 22, let us draw near with a true heart, in full conviction of faith, having these hearts sprinkled (*purified*) from an evil conscience, and the body washed with pure water.

Heb. ii. 14. Since, then, the children have flesh and blood in common, he himself also, in like manner shared of the same, that through death he might destroy him having the power of death,

that is the diabolos:—15, and might deliver such as by fear of death, throughout all their life, were subjects of slavery. 16, For truly, he layeth not hold of angels, but he layeth hold of the seed of Abraham: 17, Wherefore he was obliged in all things to be made like to the brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things *relating* to God, to make atonement for the sins of the people; 18, For by what he suffered himself, having been tempted, he is able to help those who are tempted.

1 John v. 6. This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus the anointed: not by water only, but by the water and the blood; and it is the Spirit that bears

witness, for the Spirit is the truth. 7, Because there are three who are testifying, 8, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. *Note.* Dr. Tregelles says, "that the portion omitted from the 7th and 8th verses is not supported by any evidence, it is absent from every Greek MS. older than the 16th century, and from every ancient MS. of every ancient version."

THE SPIRIT BEARS WITNESS.

1 Peter i. 11. Investigating into how, or what appointed season, the Spirit of the Anointed in them did make known, declaring beforehand the sufferings of the Anointed, and after these the glories.

Acts x. 38. How God anointed this Jesus from Nazareth, with Holy Spirit and power, who went about doing good, and healing all those being afflicted by the diabolos, because God was with him.

Heb. ix. 14. How much more shall the blood of the Anointed, who through age during Spirit offered himself (*a sacrifice*) without blemish to God, purify your conscience from dead works, for to do the will of the living God. *Note.* Griesbach thinks the word "age-during" should be "holy."

1 Peter iii. 18. Because the Anointed also once suffered on account of sins,—just for the sake of unjust,—that he may lead us to God, truly having been put to death in the flesh, but having been made alive in the Spirit;

1 Cor. xv. 45. And so it has been written, "the first man Adam was made into a living soul;" the last Adam into a life-imparting Spirit.

2 Cor. iii. 17. Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.

THE WATER BEARS WITNESS.

Of condemnation. John vi. 63 verse. The flesh profits nothing; Jesus.

And renunciation. Colos. ii. 11, in the putting off of the body of the flesh in the circumcision of the Anointed. *Note.* The *Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian MSS.* do not contain the words "of the sins," and Griesbach rejects them absolutely as spurious.

Of new birth. John iii. 3. Jesus answered and said to him; Verily, verily I say to thee, unless anyone be born from above, he is not able to see the kingdom

of God. . . . 5, Jesus answered Verily, verily, I say to thee, unless any one be born out of water and of Spirit, he is not able to enter into the kingdom of God.

To obedience. Matt. iii. 13. Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized by him. 14, But John forbid him, saying; I have need to be baptised by thee, and comest thou unto me? 15, And Jesus answering, said unto him permit it now; for thus it is becoming to us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he permits him.

And acceptance. Matt. iii. 16, And Jesus having been baptised, went up immediately out of the water; and behold! the heavens were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as it were a dove, and coming upon him; 17, and, lo! a voice from the heavens, saying, this is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight.

THE BLOOD BEARS WITNESS

Of brotherhood. Heb. ii. 14. Since, then, the children have flesh and blood in common, he himself also in like manner shared of the same.

Acts xvii. 26. HE made also of one blood every nation of men, to dwell upon all the face of the earth. *Note.* The *Sinaitic, Vatican and Alexandrian MS.* omit the word "blood," but Griesbach considers the weight of testimony to be in favour of its retention in the text.

Heb. ii. 11. For both he who is sanctifying and those being sanctified, are all out of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

Of heirship. 2 Cor. i. 20. For all the promises of God, in him are the Yea, and in him the Amen, for glory to God through us. *Note.* "The Yea" is the Greek, and "the Amen" the Hebrew emphatic affirmative; the force of this statement is seen in "the yea" denoting to the Greek, and "the Amen" to the Hebrew, that every promise of God is made sure in Christ to both Gentile and Jew.

To the promise to Eve. Luke i. 31. And lo, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.

Mark vi. 3. Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?

To the covenants made with Abraham. Gal. iii. 16. Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, even for his seed. He

does not say, "and to the seeds," as concerning many, but as concerning one; "and to thy seed,"—who is Anointed.

Matt. i. 1. An account of the genealogy of Jesus Anointed, Son of David, Son of Abraham.

And with David. Luke i. 32. And the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father.

Matt. i. 1. An account of the genealogy of Jesus Anointed, Son of David.

Which covenants of promise he confirmed in his death.

Rom. xv. 8. Now I affirm Jesus Anointed to have become a servant of the circumcision for the truth of God, in order to confirm the promises made to the fathers; 9, and for the Gentiles to glorify God for His mercy.

Heb. ix. 16. For where a covenant exists, it is necessary to prove the death of the covenant victim; 17, because a covenant is confirmed over dead victims, since it is never valid when the covenant victim liveth.

Mark xiv. 23. And having taken the cup, on giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank out of it. 24. And he said to them, This is my blood of the new covenant, which for many is being shed.

Heb. xiii. 22. But ye have drawn nigh . . . 24. And to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant; and to the blood of sprinkling, speaking better things than that of Abel.

Luke xxii. 20. In like manner also the cup, after the supper, saying, this cup is the new covenant in my blood, that being poured out in your behalf.

Matt. xxvi. 27. And having taken the cup, and given thanks, he gave to them, saying, drink ye all out of it; 28. For this is my blood,—that of the new covenant,—that being poured out in behalf of many—for passing over of sins.

Matt. xxvii. 24. Then Pilate on seeing that he does no good, but rather a tumult is made, on taking water, washed his hands before the crowd, saying; I am innocent from the blood of this righteous one; will you see to it yourselves? 25. And all the people answering, said: His blood be on us, and on our children!

1 Cor. v. 7. For also our paschal lamb—the Anointed, was sacrificed in our behalf. Note, "in our behalf;" or "for us," is omitted in the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian texts.

Heb. xiii. 20. Now the God of peace, who brought back from the dead that

great shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus, by the blood of an age-during covenant; 21, make you perfect in every good work, for to do His will; doing in you that which is well-pleasing before Him, through Jesus Anointed; to whom is the glory for the ages of the ages! Amen.

Heb. ix. 12. Neither through the blood of he goats and young bullocks, but through his own blood he entered in once for all into the holies, having found age-during deliverance; Note, the verb "having found" is in the middle voice, indicating that the finding was for himself, as well as for others.

Col. i. 18. And he is head of the body of the ecclesia, who is the beginning, the chief-born from the dead, that among all he might have the pre-eminence; 19. Because in him all the completeness of the divine favour should dwell; 20. That through him He might reconcile all things unto Himself,—having made peace through the blood of his cross,—through him, whether the things on the earth, or the things in the heavens.

Rom. iii. 23. For all did miss the mark, and failed of attaining to the glory of God; being justified freely by His favour, through the deliverance which is in the Anointed Jesus; 25. Whom God set forth a mercy-seat through faith in his blood, for to point out His faithfulness by the passing over of sins previously committed; 26. In the forbearance of God, to point out His faithfulness, in the now appointed season; for him to be just, and declaring him blameless who is of the faith of Jesus.

1 John ii. 1. My little children, I write these things to you, that ye may not sin: but if any one should sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Anointed, the Righteous One. 2. And he is a sacrifice for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for all of this order of things.

1 Peter i. 18. Knowing that, not with corruptible things—silver and gold—were ye redeemed from your perverse conduct handed down, from your fathers; 19, but with the precious blood of the Anointed, as of a lamb without blemish and spotless; 20, having indeed been foreknown, before the beginning of this order of things, but manifested in these last times because of you, 21, who through him believe in God, who raised him up from the dead, and gave him

glory, so that your faith and hope may be in God.

Ephes. ii. 13. But now in the Anointed Jesus, ye who were formerly far off, are brought near in the blood of the Anointed.

Col. i. 14. In whom we have deliverance, the passing over of sins. *Note. The Vatican, Sinitic, and Alexandrian MSS. omit the words "through his blood."*

Eph. i. 7. In whom we have deliverance through his blood, the passing over of transgressions, according to the abundance of His favour.

1 Peter i. 2. According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of spirit, for obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Anointed: favour to you and peace be multiplied!

1 John i. 7. But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Anointed His Son cleanseth us from all sin.

John vi. 53. Jesus therefore said to them, Verily, verily I say to you, if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in yourselves. 54. He who is eating my flesh, and drinking my blood, has age-enduring life; and I will raise him up for the last day. 55. For my flesh truly is food, and my blood truly is drink. 56. He who is eating my flesh, and drinking my blood, in me remains, and I in him. 57. According as the living Father sent me, and I live through the Father, he also who is eating me, even that one shall live through me.

Rom. v. 9. Much more, then, having been justified now in his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

Acts xx. 28. Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit made you overseers, to feed the ecclesia of God, which he hath acquired through his own blood.

1 Cor. xi. 27. So that whoever may eat the bread, or may drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

29. For he who is eating and drinking unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.

Rev. i. 5. To him having loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood: 6, And made us kings and priests for God, even his Father: to him *be* the glory and the power for the ages of the ages! Amen.

Rev. v. 9. And they sing a new song, saying: "Worthy art thou to take the scroll, and to open its seals: because thou wast slain, and didst redeem us for God in thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation: 10, And didst make us for our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

Rev. vii. 14. These are they coming out of the great tribulation: and they washed their robes, and made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb.

Rev. xii. 11. And they conquered him through the blood of the Lamb, and through the word of their testimony, and they loved not their life (soul) even to death.

CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE FOREGOING.

1.—That the blood of Jesus was physically the same as that which flows in the veins of the whole human family: and as "the life of the flesh (Heb. *nephesh, soul*) is in the blood" (Lev. xvii. 11), the life which Jesus had "in the days of his flesh" (Heb. v. 7), must have been physically the same as ours.

2.—As this cannot be gainsayed, we conclude that it is not by virtue of birth the blood of Jesus has power to redeem us.

3.—By birth, the blood which flowed in the veins of Jesus testifies to brotherhood to both Jew and Gentile, and also to heirship to the covenants of promise.

4.—By the blood which flowed from the veins of Jesus at his death ("the shed blood") the promises were made sure; the covering for sin provided; the atonement made; and an entrance procured into the Holies.

5.—This wonderful virtue lay in the fact that, although the blood flowed from the veins of one "who was numbered with the transgressors:" yet it came out of a heart purified by faith, and a body washed with pure water, that had passed guiltless through the severest tribulation; and therefore represented an unblemished life and a spotless character.

6.—That mere innocence of life was not sufficient for such a great work, or the shed blood of an infant of days would have sufficed: because our Heavenly Father does not require needless suffering.

7.—The practical value of the blood of Jesus to us lies in the following facts, in which it speaks to us. (a) Of the love of God for us, in providing a victim to make sure the promises to ALL the seed; who

should be a sin coverer; a peacemaker; and a High Priest in the Holies for the household of faith. And in imparting to him such wisdom, and knowledge, and understanding—such wealth of His own Spirit—that he could resist and overcome such grievous trials and afflictions as were necessary to be borne, to perfect and fit him to become the captain of our salvation. (b) Of the love of Jesus Anointed for us, in undergoing such a life of suffering for the aforesaid objects; and, also, that by the example of his life of suffering obedience, we might perceive and appreciate how exalted the glory, and abundant the riches of the inheritance; for the attainment of which so much is required: and endeavour to become worthy of attaining to the prize, by imitating his sinless life, so that we

may share in his spotless character.

8.—The more vividly this glorious work is impressed upon our minds, the more this blood of sprinkling operates on our lives and conduct, increasing our understanding, our faith, and our love. And so, our minds are gradually assimilated to the Divine Mind, and our own natural will loosens its hold upon us; thus we become obedient children, not fashioned in accordance with our former ignorant desires; “but according as He who called you *is* holy, ye also become holy in all behaviour.”—(1 Pet. i. 15.)

9.—Those who imagine that the blood of Jesus has any virtue to cleanse them from their sins, whilst they continue in their old course of life, are deceiving themselves.

S. RICHARDS.

CONDEMNATION IN ADAM AND JUSTIFICATION IN CHRIST:—

A PARALLEL.

In Romans v. 12-19, the apostle Paul draws the parallel referred to in the above heading, and, as our present remarks will have almost exclusive reference to that passage, we will ask our readers carefully to peruse it before proceeding further.

In verse 14 the apostle says that Adam was “the *figure* of him that was to come,” *i.e.*, Christ, and he then proceeds to point out in what respect he was a figure, *viz.*, that just as sin and condemnation came through Adam, so righteousness and justification came through Christ. The passage has therefore usually, and, as we contend, correctly, been understood to mean that on the one hand the condemnation of Adam had reference, not to himself only, but to all his descendants, who, being, so to speak, *in him* at the time, were, whether actual transgressors or not, condemned *federally* in him; and that on the other hand all who are immersed into the name of Christ on a belief of the truth are justified *federally* in Christ, not through any righteousness of their own, but through the righteousness of Christ. It may be well, before proceeding further, to explain that we use the word “*federally*” in the sense in which it is generally applied to Adam and Christ, and which may be illustrated by

the case of the United States of America, called “the Federal States.” All the States in the Union, though having separate legislative and executive bodies of their own, are united together for certain political purposes, and there is a general legislative body and a general executive body which represents the united whole. Whatever is done by that general executive body in its official capacity binds all the States in the Union, and the result of its action may be felt separately by the several States, though they may have taken no separate action in the matter; for what is done by the general executive is accounted by other nations, so far as regards the action of the latter, as having been done by the various States and by the whole people. In this sense we use the word “*federally*” in relation to Adam and Christ, and the old and new “creations” or bodies of which they are the respective heads, that is to say that what is done by the head is in a sense accounted as having been done by the members of the body, and what is done to the head is also done to the members of the body.

In opposition to the usual view of this passage, it has been asserted that the condemnation passed upon Adam applied to himself only, and not to any of his descendants, and that such of them as are

condemned are condemned only for their own sins—that although the condemnation, or the “judgment to condemnation,” is said (verse 18) to have come upon all men “by the offence of one” (Adam), the “all men” are not all the descendants of Adam, but simply all who have individually sinned, and come under condemnation, and that the condemnation does not come upon them *directly*, in the sense of their being *condemned in him*, but only *indirectly*; that is to say, that by the transgression of Adam, sin entered into the world, and, in consequence of his having become a sinner, his descendants inherit from him a sinful nature, and that although such of them as become actual sinners are condemned only for their sins, yet that as their sinning was due in the first place to Adam’s having sinned, and their inheriting his nature, their condemnation is said to have come “by his offence.” It is further said that although (verse 17) “by one man’s offence death reigned by one,” this death is not a condemnation, but simply the operation of a simple law which is said to have existed in Adam previously to his transgression, and which, when he transgressed, was allowed to take its natural course, and that natural death, though resulting from Adam’s sin, does not come as a *condemnation* upon his descendants.

According to this view, the parallel between Adam and Christ would consist of this: that Adam introduced sin into the world, and the fact of his having a sinful nature made his descendants sinful also, by giving them a bent or impetus to commit sin; and that Christ introduced righteousness, and his having worked righteousness made those who are “in him” righteous, by giving them a bent or impetus to do what is right.

In reference to the statement that Adam’s descendants are not condemned federally in him for his sin, the obvious reply—apart from the direct testimony on the point in verses 16 and 18—is that this necessarily follows in order to carry out the parallel, inasmuch as those who are justified are justified *federally* in Christ: they stand accepted by God, not for their own righteousness, but because they are clothed with Christ’s righteousness, and those who are accepted at the judgment will not be accepted in their own righteousness, but in the righteousness of Christ. It is true that their “continuance in well-doing” (Rom.

ii. 7) is necessary to their salvation, and that it is only “he that shall endure unto the end” that “shall be saved” (Matt. xxiv. 13), and hence it is said that “the Son of Man shall reward every man according to his works” (Matt. xvi. 27); but this “well-doing” is not the real ground of acceptance, for if it stood alone it would not entitle any to be rewarded: it is simply the condition necessary to the retaining of the robe of righteousness received through Christ.—(Heb. iii. 14; Phil. iii. 8, 9.) Those who are rejected are rejected because, by neglecting the conditions laid down, they have not retained that robe of righteousness (Matt. xxii. 11-14; Rev. xvi. 15); and hence those who are accepted, though obedience is a necessary *condition* of their acceptance, are really *accepted on the basis of the righteousness of Christ*, or, in other words, are accepted or justified *federally* in him. Hence, to carry out the parallel, the descendants of Adam must be condemned (*federally*) in him.

In answer to this our objectors again say that as the justification in Christ is dependent on certain conditions—viz., faith and obedience—with which God requires compliance, so there are what may be termed “conditions”—viz., disobedience—connected with the condemnation of Adam; in other words, that although the condemnation *results* from Adam’s sin in the manner pointed out, yet it only comes to any particular descendant of Adam when he himself has fulfilled the “conditions,” by transgressing some law of God.

It would be a sufficient answer to this objection to point out that the apostle does not introduce any condition into the parallel, and that as he (or rather, the Spirit speaking through him) evidently deemed the parallel complete without the conditions, there is no necessity for our introducing them in order to complete it. We may go further than this, however, and show that their introduction, instead of completing the parallel, produces a considerable amount of confusion, but that so far as the “conditions” can consistently be applied, they really destroy the objection urged by those who insist on this introduction. It may be taken as an axiom that if, in the interpretation of any Scripture type, figure, or parable, the introduction of any details not mentioned produces confusion between the type and the antitype, those details should be disregarded in the

consideration of the matter.

In the first place, as the way in which people are connected with Adam is so different from the way in which they become connected with Christ, it is obvious that a complete parallel cannot be drawn; but so far as any parallel can be found on this point, we shall see that it by no means supports the theory we are combating. We become connected with the first Adam by natural birth, and with the second Adam by birth of water. Now we receive the justification *at the birth of water*, and have not, after becoming connected with Christ, to wait until we have worked out a righteousness of our own in order to be justified. So, therefore, if we carry out the parallel in regard to our connection with Adam, we have not to wait until we have *sinned* for the condemnation to come upon us, but we are condemned in him because of his sin, and we experience the physical effects of that condemnation on being born into the present evil state of things, just as we shall experience the physical effects of our justification on being born of the Spirit into the better state of things to be established by Christ at his return.

In the second place, the theory we are considering completely destroys the apostle's parallel, for it represents those of the descendants of Adam who are condemned, as being condemned specifically for their own sins, and for those alone. If this be true, how are they condemned *in Adam*? In no sense whatever: they would, in that case be condemned *individually*, not *in him*. Now there are only two ways in which we can apply the figure of the apostle, viz., (1) that all the descendants of Adam were condemned *in him* on account of his sin, just as those in Christ are accepted *in him* on account of his righteousness; or (2) that as Adam introduced sin, and thus led others to sin, so Christ introduced righteousness, and led others to work righteousness; but that those who are condemned are condemned for their own sins, and those who are justified are justified for their own righteousness. Now the idea that those in Christ are justified for their own righteousness is utterly inadmissible, being contrary to the express teaching of the New Testament, and therefore

parallel No. 2 falls to the ground and we are driven to the conclusion that parallel No. 1 is what the apostle intended to teach.

Viewing that as the apostle's meaning, we are enabled to explain some things in the passage which cannot be explained on the other hypothesis. For instance, in verse 16 we read, "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was *BY ONE TO CONDEMNATION*, but the free gift is of *MANY OFFENCES* unto justification." Now if it were true that this condemnation is for individual offences, the apostle might have said that the judgment was of *MANY OFFENCES TO CONDEMNATION*, and he might have pointed out the parallel between that and the fact that the free gift has to do with *JUSTIFICATION FROM MANY OFFENCES*. But he expressly draws a contrast—"not as it was by one that sinned," &c.,—showing that he had not in his mind the theory we are combating, but that he intended to teach that the condemnation of which he is speaking came upon the race federally in Adam.

From the foregoing we see that the introducing of the "conditions" on each side produces confusion, and destroys the apostle's "figure" or parallel, and therefore that such conditions are no part of the parallel, which must, therefore, be understood without them, and if so understood, there can be no doubt as to the teaching of the passage.

The effect of the theory referred to, in its application to the apostle's figure, is to exalt personal righteousness at the expense of the righteousness of Christ; for as we have seen, the statement that the sins of those who are condemned are the sole ground of their condemnation, involves the conclusion that the righteousness of those who are justified is the sole ground of their justification. Doubtless the propounders of the theory would not urge, or even admit, this conclusion, but nevertheless it is what logically flows from it, and, as the apostasy has amply proved, the denial or disparagement of a doctrine often springs out of something which is not at the first intended to have such an effect, but which, in the end, leads to it by necessitating the "squaring" of other facts of Scripture so as to fit in with the theory which is desired to be upheld.

A. ANDREW, London.

THE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST IN RELATION TO THE MANIFESTATION OF GOD IN HIM.

ANOTHER error is advocated among some professing the truth, and, as usual, it is the result of one part of the truth being unskillfully used to the destruction of another part. Jesus was the manifestation of the Father in human nature. Therefore, argue the new errorists, he was not the subject of probation, but simply the passive medium for the exhibition of the moral attributes of God, possessing no independent will of his own, and no power of choice between good and evil, but simply yielding to the uncontrollable impulse which used him for manifestation. The seriousness of this error lies in its practical denial of the obedience of Christ, and therefore of the glory appertaining to him as the Son, of whom it is testified that he was "tempted in all points like unto his brethren (Heb. iv. 15), but "overcame" (Rev. iii. 21). and was consequently approved of the Father (Is. liii. 12; Ps. xci. 14; Matt. iii. 17), and rewarded by elevation to the position of universal lordship (Phil. ii. 9, 10.) It destroys for us our great High Priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities.

The error springs from the application of human reasoning to the testified ways of God. If, say the errorists, Jesus was God manifest in the flesh, he could not be otherwise than righteous. In a sense this is true; but it is using this truth with an unscriptural result when it is made to exclude the fact that the individual Jesus had a separate volition and character of his own, which was put to the proof under trial, and who "doing no sin," became to his brethren a captain and example, who learnt obedience by the things that he suffered. The two facts (that Jesus was God manifest and

that he learnt obedience in suffering,) are consistent one with another, as is evident from the fact that they are both testified; and they are in their nature consistent. God manifestation resulted in a new person—the Son; and this Son was made "perfect through suffering." It is only a narrow and unenlightened mode of reasoning that extracts from the one truth the negation of the other.

In two senses, the mistake is not a new one. It belongs, in the first place, to the entire religion of the Roman Mother. It is a peculiarity of the reasonings of the apostasy on the subject of God and His Christ, to destroy the probationary character of Christ's life in the flesh, and his relation to his brethren as the Elder Brother and firstborn in the house of God. And it is not the first time the notion has been ventilated by modern professors of the truth. Ten years ago it found advocates in America, and elicited the pamphlet by Dr. Thomas's daughter, entitled *The Origin and Nature of the Lord Jesus*, which first appeared as an article in the *Ambassador*, vol. IV., p. 85. This article was published with the consent and under the supervision of Dr. Thomas, and in it occur the words: "We do not say that Christ could not sin," which constitutes an express indication of the Dr.'s mind (though dead) on the subject now raised anew to the distress of some in the truth. When we are told that this idea of Christ's probation "hung as a cloud" over the Dr.'s writings on the subject, we can only wonder at the presumption which affects a superior discernment to Dr. Thomas on a subject pre-eminently requiring the power of balancing various parts of truth; and marvel also at the facility possessed by some of blinding

themselves to the explicit testimony of the Word. Scripturally enlightened minds can only dissent emphatically (if with sorrow) from those who would take from us so precious a part of the truth as Christ's brotherhood to us.

The subject is illustrated in its several bearings in the following correspondence. We suppress names from a desire to leave the door open for conciliation:—

Birmingham, 7th Jan., 1876.

DEAR BROTHER ———.—I am invited by the brethren in ——— road to visit and lecture in ———; but I do not wish by accepting their invitation to appear in opposition to you if you are not in opposition to the truth. If you recognise and acknowledge that Jesus in the days of his flesh overcame by the voluntary subjection of his own will to the requirements of the Father who sent him, I will not come to ———, except at the joint invitation of those with you and those now inviting me.

I am one with you in strenuously upholding the great truth that Jesus was the manifestation of the Creator of heaven and earth; but any interpretation of this doctrine which excludes the individual and willing part performed by Christ the Son in the object of the manifestation, I cannot but regard as an interference with a very important part of the truth with which I could not feel at liberty to be identified. I shall be glad if this result does not belong to your position; but that on the contrary, you recognise the work of the Son as well as the work of the Father in connection with it.

Desiring, if I may on scriptural grounds, to be in fraternal co-operation with you and those with you, faithfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Birmingham, 14th Jan., 1876.

DEAR BROTHER ———.—I hope you will not deny me the courtesy of an answer to the question I addressed to you eight days ago, with the desire to be able to co-operate with you in the work of the gospel. I sincerely entertain that desire. Division is most odious to me from every point of view. Sometimes it has to be accepted—nay initiated; but it is always as painful as it is hurtful in its results; and when I am invited to accept it, as in the present case, I desire

to be quite sure there is reason for my doing so. I have not yet accepted it as a finality. The intelligence in the *Christadelphian* from ——— I was careful to report as to the formation of a second ecclesia, that the way might be kept open for a right relation of things. It is in your power to preserve this right relation by an avowal of the truth in the particular matter now in question. I hope you will do so in a form that will admit of no doubt or hesitation on the part of those who desire to be at one with you; but who, at the same time, cannot be guilty of a compromise of the truth.

I do not invite you to argue the question, but merely to answer my letter of eight days ago. Silence can lead to no good result. Faithfully your brother,
ROBERT ROBERTS.

——— *Jan. 14th, 1876.*

DEAR BRO. ROBERTS—We are in receipt of yours of the 7th inst. We do not know whether you have made yourself acquainted with the notions held by those in ——— road, concerning the subject of "God Manifestation," but it may be presumed you have, considering your close alliance with them, and evident predilection for their position. However this may be, it shall not deter us from telling you what we firmly believe, and having done so, we must leave you to shape your course in relation to us just as you please. If you accept our position we shall be glad for the truth's sake and your own, but if you do not, we shall not be disturbed by any indifference or opposition which may be manifested.

1.—We believe and teach, that *Jesus Christ* of the New Testament, is Jehovah of the old.

2.—That *Jesus Christ* was the *Word*, was DEITY, and that therefore *Jesus Christ* was BEFORE manifestation.

3.—That *Deity* manifest in flesh—the *Word* made flesh, was, *Jesus Christ* come in flesh.

4.—That *Jesus Christ, the Word, the Deity*, are all *one* and the *same*, whether *before* or in manifestation, and are the *same yesterday* (before Abraham), *to-day* (from Moses till now), and for ever (yet to come.)

5.—That the *Son of Deity* was a multiple of the *one invisible Deity*, now made *visible* in flesh, and that flesh was the son of the man David.

6.—That the *conception* of this Son of

Deity and Son of Man was *not miraculous*, but *natural*, being by *flesh*—(flesh could do nothing miraculous)—but the *begettal* of this son was *altogether miraculous*.

7.—That in this begettal, *the Word*, or *Spirit*, or *Jesus Christ*, literally became *flesh seed of David*, as really so as if David himself had been the begetter, —herein was an astounding miracle —that a woman who knew not a man should have by spirit out of itself deposited in her the womb seed of man, even David's, which, when nourished by her blood and born, was now constituted *seed* or *child* of the woman. In affirming this, we entirely repudiate the idea that the *seed germ* was *formed or created out of the substance of the woman*—neither *creation* nor mere *formation* is *begettal*.

8.—We believe that Jesus Christ was the *Lord of Hosts himself*, who was a sanctuary, yet, because of Israel's blindness as to the fact that the *Word, Jesus Christ, Deity, the Lord of Hosts himself*, had now become flesh, and was talking to them face to face. We say because of this he was a *stumbling stone*, and *rock of offence*; they stumbled at the *Word*, who said "I proceeded forth from the Father," and am, therefore, "the Son of the Deity"—*oral* testimony concerning which *living* testimony they styled *blasphemy*—for, said they "Because that thou *being a man* makest thyself *Deity*. Israel never stumbled at his being the Son of *Man*, but they did at his being the Son of *Deity*, therefore this Deity in manifestation, at which they were offended, was the *stone* (of Israel) with seven eyes—the *rock* of Israel, even the rock *Christ*, which went with Israel in the wilderness, and of whom they all drank the living water—*this stone* is the chief corner stone, and all who would not be ashamed must build thereon.

9.—We believe that Deity, the *Word*, was made in flesh form to exhibit to men in flesh, *His own divine character*—this character was the *writing*, the *writer* was *Deity*—the tablet was the *flesh* upon which the law was written in *living lessons*—and as the first tablets on Sinai were the providing and writing of *Deity*, so it was with the last tablet; those for whom the lessons were intended were Israelites. When, therefore, the *Word* became *flesh of Israel*, an extraordinary spectacle presented itself before men, absolutely unique, viz.: the *law*, the *divine commandment itself*, and the *flesh* to whom it had been given, and from

which its obligations were demanded, were *both embodied* as a *living person*,—in other words, *the commandment* was *Jesus Christ*, who was now "come in flesh."—So Paul argues, Rom. x. 1-10, from Deu. xxx. 11-14. Understanding this, we shall see that the *Word* in becoming an Israelite, entered practically into the wants, the physical weakness, the sufferings, the disabilities, the curses and death of Israelites, so that He (Deity) having magnified His own law and made it honourable—having fulfilled every jot and tittle thereof—might of His *own* mercy and power *redeem* from *sin* and *death*, those who by reason of the weakness of the flesh, were victims thereof, and unable to redeem themselves or each other.

10.—We believe that the *Deity* was the *worker of the righteousness*, the *resister of the temptations* of ignorant tempters, the *overcomer of evil*, the *fulfiller of the law*, the *bearer of sin*, the *condemner of sin*, the *endurer of stripes*, the *sacrifice for sin*, the *offering* and the *High-Priestly offerer*, the *resurrection* and the *life*, the *King*, the *all*; and *Jesus Christ* come in flesh and now exalted, has been and is the form of this manifestation. The purpose of this manifestation, was not that *flesh* should have a *say*; flesh had had its say for 4,000 years, and now Deity would have *His*—therefore, "Be silent, O, all flesh."

XI.—We believe that in *Jesus Christ* or *Deity* come in flesh, only *one will* was or could be manifested, or exist, and this *one will* was by the continued operation of the spirit, the *result produced*. *Will* is the *initiatorystep of action*, commencing in the brain, therefore, if *Jesus Christ*, who came in flesh, even *willed*, in the direction of *disobedience*, then he was *morally* a sinner. Are we to admit this? Never! We affirm that not even the *thought* of foolishness or sin, or opposition to the Father's will, ever existed in him. Why? Because he was altogether a *moral* manifestation of *Deity* in flesh. You say *he could have disobeyed*, we deny it *in toto*. We grant that if *he* was *no more* than what nearly all Christadelphians say he was, then he could. But do they know him who speaks thus? We say they do not; and if you hold to that position, we tell you without any hesitation that you have yet a very imperfect knowledge of who and what he was and is. He was the *true God* and *eternal life*. Try to grasp this, bro. Roberts. But we

have it reiterated in our ears that some passages teach that he had a will of his own, as well as a will of his Father. This we deny; take the words: "I come not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me," and "not my will, but thine be done." All that these words imply is, that he had no will, action or desire in the matter, except that which was the Father's. If from these words of Jesus Christ, viz.: *my* and *mine*, we argue that he had a will separate and independent from the Father, we are bound to do the same in the matter of doctrine, for he says: "*My doctrine is not mine.*" Doubtless this passage will interpret the use of the words in the others. Does it not clearly mean that the will was not from the *flesh manifestation*, as to its authority, but from the *manifesting Spirit*. An angel might with truth say, "I come not to do *mine* own will;" but would anyone dream of saying that the angel, therefore, had a will of his own which was not to be done, but which could be used in opposition if he pleased. Also as to the passage: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, *not my will* but thine be done." Let us remember the form of manifestation was but flesh, and that none of its sensibilities were deadened. It could and did shrink from pain, even as it hungered and thirsted; neither did it as yet know all things or all the mind of the Father; therefore we may easily understand the words, as though he had said, "I as a flesh man do not know whether it is necessary for Thy purpose, O my Father, that I should now drink all this cup, in experiencing all this intense and continued agony; but if it is not let me be relieved; nevertheless, if it is, let it be done to me even as Thou wilt." But if you object to this, let me ask you a question: Do you believe, and are you prepared to show, that Jesus Christ, who came to do his Father's will, had a secret will not to do his Father's will, and, therefore, had moral inclination to transgression? (for, after all, it is a moral question when we say Jesus Christ could disobey or sin; and when we say he had a will which required subduing;) or will you say that he had a will to avoid what he knew the Father required of him in the way of suffering? If you are not prepared to do this, then you had better not use these words in the way you have done. Again, it is said, "He was made perfect through suffering;" true; but this

perfection was *not moral*, but *physical*: he was always perfect as to character, but not as to substance. Again, it is said, "he learnt obedience;" if you turn to 1 Tim. v. 13, you have the idea of "learn" as in this verse, where you will find it means "to acquire the habit by practice." Of course, the flesh had to be tutored and bent in all things in a given direction, but *who* was the tutor, the disciplinarian? Did the *flesh tutor itself*? Had it a controlling power of its own, or as you put it, a separate, independent will, by which it subjected itself or the flesh-will to the Father—nay, verily, was it not the Deity Spirit that tutored and crucified the flesh, keeping it dead all the way through? Well, so we believe; and we would say that if, in this instance, the flesh had got hold of a good independent will of its own, which could and would do such good things, then Turney may not be so far wrong after all; and certainly flesh, in such a case, had for once somewhat over which to glory. But was it so? No, No! Deity it was who held the flesh in grasp, so that through it He might manifest His lessons of obedience, His righteousness, His truth, so that *no* flesh should glory in His sight, but might glory in Him to whom all glory belonged. Now bro. Roberts, we think you need not mistake *our* position, whether you have that of *others* or not. One thing we and others have noticed in reference to your magazine, viz.: for four or five months its tone has been much lowered, arising as we believe from the position which you have taken in reference to this question; in your treatment of it, you have put Deity to the back ground, and have exalted flesh, placing it to the front, (it may be ignorantly,) and God will not suffer this indignity with impunity; you cannot be blessed in such a course, therefore we exhort you to beware lest you so grieve Him that He leave you to your idol of *flesh*, from which we are commanded to keep ourselves. Praying that you may come to a perfect knowledge and ready acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, we are faithfully yours in the hope of eternal life,

On behalf of the meeting in ———

64, BELGRAVE ROAD,

Birmingham, 21st Jan., 1876.

DEAR BROTHER ———.—I am in receipt of your letter, and would have

replied sooner, but that I have been busy with the February *Christadelphian*.

I wish I could answer you in a way that would lead to harmony. It is my grief that I cannot. It is hurtful to ourselves and hurtful to the cause of the truth we have in hand, that we should have disagreements on first principles, leading to disputations and divisions. Above all, I grieve to appear to be in opposition to the great truth which I firmly and fervently believe: that Jesus of Nazareth was the manifestation of the Eternal God in human nature. But it is unavailing to bewail my grief. I can only accept the situation as it stands, and do my duty, as in the sight of Him who knows the heart, and will at last give to every man according to his ways.

There is much that is true in your letter; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that by an unskillful use of what is true, you destroy another part of the truth which is equally important: and that part of the truth is, that while Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, and therefore the arm of Jehovah in the execution of the work which he was sent to do, he, as the Son of God, had a part of that work to do, in the rendering of a free and unconstrained obedience to the commandments of the Father, under circumstances that made obedience difficult and the rendering of it a victory, which free, loving, willing, intelligent obedience is the ground of his exaltation, and the basis of his headship over all the saints of God. This proposition I may prove further on (though I should have thought it unnecessary of proof).

Meanwhile I will notice *seriatim* some of the fallacies, as I conceive them to be, in your list of definitions. Passing over the impropriety of calling Deity before manifestation, Jesus Christ, without qualification, seeing that the name in scriptural use is only applied to "the man Christ Jesus." I notice that in proposition 5, you teach two sons—one a subdivision of the invisible Father, and the other "the son of the man David." The scriptural mode of description is that the child born of Mary was the Son of God (Luke 1. 35), and that the Deity-power in Christ was the Father, not the Son. I can see a reason for your making this distinction. You do not wish to deny in terms that the Son of God obeyed the Father; yet you aim to refuse this admission to the man born of Mary, and

so you take away the Divine Sonship from the man, and attach it to the invisible power that begot him. But in this, which exactly suits the logical exigencies of your position, you manifest its unscripturalness, for surely nothing is more obvious to the attentive Scripture reader than the fact that the Son of God was he who was the seed of David according to the flesh—named the Son of God, because begotten of God by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. Surely you will not say that the Holy Spirit was the Son of God. Trinitarianism would join hands readily with your proposition. I see in proposition 7 you distinctly call the Spirit "Jesus Christ." This is a confusion of terms. The Spirit was doubtless the basis of the manifestation presented to view in the man Christ Jesus; but the name Jesus Christ is not the name of the Spirit, but of the man through whom God by the Spirit wrought and spoke. Let us use terms as the Scriptures use them, and there will be more possibility of understanding each other. To say that Jesus Christ became flesh is both an unscriptural proposition, and one that does not define the facts of the case. I could understand a Trinitarian asserting this.

In proposition 10 the mischief of your doctrine as regards the position of our Lord and Master (who is our head as God is his head), comes out with exactness of definition. You say "Deity was the worker of righteousness, the resister of temptation, the overcomer of evil, the fulfiller of the law," &c., and that Jesus was but "the form of the manifestation." While not denying Christ's work to be the work of God as regards its initiation, superintendence, and assistance, I see great objection to defining Christ as merely a "form" of the Father's work. He was the form of it in the scriptural sense; but this form comprehended a man who humbled himself, of whom obedience was required and rendered, who was made perfect through suffering, who was tempted in all points like as we are, but who overcame. By making him "the form" of it in the sense of being a passive instrument, without intelligent choice and volition, used irresistibly by a superior invisible control, you take away His individuality, and the glory of his position as the triumphant captain of our salvation. You obliterate the principle which led the Father to observe this mode in our salvation, the principle, namely, of voluntary obedience under trial, of which

Christ is the first fruits, of whom it is testified that "since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead," viz.: by his *obedience*, through which many will be constituted righteous. And you entirely deprive of intelligible meaning the statements made concerning Christ. Let me give you a few of those statements, and then ask you to contemplate them when worded to suit your theory.

I.—THE FATHER SPEAKS THUS OF THE SON.

- 1.—Isa. liii. 12: "My righteous servant shall justify many; he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore, I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong *because* he hath poured out his soul unto death."
- 2.—Ps. xci. 14: "Because he hath set his love upon Me, *therefore* I will deliver him."
- 3.—Matt. iii. 17; Luke ix. 35: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am *well pleased*: hear ye him."

II.—JESUS SPEAKS THUS OF HIMSELF:

- 1.—Jno. xv. 10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as *I have kept my Father's commandments* and abide in His love."
- 2.—Jno. x. 17: "Therefore doth my Father love me, *because* I lay down my life for the sheep."
- 3.—Jno. viii. : "Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told the truth which I have heard of God."
- 4.—Jno. viii. 54. "If I should say I know Him not, I shall be a liar like unto you; but I know Him and keep His saying."
- 5.—Jno. xiv. 1: "Ye believe in God, believe also in me."
- 6.—John xx. 21: "As my Father hath sent me, so have I sent you."
- 7.—John xx. 17: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God,"
- 8.—Rev. iii. 21: "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I grant that he sit with me on my throne, even as *I also overcame*, and am sat down with my Father on His throne."

III.—APOSTLES AND PROPHETS TESTIFY OF HIM THUS:

- 1.—Heb. xii. 2: "For the joy set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand

of the throne of God. Consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds."

- 2.—1 Pet. ii. 21-23: "He left us an example that we should follow in his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. . . . When he suffered, he threatened not, but *committed himself to Him that judgeth righteously*; who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree."
- 3.—Psalm xlv. 7: "Thou lovedst righteousness and hatest wickedness. Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."
- 4.—Heb. v. 7-9: "Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up strong supplications, in strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a son, yet learnt he obedience by the things that he suffered, and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him."

There are many other examples, but these are such as cannot be mistaken or turned from their obvious meaning. They conclusively show the impropriety of your style of definition when employed without qualification, as you employ it, with reference to Christ. Suppose we try to read any of them in harmony, for instance, with the beginning of your proposition VII., that "Jesus Christ was the *Lord of Hosts himself*." The importance of illustrating this point is my apology for the apparent irreverence of the attempt. If I speak as a fool, it is because you have compelled me.

I.—JEHOVAH'S DECLARATIONS:

- 1.—"I, the Lord of Hosts myself, will justify many; I shall bear their iniquities; therefore shall I divide myself a portion with the great; . . . because I have poured out my soul unto death."
- 2.—"Because I, the Lord of Hosts myself, have set my love upon myself, therefore, I will deliver myself."
- 3.—"This is I myself in whom I am well pleased; hear me."

II.—THE SAYINGS OF JESUS:

- 1.—"If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love even as I the Lord of Hosts myself have kept my commandments and abide in my love."

2.—“Therefore do I the Lord of Hosts love myself, because I lay down my life for my sheep.”

3.—“Ye seek to kill me, the Lord of Hosts himself, who hath told you the truth which I have heard from myself.”

And so on.

III.—SAYINGS OF PROPHETS AND APOSTLES CONCERNING CHRIST :

1.—For the joy set before the Lord of Hosts himself, he endured the cross and despised the shame, and is now set down at his own right hand.”

2.—“When the Lord of Hosts himself suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to himself, who judgeth righteously.”

And so on.

This is the best demonstration of the fallacy that underlies your attempt to exclude the obedience of Jesus, the Son of God, through the subjection of his own will to the will of Him who sent him. What you say as to His character being a divine writing is unexceptionable, but you fail to give the right scope to the idea. God made Jesus what he was by the Spirit in his begetting. On the seed of the woman was engraved the Father's moral likeness, but this was latent in the babe of Bethlehem, and had to be developed in the man by those circumstances of suffering and trial to which he was subjected. Hence the statement of Paul, that in bringing many sons to glory, “it became him to make the Captain of their salvation *perfect through suffering.*” You say this was physical perfection. At this I am astounded. Does suffering engender physical perfection? Rather the contrary: suffering deteriorates physical nature. Adam was more perfect physically before he suffered than after. Not suffering, but the healing influence of the Spirit of God in the change to immortality makes the physical man perfect. But the moral man, the character, can only be perfected through suffering. Called upon to perform painful acts of obedience, our character of submission to God is more perfected, strengthened, settled, than it could ever be if the path of obedience was a path of pleasure. The character latent in the man Christ Jesus when a babe, and gradually ripened as he advanced in years and stature, was perfected by the sufferings he was called on to go through in the end of his career. That you should

have to so misapply the words of Paul is evidence of itself, that the ground you have taken is wrong.

Your remark that flesh had had “its say” for 4,000 years, and that now, at the appearing of Jesus, “Deity would have His,” is not a happy one or accurate. So far as God is concerned, flesh had never been allowed to have its “say.” God had always chosen to say and command “at sundry times and divers manners.” God has from the very beginning spoken unto the Fathers by the prophets, and concluded his communications by a Son, into whose mouth he put his word.—(Deut. xviii. 19; Isa. li. 16.) The manner of speaking was more complete and perfect in the Son, but it was only a continuation of what had occurred in other forms before. If the idea intended to be expressed by your remarks were correct, Jesus ought not to have come in the flesh at all, but God should have spoken directly in his unveiled glory, whereas Christ was made in all points like as we are.

Into your metaphysical definitions of the origin and action of will considered as an abstraction, it is unnecessary to follow you. They are beside the question. We have to deal with proximate practical facts and testimonies, and not with philosophical speculations, which in all ages have only tended to obscure and make void the testimony of God. It is sufficient to understand will in the general sense of power to do. This is plain enough for the unlearned, and it was to this class the Gospel was sent. No one having any knowledge of Christ would affirm that he had a purpose to disobey, but that he had the power to disobey is implied by the very fact of his obedience. It would be a gross violation of language to use the word obedience of any act that was coerced or constrained. And if I say that Christ could have disobeyed, I make his obedience the more precious; because in that case his obedience is shewn to be the result of his own deliberate choice, and not a result over which having no control, he would be in relation to it but a machine. Your denial that he had a will of his own, is the really mischievous part of your doctrine on this subject. By this you obliterate the Son, and destroy that part of the work of God which was accomplished by his obedience.

Your effort to sustain this doctrine consists of using one part of the truth to destroy another. Your explanation of difficulties in the way of your theory is the

weakest part of your case. You do not dispose of the saying of Christ, "Not my will but Thine be done." You say it only means he had no will but that which was the Father's. This assertion does not get rid of Christ's express recognition of two wills, which is in harmony with the whole course of the testimony. You think it is explained by the saying, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me." It strikes me the effect of this is in the other direction. By "my doctrine" Jesus, of course, meant "the doctrine that I preach." He disclaimed the authority of it. He said he had heard it of God.—(John viii. 40.) In this we have another recognition of the individuality of the Son, who of himself could do nothing; and the Father who sanctified him and sent him into the world. Therefore, it rather strengthens than weakens the other statement showing that Jesus had a separate and independent volition, which he subjected to the requirements of the Father; or, as he says, "I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in His love." Your reference to the case of the angels is not apposite; first, because they are not in the likeness of sinful flesh; and secondly, because in all their communications they speak as God and not as instruments.—(See Ex. iii. 1, and many other instances which you will be acquainted with.)

But most unhappy of all are your comments on the prayer of Christ that the cup might pass. "Let us remember," you say, "that the form of manifestation was but flesh; none of its sensibilities deadened; it could and did shrink from pain, even as it hungered." I have already remarked on the objectionableness of regarding Christ as a "form" of manifestation merely. What are we to say of the argument which requires him to be spoken of as "it." Why not say "he?" The Scriptures say so: "He hungered;" "Suffer this cup to pass from me." The changing of "he" to "it" is another evidence of the fallacy of your position. Restore "him" to his place and you concede all I contend for. "It," say you, "did not as yet know all things, or all the mind of the Father." What "it" is this but *the Son*, who said, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, nor *the Son*, but the Father." What reasonable objection can you have to admit that the Son "could and did shrink from pain," &c. We have then an obvious explanation of the prayer, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; but

not my will but Thine be done."

I have already answered your question (so entirely unnecessary) whether Jesus had a will not to obey. His will, purpose, or decision was certainly in the direction of obedience; but this was his choice as the result of the reasons before his mind, and not a divine constraint. To use Paul's words, it was for "the joy set before him." And it was his merit as the Son, and the ground of the Father's approbation of the Son, as proved by the testimonies already quoted. This fact gives point and cogency to the exhortations: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. ii. 5); "Arm yourselves likewise with the same mind" (1 Pet. iv. 1); exhortations which, on your theory have no application. When you admit that Jesus shrank from pain, but submitted to the Father's requirements that he should suffer, you have before you the fact which you deny, that Jesus had a will which he subjected to the will of the Father. Your phrase, "moral inclination to transgression," is a needlessly offensive and utterly inapplicable description of the case. A simple and beautiful matter is obscured by wisdom of words: the words which the Holy Spirit teacheth define the matter abundantly.

You ask another question concerning Jesus Christ: "Did the flesh tutor itself?" as to which I have to say that your question is based on a wrong treatment of the subject. You speak of the "flesh" as an abstraction. It may be spoken of in this way when we allude to the general tendencies of flesh and blood left to itself, but it is out of place when speaking literally of Christ. Christ from the beginning was human nature in the hand of God for a special purpose, and when I speak of him (as in the case you object to) as having a separate and independent will, I speak of him as a whole—the man Christ Jesus—God manifest in the flesh. As such, I have abundantly shown that he—this personage—the Son of God, had a volition of his own which he subordinated to the commandment of the Father who sent him. You say, "in that case, the flesh had got hold of a good-will of its own." You might say so if I contended he was the son of Joseph, but seeing he was the word made flesh, there is no ground for your objection. God made the man Christ Jesus what he was, and therefore the glory is all to Him.

I believe I have now noticed everything in the nature of argument contained in

your epistle. It remains for me to say that your style of definition is objectionable as attempting to square divine methods with human deductions. The subject is a great one, and our only safety in the treatment of it lies in the acceptance of the testimony regarding it in its entirety. It is not for us to argue that because Jesus was the Word made flesh, therefore so and so must have been the fact. The simple question is what is testified? If we were left to reason as to the probable effects of Christ's relation to the Father, we should say he must from his origin have been immortal, omnipotent, omniscient, whereas we know from the testimony that he was mortal, weak and limited in his knowledge of the Father's ways. We cannot safely argue to a "sequence" from any declared work of God. We must be content to ask and accept facts. In this Dr. Thomas showed a marvellous fidelity to the testimony. He gave a place in his expositions to all parts of it. He not only taught that Jesus was the Father in manifestation, but he also taught that Jesus was left uncontrolled in his actions and free to disobey; and that he rendered a voluntary obedience. (*Eureka* i. page 107; *Phanerosis*, page 43, line 18, and many other parts of his writings). We cannot do better than follow his example. I will not give place for a moment to those who teach that in these things, Dr. Thomas neutralized one part of his teaching by another. I believe (because I perceive) that he finished his work, and so long as God spares me life I shall defend it against all comers. I resist "sequences" which, when logically worked out, eat into and destroy the system of the truth he so completely brought to light.

As to the suggestion at the close of your letter, that I have "taken" a new "position in reference to this question;" or the suggestion in the beginning of your letter, that I am guided in the matter by a "predilection" for certain persons, I repudiate both entirely. As I said to sister — yesterday, so I say to you, "I teach now exactly as I have taught for seventeen years. But changes in the form of error necessitate changes in the mode of repelling it. When the doctrine of Charles Dealtry was advocated, that Christ was the son of Joseph, and the doctrine of others following in the wake of it, that Christ, though not the son of Joseph, was no less mere man, it necessitated a prominent exhibition of the truth that Jesus was the manifestation of God in the flesh. But

in all my arguments and contentions on behalf of that phase of the mystery of godliness, I never said or dreamt that the man Christ Jesus, resulting from that manifestation, had no will of his own. I presumed that the fact affirmed of him, that he was obedient in all things, involved that so obviously, as to make such a thing unnecessary. I should as soon have thought it necessary, in view of the testimony that he walked, to have argued or stated that he had legs. But now we have another form of error advocated amongst us, and this necessitates the counter assertion of a truth which may not have been so prominent before; but which has all along been recognised and expressed. I said, more than twelve years ago, (*Twelve Lectures*, 4th ed., page 138): "He (Jesus) was tried and disciplined as Adam was, but succeeded where he failed." Again, page 159: "As a man he had to develop perfection of character by obedience, as a condition of fitness for the work assigned to him."

Because this is now opposed, this has now to be more distinctly insisted on, and leads to that apparent change which leads you to say that the *Christadelphian* has lowered its tone, and that I have taken a new position. But I would say, "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." There has been no change with me. The change is with you; and if I have "identified" myself with any who may be other than they ought to be, it is a necessity forced upon me in defence of the faith from another of many insidious attacks to which it has been at various times subjected at the hands of its professed friends.

Hoping by your subjection to the truth, even yet, I may be permitted to continue in unity and co-operation with you as heretofore, I remain, faithfully yours in hope of the day when the battle will be over.
ROBERT ROBERTS.

[From a Sister.]

DEAR BRO. ROBERTS.— * * *
Regarding the proposition you sent, I don't think I can give an unqualified *yes* or *no* to it. Had I been able to do so I would have written to you before now, and my mind has been so full of anxious cares of one kind or another that I have not been able to write earlier. We recognise the obedience of Jesus Christ to be *altogether* of the Father, whose righteousness he came to manifest. We do not deny that Jesus was

perfectly *conscious of the fact* that he was doing the will of God, and that he had pleasure in so doing; but we do not believe that he had any will or inclination to disobey. We are of opinion that your proposition covers the idea that he obeyed his Father by means of a will which he had separate and independent of God, and by which he triumphed over sin and death. Whereas we ascribe the glory of this victory to Jehovah Himself, who says regarding Jesus "Behold my servant whom I uphold. I have put my Spirit upon him, he shall not fail nor be discouraged." Excuse me, my dear brother Roberts, for writing even so much. You know all this as well as any one, and, as far as I understand you, have never taught anything different on this subject, until you identified yourself with the mal-contents in ———

64, *Belgrave Road, Jan. 21st. 1876.*

DEAR SISTER ——— I am truly grieved we should be discussing first principles at this late period of the day; and if personal considerations ruled with me, I should have cause to be even more than grieved that you should attribute the fact to my having changed. I refer to your remark that I taught so and so "until I identified myself with the mal-contents in ———," which of course implies that I do not teach now what I taught then. I am so accustomed, however, to vexatious things that it does not hurt me much. I teach now exactly as I have taught for seventeen years (see extract in foregoing letter to bro. ———) For instance, in the *Lectures* (page 138, line 16), I said more than twelve years ago, 5th edition, "He was tried and disciplined as Adam was; but succeeded where Adam failed;" and again, page 139, line 28, "As a man he had to develop perfection of character by obedience as a condition of fitness for the work assigned to him." Dr. Thomas says the same thing in *Eureka I*, page 107, and in other places to which I might refer if necessary. These suffice to prove what I now say — that the cause of present misunderstanding lies not in any change with me, but with those who have influenced you. This in fact is acknowledged by them. They describe their new doctrine as a "sequence" not formerly perceived, from premises hitherto admitted: and it is part of their case that Dr. Thomas has neutralised one part of his teaching by another. I state these things, not on hearsay. Therefore be pleased, sister ———, to recognise the situation candidly. Do not attribute the change to

me; perceive that you are being dragged from your moorings by change in others, and if I have "identified myself" with any who may be "mal-content," it is a necessity forced upon me in defence of the faith from another of many insidious attacks to which it has been subjected at the hands of professed friends. That Christ "*humbled himself*;" "pleased not himself," "laid down his life" in spite of natural aversion to death; and "overcame" in drinking a cup which it was bitter to drink, are all matters of testimony, and alleged to be the foundation of the Father's approbation of him. The new-fangled and narrow-minded exposition of God-manifestation emanating from ——— destroys this truth, alleging that Christ had no share in his own obedience but that it was "altogether of the Father." God forbid that I should intercept His glory in Christ. But I prefer to see and rejoice to see His glory in the way He has made it to shine, and not in a way that frustrates the very object He had in begetting to himself a son; and reduces Christ to a mere machine, "conscious" of being employed, but not himself contributing to the work. If we separate, it will not be because I love mal-contents, but because I will follow the truth, if it cost me every friend I have.

Faithfully yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

Jan. 22nd, 1876.

DEAR BROTHER ROBERTS, — I acknowledge at once that I have been mistaken as to what you have taught on the subject of God-manifestation. Since my baptism I have not read *Twelve Lectures*, and my ideas of your position in this matter are formed from your more recent writings. Hence my mistake. In looking over the *Christadelphian* for 1874 I find many places giving the same idea we hold; and in that for January, page 41, you put it even more forcibly than I have heard bro. ——— do "He" (Jesus) "was an instrument, yet the operator in manifestation." You then speak of giving place to both sides of the shield, which I believe we do, in seeing Jesus to be a reflection of the Divine character, therefore could not be tempted to sin; but physically, like ourselves, in sin's flesh.

I know that Dr. Thomas says he was on probation, for I have read *Eureka* on the subject; but the Scriptures give no such idea, and no one would gather it from the Dr's last writings on God-manifestation. He has done much for the truth, and we are all his debtors; but he was not

perfect in knowledge. When proving to the Gentiles that we hold the truth on the nature of man, we do not refer them to the Dr.'s works. Why should we do so in the present case? It would be different if we only wished to have the opinion of the brethren, then would the Dr. stand the very first.

Allow me to assure you, brother Roberts, I am candidly wishing to recognise the situation, and I am quite sure you have no desire but for the truth. To know that my last grieved you, is to me a grief indeed; but as I never heard anyone assert that Jesus could be tempted to sin, till it went from _____, you can easily see how I made the mistake. I take "humbled himself," "pleas'd not himself," in the same way that we take "Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;" and his natural aversion to intense suffering—no sin; but a proof of physical weakness.

Will you be angry with me if I say that I think you don't see brother _____'s position? Either that, or I don't. Doubtless you will say the latter is the more likely of the two. The H. _____ R. _____ people say "Jesus could sin;" we say *he could not*, inasmuch as he was a manifestation of Deity, and the man Christ Jesus cannot be considered apart from Deity. We know that he had "to overcome," &c." And if anyone would ask, "*How did he do it?*" we could only answer as I think you do in *The Slain Lamb*: "God did it." We believe he had a will of his own, even the Father's, whose will he came to do; but he had no will separate and independent of God.

If I am to lose your friendship in the truth, because of what I have just written, it is useless for me to say what the loss will be, as it is only left for me quietly to submit. I am thoroughly convinced, however, that whatever you do your motives are true and good; but *please don't use the knife too hastily*. . . .
Yours in the blessed hope, _____

64, BELGRAVE ROAD,
24th Jan., 1876.

DEAR SISTER— . . . I have your letter of Saturday, which is only so far satisfactory. The personal part is nearly entirely so; but that is of least consequence in the present case. The unsatisfactory part is the unskilful construction you are being led to put upon certain parts of Scripture, to the detriment of other portions, just as you are doing with

certain of my own statements with regard to others. "God did" the work of Christ truly; and you know there is no danger of our separating because you hold this, which I also hold. The mischief lies in the conclusion you draw from this concerning the man Christ Jesus, our Elder Brother. You wrongly interpret God's mode in the case. You bring human reason to bear with the effect of destroying Christ's own glorious part in the glorious work. A parallel case would be if you were to reason that because God was the father of Jesus, therefore Jesus was immortal and omnipotent. In such an argument there would be much plausibility. "Like begets like. God begat Jesus; therefore Jesus was what God is." As an effort of human reason, this would appear invulnerable; and if you were to take such ground, the danger of our separating would not be in your saying "God was the father of Jesus," but in the conclusion you would draw from that fact. As a matter of human reason, the conclusion could not be resisted; but we know from the testimony that it is altogether false. Renunciationism has been created by just such a process of human reasoning upon divine facts; and No-willism is of precisely the same origin. What we have to do is to put all parts of the testimony together.

God brought Israel out of Egypt. We should not quarrel about this. But suppose you were to say, "Therefore, the action of Moses had nothing to do with it, nor the obedience of the children of Israel," you would be using one part of truth to destroy another. This is what you are doing in the important matter in dispute. You say truly "God did the work of Christ;" but you go on to insist, "Therefore, Christ had nothing to do with it except as one conscious of being used." Here is the difficulty. By implication you call this "advanced knowledge." On the contrary, it is a destruction of truth by an unskilful use of the truth on a great and difficult subject. The question whether Christ could or could not sin is a side issue which ought not to be brought into the discussion. This hangs on the greater question of whether Christ rendered a free and willing obedience. That he did not sin is the glorious fact; to say that he could not do otherwise is to take away the glory of the fact, and to destroy his brotherhood to us. You blot out one side of "the shield," simply because you cannot see how it could co-exist with the other.

I never in any of my writings intended to signify the exclusion of the fact that Christ subordinated his personal volition to the will of the Father whose manifestation he was, though you may seem to find indications of it in arguments against those who were denying the divine side of Christ, and I can say the same for Dr. Thomas. I did not refer to his writings to prove what I contend for, as you will see if you look at my letter again, but merely to prove that that was his view of the case. No man's knowledge is perfect; but if I am to choose between Dr. Thomas's construction of a scriptural fact and that of any other man I know, my choice would not hesitate. I knew Dr. Thomas, and I know bro. — and I know the Scriptures. And this combination of knowledge enables me to be very positive that you are getting away from scriptural ground, and are yourself applying the knife, which you do not fear more than I do. . . . Faithfully your bro. for Christ's sake.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

A letter to another sister in reply to one received from her.

Dear Sister — I am in receipt of your interesting epistle of the 1st instant. I exceedingly regret the occasion for it. The responsibility of this, however, is not with me. True, I have declined the publication of certain matters emanating from — in connection with the unfortunate state of things existing there; but the reason of the refusal lies in the nature of the thing refused, and, therefore, the responsibility lies there. In a matter of personal offence I admit the justice of "both sides" claiming and having a hearing; but when it is a question affecting the truth, the case is different. The *Christadelphian* is consecrated to the service of the truth, and is not open to anything that would militate against it. It knows only one side in the battle of the truth. This is a policy that makes enemies and sometimes hurts friends. I always regret this result, and would prevent it if I could, but I can only, as heretofore, follow one course, without respect of persons.

This is no case of misrepresentation. Wrong ground has been taken, even according to the version of the case emanating from — and the mischief that has come is the result. Of course, there may have been collateral

influences at work of the sort you mention, but the main feature is clear. You have arrived at and insist upon a conclusion which is inconsistent with apostolic teaching concerning the probation of our Lord Jesus, and this has been the occasion of a breach. I regretted it I assure you, and tried to prevent it as far as I could do so by the advice I gave. But the cause lies with those who have taken a wrong position. The right position I have endeavoured to indicate in the last *Christadelphian*. You desire something farther. I do not see that more need be said. The difficulty has been created by false reasoning upon true facts. This is illustrated in your own letter. You say Jesus of the New Testament being the Jehovah of the Old, it was impossible for Jesus to sin, because Jehovah could not. Would you receive this reasoning in other particulars? I trow not. Suppose I were to argue that because it is testified of Jehovah of the Old Testament that he fainteth not, neither is weary, and slumbers not nor sleeps, therefore Jesus of the New being He, could not be weary nor sleep. I would argue with apparent plausibility, but in opposition to the express testimony that Christ was weary at Jacob's well, and slept on board ship, and was crucified through weakness. I might employ the same argument as to other points with like results, and I presume you would reject the reasoning as false. Where does the fallacy lie? It lies in the assumption that the things affirmable of Jehovah of the Old Testament are true of the same Jehovah in manifestation. This is a false assumption altogether. Jehovah is immortal, Jesus was not. Jehovah is above all law. Jesus was made under the law. Jesus was "made a curse." Jehovah could not be; and so on. Jehovah in manifestation resulted in a new individual—a Son—which Jehovah was not, and the same discrimination will show that this new individual had to be tempted in all points as we are, which Jehovah cannot be.

You write like a brave and intelligent sister. I can only regret that you should be compromised in a false position as the result of fallacious reasoning, which has apparently commended itself to you as true. It is particularly lamentable that at a time of supreme interest like that in which we live, when the re-appearing of the Lord becomes more and more the possibility of any hour, the minds of the brethren and sisters should be distracted by a futile and useless controversy, instead of being built up and comforted in the

glorious things of the one faith. But Jesus has said it must needs be; and therefore I have learnt to be resigned, yet

not without great sorrow for good and honest hearts entangled.
Hoping. &c. ROBERT ROBERTS.

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 28.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13. 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

THERE is a Jew among the newly elected life senators of France, M. Cremieux.

A Jew has been nominated one of the three official professors of painting in Paris.

The *Habazaleth*, of November the 10th, (a paper published at Jerusalem,) says the latter rain at the close of the year has been plentiful in Palestine, to the joy of the population.

There are 250 Jewish medical men in Vienna, and 240 lawyers, constituting a large majority in both professions.

A Jewish deputy of the German Parliament, who is also a professor of the University of Leipzig, has been appointed professor of the University of Berlin.

JEW versus PRIEST.—A CHANGE.—A Jewish medical man at Buda having been charged by the municipality to examine the public buildings with regard to their sanitary arrangements, a priest refused to allow him to enter his house because the commissioner was a Jew. Upon this, the municipality resolved to withhold from the priest his salary until he should have submitted to their order.

THE JEWS IN EUROPE.—Holland numbers 68,000 Jews. In European Turkey are supposed to be 70,000 Jews. Russia without Poland, numbers 1,829,000 Jews. Prussia numbers 318,000 Jews, and the whole of Germany half a million of Jews. The seventh part of the population of Poland is composed of Jews. They number 783,000. Roumania, according to some, numbers 208,000, and according to others only 150,000 Jews. The whole number of the Jews in the United States is about 300,000, so that it is evident the bulk of the Jewish nation is in the territory of the Fourth Beast.

THE MONTEFIORE PALESTINE COLONIZATION SCHEME.

A letter in the *Jewish Chronicle* says there is a probability of an early report from Sir Moses Montefiore, concerning his visit to the Holy Land, but contends that whatever the report may be, it ought not to interfere with the work of the Testimonial Committee, but that the Committee should proceed to elaborate a programme that the friends of Sir Moses may have their desires fulfilled, and "that the land itself shall be blessed by such a monument, and the condition of the people gradually and permanently improved." Meanwhile, it is announced that Sir Moses having issued his report, intends making another visit to the Holy Land.

OTHER SCHEMES AT WORK FOR THE REGENERATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

A London correspondent of the *Northern Daily Express* (Newcastle,) says, Jan. 6th, "If Mr. Disraeli's intention in buying the Suez Canal shares was such as was suggested by a Liverpool minister the other day, he will have to make haste. If he does really mean to take Palestine and to send Jews back to their own country, he will have to be quick about it. In a few years the land is likely to be colonized in quite another fashion. The Palestine Society is

hard at work. Its object is to revive the whole of Syria by establishing in it people of all creeds and nationalities. It has already colonies at Jaffa, Halfa, Ramleh, and Jaaron—nay, even in Jerusalem itself. Nazareth is already beginning to flourish and has established a flour mill. Into Jerusalem, millers, locksmiths, joiners, haberdashers, saddlers, a baker, a butcher, and a confectioner have been introduced. They form a village by themselves, and promise to increase and multiply. But the work is slow, and if Mr. Disraeli is not too long about it, he may yet step in before the land of his fathers is entirely occupied by the Gentiles."

The allusion in this paragraph is to a meeting of "The Palestine Society," held in London, at the Rooms of the Universal Alliance, 41, Pall Mall, on the 17th of Dec. last, under the presidency of Colonel Gawler. The society is distinct from the Palestine Exploration Society. The following newspaper notice of it will make it plain:—"The Palestine Society.—This society is an organization upon neutral ground for all interested in the welfare of Palestine. It especially aims to promote the colonization of the Holy Land, and to unite works of benevolence and humanity in that country. The third general meeting of this society was held on the 15th inst., at the rooms of the Universal Alliance, 41, Pall Mall, Colonel Gawler in the chair. The minutes of the second general meeting were read by Mr. Charles Davis. Afterwards the report was read by Mr. Bruce. From this it appears that there are several German colonies in the Holy Land, which are doing well and benefitting the country. Several resolutions were passed, the object of which was to promote European immigration into Syria to improve the country in general. A vote of thanks to the chair concluded the proceedings.

In reply to an objecting correspondent on the subject, Colonel Gawler thus writes in the *Jewish Chronicle* of December 31st: "In reply, I would observe that, while the Palestine Society proposes more especially to encourage Jews (not solely those of Great Britain), it has made no appeal to Jews (as such) for subscriptions or encouragement. The object of the meeting on the 17th inst., to which 'Viator' refers, is one which must

prove of the greatest benefit to mankind, and to England in particular, viz., to initiate a fund to promote the colonization of Palestine by persons of good character (especially Jews). If it will open a good field for immigration; and if it will improve the revenues of Turkey and help her to pay some of the interest of her bonds, it furnishes sufficient grounds for an appeal to *Englishmen*. But the Palestine Society desires to encourage all honest and industrious efforts to improve the condition of Syria and Palestine, and the German Colony (the Society of the Temple), according to the replies received last year from the Rabbins in the Holy Land by Sir Moses Montefiore, and printed by the Board of Deputies of British Jews (see pp. 66, 67, and 70), are a flourishing and well-conducted community. One of these letters from the Safed Synagogue, dated 26th Elul, 5634, exhibits a feeling so different happily from that which the letter of 'Viator' would tend to generate, that I must be pardoned for digressing to quote from it. At p. 66 of the printed replies I find the mouth-piece of the Safed Synagogue writing to Sir Moses Montefiore as follows: 'I am anxious that you should obtain this particular tract of land. . . . as close by it, the natives of Wurtemberg (non-Israelites) have established for themselves a colony, and these are so kindly disposed to help us, that they have already expressed their willingness to assist us with all their power to crown our undertaking with success.'

TURKISH INSOLVENCY AND THE HOLY LAND.

The Turkish insolvency is likely to lead to results in the same direction apart from what may come out of the Eastern Question. A Jewish resident in Jerusalem writes as follows, in the name of many others:—"Many families which invested all they possessed in Turkish funds have been reduced to starvation, as only few of them can subsist upon half their former income. At a meeting of these, I made the proposition which received the approbation of all, to ask the Turkish government to hand over in exchange to the Jewish holders of bonds (amounting to about ten millions of francs nominal value,) such lands belonging to the State as now in consequence of mismanagement lie *uncultivated*. By such a measure

if exemption from taxes were granted for a few years, many families now in despair would be made happy, while the government would owe by so many millions less, and at the same time open a new source of income in what now is a mere desert. The soil is still ten times more productive than even blessed Hungary.

Perhaps there might be in London an influential man or society willing to support this proposition. It would be an immense benefit to Palestine.

Mr. Samuel Montagu from London, during his stay here warned people against Turkish investments; and many sold out, but as the catastrophe did not come to pass as speedily as was apprehended, they bought back at higher prices.

If you can do anything, pray let us know, when we will furnish you with all necessary details and exert ourselves for the purpose to the utmost."

The same suggestion is made in a larger form by the Buxton vicar of Norwich, in a letter appearing in the *Scarborough Mercury*, December 25th, as follows:—"Sir,—Is there no one to suggest to Turkey at this moment to sell the Holy Land, and thus to escape national bankruptcy? Is there no one to suggest to the Jew that he may have 'inherited the riches of the Gentiles' for this very end—that he might redeem back the land of his fore-fathers at this opportunity? What readier mode could Turkey find to pay her debts and be free? Of what use is Palestine to her any longer? Let us remember that one Jew advances £4,000,000 payable at sight, for a work not their own. And would not many a Christian throughout the world join in helping thus to restore Israel to the home of their race?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. Stracey."

All these are indications of the strong current that has begun to move in the direction of Palestinian regeneration—a regeneration which must to a certain extent be accomplished before the advent of Christ, and which the nearness of that advent requires that it should be early carried out.

BRITAIN, THE SUEZ CANAL AND THE HOLY LAND.

The *Jewish Chronicle* comments thus on the purchase of the Suez Canal by the English government: "The first step for

manifesting her determination to make sure of her hold on India has been taken by England. She has become the largest proprietor in the Suez Canal. The significance of this purchase is self-evident. Unintentionally and incidentally—such are often the ways of Providence—England has thereby materially become more interested in the fate of neighbouring Palestine, than she was before. Port Said, the Mediterranean outlet of the Canal, must from its geographical position, depend more for the necessaries of life on Palestine, than any other country. Egypt can do very little in this respect, as the Canal traverses land which produces nothing. On the contrary all villages and cities which will spring up along this high-road, will necessarily have to depend upon it for everything they may want, either to support or embellish existence. The Canal constitutes the great artery through which their life-blood must flow. The Canal will have to supply them with everything they may require. But the nearest land which could furnish this is Palestine, and the harbour of Jaffa only a short distance from Port Said, will form the natural store-house for this port, and through it for the whole of the Canal, and in some measure probably also for the thousands of outgoing vessels. England as the largest shareholder in the Suez Canal, will have special reasons for watching over the harbour of Jaffa, and indirectly also over the safety of Palestine, the outlet of which is Jaffa. Indirectly the Agricultural School of the Alliance at Jaffa will also be benefitted by England's co-partnership in the Canal. The additional guarantee of stability thus given to the undertaking, and the conviction that England has a special interest in the prosperity of Jaffa, will stimulate the producing powers of the farm attached to the school, while securing a ready and profitable market for its products. And now remains to be seen what England will do to secure herself also the necessary influence over the other potential high-road to India, along the Euphrates Valley. Sooner or later a railway will unite the Mediterranean with the two great rivers of Asiatic Turkey, and through them with the Persian Gulf. Syria can as little be neglected as Egypt."

JEWISH RESTORATION: PROSPECTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The *Jewish Chronicle* has an article on this subject, from which we make the following extracts:

"The crisis in Turkey, the purchase of so large an interest in the Suez Canal through the instrumentality of a Prime Minister of the Jewish race, and the notice taken by the general press of the branch of the General Alliance which has made Palestinian progress the object of its care, and of the subsequent deputation which waited on the Ambassador of the Porte—have just now given a considerable prominence to matters connected with the Holy Land, and consequently also by a natural association of ideas, to certain Jewish aspirations. The *Glasgow News* in an able and friendly article of the 17th ult., discussing the subject, even thinks that the English 'may yet be the means of restoring the Israelite to his former home.' On so important a subject it is but right that all hazy notions should be cleared away. Such of our Christian friends as talk of the restoration of the Jews to their own country of course do not think of a supernatural agency. Such an agency as was for instance at work at Israel's departure from Egypt, would naturally not require any human co-operation. But if human agency is to be employed in the matter, such for instance as was at work at the restoration under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, those Jews only it must be expected will give heed to the call as under deep religious impressions, and anxious beyond everything to carry out the precepts of the Law in their minutiae, which it is admitted is impracticable beyond the confines of the Promised Land. . . . It is now several months since a scheme has been launched from an influential Jewish quarter intimately associated with a venerated name which has for two generations been identified with the Holy Land. The object of this scheme is the material improvement of the position of the Jews in that country, and thereby—not intentionally, it is true, but as a logical consequence—to attract new Jewish settlers. The scheme has been made known far and wide." The article concludes by calling upon all who wish to benefit the Jew as he is, (that is apart from conversionist objects), to 'rally round the Jewish (Montefiore)

centre of movement to which we have referred, and evince their sympathy by evoking the Christian feeling of the country, not by mere paper resolutions, but by solid contributions to the fund now being raised for the promotion of the physical and intellectual well-being of the Jews to the Holy Land."

From the article in the *Glasgow News* to which the *Chronicle* refers, the following are extracts:—

"The influential position which Britain has recently obtained in Egypt has given rise to various speculations concerning its ultimate effect on her policy in the East. A recent rumour in this connection deserves some consideration. It is reported by a contemporary that the Jews foresee in this new acquisition of British power the 'shadow' of the 'coming event' which will herald their return to Palestine. It would appear that the policy of Britain is developing towards the realisation of the ancient hopes of our Jewish fellow-subjects. They have long looked upon Britain as their 'natural protector.' They have experienced that Britain is the 'Apostle of Freedom' in precept and in practice, and that she has exerted her influence on their behalf, not only at home, but on the Continent, and notably in Turkey. The old Lion prevented the Eagle from feasting on the Ottoman carcase in 1854, or tearing from her grasp the coveted morsel to which the Eastern Question clings. It may, therefore, be a natural sequence that the Jewish mind should drift in the direction of a speedy return to the land of their fathers, when their protector and preserver is within sight of their patrimony. Is it unreasonable to hope that, with Britain in Egypt, they will find a peaceful asylum, free from persecution and the intolerance of religious zealots? While we are pursuing a policy ostensibly for the protection of our Eastern possessions, we may be shedding a bright light on the darkness in which the Jews have been enshrouded for centuries. It is not improbable that they will now follow their upholder into Egypt by the natural process of emigration; and when British protection is assured in Palestine, they will go there too. The colonisation of the ancient land has long been meditated. Its accomplishment has hitherto been impeded by the

obstinacy and jealousy of the Moslem. The Montefiore Testimonial Fund was originated with the intention of still further extending the scheme inaugurated at Jaffa a few years ago. Hence it would seem that

one result of Britain's policy in the East has been to revive the 'trembling heart of this remarkable people, and to inspire them with renewed confidence in their restoration.'

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren. (Heb. 11. 1.)

MARCH, 1876.

"ESTABLISHED, strengthened, settled:" such is the expressive description of the state of stability in the truth to which Paul desired and exhorted believers in his day to attain. The opposite state he speaks of as being "carried about with every wind of doctrine" — a state which he declares to appertain to spiritual childhood. Paul's work remains a living fact, though Paul himself be long dead; and the objects associated with it are the same as at the beginning. As in Paul's day, so now; all who come within range of Paul's work are not in sympathy with Paul's objects, or competent to discern and apply Paul's method. They demur to the "established—strengthened—settled" policy; they love "winds of doctrine," by which they are wafted into an activity otherwise unknown to them. The glorious gospel is powerless to keep them going: something new is refreshing to them. The philosophy of their case could be defined: but it would serve no good purpose. We merely refer to them now as illustrations of a spiritual danger, which is not new or peculiar to our age, but which in our age is more perilous than before. The truth has been revived in its glorious fulness in this our century, by the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas, who rests from his labours. Those who see it, understand it and love it, are "established, strengthened and settled" in it, and are labouring to realise the objects God has associated with it, in denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and looking for the blessed hope, always abounding in the work of the Lord. They have not to discuss

what the truth is. This they know and rejoice in, and seek to build each other up in it. They resist "winds of doctrine," which are calculated to shift badly-moored craft from their position. Their policy is denounced as obstructive, and attributed to a vanity of consistency, and condemned in many hard speeches. But they know what they are about. Crotchets which are new to some and plausible to others, are neither new nor attractive to those who are grounded and settled in the unchangeable word of the living God. No condemnation in Adam was widely advocated by Pelagius fourteen centuries ago; no human will in Christ was asserted two centuries earlier. Men tore each other to pieces on abstractions connected with these subjects, blighting and scorching the spiritual soil with these barren and quibbling controversies, with the result of establishing the universal desolation which has prevailed in Christendom for ages. A little reviving is granted before the appearing of Christ in the nineteenth century; and those who appreciate their privileges will not lightly be dragged into the hurtful speculations and contentions of men, who having a form of godliness, do not exemplify the power thereof, but afflict the meek with their boastful "wrath, strife, seditions," &c. The time is short; the danger is great; he that endureth to the end shall be saved; and those who shall be saved are few of the many called.

Thurman and his sympathisers (presumably) are upon us again with a "last great warning to the world." They are the people who confidently fixed on the 19th of April last year as the day of Christ's appearing, and are said to have sat up all night waiting for him. Undeterred by the ignominious failure of that occasion, they are to the front again with the positive assurance that "the sign of the Son of Man" will appear in heaven on the 1st of March (the month of the present issue of the *Christadelphian*); and that he will

come himself on the 1st of April following; on the strength of which the world is "warned." The ground of the prediction is a revelation alleged to have been made to the publishers of the warning: the evidence of which is said to have consisted of their having fallen upon their backs in a swoon-state, from which they revived shortly afterwards in ecstasy.

As we remarked in connection with their falsified prediction of last year, it will be a matter of great joy to all who look for his appearing, if the Lord come within the next four weeks. This he may do; but as also remarked on that occasion, if he do, it will not be for the reasons given by Thurman's people, but for reasons which are manifestly beyond the range of their apprehensions. There will be no "sign" such as they are looking for: that is certain. The signs are already visible—not among the stars over our heads, where signs will never be given, but in the heavens of prophetic discourse—the upper sphere of human affairs, among Kings and Governments and States. The Scribes and Pharisees could read the state of the sky, but could not discern the signs of the times, as Jesus told them. So it is with many now. They are star-gazers; they have no discernment of the real signs which have been telling us for many years, as they tell us louder and louder each month, that the Lord is at the door. They look for things that will never come to pass.

The pretence of divine personal revelation as the basis of the so-called "last warning," is sufficient of itself to stamp the affair as a bald imposture. God never summoned the world to attention without attesting the summons in a way not to be mistaken. Even the facts of the gospel are commended to our faith by "many signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God," wrought by Jesus and the apostles, and reported to us on impeccable testimony. When God sent Moses to Egypt, he asked neither Israel nor Pharaoh to surrender to His demands without giving them proof of His having made the demand in the performance of several open undoubted miracles. And when the world is again summoned to "fear God and give Him glory, for the hour of His judgment is come," He will show marvellous things to Israel,

like as He did when He first brought them out of Egypt; "and the nations shall see and be confounded at all their might; and they shall lay their hands on their mouths; their ears shall be deaf; and they shall lick the dust like a serpent; they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth. They shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and shall fear because of Thee."—(Micah vii. 16.) That Thurman & Co. (if it be they) should expect a printed paper to be received as a message from God on the strength of their having fallen on their backs in a state of excitement, is evidence either that they are ignorant of the ways of God, or that they are conscious quacks and pretenders. Excitement is native to the human system in a state of ignorance; and is the very opposite of being an evidence of divine illumination.

But these and similar impostures are interesting in their way. They are adjuncts of the latter-day situation. As before the destruction of Jerusalem, many said: "Lo here and lo there; he is in the secret place;" it is in a certain way natural that the crisis of the Lord's actual appearing should be marked by the development of superstitious excitement and pretence, on the same subject. But as Jesus said to his disciples, concerning the circulation of false reports in their own generation, so it is safe now to "believe them not." His approach will be announced in a way that will leave no room for doubt. Angelic visitors will apprise those concerned, and instruct them in the practical details involved in the command: "Go ye out to meet him." The fanatical absurdities with which the great fact is meanwhile encumbered, is vexatious and humiliating. It is probably part of that system of trial which though somewhat severe, is not too severe to destroy the faith of such as can discern the difference between the counterfeit and the true.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE Eastern Question has advanced a stage during the month. England having given in her adhesion to the reform-scheme of the Northern Powers, the scheme has been officially submitted to the Turkish Government, and the Turkish Government has promised compliance. This has given rise

to cheerful anticipations on the part of some of a peaceful and satisfactory solution to the Eastern Question. But this feeling is not general. Mr. Butler-Johnstone declared in his place at the opening of the British Parliament, in effect, that there could not be a greater mistake than the notion that the Andrassy note would lead to the conclusion of the Eastern Question. There has been abundant evidence of the truth of his words since the utterance of them. Though Turkey has consented to the reforms, the insurgents refuse to accept them or to suspend hostilities, and great preparations are being made to carry on the conflict on an enlarged scale with the opening of the spring. The insurgents are not idle, though the winter has been hard on them. They have harassed the Turkish communications in a way that has made it very difficult for the Turks to victual Trebinge. In several considerable engagements they have got the better of the Turkish army, though sometimes suffering reverses. Serbia, which has been with difficulty held back from declaring war against Turkey on the side of insurgents is now, by the last accounts, on the point of breaking through all restraints, and appointing a warlike government. Montenegro is in the same state. She was on the point of coming to an understanding with Turkey not to help the insurgents any more, on condition of getting a certain cession of territory; but Russia interfered and prevented agreement, and Montenegro is likely to join Serbia and the insurgents in a combined onslaught on the tottering Turkish power. Even Roumania is likely to throw herself into the weight of Turkish troubles. She is tributary to Turkey, paying a large annual sum, for which she is supposed to have the benefit of Turkey's protection in case of invasion. But the Roumanian government sees and says that Turkey is no longer able to defend her, and that, therefore, Roumania has no longer any obligation to pay tribute. In fact this is alleged to be the development of a part of the plan agreed upon between Russia and Germany at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. According to the *Weekly Times* (on the authority of Mr. Butler Johnstone, an authority on eastern matters), "Prince Bismarck and his master bargained

for Russian abstention from meddling with the Franco-German War, by promising to assist the Czar in breaking through the Treaty of Paris. According to this plan, the Prince is to retire from his little Throne, his subjects are to be left in a state of quarrel with the Porte, Russia is to send troops, of course for their protection, and then to seize and hold the bit of territory she was deprived of at the close of the Crimean War.

The practical secession of Egypt by the recent events which have drawn that country more closely into connection with England, deepens the clouds of difficulty and disaster that are gathering over the doomed empire of Turkey. Her internal affairs are rapidly going to the worse. The Turkish correspondent of the *Daily News*, writing from Constantinople, says:

"The popular impression of the dangerous condition of the government is very deep. This is especially so among the Turks. At the same time the recent repudiation has paralysed trade among the native Christian merchants in Stamboul, and has inflicted a cruel blow upon a large class of Turkish women. The latter were a few years ago usually provided as dowery with houses and property.

Almost every Turkish woman either had a house or a share—sometimes very small—in a house. They soon learned, however, that by investing their money in *Consolidés* they could get a higher interest, with less trouble, and as they thought, less risk. In consequence many transfers were continually made, and the fact that prices have been during the last few years rapidly increasing, while house rent has actually fallen, urged great numbers to invest their all in Turkish security. The resentment of these women and of the class to which they belong, is at present intense, and finds vent in complaints of every kind against the government and the Sultan. My information applies especially to the capital, but all throughout the provinces this feeling is equally strong. The famine in Asia Minor left thousands of Turks houseless. The tax gatherers were unremitting in their exactions, and took the last piastre which famine prices had left them. All sorts of stories are current as to the exactions in the famine districts. This is one which I can vouch for. A tax of five piastres was put upon every apricot tree in one of the famine districts. The apricots are dried and used as food during winter, almost every house having its apricot orchard. The villagers explained that the whole yearly produce of a tree was not worth five piastres, but as the tax-

farmers were inexorable, the villagers cut down their trees rather than pay. The Bulgarians, again, are believed to be thoroughly disaffected in consequence of the extortions they have been subjected to from the local governors. Many of their young men have been thrown into prison as a precautionary measure. The whole of the smaller class of officials, both in the capital and in the provinces, have been for several months unpaid. People remark that while his people are starving, the Sultan yet finds money to buy a hundred thousand pounds' worth of diamonds, to continue the building of a senselessly expensive mosque, and gives no sign that he cares for the distress around him. Old residents are agreed that they never remember the opinion of the Turks themselves so strong against the government as it is just now. The Turks themselves are much more bitter than the Christian subjects of the Sultan, and one of the possibilities which we stand in dread of is a riot by the Mahometans against the government. Thus what with the news from the seat of war, the condition of the population at the capital, and in the provinces, and all sorts of rumours as to foreign intervention, the horizon looks very black.

To add to their dejection, they have had the news during the last few days of what they regard as the desertion of England. Hitherto the lower class of Turks have believed that Queen Victoria was a faithful subordinate of the Sultan, whom the latter had only to command in order that her fleet and army should appear upon the Bosphorus. The higher class have said openly that England dare not desert Turkey because of the value of her alliance against Russia. The purchase of the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal has, however, made the Turks believe that England has gone over to her enemy—for as such they regard Egypt—and cares no longer to support Turkey.

I have said nothing as to the dangers which Turkey apprehends from foreign invasion or interference, but there is a widespread feeling that some kind of agreement has been arrived at by the three Imperial Powers, and that in a few months all necessity for schemes of reform may be at an end. The dangers at home are for the Turk sufficiently serious. He now well understands that not only is he powerless to put down the insurrection before spring, but that his army is in great danger; that the expenses of maintaining it in the field are ruinous; that there is danger of new insurrections in more than one province of the empire, and that if efforts are made to extort new contributions to the Treasury, such insurrections are sure to break out; that the agricultural class, who have long been disaffected, have been joined by the

population of the capital, the unpaid officials, the holders of Consolidés, the small merchants and tradesmen; and he understands that at the precise moment when he should have strained every nerve to have preserved his credit, at least until he had the insurrection out of hand, his scheme of repudiation was put forward."

Among other angry symptoms in the same direction, the following may be noted:

The Roumania correspondent of the *Jewish Chronicle*, writes from Bucharest as follows:—"The indications increase daily here that war is approaching. Preparations are silently going on in Russia, and I cannot believe, from what I learned privately in passing through Austria and Hungary, that the apparent calm and seeming *nonchalance* is real. The situation here is equally unfettered, in spite of the apparent tranquillity which for the moment reigns. The commercial and financial world of Roumania, small as it may be, is passing through a crisis of no ordinary character. The failures which have occurred the last sixty days have reached unto and affected all classes.

Every one talks of the coming 'occupation,' and the unhappy farmer and half desperate merchant recalling the busy days of the Crimean War, and Russian and Austrian occupation, sigh for the coming of the stranger. The agriculturist has his grain in hand (there has been hardly an export this year), and the merchant his wares. You can see why it is that both long for the stirring times of war!"

Another Jewish correspondent writes from Turkey as follows:—"No business at all, stagnation in trade, dead calm in affairs; the misery is exceedingly great. Capital exists no more; and if there are yet wealthy families, they are indifferent to the existing distress. The city is full of soldiers. They occupy the houses of the Jews; and he who refuses to receive them is removed by force. No compensation can be received, by deriving any profit from their stay here. Their pay has been in arrear for twelve months, and, consequently, they commit robberies, taking from the Jewish women their gold ornaments *en plein jour*."

TURKISH CALAMITIES.

More than 300 Turkish soldiers are reported to have been frozen to death about Douga, and a greater number are frost-bitten in hospitals. The insurgents descend into the lower country near the Dalmatian frontier.

It appears that the Providence Tool Company, which contrived to carry off the Turkish small arms contract from the English and other manufacturers who were

competing for it, has already paid the customary penalty of excessive enterprise by becoming bankrupt. The contract was for 600,000 rifles, with the option of accepting an additional order for 200,000, making a possible total of 800,000 rifles. The consequence is that the Turkish Government is likely to experience an interruption in its supplies of small arms at a most critical period, when all its military resources are needed to cope with the insurrection in the Northern Provinces.

THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

The important events of the month, as bearing on the Signs of the Times, have included the opening of the British Parliament. The revival of the Eastern Question, and the purchase of the Suez Canal by the British Government during the recess, invested the re-assembling of Parliament with unusual importance, as it was foreseen on all hands, and now declared, that the new session of Parliament would be devoted to foreign affairs, and more particularly to Eastern matters. The address from the throne gave prominence to the two great matters referred to, and intimated Her Majesty's intention to draw herself closer with the East by the assumption of a title expressive of her headship over India.

The interest centered in the discussion which followed the opening ceremony. Mr. Disraeli recounted at length the history of the Suez Canal purchase. He stated that the government had only 48 hours to decide the question, and the house of Rothschild made the purchase on the good faith of Mr. Disraeli pledging himself to ask the House of Commons to take the shares off Rothschilds' hands. He ridiculed the idea of its being a commercial question. He said there were many reasons for it. He said, "We are to contemplate this purchase in reference to times of peace, and may form such conclusions as we like as to times of war. And in times of peace no one can doubt the advantage of this purchase, when you remember when we had not a share how we were then menaced with the shutting of the Canal. We know how there are a thousand ways, without our going to the use of preponderating force, to assert our rights; there are a

thousand ways of obstructing the navigation of the Canal, and if the interest we have obtained is merely for times of peace, it is a most important result. As for the assertion that in this affair the whole of what the noble lord calls the Eastern question is concerned, I have nothing to do with it. England is a Mediterranean power, a great Mediterranean power, and that is shown by this fact alone, that always in time of war, and frequently in time of peace, she has the greatest force and the greatest strongholds upon these waters which she never will relinquish. But the policy of England is not a policy of aggression. It is not provinces she wants. She will not interest herself in the distribution of territory on the shores of the Mediterranean so long as that distribution does not imperil the freedom of the seas and the dominion which she legitimately exercises. Therefore look upon it that in the great chain of fortresses which we possess almost from the Metropolis to India, this Suez Canal, as a means of securing the free intercourse of the waters, is of great importance, and one which we should prize."

Mr. Disraeli's speech is alleged to have produced an excellent effect in favour of the purchase, for the discussion and decision of which a night was fixed. The discussion cannot fail to be deeply interesting.

In reply to the leader of the opposition, who demurred to England's agreement in the Austrian reform-scheme for Turkey, on the ground that England had contracted obligations which it might be inconvenient to discharge at another time—Mr. Disraeli said (and in this we see the "spirited foreign policy" of the Tory Government, which providentially and unexpectedly came into office two years ago, as contrasted with that of their Liberal predecessors)—"There was no other course for England to take, but calmly and gravely to consider whether it was not better, if not necessary and inevitable, to support the Austrian note and advise the Porte to accept it. But we did not do that precipitately or without prudence, consideration and some proper hesitation. We received assurances from Russia and Austria, which to me are satisfactory, because I am not ashamed to say that I believe they are sincere. Before we agreed to support the Austrian note it had also been intimated to us, in an unmis-

takable manner, that it was the desire of the Porte, however much they might be opposed to receiving such a note, that if such a note was decided upon, England should not stand aloof. I hope, therefore, my noble lord will not feel there is any foundation for the fears he entertained that we have embarked rashly in an intervention to which there may be no limit. So far as England is concerned she is as free and as independent to act upon this matter, if the whole of this attempt at settling the provinces failed, as she ever was; and she will act in the manner, so far as the present administration is concerned, which becomes those who wish to maintain the empire of England in its independence and freedom on all those waters which are affected by this very note."

The most notable feature of the discussion, as indicating the complete and final change of English views and intentions with regard to Turkey, was a speech made at the conclusion by Mr. Gladstone, who introduced himself as "the only person then sitting in the House who was responsible as a minister for carrying the country into the Crimean war." He expressed his concurrence in the policy of the present Government with regard to Turkey. He said that Turkey made excellent promises at the close of the Crimean war, but they had not been fulfilled; and however anxious they might be to maintain the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire, they never could be maintained without some other sort of security for the redress of Christian grievances than mere words could afford."

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J.R.—The difficulty with regard to the tree of life in Eden, you will find noticed in a previous number of the *Christadelphian*. As to the tree of life in the last chapter of Revelations, it is as much a symbol as the hidden manna, the white stone, the pillar in the temple of God, &c., associated with the promises to the seven ecclesias in the beginning of the book. The tree of life, whose leaves will heal the nations, is the kingdom of the house of David, consisting of the saints of all ages, raised and glorified under Jesus their head. This kingdom is likened to a tree in other places than Rev.—

(Ezek. xvii. 22, 24; Matt. xiii. 31.) It is both millennial and post-millennial; but between the two states, there is a change in which the nations are thoroughly "healed," death the last enemy being destroyed. The last chapter of Revelations does not exclusively belong to the post-millennial state. See *Eureka* on the subject.

W.F.R.—The passage in question ("There are three that bear record in heaven," &c.—John v. 7, 8,) is awaiting in all the most ancient copies of the New Testament, from which nearly all the critics have concluded it is an interpolation upon what John wrote. A consideration of the context confirms this conclusion. You need not therefore allow yourself to be "bothered" by the text, but seek elsewhere for the plain information which is to be obtained as to the unity of the eternal God-head—the Father, from whom flows all power and wisdom in whatever form they may be manifested. See *Phanerostis*.

C.M.—See answer to W.S. below. When Jesus spoke of the Son of Man ascending up where he was before (John vi. 62), he referred to what took place forty days after his resurrection. He was taken up to heaven whence the Spirit had come forth at his conception and his anointing. The Son of Man, as such, had never been in heaven "before" the time of his discourse; but the Spirit which brought the Son of Man into the world had; and it was the Spirit, and not the flesh, that Jesus had in view throughout his discourse (see verse 63). Jesus was the Spirit or Word become flesh. This is the key to statements otherwise unintelligible, such as those you refer to, but we must beware of excluding other truths. No instructed Christadelphian would allege that the flesh the Word became was "divine flesh." It was the flesh of the house of David he became, for a reason not comprehended by those who speak of "divine flesh."

CHRIST'S WORK A WILLING ONE.

W.B.—Christ freely, willingly, and voluntarily *humbled himself* in obedience to the Father's commandments; and of his own free will drank the cup the Father gave him to drink. To deny this is to take away from the glory of his victory and to deny the truth. Granted that Christ who did this was sent and qualified by the Father to do the work, and in this sense, it was the Father's work; but it is not to be lost sight of as an equally important element of the truth that he gave a voluntary and not a coerced submission. The question of whether he could or could not sin is a side issue and ought not to be raised. In a sense, it was impossible he could; but when this fact is made use of to destroy his voluntary obedience, a mischievous use is

made of a fact we need not press. All reasonable men ought to be able to agree to this statement of the subject: "Christ was of the Father's production, but being produced, he had the free control of his own actions; and for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame; leaving us an example that we should follow in his steps, saying unto us: "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I grant that he sit with me on my throne, even as I overcame, and am sat down with my Father on His throne."

THE DIVINE GLORY IN THE AGE TO COME.

A.S.—There are some of the typical significances of the Mosaic pattern of "things in the heavens" which do not admit of certainty, though we may come near what may appear a complete analogy. We are, however, as regards most of the things typified, in the happy position of not depending upon the type for knowledge—the antitype having been so fully developed to our understanding in the writings of the prophets and apostles. This is the case with regard to Aaron and his sons, and the seventy elders of Israel in their approaches to the divine presence on Sinai. We know that in the age to come, the accepted saints—the future rulers of the nations—will be permitted to behold the manifestation of the glory of God in the person of Christ, while the rest of mankind, like the Israelites at the foot of Sinai will have to walk by faith, but whether this was what was typified by the incident in question (Ex. xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11) may be open to doubt. Christ and the saints in glory are one Christ, in head and body, and will be to Israel what the angels were under the first covenant. Consequently, they are typified by the glory which the seventy saw. Who are the seventy? We may find their counterparts in the mortal heads of the kingdom of God—that is, the favoured persons, Jews and Gentiles, through whom the authority of the saints will be administered: or, as you suggest in the saints after judgment, in their translation to the exaltation beyond.

THE SON OF GOD AS THE SON OF MAN.

W.S.—When Jesus said he was the living bread which came down from heaven, and that the bread was his flesh, which he should give for the life of the world, (John vi. 51,) he spoke a parable based on the manna that fed Israel in the wilderness. He did not mean that his flesh should be eaten literally, though some of his disciples thought so. Nor did he mean that there was life-giving virtue in his flesh as a physical thing; for when some of his disciples were disposed to take

this meaning, he said expressly "the flesh profiteth nothing."—(v. 68.) His meaning is evident in view of the fact that the sacrifice of his body (in order that sin might be condemned in a sinless sufferer from its effects), was the appointed means of opening for us a way of salvation which otherwise was closed; and that this fact would have to be the subject of faith, or be mentally eaten. His body (which was the seed of David according to the flesh) was prepared by the Spirit descending upon Mary and generating it; and afterwards, the spirit came forth in a more special form upon Christ himself at his baptism, so that it was as regards its initiation and object, a manifestation of the Spirit from heaven. Therefore there was propriety in the parable that spoke of his having come down from heaven to give his flesh for the life of the world. If the Spirit be understood as the speaker, there is no difficulty, provided the details are also kept in view. These details exclude Trinitarianism, Unitarianism and Renunciationism alike. As to his being called "the Son of the Highest" (Luke i. 32), the very same verse speaks of "his father David." He is the Son of God because begotten, not of the will of the flesh as other men are, but begotten of God; but he is also the Son of Man, because born of a member of the human race, whose nature it is testified he partook in all particulars. He was the first that he might be obedient in all things, and that the work might be of God; and he was the second, that the power of death, which is destroying the seed of Abraham, might in him be extinguished, in harmony with the law of God's action toward men; and that he might then be offered as a name for men to unite themselves with him for participation in his victory.

THE "ONLY BEGOTTEN" OF THE FATHER.

C.F.S.—Christ was called the Son of God because his begetting was due to "the power of the Highest" overshadowing Mary. This is alleged in Luke i. 35. He was therefore the Son of God from his mother's womb. This can be said of no other: we are all the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus.—(Gal. iii. 26). We are adopted sons: not sons by first production. By birth, we are aliens; but God, by the truth, hath sent forth the spirit of adoption into our hearts, whereby we cry "Abba, Father!"—(Rom. viii. 15). This is elsewhere styled "The Spirit of His Son" (Gal. iv. 6); for Christ was the Son of God by parentage, though also Son of Man by one side of that parentage. In view of these things, there can be no doubt that the phrase "the only begotten Son," as applied to Jesus, is meant to express the fact that though there are "many sons," Jesus is the only son begotten or made such at and from and by the very inception of his being

in the flesh. The Spirit laid the foundation of what he was. But this did not make his physical nature in the days of his flesh different from that of the many sons whom he is leading to glory; that is, as regards the substance of which he at that time consisted. It gave a higher form to that substance. That is, it gave us a man in the mental image of God—a man who, having exhibited that image acceptably for thirty years under trial, was openly acknowledged at his baptism on the Jordan, as one in whom the

Father was well pleased; and who was taken possession of by the Spirit, shed upon him at the time without measure, for the doing of the work which God purposed to accomplish through him during the succeeding three years and a half. Yet with all this, a man made in all things like unto his brethren; in whom, by sacrifice, death was destroyed in his resurrection; and who thus becomes our means of approach to God, and our hope of life in the day of his coming.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month, obedience has been rendered to the truth by **HENRY HARDY** (32), modeller, formerly neutral; brother in the flesh to brother **W. Hardy** of Great Bridge. Two others have applied.

The lectures for the month have been as follow: Jan. 30, Question Night. — (Brother Roberts.) Feb. 6th, Emmanuel.—(Brother Shuttleworth). Feb. 13th, The Soul.—(Bro. Shuttleworth). Feb. 20th, The Trinity.—(Bro. Hadley).

COLESHILL.—Brother **Killick** sends with sorrow, but not as those without hope, information of the death of brother **George Leeson**, of this town. He fell asleep on Dec. 31st, within an hour of the Old Year's departure. Brother **Killick** adds: "Having been a great sufferer for a long time, our brother, since he obeyed the truth, has lived in the calm and quiet enjoyment of it, doing what he could for the enlightenment of those in the dark, by word and distribution of works setting forth the truth."

DUDLEY.—Brother **Blount**, writing Feb. 16th, says: "In January, the truth had three of the best hearings it has ever had in Dudley, in the Temperance Hall. I was announced to lecture, January 23rd and 30th, on the following subjects: 'Man: is Man Mortal or Immortal?' 'Death: are the Dead Ones conscious or unconscious?' 'Heaven: is Heaven promised to the Righteous?' 'Hell: are Eternal Torments in Hell the Punishment of the Wicked?' On Thursday, January 27th, 'The Second Coming of Christ,' after which lecture, questions would be answered. The reason of this lecture was that there had been lectures delivered upon the same subject by two of the false religious teachers of the day, and upon each occasion controversy and questions were avoided. In fact one of these teachers had it prominently upon his bills, 'No controversy allowed,' and we thought it a good opportunity. I delivered the first lecture. Brother **Hadley**, of Birmingham, came over to deliver the second; and the third lecture on the following Sunday evenings. Upon each occasion the hall was

crowded by a thoughtful and respectable audience. A tea meeting was held, on Thursday, in connection with the Sunday school, which numbers 25 scholars. Prizes were given to each according to their marks. Brother and sister **Bardsley** (through business engagements) have removed to Carmarthen, South Wales. On January 31st, brother **Caddick** was united in marriage to sister **Griffin**, of Birmingham, which gives us a pleasant addition to our ecclesia."

DUNDEE.—Brother **J. Mortimer** reports that, on the 5th of February, **JOHN HAXTON**, brother in the flesh to brother **Haxton** of Glasgow, after making a satisfactory confession of his faith, was baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus. Brother **Haxton** resides at Invergowrie, about five miles from Dundee, but will meet with the ecclesia in Dundee.

The lectures by brother **Gill** continue to be well received. The subjects since last report are as follows. December 19th.—"Baptism." Dec. 26th.—"Jesus." Jan. 9th.—"Christ." Jan. 16th.—"The Holy Spirit." Jan. 23rd.—"The Work of the Spirit." Jan. 30th.—"The Age to Come."

ENFIELD LOCK, (Middlesex).—Brother **A. McKillop**, who resides at this place, mentions that the library committee of the **Mechanics' Institute** have accepted of an *Alpis Israel*, with which he has presented them.

FROME.—Brother **A. Sutton** reports the delivery of three lectures by brother **Veysey**, of Taunton, on Sunday and Monday, Jan. 16th and 17th. Subjects: "Is the Soul immortal?" "Heaven," "Hell," and the "Hope of Israel." The two evening lectures were well attended. He says also that they have just opened a room for regular public testimony to the truth.

GLASGOW.—Writing on the 15th inst., brother **Owler** states that the lectures, on the whole, are very well attended, and some, from their constant attendance, appear to be impressed with the truth. Increased exertions are to be put forth on Sundays, in spreading the glorious gospel to those who reside in the eastern district of the city,

namely at Bridgetown. A course of six lectures will be commenced forthwith, and a four-page tract on "The Second Coming of Jesus," together with the course of lectures exhibited at the end of this, will be distributed. During the past month the lectures delivered in George Street on Sunday afternoons, were—Jan. 16th: "The Davidic Covenant." (Brother Mulholland.) Jan. 23rd.—"What is Man?" (Brother T. Nisbet.) Jan. 30th.—"The Great Salvation." (Brother Robertson.) Feb. 6th.—"The First and Second Comings of Jesus." (Brother Mulholland.) Feb. 13th.—"The End of the Righteous and the Wicked." (Brother Ritchie.)

GREAT GRIMSBY.—Brother A. Harwood reports his removal from Yarmouth to this place. He would be glad, he says, of a call from any brother whom business or any other circumstance might bring into the locality. His address is 137, Cleethorpe Road.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother J. W. Diboll reports the obedience of SAMUEL DAWSON (58), shoemaker, formerly an attendant at the Primitive Methodist Chapel. Brother Diboll says, "He was induced to attend the hall by reading the announcement of our first lecture, which was by brother Elliott, of London, on the Nature of Man. The scripturalness of the things then advanced awakened the interest in him which has now so happily culminated in his putting on the saving name in the appointed way, which he did on Jan. 24th. This case is particularly interesting and encouraging to us, as being the first-fruits of the regular proclamation of the truth in this town. We hope others will follow his example if the Lord tarry. The following lectures have been delivered since my last report.—Jan. 16th.—"The Church of Christ. What is it?" (Brother T. H. Boshier, of London.) Jan. 23rd.—"The Bottomless Pit." (Brother D. Spianey.) Jan. 30th.—"The Second Coming of Christ." (Brother J. W. Diboll.) Feb. 6th.—"Soul and Spirit." (Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.) Feb. 13th.—"What is the Gospel?" (Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.)

HALIFAX.—Bro. C. Firth reports: "We have been strengthened in numbers by the removal of brother F. Dunn and family from Leeds to Halifax, making an increase of four to our ecclesia; also by the addition of bro. B. Lister, who has withdrawn himself from the meeting in Bedford square, and is now meeting with us in Harrison road." The lectures for the month have been as follow: January 9th.—"Immortality." (Brother F. Dunn.) January 16th.—"The Israelitish Hope." (Bro. M. S. Goggins.) Jan. 23rd.—"Baptism." (Bro. R. Smith.) January 30th.—"Regathering of the Jews" (Bro. C. Firth.) February 6th.—"The Slain Lamb." (Brother J. Briggs.)

LONDON.—Brother Elliott writes: "I have no additions to record this month, and have only to send you particulars of the month's lectures, which are as follow:—February 6th.—"The Good Time Coming." (Brother W. Atkins.) Feb. 13th.—"The Tabernacle of David that is fallen." (Bro. J. J. Andrew.) Feb. 20th.—"The Marriage Supper of the Lamb! Who are invited to it, and how? Who will take part in it, and when will it take place?" February 27th.—"Daniel's Vision of the four Beasts." (This lecture was illustrated by a diagram.) (Bro. A. Andrew.)

LEEDS.—Brother Paterson writes: "The brethren here have to report the removal of brethren Evison and Phillips, who, after a brief stay in Leeds, have gone to Manchester. We have also been weakened by the removal to Halifax of brother F. Dunn, and the three sisters Dunn. Brother Dunn has been of great service to the ecclesia in Leeds, and will be very much missed. On the other hand we have added sister Grant, of Grantown, who has obtained a situation here; and brother and sister Clarkson, who come from Chesterfield. The brethren still maintain the proclamation of the truth, and endeavour, amid many drawbacks, to arrest the attention of their neighbours in the things concerning the age to come." Writing again Feb. 13th, brother Paterson reports that on that date the ecclesia had come to the decision to withdraw from brethren Humphrey and J. G. Chapman, for reasons which are furnished at length, but which it is not necessary to publish.

LEICESTER.—Brother Armstrong writes as follows: "It is my pleasing duty to be able to report an addition of three to the number of those who have believed the testimony concerning the Christ, and showed their faith by obeying the injunction to be immersed into his name. The three immersions referred to all took place on the 3rd inst. The particulars are as follow: EDWARD KEIGHLEY SHARP (38), chemist and druggist, formerly neutral; EDWARD GAMBLE (22), brother in the flesh to brother Thomas Gamble, and formerly neutral; WILLIAM McADAM (25), formerly Wesleyan. These immersions have very greatly gratified the brethren here, and strengthened their belief that their labour is not in vain. There is good ground for expecting a further increase in their number shortly, several persons having expressed their belief of the truth and a desire to obey it. The number of books sold through the agency of the book club in connection with the ecclesia, is another indication of the spread of the truth. The club was established in Dec., 1874, and up to the quarterly meeting, held on Jan. 12th, in the present year (that is during a period of 12 months), the following books were sold.—3 copies *Christadelphian*, 1875; 15 ditto, 1876; 11 *Elpis Israel*; 11 *Eureka I.*; 4

ditto II.; 10 ditto III.; 4 *Hymn Books*; 3 *Twelve Lectures*; 2 *Life of Dr. Thomas*; 2 *Hebrew Titles of Deity*; 2 *Diabolism*; 1 *Chambers' Dictionary*; 1 *Bible Explainer*; 1 *Gibbon's History*; 1 *History of the Papacy*; miscellaneous works, value 13/9; *Montefiore Scheme*, value 10/6; books supplied to brethren in need, value 21/-

The lectures during January were well attended and attentively listened to. On the 2nd Jan. a discussion took place between a Mr. Dyson and brother Collyer—Mr. Dyson affirming the doctrine of eternal torments and brother Collyer denying it. Mr. Dyson quoted several passages of Scripture supposed to countenance his view, and time would not allow for a thorough examination of them all by brother Collyer; however the position taken by brother Collyer, viz., that the scriptural account of the constitution of man shows him to be incapable of suffering eternal torments, was not in the least affected by anything advanced by Mr. Dyson. The lectures on the other four Sundays in January were as follows:—Jan. 9th.—“The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given unto Peter.” (Brother E. Waite.) Jan. 16th.—“A few passages of Scripture urged in support of the doctrine of eternal torments considered.” (Brother T. Weston.) Jan. 23rd.—“Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the Earth.” (Brother Burton.) Jan. 30th.—“Christ's Work and Exaltation in relation to Heaven, Earth, and Hell.” (Brother Shuttleworth.) At the business meeting, held on the 12th Jan., it was shown that financially the ecclesia was not in such a flourishing condition as could be desired. Steps are now being taken, however, which it is hoped will speedily show a great improvement in this respect. Brother Roberts delivered a course of four lectures, commencing Sunday, Feb. 13th, and ending Feb. 17th. A more particular notice of his lectures shall (D.V.) be forwarded next month.

LIVERPOOL.—Brother Hughes reports that the brethren here have returned to their former meeting place, the small chapel, No. 1, Gill-st. Brother and sister Stapleton have removed to Crewe. On the other hand, brother Clalford has removed to Liverpool from Bristol.

MIDDLESBOROUGH.—Brother J. Smither, who, with sister Smither, left Leicester, and are now living at 85, Newport Road, Middlesborough, feel their solitude very much, though they break bread every Sunday morning. They pray God may direct the steps of believers to the town.

NOTTINGHAM.—Bro. J. Kirkland writes: “It is my pleasure to report another immersion as the result of the work at Ripley, MARY ANN KING, aged 23 years, (wife of brother Job King, Codner Park, near Ripley). She was baptised December 26th,

1875, and was formerly a member of the Methodist Free Church. Sister Hopper has returned to London.

PETERBOROUGH.—Brother F. Hodgkinson writes from Norman Cross, February 8th, as follows. “I enclose you copy of letter which appeared in the two weekly papers published in this city, simultaneously with the advertisement of your lecture, the following Sunday Evening—on ‘Babylon The Great, the Mother of Harlots,’ and which was so well attended in consequence, the room being thereby filled—(and estimated at over 400 attentive listeners).” The following is the letter and advertisement referred to: “Christadelphian Lecture in the Wentworth Assembly Room, Peterborough, on Sunday Evening, February 6th, at half-past six, by Mr. Robert Roberts, of Birmingham. Subject:—‘Babylon The Great, The Mother of Harlots,’ seats free. No collections. Bring Bibles.”

“PROPOSED THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

To the Editor of the Peterborough and Huntingdonshire Standard and Peterborough Advertiser.

Sir—Perhaps you will be good enough to insert the following letter in your columns, as further silence on the part of the Christadelphians* might be misconstrued by those who have censured them and opposed their doctrines. There is no doubt that the public mind is much exercised respecting theological matters, and in view of this fact, in connection with others, it seems a proper moment for discussing these questions. Now, as a newspaper correspondence is unsatisfactory and interminable, even should you admit it to your columns, the other alternative suggests itself, and the Christadelphians therefore take this opportunity of offering their representative, Mr. Robert Roberts, of Birmingham to discuss, in Peterborough, in a three night's debate, any one of the four following clerical dogmas, which he will deny, with any ecclesiastical functionary in England, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards; and this challenge is offered respectfully and courteously with the understanding that the debate is to be conducted in the same spirit, in the hope that the truth may prevail, error be detected, and its votaries silenced:—1st, that the Bible teaches the soul of man is immortal; 2nd, That the Bible teaches that eternal torment is the destiny of the wicked; 3rd, that the Bible teaches that there is a personal supernatural devil; 4th, that the Bible teaches that Heaven, not earth, is the abode of the redeemed. Mr. Robert Roberts will deny any one of the above propositions. The details of the debate can be arranged upon the challenge being accepted. All we ask is a fair English discussion. We would suggest that a small

* A discussion had been going on for some time in the papers, on the largely-attended Peterboro' lectures; and the brethren had taken no part in the discussion.

fee for admission be charged, and if any profit accrue, that the whole of it be given to any charitable institution, association, or purpose you may elect or appoint. Let no one consider this beneath his dignity—the command being, ‘Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the Saints.’ Paul saith: ‘There is *one* faith, one hope.’—(Eph. iv. 4, 5.) Which of the many sects of Christendom represent it?”

THE CHRISTADELPHIANS.

Norman Cross, January 20th, 1876.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports the obedience of ALBERT BARRACLOUGH (25), plumber and copper-smith, formerly Primitive Methodist, who after giving satisfactory evidence of his intelligence in the first principles of the Deity necessary to be believed for salvation, was assisted into the sin-covering name Jan. 15th. Bro. Barracough says that he is indebted to bro. John Brobson, of New Basford, near Nottingham, for his acquaintance with the truth, and that he has been a diligent searcher into the things concerning the kingdom and the name about eleven months.

STOCKPORT.—Brother G. Wait announces the immersion of MRS. THORNTON (49), who he says put on the saving name on the 22nd January. He speaks of a lively interest being taken in the truth at the present time, the result of some considerable correspondence which has taken place in the local papers respecting Christadelphian belief and a future state.

CANADA.

TORONTO.—Bro. C. H. Evans writing under date of January 12th, reports that sister Brooks has gone to reside at Fort Wayne, Indiana, where she will be isolated from fellow believers, but that she would be glad to receive a call from any who might be passing through. Her address is 187, Henry Street. He also says, that from letters received from Peterboro', Ontario, it appears that a Mr. C. Morrison, and others have attained to a knowledge of the truth, and are anxious for immersion and fellowship, but have no one to assist them. Should this meet the eye of any brother in that district, he expresses a hope that he will attend to this matter. He also reports a meeting of the Sunday school, numbering 80 children and adults, on the 1st January, when tea was taken together, hymns sung, and prizes given for attendance, and essays on the “Gospel of the Kingdom.” At the business meeting of the ecclesia it was also resolved to put forth a special effort in vindication of the truth against sundry sermons and writings.

WALKERTON.—Brother Gunn writes as follows: I am sure that you will be rejoiced

to learn that in this town, in which I have spent seven years in solitude, in the truth, an ecclesia has at length been organised. In November, 1874, brother Thomas Adamson, of New Hamburg, Co. of Waterloo, whom you met there and at Summerfield, removed to this place with his family, his wife and four of his daughters being baptised members of the one body. In consequence of the disturbing influences existing elsewhere, it was deemed advisable that we should meet informally for some time, which we did in brother Adamson's house, where, during the winters of 1874-5, I delivered a course of lectures on the important subjects that have engaged so much attention of late, in England and America, and respecting which so many who commenced to run well, have made melancholy shipwreck of their faith. Occasionally strangers came to hear, to whom we discoursed on the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, or elements of the gospel. In the month of May, 1875, we formed an ecclesia, the members being brother T. Adamson; sisters, Lydia Adamson, his wife; Hannah Adamson, Sarah Adamson, Elizabeth Adamson and Mary Ann Adamson, his daughters; Mrs. Harriet Oakley, late of Cheltenham, England, and myself. Afterwards, on July 28, we unanimously adopted the basis or statement of the One Faith, drawn up and adopted by the Birmingham ecclesia in 1871, together with the statement of fables set forth in the *Record* of that year, to be rejected. On Sunday, Aug. 1st, we met at the “Bend,” in the river Sangeen, which flows through this town, when, on a profession of their faith, after previous satisfactory examination, brother Adamson assisting in the water, the following persons were immersed into the saving name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit—viz., HENRY USSHER, M.D. (40), Canadian, the oldest medical practitioner in this town, Church of England and Free Presbyterian; but never satisfied with orthodox teaching as regards the nature of man. ALEXANDER McCARTER (53), blacksmith and farmer; and ELIZABETH McCARTER, his wife (51), both natives of the east coast of Scotland, and formerly members of the Free Church of Scotland, Mr. McCarter having been precursor of the congregation in this place. With brother McCarter the struggle to emancipate himself from the fetters of the apostasy, extending over several years, was arduous and severe, yet persistent and earnest, deliberate and prayerful. A man of strong convictions, and thoroughly rooted in Presbyterianism, you know what the conflict must be. He went through it bravely, experiencing from step to step the powerful efficacy of the truth as it is in Jesus, and now with his sister-wife and brother Ussher, who being less bound to orthodoxy, had not to contend with such difficulties, now

rejoices in that glorious liberty, where-with the truth, and the truth only, maketh us free. In brother Ussher, an educated professional man, and in brother McCarter, a man of intelligence, good sense, and judgment, with an intimate knowledge of Scripture, we have every reason to believe we shall have useful advocates of the truth. The brethren in Dundee will be glad to learn that brother and sister McCarter have at length submitted to the obedience of faith. On the 9th of December last, in order still further, if possible, to guard against disturbing influences, we adopted the declaration of the Rochester ecclesia, as reported by

brother Sintzenich, leaving out the names of individuals, but repudiating hereses, from whatever quarter they may come."

UNITED STATES.

WEST HOBOKEN.—Brother F. Robertshaw reports progress at this place, as the result of enterprize on the part of the brethren, who he says number 18. He mentions two immersions, but does not give names; and also that they have a Sunday School with an attendance of from thirty to forty scholars

AID TO MEMORY IN LEARNING THE ORDER OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

The following are the lines we promised some months ago to publish. We learnt them at a Sunday School nearly 30 years ago.

In Genesis the world was made by God's creative hand.
In Exodus the Hebrews marched to gain the Promised Land.
Leviticus contains the Law, holy and just, and good.
Numbers records the tribes enrolled, all sons of Abraham's blood. [deeds.
Moses in Deuteronomy recounts God's mighty Brave Joshua into Canaan's land the host of Israel leads.
In Judges their rebellion oft provokes the Lord to smite;
But Ruth records the faith of one well pleasing in His sight. [read.
In First and Second Samuel of Jesse's son we Ten tribes in First and Second Kings revolted from his seed.
In First and Second Chronicles see Judah captive made;
But Ezra leads a remnant back by princely Cyrus' aid.
The city walls of Zion Nehemiah builds again;
Whilst Esther saves her people from plots of wicked men.
In Job we read how faith will live beneath affliction's rod.
And David's Psalms are precious songs to every child of God.
The Proverbs like a goodly string of choicest pearls appear.
Ecclesiastes teaches man how vain are all things here.
The mystic Song of Solomon exalts sweet Sharon's Rose;
Whilst Christ the Saviour and the King the "rapt Isaiah shows.
The warning Jeremiah apostate Israel scorns;
His plaintive Lamentations their awful downfall mourns.
Ezekiel tells in wondrous words of dazzling mysteries.
Whilst kings and empires yet to come Daniel in vision sees.
Of judgment and of mercy Hosea loves to tell.
Joel describes the blessed days when God with man shall dwell. [call ;
Among Tekoa's herdsman Amos received his

While Obadiah prophesies of Edom's final fall.
Jonah enshrines a wondrous type of Christ our risen Lord.
Micah pronounces Judah lost, lost but again restored.
Nahum declares on Nineveh just judgment shall be poured. [visions give.
A view of Chaldea's coming doom Habbakuk's Next Zephaniah warns the Jews to turn, repent and live [again.
Haggai wrote to those who saw the temple built and Zachariah prophesied of Christ's triumphant reign.
Malachi was the last who touched the high prophetic chord: [Lord.
Its final notes sublimely show the coming of the Matthew and Mark, and Luke and John, the holy gospels wrote.
Describing how the Saviour died, his life and all he taught.
Acts proves how God the apostles owned with signs in every place.
St. Paul in Romans teaches us how man is saved by grace. [reproves.
The apostle in Corinthians instructs, exhorts, Galatians show that faith in Christ alone the Father loves.
Ephesians and Philippians tell what Christians ought to be.
Colossians bids us live to God and for eternity.
In Thessalonians we are taught the Lord will come from heaven.
In Timothy and Titus a bishop's rule is given.
Philemon marks a Christian's love, which only Christians know.
Hebrews reveals the gospel prefigured by the law.
James teaches without holiness faith is but vain and dead.
St. Peter points the narrow way in which the saints are led.
John in his three Epistles on love delights to dwell.
St. Jude gives awful warnings of judgment, wrath to tell. [day,
The Revelations prophecy of that tremendous When Christ, and Christ alone, shall be his people's stay.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 142.

APRIL, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

SPIRITUALISM.

By DR. THOMAS.

(Prefaced by a Letter from a Campbellite who had turned Spiritualist.)

DEAR DOCTOR.—Will you please send your bill, and discontinue my subscription to the *Herald*? I regret the reasons which impel me to this step. The principal one is your teaching in reference to the future life, and your apparent contempt for the truths, facts and solemn revelations of "THE SPIRITS."

You are certainly, as a journalist, at liberty to give your candid convictions in reference to any question of the kind; but, surely, when a formidable array of facts, substantiated by an amount of testimony perfectly overwhelming, has to be met, it is hardly consistent with my ideas of candour and courtesy to set the whole aside as "a spectral illusion," and as the sportive pranks of "Od," simply because the legitimate and

irresistible deductions to be drawn from these facts would be hostile to a favourite interpretation of a series of revelations made through the self-same channel in former ages.

The exhortation of the apostle was to "*Try the spirits*," not to reject their testimony without a trial. "*Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.*" Let this text be applied, and I have no fear as to the result.

Doctor, I once believed with you, and as firmly as you now can, that *life beyond the grave depended on a resurrection of the body*; but "the spirits" have taught me better, as they will teach you and any other man of intelligence and honesty who will give them an opportunity.

Will you try it? Dare you risk

your hobby against a careful, and impartial, and thorough investigation of the facts? Having done this, dare you give to the world your sincere and heartfelt convictions, as drawn from the facts elicited?

Believing you to be a lover of truth, and knowing you to be capable of making sacrifices for its propagation, allow me to suggest that you call on Mrs. Brown, 78, West 26th street, at 3 or 8 p.m. (fee \$1.00); or on Mrs. Coan, 60, White street; or on Mrs. Long, 416, Sixth Avenue (fee 50 cents each), and that you exchange with the *Spiritual Telegraph*, which will give you an accumulation of facts drawn from all parts of the country, such as "speaking with tongues," "interpretation of tongues," "opening the eyes of the blind," "healing the sick" (by the laying-on of hands), "prophesying," "visions," &c., in exact accordance with the promise of Jesus: "*He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these,*" &c.

These things are not done in a corner, but are occurring all over the land. The Bible, so far from contradicting them, is from beginning to end but a history of spiritual manifestations occurring among the Jews and in the early Church. The *πνευμα ἁγιον*, *pneuma hagion*, which passed from one to another by the laying-on of hands, was but spiritual magnetism, and the operation of imparting the magnetic impressibility (or mediumship) from one to another the same as is daily and hourly witnessed in modern spiritual circles. Query: Can God be thus imparted at the finger's ends? The prophets were mediums—some for impressions, as Isaiah and Ezekiel; others, perhaps, writing mediums; others, clairvoyants, as Daniel and John. Jesus was a great inedium, or mediator. So was Moses. You call all these miracles. WHAT IS A MIRACLE? *Something that never occurred.* There is a philosophy at the bottom of this thing that shows them all to be as natural as breathing—the result of natural law, by which the spirits of the dead (so called) have, can and do

manifest their living presence to men in the body. *I know this.* The same philosophy which can explain how spiritual beings could make themselves manifest to Daniel and John, Abraham and Lot, will explain how the same thing occurs now. If one be a miracle, so is the other; and if one is natural, so is the other. Account for the visions of Daniel, John and Paul, and you account for those of Andrew Jackson Davis,* Swedenborg and Edmunds.† If one be a miracle, so is the other, and vice versa.

You say that the spirit or angel who appeared to John was Enoch or Elijah. How do you know? Moses and Elijah appeared to Jesus and his three disciples. How came Moses there? You say he must have been raised from the dead! Where is the testimony? Not in the Bible. You say that those who appeared to Abraham, Daniel and Lot, and at the tomb of Jesus, were angels, and not the spirits of men. The Bible is against you, for it calls them *all men!* In the latter case, too, there is such a discrepancy as to the number, position, &c., as to destroy the claim of infallibility urged in favour of those writings.

In your adoration of old revelation, don't be afraid to open your eyes and mind to the new, for, be assured, you are wrong, and every convert you make must, sooner or later, be unmade.—Fraternally yours,

D. CORY, M.D.

THE DOCTOR'S REPLY.

SPIRITAIRIA—PULPITOLOGY THE PARENT OF POPULAR FOOLISHNESS—"THE SPIRITS" TRIED AND FOUND WANTING—BELIEVING ON JESUS—PHILOSOPHY OF FANATICISM—MIRACLE DEFINED—ANGELS NOT GHOSTS, BUT IMMORTAL MEN.

In 1841, or thereabouts, I had the pleasure of an interview with Dr. Cory, at Little Fort, on Lake Michigan,

* The man at Hartford, Ct., who is reported there to teach that eight parts of the Bible are false, and that "the spirits" reveal all it contains of truth.—EDITOR.

† One of our New York judges.—EDITOR.

now styled, I believe, Waukegan. He was then a member of the Campbellite "brotherhood," as it is styled by the chief; but he was in advance of that "divine," then, as now, a great friend of "the spirits," or of the doctrine concerning them, termed by Paul "the doctrine of demons," inasmuch as the doctor then believed the important truth, as he confesses in the above, that *life beyond the grave depends upon a resurrection of the body*. This invulnerable truth, it appears, Dr. Cory has entirely abandoned, and we now find him side-by-side with the Prince of the Brotherhood in the regions of midnight, and in telegraphic communication with gassy spirits and transparent ghosts, demons all in spirit-land.

Until the date of the epistle before us, nothing ever reached me from the doctor, or his familiar spirits, informing me whether he were dead, alive, or both at once; for, strange as it may appear, in spiritology, when a man is alive he is alive; but when he is dead he is not dead; but dead and alive at once, being dead in this world and alive in the other, which is, as it were, somewhere next door to this. I am glad, however, to find that he is here, and not there—that he is still a whole living man; and that he is not a dead and alive man in both worlds at once. Though I don't know why I should be glad. Perhaps he does not thank me for my gladness; for upon spiritological principles a man both dead and alive at the same time must be better off, seeing that he has shuffled off all the troubles and vexations of this world with his mortal coil; and, as a "spirit," "ghost" or "δαίμων *daimōn*," instead of refreshing bone and muscle in Lake Michigan, doth

Bathe in glassy realms his airy soul,
In etherous seas of heavenly blue:
Where no muddy wave of waters roll,
But all's transparent to the view!

But as our friend Mack says, "to be serious," I am sorry to find by the letter before me, that the doctor has read seven volumes of the *Herald* to so little purpose. But this is not

difficult to explain, and the explanation only deepens my regret; for while he considers me as an order of the old revelation, he assumes the position of infidelity, which can see in Moses and the Prophets only discrepancies, fallibility, and spiritual magnetism. With a brain so perverted the *Herald* can do nothing; because all its statements and reasonings are to show *what doctrine the Bible reveals for faith*; but if, when this is brought out, it is met by a virtual rejection of the Scriptures, all demonstration from them is rendered null and void. This is the doctor's case. He prefers to walk by sight to walking by faith. He has seen certain phenomena which he and spiritists interpret as it pleases them. Their interpretation, as might be expected, is at variance with the Bible, which none of them understand; and as their own opinions are "the idols of their den," they bow down to them and worship them, tolerating the Bible only so far as it can be twisted to the glorification of their own crotchets.

But after all, this is not to be wondered at. In the doctor's case, Campbellism prepared him for his present disregard of the Scriptures. That system of Gentile philosophy is notorious for its disregard of Moses and the Prophets. Its prince is remarkable for the slight he puts upon them, styling them "*an old Jewish almanac*." If the Hierophant of Campbellism speak thus disparagingly of God's "*sure word of prophecy*," what need be expected from those whose consciences he directs, but a higher veneration for "revelments of the spirits," than for the revelations of the Spirit of God to the prophets.

Other spiritists have been prepared for their present excesses and illogical conclusions by indoctrination with the double-distilled foolishness preached by the pulpsters of the land about souls, experience, spiritual operations, heaven, hell, purgatory, saints in glory, and so forth; all of which the Bible has as much to do with as with table-moving and spirit-

rap! When one enters an ecclesiastical conventicle, and listens to the speechification of the pulpit occupant, what use is he observed to make of Moses and the prophets? Literally none! The Bible is not expounded. It has fallen into desuetude in that respect; and referred to only for the text, or the *pro forma* reading of a chapter. The people have been brought to this by the incompetency of the clergy, who know not how rightly to divide the word; nor dare they if they did; for a right division would destroy their creeds, expressed or understood. The people now like to have it so; and the clergy, who live upon them, are obliged to do their pleasure. So true is it, that "like priests like people," and *vice versa*.

The people thus bedrugged have unscriptural views of everything. There is no topic, however, upon which they make such egregious blunders as that of "spiritual operations." They are unable to distinguish between the *spirit of their own brain and nervous system in its workings*, and the operation of the Holy Spirit of God. All the workings of their brainflesh on theologico-mataphysical topics, they must erroneously ascribe to the Spirit of God. By this ascription they heap upon God all the utter foolishness they detail in what they call their experiences, or God's dealings with their souls! I have impatiently listened to accounts of such dealings with souls, which, if they had been attributed to the operation of my spirit upon the narrator, would have made me highly indignant at the idea that I could have been supposed fool enough to deal with any man's soul after such a fashion. Oh that the people did but know themselves! But of his own constitution and the laws to which it is subjected, man is profoundly ignorant; and add to this his ignorance of God's prophetic and apostolic teaching, and we have as wild a beast as any that roams the woods. Solomon's wish may still be appropriately expressed, saying,

"Would that the sons of men might see that they themselves are beasts!"—for assuredly on religious topics they manifest as little scriptural reason and sagacity.

Shall we forsake the Word's teaching for the "revelments of the spirits," or for the *brain flesh workings of the nervous fluid*, which are identical? Nay, Doctor dear, I tell thee, *Nay!* I see prophecies recorded in the Bible thousands of years ago, fulfilling at this time upon the earth; I see a whole nation scattered abroad, existing, and having existed for ages, under the precise circumstances the One Spirit, speaking by Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Jesus, Paul, John, &c., declared they should; I see a civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the nations in the Old World in actual manifestation according to a word penned at the dictation of God's Spirit, hundreds of years before it had a beginning; I see all these things, and innumerable others that have come to pass exactly as foretold in the Bible from end to end. Shall I abandon such revelation, or admit the "revelments of the spirits" through Madams Long, Brown, and Coan, to equality with it, for the vagaries of Andrew Jackson Davies, Emanuel Swedenborg, and Judge Edmonds?! Perish the thought for ever and ever, that I should be such an egregious fool! No; give me the book of Daniel or the Apocalypse, and take who will all the dollar or fifty-cent revelments these three women's familiar spirits may rap out to them for their especial benefit from the spirit-world, where I suspect, they are as knavish as many of their votaries in this. I want none of them; being abundantly furnished with the most reliable revelations in the Scriptures of truth.

Dr. Cory bids us follow the apostolic exhortation to "*Try the Spirits*." The advice is very good when taken in its proper sense. The apostle, however, does not mean "Go to Madams Long, Brown and Coan and try their familiar spirits." To one who understands the Word, such an exhortation

would be a self-evident absurdity, because no enlightened man would expect to find spirits worthy of the least respect in familiarity with Gentile women, ignorant, and consequently faithless and disobedient to the gospel of the kingdom of God. In the apostle's day, the "spirits" he speaks of were "spiritual gifts," received by men and women who had previously become obedient to the faith, and imparted to them by the laying-on of apostolic hands with prayer.—(Acts viii. 15-17.) These "spirits," or gifts, were subject to those who possessed them, for Paul says, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." These gifts were styled *spirits*, because they were *manifestations*, not of so many different spirits, but of the *One Spirit of God*, which divided the gifts to every recipient severally as He willed.—(1 Cor. xiv. 32; xii. 7, 11.) *There is no instance of the Spirit willing spirits to Gentiles ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom since the Lord Jesus received gifts for men.*—(Ephes. iv. 8, 11.) Those who now profess to be intimate with "the spirit" are disobedient unbelievers, to whom God does not grant His Holy Spirit. Before men can receive this, 'granting it to be given in these days' (of which I have seen no evidence as yet), men must believe the gospel and obey it. Some who received spirits, or spiritual gifts, after baptism (Acts viii. 16; v. 32), fell into grievous errors of doctrine, and prostituted the gifts, or spirits, subjected to them to the confirmation of their teaching. Among these errors was the denial of Christ's having come in the flesh. These were "false prophets," or teachers having the gift of prophecy (1 Cor. xii. 10), by which they could speak of edification, exhortation and comfort (1 Cor. xiv. 3); or, by misusing it, to the perversion of their brethren. They went out from the Churches of Christ. John styles them, also, "anti-Christ," who, he says, "went out from us, but they were not of us—for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that it

might be made manifest that they were not all of us." In another place he calls these anti-Christ, or false prophets, deceivers and spirits, because they were of the spiritual men, or of the class having spiritual gifts, for these were not common to all the members of the Churches. John warned his brethren against these Nicolaitans, saying, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine (that Christ has come in the flesh), receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed—for he that biddeth him God-speed is a partaker of his evil deeds."

Now, in order to ascertain whether these spirits should be admitted to Christian hospitality and good wishes, they were to be tried. Those exhorted to try them were not ordered to run after them with fifty cents or a dollar in hand to fee every witch reported to have familiar spirits, but to examine the pretenders who presented themselves as claimants of your Christian courtesy before you opened your house and home to them. The test question was, "Do you believe that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh?" If he said, "I do," then the spirit was known to be a prophet of the right stamp; but, if he replied, "I do not," he was known to be a Nicolaitan or Gnostic, "whose deeds," says Jesus, "I hate."—(Rev. ii. 6, 15.)

But this test-question is no longer equal to the detection of fictitious spirits, false prophets, anti-Christ and deceivers. These troublers have shifted their ground. They aim at the same result as their evil generation did in the days of the apostles, only they propose to attain to it by different expedients. Their aim is to draw away disciples after themselves for their own advantage, and in doing this, they find it necessary to get quit of Moses and the prophets, with the testimony and teaching of the apostles. They admit that Christ came in the flesh, and, therefore, died, was buried and rose again; but they refuse to confess the law and the testimony as the sufficient rule of faith and practice. Hence they abandon "the Word that

lives and abides to the age," and seek for the living to "the dead," who, as the Scripture saith, "Know not anything."

The testimony of the Rapping-Spirits is not worth a pinch of snuff; for the theology they teach is contrary to and subversive of the Bible's. We need not run all over New York to consult the witches to ascertain this; for they pronounce "departed spirits" blessed in heaven, who while embodied were as ignorant and faithless of the gospel of the Kingdom as New Hollanders. The Lord Jesus has decreed that *he who believes not the gospel* (and there is no other in the Bible) *shall be condemned*. He, therefore, and the spirits are at issue. John, speaking for himself and the rest of the apostles, says, "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. *Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error.*" Here is a test the Rapping-Spirits cannot stand. If they testify the same things as the apostles, their testimony is superfluous; if they testify to the contrary, their testimony is false. Their votaries have no escape from this, but to reject the apostles as liars, which they virtually do.

The consulting of familiar spirits was one of the Jewish vices of old that brought down upon them the destruction of their commonwealth. Instead of seeking wisdom and knowledge, and counsel of the priests and prophets whom God raised up for them, they consulted the dead through mediums who pretended to hold intercourse with them. Referring to this absurd abomination, Jehovah said to Isaiah, "When they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto wizards that peep and that mutter:" say unto them, "Should not a people seek unto their God?" Should a people seek "for the living to the dead?" He then gives a rule by which the people may save themselves from imposition by the pretended answers of the dead, saying, "*To the Law and to the Testimony*: if they (the spirits) speak not according to

this word, it is because there is no light in them."—(Isaiah viii. 19. 20.) This rule, like John's, upsets all the "revelments of the spirits," from one end of Witchdom to the other.

Seeing, then, that these spirits are by these divine tests condemned as convicted liars, what is it to us, if those who are possessed of them, or demonized, should speak with tongues, open the eyes of the blind, or raise the dead? Paul tells us not to believe an angel from heaven if he preach any other gospel than the gospel of the Kingdom he preached. If I saw an angel descending from heaven, and on conversing with him he told me that it mattered not what I believed, so that I was sincere in my errors, and were immersed into the name of Jesus; and to prove that this was a message direct from Jesus Christ, should convert stones into bread, raise the dead, or hurl Staten Island into the Atlantic, I would not receive it. Wonders have been performed to establish lies of old times; and they are permitted now to *put our faith in God's word to the proof*.

Misapplication of Scripture is as fatal as ignorance of it, or unbelief. The Pope's throne was established and is sustained by misapplied Scripture; and from the same source arose the Mormon imposture of the West. I am sorry to see Dr. Cory has fallen into the same bottomless pit. He would have us believe that the *Spiritual Telegraph's* array of facts is an illustration of the saying of Jesus, that "He who believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go to my Father. This was fulfilled in the apostles and in those "spiritual men" who believed on Jesus through their teaching. It cannot be proved by theologians or "spirits," that the power to do such works as Jesus did as the result of "*believing on Him*," was to continue unto the Nineteenth Century, or till his return. No man who has any regard to his reputation for critical accuracy will quote Matt. xxviii. 20 in proof; because he knows that "*world*" in

that text signifies *age, or dispensation*, being *αιων, aiōn*, and not *κοσμος, kosmos*, in a universal sense. But there are many who do wonderful things that do not believe on Jesus; this text from John is therefore not applicable to them. They do their works, not as the result and evidence of faith, but *by the energy of their own wills operating upon the nervous systems of the patients*. The promise of Jesus is not to them; hence its fulfilment is not to be found in their mesmeric doings.

Nay, more than this. I would ask where are the disciples of "the spirits" to be found who believe on Jesus? The doctor may point us to the many clergymen and pious professors who believe and consult the spirits as abundant examples! But we reject them all as counterfeit. To believe on Jesus is the same thing as to "believe on God;" and to believe on them both is to believe what they promise and preach. Paul shows this clearly. He quotes the testimony of Moses, and says, *Abraham believed God*, and it (his faith) was counted to him for righteousness; and this saying, Paul explains by these words, to wit: "*Abraham was fully persuaded that what God had promised He was also able to perform*;" and therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness." For Abraham, then, to be fully persuaded that *what God had promised He was able to perform*, was for him to believe God. "Now," adds the apostle, "it was not written for his sake alone, that it (faith) was imputed to him; but for our sakes also, to whom it (belief of God's promise) shall be imputed, if we believe on Him who raised up Jesus from the dead." To believe on God, then, is not merely to believe that He exists, (none but a fool would deny that,) but to believe what He promises; "*against hope to believe in hope*."

To believe on Jesus, I repeat, is to believe what he preached. Not simply that there was, and is, such a person. A man would be set down for an ignoramus who did not admit this; and deservedly so. He that has no

more faith in Jesus than that he exists, or died and rose again, *does not believe on Jesus*. He may believe the same thing of Lazarus; but he does not therefore believe on Lazarus. To believe on a man, in the Scripture sense, you must believe what that man presents to you for faith. This is the great thing; for if you receive the man's doctrine, you receive him; if you reject that, you reject him also. "He rejecting me," says Jesus, "and not receiving my words—the words which I have spoken—the same shall condemn him in the last day." This is conclusive.

Now, who of the spirit-rappists receive the words of Jesus—the words that he has spoken? In other words, who among them believe the gospel of the Kingdom which he preached? (Mat. iv. 23.) Alas, if they have ever heard of such a gospel, infinitesimal is their conception of its import! Now, mark this—*Jesus, nor any other Scripture authority, ever promised the Holy Spirit, or its powers, to any persons who did not believe on him in believing the gospel of the Kingdom he preached*. Hence, whatever spirit it may be that spiritists rejoice in, it is not the Holy Spirit of God; but some other, it may be of Beelzebub, or some other representative of evil; but beyond all doubt or question, it is not of God. He gives not his Holy Spirit to the unholy, faithless, and disobedient, to play tricks with in moving tables, &c.; or to confirm the theological fooleries of Andrew J. Davis and Emanuel Swedenborg; or to endorse the scholastic divinities in the miraculous soul-dealings which pre-occupy the minds of professors to the exclusion of the word.

I have no controversy with spiritists about their "*facts*;" what I reject *in toto* is their explanation of them. I have done several wonderful things myself, and seen more remarkable ones performed by others. As far as my experiments have gone, the phenomena have all resulted from the energy of my own will operating on the brains and nervous systems acted upon. Without speaking or looking

at the man, I have compelled actions that he could not successfully resist; and which appeared wonderful to all who beheld him. Now, had I been a religious knave, I might have played off Simon Magus before the company, giving out that I was "the great power of God," having a prophet-mission to the world! I might have declared that these wonders were proofs of my divine character, and have set up for as great an ambassador of Heaven as any of the clergy, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Pope himself! Had I concealed from the subject my operation on his system, and had he been fanatically inclined, he might have attributed the influence he felt to the Spirit of God dealing with his soul; *especially if I had willed religious impressions upon his sensorium* instead of the secular commonplaces I did. This explains to my mind the origin of "religious experiences;" such, all such, I mean, as do not result from searching the Scriptures for the truth. People in families and societies mesmerise one another unconsciously. Their brains and nervous systems are acted upon by the ideas willed, evolving and expressed, among them. The preaching, praying, talking and silent wishes of some concerning others, create a halo of influence, which invests the community in its family and associational relations, like a fog. Individuals are pervaded by it as by the atmosphere—an atmosphere of spirituality, as it were. If the preaching, and so forth, be the vain imaginations of brain sinflesh, as it is with so few exceptions that we may say it is universally, the spiritual atmosphere is infectious, and generative of fanatical experiences, wildfire excitements, "awakenings," "miraculous dealings of God with souls," witchcraft, ecstasies, dreams, prophesyings, visions, "spirits," and a thousand other things detailed in the annals of fanatical religionism. And it may be noted, that *where the Script res are least accurately understood, these nervous - system manifestations must prevail.* No man

who is not enlightened in the gospel of the Kingdom is safe from the influence of this sectarian mesmerism. All who are seized with it, not being able to account for it upon any principles known to them, call it miraculous, or the operation of the Holy Spirit. There is nothing, however, miraculous in it, or holy. It is the natural result of the operation of the flesh-spirit of the community upon its own members. It begins in the flesh and ends in the flesh, and always leaves its victims in disobedience, (for joining a church is not obeying the gospel), and as ignorant of the Bible, and vastly more self-conceited, than when it originally demonized them.

"Speaking with tongues" is no proof of the existence of "the spirits," nor is the faculty necessarily a fulfilment of the promise of Jesus. I have heard an illiterate girl singing French and Italian songs who, five seconds before and the instant after the singing, knew not a word in either tongue. It was done by first mesmerising her, and then placing her *en rapport* with an educated lady who could perform. By this process the nervousity of the two became as one—as it were, mesmeric Siamese twins. Their two brains were a closed circle, the lady who played the guitar and sang being the positive brain-pole from which the will-influence passed to the negative brain-pole of the girl, causing her unconsciously to *sing with tongues*.

Jesus rested his claims, not upon the ground of his exclusive performance of miracles, but upon that of doing such miracles as no one had ever done before him. "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin" in rejecting me. He admitted that his adversaries cast out demons, for he said to them, "If I by Beelzebub cast out demons (or spirits), *by whom do your children cast them out?*" The casting out of demons by the Jews was "the healing the sick" by exorcism, or mesmerism, practised with religious ceremony. Finding that Paul was so successful in casting

out spirits (a Bible phrase for curing insanity, deafness, dumbness, epilepsy and such like) by the Spirit of God in the name of Jesus, the sons of Sceva undertook to mesmerise in his name. The operation of the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus was irresistible, but mesmerism in the same name was uncertain and dangerous to the operators, exciting the fury of the maniac against them. Modern mesmerists, though they believe not on Jesus, do wonderful things even in his name to confirm their vagaries, but do not meet with the same fate. The reason, however, is because their patients are as ignorant of Jesus and Paul as themselves. They cannot say, "Jesus I know and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Not knowing Jesus and Paul, they do not perceive that the mesmerisers in his name are impostors, however effectual the cure; therefore they escape, and delusion rests upon all.

In answer to the doctor's question, *What is a miracle?* I should say, *A work essentially more wonderful in power than anything that had preceded it.* This was the character of most of the works of Jesus: therefore they were miracles. They were essentially more wonderful demonstrations of power than anything performed since his day of which we have any authentic account. The apostolic miracles were also his, for "The Lord worked with them, and confirmed the Word they preached with signs following."—(Mark xvi. 20.) The time has not yet come to do greater works than his. The dead who have believed on him will arise and do them when he returns. Mesmeric manipulations, however surprising to this generation, are not miracles. They are mere physical phenomena. Cause the raging elements to cease their billowy strife by a "*Peace, be still!*" or feed your hungry thousands with five barley loaves and two fishes by the power of your "*spirits,*" ye mesmerisers, and ye may then talk to us with some show of reason of the co-mediumship of your writing-mediums and clairvoyants with Jesus

and the prophets! Till then, hide your diminished heads with shame and face confusion.

I have nowhere said that "the spirit or angel that appeared to John was Enoch and Elijah." If Dr. Cory says this under the inspiration of his familiar spirits, they have misled him. My words were, "A prophet, one of the apostle John's brethren (*perhaps* Enoch or Elijah), was sent as an angel to him in Patmos." I need not, therefore, answer his question, "How do you know?" I do not *know*, having only *supposed* it. The prophet may have been Moses. But be he whom he may, the supposition is vastly more scriptural than the affirmation that the prophet was the ghost of a dead man or a familiar spirit to John.

In the absence of direct testimony, *scripturally-enlightened reason* teaches that Moses must have been raised from the dead. Spiritists have neither reason nor testimony against it. All they can say is, they are not convinced; and we may add, while they are beguiled by "the spirits" they never will.

Yes, I say that those who appeared to Abraham, Daniel, Lot, and at the tomb of Jesus, were angels and not human ghosts. Dr. Cory thinks that the Bible is against me because it styles them all "men." It does; and, therefore, they are not ghosts. They were angel-men; that is, *men sent of God*: for *angel* defines *office*, not nature, signifying *one sent*. They were men, but different from Abraham, Daniel, &c., in this, that they were *immortal men*, which earth-borns are not. An angel may mean either *an immortal man sent of God* or *a mortal man sent by the same authority*. The angels in question were of the former class, while the Lord Jesus, "the Angel of the Covenant" (Mal. iii. 1), was of the latter, though now exalted far above all immortals.

I believe I have noticed all the noticeable points in Dr. Cory's epistle. What I have written will, no doubt, find its way to him, as the *Herald* still visits the house of one well

known to him in Waukegan. I have written with no intentional disrespect to him, though freely and plainly; nevertheless, I confess, with profound contempt for his familiar spirits. I regard these as mere *spectra of the highly-excited sensoria of mediums, reflected, as from a mirror, upon their perceptive organs*, as in dreams. The mediums see the spectra, but those who "*seek to the dead*" through them do not, unless themselves, not *supernaturally*, but *preternaturally* excited. The believers in "*the spirits*" are not sufficiently skilled in science to explain the phenomena they observe. Generally speaking, they are ignorant of the little science yet embraced in "*the circle of the sciences*," and still more notably ignorant of the true import of the Bible. Such observers are sure to err in their conclusions. When the things belonging to flesh and blood are better understood, the ghost-religious opinions of the Spiritists of 1854 will be as much a subject of merriment as those of the pious murderers of "*Salem witches*" in times bygone. They will then have

come to know that *the spirit pertaining to flesh and blood*, and the Holy Spirit of God given to prophets and obedient believers of the gospel, are entirely distinct. The former is the fleshly spirit of the world; and the latter, "*the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive.*"—(John xiv. 17.) The Davises, Swedenborgians and Edmondses of the world cannot see this, because the spirit of the flesh is blinding. It exhales from the blood like a mist, befogging the brain. No wonder such persons see sights, and, losing all control of themselves, are seized upon by *the effluence of their own organization* and made to perform the gymnastics which astonish the gaping multitude equally with themselves. For myself, I have ceased to wonder at anything short of men becoming rational and intelligent believers and obeyers of the truth. In the midst of the universal foolishness and ignorance of the Bible that prevails, this is wonderful indeed!—(*Herald of the Kingdom.*)

WHY DO MEN DIE ?

THE answer of physiology to the above question would be this: because after a certain point in a man's life, the process of eating, drinking, breathing, digestion and assimilation, do not keep up the repair of the various tissues of the human frame at an equal rate with the wear and consumption of those tissues by nervous and muscular action. Up to what is called the "*prime of life*," the waste or consumption occasioned by thinking, moving, &c., seems to be made even faster than that consumption; but, after that period, the recuperative or repairing faculty of one part and another, falls in arrear of the wear and tear, and at the end (barring accidents and special diseases) the man dies of exhaustion of the vital powers, or as it is called, "*old age.*"

But how is it, or why is it that man has been thus constituted? The answer to this question we find not in natural science, but in the Scriptures. The apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv. 21) says that "*by man came death*;" and in another place (Romans v. 12), "*by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin.*" It is sufficiently obvious that the "*one man*" referred to is Adam, the father of the race. The statement that death came into the world through his sin, implies that but for his sin, death would not have entered, and this is harmonious with the account of Adam which is given in the book of Genesis.

Referring to the early chapters of that book, the position of things presented to our notice is that of a *living* man, organised by divine power of the materials

common to the earth and its surroundings. That that man was not immortal, or incapable of death, is proved by the fact that ultimately he did die; and that he was originally in such a condition as that death would not have come in the natural order of things, is implied by the circumstances that death (not violent, but what is called natural death) was the *penalty* of his disobedience to God's commands. Now between the two physical conditions of immortality and mortality, there could have been a third, namely, a condition in which Adam was simply living; living by breathing and by eating and drinking, these processes sufficing so long as he had a sufficiency of air and food to repair *all the waste* to which his frame was subject. This is the condition in which all the circumstances of the case would lead us to conclude that Adam was, when first placed in the Garden of Eden.

We learn that Adam transgressed the divine command, and the penalty was death. How was that death inflicted? It was not a violent death, as by the sword or the cross; nor was it an instant death as by lightning, but it was accomplished by the bringing about of such a condition as that the physical frame would wear away faster than it was repaired, and the end would be decay. To accomplish this no chemical or organic change was needed in Adam's body beyond such as would result from the vital force possessed by the various parts being limited. In the case of Adam the limit of vitality was reached at 930 years. That such was the procedure in the case is probable, not only from the circumstances already related, but also by the additional circumstance that the limit was subsequently further shortened to 120 years.—(Gen. vi. 3.)

The manner in which "death hath passed upon all men" is by the descendants of Adam inheriting the vital conditions which pertained to him; and since in his case, by reason of disobedience, the vital conditions were such that, after a certain

time, death must result, so his descendants are all mortal. The "judgment" or condemnation of his sin hath thus passed upon all men; while, in addition, the ignorance and the follies of the race have further tended to weaken their vitality, and to induce various diseases, by reason of which but few men find their death of "old age." Though we were "in Adam" at the time he sinned, the moral responsibility does not descend to us because we had no voice nor will in it, but we were in him at the time he sinned, and so sinned in him; we were in him at the time he was condemned, and so die in him, ourselves inheriting the physical consequences of the penalty passed upon him. ("In Adam all die."—1 Cor. xv. 22.) There is no injustice done to us in this inheritance of mortality, for were each man put upon probation under the divine law, each would sin. The giving of the law of Moses amply proved it, for by that law was the knowledge of sin, and what a multitude of offences did the law bring to light!

It has been recently contended, by some who should have known better, that death has not come upon the Adamic race as the direct result of Adam's sin and succeeding sentence, but only because Adam's transgression bequeathed to his children "a warp or bent, or impetus which leads them naturally to commit sin," and they, committing sin, each die for their own transgressions. But see what this involves. Look at the nations of Adam's children who have never come within hearing of the divine revelation, and it will be seen that the proposition just stated involves that the God whose ways are holy, just and true, judicially condemns men to death for doing that against which they heard no law, and of which He never forewarned them that death would be the penalty. It involves, (contrary to the express statement of Scripture,) that sin is imputed where there is no law. Look at the circumstance that frequently infants die, and it will be seen

that if the proposition in question be true, it involves not only that sin is imputed without law, but that personal guilt is imputed without transgression! Oh that

men would "Hold fast the form of sound words in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus."

J. J. HADLEY.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERN-
ING A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

DARWIN AND HUXLEY REFUTED.

(Continued from page 107.)

"AMONG our primary beliefs is that of 'cause and effect,' and what is embodied in it, 'force.' Believing in these, we must carry them back and back, until at length, compelled by an inexorable logic, we believe in a First Cause, the primal origin of force. Herbert Spencer enunciates the same truth with much clearness: 'We cannot think at all about the impressions which the external world produces on us, without thinking of them as caused; and we cannot carry out an enquiry respecting their causation without inevitably committing ourselves to the hypothesis of a First Cause.' Science of itself does not reveal, because it cannot reach that First Cause; but

science reveals phenomena which, being rightly interpreted, lead by sound logical sequence to a belief in that First Cause. Here, then, is borderland between science and revelation.

We see the legitimate province of science, in which it reigns supreme, and beyond which it cannot pass. Science observes, compares, and classifies natural phenomena. It lays the whole material universe open to the mind. It reveals the constituent elements of rude matter, and the plan in which its multitudinous combinations are effected. It shows the wondrous structure of vegetable and animal organisms, and the evidences of design in them all. It unfolds the mechanism of the heavens, and the sublime simplicity of those laws which guide the stars in their spheres. It

indicates, besides, a harmony and a unity pervading nature, adapting each particle of matter; each insect, plant and animal; each planet, star, and constellation to its own place, and making it fulfil its own mission in the grand scheme of the universe. It shows that nothing is defective, nothing redundant. Scientific investigation tends to establish the fact of oneness of design and plan in everything. And thus, as one of the greatest of living naturalists tells us, we are led to the culminating point of man's intellectual interpretation of nature—his recognition of the unity of the Power of which her phenomena are the diversified manifestations.

All nature's phenomena, wherever and however observed, direct towards a Supreme Designer and Lawgiver, whose existence is also recognised, as we have seen, in the primitive instincts of universal humanity. We hail science, therefore, as a most powerful ally; we bid her God-speed in her vast field of research. But we see, at the same time, that it is not within the province of science to solve any of those great problems which I have mentioned. They lie beyond her ken. The dogma of materialism which, it has been supposed, science confirms, utterly fails to answer the questions put by the philosophic mind, or to satisfy the longings of the human heart. Tyndall himself has been obliged to confess the fact. With touching pathos he says, in the preface to the expurgated edition of his now famous 'Address: 'I have noticed, during years of self-observation, that it is not in hours of clearness and vigour that this doctrine (of material Atheism) commends itself to my mind; that in the presence of stronger and healthier thought, it ever dissolves and disappears, as offering no solution of the mystery in which we dwell, and of which we form a part.'

Scientific teaching does not come

within the province of revelation. It is true, however—and the fact should not be lost sight of—that revealed truth touches on scientific truth at many points.

Revelation does not give a scientific cosmology. That lies outside its province. But then, just where science stops short, unable to solve one of the grandest problems of nature—the origin of matter and of the material universe—revelation steps in to supplement its teaching. Science, as we have seen, points to the great truth that there must be a Creator, though it cannot of itself reach to it; revelation confirms and crowns that truth with the simple and sublime declaration, 'In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth.'

Revelation does not treat systematically or philosophically of 'force' and 'motion;' but it indicates that solution of their ultimate origin, in a living Omnipotent Being, which the highest philosophy points to. We read in the first chapter of Genesis, 'The Spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters'—representing, as it seems to me, that Almighty Being as the quickening principle of the universe.

Revelation does not touch on geology; but it leaves room for the fullest development of the successive strata of the earth's crust, even though it could be proven that millions of years had been occupied in their formation. '*In the beginning* God created the heaven and the earth.' No date is given. The simple fact of *creation* is affirmed, in opposition to any idea of development or material atheism; but myriads of ages may have intervened between that 'beginning' and the creation of man. Then, again, the historical record of the creation which follows seems to have a scientific basis, as if the writer by a Divine prescience, had anticipated the results of modern research. He tells us how the lowest forms of life were first

made, and how there was a gradual progression up to man, the last and lord of all.

Revelation does not enter into the mysteries of molecular physics, or the development of the life-germ, or the way in which it operates on material organisms. All these it relegates to science, whose function it is to investigate them. There is, however, one mystery which science cannot reach—the origin of life; and here again revelation makes a clear and full discovery. The brief account of the creation of Adam, given in the second chapter of Genesis, assumes a new significance when read in the light of the most recent discoveries of science. Chemistry has demonstrated, as we have seen, that the whole constituent elements of our bodies—in fact, organised bodies—are identical with those in the material world around us; and science, as we have also seen, indicates that the life-principle must be something entirely different from those material elements. The record contained in Genesis is here in complete accord with science, so far as science can go:—‘And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground.’ Had the writer of these remarkable words heard the recent statements of those eminent scientists, Professors Pritchard and Huxley, he could not have been more scientifically accurate. Huxley says of the matter of our bodies, that it is ‘the clay of the potter; which, bake it and paint it as he will, remains clay, separated by artifice, and not by nature, from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod.’ Again, the sacred writer records man’s inevitable doom—‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return;’ and Professor Huxley, all unconsciously no doubt, re-echoes the words of the inspired scientist—‘Under whatever disguise it takes refuge—whether fungus or oak, worm or man—the living protoplasm

dies and is resolved to its mineral and lifeless constituents.’ And the sacred writer does not stop here. He goes on to add what science might infer, but could not reach, as to the origin and implanting of life itself—‘The Lord God . . . breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul.’

Revelation gives no detailed or systematised, account of the various species of animals that exist on the earth, nor does it profess to enter into questions of structure, descent, or development. All this is outside its province; and it never interferes with the researches of the naturalist. It authoritatively declares a great general truth, however, which all the recondite theories of Darwin cannot overthrow, and which the profoundest studies of the physiologist tend to indicate and confirm—that each species was brought into existence by the distinct fiat of the Almighty Creator.’

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

We make the following extracts from a lecture by Dr. Tregelles, on “Historic Evidence of the authorship and transmission of the New Testament,” well calculated to aid the general reader in laying hold for himself of the grounds upon which the New Testament (and therefore the Old, for they stand and fall together) is entitled to implicit reception as the actual production of the apostles, who were companions of the Lord and witnesses of his resurrection.

“The historic evidence to the authorship of the New Testament books is a subject of common concern to all Christians. If attacks are made with great show of learning and research, it is well for those who may meet with such popular attacks to be fore-armed. It is not the lot of everyone to examine and search for himself through the mass of Christian literature for the first four centuries; but

there are few indeed who cannot apprehend the bearing of evidence when it is placed before them. The needful avocations of daily life will often render personal study and research impossible. The daily discharge of daily duty has to be fulfilled conscientiously, and it is to those who are thus engaged in the laborious occupations of the desk, the warehouse, or the shop that I wish especially to address this statement of evidence. All men are not astronomers, yet all can appreciate the results of mathematical knowledge when applied to astronomy. Just in the same way may the results of critical studies applied to Scripture be understood and used by readers in general. It is true that many may not even remember the names of the early witnesses to our New Testament books; still however, if they can grasp the facts and their evidence, they will retain and carry away those results, which will be of great practical value when occasion should arise.

On ordinary subjects there are things to which we give credit, because we rely on the accuracy of our informant. Thus, even amongst men of some scientific knowledge, but few calculate an eclipse for themselves; they see that its occurrence is stated in the almanac, and that is enough; and as to persons in general, they believe that the eclipse will take place on such a day and hour, with perhaps hardly a thought of how it can be defined by astronomers: and so on most subjects; we trust the information we receive because we believe in the competency of our informant. But when questions are raised, then, indeed, there is often enough a desire to investigate the grounds on which the information rests, and we may frequently satisfy ourselves as to these, though we never could have traced them out for ourselves.

In the present day, endeavours are habitually made to circulate almost every

possible statement which would invalidate the authority of Scripture. In the popular literature of the present day, how habitually do we find a laxity of thought and expression with regard to Scripture authority, or even a tacit assumption that modern research has disproved this as an antiquated superstition. I do not now speak of the open and avowed attacks on Revelation. And then, again, there is often a tone of tenderness when errors on these fundamental points are touched; whereas, any distinct assertion of the authority of God's Word is stigmatised as polemical intolerance. This may be found in publications which professedly avoid all mention of religious opinions. Thus a popular review, conducted ostensibly on such principles, recently dismissed a work with only the following remark: 'A thoughtful book on a great and difficult historical problem.' This said 'thoughtful book' being one of the most bitter and unseemly of modern attacks upon revealed religion, intolerant and severe; and the 'difficult historical problem' being just this: whether the four gospels are forgeries or not! If avowedly neutral publications, through oversight, admit what casts, by insinuation, such doubt on the objective facts of Revelation, what must be the tone of those which oppose it?

And there *are* open opposers—men who use all their influence, not only to negative the truths of revealed religion, by causing a rejection of the distinctive doctrine of Christianity—a redemption by the blood of the Son of God—but who set themselves to disprove the records of our faith; and when any defend those truths which they know to be of infinite preciousness to their own hearts, they stigmatise such with being actuated by sectarian bigotry and a narrow-minded rejection of the highest results of modern philosophy.

The mode in which many conduct

their opposition to the truthfulness and authority of the Scriptures has been thus defined:—Religion and metaphysics are now contemplated from within and not from without. The world has been absorbed in man. The opponents of Christian doctrine in the 17th and 18th centuries, were generally men of reckless and abandoned impiety, while they now claim its blessings without a Church; affect its morality without a Covenant; assume the name of Christ without acknowledging a personal Saviour; and regard Christianity itself as a necessary truth, independent of any Gospel-histories, and unsupported by any true redemption. They have abandoned the 'letter' to secure the 'spirit;' and in return for the mysteries of our faith, they offer us a law without types—a theocracy without prophecies—a cluster of definite wants, with no reality to supply them, for the 'mythic' theory concedes everything which the gospel satisfies, and only accounts for the widespread "delusion" by the strength of man's need. Christian apologists have exhibited the influence of the same change; they are naturally led to value exclusively those arguments which meet the exigencies of their own times; and, so now, it is a common thing to depreciate the outward evidences of religion which are not, however, the less important, because they are not conclusive to some minds. Historical proofs must necessarily claim attention, even when they cannot convince; and, as aforetime, many who did not believe Jesus' words, believed for his very word's sake, so still the external array of Christian evidence may kindle the true inner faith, and in turn reflect its glory."—(*Elements of Gospel Harmony*. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, pp. 3, 4.)

Whatever be the tone of mind in the present day, nothing surely can deprive historic proof of its value and force. Be it remembered that its force

depends not on the mental power of perception of those to whom it is addressed, but upon its own nature. If a man be incapable of understanding a demonstrated theorem, the fault lies in *his* mind, and not in the nature of the proof itself. We must consider this whenever we see men who are not convinced by the plain and distinct testimonies to the historic reality of the Christian revelation. Those who are proof against all conviction, seem to assume that it displays mental superiority; if so, it is of the same kind as would be shown by one who would deny the conclusiveness of a single geometrical demonstration. Such an one *might* deem himself superior to common opinions: what others would think of *him*, is a somewhat different question.

I wish if possible to restore the historic grounds of Christian evidence to the proper place. They are, I am persuaded, a citadel which will ever be found impregnable; it seems as if the enemies of revelation have secret misgivings as to this point, for they direct those attacks which are intended to make an impression on the *multitude*, on any other point rather than this; they casually describe it as of little importance, or else they pass it by as if they would rather ignore its very existence and lead others to do the same.

In speaking of the historic evidence of the authorship and transmission of the books of the New Testament, I propose first to bring your attention to those proofs which are conclusive on the subject of their having been written by the apostles and their companions, and then to point out briefly the channels through which they have been transmitted to us.

How, then, can we know satisfactorily to whom we ought to ascribe the authorship of the ancient works? How can we *prove* that any book was really written by the person whose name it bears? How can we, living at this time, enquire with all confidence into points of author-

ship which relate to a period eighteen centuries ago? In other words, What is the process of proof which must be applied to this subject?

A very distinct statement of the mode of investigation is given by the "Christian" writer, Augustine, about the year 400. He lays down plainly and unhesitatingly that the authorship of Scripture must be investigated in just the same manner as he would enquire in secular writings. In the case of profane writers he says, most truly, that it has often happened that works have been produced and attributed to their pens which have afterwards been rightly rejected as spurious—and why? Because such alleged writings possess no external evidence of their authenticity, not being mentioned by contemporary and immediately subsequent authors; and because they also, in their contents, present those things which are not in accordance with the author to which they have been ascribed, or to his known writings, or to the time in which he lived. This is a plain discriminating canon of Augustine for the rejection of supposititious writings.

But as to authentic works, we have simply to apply the converse of this canon. Augustine asks how we can then determine such and such works to be the genuine productions of Hypocrates? He replied: "Because a succession of series of writers, from the time of Hypocrates and onward to the present day, have declared them to be such, so that to doubt would be to act the part of a madman." "Whence (he continues) do men know as to the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and other authors, what is really theirs, but by the same continued testimony of successive ages?"

This principle he then applies to the point, with which I would now connect it:—

"Many (he says) have written much on the subjects relating to the Church, not

indeed with canonical authority, but for purposes of aid or instruction. Whence does it stand as an admitted fact whose any work may be, unless it be by testimony from the author's time, by the continued and widely-extended knowledge amongst those who come after, that these things have been transmitted to us, so that, when asked, we need not hesitate when we ought to answer?"

Augustine, in this passage, is addressing Faustus, the Manichæan, the first (it is said) who denied that the gospels were really written by those whose names they bear. He then applies the argument to the controversy which he was at that very time carrying on with him.

"Why should I go back to things long past? Look at these very letters which we hold in our hands; and if, sometime after we shall be dead, any should deny those to be Faustus's, or those to be mine, whence will he be convinced, except through those who now know these things, transmitting, by continued succession, their acquaintance with the facts to posterity?"—(*Contra. Faustus*, i. 33).

Now, these principles are of the utmost importance, with regard to historic proof; for although it might be objected that Augustine concedes too much to his opponent, in laying down that a genuine work ought of necessity to possess such successive testimonies; and although we know that many writings are received without doubt or hesitation, although the absolute evidence is but small in itself, yet this is certain, that no work can be spurious which is authenticated by such evidence as that which Augustine has described.

Thus, if in the ages which immediately follow that in which a work is said to have been written, we have distinct statements from credited witnesses of its existence and authorship, we possess that definite historic ground on which we receive the best authenticated productions of antiquity.

The New Testament we must remember consists of a collection of books; the statement of evidence must therefore relate in part to the collection as such and in part to the several portions of which it is composed.

The period of enquiry as to any work

is, of course, limited to the ages immediately following that in which the authors are said to have lived. We need not go below the fourth century as to the New Testament, for from that time our twenty seven books have been commonly received.

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA, No. 75.

“Exhort one another daily.”—PAUL.

It belongs to us, brethren and sisters, peculiarly on the present occasion to contemplate “the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.” Of course, we can only do so in a cursory and superficial manner, for the phrase when thoroughly followed out in all its significance covers the whole ground of what God has been pleased to reveal to us, both in its practical bearing upon us in the matter of duty, and in its future relation to us as a matter of hope. Still a little edification is better than none, and we cannot look upon the sufferings of Christ or the glory which is to follow without being edified.

Christ was a sufferer in a sense which perhaps few people realise. The majority of persons are apt to look at the cross, and the cross only, and to imagine that the sufferings of Christ relate only to the physical pain he experienced in being put to so cruel a death, or at most to the anguish of feeling to which he was subjected in being mocked and insulted by a crowd of soldiery. To those, however, who study Christ’s life attentively, and particularly in the light of what the spirit of Christ has testified in the Psalms as to the sufferings of Christ, it becomes manifest that those sufferings were much more widely spread over his life than is popularly imagined; that they consisted largely of the mental

suffering caused by the present evil state of things among men; that in fact he was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. His sorrow and his grief were of a sort that many, and we might add, that nearly all, are unsusceptible of. Christ had a high conception—far higher than ever we can hope to reach—of what men ought to be and of the position that God ought to occupy among men, and therefore he felt a pain, that none could experience who were not of the same state of mind, in mingling with men who were on the whole, as regards God, like the brutes. We find that we come into fellowship with the sufferings of Christ in proportion as we grow up to him and become like him, drinking to his spirit, sharing his tastes, and laying hold of his hopes. We come to find that it is no empty metaphor which likens the people of God to strangers and pilgrims, having here no continuing city. We come to feel that David did not speak extravagantly when he said “My flesh longeth as in a dry and a thirsty land, wherein there is no water.” “I am as an owl in the desert, I am as a pelican in the wilderness.” If you examine the Psalms where these expressions of misery occur, you will find that they all have relation to the moral and mental attitude of the men around him. David suffered from the godlessness of those who became his

enemies, and from the proud indifference or brutish inertia of men whose portion is in this life, and who have not set God before them. In this, David was a preliminary exhibition of Christ, for the spirit of Christ was in him and made use of him to paint, in advance, so to speak, the portrait of the inner personal experiences of the Lord.

Now anyone who lays hold of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, with the result which those things were given to produce, will feel in fellowship with his sufferings on these points: he will feel alone; he will feel that the present is an evil world in a high sense; he will feel a pilgrim in the midst of it. It is well to see this; for in proportion as we see it, we are able to reconcile ourselves to our position, and to go through our course with much less chafe than we should experience if we were to go upon the supposition that we were to find things satisfactory in the present. If we act upon the idea that we are now to find edification, comfort, pleasure in all around, or to any great extent anywhere, we shall be grievously disappointed, because we shall be finding at every step that it is impossible at present to realise the aspirations of our hearts; impossible for a great variety of reasons. Even if the world were all we could wish, we are in ourselves only flesh and blood just now, and that is a weak thing both physically and spiritually. We do not require to live in the first century to fellowship the sufferings of Christ. We may have thought so in the first days of our spiritual childhood. We all, no doubt, had the idea that we required to be put in prison and to have the officer of the law come into our houses and take our things, or that we should be led forth to the stake or have our heads cut off, before we should suffer with Christ. We come to see the fallacy of that idea as we grow older. In one respect we are called upon to endure a more difficult martyrdom than the faggot

or the block. Many have undergone that kind of martyrdom whom Christ will not acknowledge in the day of his coming. In the early centuries, many rushed into that kind of martyrdom upon the same principle as that which leads the votaries of the Roman Catholic religion to submit to painful penances. Dreadful things have been suffered in the way of penances. The Emperor Charles V., who was one of the mightiest potentates in Europe for nearly half a century, after his abdication, lacerated his flesh with thorns and instruments of torture, ordered his coffin and lay in it, conducted his own burial service and went through many physical sufferings with the idea that by going through all those sufferings he would appease God for all the misdeeds of his life, and earn a place in the world to come. But Charles V. was an unjustified sinner. We know that God is not pleased with will worship, that is, with anything man can devise for His satisfaction. He is pleased only with our compliance with that He appoints; and all His appointments aim at the very contrary result secured by penances. For if you examine such matters to the root, you will find that they have their root in self-satisfaction and the desire to pay God off. Wicked people feel that God has a claim on them so to speak, and they want to pay Him off and be independent, whereas the true worship which God exacts excludes that feeling entirely, and brings us to the recognition of the fact that we cannot pay God off. All we can do is to obey Him in thanksgiving for His goodness in offering us forgiveness on the recognition of our position. The poor creatures who allow themselves to be crushed under the car of Juggernaut have just as much ground for hoping they will be saved as the Emperor Charles V., and the multitudes who, under the influence of a similarly perverted idea, in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th centuries, rushed to the faggot under the delusion that they were making themselves sure of a heaven before un-

certain. It is painful to read the writings of professed Christians of that time. One of the fathers of the so-called Christian Church—Ignatius—takes the lead in that kind of pernicious teaching by which men were taught to regard martyrdom as the true way into the kingdom of God.

The age of true martyrdom has not passed away. We are invited to offer ourselves as living sacrifices to God, and that is a far more difficult kind of sacrifice to offer than that which is at an end almost as soon as the pain is felt. Death by the sword or at the stake is sharp, short, and decisive, but a living sacrifice is a living martyrdom. It is a living mortification—a tedious and protracted suffering; it is a waiting for God in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation; it is an obeying of commandments which are irksome to the natural man; it is submitting to a trial which is not joyous but grievous. How is that? Because God forbids those who are invited to be heirs of His kingdom to be friends with the world, or to seek for pleasure in the present time. Those who are at liberty to be friends with the world, and to seek for pleasure in the present time, have a great deal to entertain them; and those who accept the calling to which God has called all who have ears to hear, experience the deprivation; though I admit that, after a while, the deprivation is felt in a different direction. What I mean by that is this: they do not feel the deprivation of present gratifications such as they are called upon to leave, for they learn to hate these, seeing that they are built on the wrong foundation. The world disregards God; they follow pleasure for its own behoof, and a saint learns to have no pleasure in anything from which God is absent, so that if he could, he would not take part; but he feels the deprivation in another way. He learns not only to hate those things, but to love another set of things, and the things he loves are not present to him except by

faith. If they were present to us now, there would be thousands who would make the exchange; indeed it is possible that three-fourths of the human race would make the exchange at once, if as soon as a man believed and obeyed the gospel he became immortal and the subject of glory and honour. But then, they would do it for the sake of getting something better than they had, and God is not pleased to bestow the highest good on that principle. He offers the highest good on condition of pleasing Him and not pleasing ourselves. This uninviting religion of faith gives us that opportunity. God is pleased with faith, and he is not pleased with anything short of it. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him;" but He has given us an opportunity of pleasing Him. What a great honour, if we could only realise it! What a great dignity for mortal men to have placed in their hands the power of giving satisfaction to the Creator of heaven and earth. He has given us that opportunity in Christ; but in giving us that opportunity He requires that the good things spoken of in the gospel be postponed, and the deprivation, therefore, relates to our being cut off, for the time being, from the things that are to come.

Nevertheless, we see them. Abraham saw them: he lived a long time ago, but he saw them and was glad. That is Jesus' testimony: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." Abraham is the father of the faithful; that is, he is the leading specimen of the kind of people with whom God is well pleased. We also look forward; we see, and we are glad; but our rejoicing is only in hope, and is mixed with weakness and with fear. We are told to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. Why with fear? The question is answered: "Let us, therefore, fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." That is an

apostolic reply to the question. With all our joy in looking forward to the rest before us, our rejoicing is moderated by the apprehension that possibly we may fail to enter in. Christ said, when Peter asked him upon the point, that many should seek to enter in but should not be able. Why not able? Because they are not in earnest about it; they are not persevering in it; they do not give enough energy to it. "We ought to give the *more earnest heed*," says Paul, "to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should *let them slip*." Many fail to attend to the things in this earnest way; they lay hold of the kingdom of God, but, at the same time, keep hold of twenty other things. They devote their best faculties and their principal time to the promotion of objects unconnected with Christ entirely, and which are not even necessary for them in the provision of their livelihood. A man, of course, must labour for his daily bread, and, in fact, that may be made a service of God; for it is one of the teachings of Paul, that whatever a man doeth, he is to do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men. He says that to servants; so we have it in our hands to turn everything to spiritual account if we are wise. I am referring, however, to people who are under no obligation to attend to things they have in hand, but who choose them as a matter of special taste, as a matter of honour, or as as a matter of respectability. These things engross all their energies, run away with their time, and steal their hearts, so that the things of God have little hold upon them, and, therefore, they fail.

Our rejoicing therefore is mixed with fear, and ought so to be. No one should slacken his hand until his course is run. Never put off the day of wisdom. If we reject wisdom for our own convenience, wisdom will reject us. It is one of the delusions we have to be on our guard against.

"While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

That is what is said by the false prophets of modern religion. The spirit of God says "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for 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. It will be too late for a man to hurry up and to be spiritually minded when he finds himself in the grasp of death.

What a refreshing thing it is to see men and women under the power of the fear of God. We need not fear men; we need not fear what brother this or brother that may say, because in a short time, in the order of nature all men will be in their graves, and there will be no reality in relation to us then except God, His mind, His purpose and His judgment. Therefore we need not vex ourselves, or encumber our spiritual operations with anxieties about the opinions of our fellows; let us be right with Christ. To be right with him, requires that we be in earnest, and all the time in earnest. Recollect his somewhat abrupt declaration to a young man who came to him, saying, "Lord, I will follow thee, but suffer me to go and bury my father," and to whom Jesus said, "Let the dead bury their dead; go thou and preach the kingdom of God." What is the application of that saying, unless it be to suggest that the young man in question by proposing to do something else besides seeking the kingdom of God, was as a man turning his hand from the plough? Christ's stern declaration is that such a man is not fit for the kingdom of God. That implies that there are some who are "fit," and some who are "not fit," and it also shows who are they that are "fit." Those who are fit are those who lay hold with full purpose of heart and accept the calling in Christ in its entirety. That calling is a thing that is very exacting indeed: it claims absolute ascendancy with those of whom it lays hold. It is a very

different thing from the religion preached from the pulpits of the churches and chapels. The clergy give the people to understand, though they do not say so in express words, that they need not be very much taken up with religion, that a sprinkling of it will be sufficient; whereas the truth of Christ demands to be the object of life, the principle of action, the subject of supreme affection—the engrossing thing.

How reasonable this seems when we allow ourselves to realise all the surrounding facts of the case, and the end of every human being. Walk through a cemetery, for instance, and read the tombstones. There you have a sleeping congregation of people, who have done with life. There are all sorts—from the grey-haired captain who acquired military or naval honours in various parts of the world, and in the language of Parliamentary compliment, “deserved well of his country,” to the unknown pauper who drivelled out his inglorious days in the workhouse. There are merchants under these sods, who, in their day, had risen to the top of the social scale by their industry and by talents which were highly applauded as their own, and who died in the lap of luxury. And there are beautiful daughters of rich men, who pined away in the surfeit of luxury, when, perhaps, a fair battle with the rough responsibilities of life, might have saved them from an early grave. And there are also strong young men and beautiful children, with whom parents had to part, and whom too, notwithstanding breaking hearts, they have had to follow into the grave. There they lie a common mass of corruption, “unknowing and unknown,” forgotten in the land of the living.

Now, let us imagine that we are included in that congregation, as we certainly shall be if the Lord arrest not the course of nature by his coming, and let us imagine the time for resurrection come. On the one side of the resurrection-line

there is the past—the human past, with its dropped burden of human anxieties and human business; and on the other side, what is there? God’s business; God’s business on a large scale. Christ is at the head of it. He puts aside the kings first and all their governments, and his great business is to exalt the name of God in the earth, and to bring the nations into subjection and harmony with him. Now, whom of all that congregation of the dead, whose mortal days and mortal concerns are all gone, whom of them would you select to be companions of Christ in this mighty work upon earth, which has as its object the exaltation of the honour of God’s name for ever and ever, in the countless population with which the earth is yet to be peopled? Would you think it a large price to ask of any of that dead rotting congregation for the privilege of immortal partnership in this work, that they should have devoted their mortal affections, their mortal energies, their mortal day, their mortal opportunities, to holding up the name of Christ in the day of his disgrace? I am sure that no one realising the matter would falter in the decision. Everyone would say it was most reasonable that people who lived for themselves, should reap what they had sown. The great majority of the dead lived for mortal life; and they cannot complain that they get and perish for what they worked. All they worked for was to have good things to put into their mouths, fine clothes to put on their backs, and the satisfaction of “respectability” in their day and generation. They got what they worked for; they had their reward; therefore what would you bring them forward into the kingdom of God for? The kingdom of God is for those only who seek it first, and work for it in a practical enthusiastic way, and are considered fools for their pains. Let us then, brethren, never listen for a moment to those who would hinder in the good fight by recommending what is called “tem-

perance" and "moderation" in the things of Christ. Their exhortations are altogether misplaced, and altogether uncalled for. The tendencies of the sluggish beast of the natural man are sufficiently powerful in that direction to render it quite needless for anyone to exhort us in that line. We need exhort the other way. We want continually to be pulled up in the direction of the path which the Captain of our Salvation himself has trodden before us, and in which he is, so to speak, leading us on. We know what sort of path that was. We know he was no "mild" and "moderate" man in the things of God." We know he had no schemes in hand but the one scheme of God's purpose. We know that he was never found trimming his sails to worldly breezes, or emulating or inculcating worldly principles; he devoted himself solely to the work which the Father gave him, and his relation to the world was one of continued antagonism. Our work and our attitude, if we are his brethren, will be the same. The work may be different now in its external form, but it is the same work for all that, based upon the same testimonies and the same principles, and aiming at the same end—the purifying of a peculiar people for the inheritance of the kingdom of God. Let us not fear to give ourselves to it with all our hearts. We shall not regret it when that day comes to us, or when we shall gasp out the vital energy which keeps us going for the time being. We shall look back with satisfaction on our little course if we are able to say: "Well, I know my efforts were weak, and I know my shortcomings were many, but I have sought to serve Christ to the extent of my mortal possibilities as circumstances allowed, and although it has been a toilsome career, hard work and unsatisfactory in some respects, I am glad to look back upon it and would do as I have done if I had to live it over again." On the other hand, the men or the women

who have merely mild notions of Christ, and who have been devoting themselves to personal aims connected with this mortal life, as the object of their exertions when they get through their comfortable drive and come to die, they will be far other than satisfied with the account they will have to look upon; they will be filled with consternation when they come to present it.

It is a glorious day that is coming, but glorious only in a certain line of things. The greatness and the glory of the day of Christ are all on a certain foundation. The glory and the foundation of the glory are both visible in the psalm that has been read. Let us glance at them for a moment. "The Lord reigneth." What is the leading feature of the system of government and of human life when the Lord reigneth? "The Lord is great in Zion, He is high above all the people, let them praise Thy great and terrible name; for it is holy." "Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship ye at His footstool; for He is holy." The recognition of the greatness of God is the foundation of the glory of those glorious "good times coming." It is testified that all nations shall come and worship before God; and that the knowledge of the glory of God shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea; God's will shall be done upon the earth as it is done in heaven. There will be glory to God in the highest at the time that there is peace on earth.

Now, in contrast to this, just look at the world at present. What does it know or care for the greatness and the glory of God? What conception has it of his holiness? Speak to it of such matters, and your speech is to them the speech of a madman. This helps us to realise how thoroughly evil the world is. Some people have a difficulty in realising the truth on this point. They certainly think the world was bad at the time of the Roman Emperors, and at the time that Christ appeared; but they have an idea that now we are advancing

by slow degrees towards an age of progress and enlightenment, and that in fact the world as a whole is already tolerably righteous. The prevalence of this idea is only proof of the ignorance that exists as to the nature of true enlightenment and true civilization. The world lieth in wickedness now as much as it did in the days of John. The wickedness has only changed its form a little. Wickedness in our day is refined; it is cultivated; it is methodical; it has got on a beautiful skin outside, but according to the divine standard, it is, perhaps, more reprobate than the untutored barbarism of early days. It is more proud and more blind to its weakness and dependence. The barbarians had some notion of a God, and entertained some idea that they must give some service to that God; but this miserable world of modern civilization is like to burst with exaggerated notions of their own importance. It is ripe for destruction. It is respectable enough according to current notions of respectability, but, in the eyes of God, it is sunk in corruption as much as it was before the flood, when mankind had corrupted His way upon the earth. Mankind have now utterly corrupted His way, and are walking after a thousand imaginations of their evil hearts, fearing not the Possessor of Heaven and Earth, regarding not His law, nor caring to know the state of the poor. Christ is with them a byword. We are close to the time when it is revealed that the angel—the symbolic angel with the sickle—will gather the harvest of the earth and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God, that it may be trodden by him to whom alone is allotted this great mission, even the man of sorrows who in his day bore testimony to the wickedness of the world; who upheld the faith and the honour of God, and who is to have the great honour of executing the work of judgment when the time arrives. To that work and that great honour we

are called if we are of his Spirit, if we are his brethren, if we have a family likeness with him. The family likeness, in this case, is a thing of principle and not of flesh and blood, and the principle shines through the gorgeous picture of the kingdom presented in this psalm. It is the greatness of God and holiness unto Him. "Be ye holy," Christ said to his disciples, and, therefore, to us. We may imagine him standing here this morning and saying, "Be ye holy;" and his apostles coming after him and saying the same thing: "Be ye holy in all manner of conversation." This is a practical exhortation. There are things which we ought to dismiss as inconvenient and unbecoming in sons of God, and Paul mentions among them covetousness, jesting and foolish talking. These are things which waste and burn up the mind. There are indulgences in common follies which dry up the spiritual sap and engender aversion to spiritual things. Let us avoid them. Remember, we are going on to the state symbolised by the four heraldic living creatures of Israelitish commonwealth, full of eyes, and which rest not day and night, saying Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is, and is to come. . . . Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created. We are to be incorporated in those four living ones if we are acceptable to Christ at his coming; and that acceptability will only exist then if we are now constituents of the peculiar people. Christ is working now; purifying the people unto himself, and he has been working at this work ever since he went away, through instrumentality employed.

It is hard work in our generation. The world is in such a wretched plight with regard to the truth, that we cannot begin where the apostles began. The apostles began straight off, whereas we have to convince men of the elementary principles.

We have to begin at the very foundation, and show that man is mortal; that Christ is coming, and that the kingdom of God is to be established on earth. Consequently there is the tremendous danger that people getting to know these elementary things may think they are all right, whereas the fact of the matter is that the foundation is only laid for the work of fashioning them into the likeness of the people prepared for the Lord. Well, if the difficulties are great, no doubt Christ's sympathies are great; if our situation is peculiarly discouraging, no doubt our welcome before him, if we over-

come, will be correspondingly cordial. He may say: "Many believed on me who saw the signs and wonders of the apostolic age, but ye saw them not, and yet believed: blessed are ye; enter now into the glory revealed." In prospect of that, and with the desire for such a reception, let us continue patient in this well-doing; breaking bread from Sunday to Sunday, daily reading the Word and persevering under all circumstances, however discouraging, in the patient observance of all the things that Christ has commanded.

EDITOR.

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

BY F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 123.

THE STANDARD.

THE standard measure of zeal for the house of God is, that a man be eaten up of it.—(John ii. 17.)

The standard length of patience is "long-suffering."

The standard degree of brotherly love is, that "we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."—(1 John iii. 16.)

The New Testament standard of retaliation for the saints is thus defined: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink."—(Rom. xii. 20.)

The standard examples of all spiritual excellence are Christ, the apostles and prophets.—(James v. 10.)

The standard by which rejectors of the truth will be judged is "Christ's words:" those which he hath already spoken.—(John xii. 48.)

The standard measure of love due to God and man is defined in the first and second commandments.

The standard height of perfection to which we are required to grow up, is defined in the action of our Heavenly Father, who, without respect of persons, pours down the blessings of rain and sunshine equally upon the appreciating and the unthankful.

The standard strength of adhesion to

the truth and the love of God as defined in the New Testament is, that neither tribulation, nor distress, nor persecution, nor famine, nor nakedness, nor peril, nor sword, nor death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from it.—(Rom. viii. 35-39.)

The standard gospel is inscribed with the "blessing of Abraham," the "hope of Israel," the "sure mercies of David," the "things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," and the "mystery of godliness."—(Gal. iii. 14; Acts xiii. 34; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Acts viii. 12.)

The standard kingdom of the past and the future, is the "kingdom of God," the "kingdom of David," the "kingdom of Israel," which, as regards the days to come, is the "kingdom of Christ."—(Matt. vi. 33; Rev. xi. 15; Mark xi. 10; Acts i. 6.)

The standard faith is the "faith of Abraham," the "faith of Jesus Christ," the "faith of the gospel," the "faith of God," which also is the "one faith," without which it is impossible to please God."—(Rom. iv. 16; Gal. ii. 16; Rom. iii. 3; Eph. iv. 5.)

The standard hope is the "hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers," the "hope of Israel," the "hope and resurrection of the dead," the "hope of

eternal life," the "hope of righteousness," the "hope of glory," the "hope of salvation," the "hope for grace," and the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. which is also the "one hope," than which there is no other for the sons of men.—(Acts xxvi. 6; xxiii. 6; xxviii. 20; Tit. iii. 7; ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 13; Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 27; 1 Thess. v. 8.)

The standard works upon the truth are the sixty-six volumes written by Moses, the prophets and the apostles.

REFERENCE TABLE No. 124.

EXHORTATION

To sinners: "Repent ye and believe the gospel."

To saints: "Fornication, uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once named among you as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient"—*i.e.*, we have no time for such things, neither are they fit and proper elements of saintship at any time or place, or under any circumstances whatever.—(Eph. v. 3.)

To Christ's soldiers: "Take unto you the whole armour of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day."—(Eph. vi. 13.)

To babes in Christ: "Leaving the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection."—(Heb. vi. 1.)

To strong brethren: "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not please ourselves."—(Rom. xv. 1.)

To doubters: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."—(Rom. xiv. 23.) "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

To contenders: "In meekness instruct those who oppose themselves."—(2 Tim. ii. 25.)

To the spiritual workman: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, *rightly dividing the word of truth*. But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness."—(2 Tim. ii. 15.)

To young men in Christ: "Flee youthful lusts; but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the name of the Lord out of a pure heart."—(2 Tim. ii. 22.)

To the free: "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves

also in the body."—(Heb. xiii. 7.)

To the worldly anxious: "Be careful for nothing."—(Phil. iv. 6.)

To those who attend regularly upon the meetings: "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is."—(Heb. x. 25.)

To well-doers: "Let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not."—(Gal. vi. 9.)

REFERENCE TABLE No. 125.

APPROPRIATE.

Barabbas (the robber) signifies "the son of shame."—(Matt. xxvii. 16.)

Bildad (one of Job's three friends), signifies "son of contention."—(Job ii. 11.)

Baasha (signifying "wickedness") followed in the wicked ways of Jeroboam.—(1 Kings xvi. 1-5.)

The name of Hagar, who fled from the face of Sarah, signifies "flight."—(Gen. xvi. 16.)

Korah, who with Dathan and Abiram, headed the conspiracy against Moses and Aaron, fittingly signifies "boldness."

Eutyclus, who was brought to life by Paul after falling down from the third loft, appropriately signifies "fortunate."—(Acts xx. 9.)

Egypt (Heb., Mizraim), where Israel was in bondage, signifies "that binds, straitens, or that troubles or oppresses."

Onesiphorus, who ministered very seasonably to the relief and comfort of Paul, signifies "bringing profit."—(2 Tim. i. 16.)

Rome, which is the "fourth kingdom, strong as iron," signifies "strength."

Saul, to whom Christ gave a new mission, signifies "demanded;" and Paul, who esteemed himself as "less than the least of the apostles," means "small or little."

Phygellus, the brother who forsook Paul, his name aptly means "fugitive."

Job's name signifies "he that weeps or cries," which fitly harmonises with his own experience, and also with his express statement, "my face is foul with weeping."—(Job xvi. 16.)

Ruth, who became the ancestress of Christ by the birth of Obed, the father of Jesse, the father of David; her name means "satisfied," and suitably fits the circumstance.

Crete means carnal, fleshly, and quite harmonises with a description by one of

their own prophets, and quoted by Paul, viz., "The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies." This witness says Paul is true.—(Titus i. 12.)

Andronicus, who was "of note among the apostles," his name means a man excelling others, a victorious man.—(Rom. xvi. 7.)

Phœbe, which signifies "shining, pure," was well counterparted in her character as a sister in Christ; for Paul commends her as a "servant of the ecclesia," and a "succourer of many," including Paul himself.—(Rom. xvi. 1.)

Onesimus means profitable, useful, and fits in with his ultimate character, as expressed by Paul to Philemon, "which, in time past, was unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me."—(Phil. i. 10.)

REFERENCE TABLET, NO. 126.

MESSIAH.

Adam.—The Messiah comes before us (typically) for the first time in the Bible in connection with the very first man, concerning whom Paul says, "he was the figure of him that was to come."—(Rom. v. 14.) The principal matters in which Christ was prefigured were, 1st, that Adam was "Son of God" (Luke iii. 38); 2nd, that he was constituted federal head of the race ("be fruitful and multiply"); 3rd, that to him was given dominion over all the earth, (Gen. i. 28,) with command to replenish and subdue it. (Compare Psalm viii. with Heb. ii. 6-9; 1 Cor. xv. 25-28.) 4th, his wife was taken out of him, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, and called also by his name—*Ish*, man, and *Isha*, woman, (which compare with Eph. v. 30-32.)

Eve.—The second time Messiah is presented to notice is in the promise to Eve of a serpent-bruising seed, (Gen. iii. 15); and again his sacrificial sin-covering character is prefigured in the "coats of skins" where-with the Elohim "clothed them," subsequent to the transgression and the promise of a deliverer.

Abraham.—The Messiah is again distinctly brought to view in the promise to Abraham: "to thy seed will I give this land" (Gen. xii. 7); which seed Paul says is Christ.—(Gal. iii. 16.) And again he comes forth in the promise, "thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies," and bless the nations.—(xxii. 17, 18.)

Isaac.—Christ is again prefigured in Isaac who was the child of promise, "born

after the spirit," offered up, and received again from the dead.—(Gen. xxii; Gal. iv. 28-9; Heb. xi. 17-19.)

Jacob.—Christ was again prefigured in Jacob's vision of the angels ascending and descending upon the ladder (see John i. 51.) And as the shepherd and stone of Israel, and the son of Jacob's God.—(Gen. xlix. 24.)

Judah.—Messiah is again promised in connection with the prophetic blessing pronounced upon Judah, "Shiloh is to come, and to him the people are to be gathered."—(Gen. xlix. 10.)

Joseph.—What Joseph's brethren did to him, is just what the Jews did to their Messiah in the days of his flesh; they both made a sale for silver of the one destined by God in due time to be their great Saviour in the time of "Jacob's trouble."—(Gen. xxxvii. xlvii.)

Moses.—Most clearly are Messiah's days foretold in the prophesying by the Jewish lawgiver. Moses tells Israel that Jehovah will raise to them a prophet from their midst like to him, to whom says he "ye shall hearken."—(Deut. xxviii. 15; Acts iii. 22.) Then also in the words "Who shall go up for us to heaven" (Deut. xxx. 11-14), we have both the coming of Christ and his resurrection signified.—(Rom. x. 5-9.) The song of Moses is also a prophetic shadowing forth of his reign when the Gentiles shall rejoice with his people.—(Deut. xxxii.; Rom. xv. 10.)

The Law.—Christ is also most clearly shadowed forth in the law, and being witnessed by the various offerings of beasts and first fruits, by the manna, by the mercy seat, by the altar, and by the veil and its colours, by the ark of the testimony, and the lamp stand and its light, by the anointing oil, and by the blood of atonement, by the paschal lamb, and by the urim and thumim, by the high priestly offerer, and indeed by the entire tabernacle, which is the "form" and "letter" of the truth, the substance and spirit of which is Christ.—(Luke xxiv. 27; Heb. x. 1; John vi.; 1 Cor. x. 4, 5 7; Heb. ix.)

Joshua.—In both name and mission Messiah is well typified in Joshua. (See Heb. iv. 1-10.)

David.—The covenant with David (2 Sam. vii.) establishes Messiah upon David's throne and kingdom at a period future to his resurrection from the dead.—(Acts ii. 29-36.)

The Psalms.—The Psalms foreshewing the sufferings and kingly glory of Israel's Messiah are not a few—his experiences

during the "days of his flesh" is pre-eminently discoursed upon in the following Psalms iii., vii., viii., xvi., xviii., xxii., xxiii., xxx., xxxi., xxxv., xxxvii., xxxix., xl., lv., lxi., lxiii., lxxviii., lxxx., lxxi., lxxxiv., lxxxviii., lxxxix., xci., cii., cix., cxviii., cxix., cxxxix. His future government of the nations upon earth is the subject of prophecy in the following: Psalms ii., xlv., xlvii., xlviii., lxxv., lxxvii., lxxii., lxxvi., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxix., xciii., xcvi., xcvi., xcvi., xcix., cii., cxxii., cxxxii., cxlvii., cxlviii., cxlix.

The prophets.—That the Messiah of Israel's prophets was to be both a sacrifice for sin, and a "great king" upon David's throne, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt. The principal witnesses to his sufferings are Isaiah (viii., liii., xlix., l.), Daniel (ix.), and Zechariah (xi., xiii.); while the sure testimonies to his final exaltation in Jerusalem restored, may be set down as follows: Isaiah ii., iv., ix., xi., xxv., xxx., xxxi., xxxii., xxxiii., xxxv., xl., xli., xlii., xliii., xlv., xlix., li., lii., liv., lv., lix., lx., lxi., lxii., lxiii., lxxv., lxxvi.; Jer. xxiii., xxx., xxxi., xxxiii.; Ezek. xl.; xlviii.; Dan. ii., vii., xii.; Hos. xiii., xiv.; Joel ii., iii.; Amos ix.; Mic. iv., v., vii.; Jeph. iii.; Hag. ii.; Zech. i., ii., iii., iv., vi., ix., xi., xiv.; Mal. iii. iv.

New Testament.—Those Jews whose eyes were open to the truth, recognised in Jesus the promised anointed one; when they saw him they said "We have found the Messiah;" "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write;" "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel."

To the Jewish nation, as a whole, Christ was a stumbling-block, the cross was an offence, and is so to this day; they did not "believe *all* that the prophets had spoken;" their moral status was at fault; they judged only after the flesh, in which also they gloried, to the obscuration of the righteousness which was being prepared for them before their eyes; they were undiscerning in reference to the most palpable correspondence between the prophecies of the Old and the facts of the New Testament.

To professors of wisdom of the Grecian school, "Christ crucified" was "foolishness;" and it is just the same with the philosophic minds of the present day; they all turn away with contempt or incredulity from the contemplation of a reform which has its roots in the ignominy of the cross. They are too well satisfied with human nature, such as it is, to either

see the wisdom or necessity of a sacrifice for sin as the foundation of a kingdom of righteousness and peace.

The modern professor of Christianity is perhaps the most paradoxical and absurd case of all; he professes to accept of the cross, but agreeable to his metaphysical notion of things, he complacently strips the crucified One of his Messiahship altogether, and vigorously preaches a crucifixion without a Christ. He nevertheless, while rejecting the Christship of the prophets as a carnal idea, still retains the name, which he applies to the fictitious work he thinks proper to fill in, as more compatible with his Grecianised notion of the fitness of things. As a whole, the Gentiles are rejectors of Christ equally with the Jews, as will be seen when he returns to rule the world on David's throne. Not looking for him in any such capacity, they will fight against him as boisterously (though this time not so successfully) as ever did the blind Jews.—(Psalm ii.)

REFERENCE TABLET No. 127.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF LIFE.

There were two reasons why the Jews in the Galatian ecclesia wanted their Gentile brethren to be circumcised, viz., first, lest they should "suffer persecution for the cross of Christ;" and, secondly, that they might "glory in their flesh."—(Gal. vi. 12-15.)

Free-will is a scriptural phrase, and therefore a scriptural idea, and is illustrated in the following passages, viz., Num. xv. 3; Deut. xvi. 10; xxiii. 23; xii. 6; Ezra i. 4; iii. 5; vii. 16; viii. 26, Lev. xxii. 18-23; xxiii. 38; 2 Chron. xxxi. 14; Psalm cxix. 108.

The word "willingly," as used in the Scriptures, is equal to "free-will;" thus, we have the phrase "not as of necessity, but willingly" (Philem. 14); and again it is said "not by constraint, but willingly."—(1 Pet. v. 2.) Other examples are as follows: Ex. xxv. 2; Jud. v. 2; viii. 25; 1 Chron. xxix. 6; 2 Chron. xvii. 16; Neh. xi. 2; Prov. xxxi. 13.)

For *voluntary* offerings, see Lev. i. 3; vii. 16; Ezek. xlvi. 12.)

A man who is quick to take and resent offence, will sometimes find himself in loud and unsaintly declamation against what he has but rashly and unjustly construed into such a case. The right way

is to accept of all things, whether good or evil, in a spirit of courtesy and meekness.

A man who prefaces a gospel discourse with flattering allusions to the reception and appreciation he may have received and experienced on former occasions; or who keeps himself figuring in the forefront of his discourse, or pulls himself up at all prominently in the rear, is manifestly a carnal man, "having men's persons in admiration," and especially his own.

For a man to attach his name to a book

or a lecture of which he is the author, is not vanity; but is even requisite as the feature of a straightforward action, and a genuine and unconcealed identification of one's self with the social opprobrium that gathers round the truth spoken. Any policy dictated by a desire to avoid identification with the stigma the acceptance of the truth brings with it, is totally unworthy of any professing the name of the "despised" man.

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

The Jewish Chronicle says: The examinations undergone by the Italian students at the National School of Mining, of Paris, have turned out splendidly for the Jewish scholars, two of whom were declared to be the best in the institution.

JEWISH SUPERINTENDENCE OF GENTILE FRANCE.—In either half of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, a Jew has been elected by the respective Parliaments to report on the state of the finances. At Vienna it is Herr Kuranda, and at Budapest it is Herr Wahrman, upon whom this task devolves.

THE AMERICAN EXPLORATION OF PALESTINE.—The Exploration of Palestine is being pursued by the American Expedition as well as by the English party, under Lieut. Conder, and the Transatlantic explorers have just concluded a successful tour east of the Jordan. The country has been mapped out for future work; important observations have been made, inscriptions copied and measurements taken of ancient churches, temples and ruins.

THE JEWS IN THE PAPAL STATES SINCE THE EXPIRY OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.—Under the Papal Government the Jews were excluded from the professions and higher callings. Since the Papal

States have been annexed to Italy, the Jews of Ancona can already boast of two advocates, two engineers, an experienced surveyor, several officers in the army and navy, five certificated schoolmistresses and two medical students. In Rome itself, a benevolent society has been formed under the title of "Society of Brotherhood for the Civil Progress of the Poor Israelites at Rome." Its object is to promote culture among the much neglected poverty-stricken Jewish population, thereby to raise its status, and to induce it to betake itself to the several honourable careers now open to it, instead of continuing to engage in those poor and despised trades which formerly were the only means for obtaining a livelihood permitted the Jews by the Papal governments. The appeal, which is signed by the leading men of the Roman Jewish community, gives a saddening account of the former oppression of the Jews, and its degrading effect upon them.

THE JEWS IN SWITZERLAND.—Switzerland was for several centuries one of the most intolerant in Europe. Only in our days have the laws been repealed which excluded the Jews from the republic. The consequence of the new laws has been that the Jewish population formerly restricted to

two places in the canton of Argovia, spread over the whole of the country, and grew to be 6,696 souls in the year 1870. There exist now twenty organised congregations in the republic. But only two of them have rabbis—that of Geneva and that of St. Gallen. There therefore exist seventeen synagogues. There are however 2,206 Jews who have not joined a congregation. The whole population of Switzerland is two and a half millions; consequently the population of the Jews to the general population is 1 to 382.

IMPORTANT POSITION OF THE JEWS IN ROUMANIA.—Most of the artisans and mechanics in Roumania are Jews. In fact, if this industrious population were at once to disappear from the country, there are cities and even whole districts the inhabitants of which would thereby be deprived of every comfort. This would be especially the case at Jassy. A traveller writes: "How extensive the occupations of the Jews are, I have had exemplified in a most amusing manner. I visited the church of the 'Three Patriarchs.' Here is preserved the coffin of Saint Peeraschiva, the patroness of Jassy. It consists, in the Byzantine manner, of plates of gold and silver. On it lay a modern artistically embroidered coverlid. The priest pointed to it with pride as the present of the wife of a deceased hospodar, and then incidentally observed that it was the work of Jewesses of Jassy. The tastefully carved door which, after the fashion of the Greek Church, closes the area behind the altar, he told me was gilt by Jews of Jassy. In the church itself sat a Jew copying the image of the patroness saint, by the sale of which the priests of the church do a splendid business. The Jews are equally active in the domain of purely mental occupations, so far of course, as the law permits. The physicians most sought after are Jews. They now also begin to apply to the studies of law and philosophy, and in time no doubt, if the law will only permit, will act as advocates. The establishment of the university of Czernowitz, so close to the frontiers of Moldavia, will no doubt give a great impulse to these studies among the Jews of Moldavia.

PREPONDERANCE OF JEWISH MEDICAL MEN AT VIENNA.—An amusing illustration of the important and influential position of the Jews in Vienna, the capital of the Austrian Emperor, has just occurred. Professor Billroth, an eminent surgeon recently issued a work "Medical Studies," in the course of which he emphatically condemned the practice of men entering the medical profession from mercenary motives, and he specially classed among the latter the Jewish students. The publication of the *brochure* created a great sensation, as the Jews form the leading part of the medical body. The eminent writer Auerbach severely condemned Professor Billroth (with whom he was on

very friendly terms) for attempting to revive class prejudices. The *Medical Examiner* says: "It will be seen from our Austrian correspondent's letter that Vienna has been thrown into ferment by Professor Billroth's last book. We fully endorse his views as regards the importance of colleges possessing an independent autonomy; but we think that he has been a little hard on 'the chosen people.' The position occupied by the Jews at Vienna is so widely different from what it is here, that it is difficult for English people to realise the temerity of the distinguished professor of surgery. Two-thirds of the professors of the University and five-sixths of the medical students are members of the Jewish community; and nearly all the medical papers are in the hands of this highly cultured race.

THE MONTEFIORE AND OTHER SCHEMES FOR THE REGENERATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

The *Daily News*, under the heading of "Sir Moses Montefiore and Palestine," publishes the following article on the report of Sir Moses, on his recent journey to the Holy Land, which has now appeared: "Sir Moses Montefiore has just issued the long-looked-for report of his experiences of his recent visit to the Holy Land. He has embodied in his statement a letter addressed to him from two of the leading Rabbis of Jerusalem, in which they refute the charges of idleness and incapacity to work brought against them by a prominent member of the Anglo-Jewish community, Mr. Samuel Montague. The publication of these charges, indeed, prompted Sir Moses Montefiore, now in his 92nd year, to undertake a seventh journey to the Holy Land, to see for himself whether his brethren were the degenerate people they had been described. The report now published by Sir Moses possesses great significance, at the moment when the Jewish community are endeavouring to promote the establishment of an extensive agricultural colony in Jerusalem. The following facts, summarised from the report in the order in which they are therein given, are of considerable interest.

Sir Moses states that there would be no difficulty whatever to secure as much land as might be required, either for cultivation or building purposes. The Governor and Kâdi of Jerusalem assured the worthy baronet of the readiness of the Turkish Government to render every possible assistance to encourage agriculture, as well as any other

industrial scheme for the promotion of the welfare of the people in the Holy Land. The French and American Consuls also assured him of their willingness to assist.

Sir Moses speaks of the skill of Jewish mechanics in Jerusalem, and his statements are of great interest, seeing that it has been said that there are no Jewish mechanics in the Holy City. Sir Moses saw watchmakers, engravers, lithographers, sculptors, goldsmiths, bookbinders and carpenters, and, says he, "All did their work most satisfactorily." A watchmaker into whose hands he gave a valuable repeater for repairs put it, within a very short time, in excellent order. The same man, in addition to his skill as a watchmaker, displayed also great talent as a Hebrew calligraphist. He presented Sir Moses Montefiore with a grain of wheat on which were written nineteen lines, forming an acrostic on the name of the philanthropist. The distinguished traveller states that he has had every opportunity of convincing himself that the Jews are eager and willing to engage in any kind of labour, agricultural or otherwise, which will obtain for them the necessaries of life, and place them above the charity of their benevolent co-religionists. Sir Moses says that the great regard which he always entertained towards his brethren in the Holy Land has now become, if possible, doubly increased; and he emphatically asserts that they are worthy and deserving of assistance, they are willing and capable to work, their mental powers are of a satisfactory nature, and that all Israelites ought to render them support. The Jews in Jerusalem, and in every part of the Holy Land, he observes, 'do work,' and, he furthermore says that they 'are more industrious even than many men in Europe, otherwise none of them would remain alive. But when the work does not sufficiently pay, when there is no market for the produce of the land, when famine, cholera, and other misfortunes befall the inhabitants, we Israelites, unto whom God revealed Himself on Mount Sinai, more than any other nation must step forward and render them help—raise them from their state of distress.' He suggests the building in and outside Jerusalem, with European improvements, also colleges and public baths. Each house should possess a plot of ground large enough for the cultivation of olive trees, the vine, and necessary vegetables, so as to give the

occupiers of the houses a taste for agriculture. He states that many persons in the cities around Jerusalem have already announced their willingness to follow agricultural pursuits.

As is well known, a few months ago a committee was formed in London for the purpose of collecting a fund as a testimonial to Sir Moses Montefiore. On inquiring of the venerable philanthropist what form he wished the testimonial to assume, he informed the committee that if they wished to honour him the funds collected should be devoted to the encouragement of agricultural and other mechanical pursuits among the Jews of the Holy Land. The appeal of the committee was not so liberally responded to as was anticipated, owing to some unfavourable statements having been circulated respecting the character of the Jews of Palestine generally and of Jerusalem particularly; but it is expected that Sir Moses Montefiore's report will have the effect of adding greatly to the £10,000 at present in the hands of the Testimonial Committee."

So much for the *Daily News*.

The *Jewish Chronicle*, commenting on the report of Sir Moses, regrets the tone of a letter appearing in it from the Jerusalem Rabbis, advocating views in opposition to those of Mr. Montague, whose report on his own visit to the Holy Land appeared some time ago. But it adds, "That wherein all agree is, that great and crying evils exist in the Holy Land, and should be remedied. That wherein all agree is, that by the publicity given to the efforts made for collecting a fund for coping with these evils, an expectation has been raised which it would be most cruel to disappoint. But what those remedies are to be, on this point we presume there will be a difference of opinion. Sir Moses advises to follow the suggestions of those in the Holy Land consulted by him. But he does not say to whom the supervision of the carrying out of any scheme for the improvement of the deplorable position of our brethren in the Holy Land is to be entrusted. Few will be of opinion that any purely local agency would be adequate to cope with the existing evil. Most donors, we presume, will be of opinion that an European agency should be entrusted with the administration of the fund. The attentive reader of this report will also miss . . . any reference to

the evil of unrestricted immigration and the *Halukah*. It will be easily understood by those acquainted with political economy, that the moment it will become known that the Palestinian Jewish community has been made the object of some special benefactions, the influx of strangers will be so great as to neutralise altogether the benefit it is intended to confer; and that simultaneous distribution of charity and the promotion of industrial pursuits among one and the same population are not compatible."

ISRAEL'S EXILE AND ISRAEL'S OPPORTUNITY.

Another Jewish writer, deploring the controversies that have impeded the scheme, says, "To what end have we been exiled? To what end became we 'Tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast?' To what end do we fast, and pray, and weep, and rend the garments as for the dead, and make pilgrimages, and kiss the soil, and mourn at the awe-inspiring valley of death Jehoshaphat and Hirmoim, for those whose highest hope on earth was to be buried in the land of prophecy, and there await the trumpet-sound that should summon the dead to arise and live again? To what end do we turn our faces in prayer to Zion's mount and pour out our heart's plaint, that the heel of the stranger to our race and faith proudly treads the ground moistened with the blood of our noblest and our best, and that in the irony of history, 'our *holy places*' are in the custodianship of those who have dethroned Israel's God, discarded Israel's prophets, and violated Israel's law, and ascribe the dwelling-place of His holiness and the sanctuary of His glory to a deity of their own conceiving, a prophet of their own invention, and a law of their own convenience? To what end, alas! to what end? Having forgotten nothing and learnt nothing in the exile, only to play over and over again, whenever opportunity offers, in mimic warfare, the terrible scenes of that fearful drama which preceded the nation's downfall, and which lives in the pages of Josephus, truthful, and depicting the horrors of the war *within Jerusalem*, if like the rest of the factions of his time, the partial historian distorted the acts and motives of his dissentients.

How truly and fatally does history repeat itself. For years Jerusalem has been to

many, an empty phrase, to be found in the prayer book, and made an occasion for the witticisms of the well-to-do who are yet old-fashioned enough to read the passover service. An opportunity long sought, and at last found, arises in our own community, in which a great cause can be served, and an affectionate tribute of respect can at the same time be paid to one to whom Jerusalem is a holy sentiment.

We seem to live our history over again. Jerusalem is again to be saved. Many in singleness of heart are anxious to rescue its inhabitants from squalor and pauperism; and with what result? The Holy Land will and must, however, if the unseemly procedure be carried on further, continue to remain as now, a scandal and reproach to every intelligent Jew in the whole world, and all because faction is rife. Instead of common action, the taking of wise counsel and maturing deliberation, we are scolding each other, ranging ourselves into parties, questioning each other's veracity, and more than that, impugning each other's motives."

SIR MOSES MONTEFIORE'S IDEA OF THE BEST SCHEME.

Mr. H. Guedalla (Member of the Executive Committee of the Montefiore Testimonial) has issued a circular with the title "Conclusions arrived at by Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart., as to the best scheme for expending funds raised by Jews throughout the world permanently to benefit the condition of their co-religionists in the Holy Land, as published in his narrative of a Forty Days' Sojourn there in July and August, 1875." After making various extracts from the report of Sir Moses Montefiore, Mr. Guedalla concludes as follows: "In accordance with the above suggestions, it is our imperative duty to devote the funds in hand at once, mainly to building houses, and a small portion of them for the promotion of agricultural purposes."

THE TESTIMONIAL COMMITTEE'S DECISION.

The following appears in the *Jewish Chronicle* for Friday, Feb. 25th: "The secretary presents his compliments to the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*, and begs to forward him the enclosed, which was passed at the last meeting of the Executive Committee.

Resolved:—That it be recommended to the General Committee that the Fund be expended in the purchase of ground in the Holy Land, in the building of houses there, and in establishing a Loan Fund, and in aiding the able-bodied inhabitants in agricultural and trading pursuits.

36, Finsbury Circus, Feb. 23rd, 1876."

JEWISH EMIGRATION TO THE HOLY LAND.

The *Jewish Chronicle* states that at Kowno, Russia, a society has been formed, the object of which is to enable one or two persons every year to emigrate to the Holy Land. It works this way. Every member has to pay an annual subscription of one rouble (about three shillings). Lots are drawn periodically, and the members fortunate enough to draw lucky numbers receive out of the fund formed from the subscription a sum sufficient to enable him to repair to the Holy Land, and is, moreover, supported there in comfort all his lifetime. As the society is composed of a very large number of members, it has at its disposal a considerable fund. The society is called "Inquirers after the Welfare of Zion," and the flourishing state of the exchequer shows how great must be the love of these men for the land of their forefathers.

ENGLAND AND THE HOLY LAND, re THE EUPHRATES VALLEY.

The *Jewish Chronicle* says: "We desire that England should, as soon as possible, secure to herself the other possible highway to India by means of the Euphrates Valley Railway. In these aspirations we do not deny specifically Jewish elements have their

share. We are anxious to see England connected as closely as possible with the Bible Lands. It is but right that the country which, more than any other, loves and cherishes those regions, and to whose inhabitants the Bible lands have become household words, should possess in them something more than a mere theoretical interest. And if ever Israel's highest aspirations are to be realised, we faintly believe that it would be England to which the glorious call would go forth."

On the same subject, the *Rock*, remarking on the English purchase of the Suez Canal, says: "The more important the Canal to the interests of this country, the less ought we to lean upon it, or some day in a time of war we may possibly find our vaunted highway to the East suddenly stopped at a critical moment, by the scuttling of a single ship in the bed of the Canal. An enemy, or even an accident might easily do this. It now, therefore, becomes more than ever important that we should secure an alternative route, and this can only be effected by the formation of a railway across the moderate space which separates the Mediterranean from the valley of the Euphrates. It is quite time this subject were seriously discussed. That we are not singular in our view, we may cite a high German authority, Baron Kuhn, who has well described this as a 'factor of inestimable importance in the problem of the great contest with Russia; for whatever may be the commercial value of the Suez Canal to Central Europe, there is no doubt that it is secondary in importance to the Euphrates Valley Railway, which affords the only means of stemming Russian advances in Central Asia, and which directly covers the Suez Canal.' Should this railway be made—as it must and will—we should soon see the 'swift machines' (not 'swift beasts'), of which Isaiah spoke, freighted with multitudes of the outcasts of Zion returning to their long-lost home."

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren. — (Heb. ii. 11.)

APRIL, 1876.

We live in the age that witnesses Christ's return to the earth, and the signs all tell us that the event may occur at any time. But though the era of his coming is revealed, the exact date of it is concealed from knowledge. We know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh, though enabled to discern that it

is "nigh, even at the door." The wisdom of this, like every other work of God, becomes more apparent to us with increasing acquaintance. The revelation of a definite date would have attracted sensation lovers, without helping the true sons of God in their patient waiting for Christ. This has been illustrated in the several date-fixings of American Adventism. Immense numbers became interested in Christ after a fashion, when they supposed he was to appear on a certain day; but when the day passed without his appearance, they abandoned the hope, and went everyone his own way, as completely as if there never had been a Christ, shewing

that their attention to him was not the result of an enlightened apprehension of his existence and mission, as stamped upon every record of the past, but the mere effervescence of superficial and ignorant sensationalism. The true faith in Christ is based upon foundations stable as the immovable rocks of history; the love of him, a sentiment with roots and sources deeper and more numerous than those which nurture every human joy upon earth; and the confidence of his reappearing a conviction beyond reach of disturbance from any disappointment or event that can transpire within the limits of mortal life.

The uncertainty thrown over the exact date of his appearing, admits of the trial and manifestation of that genuine loyalty which stands on the broad foundation indicated. On the other hand, the manifest expiration of the period of down-treading, at the end of which the glorious event is to happen, and the current activity of the sign-events which mark its nearness, give emphasis to our hope, and heart to our courage, and resolution to do what the hands design to do. If we knew the day and the hour, we might be tempted to slacken enterprise in Christ, under the idea that there was no time for any more work of moment; whereas, knowing not in what watch the thief-like coming will be, we are helped to maintain a constant vigilance. The blessing is for those servants who are found "so doing." The reproach of the master will be for those who sink into a state of self absorption and self-ministration through the effect of delay, to the neglect or half-hearted maintenance of the things that belong to Christ. He ought to find us at his coming as busy with his affairs as if we had a thousand years' work to do. Certainly, at no period ought the apostolic exhortation to have more weight than at the end of the allotted 1260 years of Daniel's Little Horn power, namely, "Be ye steadfast and unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

These remarks are suggested by the variety of purposes before our minds in connection with the work of the truth, which hitherto we have lacked time and strength to accomplish. Whether we shall be able to do them in days yet to come (if there be

days yet to come,) we cannot know. Health is a main condition, and the prospects on this point, though not discouraging, are by no means equal to our desire. Probably, we shall only be equal to the routine work of the *Christadelphian* and those other duties connected with the meetings that come between. If so, we can only say with the brethren at Cæsarea on a certain occasion, "The will of the Lord be done." If otherwise, we shall give thanks to be able to do all that we see desirable to be done. We should like to be more at liberty to help the brethren in various places in the way of public lecturing, instead of so often having to turn away requests made to us. But it is other things we more particularly have in view. We should like to write (1) a long contemplated series of articles in *illustration of the authenticated workings of Providence in the affairs of men*; also (2) a series of articles on *the law of Moses and its lessons*; a series of *parables* in refutation of current spiritual fallacies; (3) a series of *familiar conversations on passing events*, both particular and general; (4) a *comprehensive treatise, in separate form, on the practical bearings of the precepts of Christ in their every-day details*; (5) a complete *demonstration of the divinity of the Bible*, in numerous lines of thought, never before touched, so far as we know. We should also like to accomplish (6) the re-writing of *Twelve Lectures*; (7) the resumption of the *Children's Magazine*; (8) the writing of a complete *series of elementary tracts*; (9) a *guide to the conduct of an ecclesia in this unapostolic age*; (10) a continuation of *Saturday Evening Scripture Studies*; (11) a continuation of a *mourner's untrammelled musings on things as they are in relation to God*; and several other things at present too nebulous to be defined.

We shall aim at the execution of this programme, so far as the difficulties in the way may allow during the shortening hours of this culminating dispensation. We cannot say that we survey the prospect with much hope. Should God, in His providence, place sufficient means in our hand to allow of our employing the constant services of a shorthand writer, whom we could also associate as editorial assistant in the conduct of the *Christadelphian* (for brother Shuttleworth has

already his hands full in the office department), we might hope, even with present health, to accomplish much of the work laid out in the foregoing sketch; but as things stand, most of it must remain in the region of impossibility. We always take things as they stand as the measure of the purpose of God, and are, therefore, in no wise fretted with our perhaps impracticable glimpses of desirable extensions. Nevertheless, as in the providence of God, there may come deliverance, we have thought it not amiss to freely speak of things for a long time hovering on our horizon, but concerning which, we are prepared for whatever the future may have in reserve; whether it be curtailed activity, enlarged operations, or (unspeakably to be preferred before all) the speedy arrival of the Lord to take unto himself his own great power and to reign.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE Eastern Question is in process of evolution, though the rate of progress is slow. This is the satisfactory fact of the situation. Things are not at a standstill. Much is not visible on the surface, but what is visible is indicative of the right current of events.

The insurrection lives, notwithstanding the diplomatic endeavours on the part of the Powers to put an end to it by inducing the Turkish Government to enact reforms. After the proclamation of these reforms, in accordance with the Austrian scheme of Count Andrassy, an Austrian official (Baron Rodich) waited on the insurgents to induce them to lay down their arms; but the insurgents refused. They declared they would no longer trust in Turkish promises, and preferred death to submission.

During the month there have been several collisions in the field between the insurgents and the Turkish troops. The results of these conflicts are variable, being sometimes in favour of the one side and sometimes the other. Their importance lies in the fact of their occurrence. Everything, humanly speaking, depends upon the insurgents being able to hold out during the winter now fast coming to an end; in

that event, the certainty seems to be that the insurrection will spread to other parts of the Turkish Empire.

Thus, writing from Constantinople, the correspondent of the *Daily News* says: "The great question which everyone in Constantinople is now asking is, Will the insurgents in Herzegovina and Bosnia be joined in the spring by others in various parts of European Turkey? It seems not improbable that there may be risings in various parts of Turkey in Europe in the spring. Much will depend upon whether the Turks succeed during the next two months in crushing out the insurrection in Herzegovina. As I have before mentioned, we are indebted mainly to the English newspapers for the latest news from the seat of war, the press department here prohibiting the publication of other than official telegrams. But these, in their clumsily-constructed statements, allow a careful reader to get the general result with tolerable accuracy. Though every engagement is a great victory, with hundreds of rebels left dead on the field, and only one or three, or some equally absurd number of soldiers killed; and though every position from which they have been driven was for strategic reasons abandoned, and always in excellent order; yet, by remembering that six weeks ago we were officially assured that, taking all the bands together, there were not any more than three thousand in arms against the Sultan, we are able to judge of the value of the statement when this week we are told, again officially, that the troops had from eight to ten thousand men against them. The official communications certainly give no sign that the rebellion is likely soon to be put down. Meantime the leaders of the insurgents are understood to have placed themselves in communication with revolutionary committees in various parts of Turkey. The Turks, as the telegraph will already have informed your readers, have threatened Montenegro for the support which the people of the Black Mountains are giving, and no one here would be surprised if the Prince found himself forced to accede to the wishes of the people, and openly join the rebels. Though *Servia* is evidently divided as to the course she shall pursue, she will hardly care to allow

Montenegro to be the chief supporter of the insurgents. Even Roumania is getting fidgetty, and would obviously like to join her neighbours if she sees that they have a fair chance of success. Bulgaria has for some time been unusually discontented. Misgovernment has driven her people to the verge of rebellion. Many young men have been arrested on suspicion, and are now in prison; but the dispossession of many of their race to make way for Mahomedans, the sight of a Christian race with self-government on the opposite shore of the Danube—a race which, like their own, was till recently subject to the Porte, and the knowledge of their rights and capabilities which they have derived from their improved education, will make it a difficult task for the Turks to restrain this stubborn race. The Greeks in Crete and elsewhere are known to be treating the rebels, and troops have been sent down to the island in anticipation of an outbreak. Hitherto the hostility between them and the Bulgarians, which has been carefully nursed both by the Porte and by Russia, has prevented any joint action, but the opportunity of success against the common enemy is causing them to believe that they may well leave their ecclesiastical dissensions until they have settled with the Turk. If one is to attach any importance to common rumour, Greece herself is in various ways privy to the general movement which is in contemplation."

AUSTRIAN INTERVENTION AND ITS MEANING.

Something like a military intervention in the insurrection, on the part of Austria, has occurred during the last month. Several of the insurgent leaders who ventured on Austrian territory were arrested. The *Daily News* well says: "The action of Austria (in the Andrassy note) is not dictated by any regard to the interests of Turkey. It is inspired," says that paper, "by fear for the safety of Austria. Count Andrassy knows perfectly well that Turkey is doomed. She will die either of her disease or of the medicine, of Christian rebellion against abuses, or of Mohammedan rebellion against reforms; and foreign intervention can but delay the inevitable

hour, which on the other hand it is just possible that it may hasten. The permanence and integrity of the Austrian Empire, and not the Turkish, are the objects of Count Andrassy's solicitude. It is at Vienna that the peril which he desires to ward off is felt and not at Constantinople. The discord of Hungary and Austria is day by day a growing embarrassment in the conduct of public affairs; and it is complicated by the jealousy which the Hungarians entertain towards the Slavonic provinces and population of Austria. So long as the insurrection of Herzegovina and Bosnia continue, this excited feeling within and without the Empire is an element of danger to Austria. The difficulty of preserving neutrality upon the Military Frontier is great; the task, indeed, is impossible. The continuance of the insurrection, or the establishment of an independent Slavonic State, united with or separated from Serbia, or the absorption of the provinces in the Austrian Empire, thus increasing the Slavonic element there, and raising troubles with Hungary, which are troubles for the whole Empire—these are alternative dangers to which no Austrian statesman can be insensible."

PROGRESS OF THE EUPHRATEAN EVAPORATION.

The arrest of the insurgent leaders is regarded with disavour in Russia. The correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* says disquieting rumours come from Constantinople. He says the Sultan cannot carry out the reforms required of him, and that the end of it all is likely to be an invasion of Turkish territory and the end of Turkish rule.

The Constantinople correspondent of the *Daily News* writes as follows on the general bearings of the question, showing the steady progress of that Euphratean evaporation in which all true saints are so deeply interested: "If the beginning of the end has come, it is time that England no longer figures before the Christian population of Turkey as the one power which has persistently supported the oppressor in his struggle with the oppressed. There is every indication here that all the Christian populations are increasing in comparative wealth,

in numbers, in influence, and in education and civilization. They cannot be kept back. The Turks, on the other hand, are either stationary or retrogressive. The Turkish population is actually diminishing, owing to the enormous drain upon it for the army, and to other causes which can only be alluded to in your columns. At the same time land is everywhere passing out of the hands of Turks into those of Christians. The efforts which the Bulgarian, the Orthodox, or Greek, and the American churches have made for the education of children under their care are really great, and are beyond all comparison greater, both as efforts, and in their results, than has been attempted by the Turks. As the Turk does not engage in trade, he is, in the midst of the trading communities of the towns, rapidly becoming poorer. We have here in Constantinople wealthy bankers and merchants belonging to almost every nationality in Europe, together with Turkish rayahs who are Jews, Bulgarians, Greeks, or Armenians. Greek and Armenian firms are well known at Marseilles and Manchester, but a firm consisting of Turks—beyond a few small shopkeepers, who form an exception to the rule—does not exist. Thus while the Turks are diminishing in numbers, those who remain are becoming poorer. The fact which, among so many things in Turkey which are doubtful, comes out most prominently to those who have either watched or studied the history of this country during the past generation, is that the Turks are rapidly being replaced by the Christians. This is well known and admitted by the Turks themselves, and is simply regarded by them as inevitable.”

THE PURCHASE OF THE SUEZ CANAL SHARES.

This act of the British government has received its final ratification in the British Parliament since our last notice of the subject, not however, without considerable opposition from the members of Mr. Gladstone's late government. In this opposition Mr. Gladstone himself took the lead, eliciting from Mr. Disraeli the following remark: “the discussion of this evening, has at least proved one thing; it has shown in a manner

which neither the House of Commons nor the country can mistake, that had the right hon. gentleman the member for Greenwich been minister of this country the shares in the Suez Canal would not have been purchased.” (Conservative cheering.) There can be no doubt that Mr. Disraeli spoke the truth in this remark, and the fact shows how important and essential that change of the English Ministry was, which was precipitated by the action of Mr. Gladstone himself two years ago, to the universal surprise, which had been pointed out as a necessity by Dr. Thomas before his death, and which was hailed with such entire satisfaction by all who are earnestly watching the signs of the Lord's return to the earth.

The action of the Disraeli government in the matter has been universally approved, followed as it has been, by Mr. Cave's mission and other transactions with Egypt, which have drawn closer the bonds of connection between that country and England. Mr. Disraeli referred to this general feeling of approval in the course of the debate which took place on the subject. He said the country understood the question, if his critics did not. The country desired the empire to be maintained and strengthened, and would not be alarmed if it were even increased by an important position in Africa, securing to them the highway to their Indian empire. This allusion to the position of England in Egypt, as the virtual addition of that country to the British Empire, justifies the following remarks of the French *Debats*: “The English argue in this way:—‘Let what may come of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, one thing interests us—our free communication with India. We have now what we had not before the Crimean war—the Suez Canal. It is true that we did all in our power to prevent its execution, but an obstinate Frenchman would make it. If any one takes a bite out of the Ottoman Empire we have selected our morsel, and shall lay hands on Egypt.’”

The pictorial political weeklies are unanimous in their commendation of Disraeli's action in the Egyptian question. In various ways they illustrate their sentiments. One, under the title of “The Lion's Share,” shows that majestic animal in the foreground, with a key marked “Egypt” (or

something of a similar meaning) under its paw. Another shows the British ensign floating over the Pyramids, in charge of the Lion. A pyramid in the front, representing the Canal shares, is inscribed "A good investment, a commercial advantage, a political necessity;" and the futility of the opposition of the Liberal leaders to the Government proposal, is indicated by a number of these gentlemen butting their heads against the immovable structure. A third represents Disraeli astride on the back of a camel, with his opponents sprawling under the feet of that Egyptian animal. There are various other illustrations of the complete triumph of the Egyptian policy of the government. Of this policy, in its connection with the negotiations on the Eastern question which are going on, a grave and moderate journal like the *Daily News* says, "England has no part or share in the motives which have led to the composition of Count Andrassy's note. England does not desire to see the destruction of the Turkish Empire, and she will certainly do nothing to hasten it. She does not believe that it can be averted, and she cannot honourably be a party to recommendations which, if they are not fraught with danger, yet contain in them no hope or element of safety. Her interest in the Eastern Question lies elsewhere; and we believe that, in spite of financial objections, she has done well in concentrating her influence and moral authority upon Egypt and its rulers."

ORIGIN OF THE EGYPTIAN PURCHASE.

During the month, the correspondence which passed respecting the purchase of the Suez Canal Shares has been published by the Government, and embraces fifty-six distinct communications, extending from Nov. 15th, 1875, to Jan., 1876. The most interesting feature of this correspondence, to those who regard the situation from a divine point of view, is the evidence it affords of the step which has planted England in Egypt, having been forced upon the British Government in the ways of Providence.

In the middle of November, the British Government heard that a combination of

French capitalists were proposing to the Ruler of Egypt to buy out his interest in the Canal. Lord Derby instantly telegraphed to the British representative in Egypt to ascertain the facts of the case. That gentleman (Major General Stanton) found that the Egyptian Government, being hard pressed for money, were actually in communication with French financiers with a view to raise the requisite sum on the security of the shares. This information was telegraphed to Lord Derby, who replied by telegraph the same evening, instructing the British agent to intimate to the Khedive the disposition of Her Majesty's Government to purchase the shares. The Khedive said he had no intention of parting with the shares, though trying to raise money on the security of them; but he would consider the matter. The result was a final decision to sell to the British Government.

The official correspondence just published, includes the expression of the views of the various European governments on the transaction. There are the warmest expressions of approbation from Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy. Russia and France were not altogether pleased, but did not express open dissatisfaction. Prince Bismark said, England had done the right thing at the right moment. He however, would be simple indeed, who should accept these official declarations, as indicative of the real sentiments of the powers. Diplomatic language more often conceals than reveals the actual sentiments of the speaker. The governments of Europe could not do otherwise than outwardly approve a transaction so perfectly legitimate and free from legal objection. There can be no question however, that in fact, a step which has made England virtually lord in Egypt is regarded with secret jealousy, and will quicken those sinister designs upon the falling Turkish Empire, which Russia and Austria scarcely conceal under the diplomatic communications which began some months back.

MORE RUSSIAN ADVANCES IN INDIA.

The *Daily News* of March 16, has a leading article on the continued advances of Russia in Asia, which the writer professes to believe are in opposition to the desires of the

Russian Government. It matters not to the believer in "the sure word of prophecy," whether the Russian "overflowing and passing over," be the result of Russian initiative or of circumstances compelling Russian action. It is the fact of her appointed extension that is gratifying and encouraging. This extension is going on, not only with steadiness but with rapidity, as will be seen from the following extracts from the article in question.

The article says: "The incorporation of Northern Khokand by the Russians last autumn, has been quickly followed by the absorption of the remainder of the Khanate into their empire, and its formation into the new government of Ferghana under General Skobelieff, who annexed it. It was on the 9th of November, 1875, that the General commanding the Imperial troops in Turkestan announced, by order of the day, that 'the territory on the right of the Sir Daria, from the River Naryn, passes under the dominion of Russia,' leaving the inhabitants south of the river to make the most of an independence more than ever precarious. Four months have elapsed since that event, and now another order, issued from the city of Khokand itself, informs the hitherto unannexed people that they too have become the subjects of the Czar. Although the inclusion of the remotest of the old Khanates of Central Asia in the Russian Empire has been indicated as probable by all the events of the last twelve months, the event, nevertheless, strikes the observer by its importance.

The annexation which has thus obliterated another of the independent principalities of Central Asia, is the last act of a series of similar but partial operations which date from the year 1860. In 1864, the capture of the towns of Turkestan and Chemkend, both belonging to Khokand, attracted so much notice, as a violation of the principles on which Russia had professed to act, that a circular letter was sent to all the 'Legations and Embassies of the Russian Emperor in Foreign Countries,' explaining that the late territorial acquisitions had been brought about 'by imperious necessity, and in opposition to the wish of the Emperor. The important statement was added that the expansion of the Empire in Central Asia had now reached its limit. It soon

appeared, however, that the Russian Government had been greatly wanting in foresight in giving this assurance to Europe, and another official explanation became necessary. Uzbek troops and the Cossacks got into one another's way, with the usual result. The people of Khokand, instead of calculating the resources of Russian power, consulted only their own exasperated feelings, and as a consequence of the new war that ensued, the Russian province of Turkestan was formed in 1865. Tashkend then fell into the Russian power, and although an announcement was immediately made that it would only be held until a settlement had been arrived at, it was apparent that the independence of Khokand had received its death-blow. Since 1865 all the great lines of communication on which the commerce of the Khanate depended have been in the hands of the Russians.

The annexation of Khokand in 1876 may not fix the limit of the extension of the Russian Empire in Asia, any more than the capture of Chemkend did twelve years ago. While the old Khanates have been in process of disintegration, a new one, that of Kashgar, has been formed on the line of the eastward advance of Russia. As marking the progress of the Russian arms it is well calculated to strike the imagination of observers, and to exalt that spirit of conquest in the nation which manifests itself independently of the character of the reigning Emperor, and is apparently too strong always to be controlled by the able statesmen who occupy the highest positions in the Imperial Councils. Khiva is enveloped in a network of Russian power; Bokhara is at the mercy of the Imperial Governor of Tashkend; and now Khokand as a State of Central Asia has ceased to exist. So far as the resistance of old organised governments is concerned, Russia has nothing serious to apprehend from those powers which, until very recently, were supposed to be barriers to her advance, or at least able to prevent the consolidation of her powers."

RUSSIA IN PERSIA.

It will be recollected that Baron Reuter obtained from the Shah of Persia authority to develop the resources of that country in a variety of ways. England, under Mr. Gladstone's government, failing to support

the Baron in the manner he expected, his scheme collapsed. The Baron is now trying to revive it, but the Shah is unwilling to reopen a defunct enterprise, and it is now stated that Russian influence, which is dominant in the Persian Capital, is likely to obtain a concession for a Russian company, or for the Russian Government itself.

RUSSIA AND CONSTANTINOPLE.

A correspondent writes as follows to the *China Mail*:—"SIR.—At this moment, when the thoughts of European statesmen seem directed towards the absorption of Turkey by the Russian Empire, as a probability of the near future, it is interesting to observe the existence of a tradition among the people of Constantinople, as early as A.D. 950, that their city should one day be in possession of the barbarians of the North. Gibbon, in relating the history of the early attacks of the Russians upon Constantinople, says: 'The memory of these Arctic fleets that seemed to descend from the Polar circle, left a deep impression of terror on the Imperial City. By the vulgar of every rank, it was asserted and believed that an equestrian statue, in the square of Taurus, was secretly inscribed with a prophecy, how the Russians, in the last days, should become masters of Constantinople.' And he remarks further on: "Perhaps the present generation may yet behold the accomplishment of a rare prediction, of which the style is unambiguous and the date unquestionable."—(*Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap lv., Chandos ed.)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G.A.B.P.—The children of Israel were not actually in Egypt 430 years. Four hundred and thirty years was the interval from the confirmation of the covenant with Abraham to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai.—(See Gal. iii. 17.) The "sojourning of the children of Israel" included the sojourning in Canaan before they went down into Egypt. The fathers were "strangers and sojourners" there as well as

in Egypt. This reconciles all apparent discrepancies. For particulars, see page 12 of Dr. Thomas's *Chronikon Hebraikon*, at the end of the second volume of *Eureka*.

W.F.G.—The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is illustrative of the moral relation of classes in Israel, and not of the national fortunes of Israel. The Lazarus class was as much a part of Israel as the rich man class. No construction of the parable that ignores this can be right. The drapery of the parable is derived from the Pharisee theory of the death-state, and was intended to teach Scribes and Pharisees that they who were "first" should be last, while those whom they made "the last," by casting out and rejecting them—even himself and his brethren—would be "the first" in the great day of recompense; also to insist on the supremacy of Moses and the prophets as the standard of judgment.

J.R.—*Jesus says, "Ye (the Jews) shall not see me until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." are they to believe before he comes?*

ANSWER.—No. The version of Christ's words given by Luke shows the meaning (Luke xiii. 35): "Ye shall not see me henceforth until the time come, when ye shall say, &c." Christ meant to say that though they rejected him then, there was a time coming when they would change their minds; and that till the arrival of that time, there would be a long period of desolation, during which they should not see him though they should desire ever so much. We know from many Scriptures that the change of mind in the Jews about Christ is brought about by the reappearing of Christ and the execution of signs and wonders, according to the days of their coming out of the Land of Egypt. Till that reappearing, they remain stoney-hearted and unbelieving as at this day.

H.H.K.—The difference in the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper are not "antagonistic details." They are only such variations as naturally arise in the independent rehearsal of any matter by several narrators. The variations are proof of genuineness; for if the accounts were identical, there would be a strong presumption of concoction. As to Col. ii. 9 ("In him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily"), it affirms a fact concern-

ing Christ at the time of Paul's writing. It is not retrospective in its being. It teaches that Christ (crucified and glorified) is the sum and substance of all that God is pleased to manifest of Himself or to offer to man; and this teaching it enforces in opposition to the pretensions of the "philosophy and vain deceit" referred to in the previous verse, which came into competition with Christ as even at this day; against which Paul was warning the Colossians. Christ glorified is the perfected manifestation of God. The verse affirms this in other words; it has nothing to do with the Trinitarian ideas of co-eternity.

THE ANGELS THAT FELL.

"In Jude and Peter we read of the angels who sinned by leaving their first estate, and of their being reserved in chains of darkness (or death) unto the judgment of the great day. And in 1st Corinthians we read that the saints shall judge angels. Now, in Luke, Jesus teaches those who are accounted worthy to attain a future life are equal to the angels and can die no more. This angelic nature is what we saints of the present time are striving for, as being one of the highest and best possible good; yet we read of angels sinning and dying. How is this?—(M.A.B.)"

ANSWER.—The fact of the angels in question sinning and dying is proof that they had not attained to "the highest and best possible" nature; and that, therefore, there can be no parallel between them and the glorified saints among whom we are striving to be numbered. The state of the glorified saints is one in which there is no death, curse or unspiritualness (Luke xx. 36; Rev. xxi. 4; vii. 15-17)—a state, therefore, in which "fall" is impossible. That there were angels who fell, merely shows that angelic exaltation, where attained, has been preceded by probation as in our own case; and that some did not come through the probation successfully. Paul speaks of "the elect angels," which is in manifest contrast to those who were not chosen or elected, but rejected on account of disobedience. It is "the elect angels" who furnish the standard of comparison for the accepted saints. These elect angels fell not, and now cannot fall. Consequently, in

being made like unto them, our salvation will be made sure against all possibility of failure afterwards.

WHO WERE THE ANTEDILUVIAN SONS OF GOD.

A.A.C.—*"Who were the sons of God who married the daughters of men in antediluvian times?"*

Mankind were divided into two classes from the very beginning—the one owing allegiance to God, and the other following the ways of the natural man. Murdered Abel, afterwards replaced by Seth, represented the first class, and the murderer Cain, the second. These were not only moral representatives of the two classes, but the heads of two separate families, who continued genealogically distinct till the corruption which ended in the flood. The line of Seth is given in Gen. v., and the line of Cain in Gen. iv. We know that, under the gospel, all who have separated themselves from the world, are divinely recognised as the sons of God.—(1 John iii. 1.) This is the Spirit's description of them. Gen. vi. 1, is evidence that this description is not confined to the apostolic age, but was applied before the flood to that section of the human family that were subject to the divine appointments. The idea entertained by some that they were supernatural beings is inconsistent with the narrative, which alleges the crimes of the sons of God as a reason why God should no longer strive with "man," and refers to them as an illustration of "all flesh" having corrupted the divine way upon earth. The sons of God were members of the human family, who were all drowned, with the exception of Noah, on account of their own wickedness. Intermarriages with the fashionable and fascinating daughters of pleasure was their ruin.

THE EATING OF BLOOD.

"Your answer in the January number of the *Christadelphian* on the subject of eating of blood, is not satisfactory. The decree of the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) was binding on the Gentile believer in the apostolic age, and must be binding now. If we may eat blood, may we not also commit fornication, for they are both

joined in the same prohibition? And what then becomes of Paul's declaration that no fornicator shall inherit the kingdom of God? It seems to me they stand or fall together, with the other points mentioned in the decree. Give the subject your re-consideration. It appears the decree on the subject was sanctioned by the Holy Spirit. It is, therefore, serious."—(J.P.)

REMARKS.—In our first impressions on the subject, and for a considerable time, we were of our correspondent's mind. The considerations which have modified our original view are set forth in the answer given in January last. These considerations might be amplified, but cannot be added to in substance by anything we could now say. We must, therefore, refer again to what is there written. If there were nothing outside the Jerusalem decree on the subject, our correspondent's argument would stand; but Paul having expressly allowed, under certain circumstances, of the eating of things offered in sacrifice to idols, which is forbidden in the decree, the conclusion arises that that decree arose out of the peculiar circumstances of the Gentile believers, and not out of the nature of the things themselves. This conclusion is confirmed by the arguments used at the council at which the decree was enacted. It does not follow, however, that fornication becomes equally a matter of indifference, with the eating of things offered in sacrifice to idols; fornication is constantly forbidden, independently of the Jerusalem decree. It, therefore, stands on separate ground. Its mention along with the eating of things sacrificed to idols was, doubtless, due to the circumstance that fornication was a part of the idol worship. If the eating of blood had been condemned by the apostles apart from the Jerusalem decree, as part of their general teaching, the points would, as our correspondent says, have stood and fallen together. The eating of blood was condemned by the law of Moses, and also forbidden to Noah and his family; but, in both cases, the prohibition was connected with the system of worship by blood-shedding of animals; and in the case of the Mosaic law, the use of blood in sacrifice is the reason given for it (Lev. xvii.): a reason which has lost its force at a time when God no

longer requires the blood of bulls and goats in our approaches to Him. But if any brother have conscientious scruples on the point, Paul has taught us to respect those scruples, and to grieve Him not in our eating. It is cruel to do otherwise. Blood in any form is repugnant to every undepraved appetite, and in no case can the disuse of it be a hardship. A brother or a sister who would not dispense with blood-pudding and such like, to please another who thinks it wrong, can scarcely claim to belong to the class who are ready even to lay down their lives for the brethren.

WHAT CONSTITUTES OUR IDENTITY?

T. H. Q.—It is not the particular atoms which constitute us, it is a particular organization of any atoms. We do not require to go to the resurrection. Here we are now, we are all the same people we were ten years ago, and yet we are not the same atoms. How is it we are the same persons? Because that which constitutes our identity has been preserved in organic continuity by the new material used up from year to year. You can see that in any scar you have on any part of your body, you will have that scar from the cradle to the grave, and yet when you go to the grave there is not a single atom of the matter that went to constitute the scar at the time it was formed. How is it? It has been kept up there by a succession of any material thrown into the organisation which constituted the scar. If any material will answer to keep us going, won't any material do to set us up again. In that case what will constitute our identity? Well, what constitutes our identity at the present moment. Turn your thoughts upon yourselves, and you will find it is the sum of the electric impressions made on the brain through the medium of the senses. There is no identity of a new born babe, and if it does not proceed to develop, it will die without identity. The foundation of its identity is made by the sounds it hears, the sights it sees, the faces it is accustomed to look upon, or which are accustomed to peep in upon it through the curtains of the cradle; and as it goes on step by step, the house where it lives, the street, the town, the people, the circumstances of its life, all these things go to create in its brain identity

which would have been totally different if the child had been born under different circumstances, and put through a different state of experiences. Now what is necessary to reproduce identity is simply to reorganise a man that was, or a body in the exact form of the man that was in all material particulars, and to write upon the brain the impressions which went to constitute the person that was before, and you have the person that was.

WILL PARTIAL OBEDIENCE BE
ACCEPTED?

"E." having been asked whether he would baptize a person who intended to neglect the breaking of bread, for a time, to please a relative, returned the following ANSWER—"Jesus Christ says: 'Whosoever shall confess me *before men*, him will I confess also, before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall *deny me before men*, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.'" By immersion in water upon confession of the truth, the person immersed is inducted '*into Christ*,' thereby justifying God in the confession of his sinfulness. This is a public confession of Christ so far as it goes; the confession of Christ before men does not end there. To confess Christ before men is to obey his commands in all things. One of those commands is to meet with his brethren for the purpose of breaking bread and drinking wine, in remembrance of him, as laid down by the Apostle Paul in first, (Cor. ix. 23, 26). If it be asked how often the ordinance is to be observed, the example of the apostles is a sufficient guide; the first and second verses of the sixteenth chapter of the 1st Corinthians shew that *the churches met together* on the first day of the week, and the object of their so meeting is defined in the twentieth chapter of the Acts, verse 7, &c, for the breaking of bread. The fact that the apostle directed the collection for the saints to be made on that day, because of the presence generally of the brethren, is a sure indication of the importance and necessity which the disciples attached to the obedience of this audience. It is also recorded in the second chapter of the Acts, that those who gladly received the word were baptised; "and *continued steadfastly* in the apostles' doctrine and *fellowship*, and in the breaking of

bread, and in prayers.'" So that the act called baptism is only an introduction to many other acts having the same end and object, viz., the declaration that those who perform them have come out and separated themselves from the world (2 Cor. v. 14-18), and are waiting for Christ (1 Thess. i. 10); that they are now constituents of the ecclesia of Christ espoused to him (xi. 2); that henceforth they are not their own, but are "bought with a price;" that they are a peculiar people, zealous of good works; and that henceforth they have no part or concord with Belial. Anyone, therefore, who wishes to be baptised into Christ must be prepared to publicly confess him in all the other ways involved in a scriptural sequel to the act. Some point to the eunuch as an instance of one not required to consort with the brethren; but this is not a case in point. His duty to his mistress, the Queen of Ethiopia (and the duty of servants to masters is by the gospel constituted a duty of Christ), called him to a heathen court where there were no disciples to meet with; and this would be the justification of his isolation, though there might be a way even out of the difficulty for him. But the case now in question is a very difficult case. The person is within reach of an ecclesia of Christ, and *can* meet with them, but for considerations which ought not to sway or influence in such a case, the person desires to render a half obedience to Christ. How can anyone think to benefit by such an act. Listen to the voice of the Master: "If any come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife (or husband), and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he *cannot* be my disciple." "And whosoever does not bear his cross, and come after me, *cannot be my disciple*."—(Luke xiv. 26-27.) "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me."—(Matt. x. 37.)

To be worthy of Christ, we must serve him in the way he has required, not only by observing his personal precepts, but by associating ourselves with his people. If we despise them we despise him. "Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these my brethren, ye did it not unto me," is the rule of judgment in the day of Christ.—(Matt. xxv. 35-45.)

But it is said, we must "do unto others as we would that they should do unto us," and that therefore, as association with the brethren would in this case pain a relative, it must not be persisted in. I answer, we must not set one command against another. Are we to do evil that good may come? But the argument is misapplied. Surely we would not wish any relative under any circumstances to do for our sake what would be wrong, to despise the appointment of Christ in order to save our feelings, or even our life. The course proposed would be making a compact with satan. No mind thoroughly bent on winning Christ as Paul was would think of such a thing. It would

be to tamper with eternal life. The benefits invested in Christ can only be obtained by the obedient.—(John ix. 31; Heb. x. 25-27; v. 9; ix. 28.) He intercedes only for those who confess and forsake their sins.—(1 John i. 7-9; ii. 3.) To try and get the benefit of his advocacy and yet to neglect his command to remember him, would be like those described by the apostle in his letter to Titus (ch. i. verse 16,) who profess that they know God, but in works deny Him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work void of judgment, and the end of such a course would probably be as defined in the 2nd chapter of Peter's 2nd epistle.

HEADS OF A LECTURE, DELIVERED BY DR. THOMAS MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS AGO.

"WHO TO PREACH THE GOSPEL?"

BROTHER Hawkins, of Grantham, forwards the following heads of a lecture by Dr. Thomas.

Romans, chapter i.: Paul put apart to preach the gospel, by receiving favour and apostleship that all Gentiles should obey the faith of the name of Jesus, to 15th quote, showing some of the offices of apostleship, such as imparting spiritual gifts. "How shall they preach except they be sent? (x. 14, 15.) I speak to you Gentiles inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles (xi. 13, 15, 16.) Paul the minister of Christ to the Gentiles (to 21). Proofs Paul gave of his apostleship (xvi. 25). 1 Cor. i. 1: Paul called to be an apostle of the Gentiles by the will of God. (17)—*Paul sent by Christ to preach the gospel.* (ii. 1-6), the nature of Paul's preaching. (12), Paul received the Spirit of God. (13), speaking those things the Holy Spirit taught him. (16), Thus, Paul had the mind of Christ. (iii. 6), Paul's avocation was to plant—he engaged or chose coadjutors or evangelists, viz. Apollos, Timothy, Titus. Thus, Paul and Apollos together were God's labourers; those who believed God's husbandry. 9th verse, Paul laid the foundation—others builded thereon; others could lay no foundation—they might build, the result to be the temple of believers. (iv. 1), Men to think of the apostles, as

the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the secrets of God. (9th verse), The pains to which the apostles were subject. (16th verse), Though they had many instructors they had but one Father. (17th verse), Timothy his son. (21st verse), His power over the Corinthians. (5th chapter), Paul dictates to them rules for internal government by virtue of his authority over them. (ix. 1-6), shewing he and Barnabas had power not to work. (11th verse), Thus having sown them spiritual things by virtue of apostolic office, he had a right to their carnal things. 16, 17—necessity for Paul to preach it being committed to him. See his conversion. (x. 33), Seeking not his own profit, but that of many that they may be saved. (xi. 1), Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ. In doctrine he teaching as committed to him by Christ. In practice in all things studying to be a pattern to them—like his Master. (xv. 8), Paul saw Jesus last of all, as one born out of due time. (9, 10, 11), Paul in his character of *e-pos*, laboured more abundantly than they all. (xvi.), Illustration of Paul, in his character of apostle, giving laws for government, &c. (2 Cor. i. 1), Paul was an apostle by the will of God: Timothy, *our brother.* (x). Paul's power as an apostle to forgive, in the person or sight of Christ. (14, 15, 16, 17), Proofs of

apostleship and acceptance of his mission as a sweet savour of God.—(iii. 5) iv. 5: "The subject continued. The treasure of the gospel contained in earthen vessels, that the excellence of the power might be of God, and not of us. The subject continued till v. 20. We, says Paul, are ambassadors vi. 1, We, therefore, (Paul and Timothy). (viii. 8), Another instance, as in case of Paul speaking not by command, or of inspiration; or of knowing the mind of the Spirit. (x. 8), The authority given to Paul for the edification of the churches. (xi. 5), His position of not being inferior to the chief apostles. (28th verse), Paul as an apostle, had the ear of all the churches. (xii. 11, 12), The signs of an apostle! What are these (xiii. 3)? Christ spoke in Paul. (Gal. i. 1), Paul an apostle—not of men,

neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead. (12th verse), The gospel Paul taught was by revelation of Jesus Christ. (16th verse), It pleased God, says Paul, to reveal His Son in me. Eph. i. 1, Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God. 1 Phil. i.; Col. i. 25; 1 Tim. i. 11, The gospel committed to Paul; ii. 7, Timothy's gifts given by laying on of hands; iv. 14, difference in function between two elders, to rule, and to rule and teach, those who ruled well and taught also to be especially worthy of double honour; v. 18; 2 Tim. i. 6, received his gifts through the laying on of *Paul's hands*; 11th verse, Paul's mission again; Tim. ii. 2, Tim. to teach those things Paul taught him and none other.

AN EX-SPIRITUALIST'S OPINION OF SPIRITUALISM.

THE Spiritualists have had rather a serious rebuke. One of their own papers has been publishing confessions from ex-spiritualists, which, in no uncertain and ambiguous language, accuse their former companions of having dealings with the devil, and of being grossly immoral. Among the most vehement of the denouncers of Spiritualism, is the husband of the medium who is now called Mrs. Cora Tappan, but who used to be called by his name, Hatch. Dr. Hatch declares that "the most damning iniquities are everywhere perpetrated in Spiritualistic circles, a very small percentage of which ever comes to public attention." He adds, "I most solemnly affirm that I do not believe that there has during the past 500 years arisen any people who are guilty of so great a variety of crimes and inencies as the Spiritualists."—*Paper*.

EFFECT OF READING THE BIBLE.

The Czar, Alexander I. had not enjoyed a religious education. His teacher La Harpe, was a Voltarian who instilled his own principles into the mind of his pupil. Yet Alexander in after life was very religious, and according to some even inclined to the mystical school. What wrought this change in his mind? If we are to believe M. C. Joyneville, ("Alexander I., His Life and Times.") it was effected in this way: "One day, Alexander having been some years Emperor, happened to offer the appointment of Minister of Public Worship to his friend Prince Alexander Galitzin, who at first

declined to accept the post on the ground that he knew nothing of religion. The Emperor thought that an advantage, since he did not require the service of a specialist or fanatic, but of an intelligent man who would be tolerant and do justice all round. Prince Galitzin having accepted the ministry, determined to qualify himself in some measure for his functions, and with that view begged Plato the Metropolitan of Moscow, to lend him some useful book on the subject of religion. Plato sent him the Bible. Prince Galitzin found it so interesting that he lent it to the Emperor, who reading it like Galitzin—for the first time—was much struck by the beauty and wisdom of its words. From that time forward Alexander carried with him wherever he went, a Bible in the French language, and throughout his campaigns made it a point of reading three chapters daily."—*Jewish Chronicle*.

CHEAP JOHN RELIGION.

(From the "New York Weekly Sun.")

"Here's your cheap religion! cries Cheap John. It costs you nothing; it gives you no trouble; it amounts to nothing; nobody will ever find out you've got it; take it along with you. It's so thin you can see through it; it's so soft you can't feel it; it's so light you can fool with it. Going, going, gone—free, gratis, for nothing; and when you think you've got it, see if you've got what you think."

So cries Cheap John, as he goes to and fro, with his gospel wares in his hand, and a glib tongue in his mouth. Before him are the gaping multitudes, and, behind him, are

his shipwrecked victims.

There is any quantity of this cheap, easy, and worthless religion in the world. It is the devil's counterfeit. It is the bogus currency with which he defrauds countless dupes. The Rev. Mr. Bell's method is interesting. When he appears before an audience, he does not begin by preaching a sermon and end by singing a hymn. He preaches a few moments, then sings a verse or two; next preaches again a few moments, then sings a little more; next preaches, then sings, and so on to the end.

What kind of salvation is it into which the Rev. Frederick Bell has sung so many sinners? As his songs seem to be of the sentimental, emotional, pathetic sort, we presume that he stirs up these feelings in his hearers, and that they have a sweet sense of enjoyment which they take to be the experience of religion. If this be Bell's salvation, it is the devil's counterfeit. True religion is something else than sentimental indulgence, and true conversion is something

more than the Bell business. In the scriptural sense it is a practical serious life-transforming thing, "quick, powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow." It is not a thing that can be sung into any man, though the singer twist his music into the notation of despair. Does Bell sing men and women out of their evil lives, ways, and passions? Does he sing out their malice, avarice, and devilry? Alas! for the converts made in the Bell fashion, if they are not afterward made over again. We fear that Paul would describe them as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Jeremiah, Isaiah, and the other austere prophets of Israel, did not operate on the sinners of their times by singing ditties to them in twisted music. They proclaimed the great truths of the divine law in those sublime words and tones which, after rolling through the ages, are yet powerful over the human soul.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The immersions for the month are as follow: W. COLE (41), baker and confectioner, formerly Wesleyan; WILLIAM ANDREW CORNWALL (32), silversmith, formerly Wesleyan; and his wife, ELIZABETH CORNWALL (33), formerly Wesleyan; also MISS MURFIN (31), from Worcester, who came to an understanding of the truth through sister Mary Turbyfield of Birmingham. She is henceforth to reside at Preston, Lancashire.

The following has been the public work done during the same time: Feb. 27th, Questions, answered by brother Roberts. Mar. 5th, The End of the World, and the World to Come.—(Bro. Hodgkinson). Mar. 12th, The Bible; Christ rejected by Jews, Philosophers and Christians of all denominations.—(Bro. Shuttleworth). Mar. 19th, Christ *versus* Christians.—(Bro. Shuttleworth). 26th, Question Night.—(Brother Meakin).

CREWE.—Brother W. Booth reports the existence of a small ecclesia at this place, composed of himself and sister-wife, and brother and sister Stapleton. He mentions a visit from brother Barber, of Sandbach; and that as a result of labour bestowed, a spirit of enquiry has been evoked, which leads them to hope for fruit by and bye.

DUNDEE.—Brother Gill writes: "The ecclesia here has sustained the loss, by death of sister Mortimer (32), the beloved wife of brother James Mortimer, who died this morning, Mar. 14, after a severe illness of nearly three weeks. She was a sister who had a good understanding of the word, and was an ornament of the truth in its practical mani-

festation by good works. Our brother is left with a young family of five, none of whom are able to render him any assistance in housekeeping—a circumstance which, as a working man, will entail on him considerable inconvenience and expense. However, we must 'bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.'"

Our lectures since last report have been as follow: Feb. 6th, Is the soul immortal? Feb. 13th, 20th, 27th, Hell, and Future Punishment. Mar. 5th, The Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Mar. 12th, The Church of God. The attendance has been pretty good throughout. A few are giving heed to the truth. Whether any practical results may appear or not, we labour in hope that God will give the increase."

CHELTHENHAM.—Brother Otter writes as follows: "You will be glad to learn that we have now obtained a public room, capable of holding about 150; and we intend by God's help, to set forth the truth to the best of our ability. The address is 228, High-street. The room was formerly in the hands of the Good Templars. We have an addition by the removal of bro. J. Gale, from Cinderford, who has obtained a situation in this town."

GALASHIELS.—Brother J. Bell announces the obedience of ISABELLA MCKELVIE (50), wife of brother Andrew McKelvie, of East Gordon (16 miles away). She formerly belonged to the Baptists.

GLASGOW.—Writing on the 14th instant, brother Oowler says: "My anticipation in last month's note, of our efforts bringing forth an increase in our numbers, has hap-

pily been realised. Three immersions have taken place, viz., JOHN DICK, brother in the flesh to brother George Dick; WALTER CAMERON, who has since left for Callao; and JAMES HOWATSON. They all attended our meetings for a considerable time. The lectures for the month at 280, George-street, were, Feb. 20th, What is the Gospel?—(Bro. James Nisbet). Feb. 27, The Kingdom of God.—(Bro. Owler). Mar. 5th, Prove all things.—(Bro. T. Nisbet). Mar. 13th, Sufferings of Christ.—(Bro. Robertson). The meetings at Bridgeton have been very successful, so far as attracting an audience is concerned; and the following lectures have been delivered. Feb. 27th, God, Man and the Bible.—(Bro. T. Nisbet). March 5th, The Gospel that Saves.—(Bro. Robertson.) March 13th, Immortality.—(Bro. D. Smith, Edinburgh). Other lectures are to follow.

GRANTHAM.—Brother J. Hawkins sends intelligence as follows: "We have to report from Grantham that we have prosecuted our monthly lectures for January and February, to audiences numbering upwards of two hundred each time. The former of these lectures was by brother A. Andrew: subject, The Second Appearing of Jesus Christ; the latter by brother Shuttleworth: subject, The Coming Man, who is to remedy all political, social and religious evils. These lectures appear to have excited some controversy, one saying one thing, others another. No fault could be found with the audiences, they being most orderly and attentive. At present, however, the results have all to come. We hope to put the whole matter by these lectures clearly and intelligently before this community in discharge of our duty. Having done that, we are free from the blood of these people."

LEICESTER.—Brother Collyer, in the absence of brother Armstrong, reports as follows: "The lectures, by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, referred to last month, were four in number, and the subjects were as follow: Sunday, Feb. 13th, The Bible: a true revelation from God, and the only hope of mankind. Tuesday, Feb. 15th, Bible Teaching on Sin and its consequences: something for the Unbeliever and the orthodox Misbeliever alike to consider. Wednesday, Feb. 16th, Bible Salvation: what is it? and how are we to obtain it. Its results to the world and mankind at large. Thursday, Feb. 17th, Bible Teaching Concerning the Earth's Future; signs that the tremendous changes predicted are near. The lectures duly came off; on the whole we think them the most successful we have had in Leicester. On Feb. 14th we had two immersions, both subjects being previously Church of England. They are as follow: HENRY WARWICK (30); ISABELLA GAMBLE (49). Sister Gamble is mother of two of the brethren Gamble and sister Mary Gamble. Another application is having the attention of brethren appointed

this week. These several additions of late have greatly cheered and comforted the brethren, being a good assurance of the favour of our heavenly Father on our work. We hope to continue steadfast even unto the end, striving together for the hope of the gospel, and enlightening our neighbours as far as we can."

LONDON.—Brother Elliot reports "We have added to our number by the immersion, on Feb. 20th, of THOMAS FRANK STANLEY, previously neutral; while on the other hand our numbers are diminished by the loss of brother Thomas Johnstone, who after a painful illness died on the 22nd of February. Our deceased brother was much beloved of those who knew him, and leaves in addition to them, sister Johnstone, his widow, to mourn his loss. About twenty of the brethren and sisters assembled at Finchley Cemetery on the following Saturday, to behold the laying of our brother in his temporary resting place; on which occasion a few words of comfort and exhortation were spoken by brother A. Andrew, after which we returned to our homes to see him who was alive among us no more until he be loosed from the now conquering grave. The lectures for March were as follow: Mar. 5th, The Second Appearing of Jesus Christ.—(Brother W. Atkins.) March 12th, The Restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land by Jesus Christ at his Second Appearing.—The process of restoration, as foretold by the prophets of Israel, involving the punishment of the rebellious Jews, and military conflicts between the Jews and the Gentile nations. The nearness of the event as indicated by transpiring events. The condition of the Jews when restored to Palestine under the rule of the Messiah.—(Brother A. Andrew.) March 19th, Predestination, or God's method of saving Sinners.—(Brother Phillips.) Mar. 26th, Infant Salvation. Do the Scriptures teach that Infants will inherit the Kingdom of God?—(Brother Bosher.)

MANCHESTER.—Brother Truëb-cod reports withdrawal from William F. Roche, because of disorderly walk. On the other hand, he says, I am pleased to report an addition to our numbers by the obedience of ANNIE SUTCLIFFE (13), who put on the saving name on the 30th of January last. She is rather young, but made a very good confession of the things necessary to be believed. She says when reading the Bible she could not understand the prophets when they spoke of "the waste places of Jerusalem" &c., being restored, and her Sunday School teacher was unable to satisfy her on the subject, not being able to make it fit with orthodox views, but when she came amongst us, she saw how beautifully harmonious every part of the word was. She is niece of sister Dixon. We continue to sow the seed, and a good attendance at our lectures, &c., continue, thereby showing a good interest."

NEDDERTON.—"I have the gratification to inform you that JAMES HERRIOT (42), screener, residing at Burradon Colliery, about six miles from Nedderton, who has occupied a neutral position for about ten years, and was once on the verge of Atheism, was assisted in putting on that glorious name, called by Jesus the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Living some five or six miles from here, he was led to ask a day's intercourse with me, having seen the report of my own and then my daughter's baptism, which has led to this pleasing result."—SAMUEL BRIGGS.

NOTTINGHAM.—Bro. J. Kirkland writes:—"It is my pleasure to report the obedience, on March 7th, of Miss ANNIE ANDREWS (24), late of Olney, Buckinghamshire, formerly a member of the Church of England; also that sister MARY CLARK (niece of brother Owen), returned to fellowship on Feb. 20th. She is one of those who, by reason of the Renunciationist heresy, have not been in fellowship either with us or with those who deny the truth concerning Jesus the Christ. She was prevented at the time of the division from looking into the matter by reason of family affliction, but now has cast in her lot with those who believe all the things testified of Jesus of Nazareth in the days of his weakness and subjection to death. On Sunday, March 5th, we removed from the Mechanics' to the People's Hall, where we hope to be instrumental in enlightening some who are yet in darkness concerning the glad tidings of the kingdom of God."

PETERBOROUGH.—Brother Hodgkinson writes: "Immersed into Christ, February 22nd, 1876, VINCENT JOHN YOUNG (39), wheelwright, formerly neutral; parents Baptists; formerly in attendance at George Dawson's Church, Birmingham. He has been in search for a dry place for the sole of his foot for years."

Writing again, on March 19th, brother Hodgkinson reports another addition to the number of believers, which took place that same evening, by the immersion, in the presence of several witnesses, of ANNA MARIA YOUNG (37), wife of brother Young above mentioned. She was formerly neutral. Another has applied, and witnessed a good confession, and will be reported in due course. "The audiences keep up remarkably well, numbering from 200 to 350. The dogs have ceased barking since the crack of the whip, and men marvel thereat."

SWANSEA.—The brethren here have adopted and printed the statement of the one faith appearing in the *Record of the*

Birmingham Ecclesia of 1874-5. They have been compelled to take this step on account of the advocacy of unscriptural views in their midst. The step has resulted in the separation of the Goldie family, and one or two others. Brother Randles, in communicating this result, while deeply regretting it, says the step has been forced upon them in defence of the purity of the faith and the name of the Son of God.

WALKERBURN.—Brother W. Dew informs the brethren that he and his sister-wife are now left all alone in this "outlandish country," brother Milne having removed to Galashiels and brother Lees to Selkirk. Nevertheless they are doing what they can, under the influence of the daily reading of the Word, to save themselves from this "untoward and perverse generation," and to preserve in themselves the freshness and beauty of the truth in a dry and thirsty land where no water is, not forgetting the weekly forthshowing of him, who having given himself a sacrifice for our sins, is all our hope until he come again.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Bro. Diboll reports as follows: "Since my last report lectures have been delivered here on the following subjects: Feb. 20th, The Earth not to be Destroyed.—(Bro. D. Spinney). Feb. 27th, The Restoration of Israel.—(Bro. J. W. Diboll). March 5th, Nebuchadnezzar's Dream.—(Bro. J. W. Diboll, jun.) March 12th, Immortality.—(Bro. D. Spinney). I am thankful to say that our audiences on Sunday evenings have somewhat improved as regards numbers of late; and though we do not wish to speak too prematurely, yet we hope we see signs of awakening interest in the great things set forth, in one or two cases. But, however this may be, we know that it is ours to do our duty, regardless of results."

UNITED STATES.

BALTIMORE.—Brother Trezise, writing under date Feb. 21st, reports the obedience of ALICE BEALE, a coloured woman, who has shown very much intelligence in the truth as it is in Jesus.

CENTRE POINT, TEXAS.—Brother J. A. Corbell, writing on Feb. 7th, says the recently-constituted ecclesia here now numbers nine members. He hopes, before a great while, to have the pleasure of reporting the obedience of others, as a few appear to be interested in the truth.

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.—Brother J. D. Tomlin announces that the brethren have secured a desirable place of meeting in the most frequented street of the city. He speaks also of a steady increase, both as regards numbers and interest.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 143.

MAY, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

By DR. THOMAS.

Is the punishment of the wicked unending torment in a subterrene pit of fire and brimstone? In other words: Have they, as a constituent of their nature, undying souls, derived hereditarily from Adam, capable of *post mortem* disembodied existence; and are these souls precipitated into a subterranean cavern, burning with fire and brimstone, to writhe there in intellectual and *physical* (?) anguish continuously with the years of their everlasting Creator? This is an inquiry first announced for public discussion in this country by me in the *Apostolic Advocate* for 1834. Some of our readers of the *Herald* will remember that a hue and cry was raised by the Rev. Alexander Campbell, President of Bethany College, and Professor of Sacred History, together with all, or most,

of the little ambitions that looked up to him as the colossal incarnation of their opinions, against me, for even proposing such an inquiry; and that, too, before they were aware of what my real views were upon the subject. By appeals to passion, prejudice, and bigotry; by sophistry and slanderous attacks upon character; and by every meanness peculiar to "orthodoxy," and the stereotyped littleness that breathes it, they labored to suppress the agitation of it in the extinction of the periodical and myself. But, though this system of attack continued for years, all their efforts to extinguish the truth have proved notably abortive. Their leader and themselves, though multitudinous as the giant of Gath and his Philistines, exist as our monuments of victory and their own miserable defeat. Their

contempt of "*the Strippling*," as they used to style me, and their denunciations of his "speculations and untaught questions," have resulted in their conviction of *spermologism*—mereretailers of the babblery of paganism.

This is the certain fate of all who, by their "learning," stultify the truth—they make void the word of God by their traditions, and expose themselves to open shame. No set of men are so ignorant of God's truth as "the learned;" and as they are the leaders of the people, these are, therefore, darkness twice intensified. This theological obscurity in the brightest realms of civilization, is a great sign of the times. It marks the approaching overthrow of Gentilism in all its diversity of creed and symbol: for, as the Scriptures teach, when Jerusalem is about to "arise and shine," "darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people." This is the helpless and hopeless condition of all ecclesiastical establishments, whether for the education of priests and clergy, or for the religious instruction of the people, throughout "Christendom." Establishments, national and nonconformist, schools and colleges, principals and presidents, professors and divines, all are dense embodiments of earth's universal fog. So that unless the Lord come, and say, "*Let there be light!*" chaos must reign.

The worst spirits are the demons of the "religious world," falsely so called. They are good haters, breathing out curses upon all who do not echo the watchwords of their foolishness. This is all the religion they have—a zeal for the notions and dogmas of their sects and leaders, irrespective of their relation to the divine Word, which has their approbation no further than it is supposed to harmonise with them. The most zealous supporters of "orthodoxy" are always the least intelligent in the Scriptures; and always on the side of majorities and power. Hence, it is never subjected to persecution, because "on the side of the oppressor is power;" and it is only with the weak

and the few that the truth abides. "Orthodoxy" never suffers, for it is rich, and makes rich with all that the flesh desires. It has no practical appreciation of the saying, "If we suffer, we shall also reign;" "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall be persecuted;" and, "It is through much tribulation we must enter the kingdom of God." Suffering, persecution and tribulation belong only to those who are struggling to free themselves from human authority in religious matters. "Orthodoxy" has no fellowship with these.

The grand error that underlies all the speculations of "divines," is the assumption that there exists in universal man an essence they term "*the immortal soul*," capable of performing all the functions of the individual when separated from the body by death; and, as "immortal" implies, of an indestructible or imperishable nature. With them, all have "immortal souls," whether righteous or wicked—so that the one class of mankind is as immortal as the other; and being possessed as aught else is inherently possessed, and derived hereditarily from their common ancestry, immortality is not in their systems to be hoped for or sought after: for "hope that is seen," says Paul, "is not hope; for what a man sees [or hath] why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that we see [or have] not, then do we with patience wait for it."

It is about the destiny of this immortal essence that theologians preach and dispute. Their religion is contrived to save this thing from the pit into which they have transferred the "fire and brimstone" from the *territory of the Beast and False Prophet*. This is their "hell," theologically hocus-pocussed by worldly-wise men out of Scripture phrases used in prophecies, foreshowing the judgments to fall on "the powers that be," and the armies and peoples that sustain them. The "great salvation which began to be preached by the Lord and his apostles," is *not* with the deliverance, *first* of the saints

from the evils of the present state and death; *second*, the salvation of the Twelve Tribes of Israel from all that hate them; *third*, the emancipation of the nations from their oppressors, and their enlightenment in the glory of Jehovah; and, *fourth*, the total and final abstraction of sin and death from human nature, and the renovation of all things terrestrial. No, they have but little conception that such things are treated of in the gospel. The "great salvation" with them is the saving of "immortal souls" from the awful destiny that awaits the impenitent in their bottomless pit of eternally flaming brimstone, the natural element of the theological "devil and his angels." Their "divinity" can rise no higher than this. Its loftiest flight is to snatch disembodied essences from eternal agony by faith in their traditions, and so to give them "viaticum" or a *carte blanche* for a passage to kingdoms beyond the skies, on the down of an angel's wing. This "salvation by grace," as they style it, is not an eternal process. When the Calvinistic elect are all saved by grace, the work of human salvation will be finished, and the time have arrived for "the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds." This is what they call "the consummation of things," which being interpreted signifies the consummation of theological foolishness.

By grace are ye saved through faith alone. This is the theological prescription for the salvation of immortal essences, familiarly styled "ghosts." The faith which saves may be put into a nut-shell, with room to spare. A poor ignorant sinner, who for nearly threescore years and ten has devoted himself to the service of Mammon, body, soul and spirit, comes at last to be stared in the face by the King of Terrors. He knows nothing of "religion" but roasting eternally in hell fire. His horror is naturally extreme. He hears of Dr. Jelf and sends for him, that he may administer to his soul "the consolations of religion," as if the

doctrine of Christ had any consolation for such as he! "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." He asks the doctor if eternal torment be true? "Verily," quoth he, "for Professor Maurice was expelled King's College for denying it. It is true; and God hath ordained it *in terrorem* for sinners." "And is there no escape, Doctor?" "Yes, for the vilest: Jesus Christ made a complete satisfaction on the cross for the sins of the whole world. His merit is as infinite as the demerits of mankind. Believe that this is the case, and that he died for you, and you shall be saved from hell, now yawning to receive you." "But, Doctor, how am I to believe what you say is true?" "Pray to God for faith." "Ah, Doctor, I never prayed; do you pray for me!" Upon this Dr. Jelf, as a Church of England "divine," taking the man's wish as an evidence of repentance, draws forth from his pocket a splendidly bound *Book of Common Prayer*, and reading from "The Visitant of the Sick," in the tone peculiar to Low Church piety, soothes the immortal essence of the hoary sinner, who, being thus clerically magnetised, imagines that the tranquilisation of his fears is the fruit of faith and the Holy Spirit's assurance of peace and joy eternal!

But what becomes of all this if they fail to prove, or if it be demonstrated that there is no such immortal essence in man to be operated upon? It vanishes just like a dream. Immortal-soulism is the foundation-corner laid in the quicksand of Gentilism. The "divines" of all Gentile "Christendom," in one Œcumenical Council, could not produce an inkling of testimony from the Bible in proof of the existence of an immortal soul in human flesh. The burden of proof lies upon them; and, failing to do this, of course their dogma of *its* endless torture, in flames of sulphur, and all their twaddle about *its* intermediate state, and *its* translation beyond the skies—is the quintessence of absurdity. Messrs. Jelf and Maurice may "dispute,

change hands, and still dispute" indefinitely about eternal punishment, and arrive at no practical result in aid of truth, until they have disposed of the question concerning immortality. If there be no immortal essence to be tortured or saved from torment, there can be no such places for its reception as "orthodoxy" provides. The truth is, their immortal essence, religion, heaven and hell, are mere theological chimeras of brain "spoiled by philosophy and vain deceit," unprofitable vanities having no place in the Word of God.

But, while we testify these things, let it not be supposed that we deny immortality to man, or "eternal punishment" to the wicked. The regular readers of my writings are too well informed for this, Immortality is a good thing—too good for the wicked. It is defined in the Bible as *incorruptibility and life*, having relation to *body*; so that *life manifested through an incorruptible body* is the immortality revealed in the Bible. This immortality is a matter of promise to the righteous only; and the righteous are they who believe what God promises, and what He has done, and who do what He requires. Hence immortality is *one of the good things* set before them in the gospel of the kingdom. "Glory, honor, incorruptibility, and life" in the kingdom are evangelized to them, and promised, on condition of their believing the gospel of the kingdom, being immersed, and patiently continuing in well doing. Fulfilling this condition is styled "*seeking for*" them. Thus sought for, they are found at the resurrection of the just, which is termed "the adoption, the redemption of the body." The body redeemed from death is the only *immortal soul* spoken of in the Bible; and stands there in contrast with *the mortal soul*, called "living soul" by Moses, formed from the dust. The body, redeemed from death, is, consequently, thenceforth deathless, or ever-living. It is indestructible and imperishable. Fire and brimstone as torrid as Nebuchadnezzar's furnace

cannot scorch a hair, or leave their smell upon it. It can dwell with everlasting burnings unsinged; and as secure from eternal decay as from destruction by violence from without. Such is the testimony of the Bible concerning the body, which is spirit, because it is begotten of the Spirit, when born from the grave.

But when the intelligent wicked are raised from the dead, they are not redeemed from death. The destiny marked out for them by Paul is expressed in the words, "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Now, as all classes of the living die and corrupt, the corruption to which he refers must be taken in a special sense—a corruption subsequently to the resurrection of such sowers to give an account of themselves to Christ at his tribunal. But death of the body precedes its corruption; parts of it may corrupt before death of the whole; but then the organization of those parts is broken down, or death-stricken, first, and corruption follows; so that the saying is unexceptionable, that *death precedes corruption*. When, therefore, the apostle saith that such persons shall "reap corruption," it is, in effect saying, that *he who sows to his flesh shall become flesh again at his resurrection, after which he shall die a second time, and turn into corruption, as before*. Beyond the evil that is in the world on account of its introduction through sin, there is no punishment for sin till after resurrection. It is then "we must all appear before the tribunal of Christ, that every one may receive again the things of the body according to what he hath done, whether good or bad." To "receive again the things of the body," is the reason of resurrection; in other words, that a man may reap what he sows. The things we do now are *the body's deeds*; not the doings of an immortal essence. If they were an immortal soul's deeds, the apostle would have necessitated our appearing at Christ's tribunal that we might

receive again the things of the immortal soul or mind. In this case resurrection would have been unnecessary, because, on the hypothesis of such a soul's disembodied existence, it might reap what it sows without re-embodiment at all. But this piece of silliness never entered the apostle's mind when he wrote the fifth chapter of the second of Corinthians. *The mortal body that does the things is responsible for what is done.* It must, therefore, give an account of itself to Christ; and to do this, its dust must become body again — *animal body again.* The same dust, once living, then demolished, and afterwards built up again as before, is the same person, though a thousand years may have intervened between the demolition and rebuilding. It is the same person with his old habits of thought and action revived; so that when he comes to give an account of himself, he will be like Adam before the Lord God, a faithful witness against himself; unable, however willing, to conceal the truth. "The Spirit of God shall make alive your *mortal bodies*," says Paul: their immortalization will be by transformation in the twinkling of an eye, subsequently to their post-resurrectional appearance at Christ's tribunal, where the sentence of blessedness will be consequent on their presentation as "holy, unblamable, and unreprouvable in God's sight;" otherwise, they will retain their *terminable nature*, and, like Cain, as exiles from the Divine presence, become "cursed from the earth; and fugitives and vagabonds" in the dominions of the Beast, and False Prophet, and of the Kings of the earth, styled by Jesus, "the Devil and his angels." They will be involved in the fire and brimstone, sword and pestilence, famine, hailstorm, and earthquake judgment, to be visited upon these when the Lord Jesus and the Saints shall make war upon them and overcome them.

Death having overtaken them a second time, and by these means, will they ever be redeemed from its power? The answer is, No; for it is written,

"The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," which "is for ever and ever." There is no salvation out of this kingdom; and exclusion from this will be a cause of great anguish: for the King himself hath said, "*There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth*, when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast out." To be exiled with shame into the land of the enemy, and there to be subjected to poverty, pain, vagabondism, hunger, pestilence, and death, without hope of deliverance, will doubtless exhort from each one the lamentation imputed to Cain, "My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth; and it shall come to pass that every one that findeth me shall slay me." Thus, "the wicked and the sinner shall be recompensed in the earth; but shall not inhabit it;" "the righteous shall never be removed."

"The meek shall inherit the earth;" but "the wicked shall not inhabit it." This is the divine sentence upon the two classes; and as the wicked do now inhabit and possess it, it is clear that the sentence has relation to a future period of the earth's history. When that period arrives, it will be said, "*the wicked are no more.*" As the whirlwind passeth, so will they — with a terrible sweep, to oppress and annoy our race no more. Their extermination from the earth will be final — "an everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power when he shall come to be glorified in his saints," will make their ruin complete. The destruction is *aiouian*, rendered "everlasting." It is a destruction pertaining to the *aiou* of the wicked — one peculiar to their "*course*," which is "the course of this world." They are pre-eminently mortal, having no right to eternal life; so that destruction is to them "*death until death*," and needs no adjective to inform us

that it is eternal.

This then is the "everlasting punishment" "into" which the wicked "go away." Being mortal, they reap corruption from which they are never redeemed. This is the consummation of their punishment which endures; their consciousness of it precedes this consummation, and dates from the sentence pronounced upon them in the court of heaven till death seizes upon them the second time. How long in each individual case this consciousness may continue, depends upon "the things of the body;" for "stripes" will be "many" and "few," according to its deeds of offence. The *aion* of judgment is about forty years. The punishment of great offenders will doubtless exceed in duration and intensity that inflicted upon those who have been less; for "every man shall be judged according to his works." It is the prerogative of the judge to enter into details as to

whether A shall be subjected to death, with shame and contempt in the land of the enemy for ten years previous; or B to death with twenty years of suffering preceding his final obliteration from the universe of God. These are particulars beyond our ability to define. The least amount of punishment will be agony to the condemned; for "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, who is a consuming fire." Be it then ours, O reader, to believe the gospel of the kingdom, and to obey it, and by a patient continuance in well-doing to walk worthy of that kingdom and glory to which it calls us. We need fear no punishment then, for the "terrors of the Lord" are only for them who are contentious against the truth, disobedient to its commands, and sow to themselves in gratifying their passions and lusts to the crucifixion of the truth before the world.—*Herald of the Kingdom*, 1854.

RESTORATION OF ISRAEL BEFORE AND AFTER THE ADVENT.

By DR. THOMAS.

QUERY BY A CORRESPONDENT.

"ALLOW me to suggest a thought respecting the degree of restoration of the Jews to Palestine, predicted. Are you sure that the Scripture gives us to understand that such a degree of restoration as described in Ezek. xxxviii. 11, 12, will be effected previous to the advent? Are we not rather to expect that Gog will not come against the land of Israel but to a limited degree, before the possession of Palestine by all the saints after the Advent? If so, the destruction of all but 'the sixth part' is an event of the millennial period only.—(Chap. xxxix. 1-4.)

I would distinguish between threatened judgments in the present dispensation and those of the age following. One is a judgment to cause men to learn righteousness, and

the other the opposite—the great battle.

I am a believer in the doctrine of God's restored favour to the Jews, previous to the Advent; but expect that such favour is to be manifested in special efforts for their conversion principally, together with a Divine *attempt* only to establish them in Palestine, rather than that they will all be converted, and also be reinstated in Palestine to the degree you and others expect previous to the Advent. I cannot find a single instance in the whole Bible where God has ever accomplished any purpose respecting His people's deliverance by the destruction of His enemies until He had first tested them; or in other words, attempted to effect that purpose by merciful and peaceable means. And as the deliverance of His people is synchronous with the termination

of the times of the Gentiles, I must, in harmony with the above-mentioned truth, look for a certain degree of effort to gather His people, the Jews, to their ancient land (Rom. ii. 9, 10), but to no greater degree than the gradual termination of the times of the Gentiles, which times will not fully terminate till the complete deliverance of God's people at the coming of Christ. But the standing up of Michael (Dan. xii. 1.) is synchronous with the termination of the Gentile times with respect to them *as nations*; for an effort to deliver one people in a national point of view, argues the casting away of an opposite people *as nations*.—H.B.

Nov. 2nd, 1853.

A N S W E R

The invasion of the Holy Land by Gog is to be "*in the latter years*," which are also styled by the same prophet the "*latter days*;"* which are both pre-adventual and contemporary with the appearing of Jesus Christ, and continue forty years subsequently to that event. They are also premillennial, that is, they end before the thousand-years period begins. The primary and partial, and the ultimate and complete restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel is effected during these latter days. The beginning of restoration, in the extent of it, is defined by the prophet in the words "the land brought back from the sword and gathered out of many people; and brought out of the nations dwelling safely all of them," "without walls, and having neither bars nor gates;" and therefore, styled "the land of unwalled villages," "in the midst of the land." This immigration and settlement is therefore not spread over the whole land; but principally confined to the midst or navel of the land; to that part, in other words, styled by Isaiah "a tenth." His words are, "a great forsaking in the midst of the land. But

yet in a tenth, and it shall return and be eaten."† By reference to this passage the reader will see that this is part of the prophecy concerning the desolation and subsequent restoration of the people and land of Israel. It predicts that in the midst of the widespread ruin a tenth part should escape utter desolation; and that the people should return and occupy it, and browse it with their cattle, which is implied by the phrase, "and shall return and shall be eaten." This is restoration in a limited degree—a restoration in a tenth part of the land, in the midst of it. What proportion of the nation will occupy this tenth part is not revealed; but this we are informed, namely, that be it large or small, only "*one third part*" will survive the calamities inflicted upon them by God's invasion of the country and siege and capture of Jerusalem; for, "thus saith Jehovah, it shall come to pass in all the land, that *two parts* therein shall be cut off and die; but *the third* shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: *they* shall call on My name and I will hear them: I will say, it is My people: and they shall say the Lord is my God"‡—that is Jesus, "whom Jehovah hath made both *Lord* and Christ."§

After Gog's power is broken on the mountains of Israel the work of restoring "the *whole* house of Jacob" begins. The destruction of the Czar's "*mighty army*," made up of the contingents supplied from all his subject nations, is styled of God, "My slaughter that I do sacrifice for you a great sacrifice upon the mountains of Israel." This He terms, "My hand that is laid upon the nations." Isaiah calls this "The day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall"—"The day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound,"—the day when He shall "cause His glorious voice to be heard and show the light-

* Ezek. xxxviii. 8, 16.

† Zech. xiii. 8. ‡ Isa. vi. 13. § Acts ii. 36.

ing down of His arm with the indignation of His anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hailstones. For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian (Gog) be beaten down, who smote (Israel) with a rod.* This will be a dreadful day upon the invaders of Israel's land, "the day of vengeance of their God;" but at the same time "the year of His redeemed." When these things have come to pass the words of Jehovah by Ezekiel will be accomplished, saying, "It is come, and *It is done*: this is the day (the day of Christ) whereof I have spoken," the day of Gog, the Assyrian-clay's destruction, and of the deliverance of His people Israel—the day of the "great voice" of the Seventh Vial, "issuing from the throne, saying, *It is done!*" Having predicted the events of this day of judgment upon Gog and his forces, in his thirty-ninth chapter, Ezekiel then says, "So the house of Israel shall know that I (Jesus) am the Lord their God *from that day and forward.*" This terrible overthrow of their enemy proclaims Jesus Jehovah's servant and their deliverer. Having smitten the Assyrian image, it remains for him to proceed with the work of "planting of the heavens, and laying the foundations of the earth, and saying unto Zion, 'Thou art My people'—a work equivalent to "raising up the tribes of Jacob, and restoring the desolations of Israel;" and one to which Jehovah refers, when He says by Ezekiel, "*Now,*" after the overthrow of Gog, "will I bring again *the captivity of Jacob,*" which "the north" hitherto refuses to "give up," and "the south keeps back;" "and have mercy on *the whole house of Israel;* and will be jealous for My name." This is the final and complete restoration of the nation, which can only be effected by the invincible prowess of the Son of God.

It is not very apparent what is meant by Gog going against Palestine "to a limited degree." He either

invades the land, or he does not. If he invade it, it is not a question of degree, but of fact. He invades it for a purpose—to take possession of the Holy Places, and to convert the country into a province of his empire, then fitly represented by the image Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream. He only accomplishes his purpose in part. He captures the Holy City; but fails to subdue the country. The post-millennial Gog aims at both, but succeeds in effecting neither.

Our correspondent does not seem to be acquainted with my views of the restoration of Israel before and after the Advent. If he read what I have written on the "Second Exodus," in *Elpis Israel*, he will see that I do not teach the conversion of the Jews before they settle in the land, previous to Christ's appearing; nor the conversion of all Israel who are gathered into "the wilderness of the people," after the Advent. The ten thousand Jews now dwelling in Jerusalem are "unconverted," in the Gentile sense, and have no faith in Jesus. Yet they inhabit the land, with several thousands besides, having as little faith as they. Let this number be increased by British or other policy, and you have the character of the preadventual colonization of the "tenth," whose people are to return, and browse it with their cattle. But, before "*the captivity*" held in bondage by "the north" and by "the south" can get back to Palestine, they have to pass through "the wilderness of the people," as, in the days of Moses, their fathers passed through "the wilderness of the land of Egypt." In that wilderness Elijah will bring them to acknowledgment of that same Jesus whom he saw in majesty on the Mount of Transfiguration, as Son of God and King of Israel; and at the same time, all the sons of Belial among them, "children in whom there is no faith," will be purged out of the host, and be forever excluded from Israel's land, as unworthy of the national sabbatism promised of Jehovah in the covenant

* Isa. xxx. 25, 26, 30, 31.

made of old with their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

H. B. believes that "God's restored favour is to be manifested in special efforts for Israel's conversion principally." By whom? it may be asked. If it be answered, by special efforts of pious Protestants, we lift up our hands in astonishment at any one professing intelligence in the Word of the kingdom, supposing that there would be any divine favour manifested in such special efforts! Pious Protestants do themselves need special efforts for their own conversion. To set them to work converting the Jews, is like setting a man with a beam in his eye, to pull out a mote in the eye of another; or appointing a blind man to lead another across a precipice! Protestants know not the gospel, and therefore believe it not; how then can they by special-efforting convert the Jews? The gospel of the kingdom is the power of God for the salvation of every one that believes. As, therefore, they do not believe this, God's power for conversion cannot operate through them. None can convert Israel but God. He alone can give them a new heart and renew a right spirit within them. He has promised to do this; not through the special efforts of Gentiles, however pious, according to their sectarian standards; but through the special efforts of His Servant, and the system of means He comes in power and glory to execute.

I can, however, conceive of the possibility of a Jew being converted, through the aid of pious Gentiles. Generally speaking, there are more Jews to be found who believe the Hope of Israel, for which Paul was bound in chains, than sectarian Gentiles. Now, if these Gentiles could convince such Jews that Jesus was their Messiah, and that the serpent was condemned in his flesh when he was lifted up, and that he was raised from the dead for their justification, they would be made what their Gentile teachers are not, and that is, believers of the kingdom's

gospel in the name of Jesus. But in Paul's day the Jews were enemies of the gospel, which was turned by the favour of God to the advantage of the Gentiles; and so it is now, only reversed: the Gentiles are enemies of the Gospel for Israel's sake. Hence, *the Great Eastern Question*, whose solution will result in breaking off the Gentiles, and the reingraftment of Israel into their own olive tree.

Our friend is right enough in supposing that before the destruction of all Israel's enemies, there will be an effort to effect their deliverance by merciful and peaceable means. But the institution of these means will not precede the overthrow of Gog's mighty army. This host will fall like Sennacherib's, without warning or premonition. Being in possession of "the city of the great King," he will be summarily ejected, and terribly discomfited in Edom. But the Image being shattered by the Czar's irreparable defeat, Jerusalem delivered, and Judea freed from the presence of the spoiler, the first angel proclamation *after* the Advent is sounded throughout the world. The Age-gospel is once more announced by divinely commissioned messengers. It is not proclaimed to be believed as the ground of forgiveness of sins, and exaltation to the possession of the kingdom in its glory, honor, power, riches, and dominion, which are eternal; but as a ground of escape from the judgment then about to be executed by Jesus of Nazareth, and the saints, upon those who rule the nations. Those in Egypt who desired to escape the plagues inflicted upon it by Moses, associated with the Israelites, and left the country with them, "a mixed multitude of men and women:" so, when the symbolic angel flies through the apocalyptic heaven, if any would escape the judgment upon Babylon, and upon the worshippers of the Beast and of his image, whose dominion-area is "*spiritually*," or figuratively, "*called Sodom and Egypt*;" which judgment is the

burden of the Second and Third *post-adventual* proclamations,—they must “give glory to God” and “worship:” that is, they must renounce their allegiance to “the powers that be,” and consort with Israel in their exodus, or goings out, from “the land of the enemy,” according to the commands of Jehovah’s King, then in Jerusalem, awaiting the result of the First Angelicism, before he proceeds to reduce the fragments of the shattered Image to the likeness of “the chaff of the summer threshing-floors.” For the powers that resist there is no more mercy than for Pharaoh and his army, that were swallowed up in the Red Sea. The nations inhabiting the earth to its utmost bounds are the promised inheritance of Jesus; therefore, the kings, and nobles, and judges, or rulers, of the earth, that would retain power over them, are his enemies, and doomed to destruction by fire and sword.

If by “all God’s people” is meant the Twelve Tribes of Israel, *and* all

believers of the gospel of the kingdom, Jews and Gentiles, living and dead, H. B.’s notion of their “complete deliverance at the coming of Christ” cannot be sustained by the testimony of God. The dead in Christ will be raised, and the living saints transformed, and Jerusalem and Judea wrested from the spoiler, at his coming: their deliverance will be complete. But it will take the subsequent forty years, according to the plan revealed, to complete the deliverance of the Twelve Tribes, and mixed multitude consorting with them. The complete deliverance these will experience will be civil and ecclesiastical; but not a deliverance from mortality. In their case, this will be postponed for a thousand years. There may be multitudes of them that will never attain to that deliverance at all; as there were, doubtless, many that obtained settlement in Canaan under Joshua, who will have no part in eternal life and glory.—*Herald*, 1854.

IS TRINE IMMERSION APOSTOLIC BAPTISM?

THE INNOVATION DISCOVERED AND THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM RESTORED. By
W. C. Thurman, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

THE APOSTOLIC BAPTIST AND HERALD OF THE TRUTH AS IT IS IN JESUS. Edited
by Messrs. Evans, Staples and Hacking: U.S.A., and Canada.

ONE of the numerous errors that have started into successful activity among the brethren since the death of Dr. Thomas, is represented by the two publications described above—one of these being a monthly magazine started for the advocacy of the new doctrine. The new doctrine is that baptism, as hitherto practised among the brethren, is not the baptism established by the apostles; that the baptism established by the apostles consisted of three immersions—one each for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; and that all who are not so baptised in three immersions, are without Christ and have no hope. This doctrine is accompanied by one or two other peculiarities, such as the practice of feet-washing, as a ceremonial institution, and the claim to have the presence of the Spirit in the gifts of healing, tongues, &c.

The leader of this class of errorists is one W. C. Thurman, who has given the whole American press occasion to blaspheme the coming of the Lord, by positively fixing various dates which have all been falsified. His doctrine has found ready believers

among a goodly number formerly professing the faith. We have been repeatedly importuned by letters from America, to enter thoroughly into the question for the purpose of confuting trine immersion, and arresting the destroying progress of that doctrine among those professing the truth on the other side of the Atlantic. Hitherto we have not responded to these numerous and importunate requests.

At first the affair seemed unworthy of serious attention. The doctrine seemed too absurd to need confutation: but the progress of the doctrine has changed this aspect of the matter, and rendered formal attack a thing called for. Then, the arguments were almost wholly non-scriptural, that is they were drawn from the region of ecclesiastical history, and not from the Scriptures. Consequently, it seemed that any argument to be effective must be drawn from the same source. We have, therefore, delayed the answer till we should have sufficiently investigated the matter from a historical point of view, to be able to make the answer complete. We have been able to do this thoroughly by means of *Robinson's History of Baptism*, a very elaborate work, published at the close of the last century, in which is presented a mass of information drawn from a vast number of ancient books, to which exact references are made for almost every assertion made. It is in many respects a dreary book, but one of great value in the particular argument required in the present question. We are indebted to it principally for the facts set forth in the extracts quoted in the course of the following argument.*

The right mode of baptism is made known in the Scriptures clearly enough to enable the anxious enquirer to know the will of God, without reference to the endless and enormous human vagaries of which ecclesiastical history is the record. We shall glance at the scriptural evidence by and bye. Meanwhile, we must look at, for the sake of meeting, the arguments of another sort, by which these partakers with the apostasy are seducing some who were clean escaped from error.

In logical order, their first argument is founded on the word *baptise*. They contend that ending in *zo*, baptise is necessarily a "frequentative verb," that is, a verb expressing a performance that cannot be executed without repeated action, as when we say a man *swims*, or *rows* a boat, which cannot be done without repeated movement of the arms. They say baptise means repeated dippings, and that a man who is only dipped once is not baptised. In support of this, there is a considerable quotation of learned authorities, with regard to whom it is to be observed that they can no more be accepted as decisive on the point than Webster on the meaning of the term soul. Webster testifies to the current understanding of "soul" as "the immortal part of man;" but he leaves it still a matter of enquiry whether that understanding is scriptural. So the authorities on the question of baptism are mere witnesses to the prevalence of the idea of plurality of action in baptism; but are no authorities on the question of whether that idea is scriptural. It may be said they are competent witnesses to the grammatical sense and construction of a word. No doubt, but the grammatical sense and construction is a question of usage, and usage is the offspring of tradition; and tradition may be the offspring of fancy. It is, therefore, insufficient to tell us what is the commonly accepted sense of a given word, which is all that lexicographers can do. We must enquire if the commonly-accepted sense is true.

Baptism, for ages, has been held by a false church to consist of a plurality of actions. This notion is, therefore, reflected in all the ancient literature of that Church. When, therefore, lexicographers, who merely collect and arrange words as used, came to look into that literature, they could do no less than testify to

* The references to pages apply to the quarto London edition, 1790.—Ed.

the use of the word as a "frequentative" verb; but who made it by usage a frequentative verb? This is the question. Investigation will shew this classification of the word to be artificial, originating in that corruption of the ordinances of God which began in the very lives of the apostles by those deceitful workers and false apostles, whose word Paul foretold would eat as doth a canker.

There is evidence of the foolishness of the "frequentative" theory in the very arguments employed to uphold it. Thurman's contention is that *bapto* means to dip once, and baptise to dip several times. In proof of this, he quotes Hippocrates, the ancient physician, who in a prescription says, "having dipped (*bapto*) it into the oil of roses, let it be applied during the day; but if it should be too painful, *baptise* it again." Thurman's comment on this is, "Hippocrates in speaking of one dip used the word *bapto*, but if this is to be repeated, then dropping the word *bapto*, he employs the word *baptizo*." This is a specimen of the false reasoning that characterises his whole pamphlet; false yet craftily involved so as to appear plausible, and likely to deceive the unwary. The comment on the case of Hippocrates is a pure gloss. The case stands just the other way. Hippocrates uses *bapto* for one dip and *baptizo* for one dip—the one word being a mere variation of the other. As one of Thurman's own authorities states, "*bapto* and *baptizo* agree in one common original meaning, viz., that of immersion or plunging." The distinction between them is not the number but the nature of the dippings signified. *Bapto* is to dip simply, while baptise is to dip with the object of producing a result, as in dyeing. But even this distinction is more one of conventional usage than of radical significance. Hippocrates in the very instance quoted uses them synonymously. "*Baptise* it again" says he: surely this means "Do again what you did before; you dipped it once: dip it once again." Baptise applies to the *second dip*, but the second dip is only one dip, so that Hippocrates proves baptise to mean one dip though quoted to prove that it means a plurality of dips.

The origin of the frequentative notion is visible in the course of Thurman's own argument. He quotes Professor Stuart to the following effect: "It would appear that a *feelin* existed among some of the Latin Fathers, when they rendered *baptizo* (Greek) by *mergito* (Latin), that *baptizo* is in its *appropriate sense* what the grammarians and lexicographers call a frequentative verb; *i.e.*, one which denotes repetition of the action which it indicates. Nor are they alone in this; some of the best Greek scholars of the present and past age have expressed the same opinion in a more definite shape." SOME of the Latin fathers—not all—had "*a feeling*" that baptise was a plurality of dips. Why didn't *all* have this "feeling" if the verb were intrinsically frequentative in its nature? Some of the Latin fathers were on the other side of the question. They did not share the feeling that the verb was frequentative. So far as argument goes, one set of Latin "fathers" are as weighty in the scale as another. The Latin fathers who did not think *baptizo* was a frequentative verb are as much authority against the frequentative theory, as some who had "a feeling" in favour of it. If it was a matter of fact and judgment, why should it have been a matter of "feeling?" For a very good reason. The baptism the fathers practised was trine immersion—of the scripturalness of which we shall presently enquire; and as in their practice baptism was unquestionably a frequentative act, no wonder they should "feel" that it ought, contrary to the usual views of the case, to be classed as a frequentative verb.

Then it is laid down as "an established principle of the Greek language that a class of verbs (terminating) in *zo* formed from other verbs, have the signification of

frequentatives." Take the "established principle" for what it is worth: what does it amount to? "A class of verbs in *zo*, formed from other verbs," is not "*every* verb in *zo* formed from other verbs." If there are exceptions (and there are very many, such as *αποδοκιμαζο*, to reject; *αφανιζο*, to put out of sight; *ανακαθιζο*, to set up—all verbs of a single act), then *baptizo* may be one so far as the rule goes, and therefore the quotation of the rule is utterly without effect in the argument. The nature of a verb is not to be determined by the technicalities of grammarians, but by the act of which it is the expression, of which even correct rules are but the witnesses or description. If *baptizo* is a frequentative verb, it is so not because it ends in *zo*, but because the act of baptism is frequentative in its nature. And certainly no wise man will accept as evidence, on this point, the practices of a system of religion which is a corruption of apostolical Christianity in all particulars.

Of the nature of baptism, the Scriptures must be the witness, and not the writings of men, however reputedly "learned," who lived in and perpetuated the long age of apostacy and corruption which set in while the apostles were alive, and soon shrouded the world in night. Learnedness in the conventional sense is by no means a guarantee of reliability in divine things. It is one bad indication of the whereabouts of Thurman & Co., that throughout their arguments, they are constantly salaaming, so to speak, to "the learned this and that, and this authority and that."

Let us try this "frequentative" notion by the Scriptures. Jesus said to his disciples just before he left them, "Ye shall be *baptised with the Holy Spirit* not many days hence."—(Acts i. 5.) The promise was fulfilled ten days afterwards. The Spirit came on the day of Pentecost and "filled all the house where they were sitting," (Acts ii. 2.) "and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit."—(verse 4.) Did the Spirit descend three or any other number of times? Was it not a *single effusion* in great plenteousness?

Jesus, alluding to his approaching death, said "I have a *baptism to be baptised with*, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?"—(Luke xii. 50.) Did Jesus go through three or four deaths? Is it not so that he "died unto sin ONCE."—(Rom. vi. 10.)

Paul, alluding to the passage of Israel through the Red Sea, and under the cloud (by both of which they were concealed from view), says they were thus "all *baptised unto Moses*."—(1 Cor. x. 2.) Did Israel go several times through the sea and several times under the cloud, as the fictitious "frequentative" notion requires?

These illustrations are sufficient, though others might be quoted. Thurman himself affords several. He admits that John's baptism was not trine immersion. He says the triple formula was "*never used in baptising Jews*"—his explanation being that they were already in the Father, and needed not to be baptised in the name of the Father. The Jews, he argues, had only to be baptised into Christ's death. He dates trine immersion from the commission of Matt. xxviii. 19, and says it was intended alone for the Gentile nations, who were entirely outside. Without discussing the value of this explanation, the important point to notice is that the author of the explanation admits that John baptised and Jesus baptised—before *trine immersion* (as he contends) *was instituted*. The baptism with which they baptised, as his explanation requires, was SINGLE IMMERSION—the Jews being, according to his contention, already in the Father and in the Spirit. Hence the "frequentative" notion is upset by its own advocates; for if John could *baptise* by a single act of immersion, obviously baptise is not a frequentative verb, but has become so only by ecclesiastical corruption.

But, says Mr. Thurman, "Christ has certainly enjoined the use of three names, which," he adds "*no man can account for but upon the supposition that he meant three actions.*" Mr. Thurman should have contented himself with saying that he could not account for the use of three names otherwise than by trine immersion. He ought not to have spoken for other men. Anyone comprehending the truth as it is in Jesus can account for the use of three names, without the assumption of trine immersion. Nay, they go further, and contend that trine immersion would obscure the reason for Christ's injunction on the point, and destroy the mystery of godliness of which the three names are the expression.

Paul says there is but "one baptism" (Eph. iv. 4), which proves that the baptism with which he and other Jews was baptised, was the same as that with which all believers were baptised. In view of this, let these facts be considered and reconciled. The Gentiles, as Mr. Thurman contends, were baptised "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." But it is testified of the Galatians (and these included Gentiles) that they were *baptised into Christ*; also that Paul was *baptised into Jesus Christ*; and that many others were *baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus*.—(Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3; Acts viii. 16; xix. 5, &c.) Now, how are we to reconcile baptism into Christ with baptism into "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" Mr. Thurman's mode of argument about baptism into "the three names" compels him to regard "baptism in Christ" as one act of immersion, and baptism into the three names as three immersions. Thus, we should have two baptisms instead of one, and some Gentiles baptised with the one and some with the other. But Paul testifies there is but one baptism. Consequently, baptism into Christ must be the baptism in the three names prescribed by Christ. They must agree one with another. And investigation will show that they do agree—that to be baptised into Christ is to be baptised into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. The testimony concerning Christ will shew this.

1.—*In relation to the Father.* Jesus says: "No man cometh unto the Father but **BY ME.**"—(John xiv. 6.) "I am come in *my Father's name.*"—(John v. 43.) "The Father is **IN ME.**"—(John xiv. 10.) "He that hath **SEEN ME** hath *seen the Father* also."—(verse 9.) "I and my Father are **ONE.**"—(John x. 30.) "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."—(2 Cor. v. 19.)

2.—*In relation to the Son.* "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."—(Matt. iii. 17.) "Thou art the Son of God, the King of Israel."—(John i. 49.) "I am the Son of God."—(John x. 36.)

3.—*In relation to the Holy Spirit.* "The Holy Spirit descended and abode upon him."—(John i. 32-33.) "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him."—(John iii. 34.) "I by the Spirit of God cast out demons."—(Matt. xii. 28.) "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak are Spirit and life."—(John vi. 63.) "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. . . . He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what **THE SPIRIT** saith unto the churches."—(Rev. xxii. 16; ii. 7.)

Thus, in Christ, we have the three names in focal combination. He is the Father manifested in the Son by the Holy Spirit. Consequently, in being baptised into him, we are baptised in or into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. They are all three presented to us in one person—Jesus, who by the Holy Spirit, is the Mystery of Godliness. This is the **ONE NAME** given under heaven for the salvation of men. Peter declares there is none other. It is not three names, but one name made up of three. The three are exhibited in the baptismal formula in order

that the one may be understood. By this formula, the great truth is always kept in view that Jesus is not the Saviour by his own personal power, but by the power and grace of the Father in him by the Spirit. To dip three times is to hide this unity; and it is to assert that the Son can save by himself, and the Spirit by itself, and the Father by himself. In the wisdom of God, it required the three in combination before a name could be provided for our salvation, and that is, the name of Jesus, to which every knee shall bow and every tongue confess. Here is the mystery of Godliness which those do not comprehend who contend for a Trinitarian baptism. Here is a complete explanation of baptism in the three names being used interchangeably in the New Testament with baptism into Christ. And here is an end of the difficulty which compels trine-immersionists to teach one baptism for Jews and another for Gentiles, in opposition to Paul's declaration that there is but one baptism.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ARGUMENT.

The great argument upon which trine-immersionists rely, is the ecclesiastical one: and to that we shall now give attention. It is this: Trine-immersion has been used from the earliest ages. It was used by those who lived so near the apostolic age, that they must have known whether it was apostolic or not. The monk Chrysostom, afterwards Bishop of Constantinople, who lived in the fourth century, is quoted to the following effect: "Christ delivered to his disciples one baptism, in three immersions, when he said 'Go teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.'" Jerome is quoted: "We are thrice dipped in the water." Also Tertullian, who flourished in the third century: "We are thrice immersed as the Lord commanded in the gospel." Then the Council of Carthage (A.D. 256) is quoted: "The true doctrine of the Holy Mother, the Catholic Church, hath always been with us, and especially in the article of baptism and trine-immersion wherewith it is celebrated." Clement of Alexandria (2nd century) is quoted: "Ye were conducted to a bath just as Christ was carried to the grave, and were thrice immersed to signify the three days of his burial."

Then we have it asserted that "the true apostolic order was continued not only in a few branches of the Church, but in all the world, down at least to A.D. 185:" when Tertullian was baptised by trine-immersion; and that, therefore, trine-immersion must have been the mode practised by the apostles. This is asserted on the authority of Irenæus' declaration (writing A.D. 185): viz., Polycarp "always taught the things which he learnt from the apostles and which the Church has handed down and which alone are true. To these things *all the Churches of Asia* testify, as also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time;" and again: "The Churches dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth have received from the apostles and their disciples, *one and the same faith*, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles until now" (A.D. 185). At this time trine-immersion was in vogue. How are we to account for this, ask the trine-immersionists, if it was not apostolic? They go further and declare that for the first five hundred years, trine-immersion was "the *one universal custom* of all the world, without a SINGLE EXCEPTION." Mr. Thurman says, "I have not yet met with a single author who, writing before the *eighteenth century*, was of a different opinion" than that "trine-immersion was the most ancient manner." He says still more pointedly, "The new mode of single immersion, which was cradled in the ignorance of the Baptists in A.D. 1522 *is not yet 350 years old*." He further says "the Baptists' new

mode of immersion" was "invented by Thomas Munzer, in March, 1522, not as the original institution of Christ, but only to avoid the necessity of having anything in common with the Catholic Church." He declares it was "*unknown on earth before the year 1522.*"

If these assertions are correct, trine immersion has, doubtless, a serious claim at our hands. Are they correct? Let us see.

1. Did apostolic faith and practice continue unchanged down to A.D. 185?
2. Was trine immersion universal at that time?
3. Was single immersion unknown in the early centuries? Is it true that it was invented in 1522?
4. What was the origin of trine-immersion, and is the meaning attached to it by the ecclesiastical systems of antiquity favourable to its being regarded as the truth?
5. Who were the upholders of trine immersion, and who were the practisers of single immersion from the very beginning?
6. Granted that there have been changes, with whom did they originate—with those who claimed official episcopal power to enact laws under the assumed guidance of the Spirit of God; or the unpopular, obscure and poor "heretics" who in all ages have rejected councils and adhered to the word of God?

Let us consider these points *seriatim* :

1. *Did apostolic faith and practice continue unchanged till A.D. 185?* In judging of this question, we are safer to follow the apostles than to follow Irenæus or any other of the so-called "apostolic fathers" of the early centuries, not only because the former were inspired and the latter not, but because there is a manifest conflict between the testimony of the one and the testimony of the other—a conflict of such a kind as to show that the apostles are trusty guides and the fathers not so. Thurman accepts their testimony and Irenæus that "the churches dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, have received from the apostles and their disciples, one and the same faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles even till now;" and on this, and other similar ecclesiastical testimony, he grounds the assertion that "the true apostolic order was continued, not only in a few branches of the Church, but in all the world, down at least to A.D. 185." But this is in conflict with the testimony of the apostles themselves. So early as A.D. 60—*one hundred and twenty-four years before Irenæus wrote*—Paul said there was a set of men among the brethren who were jealously seeking occasion to obstruct the truth in his hands, whom he styles "false prophets, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ."—(2 Cor. xi. 12-13.) In writing to Timothy, he alludes (A.D. 66) to the success of the intrigues of these men among the brethren, saying, "This thou knowest, that *all they which are in Asia* (the very "churches of Asia" appealed to by Irenæus for confirmation of his statements) *BE TURNED AWAY FROM ME*; of whom is Phygellus and Hermogenes."—(2 Tim. i. 15.) Paul had a gloomy forecast of the influence these ambitious, intriguing false apostles would have after his death. On this point, he expressed himself thus to the elders of the Ephesian ecclesia (the very "church in Ephesus" which Irenæus declared to be in his day a true witness of "the tradition of the apostles"): "I know that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in *among you*, not sparing the flock; also of *YOUR OWN SELVES* shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."—(Acts xx. 30.) In the same strain, he

addressed Timothy just before his execution by Nero. "They will increase unto more ungodliness, and *their word will eat as doth a canker*, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred. . . . The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts, shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned into fables."—(2 Tim. ii. 17: iv. 3.) Peter also told the brethren to whom he wrote that false teachers should spring up among them; and he adds, "AND MANY shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom THE WAY OF TRUTH SHALL BE EVIL SPOKEN OF."—(2 Pet. ii. 2.) Jude refers generally to these and other similar predictions of the apostles, saying: "Beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before, and of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that THEY TOLD YOU *there should be mockers in the last time.*"—(Jude, verse 17.) Here we have not only apostolic predictions of an early corruption in the community founded by the labours of the apostles in the first century, but actual testimony by the apostles themselves that the mischief had begun in their own lifetime, and had advanced to a considerable stage of success. Not only did Paul say that they would "turn aside to fables," but he testified "the mystery of iniquity doth *already work*" (2 Thess. ii. 7)—a general statement, amply illustrated in the activity of the false apostles, who "zealously affected the brethren, but not well" (Gal. iv. 17), and had succeeded in alienating the whole of the lesser Asian district from Paul. John wrote his Epistles thirty or forty years after Paul's decease; and John bears ample testimony to that which Paul said would happen after his decease. He says: "Try the spirits whether they are of God; for many false prophets (or teachers) ARE GONE OUT *into the world.*"—(1 John iv. 1.) Where had they gone out from? John answers the question in 1 Epis., chap. ii. 9: "They went out *from us.*" What was their characteristic with regard to popularity, as contrasted with the world's treatment of the apostolic "little flock" of the narrow way? John answers "They are of the world; therefore, speak they of the world and the world *heareth them.* We (adds John, meaning the apostles) are of God. He that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error."—(1 Epis., iv. 5, 6.) But not all even professedly in the narrow-way party submitted to the apostles; for we find John saying, in his third epistle: "I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, *prating against us with malicious words*; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would and casteth them out of the church."—(verse 9.)

Here is evidence of the most unimpeachable kind that long before the close of the first century, the professing Christian community was in a state of seething corruption and antagonism to the apostles, through the ascendancy of ambitious men of a worldly education, who had learnt philosophy and rhetoric in the schools, and embraced the gospel on the irresistible evidence presented; but embracing it in a crude form, and mixing with it the carnal principles they had imbibed in their early days, with the result of producing the insipid compound of philosophy and apostolic tradition existing in the creeds of "the Church." "Even now," says John (A.D. 90) "are there *many anti-Christ*s, whereby we know it is the last time."—(1 Epis., ii. 18.)

In view of these incontestable facts, it seems a mockery to assert that "the true apostolic order was continued in all the world, down at least to A.D. 185." It seems amazing that any man should urge such a conclusion on the strength of assertions

made more than a century after the corruption began. What should we expect from the leaders of "the Catholic Church" in the second, third and fourth centuries, but the assertion that the faith and practice of their church were the veritable articles introduced by the apostles? Are we to take their assertion as evidence? "The simple believeth every word." The marvel is that men should be found in America, who having learnt the truth, can be beguiled by such a simpleton's argument as this.

2.—*Was trine-immersion universal at the time?* Even if it were, it would not be evidence that trine-immersion was apostolic baptism, in view of the ascendancy of men of carnal wisdom, who corrupted the word by their own traditions, and assumed to have "authority" to decide all questions affecting the faith and practice of the Church; and of whom it was predicted, that their traditions would prevail cankerously to the eating out of the truth. But there is evidence that it was not.

Before introducing this evidence, it is well to look at the fact that the institution of baptism has been the subject of as much perversion and alteration as any of the doctrines and appointments of the gospel. The importance of the fact lies here: if there has been perversion and alteration of baptism, true light on the subject is not to be sought for in the practices of any church, but in apostolic teaching alone. If there has been interference and change, we are at liberty to choose that form which is in accordance with the Scriptures, even if it should have been confined to a contemptible and unheard-of few, in defiance of the "canons" and prescriptions of the successful, respectable and overwhelming majority, particularly when the apostolic predictions require that the truth should be found among a despised and oppressed minority. Has baptism been the subject of alteration and change?

Robinson, in his *History of Baptism*, speaking as the result of acquaintance with ancient ecclesiastical literature, says (page 267): "Baptism is one of the most curious and complicated subjects of ecclesiastical history. Among men who stepped off the ground of Scripture and laid another foundation (tradition—Ed.), it was variable as the wind, and in every province practised for a different reason." Dr. King, in his *History of the Greek Church*, quoted by Robinson (page 322), says: "A vast number of inventions have been added to the plain institution of Christ, baptism: inventions which arose from the capricious imaginations of bishops, while each appointed all the offices and ceremonies in his own diocese."

The former writer says: "Baptism rose pure in the east: it rolled westward diminished in lustre, often beclouded with mists, and sometimes under a total eclipse. At length it escaped the eye and was lost among attenuated particles, shades, non-entities and monsters. Then it took a contrary direction, and probably, in time, it will emerge from every depression and shine in its original simplicity and excellence."—(Page 343.)

"The Baptists held that nothing but baptism was essential to baptism; but the Catholics, besides baptism, held the necessity of no less than *two-and-twenty ceremonies* which they had affixed to it: twelve preparatory to baptism, five at the administration of it, and five after it. Others make many more, and as each ceremony includes several rites, the whole ought certainly to be multiplied by five, or probably by ten, so that a valid baptism includes more than one and perhaps more than *two hundred ceremonies*."—(Page 512.)

Speaking of the additions to and corruptions of baptism which occurred from the beginning, Robinson says (page 49): "There is no mention (in the New Testament) of any of the ceremonies which modern Christians have affixed to baptism: no con-

secration of water, no sprinkling, no use of oils and unguents, no sponsors, no kneeling in the water, NO TRINE-IMMERSION, no catechumen state, no giving a name, no renunciation of any demon, none of the innumerable additions which, under the pretence of adorning, have obscured the glory of this heavenly institute."

Now for the evidence that trine-immersion was not universal from the beginning, but that single immersion was also practised. The following are extracted from *Robinson's History of Baptism* :

"Immersion, SINGLE or trine, was the ordinary mode of baptising in the Catholic Church *from the beginning till the Reformation*; and the Lutheran reformers continued it."—(Page 441.)

"Baptism was universally performed by immersion, SINGLE or trine, for the first thirteen hundred years: from thence till after the Reformation it was generally performed by trine-immersion. Pouring or sprinkling began only to be allowed for baptism, only in the eighth century, in cases of necessity."—(Page 132.)

"In the reign of Charlemagne, the law of baptism was excessively severe. It was death for a man to refuse to be baptised. . . . Baptism was defined immersion, SINGLE or trine. Alwin, the Emperor's prime ecclesiastic, contended warmly for trine-immersion: but some bishops practised the Roman mode and *dipped only once*" (three ancient authorities are referred to by Robinson for this statement).—(Page 426.)

"To prevent confusion, the hierarchies of Greece and Rome issued directions as to each person's part (in baptism). Father Mabillon has collected the most ancient copies, the first being of the 9th, and supposed to describe the 7th or 8th century; the last, the 14th; and he published sixteen. In regard to the mode of baptising, there is not a trace of sprinkling or pouring; it is dipping, and, *in some*, trine immersion.—(Page 76.)

A Catholic commentator upon the mode of baptism, after speaking of sprinkling, says: "It is safest, in all possible cases, to immerse the whole body, and *most laudable* to immerse three times" (shewing the alternative of single)—Page 128.

The Spaniards, as a nation, used single immersion, from the 6th century at least.—(Page 435.)

"The Greek Dissenters all baptised, and particularly the Eunomians, who denied the Trinity and *rejected the baptism of trine immersion of the Established Church*, and administered baptism by SINGLE IMMERSION, either in the name of Christ or in the death of Christ."—(Page 48.)

"The rubrics of baptism ordered that the priests should teach their parishioners to get by heart the form of baptising . . . that they should charge only one of them to utter the words once, clearly and distinctly, word for word . . . that they should order them to dip three times OR ONCE, or sprinkle in cases of extreme danger."—(Page 520.)

3.—*Was single immersion unknown in the early centuries? Is it true, it was invented in 1522, and that it was "unknown on earth" before that time?* Mr. Thurman says, "The one universal custom of all the world, *without a single exception*, was the three actions down to the sixth century, and with the exception of a few of the Spanish Catholics, down to A.D. 1522." This is a very extraordinary statement in view of the evidence adduced in answer to the last question. It is contrary to truth. We shew its untruthfulness by other evidence. A Synod of Constantinople censured the Eunomians for practising *single immersion*, so early as A.D. 381.—(pp. 48, 514.) Mons. Daille, in answer to Card. Bellarmine on another subject

(as quoted by Mr. Robinson), states that the apostolic canons *expressly forbid it*. (Ibid.) Now what are these apostolic canons? They are the most ancient digest of ecclesiastical rules extant. It is claimed for them that they belong to the earliest century, and had the sanction of the apostles. They are, however, of a later date, as all scholars allow. Still, they are, unquestionably, one of the earliest ecclesiastical instruments extant; and they "expressly forbid"—what?—"Single immersion," shewing that single immersion was practised in the very earliest age of which we have ecclesiastical record.

4.—*What was the origin of trine-immersion, and is the meaning attached to it by the ecclesiastical systems of antiquity favourable to its being regarded as the truth?* A definite answer cannot be given to the first part of this question, as regards fixing a date and stating the circumstances which led to the adoption of trine-immersion, simply because ecclesiastical history does not furnish the one or the other. Robinson says (p. 168) the practice was universal among "Christians of the Catholic kind," that is, concurrently with the use of single immersion, as evidenced in the extracts already quoted; but he adds it was "of uncertain origin." There are certain clues, however, which enable us to approximate to a probable conjecture, sufficiently satisfactory to account for the practice. The first clue is to be found in the fact that tradition, expounded by councils and bishops, was accepted after the apostolic age as of equal authority with the Scriptures. This Robinson declares.—(Page 63.)

"The Greeks divided their institutes into two classes, (1) the scriptural and (2) the traditional. The division was merely speculative, for they thought *both equally binding*." Basil gives an instance in baptism (*Op. De Sancto Spiritu, cap 28*). He says: "The Scripture says, 'Go ye, teach and baptise,' and TRADITION ADDS, *baptise by trine-immersion*; and if any minister or presbyter shall administer baptism, not by three dippings, BUT ONE, let him be punished with deprivation." This proves two things, first that Basil, who is one of the authorities so affectionately quoted by the trine-immersionists, did not regard "baptise" in the commission as "a frequentative verb," or the words of the commission as a whole a proof of trine-immersion; and secondly, that trine-immersion was founded on *tradition*. It proves, thirdly, that baptism by one dipping was a thing *well known in his day*, for he says baptism by one dipping exposed the baptiser to the pain of deprivation. Here we have trine-immersion *the persecutor*: single-immersion *the persecuted*; an important fact in the argument by-and-bye.

Mr. Robinson says that Mons. Daille, a writer of several centuries ago, proves by unquestionable authority that "trine immersion was *first mentioned at the close of the second or beginning of the third century*:" also that according to the same writer, "Basil, Jerome, Gregory Nysson and others, *pretended at first it was an apostolic tradition*."—(p. 514.)

It is now profitable to see that the practice was associated with the doctrine of the Trinity, which, though formulated for the first time by Athanasius at the close of the third century, had been in formative agitation for a long time before. The following extracts will prove this association:

"James Sadolet, who was first secretary to Leo X., and afterwards created a cardinal by Paul III., in the year 1536, says: 'Our trine immersion in water at baptism, and our trine emersion, denote that we are buried with Christ *in the faith of THE TRUE TRINITY*, and that we rise again with Christ *in the same belief*.'"—(Robinson, p. 444.)

Speaking of a picture on an octagon font in Orford Chapel, Robinson says: "The two Catholic reasons for trine immersion are represented here: the one by an angel, an escutcheon in his hand, with a *triangle to represent THE TRINITY*; the other a woman sitting and holding a dead corpse in her lap, to signify either the dead body of Christ, or a dying and being buried with him in baptism by trine immersion, which represented the *three days' burial of Jesus* . . . The Catholics speak of baptistries abroad, which used to flow with water at Easter without the aid of art, and to become dry of themselves after the priest had done baptising. They gave this out for a miracle in proof of *the doctrine of the Trinity INTO WHICH THEY WERE BAPTISED.*"—(Page 131.)

Vedast and Remigius first instructed Clovis in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, *which he afterwards professed to believe, by being THrice DIPPED at his baptism.*"—(Robinson, page 113.)

In A.D. 381, Gregory pronounced the funeral oration of Basil, and alluded to baptism as a Trinitarian thing.—(Page 253.)

"The metropolitan of all Greece . . . advises the good matrons to lay aside the use of demoniacal baubles, and to give them (the children) *the Trinity*, that is BAPTISM, as the only great and good amulet."—(Page 250.)

"When the scenery was removed, it was found that the chief secret was the doctrine of a TRINITY. It was the principal article; * * it was that without which all the ceremonies were inefficacious and *baptism itself invalid.*"—page 243.)

5.—*Who were the upholders of trine immersion; and who were the practisers of single immersion from the very beginning?* These extracts prove that trine immersion was regarded as the symbol of the Trinity. It is but going one step further to assume it was invented to uphold this doctrine, or adopted from a previous corruption to sanction it. There was invention somewhere. The evidence shows this. Either some discarded trine immersion for single, or some added to single immersion and made it trine. Even apart from the voice of the New Testament, it would not be difficult to surmise correctly on which side the innovation took place. The trine immersionists were men in power, and who did not bind themselves by the authority of Scripture, but claimed an equal authority for tradition, and the right of stating and interpreting that tradition; who therefore had the amplest opportunity of adopting and establishing any vagary that might suit their fancy or their convenience. This was the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. There were those, however, who did not accept their traditions, and with whom they held no communion. Thus Robinson says: "The hierarchy was formed long before Constantine established it. . . . There were real Christian Churches in the city (of Rome) *with whom they held no communion, and whom they persecuted as far as they could.* Constantine only brought the great faction into public; *THEY SUPPRESSED THE REST.*"—(Page 346.)

6.—*Granted there have been changes in baptism. With whom did they originate? With those who claimed official power to enact laws under the assumed guidance of the Spirit of God; or the unpopular, obscure and poor heretics, who, in all ages, have rejected tradition and adhered to the Word of God?* This is in part answered. It remains but to see how stood these persecuted heretics with regard to baptism. Robinson, speaking of the final application of baptism to infants, says: "But this is

only to be understood of Catholic hierarchies; for *it does not appear that those Christians, whom the domineering parties called 'heretics,' MADE ANY SUCH ALTERATIONS IN BAPTISM.*"—(Page 155.)

There is another statement having a bearing on the subject of early heretics and baptism. Tertullian of Carthage wrote in the third century against them. Robinson says (p. 177): "The book itself is not addressed to the Church of Carthage. It is a pamphlet written against the Quintillianists, whom the writer reputed 'heretics,' who were not in communion with the Church, and who *did not believe the doctrine of the Trinity*; for he (Tertullian) says, *they had not the same God*, therefore it was no wonder THEY HAD NOT THE SAME BAPTISM."

With these facts in view, the reader is able to estimate rightly the value of the assertions of the American trine-immersionists in their efforts to re-establish the traditions of the apostasy among those who have hitherto made a good profession as brethren. They are the assertions either of ignorance or knavery. So far from single-immersion being "unknown on earth before 1522," it has been practised in the world since the days of the apostles. Trine-immersion got the upper hand, because on the side of the innovator was power, and assumption of spiritual legislative authority; but single immersion continued to be practised by those who were accounted heretics by the domineering factions; and who were not only excommunicated, but prevailed against by them. Ecclesiastically speaking, therefore, we have to choose between an ambitious hierarchy, claiming spiritual authority, with the power and learning of the world on their side; and a cast-out community of so-called "heretics," who adhered to the Scriptures and "rejected the trine-immersion of the established church," as stated above.

Is it not evident that the question must be decided by appeal to the Scriptures alone? Confusion reigns in the region of ecclesiastical history. The faith and practice of any class of men after apostolic times, is no foundation to build upon. We may or may not be right in following such a lead. We quote the case of the heretics merely to show that trine immersion, though general, was also rejected, and single immersion practised from the very beginning; and that, therefore, there is no safe discussion of the subject outside the writings of the apostles themselves.

If the so-called "apostolic tradition of antiquity" is to be received, it will commit us in the matter of baptism, not only to trine-immersion, but to a vast number of other additions to the divine ordinance. The ecclesiastical practisers, who are quoted as our example in the matter of trine-immersion, not only dipped three times, but consecrated the water used in the baptism. They baptised only twice in the year—Easter and Whitsuntide—wax candles were burnt during the performance; the person baptised was first exorcised by a professional exorcist, with solemn and menacing formula, of a demon supposed to reside in every unbaptised person; the subject was then rubbed with ointment; salt was put in his mouth; he was signed with the cross; after immersion milk and honey were given him to taste; then he was again rubbed with ointment; finally a crown was put on his head, and he was dressed in a white robe, which he had to wear seven days. In addition to these, there were incantations, and various other ceremonies. All these things were alleged to be founded on apostolic tradition, and they can be traced back (most of them) to the second century. Why should trine-immersion only be insisted on by the new schismatics in the United States? If antiquity and "tradition" prove trine-immersion apostolic, they prove wax candles apostolic also; and consecrated water, and salting, and ail the other

mummeries invented by the evil men and seducers, who, true to Paul's prediction, waxed worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Not only so, but the same authority will prove immortal-soulism and eternal torments, and no end of things still professedly rejected by trine-immersionists; for Robinson says, speaking of the *third century*: "The Africans made no scruple to affirm that infants dying unbaptized in the name of the Trinity, were inevitably punished with *the torment of everlasting fire*. This doctrine was the parent of the baptism of abortives; and this doctrine in all its stages was called 'AN APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.'"

The Eastern Church, whose example is so much insisted on as a reliable illustration of persevering faithfulness to apostolic baptism, not only dips three times, but pours, or did *POUR as well*, according to the following evidence: "In the church of St. Lawrence, at Rome, Romanus is represented naked, as having been just immersed. Lawrence is pouring water out of a vessel upon him, according to *the custom of the Greeks*, who beside trine immersion, *POURED WATER UPON THE HEADS OF THE BAPTISED.*" Describing baptismal pictures on a tomb, "Father Mabilon observes that they resemble the baptism of Romanus by St. Lawrence at Rome, and that they are intended either to exhibit a *Greek baptism where BESIDE TRINE IMMERSION, superfusion is practised*, or a baptism where the laver was too small, &c."—(*Robinson's History of Baptism*, 1790; pages 104-108.) Consequently, our trine immersion friends don't go far enough, or else the Greek Church is no authority on the subject of baptism.

The state of the case is sufficiently obvious from all the evidence adduced, to guard the sincere enquirer after the way of God against the imposition being practised upon some in America; and to induce even those who have been entrapped to retrace their steps and renounce the foolishness of trine immersion, in confidence in his compassion who forgives the erring when they confess their errors and forsake them. By way of bringing the evidence to a focus, we may transform the questions appearing on page 208 into a string of corresponding propositions.

1.—Apostolic faith and practice, so far from continuing unchanged till A.D. 185, was extensively corrupted more than a hundred years before that date, while Paul was yet alive, by men of whom he foretold that they would wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived, until the whole truth would be eaten away as by a hideous cancer.

2.—Trine immersion was not universal though general in A.D. 185; for trine immersion was rejected, and single immersion practised at that time by certain who were regarded as "heretics."

3.—So far from single immersion being unknown till 1522, the practice was "expressly forbidden" by the earliest "canons," of which there is any record; and any clergyman practising it was threatened with deprivation, shewing it was a practice sufficiently general to call for serious notice and official interdict as early as the second century.

4.—The precise origin of trine immersion is uncertain, the same as the origin of the use of wax candles, anointing, exorcism, &c., in the administration of baptism, is uncertain; but this much is certain—that it was associated with the doctrine of the Trinity, and practised only by those who believed in that doctrine—a fact which is *prima facie* evidence against its claims to be a divine institution.

5 & 6.—The practisers and upholders of trine immersion were men of learning in the worldly sense, and popular with the world; and claiming powers as successors of the apostles to settle all questions of faith and discipline. This establishes a three-fold presumption against the scripturalness of their doctrine; for (1) human learning,

(which Paul styles "philosophy and vain deceit"), incapacitates men for retaining or receiving the truth of Christ in its purity and simplicity; (2), popularity is evidence of their being unspiritual; and (3) their claim to possess spiritual legislative power makes it morally certain that any changes that took place in the institutions of Christ would originate, without scruple, in their hands, as the "mystery of iniquity" already working in the days of Paul, which was to develop, and did finally develop, the power exalting itself above every authority, and arrogating to itself the right to "change times and laws," viz., the Roman Papacy. The practisers of single immersion, "the heretics," whom the trine-immersionists strove to suppress, and of whom we have but scanty and incredible accounts in the writings of their enemies, were poor men, who made no such pretensions, and who having nothing to gain by it, were little likely to "change the ordinances."

The Donatists are said to have practised trine immersion; and stress is laid on this fact in view of Dr. Thomas having identified them with the angel-sealing of Rev. vii. 2-8. On this it may be remarked—1, The proof is not clear that trine immersion was general among the African dissenters from the Catholic church in question. 2, Even if it were so, it would not follow that it was a scriptural institution, because though the Donatist schism may have been the outward form and providential means of the sealing work, the real work may have been confined to obscure classes not recognised in the Donatist communion, though developed in connection with it, just as Christadelphians are the result of Dissenterism in our day, but not identical with it. 3, In the determination of scriptural truths, doubtful questions of ecclesiastical history must be governed by the testimony of the Word. It would be a wrong as well as an uncertain method to allow the teaching of the Word to be over-ridden by doubtful ecclesiastical history.

In the ecclesiastical phase of the question, the balance of probability is all against the trine immersionists. But the question cannot be settled by the ecclesiastical argument. Ecclesiastical history bears testimony to the existence and practice of single immersion from the beginning, and it bears testimony to the early practice of trine immersion. Consequently it proves neither; so we are sent back upon the Scriptures for an answer to the question: "Which is right?"

And there is no uncertainty about the scriptural answer. We get it in a variety of ways. The direction of Christ to his disciples to baptise "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," (which occurs only once) must be consistent with the practice of the apostles, whom the Spirit of Truth guided in the execution of the commission. If it meant three separate dips, in or into three separate names, we ought to find the meaning carefully illustrated in their administration of baptism. We certainly should never find their confining baptism, or the idea connected with it to *one of the names*. But how stands the fact? There is not a single case of baptism where the three names are mentioned, let alone three dips. Where the relation or meaning of baptism is at all defined, it is always confined to Christ.

EXAMPLES.

"Be baptised every one of you *in the name of Jesus Christ*."—(Acts ii. 38.)

"Peter commanded them to be baptised *in the name of the Lord*."—(Acts x. 48.)

"They were baptised *in the name of the Lord Jesus*."—(Acts xix. 5.)

"So many of us as were baptised *into Jesus Christ* were baptised into his death."—(Rom. vi. 3.)

“As many of you as have been *baptised into Christ* have put on Christ.”—(Gal. iii. 27.)

Indirectly, the same point is illustrated by Paul's question to the Corinthians, when seeking to exalt Christ: “Were ye baptised *in the name of Paul?*”—(1 Cor. i. 13.)

How is this peculiarity to be explained—this apparent discrepancy between the direction of Christ to the apostles to baptise in “the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” and the practice of the apostles in confining the ceremony to the name of Christ? Some explain it by supposing Christ never did tell his disciples to baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and that the only passage in the New Testament where these words occur is a human addition to the narrative of Matthew. But there is no need for this mode of explanation, (which is besides inadmissible on critical grounds, for the preponderance of evidence is in favour of the words in question being in Matthew's original MS.) The explanation is to be found in the fact dwelt upon early in this article—that Christ is the name of Jehovah by the Spirit in a Son, and to be baptised into him is to be baptised in, into, or for the three names of which he is the individual illustration or expression. You cannot separate Jesus from the Father and the Spirit. He and they are all one, and in one; and make up, in one person, the glorious name given for salvation. It does not require three baptisms to induct a poor Gentile into this name. Three dips would be out of harmony with the thing signified altogether, and it would imply that a man could be baptised into Christ without being baptised into the Father and the Spirit; and that Christ was separate from and independent of the Father and the Spirit. One baptism, and that a baptism into Christ, is sufficient to introduce us to the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and, therefore, the apostles always speak of baptism as a baptism into Christ, which is only at variance with the theory of trine immersionists, and altogether at variance and inconsistent with the Trinitarian jargon of ancient ecclesiastical authorities on the ceremony and meaning of baptism.

The uniform description, by the New Testament, of baptism, as baptism into Christ, is proof that the New Testament baptism is one immersion, and not three or any other number. This is shown conclusively by the apostolic explanations of its meaning and effect. It is explained as a symbolic participation in the death of Christ, and an induction into his one body. The following are very definite on this point:—

1.—“Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised *into his death*. Therefore, we are buried with him *by baptism UNTO DEATH*.”—(Rom. vi. 3-4.)

2.—Ye are . . . *buried with him in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.”—(Col. ii. 12.)

3.—“Baptised *into one body*.”—(1 Cor. xii. 13.)

4.—“As many as have been *baptised into Christ* have PUT ON CHRIST.”—(Gal. iii. 27.)

Trine immersion destroys these explanations. It teaches three deaths and three resurrections, whereas Christ only died and rose once; or it teaches that not only Christ but the Father and the Spirit died, which are impossibilities, and contrary to the testimony. It propounds the unscriptural tradition that the three dips signify the three days during which Christ was dead, thus degrading the saving institution of the gospel from an act of the highest doctrinal significance, to a mere memento of

an unimportant historic detail. Logically, it destroys the unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as subsisting in Christ. It teaches the possibility of being baptised into the Father without being baptised into the Son. It does this, not only by implication, but in express words, for its upholders say "None of the Jews were baptised into the name of the Father," "they being already in the church of God, claiming him as their Father."—(*The Innovation Discovered*, page 4). Again, "The (trine) formula" "was never used in baptising Jews."—(*Ibid.*)

Here is its completest refutation. Jesus said to the Jews: "No man cometh unto the Father *but by me.*" Trine-immersion makes him teach, "Ye (Jews) are already come to the Father whether ye receive me or no." Thus it separates Christ from the Father. John wrote, "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father."—(1 John ii. 23.) Trine-immersion contradicts this in saying that the Jews (who denied the Son) already had the Father, and that it would have been "ridiculous to think of baptising a Jew in the name of the Father."—(*The Innovation Discovered*, page 4.)

Paul says, "The head of every man is Christ and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. xi. 3), and again, "Ye are Christ's and Christ is God's.—(1 Cor. iii. 23.) Furthermore that Christ "is able to save to the uttermost all that *come unto God* BY HIM."—(Heb. vii. 25.) Trine-immersion disarranges this teaching in making Christ only one of three names into which we have to be separately baptised. According to trine-immersion, it is not sufficient to be baptised into the Son: we do not, by this doctrine, obtain access to the Father and the Spirit by the Son, but must be baptised also into the Father direct and the Spirit direct. Thus Christ is displaced from his position as the connecting link—the "door" of entrance—the "new and living way." And thus, there are three names under heaven whereby we must be saved, in opposition to the apostolic declaration, that "there is none other name (than the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth) under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."—(Acts iv. 12.)

Trine-immersion also destroys Christ's headship and Christ's mediatorship, for by its teaching it says, the head of every man is not Christ in particular but the three names into each of which he is baptised; and we come not to the Father by Christ, but we come to the Father direct and the Son direct, both in the same separate, independent approach, in being baptised into each separately. In fact, it is a destruction of the scriptural doctrine of baptism. It is Trinitarianism, instead of the apostolic doctrine of God manifest in the Son by the Holy Spirit, as the way of our approach to the Eternal Creator of Heaven and Earth.

We have already noticed the sophistry of the frequentative theory of the word "*baptise.*" The true sense of the word, as distinct from *bapto* is tersely given by Mr. Robinson, on the authority of Dr. Gale, "whose accurate knowledge of Greek," he says, "was never doubted." He says that this gentleman has traced the original word among profane writers and finds it associated with dyeing and the dyer's art. He gives several illustrations, the most to the point being *baptisterion*, which was the name of a dyer's vat. He says "Mohammed has most fully translated the original word (baptism.) He calls it *segbatallah*, that is, a divine dyeing or the tinging of God, from *segbah*, dyeing, and *Allah*, God. . . . He made use of this compound term for baptism because in his time, Christians administered baptism as dyers tinge by immersion. . . . The inward tinct is half the meaning of baptism; the other half is immersion in water. . . . The single word *baptism* stands for both dipping, the *mode*, and a person of real character, the only subject of baptism. There is a

propriety in acknowledging a believer in Christ a real character by baptism. It is giving him the name who hath the thing."—(*Robinson's History of Baptism*, p. 7.)

The meaning of baptise, as distinct from *bapto*, is, therefore, evident. *Bapto* is to dip merely, as in bathing, without producing or seeking to produce any change, while baptise is to dip with a view to produce a change as in dyeing. Dyeing may, in some cases, require repeated immersions, but this is an accident of the process and not the essence of the process. The essence of the process is the *changing of the colour*; and where one submersion is sufficient (as it is in many cases) to change the colour, it is none the less a baptism, in the dyer's sense, than where the article has to be dipped twenty times. With this in view, we are at no loss to comprehend the employment of the term baptise, in describing immersion into Christ. This immersion is not a merely formal or unessential dipping. It is an immersion to produce a change in the person immersed. The change is described in the New Testament as "a washing away of sin."—(Acts xxii. 16.) A sinner's transgressions are all forgiven in the act of baptism.—(Acts ii. 38; Rom. vi. 4-11.) It is the appointed institution by which believers are saved and purified in conscience.—(1 Pet. i. 22; iii. 21.) Consequently, as regards his moral relations, a believer comes out of the water a different colour from that which characterised him when he went in. He goes in crimson, which is the scriptural colour for sin (Isaiah i. 18); and he comes out white, according to that other statement of the Spirit, when speaking of his class, that "they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."—(Rev. vii. 14.) But this divine dyeing requires not three immersions. One immersion is sufficient, even immersion into Christ, whose blood was shed for the cleansing of those who should thus put on his name. The cleansing name is not the Father nor the Spirit in their abstract relations to mortal men, but the name of the Lamb slain for the cleansing, even the Son, who, however, is the Father manifested in the seed of David by the Spirit, and, therefore, the three names in one person, which is their appointed relation to the sons of men in baptism or the divine dyeing.

Trine immersion confounds the dyeing process, and in reality stultifies the "frequentative" theory with which it is associated. Granted that a thing may require to be dipped several times in a dyeing solution to dye it; it is the same liquor it is dipped in each time; but trine immersion first dips the sinner in one dye, then in another, and then in a third. It is a single immersion in each of three colours; so that "baptise in the name of the Father" is not in their practice "frequentative," but a single act; so with baptise "in the name of the Son," and baptise "in the name of the Holy Spirit." Baptise in each case is *single immersion*, notwithstanding the "frequentative" theory they have invented. To be consistent, they ought to baptise several times in each name; and then who ever heard of a wet fabric being dipped first in one dye, then in another, and then another?

The "frequentative" theory is an invention, founded on ecclesiastical corruption as we have already seen. The explanation founded on the dyer's use of the term is much more sensible and in harmony with the scriptural use of the term. In every instance of scriptural use, it is *one immersion to produce a change*.

1.—Israel were immersed once (baptised) "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—(1 Cor. x. 2.) They passed into constitutional relation to Moses by the act of concealment in the cloven waters, under the cloud.

2.—John immersed *once* for a reformation of life. Trine immersionists themselves admit one immersion in the case of John's baptism, and, therefore, are consistently

bound to abandon the "frequentative" theory; for the word baptise is constantly applied to John's baptism (Matt. iii. 11-13; Mark i. 4; John i. 33.)

3.—Jesus baptised in the same way as John; for it is testified that "Jesus made and baptised *more disciples than John*."—(John iv. 1.) Therefore Jesus immersed *once*; that is, his disciples did it for him.

4.—Jesus *baptised* the apostles with the Holy Spirit.—(Matt. iii. 13; Acts i. 5.) He immersed them *ONCE* in the Spirit.

5.—Jesus was baptised with death.—(Luke xii. 50.) He was immersed *ONCE* in the terrible waters.

6.—"We are *buried with him in baptism* into death."—(Rom. vi. 4.) Therefore, we are immersed *ONCE*.

7.—To us there is "one Lord, one faith, and *one baptism*."—(Eph. iv. 5.)

No more needs to be said, though much more might be said if notice were taken of all the extraordinary statements and arguments advanced in the publications mentioned at the beginning of this article. Trine immersion is an invention of the apostasy. It is ancient, yet not so ancient as some of the arguments would try to make it appear. The quotation of Justin Martyr, and one or two others is not justifiable; they mention the three names in connection with baptism, but not three immersions.

By the three names, they may only have meant their scriptural significance in connection with the one baptism taught by the apostles. Their mention of the three names no more proves them trine-immersionists than that a similar mention of the three names proves Christadelphians trine-immersionists.

However, ancient a little or ancient much, we have adduced evidence sufficient to show that it is a corruption of the apostolic institution founded on a corruption of the doctrine of which true baptism is the form and expression. Its revival among some who had professed the truth is a matter of deep regret. Some of these are to be pitied perhaps more than blamed. The argument by which they have been deceived is subtly drawn and plausibly set forth and supported by assertions which, taken for truth, would seem to establish them. The argument in reality is an ingeniously complicated skein of fallacy, coloured by an element of historical truth, strengthened with quasi-learned demonstrations of a very superficial character, and held together by statements that are positively false. When this is seen by honest men, they will repudiate the imposture that has been palmed upon them, and retrace their steps to that position of truth and liberty from which they have been seduced.

April, 1876.

EDITOR.

WINDS OF DOCTRINE

That have tossed to and fro some who had received the gospel in the nineteenth century.

1, A personal devil; 2, no judgment at the coming of Christ; 3, literal fulfilment of the apocalypse; 4, Christ a mere man; 5, Christ not a son of Adam and not a sharer of human mortality; 6, the human race not condemned in Adam; 7, Christ in the days of his flesh partly of "divine substance;" 8, Christ a passive medium without a will of his own; 9, baptism, an induction into Jesus only, and having nothing to do with the Father and the Spirit; 10, Trine Immersion; 11, revival of the Spirit gifts; 12, Speerism, or no gospel invitation for anybody since the destruction of Jerusalem.

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

AMONG the 171 ladies who last year pursued medical studies in Russia are twenty-three Jewesses.

Bacur Effendi Ashkenasi, a Jew, has been appointed a member of the Supreme Court of Appeal, in Constantinople, which is the highest court of judicature in the Turkish Empire.

Among thirteen million of inhabitants of Hungary there are 554,000 Jews. Between the years 1866-70 the Catholics have increased by 16, the Protestants by 29, and the Jews by 49 per cent.

The Jewish community of Cairo possess a school in which 300 pupils receive education. The institution owes its origin to the exertions of M. Albert Cohn, and now proves of great advantage to the Jewish congregation.

JEWISH LONGEVITY.—The *Jewish World* states that a Jewish resident of Liverpool, well known in that town as Rabbi Lyzer, has lately died at the advanced age of 102 years. Up to the last he retained possession of all his faculties.

JEWISH HONOURS.—The King of Holland has conferred the knighthood of the Order of the Netherlands Lion on Mr. Asser, the eminent advocate and counsellor to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the knighthood of the Order of the Oaken Crown on Mr. V. Salomon, who holds a post in the Cabinet of the King.

JEWISH PROTECTION.—The Minister of Public Instruction in Austria, has given orders to all the school authorities in the cis-Leithan portion of the monarchy, in future not to compel the Jewish children attending on Sabbaths and Festivals to write or to draw, and to exempt them altogether from attendance on certain high festivals.

A JEW AND THE PRINCE OF WALES' RETURN.—The Special Committee appointed by the Court of Common Council to offer

a public reception in the City of London to the Prince of Wales on His Royal Highness' return from India, have appointed a Jew, Mr. H. A. Isaacs, their chairman.

THE JEWS IN NORWAY.—The Jewish population in this country, says the *Jewish Press*, is on the increase, especially in the larger cities, such as Christiania, Bergen, Drammen and Drontheim. It is scarcely twenty years since Jews have been admitted, and now there already exist several congregations. What is most gratifying is that the new comers are treated by the general population with the greatest respect.

PROVISION FOR THE JEWS AT HEBRON.—At the meeting of the Jewish Board of Deputies, held on the 2nd ult., Mr. Samuel Montagu said that while he was pleased to find that the Board had appointed a medical man specially to attend the Jews at Safed, he found that such a gentleman was also required at Hebron. He knew that the Board had no available funds to defray the expenses of such a desirable and necessary provision. But, as on his recent visit to the East he had been much impressed with the value such an appointment would be to the Jews who might fall sick at Hebron, he would have much pleasure seeing that the expenses involved in such an appointment were defrayed without the Board making a special appeal or trenching upon other funds for the purpose. Thereupon Mr. Montagu handed over to the Treasurer of the Board a cheque for £250. The offer of Mr. Montagu was received with every manifestation of extreme pleasure by the meeting.

BRITISH GOVERNMENT ACTION ON BEHALF OF THE JEWS OF PERSIA.—At a meeting of the Jewish Board of Deputies, held on the 2nd ult., a letter was read from Sir Moses Montefiore, with accompanying documents, stating that the Jewish Committee at Zergoon in Persia, consisting of 300

souls, were greatly distressed, and that some of them had been compelled to embrace Islamism. Sir Moses Montefiore immediately communicated with the British government at Teheran and with Earl Derby, and has since received the assurance of his Lordship that Her Majesty's government would do everything in their power to arrest the persecution which had been commenced. The good offices of H.M.'s Minister at Teheran had been obtained through Earl Derby, with the view of befriending the Jews. The Minister had promised to do all that lay in his power. As it appeared that the Jews were in great distress the Board voted £100 from the balance of the Persian Famine Relief Fund; the amount to be placed at the disposal of the British Minister at Teheran, to be expended in such a manner as he may deem advisable.

FURTHER IMPROVEMENT IN THE POSITION OF THE JEWS IN TURKEY.—At the last meeting of the Anglo-Jewish Association, the following letter was read from the British Foreign Secretary.

Foreign Office, February 28th, 1876.

Sir.—With reference to my letter of the 27th ult., on the subject of the position of the Jews in Turkey, I am directed by the Earl of Derby to inform you that a despatch has been received from H.M. Ambassador at Constantinople, stating that the Jewish population will benefit equally with the Christian by the removal of the disabilities under which the non-Musselman population may hitherto have laboured. Sir Henry Elliot observes that although in other countries there has been a habit of speaking of the Mahomedan and Christian population, the terms employed by the Porte are almost invariably "Musselman" and "non-Musselman" and that those terms are used in the new regulations issued by the Porte respecting the acquisition of land which will therefore apply to the Jews exactly in the same way as to the Christians.—I am, &c.,

(Signed) TENTERDEN.

The chairman commented on the importance of the letter as showing, first, that Lord Derby has continued that liberal course of action in regard to the Jews with which he has been identified in former cabinets as well as in the present, and second, the position of the Jewish Association was recognised as a political power which could act effectively on behalf of Jewish interests throughout the world.

PHOTOGRAPH OF JERUSALEM.—Messrs. Wunderlich and Co., of 91, London Wall, have published a large photograph of the city and environs of Jerusalem. The photograph is taken from a model. It is practically impossible to take such a photograph direct on the spot; only a bird or a man high up in a balloon could possibly obtain such a view of Jerusalem; consequently the proportions of the view and the

perspective are not so faithfully reproduced as would only be possible in a photograph from nature. When one once realises the fact that the photograph is that of Jerusalem, it is easy to localise the various spots prominently brought out. We have no doubt that the photograph will command a ready sale; as it is, we believe, the first which aims at reproducing at one view the entire city of Jerusalem.

PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND.—The January quarterly statement maintains the general interest which its predecessors have aroused in the work in hand. It contains the identifications of several new sites, and much light is thrown upon the wanderings of David when a fugitive from Saul, and his history is thereby greatly elucidated. We have been chiefly attracted by the account given by Lieutenant Conder of the ruins of the synagogue of Umm El Amud (p. 22), the measurements of which have been recovered, and which we suppose is sufficiently clear to enable an architect to form an idea of the outline of the structure and of the style in which it was built. At present, we believe, no architect is in possession of any special traditional type upon which he could model his designs for synagogues. But this we imagine would be possible if architects had an opportunity for studying ruins of ancient synagogues, just as they do those of temples. There were plenty of synagogues all over Palestine of old, and the merit is due to our explorers of having brought to light the ruins of several of them, described and photographed them, for the benefit of those interested in studies of this sort.

A JEWISH MARRIAGE A PUBLIC EVENT.—It is one of many tokens of Jewish emancipation that a marriage in the Rothschild family should have been a public event in Paris, honoured with the presence of princes and members of government. The marriage was that of Bettina, daughter of Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, with her double first cousin Albert, son of Baron Salomon, of Vienna. It was celebrated in the synagogue of Rue de la Victoire. At ten o'clock a brigade of police was sent to keep order among the equipages of the persons invited. Shortly after twelve some hundred tapers, behind a seven-branched candlestick, were lighted. Their rays, falling upon the ornaments, produced a glittering effect. Then entered, in Oriental hats and vestures, Isidore, the Grand Rabbi of France; Zadoc Khan, the Grand Rabbi of Paris; and Rabbi Bauer, who was to offer wine to the newly-wedded couple. They awaited for some moments the bridal party in front of a baldequin placed on an elevated part of the floor, and resembling a Moorish kiosk. The Princes and Princesses of the Orleans family were placed close to the sanctuary. Behind them were

the Ministers of Finance, War, and Foreign Affairs, and several generals in plain clothes. When the bride was announced the rabbi went to meet her. She entered, leaning on the arm of her father, who kept on his hat, as did the other gentlemen in her train.

When the affianced couple ascended the dais beneath the baldequin, the service began with a Hebrew canticle sung by M. Levy to the organ accompaniment. Zadoc Khan then delivered an exhortation, in the course of which he alluded to the great financial power of the Rothschilds, and spoke of the marriage as a fresh tie between the closely united branches of that House. This discourse was followed by prayers recited in the ancient language of the Jews.—Abridged from the *Daily News*.

THE PILLAR OF KING MESA.—This famous stela has now been placed for public inspection in that part of the Louvre which is set apart for Hebrew antiquities. It bears the oldest inscription in the world that has yet been deciphered, and is an historical monument without rival, contemporaneous with the Bible, dating back 900 years before the Christian era. The pillar is of black basalt, having almost the same form as the tables of the Decalogue. It measures 49 inches in height, 28 in width, and 14 inches in thickness, and for 2,800 years has remained in the same position in the country of the Moabites, on the shores of the Dead Sea, at the spot, as is supposed, where the frontier of their territory joined that of the tribe of Reuben. The column of Mesa was not buried; it had remained erect in the full light of day for 28 centuries. In 1870, M. Clermont-Ganneau, attached to the French Consulate at Jerusalem, heard something about a stone placed at the entrance of a small village near the Dead Sea, and covered with "mysterious" characters. Attracted by these reports, he sent two intelligent Arabs with instructions to bring him an impression of the inscription, by using the same process as is employed in some printing offices for obtaining a proof of type—viz., to spread a sheet of moistened paper on the letters, and by means of a brush to drive the pulp into the cavities. The operation succeeded perfectly, as may be seen from the impression which is exposed by the side of the pillar itself in the Louvre. But at the moment when Yacoub, one of the Arabs, was preparing to depart he was attacked by the Bedouins and badly wounded; but his companion was fortunate enough to get on his horse and escape with the greater part of the impress. M. Clermont-Ganneau, some time after, sent another Arab with instructions to copy by hand the inscription, and the man fulfilled his mission with great intelligence; the copy and sketch of the stone which he made are also exhibited at the Louvre. Eventually, the same enthusiastic

functionary succeeded in translating the famous inscription. It refers to King Mesa, the chief of the Moabites, spoken of in the second book of Kings, chap. iii., v. 4. The inscription on the sarcophagus of Echnounazar had hitherto held the first rank, but the pillar of King Mesa is older by four centuries.—*Jewish Chronicle*.

THE COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE.

Prospects for the latter-day colonisation of the Holy Land are opening up in all directions. A new society has been formed for the promotion of the good work, by those who have little idea of supplying an element in the signs of the times and the latter-day situation of things. We learn this from the following newspaper paragraph.

"COLONIZATION OF SYRIA AND PALESTINE SOCIETY.—Yesterday a number of ladies and gentlemen held a drawing-room meeting in Osborne House, the residence of Mr. Edmund and Mrs. Beales, Bolton Gardens, for the purpose of promoting the above society. Mr. Beales occupied the chair. It appeared from the report that the idea of starting such a society was only formed in December last; and it was calculated that, to enable it to begin its operations efficiently, a minimum sum of £50,000 should be raised. The Council believed they would be able to obtain suitable grants of land, and efforts were now being made with this object, though the society did not favour the idea of purchasing land for settlements. There was no obstacle, however, in the way of emigrants purchasing land for themselves, as the Germans (emigrants from Wurtemberg) had done. The work of the society would develop into a home branch and a Syrian branch; and this would be productive of mutual good, and would promote the civilisation of Syria. Persons of good character, whether Christians or Jews, were to be selected as emigrants. The 'Rev.' Canon McCall moved a resolution, 'that it was desirable to bring forward the objects of the society by means of public meetings' (throughout the country).—*Daily News* for the latter end of March.

"Joseph Jecheskeel" also writes to the *Jewish Chronicle* to say that a private society has lately been formed which has commenced purchasing land. It consists of fifty members, each of whom has contributed £60.

WHOLESALE APPLICATION TO THE
TURKISH GOVERNMENT FOR
LAND IN PALESTINE.

The most important item of the month's intelligence is that the intimation from Jerusalem, by Herr Simon Stamffer to Herr Josef Jecheskeel, of London, that the desire is general among the Jewish population to come into possession of land in exchange for Turkish bonds, in which many of them have invested all their property. A committee for this purpose is forming. The Jews of Constantinople and Smyrna, holding Turkish bonds, have already applied for land in Palestine in exchange for their bonds; and other non-Jewish holders of bonds have made a similar application. The *Jewish Chronicle* urges the Montefiore Committee to take this project in hand. It says: "The fund at the disposal of the Committee is comparatively small, but the work to be done is great. The greatest economy, therefore, becomes imperative. Everybody can see how little can be done with ten thousand pounds for the promotion of agriculture. Yet we are assured that in a country with scarcely any harbour, with mere tracks for roads, without water-power and without mines, agriculture must be the chief means which must be relied upon for earning a livelihood. Now, the Committee will have seen a fortnight ago, and a few weeks previously, communications emanating from Jerusalem, inserted in our columns, in which the wish is expressed that a proposal to be made to the Porte should be influentially supported. The object of the proposal is to induce the Turkish Government to take its bonds in payment for land to be purchased in Palestine. Herr Jecheskeel, residing here in London, is informed by his Jerusalem correspondent that many Palestinian Jews, holders of Turkish bonds, would willingly buy land offered by the Government for sale if payment were taken in these securities. It is evident that by the

acceptance of this proposal all parties concerned would be gainers. The Porte would save the amount of interest which it has now to pay in hard cash for land which at present brings her in nothing, and which by being tilled would become productive and pay taxes. The general body of bondholders could not but be pleased with the withdrawal of a number of these securities from the market, by which the value of their own must be enhanced, while the purchasers of land by careful husbandry would have a chance of recouping themselves for the loss they have sustained by the reduction of the interest. It does not appear to us that it should be so very difficult to elaborate a scheme that should be acceptable to all parties concerned, or to persuade the Porte to agree to it. The Committee by undertaking this task, if successful, would have no occasion to lay out any money in the purchase of land, and would have the more to spare for the promotion of the other objects in view."

Since the appearance of the *Chronicle's* argument on the subject, intimations have appeared that the English Committee of the General Debt of Turkey have favourably entertained the application of Jewish bondholders for land in Palestine, and are urging it on the consideration of the Turkish government. The following paragraph republished by the *Daily News*, from the *Chronicle*, shows that the matter is in a favourable position.

LAND IN PALESTINE AND THE TURKISH DEFAULT. — Mr. Hammond, M.P., has informed Mr. H. Guedella that the proposal of some of the members of the Jewish community to take lands in Syria in exchange for Turkish bonds is under the consideration of the Grand Vizier; the proposal having been sent to him from London on the 24th ult., in conjunction with an application to a similar effect from the bondholders of other religious denominations. A telegram has arrived, stating that the Porte will take the proposal into consideration, and let its decision upon the subject be shortly known.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

MAY, 1876.

APRIL 1st has come and gone without the conflagration of heaven and earth which the Adventists looked for on that date. March 31st closed with a dark crimson sunset of unusual character; and those who were looking to the next day with expectancy, saw, perhaps, in the curious appearance of the sky a token of coming events. But, of course, the coming events did not come. The real coming events will come. Christ will re-appear in the world at the appointed time, and the time is not far off; but the signs of this fact are not to be found in atmospheric phenomena, but in those affairs of men which are providentially-directed with relation to and in preparation for the work of the Son of Man at his coming. The Creator of all things, who holds heaven and earth in His hand, has expressly forbidden anxiety in an astrological direction. He says by Jeremiah: "Be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them; for the customs of the people are vain."—(Jer. x. 1-3.) The sign of the Son of Man is not to be seen in the literal sky, but in the upper heaven of human affairs, where the angels by their power of secret influence, work out the programme committed to their hands by the Great Worker of all things. Affairs in this upper heaven are mutable; here the sun may be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, and stars be riven from their places and projected into the abyss of darkness. In the literal universe it is otherwise. The ordinances of heaven and earth are for ever. "It," says Jehovah, "those ordinances depart from before me, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me for ever."—(Jer. xxxi. 36.) But there will be no end to "the seed of Israel:" for Jehovah declares, "Though I make a full end of all the nations, whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee."—(Jer. xxx. 11.) It is testified of Christ (Luke i. 32), "He shall reign over

the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom THERE SHALL BE NO END. "His name shall be continued as long as the sun." Consequently, the physical ordinances of heaven and earth are perpetual. For want of a knowledge of this, and through a consequent misconstruction of certain prophetic figures of speech, a large class are always on the outlook for some physical catastrophe which never happens. They come to the surface every now and then; and their vagaries assume new shapes with every appearance. The latest fixes on next September as the month of destruction. We are told that "a terrible cosmical convulsion, by which our earth and its inhabitants shall pass away, will surely overtake us about September of current year." This is quoted by a correspondent of the *English Mechanic*, from the *Weekly Budget*, who derives the information from the *New York Sunday Mercury*. The speculation is professedly deduced from astronomical calculations. The inventor of it seems to have seen some strange occurrences in the state of the surroundings of Saturn, Jupiter, and other planets, from which he argues the woful conclusion that the earth is to be blotted out of existence. He is a false prophet. The earth is given to Christ for an everlasting inheritance, on the word of the Former, Upholder and Proprietor of the entire universe; and the word of the Lord endureth for ever. "The purpose of the Lord, that standeth fast." Neither the earth, nor the moon, nor the sun, nor the stars physical will ever be moved out of their places. They are established for ever.

Vagaries of the class in question are, doubtless, and, perhaps appointed, trying to those whose hope is fixed on the coming of the Lord. Absurd prophecies of "cosmical" perdition, especially when cumbered with falsified date-fixings, engender contempt of that which is true: "the (coming) glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Worldly-minded people eagerly clutch hold of an additional reason for dismissing a matter which they have so many other reasons for avoiding. Half-hearted professors, but imperfectly skilled in the word of Christ, use them to justify increasing apathy with reference to the whole subject, and the latter begin to say that Christ has always been looked for

in a tone that suggests that in the judgment of the speaker, it always will be looked for, and nothing more. Well, Christ will come for all that; and the signs of his approach are multiplying with the advance of the times; and when he comes there will be those to whom he will come "in a day when they look not for him." The very prevalence of vagaries is itself a sign of the times. It is one of the many trials of our faith, that faith may come out of the furnace pure and bright, and "be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Christ." He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.

"THE ENORMOUS AND EVER-INCREASING ARMAMENTS OF EUROPE."

Such is the question which is said to be occupying the earnest attention of some leading politicians in Germany, and especially in Austria. Some time ago Dr. Adolph Fischhof published two articles in one of the leading journals of Vienna on the "Reduction of Continental Armies," which attracted great attention. These letters have been translated and published in a pamphlet, with much other elucidatory matter on the same subject, by W. H. Freeland, formerly member for Chichester.

Dr. Fischhof calls attention to the helpless position of members of different legislatures of Europe, when their Governments make year by year larger demands for military estimates, on the ground that their neighbours are increasing their armaments, and they must therefore increase theirs. "In answer to such an appeal as this," says he, "how can patriotic chambers refuse supplies demanded by a minister? Parliaments do not govern the European situation, they are governed by it. It is under the pressure of a state of things which is, in fact, equivalent to coercion that army estimates and supplies are voted in Continental Parliaments." Dr. Fischhof therefore suggests as a practical remedy that there should be a conference of the members of different European legislatures to consider this state of things, and to concert measures for a mutual and simultaneous reduction of armaments.

Dr. Fischhof's suggestion almost reads like a joke. What can a few private citizens

(for such are members of parliament when assembled in an unofficial capacity,) do to check the operations of military governments, hounded on by mutual jealousy and distrust in the path of ever-increasing armaments? They may "consider" the subject and lament the evils with every emphasis of doleful lamentation, and "concert" the most ingenious and likely "measures" to bring about a change: but what can it avail?

As a merely human problem, the prospect of checking the military development of Europe might doubtless be regarded as at least eligible for consideration, in view of the unlikely things that come about with perseverance; but it cannot be regarded as a merely human problem. It is a matter upon which God has spoken. He has a purpose, and He has declared it; and who can hinder it? It is one of the signs of the times in which we live that Europe should present the spectacle of "enormous and ever-increasing armaments." It would have been depressing indeed to those who have placed their hope in God, if the situation had been of any other character. The prevalence of "ploughshares" at the close of the 1,260 years of Papal power, would have been a token of despair and not of hope. It is appointed that as the day of vengeance on the Gentiles and the day of Israel's restoration draws near, the nations should "beat their ploughshares into swords, and their pruning hooks into spears."—(Joel iii. 9.) It was revealed 1,800 years ago, that when Christ should be about to come as a thief, with a drying Euphrates, there should be an organising of the nations for "the war of the Great Day of God Almighty." It was revealed that this state of military preparedness should be brought about by a political agency, symbolised by frogs. Within the last twenty years, we have seen the frogs do their work. French imperial intrigue—by sowing distrust and suspicion, and exciting military emulation, has brought Europe from the depths of a forty-years' peace, to the state of "enormous and ever-increasing armament" which excites the painful interest of thoughtful minds, but which is the purpose, and (indirectly) the doing of God, and which no man or combination of men can alter. It is the gladdening token of the nearness of the great revolution by which

power will be taken from the governments of men, and concentrated in the hands of the man of God's right hand, even the man whom He hath appointed to judge the world in righteousness, whereof He hath given all men assurance in that He hath raised him from the dead. When this revolution takes place, and not till then, war will cease to the ends of the earth, and there will be an end to "the enormous and ever-increasing armaments of Europe."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The Eastern Question has, during the month, made satisfactory progress in the direction desired by those who are longing for the consummation of the Divine purpose, as declared in the sure word of prophecy. To use the language of a foreign paper, "the Turkish reforms conceived by diplomacy, have passed away like smoke," and "the Eastern Question has suddenly taken a sharp turning, which opens to view a quicker decision than could have been expected when Count Andrassy's famous five points were first considered." The allusion is to the rapid progress of the insurrection. The truce that was agreed upon, and the negotiations attempted by the Austrian agent, Baron Rodich, with the Insurgents, to induce them to accept the Turkish proposals, are alike at an end, and the argument of force is in full play on both sides. One of those sides is growing larger every day. The insurrection is spreading. It is announced that the whole of North-Western Bosnia is up in arms. All places between Mogdane Polje and Petrovatz have risen against Turkish rule. The new insurgents have organised three columns of 2500 men each. The Roman Catholics who have hitherto abstained are now joining. Even 300 Mohammedans have joined. The Turks, exasperated, are having recourse to the butchery of inoffensive inhabitants. In one village which had never taken part in the insurrection, they placed the heads of murdered men and women on pikes and carried them about as trophies.

The Porte is uneasy, and sending reinforcements, but with little effect. Many engagements have been fought on both sides, the result being mostly in favour of the

insurgents. The last is the most serious illustration of this. The following telegram appears at the date of this writing: "Mukhtar Pacha, unable to relieve Nicsie, where half the garrison is reported to be sick, has returned to Gatzko. He fought six engagements in six days, retreating steadily before the insurgents. His losses are said to have been enormous. In the mountain passes only five men could march abreast, and rocks were continually hurled down the precipices upon them." The surrender of Nicsie to the insurgents is expected daily. In the latest engagement, the Montenegrans openly assisted the insurgents with 7000 men. The fact is officially certified by the Turkish general, who, in his despatch to Constantinople, says, "This time the prince of Montenegro openly made war upon us." The statement has created a panic in the Vienna Bourse, where the news was regarded as very serious on account of the European complications to which it is likely to lead. The Turkish government had been endeavouring to secure the neutrality of Montenegro by the offer of the harbour of Spezzia: and her participation in the insurrection is regarded as the failure of the negotiations. In fact the failure is openly announced, and Montenegro may be considered as fairly committed to the insurrection, which is as serious an event for Turkey as it is an auspicious one for the insurgents; for Montenegro has a well-armed and regularly organised army, though small. Servia may be expected to follow the example of Montenegro. Strenuous efforts have been made to induce her to espouse the cause of the insurgents. A fresh deputation has been despatched from Bosnia to Belgrade, the Servian capital, to prevail on Prince Milan to unite in the general effort that is being made all over "Christian" Turkey to overthrow the rule of the Moslem. There is every likelihood of a favourable response. The Servian people have been burning all winter to join the movement, and the government has only been restrained by the pressure of Austria, who threatens to march her troops into Servia if she make war on Turkey. But Russia, desirous of encouraging the insurrection, is acting as a check on Austria, though professing other views; and Servia seems likely to be precipitated into the conflict—and if

Servia, possibly Roumania, and Bulgaria, and Crete. Servia has organized and mobilised her army in six divisions; and Turkey has demanded explanations. The answer is that the measures in question are part of the periodical national drill, but the answer is considered a blind, and hostilities are expected to break out immediately between Servia and Turkey.

The situation is well summarised in the following extract from a letter of the London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury*:

"Larger, denser and blacker grows the cloud in the East. All hope of its dispersion without a storm is now well-nigh at an end. The half-mad Sultan is full of wrath against the Western Powers, and declares that the wholly melancholy Czar is his only friend. Abdul Aziz, who cannot find the money to pay his defeated and demoralised army in Herzegovina, is now wishing to send another army to Servia. That he will want one there shortly, seems probable enough. Prince Milan will not be able to restrain his people much longer, and the critical nature of the situation may be gathered when we find the Czar advising that 'if the Eastern Question could still be solved without a great conflict, he hoped that Prince Milan would avoid doing anything that might disturb the peace of Europe. In case further complications arose Servia would lose nothing by having waited.' Meanwhile, the Sultan seems to be possessed by that madness which precedes destruction. In the negotiations which have been going on with the Herzegovinian insurgents he recklessly insists upon conditions so preposterous that Baron Rodich, the Austrian Governor of Dalmatia, who has been acting as mediator, has been compelled to abandon the negotiation. On the other hand, the Sultan, as though he were a conqueror instead of having been repeatedly defeated, demands that he shall be allowed to revictual a town where his troops are beleaguered; on the other hand, he refuses to give any guarantee that the promises of pardon and reform which he now makes will be any the better observed than repeated similar promises have been heretofore. And just at this juncture his troops choose to perpetrate a barbarous massacre, and to scandalise the civilised world by cutting off the heads of Christian women. No wonder that Russia believes her time is at hand—that the beginning of the end—the beginning of the break-up of the Turkish empire—has come; no wonder that the Russian press is demanding that the Turkish troops shall be withdrawn from Herzegovina, and that the Slavonic subjects of the Porte shall not be prevented by any outside

Power—meaning Austria—from working out their independence."

The Birmingham Daily Post says: "When the sky is overcast, and the air is charged with electricity, and it is evident that a storm is imminent, even if there is no rain absolutely falling and no lightning flashing, people do not go abroad without taking precautions. There is just such a disturbance now in the political atmosphere, and the wind from the East—always unpleasant—threatens us with trouble. Every sign of danger that can be given is now to be seen, and it is difficult to say from which point the storm will first break upon us. Turkey, now under the protection of the great Northern Powers, seems weaker than ever, and Egypt, upon whom we have bestowed our own special and embarrassing attentions, has derived so little strength from our four millions that she cannot pay the current interest upon her debt. Every way there is temptation to interference; on both sides we are invited to commit ourselves to some policy which may involve us in serious responsibilities.

It is not easy to get at the truth of the alarmist rumours now flying about Europe. Within the last few days there have been exhibited abundant evidences that an uneasy feeling prevails with reference to the relations of the three military empires with each other, and their attitude towards the revolt still proceeding in the Turkish provinces. So far has this feeling been carried that some critics would have us believe in the possible, and even the probable outbreak of war at some very early period—perhaps immediately. The speculators, of course, as they always do, have caught the fever of apprehension severely. At Vienna, at Berlin, and at St. Petersburg, the Bourse—the quick measurer of public fear—has been what is commonly called "violently agitated." Something of this is no doubt due to the uncertainty which hangs over the fortunes of the Herzegovinian insurrection, and to the suspense which is felt as to the action of the advising or intervening Powers. While they remain inactive, the insurrection proceeds, and the position of Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania towards the insurgents becomes increasingly strained. This is a real element of uncertainty, and in this case uncertainty means danger. Judging from the manifestations which every now and then take place, it may not be possible to restrain the people of the border States much longer; and if they once translate into action their sympathies with the insurgents, then Russia and Austria, and probably Germany, must move also; and in that case, Europe will have this terrible Eastern question full upon it. But the attitude of Servia and

the other states along the border line is not the only cause of alarm. The discussions going on in Austrian, Russian, and German newspapers also indicate a new and even more important source of difficulty, if not of danger. Judging from these signs of movement, there is plainly a very nasty feeling existing.

Russian journalists are stirring up an anti-German feeling, and German journalists are fulfilling the same friendly function towards Russia. Under ordinary circumstances these bickerings, though suggestive enough, would have no immediate importance. But the state of things at this moment is by no means of an ordinary kind. The three Powers—Russia, Austria and Germany—are nominally united in their policy towards Turkey and the insurgents in Herzegovina. By their recent interference, they have put themselves in a position from which it is equally difficult to advance or retreat, and yet they must do one or the other, for standing still is out of the question; unless, indeed, intervention is a farce, and the collective note was a solemn way of throwing dust into people's eyes. Yet, if the three Powers are thus out of sorts with each other, how can they resolve upon any reasonable united action? The prospect of disunion, to be followed by dissension, and perhaps by open rupture, is the danger scented by the speculators on the various European exchanges. Austria, which, above all things, desires peace and quiet, exhorts the insurgents to submission, and menaces Servia with her displeasure. Russia studiously and pointedly refrains from backing the counsel of her ally, and is suspected of secretly helping to fan the flame. Germany—so Russia says—is watching her opportunity, prepared to take whichever side best suits her own interests; and Russia, Germany retorts, is a Power whose friendship, though desirable, is not indispensable. We do not pretend to say what will come of it—nobody can tell—but it is plain enough that there is difficulty ahead, and that the difficulty may at any moment pass into the phase of imminent danger.

The *Daily News* (April 12th) says: "The telegrams of our correspondents at Berlin and Vienna express the uncertainty and anxiety which the state of affairs in Eastern Europe excites in those capitals. Simultaneously with the failure of General Rodich we hear of extensive armaments in Servia, of a war loan, and the organization of an active army, while a public utterance is ascribed to Prince Milan very different in tone from the pacific assurances which he has hitherto given to the Powers. At the same time insurgents are reinforced by

more bands, and the area of the contest is enlarged, while it is waged on both sides with a fury that respects nothing, but overflows all bounds. What, however, has alarmed Continental politicians more than all these local phenomena is the altered tone of the Russian press with regard to the insurrection, the favour which is shown to the insurgents, and its disposition to criticise the action of the Austrian Government, it being remembered that nothing is published in Russia of which the Government seriously disapproves. Our Berlin correspondent states that the German Cabinet is anxiously labouring to prevent the rupture which it apprehends. Last November probably few observers of events believed that in the following spring the insurrection would be in full vigour, and a cause of solicitude to neighbouring Governments. The winter has come and gone, and the Ottoman Government is apparently as far as ever from pacifying the disturbed districts. The opening season finds the insurgents not only numerous but full of the confidence acquired by the recollection of difficulties surmounted and hardships to which they have proved superior. They have defeated one after another of the generals sent against them by the Porte, capturing convoys, camp equipage, and more than once the artillery of the enemy, and cutting off his access to forts which he was anxious to relieve.

The mere continuance of the war does not affect Russia so injuriously as it does Austria, whereas its extension, by the entrance of Servia and Montenegro into the fray, would precipitate a crisis which the former power has good reason for wishing to see postponed. Even the strongest governments, however, are not always able to control the course of events; and if, owing to some explosion of popular passion, Servia or Montenegro, or both, were drawn into the strife with Turkey, the Russian Government would be bound to take such measures as would maintain its moral ascendancy over the Southern Slavs, even at the risk of coming into conflict with Austrian policy. The Russian Government will probably not do anything with the intention of provoking a collision, but if its hand is forced, it must act for its own interests. This is the danger which Continental observers fear most from

a continuance of the war in Herzegovina; and their apprehensions have been excited anew by witnessing the failure of General Rodich's mission."

The *Leeds Mercury* says:—"The terrible reality of the crisis which is approaching in Turkish affairs must be patent to everybody. So far from any improvement having been effected by the elaborate negotiations of Count Andrassy, it is now evident that matters have been going from bad to worse, and that a catastrophe of some kind is very near. Perhaps England ought to have been prepared for this. She has, at any rate, been warned that all the diplomacy of the winter could do no more than delay the development of the crisis until the spring. The spring is now at hand, and we fear the crisis is coming with it. If the insurgents reject the promises of the Porte, and persist in fighting to the end, the intervention of Austria and Russia will take a more tangible form than that of mere diplomatic remonstrances, and the second stage of the Eastern Question will thus have been definitely reached. It may, of course, be said that the Porte should receive active assistance in the repression of the revolt; that England and the other Powers, for example, should acquiesce in the armed intervention of Austria in the Herzegovina. That solution, however, cannot now be attempted. The truth is, that even those who do not feel any great amount of sympathy with the Principalities must feel still less with the Turks. The fiendish cruelties inflicted by the Porte upon the insurgents have made it impossible that any civilised nation should attempt, by force of arms, to reduce these miserable creatures to their old state of bondage. If Turkey cannot do that for herself, and if the Christians feel so little faith in the value of Ottoman pledges that they will not accept the promises of reform, the solution of the difficulty must be found elsewhere. All this, we are sorry to say, points to that partial dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire which was discussed, and which seemed to be so near, in the autumn. England cannot hold itself free from blame for the pass to which matters have thus been brought. That the present state of Turkey, financial, political and social, is rotten to the core, becomes more and more plainly

evident every day; but would it have been so if this country had maintained that active part in watching over the interests of the Porte which distinguished her when Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was at Constantinople? Under Russian protection the Turk has gone from bad to worse, and that catastrophe for which Russian politicians have been so eagerly longing seems at last to be at hand. That we must blame ourselves, in some degree, for this rapid decadence of the Ottoman Empire seems certain. Without money, without credit, without the power to repress an insurrection, which has now raged for many months, the Sultan has, undoubtedly, a gloomy spring and summer before him. What it may bring forth no man can say; but we shall be surprised if it should fail to witness something more serious than the presentation of Notes by Russia and Austria on the subject of the war in Herzegovina."

THE DRYING EUPHRATES.

No better illustration of the progress being made in the development of this sign of the Lord's nearness, can be given than in the following extracts from a letter dated "Constantinople, March 24th," appearing in the *Daily News*, on April 4th:—

"Turkey is now reaping the fruits of her partial repudiation last autumn. Those who were bold enough to advise her to reduce the interest upon her debt to half what had been promised, reasoned that it would be much easier to pay seven than fourteen millions, out of an income of nineteen. But they left out of their account the fact that very considerably more than seven millions had been paid out of *the loans themselves*.

"Just at this moment every department is in an unusual state of disorganization, owing to the want of money. It is now, I think, pretty clear that the April coupon will not be paid unless by adopting one of these schemes at present submitted to it, the Government can succeed in obtaining a new loan. Every piastre which can be obtained is wanted for the army and expenses which can only be met by ready money. Most of the troops are fifteen months in arrears of pay. The cost of the war can hardly be less than £40,000 a day. The Admiralty is put to the utmost difficulty to obtain coal. There is hardly a merchant in the place to whom the Government does not owe money, and the merchants, many of whom are on the verge of bankruptcy because they cannot get payment from the Government, either flatly refuse to supply more goods, or only supply them at exorbitant rates."

THE PROPOSED DISCUSSION WITH MR. BRADLAUGH.

THE reader will best gather the position of this matter by perusing the correspondence which has taken place, which is as follows. The discussion is likely to come off in a broken form, two nights at Leicester and four nights at Birmingham, which will be awkward for both the audiences and the disputants. It is in explanation of this state of things that we have concluded to publish the following letters:—

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,

18th February, 1876.

Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, Dear Sir.—You may be aware that the desirability of a meeting in debate between yourself and me has been for a considerable time urged by many persons who know us both. I believe the matter was verbally mentioned to you some months ago by Mr. Arthur Andrew, of London; and you were good enough to express your willingness to hold the proposed meeting.

I now write for the purpose of putting the proposal into formal shape. I will undertake for six nights—spread over two weeks—three successive nights in each week, to affirm that the Scriptures are the authentic and genuine records of divine revelation, (and the only source available to man of true knowledge concerning God and His purpose.)* I leave you to choose whether the debate shall be by ordinary speeches, or by the Socratic mode, or a mixture of both, merely expressing my opinion that the latter is perhaps on the whole best calculated to put a matter in debate to a thorough test.

As to the place where the debate should take place, the majority of my friends are in favour of Birmingham. I presume Birmingham will not be unacceptable to you. We should probably have a larger audience there than anywhere else.

As to the date, it will probably suit the state of your engagements, as it will mine if I name a somewhat distant day, say, the autumn of the present year; by which time the Town Hall, Birmingham, will be reopened after alterations and repairs. The disposal of the surplus, if any, after the payment of expenses, I would leave to your proposal, subject to mutual agreement.

If these proposals are agreeable to you, you could probably name a local committee for the execution of arrangements in detail.—Respectfully yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

* The Editor is not certain if this clause in parenthesis, was in the letter sent to Mr. Bradlaugh. It is in the shorthand sketch from which the letter to Mr. Bradlaugh was copied.

"The National Reformer," 29, Turner Street,
Commercial Road, London, E.

21st February, 1876.

Dear Sir.—I have handed your letter to Mr. W. H. Holyoak, Belgrave Gate, Leicester, who will write you, and who has my full authority to arrange.—Yours respectfully,
BRADLAUGH.

Robert Roberts, Esq.,

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham.

45, Humberstone Gate, Leicester,

February 25th, 1876.

To Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—I write on behalf of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. He has left to me the arrangement of the debate between you and him.

Please consider that it is settled to come off. The time we prefer is during the month of April or beginning of May.

The place, Leicester Temperance Hall, for, say three nights. Mr. B. will not object to three nights in Birmingham as well if you wish. The mode of debate: we assent with you to the mixed, viz., question and answer and ordinary speeches.

We trust you will see your way to this earlier date, for the date you name appears to us so remote, that a thousand events may occur between now and then to prevent its ever taking place. Trusting however that you will see your way, and waiting your reply.—I am Sir, yours sincerely,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,

26th February, 1876.

Mr. Holyoak, Dear Sir.—Thanks for yours of the 25th inst., according to Mr. Bradlaugh's promise to me.

Your proposals, however, are not quite acceptable in some details. The date is too early. It is a matter of impossibility for me to take part much sooner than the time I mentioned to Mr. Bradlaugh. Mr. Collyer, your townsman, will be able to inform you of one reason, sufficient of itself. I admit my time is somewhat remote; but this need not be a disadvantage. As for the uncertainties, they would apply with nearly equal force to an earlier date, and must be submissively encountered.

As to the place, I presume Mr. Bradlaugh can have no personal choice, as his friends will be as numerous in Birmingham as in Leicester; therefore I must ask your consent to Birmingham. It would be a great dis-

appointment to the majority of my friends, if it were not to take place there, and would, to some extent, frustrate the object I have in view in consenting to encounter a man of Mr. Bradlaugh's calibre and reputation. I can understand your preference for Leicester, and do not quarrel with it. To have the debate there would also be in accordance with the wishes of many in that town whom I should greatly desire to gratify. Nevertheless, the preponderance of reasons from my point of view is sufficiently in favour of Birmingham to justify me in pressing for it. If you feel it would be conceding an advantage to me, you have also to remember that you can well afford to concede any advantage to one who will figure so small in collision with so popular a man and cause.

Three nights is an utterly inadequate time for the argument I have to submit. Twelve nights would not be too long. It will be necessary for you to consent to six nights, and these must of course be in one place; for it would place both speakers in an awkward position to have a new audience for the second half of the debate.

Regretting my inability to return a simple affirmative to your proposals, and looking for your reply, Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, Humberstone Gate,

Feb. 28th, 1876.

To Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Yours of the 26th inst. I have forwarded to Mr. Bradlaugh, along with a copy of what follows, not seeing what I can have to do with arranging for a debate to come off in Birmingham.

I should have been pleased to be instrumental in bringing it about in Leicester—but in Birmingham, the Birmingham friends had better be consulted. It seems to me they are the parties to move in the matter and not I. You will please reply, advising me of your opinion.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

45, Humberstone Gate.

To Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Mr. Bradlaugh writes me as follows:—

“Dear Sir.—As the challenge was given by Mr. Roberts's friends in Leicester, and as the Leicester friends first asked me to meet Mr. Roberts there, a debate in Leicester must take precedence of any other debate with Mr. Roberts, therefore I return you his letter, and you had better send a copy of mine to you. I do not mean this as an objection to meet Mr. Roberts in Birmingham, but I do mean that I think it would be a slight on the Leicester Secular Society

if I passed that town over. I nevertheless leave myself entirely in the hands of the Leicester friends.—Yours truly,

C. BRADLAUGH.”

I might say that we in Leicester quite concur with the view Mr. B. takes.—I am, Sir, Yours obediently,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham.

2nd March, 1876.

Mr. Holyoak.

Dear Sir.—I am in receipt of yours, without date, but presumably of to-day.

Mr. Bradlaugh leaves himself entirely in your hands. I cannot quite comprehend why a man of his independence should do this instead of dealing directly with me, and shaping his own course. Nevertheless, he having done so, with you will rest the responsibility of preventing the discussion, if you insist upon a condition needless on your side, and on my side inconsistent with the object of the discussion.

I cannot recognise the claim, or at least the ground of the claim put forward on behalf of Leicester. It is not true that the “challenge” was given by my friends in Leicester. The “challenge” has been given by me, at the instigation of friends in Birmingham, London, Leicester, and other places; and therefore Leicester has nothing to do with fixing the place. Mr. Bradlaugh may have heard of it first at Leicester; but this does not confer the right in question. I named Birmingham in my first letter, pressed for it in my second, and you will pardon me if I insist upon it in my third.

If a second debate should seem desirable to all parties, I promise it shall be in Leicester, so far as I am concerned; but the first encounter must take place in the metropolis of the Midlands.

Mr. Bradlaugh says he has no objection to meet me in Birmingham, and although he says in the beginning of his letter, that Leicester must take the precedence, by the last sentence he leaves the decision with you. To you therefore, I appeal, to waive the objection and to allow the arrangements for the discussion to proceed.—Respectfully Yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, Humberstone Gate, Leicester,

March 3rd, 1876.

Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Yours of yesterday is to hand, Mr. Bradlaugh has left the arrangement of bringing about a debate with you in my hands. With the reason why, I imagine we are not concerned. I take it that what we have to do with is the fact. And the responsibility you name, I accept. You say, “It is not true that the challenge was given

by my friends in Leicester." That, sir, is a positive statement—let us see upon what basis it rests, and whether that little word *not* is not a mistake on your part. The date of your first to Mr. Bradlaugh is February the 18th, 1876, but on January the 30th, 1876, a gentleman made a statement in the Lecture Hall of the Temperance Hall, Leicester, before a large audience, to the effect that Mr. Roberts *was* prepared to meet either Mr. Holmes or Mr. Bradlaugh in public debate upon the question, "Is the Bible true?" I see no reason why I should not give the gentleman's name, it was Mr. Vicars Collyer, who I believe is a friend of yours; and with the view of testing that statement, I waited upon him during the week, and on February the 4th I advised Mr. Bradlaugh of the statement publicly made by Mr. V. C., and Mr. B. replied by saying that he only knew Mr. Roberts as a Christadelphian, that he knew nothing against him, and wished to be informed of the terms of the challenge, and whether he had a respectable committee in Leicester, saying I shall probably be governed by my friends there. How, sir, you can reconcile this by saying, "It is not true," I do not see. On that point I beg to differ from you in thinking that Leicester has nothing to do with it.

To second promises I cannot attend until the first statement be verified. It is with that I have to do, and to that I confine myself.—I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,
4th March, 1876.

Mr. Holyoak,

Dear Sir.—The circumstance you mention, which had escaped my memory, explains your view and Mr. Bradlaugh's as to the origin of the challenge. I cannot admit, however, that it gives the real foundation for the facts as they stand.

Mr. Collyer's intimation of my willingness to debate, (which he made of his own motion in response to some challenge from the platform), was merely the declaration of a privately-known fact, and not a challenge in the sense of carrying with it the local obligations now sought to be deduced from it. I was not aware of the incident till after it happened, and it made so little impression on me that I had forgot it. I admit it is open to the construction you and Mr. Bradlaugh have put upon it, and that therefore you are free from the imputation you seem to see in my denial; but you must be too experienced in such matters, to confound an unofficial intimation of willingness to debate with the formal thing implied in a "challenge."

The "challenge" is contained in my letter of the 18th ult., and with that as

such, my Leicester friends had nothing to do. That challenge, as I said in my last, is the result of the expressed wishes of friends in divers places.

To free the matter from the complications arising from the intervention of third parties, I hereby renew the challenge, to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham for six nights, for the discussion of the subject proposed in my first letter.—Yours respectfully, ROBERT ROBERTS.

45, Humberstone Gate, Leicester,
March 6th, 1876.

To Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Your acknowledgment of your memory having been refreshed as to the *origin of this correspondence*, and the contemplated debate between yourself and Mr. C. Bradlaugh, is very honourable to you. And although you cannot admit that we in Leicester have the strongest claim for the debate to take place here, it is satisfactory to know that you do not deny that we in Leicester were the *first movers in this matter*.

The facts I named in my last I repeat. Mr. V. Collyer said you *were* prepared to debate, and I with a view of testing that statement, waited upon him to accept and arrange. Ever since I have been *trying to bring* you and Mr. B. together; but now I begin to fear that my efforts will be fruitless.

I should have been glad if it could have been arranged, but you seem to stick fast to Birmingham, for what reason I cannot tell, but I can tell that I have *nothing to do with Birmingham*, and am not interested in any way of its taking place there.

The facts are very simple. You were either prepared or you were not.

The statement was plain, as plain could be, and now I think we in Leicester cannot be charged with neglecting it; and besides according to your letters you will not be prepared until *towards the end of the year*. If so, it appears to me that there can be *no use* in talking about it so very long before hand. It will be soon enough in September to re-open the correspondence.—I am Sir, yours respectfully, WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

Sea Side, 10th March, 1876.

Mr. Holyoak.

Dear Sir.—Your letter of the 6th inst. has been forwarded to me from Birmingham, and as it is calculated to create an artificial version of the facts, I cannot refrain from making the following remarks.

1.—I have not acknowledged that "my memory has been refreshed as to the origin of this correspondence, and the contemplated debate." The refreshment of my memory related to an incident

which explained how you could take such a view of the origin of the debate as you did; but which had nothing to do with its real origin. The origin of the correspondence, is my own letter to Mr. Bradlaugh of the 18th ult. The origin of that letter was of many months' previous date, in conversations at different places. The letter itself contains evidence of this. The second sentence refers to the matter having been mentioned months before, by Mr. A. Andrew of London. I have merely been waiting for such prospects of health as would justify me in venturing upon the strain of a debate with Mr. Bradlaugh.

Please therefore to understand, that my acknowledgment of refreshment of memory refers to the origin of your misconception, and not to the origin of the proposed debate; also that I do deny that you in Leicester were the first movers in the matter. I am the first mover in the matter, as the result of the suggestions spread over a considerable antecedent period. You have come to consider yourselves as the first movers, by an incident which I have admitted excuses you; but which I deny constitutes the origin of the matter.

2.—It strikes me as somewhat absurd, for you to talk of ineffectual attempts to bring Mr. Bradlaugh and me together, seeing that I have offered to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham, and that Mr. Bradlaugh has left it with you to decide whether the meeting shall be there or not. You have simply to decide to bring us together in Birmingham, and the thing is done. Your saying you have nothing to do with Birmingham, does not dispose of the fact that Mr. Bradlaugh has left the decision in your hands.

3.—The facts are, as you say, exceedingly simple. I am prepared to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham and have sent him a proposal to that effect. Mr. Bradlaugh says he leaves it with you, and you interpose yourself as an obstacle. If I could be sure you are in this acting by Mr. Bradlaugh's instructions, I should be tempted to doubt Mr. Bradlaugh's reputation for courage; but having no evidence that it is so, I refrain from drawing a conclusion.

4.—The lateness of the date proposed by me, is no reason for deferring the decision. That lateness is a necessity apart from the condition of my health. My engagements are generally filled up six months in advance, and if we don't arrange now, it will be difficult for me to arrange at the time you mention. Another consideration is, that the Birmingham Town Hall is so well occupied that we should stand a poor chance of engaging it, unless we did so several months ahead.

But you say you "have nothing to do with Birmingham." Consequently early or late, we could have no object in re-opening

the correspondence with reference to a discussion to take place in that town. I must, therefore, appeal direct to Mr. Bradlaugh, which I do by this post.—Respectfully yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

Sea side, 10th March, 1876.

Mr. Bradlaugh.

Dear Sir.—In a final letter forwarded from Birmingham, Mr. Holyoak writes me that he has nothing to do with Birmingham, and no interest in the discussion taking place there. This compels me to appeal direct to yourself in the matter.

My proposal for the debate with you, had reference to Birmingham, and I must ask you to nominate some gentleman in that place who will be interested in forwarding arrangements on your behalf, unless you would prefer to communicate directly with me yourself, which would be more satisfactory.—Yours respectfully, ROBERT ROBERTS.

Humberstone Gate, Leicester,
March 19th, 1876.

Robert Roberts, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Mr. Bradlaugh has forwarded me your letter of the 10th inst. And lest you should deem me wanting in courtesy, I acknowledge yours of the 10th inst. to myself, and in doing so take the opportunity of reviewing the case as it stands, or as it appears to me.

I was anxious upon hearing it announced publicly before a large audience here "that you were prepared to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in public debate upon the question 'Is the Bible true?'" to bring about such debate if possible, and I waited upon the gentleman who made the announcement for that purpose. This, Sir, I take to be the first action in this matter. This was in January, and on the 31st Mr. B. communicated to me his consent.

Your first letter upon the subject bears date February 18th, in which you state in reference to the place where the debate should take place, "the majority of my friends would prefer Birmingham, I presume this would not be objectionable to you, but in this you will speak your mind." Mr. Bradlaugh has spoken his mind, and having left the matter in my hands, I being the first who communicated with him upon the subject, do most decidedly object to your presumption in fixing upon Birmingham.

I acknowledge that I may, and I think rightly, be an "obstacle" in the way of the debate taking place in any town until we have had the satisfaction or opportunity of hearing it in the town where the announcement was made. If anything can be done towards this end I will willingly work. If not I will have nothing to do with it, and can only conclude that you were not pre-

pared. But if you say "I shall be prepared between now and the end of the year to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Leicester," I will consider it settled and shall be glad to be informed thereof.—I am Sir, yours respectfully, WILLIAM HENRY HOLYOAK.

Sea side, 24th March, 1876.

Mr. Holyoak.

Dear Sir.—Yours is forwarded to me. I have already expressed my mind on the contents of your note. Having nothing to add, our correspondence must now close.

I address Mr. Bradlaugh direct by this post.—Respectfully yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,
26th March, 1876.

Mr. Bradlaugh.

Dear Sir.—I pray you to pardon me for troubling you again, but it seems necessary.

My correspondence with Mr. Holyoak has become inextricably complicated by the unofficial action of one of my friends having associated Leicester with my proposal of debate with you. I have, therefore, closed the correspondence, and begin *de novo*, by placing directly before you the proposal I make, which I beg the favour of your accepting or declining directly to myself as the laws of courtesy require.

I offer to meet you in Birmingham for six nights, in support of the affirmation that the Bible is the authentic and reliable record of divine revelation.

Until you accept the proposal in this general form, I need not say more, but remain, Yours respectfully,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S.—I am at the sea-side, at this writing, but head my letter with my permanent address, which will always find me.

To this letter no answer was received.

The following note meanwhile appeared on the cover of the *Christadelphian*. We re-publish it in this connection as presenting our reason for pressing for Birmingham.

"S.—The discussion with Bradlaugh seems likely to fall through, owing to that gentleman's refusal, by his agent, Mr. Holyoak, to hold the discussion in Birmingham. He insists on Leicester, where his friends are numerous. This interposes a barrier on our part, since one principal object in consenting to challenge Bradlaugh was to make a discussion with him useful in delivering the truth from the imputation of infidelity, in a town where the truth is better known than in any other, as the result of many years' proclamation, but in which nevertheless, it has that prejudice to encounter. A discussion with Bradlaugh would be a great effort for our peculiar physical liabilities;

and we should not feel justified in venturing upon it without some commensurate object such as we have mentioned. In any other town but Birmingham, unless it be London, we should fail to realise sufficient incentive; for we have no hope of benefitting the class of minds who have embraced Secularism. Our aim would be to serve the truth. Having to serve it in many ways, we cannot afford to incur the physical risk of an encounter with Bradlaugh without a tangible prospect of good service. Hence our proposal for Birmingham, which Mr. Holyoak declines. If the proposal fall through, we may publish the correspondence."

The following note appeared in the *National Reformer*, of March 26th, among "Answers to Correspondents."

"R. Roberts, Birmingham.—Having in consequence of the action of your own friend placed the matter in the hands of the Leicester Secular Society, we decline to withdraw our authority. Our health does not permit us to engage personally in a lengthy correspondence."

To this, the following answer was sent.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,
6th April, 1876.

Mr. Bradlaugh.

Dear Sir.—I have only seen for the first time to-day your note in the *National Reformer*, in answer to my letter. I am not a reader of the *Reformer*, but a friend has handed me the issue of March 26th, containing the note in question.

I write to say that I do not propose a correspondence, lengthy or otherwise, I wish you merely to say "Yes" or "No:" will you meet me for a six nights' debate in Birmingham or London on the subject named? Your friends in Birmingham can arrange the details. Awaiting your answer.—Respectfully yours, ROBERT ROBERTS.

To this letter, Mr. Bradlaugh sent no reply but inserted the following note in the *Reformer*.—"R. Roberts, Birmingham.—We really cannot take the matter out of the hands of the Leicester Secular Society."

Mr. Bradlaugh was advertised to lecture in Birmingham on Sunday, April 9th. On that date, Brother Hodgkinson of Peterboro', visiting Birmingham and observing the fact, expressed a curiosity to see and hear him. This led to conversation which resulted in a proposal, accepted by Bro. Hodgkinson, that he should attend Mr. Bradlaugh's meeting, and if an opportunity offered, propose a six nights' discussion in Birmingham. Mr. Hodgkinson did so, and at the close of the meeting, being invited to the platform, he read the following written authority:

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,
9th April, 1876.

I hereby authorise Mr. Frank Hodgkinson, the bearer of this note, to state in Mr. Bradlaugh's meeting this afternoon, that I am willing to meet Mr. Bradlaugh in Birmingham for a six nights' debate on the subject:

"Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation?"

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Mr. Bradlaugh said the challenge having first been delivered in Leicester, he was in duty bound not to disappoint the people there; but he was willing to make this compromise—to have two nights in Leicester and four nights in Birmingham. After the meeting Mr. Hodgkinson communicated with Mr. Roberts, and sent

the following letter to Mr. Bradlaugh, having it placed, by a messenger, in the hands of the chairman of Mr. Bradlaugh's evening meeting the same day.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham,
9th April, 1876.

C. Bradlaugh, Esq.

Dear Sir.—Mr. Roberts accepts your compromise, but with regret that you insist upon a division. Will you inform Mr. Holyoak, and also appoint some one here with whom the arrangements in detail can be made for the two nights in Leicester and four nights in Birmingham? Mr. Roberts accedes to this plan reluctantly, but submits rather than the discussion should fall through. Please reply to me at "Norman Cross, Peterborough."—Yours truly,

FRANK HODGKINSON.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month the following cases of obedience have occurred:—Feb. 23rd, GEORGE GEE (28), labourer, formerly neutral: (*this ought to have appeared in the March number*); April 1st, THOMAS COLLINS (28), tailor, formerly Independent: April 12th, JOHN RICHARD MAWSON (19), brother in the flesh to brother J. Mawson; April 15th, CAROLINE WAGSTAFF (36), residing at Evesham, where she came to a knowledge of the truth through brother and sister Smith, of Worcester.

The quarterly meeting, held on April 5th, disclosed (in the reports) satisfactory progress in all departments. The secretary stated that the number of brethren and sisters on the roll is 240, which, however, includes about 20 residing in the district and not able to attend the Birmingham meetings regularly. A proposal to discontinue the monthly question night was brought forward, but was something like unanimously rejected, the brethren being of opinion that it was working well to the advantage of the truth. It was resolved to adopt the plan of the Leicester ecclesia, as regards the Bible readings at the Sunday morning meetings—that is, to take the *Bible Companion* reading of the day, leaving out the first of the three portions; and also to adopt the *Bible Companion* reading of the day for consideration at our week-night meeting.

On Good Friday there was a large tea meeting of a thoroughly enjoyable character, followed by many addresses on the truth in its various bearings. Several brethren from a distance were present.

The lectures for the month have been as follow:—April 2nd, The Hope of Israel and the Hope of the Gospel.—(Brother Roberts.) April 9th, Looking for the Appearing of Christ.—(Brother Roberts.) April 16th, Waiting for the Kingdom of God.—(Brother Shuttleworth.) April 23rd, The Time of the End.—(Brother Roberts.)

BRISTOL.—Brother Cort reports the immersion, on Sunday, April 9th, of JOSEPH BELLAMY (26), formerly Wesleyan—the first fruits of the work of the truth in Bristol.

BRISTLEY HILL.—Brother Samuel Dawes reports the obedience, on March 26th, of JAMES MARSH (32), painter, formerly an occasional preacher in the New Connexion. He also adds: "I omitted reporting for the *Christadelphian* the immersion of sister MARY ANN DAWES, wife of brother Joseph Dawes, in August of last year, now residing in Hanley. We are advertising a Bible Class on the Saturday Evening, independent of our lectures on the Sunday evening. We hope to be instrumental in enlightening some who are yet in darkness concerning the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, and the things concerning the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

DUNDEE.—Brother Mortimer writes: "We have no immersion to report this month, but we are still keeping an open door for any who will listen to the Word. We have been cheered and encouraged in our little community by the removal of brother William Ker from the Glasgow ecclesia to Dundee, and it is intended that sister Ker will follow soon. We expect that brother

Ker will be of some service. The lectures by brother Gill, since last report, have been as follows: March 19th, The Organization of the Church. Mar. 26th, Church Order and Discipline. April 2nd, Church Order and Discipline.

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Smith reports: "The ecclesia here has suffered the loss of one of its number this week, by the death of our brother Durrie. He has suffered a great deal, having a very weak constitution naturally. While he had strength, he did much in the service of the truth, and was an able member of the Young Men's Bible Class, who will miss him much.

FROME.—Brother Sutton announces the obedience of JOHN YOUNG, coal miner, residing at Radstock, about eight miles from Frome. Brother Young was immersed by brother Shuttleworth, on the 9th of April. He was formerly connected with the Methodists. The truth was first introduced to his notice by brother Hawkins about six years ago. Brother Sutton also announces with regret the removal of brother and sister Clark from Frome to Exeter.

Two lectures were delivered by brother Shuttleworth, of Birmingham, on March 22nd and 23rd, subject: Signs of the Times; also two lectures on Sunday, April 9th, subject: The Way of Salvation—is it a Broad or Narrow Way? and Do Men really Die, and if they really die, are they alive when they are dead? The lectures on The Signs of the Times were delivered in the Temperance Hall, the two last in the meeting room. The following notice of the first two lectures appeared in a local paper.

"CHRISTADELPHIAN LECTURES.—On Wednesday and Thursday evenings, Mr. F. R. Shuttleworth, of Birmingham, delivered two lectures at the Temperance Hall on The Approaching Climax and Perdition of all Human Governments; and The Impending Reappearance of Christ in the Earth to establish the Kingdom of God and to rule the world in righteousness." On the first evening a large number of youths obtained early possession of the back seats in the hall and greatly disturbed the proceedings. In vain were they exhorted to behave themselves or leave the room, and having interrupted the lecturer very considerably by talking, laughing, whistling, and stamping, several of them were ejected from the room by some of the adults present. The lecture consisted largely of quotations from Scripture, with very dogmatic exposition. The speedy downfall of all Gentile forms of government, and the restoration of a Jewish theocracy under the personal reign of Christ at Jerusalem, were announced in the most positive manner. The close of the time of the Gentiles and approach of the millennium were sought to be proved from such facts as the following: the recent liberties conceded to the Jews in almost

every country; the increase of knowledge; the increased interest taken in the colonization and regeneration of Palestine; the decay of the Turkish empire; the immense European armaments in preparation for the battle of Armageddon; the disappearance of the temporal power of the Pope; the downfall of the French empire; the restoration of the Spanish monarchy; the "evaporation" of Turkey; the increase of Russia's power, preliminary to her coming down upon Constantinople and taking it, after which her own hosts would be vanquished by the hosts of the Lord of Jerusalem; and the rise of the Tory or war party in England, with a Jew at its head, prior to England confronting Russia on the mountains of Israel, English interest in the occupation of the Holy Land being sufficient to induce her to fight Russia. The power of Britain would be broken by the Divine power, but there was an interesting position reserved for her in the latter days. Lastly, people were being taken out (the Christadelphians, we presume) from the rest of men in the expectation of the speedy re-appearance of the Lord Christ. There was war ahead. The world was filled with chaff, which must be burnt up. Great as the English nation was, its sins and iniquities were reaching to heaven. Before the sword would be beaten into ploughshares, the ploughshares would be beaten into military weapons. On Thursday evening there was a good deal of interruption. Some questions were put to the lecturer by the persons present, and the answers were anything but satisfactory."

GLASGOW.—Brother Owler, writing on the 13th inst., says: "During the past month, two immersions have taken place, namely—on the 31st March, JAMES GILLIES, second son of brother and sister John Gillies, of Beith; and on the 9th April, MRS. STEEL, wife of brother James Steel; and one removal, brother Wm. Ker having gone to Dundee. The lectures on Sunday afternoons, in George Street, still go on from week to week, but the attendance is variable. The subjects were: March 19th, Salvation of the Jews.—(Brother J. Mulholland.) March 26th, The Destiny of the Jews.—(Brother John Ritchie.) April 2nd, The Serpent's Lie.—(Brother Nisbet.) April 9th, Who hath believed our Report?—(Brother Owler.) The course of lectures delivered in the Bridgeton or Eastern District of Glasgow, were very successful, so far as attendance goes, as there would be an average audience of about 100 per night. Spiritually we cannot say, but hope that they may bring forth fruit in good season. It is as true now as in apostolic days—that Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God alone giveth the increase. The brethren are, however, hopeful that in 'casting their bread upon the

waters, it may return in many days.' In addition to three lectures announced last month, the following were also delivered: March 19th, *The Restitution of all Things*.—(Brother Robertson.) March 26th, *Reasons for believing the Coming of Christ to be near*.—(Brother T. Nisbet) April 2nd, *What must we do to be saved?*—(Brother Robertson.) On Monday, April 3rd, brother Charles Smith, of Edinburgh, was present, and answered a number of questions. This meeting was very successful, and the questioners appeared to be satisfied with the replies. It will be remembered that brother Nisbet was challenged to discuss the immortality of the soul with a Mr. Mitchell, of Govan, in October last. A course of lectures followed, and since that time much interest has been manifested, in consequence of which, another discussion took place on the 29th and 31st March, the subject in dispute being the mode and necessity of baptism. Large audiences were obtained each night, and the brethren in Glasgow feel justified in following it up with a course of four lectures, commencing on Sunday evening, April 16th."

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother Diboll, jun., writes: "Since my last report lectures have been given on the following subjects.—March 19th.—*The Word of God*. Its study recommended.—(Bro. J. W. Diboll.) March 26th.—Several passages supposed to prove that the dead are still alive.—(Bro. J. W. Diboll, jun.) April 2nd.—*The world's wrongs and God's revealed way of righting them*.—(Brother D. Spinney.)

GRANTHAM.—Three lectures were delivered here by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, in the Exchange Hall, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, April 18th, 19th and 20th. The hall was very large, but the audiences very small on all occasions. However, judging from private conferences with hearers afterwards, some good work appeared to be done for the truth.

NEWBURGH (Fife).—Brother Hepburn, in ordering books, says, "I have engaged the services of a colporteur, who, in his ordinary journeys, is to push their sale."

LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew writes: "On behalf of the Leeds ecclesia I have to report the great loss sustained by the death of our beloved bro., Robert Paterson, who, on April 3rd, tranquilly passed from a natural sleep to that sleep from which we trust he will soon be awakened by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The complaint which caused his death was pulmonary consumption, (which the doctors say is incurable,) the result of rheumatic fever, by which he was prostrated whilst living in Edinburgh, and from the effects of which he seems never to have thoroughly recovered. His health has not been good for some time, but he has continued his employment until within nine or ten days

of his death, with the exception of one week's rest. We did not think his end was so near, nor does he appear to have done so, for he spoke of returning to Edinburgh. He went very rapidly at the last. We feel that we and the truth have sustained a great loss, and our hearts are filled with sorrow; but we know that there are many others who will equally mourn his loss with those in Leeds, for our brother was well known and greatly beloved. We sorrow not as those who have no hope, but put our trust in Him who doeth all things well. Brother P. was not quite 30 years of age, and leaves his sister-wife, with a daughter to mourn his loss. I have to report one addition to our number, **HARRIET CAYGILL** (21), formerly neutral, and daughter of brother Caygill, was immersed into the saving name on March 11th. Brother and sister Clarkson, who have been in fellowship with us for a short time, have removed to Middleborough. Brother Alexander Rae, formerly of Glasgow, has obtained employment in Leeds, and is for the present in fellowship with us.

On the subject of brother Paterson's death, brother Owler, of Glasgow, writes as follows:—"You will be aware by this time that brother Robert Paterson and brother Alexander Durie, jun., have been committed to the dust. Sister Paterson's loss is great, but it is for her future that I am concerned. Brother Smith has written to one or two Scotch ecclesias, asking assistance for both sisters Durie and Paterson. Now, I know well that both Robert Paterson and the brethren Durie (father and two sons in the truth, who have died within 18 months,) did everything possible while in life to make ends meet, and also to assist all of a like precious faith. Neither (as far as I can see) can have anything to live on; for Robert was ill for three or four months and Alexander Durie lay for 12 weeks. My object in writing you is to see if you could do anything for them through the columns of the *Christadelphian*. I have known them all for over 12 or 13 years, and I know they are deserving and kindly folks. I fear with the great drain there has been on the resources of the Glasgow and Edinburgh ecclesias this winter for sick brethren and sisters; and also for two sisters that have to be provided for, all that will be gathered will not go far. Both in Edinburgh and Glasgow this past winter has been the heaviest that I recollect. You will, therefore, readily appreciate my anxiety for our dear sisters, and see from this that their cases are urgent.

LEICESTER.—Brother Collyer reports as follows: "I have to convey the following intelligence: on Tuesday, March 21st, the immersion of **JULIA ROBERTS** (25), formerly Methodist New Connexion. Some others are giving attention to the 'one thing needful,' and will soon be one with us, we

hope. As to the general public, with the longer days, they avail themselves of the opportunity to get out for walks, &c., which makes a corresponding difference to our meetings. However, whether they hear or forbear, we intend to continue the work of proclaiming the glorious truth of our Lord and Master, in the hope that some may be delivered who are 'drawn unto death,' knowing that he that pondereth the heart knows all, and will render to every man according to his works. We regret having had to withdraw from brother Burback, on account of intemperance."

LONDON.—Brother Elliot writes: "I have nothing of interest to contribute to the 'intelligence' department beyond the particulars of our lectures here for April, which are as follow: April 2nd, The Resurrection of the Dead; and April 9th, The Judgment of Quick and Dead.—(Brother W. Atkins.) April 16th, The Number of the Beast: six hundred, threescore, and six.—(Rev. xiii. 18.) What does it mean? and where is it to be found?—(Brother J. C. Phillips.) April 23rd, The Unknown God, or the apostle Paul's Discourse on Mars Hill.—(Brother A. Andrew.) April 30th, The Undying Worm and the Unquenchable Fire. Do the Scriptures teach the eternal torment of the wicked in hell?—(Bro. Boshier.) Bro. J. J. Andrew, who has been seriously ill, is convalescent."

OLDHAM.—Brother Hatton reports that brother J. Clatford and his sister-wife have come to reside here, from Liverpool. There are one or two enquirers searching for the truth. There has not yet been any public proclamation of the truth, but brother Hatton hopes soon to be able to proclaim the blessed tidings of salvation as it was in the apostles' days.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler writes, April 14th, "The brethren here have accomplished a desire which they have long entertained, and that is to have a room at Sheffield for the proclamation of the truth. It will hold over a hundred people, and is very central, being close by the old church. Still, even here, we labour under disadvantages. The proprietor will not allow us to have a sign outside, or any notices in the windows in connection with our meetings. We can only have it for the Sunday evening lectures, consequently we still meet at the old room, at Carbrook, in brother Joseph Unwin's house, for the breaking of bread; which place is a distance of over four miles for most of us to go. The lectures in the new room at Sheffield during the first four weeks have been as follow: Sunday, March 19th, The Kingdom of God.—(Bro. Boler.) March 25th, The Gospel.—(Bro. Skinner.) April 2nd, The Sabbath.—(Bro. Boler.) April 9th, Resurrection not Death the Gate of Life. (Bro. Skinner). The subjects were advertised in the local papers; and we have had some very

respectable audiences, numbering from 40 to 50 strangers, who paid very great attention. Questions were asked and answered in a way which appeared to give general satisfaction. Enquirers are earnestly looking into the truth, and like the Bereans of old, they are searching the Scriptures daily to know whether these things are so."

SWANSEA.—A lengthy communication is to hand from those who have withdrawn as reported last month. They allege that it was not the adoption of the Birmingham statement of faith, but the way it was done that led them to leave; and that they did not sympathise with the unscriptural doctrine which has been taught. With this brief statement, which is as long as appeared last month, we must leave the matter. We cannot open the pages of the *Christadelphian* to personal controversies. We will but add that the true friends of the truth are found on the truth's side, whatever difficulties or misunderstandings turn up.

WALSALL.—Lectures are being got up here by one or two of the Birmingham brethren, in connection with a brother and sister resident in this place. There is some interest, though as yet of a hostile character.

CANADA.

TORONTO.—Brother Evans writes. "When letters like the enclosed appeared in the leading papers of this city, and ministers of the English, Baptist and Presbyterian Churches preached special sermons in confirmation of their dogma of eternal torments (without, however, first proving the everlasting nature of man), we thought the time opportune, and it both our duty and privilege to contend with increased diligence for the truth of God in these matters. By a distribution from house to house of about 10,000 tracts, consisting of a reprint of one of the letters to the *Globe*, with some supplementary matter of our own and advertisement of lectures on back, and by otherwise advertising in the press, we secured, on the 1st and 2nd March, in the Temperance Hall, audiences of about 350 each night. The subjects of lectures were: 1st, On the Nature of Man. Immortality not Inherent, but a Gift. 2nd, Man's Relation to the Future. The Doctrine of Future Reward and Punishment examined in the light of Scripture. At the close of each lecture, we distributed the tracts, entitled, *Particulars of the Kingdom of God*. On the succeeding Sundays, brothers Gunn, of Walkerton; Coombe, of Weston; and Thomas, of Brooklyn, followed up the lectures. A good few are giving heed to the things spoken, and several of our friends have intimated their intention (and wisely so for the time is short) of accepting God's salvation, which is through faith and obedience of the gospel of Jesus

Christ. But while thankful and joyous for these things, we are again called upon to mourn the temporary loss of another of our number, that of sister Read, who was one of the oldest members of the ecclesia in this city, having known the truth for nearly 20 years. She fell asleep on the 8th March. But thanks be to God, the great deliverer, he who hath the keys of death and the grave, is at hand. Here follow the letters referred to:

In reference to certain questions at present agitating the public mind, the following appeared in the *Globe* of Tuesday, Jan. 25th, 1876:

"IMPORTANT QUESTION FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS.—To the Editor of the *Globe*, Sir.—Of late numerous sermons and writings have appeared in our public journals concerning the future state of the ungodly, and the utility or necessity of creeds and confessions of faith. I, therefore, request a little space in your columns, not to add to the elaborate discussion on those subjects, but to ask a few questions which appear to me to be at the root of both. It will be admitted by all that the current theory concerning the future state of the ungodly is based upon the assumption that all our race have been created immortal; instead, therefore, of elaborate and learned disquisitions to prove the eternity of sin and misery which is based upon that assumption, why do not the ministers of the gospel attempt to prove the assumed dogma of the immortality of the soul from the Word of God? If it be true, it must be found there plainly revealed; if not to be found there, it is, then, but a learned fiction, having a heathen affinity or origin, and all the reasoning formed upon it being an illusion, should be rejected by every one who reverences the authority of the Divine testimony.—Yours, A BIBLE READER."

"WHERE ARE THE WATCHMEN OF THE TRUTH?"—To the Editor of the *Globe*, Sir,—On the 25th January, I obtained your consent, as a sincere enquirer after truth, to publish a brief letter, entitled, 'Important Questions for Religious Teachers,' in which I urged that some of our learned men would give Scripture proof of the immortality of the soul, or the inherent immortality of all men, because on the assumption of the truth of this dogma is founded the purgatory of the Roman Catholics, the ruinous errors of Spiritualists, as well as the eternity of evil and suffering, all which appear contrary to Divine revelation, or to the revealed character and purpose of God.

I also submitted another question, vitally connected with the cause of truth, the rightful moral independence of the Christian ministry, the peace and welfare of churches,

and the good of all, namely, Are creeds, articles and confessions of faith, as commonly employed, to be authoritative standards of faith and duty, warranted by the Word of God—since we find neither precept or example for anything of the kind given either by the Saviour or his inspired apostles?

To these questions no reply appears to have been given. Am I, therefore, to conclude that our learned theologians (who boldly proclaim that from the Bible alone proceeds the religion of Protestants) admit by their silence that they cannot prove either the one or the other to be founded on the Word of God? Or am I to conclude that they are indifferent to the alleged existence and process of error on those subjects?—I am, Yours, &c.,

A BIBLE READER.

Toronto, 15th Feb., 1876."

UNITED STATES.

BUCYRUS (Ohio).—Sister Wentz says that believers in this place would be thankful for a call from any faithful brother passing through. Call for William Wentz, machinist.

CENTRE POINT (Kerr Co., Texas).—Bro. S. H. Oatman writes: "Brother T. A. Corbell desires to suggest (through the *Christadelphian*) to the brotherhood that a fraternal gathering be held at Centre Point, where he resides, commencing on the first Sunday in August next, and would hereby extend a general and cordial invitation to all the brethren in Texas or elsewhere. He desires to state further that all will be made welcome to such fare as he may be able to provide; also, that the use of a large school-house will be obtained to meet in, and such other necessary arrangements will be made as may be in his power to make."

JEFFERSON (Stephenson Co., Ills.)—Bro. Wood reports obedience on the part of **BESSIE JANE SNEATH (23)**, daughter of brother and sister Sneath, whose post office address is Shannon, Carrol Co., Ills., but their residence is Jefferson, as above stated; also **MARY T. WOOD (22)**, cousin to the first one named; also **ELIZABETH SOOTHILL (20)**, daughter of brother and sister Soothill, of Harvard, near Henry Co., Ills. Brother Wood (heretofore of Burrill) and his son and sister-wife were present on the occasion, also brother Fish, of Beloit, and brother Soothill, of Harvard. They came together almost fortuitously at brother Sneath's. A pleasant three days' meeting was held, of which brother Wood gives lengthy particulars. He says it was a rare and remarkable event in these parts, and gave them great joy.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 144.

JUNE, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

“WILT THOU AT THIS TIME RESTORE THE KINGDOM TO ISRAEL?”

AN EARLY PRODUCTION OF DR. THOMAS'S.—FROM THE “INVESTIGATOR,” 1844.

“LORD,” said the apostles to Jesus, who had promised them that they should sit on thrones, judging the Twelve Tribes, “wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” This was their earnest hope and expectation—a hope which was founded on the promise of God, and one in which all Israel shared with them, and to which the whole nation hoped to attain. The hope was not a false hope; they erred, not as to the object of their desire, but as to the time when they should realize it.

The national hope was that the Most High should set up a kingdom which should be everlasting, of which Israel should be the possessors, and to which should be attached all dominions, which should serve and obey their king. This king, whose appear-

ance they expected, they designated as the Great King, whose city Jerusalem was.—(Matt. v. 35). It was in that city, the vision of Peace, on Mount Zion—they hoped to see him reign “before his ancients gloriously.” (Isaiah xxiv. 23). Some of the Jewish nation recognised in Jesus this king, whose kingdom and glory had been for so many centuries the theme of prophetic inspiration and song. Mistaking the time, and imagining that they were to set up this kingdom, they essayed to take Jesus and to make him king.—(John vi. 15). But he eluded their violence upon that occasion, though he at length fell a victim, testifying his right and title to the royalty of that kingdom which God would set up at the appointed time.

He suffered death because he maintained that he was born King of the Jews.—(John xix. 21). This was the cause of his death, as expressed in the superscription nailed to the cross, and written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews. "Write not," said the chief priests, "The King of the Jews, but that *he said* 'I am the King of the Jews.'" Now when he was arraigned before Pilate, Pontius asked him "Art thou the King of the Jews?" to which he replied, "I am a King—to this end was I born." Could anything be more explicit? He avowed that he was King of the Jews, though he gave Pilate to understand that his kingdom was not of that age contemporary with Tiberius Cæsar, or his servants would have given battle to prevent his being a prisoner in his hands. From this Pilate, seeing that he had nothing to fear from his ambition, pronounced him innocent of any designs against the state, saying, "I find no fault in him," and from thenceforth sought to release him. But the tumult was not to be thus appeased.—"If thou let this man go," said the Jews, "thou art not Cæsar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar." Whereupon Pilate brought him forth, saying "Behold your king!" But they cried out "Crucify him!" "What!" said Pontius, "shall I crucify your King?" And their priests answered "we have no king but Cæsar."

"To this end was I born:" I came into the world that I might be a king, and sit upon the throne of David my Father, and rule over the house of Israel for ever. This is the truth, and I bear witness to the truth. Everyone that is of the truth understandeth this my declaration. Few, then, however, understood how this reign over Israel was to be brought about. He was put to death, and with him the hopes of all his friends. "We hoped that it had been he who would have redeemed Israel" from this bondage to the Roman power; but in this his disciples were mistaken. The day of

national redemption was not then. The king was prepared but the citizens were not enrolled; the charter was given, but the throne of David was and still is in ruins.

All hearts in Israel were fixed upon the kingdom of God. They regarded it as Paradise, in which was the Tree of Life, and all the delights spoken of in the prophets as connected with Messiah's reign. With them the kingdom of Messiah, or Jehovah's anointed king, and Paradise were synonymous, or words signifying the same thing. Hence, when the malefactor prayed to be remembered when Jesus came into the kingdom of which the superscription announced him to be the king, our Lord replied to him that he should be with him in Paradise at the time to which he referred.

We might stop here and argue against a popular error, which supposes Jesus and the thief to have been both in Paradise on that self-same crucifixion day! But of what use is it to argue with prejudice? The kingdom of Jesus had no existence in form or feature. Jesus entered his Father's house by a resurrection from the dead, and none can meet him there unless they tread the same "path of life," or are transformed. Paradise is entered from the grave by a resurrection unto life. The thief did not rise before Jesus, for he is the first begotten, nor is it testified that he is risen since; and we are certain they met not in the presence of the Father before the third day; for till after that day, Jesus did not ascend to heaven. The truth is the kingdom is not yet restored to Israel; and until it is, neither Abraham, David, nor the thief will be with Christ in Paradise.

It was for this national hope that Paul stood before Agrippa. He terms it "The hope of the promise made by God unto our Fathers, unto which our Twelve Tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." And that this hope embraced the resurrection of the dead is obvious from Paul's apostrophe to the king: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible

with you that God should raise the dead?" The hope of the resurrection and the hope of Paradise, or of Messiah's kingdom, in all its glory, were two features, then, of the Hope of the Twelve Tribes.

Again, when in Rome a prisoner in chains, Paul told the chief men of the Jews, that for the hope of Israel he was bound. This, in his letter to the Ephesians he styles the "hope of God's calling and the riches of the glory of his inheritance among the saints." He terms these "the unsearchable riches of Christ," which were a secret or mystery, and "hid with God" until He revealed them to the apostles and prophets by His Spirit. That there may be no doubt as to the identity of "the hope of Israel" and the "hope of God's calling," Paul styles them "the one hope of your calling"—Ephesians in Christ, among whom were Jews as well as Gentiles. He tells them of Colosse that "this hope is laid up for them in heaven," and that it is set forth in "the word of the truth of the gospel;" and hence it is styled "the hope of the gospel," which in less than thirty years after the Day of Pentecost, was preached "to every creature under heaven."

The hope of the gospel is something of vast interest and importance. The subject of it was unknown to the world for upwards of 4,000 years. Paul styles it "the mystery which had been hid from the ages and generations; but now (in his day) is made manifest to his saints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, (Colossian disciples), the hope of glory." Glory, then, is a matter of hope, and he tells us when we shall attain to it in these words—"your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Life and glory are to be brought to us at that time, namely, at his appearing on earth again. If to this we add that the apostle says to the disciples in Rome, that "God will render to

them eternal life, who by a patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and incorruptibility—we cannot fail to perceive that glory, honour, immortality, and eternal life being all promised to the faithful, they are all equally parts of that whole, which constitutes the one hope promised before of God unto the fathers of the Jewish nation.

But if the hope of Israel consisted of no more than personal attributes, there would be a manifest deficiency. A glorious, honourable, incorruptible and eternally existent community of people would be an anomaly in such a system as the celestial, teeming as it does throughout Jehovah's immensely spacious dominion with material globes, the inheritances of intelligences, superior, co-ordinate, or inferior to man, without a habitation, or dwelling-place, adapted to them as the sons of God. To what orb of heaven, then, is this general assembly of glorious immortals directed as their glorious abode during the countless ages of eternity? Is it to the splendid orb of day, to the silver Queen of Night, to the broad ringed Saturn, or to the wide-belted Jupiter? What right has man, I would ask, to claim these, or any other of the celestial planets, satellites, or suns as his estate, habitation or inheritance? Does the Book of Eternal Destiny anywhere proclaim, that the heaven of heavens is for Jehovah, but the sun, moon, or stars hath He given to the sons of men? Nowhere. These spheres are the celestial mansions of the sons of God and of the morning stars; of those intelligences whom God permitted to view the earth, when formed for the sons of men, according to this saying,

Where wast thou, O Job, when I laid
the foundations of the earth?

When the morning stars sang together,
And all the sons of God shouted for joy?

From this we learn, that before man dwelt upon the earth, numerous joyous intelligences peopled the provinces of heaven. Some of them are termed "morning stars" because

they were some of the sons of God who inhabited the morning stars. According to a well-known metaphor the dwelling-place is put for its inhabitants; hence the stars are said to sing, that is, the population of the stars sang together when they beheld this new effort of the Lord their God or King as displayed in the perfection of the work of the six days' creation. These were some of the favoured hosts of heaven who perfectly obeyed His will—squadrons of light horse robed in the splendour of His Majesty, who swept the boundless fields of space, and ranging around his glory, echoed through the vales of earth, and rent the air, with joyous shouts and melodious strains, in loud sounding praise of the power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength of their imperial Lord. Never has earth witnessed so brilliant a review as this. Our feeble imaginations cannot conceive the glory of that field-day of heaven's hosts, marshalled by the Great Ruler of the unwise. Having beheld the glories of this new world, the retreat was sounded and they sped to their celestial abodes. From that time until the annunciation of the birth of Jehovah's King, the sons of God visited the earth but seldom, and at most by two or three at a time. But on that occasion, when the foundation corner stone of the new creation was laid, a multitude of the heavenly host again appeared, praising the Most High, and saying:

“Glory to God in the highest heaven,
And on earth, peace, goodwill to men.”

When men shall attain to the rank of sons of God by a resurrection into life, they will be as these the angels of God; for “they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, or age, and the resurrection from the dead, are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.” Those of men, then, accounted worthy will become angels,

or glorious, honourable, incorruptible and ever-living corporeal intelligences, of the same fashion as the glorious Jesus, to whom “we shall appear.” But concerning the dwelling-place, or inheritance, of this new community of angelized men, it is manifest from the Scripture, it will not be on any of the orbs, revolving in distant regions of space.

Wherever the right hand of the majesty in the heavens may be, where Jesus now dwells, terrestrial immortals will not be translated thither *en masse*. Enoch, Moses and Elijah are gone temporarily as visitants to some remote sphere; but whether they be with Jesus, or guests of a different angelic community in the heavens we are not informed. Suffice it to say, that the Scriptures everywhere announced the return of Messiah to Earth, and not the translation of the citizens of his paradisaic Kingdom to him. They pay the debt of nature; they are deposited in the earth; the grave consumes their form and they mingle with the dust. In this it is “appointed” for them to make their bed; there they recline their appointed time, the dreamless sleepers of the tomb. No voice disturbs them, no care corrodes them, no trouble breaks their rest. Envious tranquillity of the dead in Christ! Time is a point with them, without parts, magnitude or extension. Asleep, insentient, dead, they repose for ages of ages until the voice of the Archangel, and the last loud sounding blast of the seventh trumpet of God, start them into being. The prolific womb of earth, teeming with the living sons of God, “cast out the dead;” who come forth resplendent, “like dew from the womb of the morning.” For the first time, thousands behold him in whom all nations of the earth are blessed. The brightness that surrounds him, the flashing lightnings, and the mighty angels which attend him, display a scene of grandeur, equalled only at the birth of the old creation. Brilliant with light, his new formed battalions

“meet him *etc aepa.*” What a splendid induction will that be of the earth-borns into the ranks of the celestial array! Who can imagine the intensity of that voice of the great multitude that welcomes them to the standard of the king and captain of their salvation, saying,

“Alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth;
Let us be glad and rejoice, and give glory to him,
For the marriage of the Lamb is come,
And his wife hath made herself ready.
Scarcely hath this died upon the breeze,
when the order of immortals raise their voices to the praise of him that is faithful and true, saying,
Worthy art thou;
For thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood,
Out of every kindred, and tongue, and nation,
And hast made us unto our God kings and priests;
And we shall reign on earth.”

Many other passages might be adduced to show that the earth is the theatre upon which will be developed the heavenly constitutions of things. God hath given this orb of the solar system to men as the sons of God for ever, while He reserves to Himself the highest heaven. This is abundantly proved by the record which testifies that

“The highest heavens are for Jehovah;
But the earth He hath given to the sons of men.”

This was a noble gift, and it remains only for Him to remove the curse under which it lies, to make it a heaven indeed. The earth progressively renovated, and placed under the constitutions of the second and third heavens, is unfolded to our view in the Scriptures of truth, as an “inheritance” to which our hopes are continually directed. “Whatsoever ye do,” saith Paul, “do it heartily to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of inheritance;”

and again he saith that “by faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place or country, which HE should afterwards receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and sojourned in the Land of Promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs of the same promise; for he looked for a city, or state, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. These all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us—that they without us should not be made perfect.” Here, then, is an inheritance pointed out as the nucleus of a new world or order of things upon earth; for Paul saith “the promise that he should be the Heir of the World was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.” From which it appears that the apostle considered the promise of Palestine to Abraham and his seed was equivalent to promising them a world. Yea! and what a splendid world it will be that has the Holy Land for its demesne, Mount Zion for its throne, Messiah for its High Priest and King, the whole earth for its territory, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and the righteous from the dead for its subaltern rulers, under the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, its constitution righteousness, and its covering, knowledge as the waters of the sea. This world of which we speak is founded in Abraham and his seed, as sons of God, or angels, by “the adoption—to wit, the redemption of the body. For we are saved by hope. But hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.”

In selecting Palestine, Abraham, and his seed as the nucleus of a new world, God has adopted a practice common among the kingdoms of the earth. In these the monarchs select a tract of country, and style it a lordship, barony, earldom, dukedom, or principedom, as the case may be. To this tract they attach certain

properties, which are inseparable, or which can only be obtained by having possession of the land. Thus, to one tract are connected certain rights, privileges, and immunities, which confer upon the owner of the soil, nobility, exemption from arrest, precedency, title, revenue, office, &c.; so that a peasant, who can prove his right to the inheritance, takes his stand at once among the nobility of the realm, robed in ermine, adorned with a coronet, and brilliant in all the attributes of his order. Or, this man may have sons; the law of primogeniture, however, excludes all but the eldest? it remains for them, therefore to prove who is the senior, and in so doing, they determine whose are the estate and all the honours thereunto attached. A stranger may claim the lordship, but unless he can prove he is the peasant's heir, he can have no interest in the inheritance.

Upon this principle God has acted in relation to the future world. He has selected a certain tract of country, which he has defined as bounded by the Mediterranean

on the west, the Dead Sea on the east, the Euphrates on the north, and the river of Egypt on the south. He has constituted it a kingdom, all of whose citizens are kings and priests. Of the King who is to reign over it, among other things he has affirmed that he shall sit upon the throne thereof for ever. The rights, privileges, immunities, honours, glories, &c., attached to this land are abundantly set forth in the prophets who have spoken of Messiah's reign. Glory, honour, peace, purity, incorruptibility and eternal life are qualities that belong to those who can prove their right to share in the soil of the Holy Land. Hence Peter, in view of the grand development when Messiah comes in his kingdom, styles it, "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;" and speaks of it as "reserved in heaven ready to be revealed at the appearing of Jesus Christ," when "according to His promise," God will organise "a new heavens and a new earth," *i.e.* a new constitution of things in Palestine, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

"IS THE SOUL MATTER OR SPIRIT?"

FROM THE "INVESTIGATOR," 1844, BY DR. THOMAS.

MR. EDITOR.—Sir.—Is the soul matter or Spirit? Is there anything separated from God and matter? If not, I should like to know how it is possible for the Immortal Spirit to be annihilated? Yours, &c.,
St. Charles, Thane, Ill.

REPLY.

Who propounds these questions we know not. They were left at our office for solution, and in the spirit of investigation we reply according to the information we believe we have derived from the Scriptures of truth.

The first question is: Is the soul matter or spirit? To aid us in the determination of this we must "search the Scriptures" for the

definition of a human* soul; for that is the kind of soul, we presume, the querist has reference to. This definition we would naturally expect to find in the history of its creation by Moses. To his writings, then, we turn. In the first chapter of Genesis, he testifies that "God created man in His own image; male and female created He them." And after He had made them, He declared them to be "very good."

But, from what material did the Lord God create this very good man

* Human from *humus*, which signifies the ground; the soul is so termed because it came out of the ground. It is generally derived from *humanus*, but this is of the same family as *humus*—the latter being the primitive, and the former the derivative.

and woman? Moses says that He "formed man, the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—(Chap. ii. 7.) But as to the woman, the Lord God "took one of Adam's ribs, and closed up the flesh thereof; and the rib He made a woman.—(Verses 21-23.) And when sentence was passed upon Adam because he had disobeyed the law of God, the Lord said "out of the ground thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."

From these data, we learn that the "very good" man of chapter i., and the "living soul" of chapter ii. 7, were made from the dust of the ground, and so formed as to reflect the image of God. Man is, as a whole, a living soul; and a living soul is a living man. Let it be observed that it does not say that man became an ever-living soul nor an "immortal soul" either, but simply a "living soul" or man. This living soul, Moses informs us, sprung from the ground, and derived its vitality from the atmosphere: for after the Lord God had organized man from the dust, "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives"—for so it reads in the margin of the Polyglot. Why was this styled by Moses "the breath of lives?" Manifestly because it sustains the lives of all animals, as well as man, who respire it through their nostrils. "The breath of life" is common to the whole animal kingdom, as the following quotations from Moses prove: "I do bring the flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life" (chap. vi. 17); "and all flesh that moved upon the face of the earth died: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life—both man and cattle."—(Chap. vii. 22.) That by "a living soul" is to be understood a "natural body," Paul teaches in his letter to the Corinthians. He affirms "there is a natural (or animal) body," and this he proves by quoting the words of Moses, namely: "The first man Adam was

made a living soul."—(Chap. xv. 45.) But if natural body and living soul do not mean the same thing, then Paul failed to prove his affirmation; but he did prove it, and this nobody denies; hence the phrases are synonymous. And living soul, natural body, animal, living creature, man, human soul, all signify one and the same thing. The first query, then, is answered. If dust, ground, and breath of life, or the air, be matter, then "the soul" is spirit; but as to what you mean by spirit in opposition to matter, I cannot tell; therefore am unable to say, whether "the soul" is what you call spirit or not. I leave it with the ratiocinators upon "entity and quiddity" and the "ghosts of defunct bodies" to split hairs upon abstractions; for myself I have neither time nor taste for such matters.

The second question speaks of the "Immortal Spirit." What are we to understand by this? The phrase occurring to my mind having the nearest affinity to it, is the "Great Spirit." Whoever read of the Great Spirit being annihilated, or reduced to nothing? But, perhaps the querist means by the "immortal spirit" what the heathen philosophers, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and their disciples in these times still characterised by mythological traditions—term the "immortal soul;" and which they describe as a something in every man, woman, and child, which when the body becomes defunct, lives in heaven beatifically, or wails or gnashes its teeth (?) in the dark and torrid dungeons of the damned. I confess that concerning such a phantasm I know nothing, for I find no such thing either in the Scriptures of truth, or in the records of the discoveries of modern science. The phrase "immortal soul" is not to be found in the Bible; and therefore, we argue, the idea it conveys is not there either.

But, we presume the querist wishes to be informed if "the soul" be matter or spirit, whether that soul is immortal? The material of which the soul is made does not affect the

question one way or other. He that could form a "living soul" of the dust, could endue it with life for ever. But the question is not could He, but did He make man immortal? To this we reply, that "God made man upright"—He made him "very good" and "in His own image after His own likeness;" and when what follows is attentively considered, it will be perceived that the mortality or immortality of man was not a congenital attribute of his nature, but were qualities acquirable upon certain conditions.

Moses tells us, that the Lord put the living soul whom He had formed in the Garden eastward in Eden. In this Garden there were, among others, two remarkable trees. One is styled the Tree of Life; the other, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. In this Garden, man, the living soul, stood related to these two trees. They were both accessible to him. But he was forbidden to eat or even to touch the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil; and why? Because he would incur the penalty of death or mortality if he did. This tree, then, was to him the tree of mortality. Now, if death were the penalty of disobedience, who would be so obtuse as to affirm that before the man transgressed he was mortal? If he were mortal, why threaten him with death if he ate thereof? But let us beware of jumping hastily to the conclusion that because he was not inherently mortal, therefore he must have been immortal. This by no means follows.

From Genesis iii. we learn that the Tree of Life had the property of conferring eternal life upon the eater. "Behold," said God, "the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat and live for ever, therefore he drove out the man." Here we find that Adam was expelled from Eden, that he might not become immortal by eating of the Tree of Life. Who, then, will be so unreflecting as to affirm that he was created immortal? If he were immortal, why drive him from Eden that

he might not become so? No, when Adam was first placed in Eden he was on probation. Immortality was in the Tree of Life, not in his body; and mortality was in the Tree of Knowledge, not in him.

The conclusion is that God made man "very good," a free and noble being, dependent only upon His goodness, and susceptible of either mortality or of immortality. For the sake of knowing evil as well as good, and that he might be as gods, he chose immortality. Having thus become a mortal he was expelled from the Garden, and subsequently entailed upon his descendants "all the ills to which flesh is heir." We are his offspring, and, therefore, in us, as yet, there is no immortality at all.

If man had been created immortal, and had eaten of the Tree of Knowledge, what would have been the consequence? He would have lived for ever the hapless sufferer of all the evils of the present system of the world. Why did God drive out the man from the Garden? That he might be prevented from eating of the Tree of Life, and thus perpetuating his unhappy existence in a state of good and evil. If God expelled him to prevent so great a catastrophe as this, did He drive him forth to involve him in a greater by perpetuating his being through the endless duration of ages in pure evil—in unmitigated torture? Surely not! And if a man be devoid of immortality, upon what principle can he obtain it? The Scriptures teach that immortality is a gift of God, and to be obtained only by obedience to the law of faith. What then becomes of the unconditional salvation of all men? It is the "baseless fabric of a vision," which is doomed to "leave not a wreck behind."

The annihilation of an immortal is an absurd notion. That which is deathless cannot cease to be. An immortal man cannot be annihilated: for were it so, then it would be proved that he was not immortal. Not believing in the doctrine of annihilation of matter, we feel no

interest in defending it. To annihilate is to reduce to nothing; when the unjust are the subject of "death ending in death," they will not be reduced to nothing, but resolved into the pristine elements of human nature: "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." There was a

time when man was not; there will be a time when the wicked will be as when the dust of the ground was unformed by the plastic hand of Deity. To this they will be reduced by violence, but nowhere is it said to nothing.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God,"—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 18.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

GOD MANIFEST IN NATURE.

(Rom. i. 19-20.)

THE *English Mechanic* six months ago, had a pithy paragraph on this point, without stating it in this way. We reproduce it in a paraphrased and amplified form for the strengthening of the argument:—
"Nature and her laws must exist either with or without a cause. If she exist without a cause, the atoms of which she is composed must of themselves possess intelligence, since they work by means to an end. Consequently, God exists even on this hypothesis, for the intelligence resident in the atoms would only be another name for Him; and if this intel-

ligence is so great and wise as to produce a creature like man, and a habitation like the earth, and a stupendous system like the starry host, it is equal to the production of all that is hoped for by the believers of the gospel. The power is confessedly there; it is merely a question of whether it will be exerted. The sceptical philosopher cannot say the power will not be exerted; for had he lived before man appeared upon earth, he would by his principle of believing only what he can see, have pronounced such an appearance impossible. How does he know a higher exercise of power will not take place? He must

confess himself in the dark, and admit the possibility at least, of what the gospel promises. To say there will be nothing higher than the mortal life of man and the present state of society on earth, is to propound the idea that the illimitable forces of the universe exist for no higher end, or contain no higher possibility than the objectless multiplication of a weak and perishing race of men—an impotent sequence, certainly, to a mighty causation, and philosophically improbable in the highest degree. Again, if the latent intelligence of nature was equal to the formation of the human organization, involving such exquisite adaptations of means to the end, no true philosopher would deny its capacity to foreshadow its plan by revelation. The usefulness of such a foreshadowing is shown by the cravings of our hope, and by the influence of coming facts on our actions; consequently, there is an antecedent presumption in favour of its being made. Thus, the theory of an uncaused self-evolved system of nature, when logically worked out, will lead us to the same result as the gospel.

But the idea of an uncaused nature is inconsistent with the fixity of all established relations. Everything works on the principle of helpless affinity. Ice cannot help dissolving before heat: paper cannot help burning when a flame is applied; the rock cannot help falling when dislodged from its place in the precipice; and so in everything. This helplessness is inconsistent with the notion of intrinsic intelligence. Yet there are marks of intelligence in everything. Therefore intelligence exists somewhere, and if this intelligence is external to nature, then nature is caused, and if caused, the cause must be eternal and infinite, and thus we get by nature to "the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth, who fainteth not, neither is weary, and there is no searching of His understanding."

THE ALLEGED DESCENT OF MAN.

Some of the scientific anomalies of the Darwinian theory of the development of man from the lower animals are forcibly pointed out by a writer in the *Mechanic*. We give the gist of his remarks: "The development theory is undemonstrable by any evidence as yet. It does not account for multitudes of phenomena, and is admitted to have serious outstanding difficulties waiting for explanations. We may find remains of men in pre-historic times, from which, some conclude that they were the progenitors of the present men, because they are exactly alike, so far as we can judge from the remains, but for this there is wanted some authority in the shape of evidence. The logic we are called upon to swallow, on pain of being classed with antigravity and 'flat earth' men, is simply this: *similia similibus procreantur*, as we see daily now; therefore, in former times, *similia dissimilibus procreabantur*. In other words, men produce men, and apes apes: therefore, we take a further step, and conclude that in former time apes produced men. Then, as if this step had been founded immovably on a rock, the development advocate proceeds: — 'Since the organisms at present existing are in some respects very different from those existing in the inferior strata, we are driven to the conclusion that a slow variation of organic structure has been taking place.' I beg to say that even on his own hypothesis he is driven to nothing of the kind, for the actual phenomena would be accounted for just as well by sudden and great variations as by slow ones. He appears to forget that 'complicated changes of structure must be made once for all,' and that difficulty is yet unsolved by the evolution theory. Moreover, this piece of logic belongs altogether to the well-known formula of cart before the horse; he is not 'driven to that conclusion' at

all, except that he wants it to support his previous conclusion that animals formerly produced their unlikes by some spontaneous process of which there is no evidence. Does he expect us to receive as evidence of that process his statement that the muscles for moving the ear and scalp were generally 'used by our mammal forefathers,' though only now 'in some rare cases of atavism,' or relapse into the ways of our forefathers? How does he know that? And if by our mammal forefathers, he means apes, that again is his usual process of begging the question. And further, how does the gradual disuse of some muscles, as men advance in civilization or change their habit, prove the possibility of making entirely new organs, especially those which are continually being resisted—as, for instance, the ligaments or pulleys under the joints, which the muscles or tendons pass through, and are continually trying to pull to pieces, and innumerable others? The law of development does not account for the fixed place in the animal economy of many parts that are not only never exercised but are exposed to disintegrating influence, and it is inconsistent with the fact that certain organs which are much used retain their relations to the system as a whole, notwithstanding their constant activity and the constant quiescence of the adjacent parts, such for instance as the jaw, the hand, the foot, &c.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

A preacher, whose utterances are recorded anonymously in the *Santa Barbara Press*, for Feb. 5th, 1876, says: "There are many difficulties involved in the supposition that this claim is fraudulent. The volume is cleft asunder by the deep gulf which separates such dissimilar tongues as the Hebrew and the Greek; the very

milestones that marked the growth of language are built into its composition; they stretch across its surface many centuries remote from each other, the time of Abraham and Job, standing out in their simple patriarchal garb upon its pages together with the more cultured and complex life that belongs to the age of Plato and Solon; it gathers its materials from many lands, passing from the Nile valley to the deserts of Arabia, from the villages of India to the banks of the Euphrates; from the tents of Gilead and Bashan to the Areopagus at Athens and the Via Sacra of Rome; and ever and everywhere with the most absolute veri-similitude, giving its pictures the same life-like reality, whether it paints the court of Belshazzar or the tent of Jael, using the same brilliancy of coloring and vividness of detail, whether it sketches the building of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the crucifixion upon Calvary, or the pearly gates and golden streets of the New Jerusalem in the vision of the Apocalypse—it weaves these varied materials into prose and poetry, song and history, proverb and parable, dialogue and sermon, familiar letter and lofty prophecy, and through all this variety of form and material, of lands and languages and centuries, there runs an unmistakable, and, on merely human grounds, unaccountable unity.

I wish now to examine this supposition of a merely human origin more especially with reference to the Old Testament, against the inspiration of which doubts are more often urged. Suppose that some Jew in the time, say, of Ezra, gathering such traditions as he was able, sat down to fashion a history of the Hebrew nation. The same work had to be done in Greece and Egypt and other early nations. In all other nations, however, the narrative ascends from the historic to a legendary period.

Extracts from Grecian history were here read, showing the confused and mythical character of its earlier periods. The fables of early Rome, and the conflicting dynasties of Egypt before the reign of Menes, show the same fact. But open the Jewish history and see with how firm a hand the first note is struck—'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' Then follows the order of cosmic arrangement, chaos, light, separation of land and water, life, vegetable, animal, human. Compare now with this the Babylonian cosmogony, first, darkness and water; then monsters half-man and half-beast, then a woman rent asunder, and portions making heaven and the other earth; then Bel, a deity, cuts off his own head and the blood mingling with dust forms men! The Greeks, Phoenicians, Egyptians and others fashioned histories of the creation, and all show the same mingling of monstrosities and puerilities. Their details are as contrary to science as they are offensive to the moral sense. How happens it that those Jews alone devised an account of the creation whose successive epochs answer to those which Agassiz and Guyot and Hugh Miller find recorded in the rocks of the earth itself? And when science has uttered its latest words as to the primeval form of matter, and the busy mind asks whence came the matter itself, how comes it to pass that these Jews alone are able to make answer: 'In the beginning, God created it.' When geology has dug its way down to the primary granite, these Jews lay their finger on the lowest stratum and say, 'God created it.' When the nebular hypothesis has melted the solid earth down into gaseous ether, these Jews are there to exclaim, 'God created the ether.' When the Darwinian theory has followed its curious chain from the man to the ape and back to the primal

protoplasm, these Jews stand by to declare 'God created the protoplasm.' If any Jew forged the first chapter of Genesis, it was a more amazing miracle than any which the Bible records."

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 162.)

The first statement, then, to which I shall call your attention, is the list which Eusebius gives of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament.

This well-known ecclesiastical historian was born in Palestine about the year 264. In his history, written about the year 330, he thus mentions the Scriptures of the New Testament:—"Now, this appears to be a suitable place to give a summary statement of the books of the New Testament which I have already mentioned. In the first place, then, we must put the holy quaternion of the gospels; these are followed by the Acts of the Apostles; then we must mention the Epistles of Paul; then we must place the acknowledged first Epistle of John, and, similarly, the admitted Epistle of Peter; after this may be placed, if it appear suitable, the Apocalypse of John; the various opinions about which we shall set forth in proper time. And these are amongst the books *universally owned* (*Homologoumena*). Now, of *opposed* books (*Antilegomena*), which are, however, acknowledged similarly by the many, are reckoned the Epistle called that of James, and that of Jude, and the second of Peter, and those named the second and third of John, or of some other of the same name. Amongst *spurious* writings are reckoned the Acts of Paul, and the book called the Shepherd, and the Apocalypse of Peter, and also the Epistle of Barnabas, and what are called the Instructions of the Apostles; and also (as I said), if it appear suitable, the Apocalypse of John, which (as I said) some reject, but

which others rank among the books universally received. And now some reckon amongst these the gospel according to the Hebrews, which especially pleases those of the Hebrews who have received Christ. And these are all the books which are *opposed*. We have of necessity included these two in our catalogue, having distinguished the writings which, according to the accounts delivered by the church, are true, genuine and universally owned; and those others which, although known by many ecclesiastical writers, are not reckoned in the canon, but are *opposed*."—(l. iii., c. 25).

From this passage we learn, that in the time of Eusebius—the latter part of the third century and the beginning of the fourth—all the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were known and received by Christians in general,—that there was discrimination exercised as to *what* books ought to be included in the New Testament collection; that several books *professedly* apostolic were rejected, but that none were included in the collection which we do not now receive; and none of those which we receive were absolutely rejected, although, as to a few of the number, there was some difference of opinion.*

Not long before Eusebius wrote his history, events had occurred which rendered it needful for the Church to discriminate accurately between its authoritative Scriptures and other books. The Diocletian persecution, which commenced in the year 303, was directed even more against the sacred books of the Christians than against their persons. The endeavour was made to exterminate the Christian Scriptures: had this effort succeeded, it was thought that the form of belief which hindered the disciples of

* This difference of opinion may be ascribed to the denunciations of Peter, James, John and Jude, recorded in these epistles against the clergy, who were contending for preëminence over the Church, and which they at length acquired.—*Dr. Thomas.*

Christ from uniting in the popular idolatries, would at once fall to the ground. Such an effort had been made by Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the Old Testament, and thus to annihilate Judaism. However foolish such an attempt may sound, there are facts which show that such an endeavour to destroy a book may be successful. A century after the invention of printing, an Italian book, on *The Benefits which we receive by the Death of Christ*, had passed through many editions, and was possessed (it is said) by almost every intelligent family in that peninsula. The question of heresy was raised—the free grace of the gospel of Christ was found to be set forth in this widely-circulated volume, and its destruction was decreed. The machinery of the confessional was set in motion; all were required to surrender their copies, and thus the work disappeared so thoroughly that its contents were only known from the accounts of contemporary writers. Ranke in his *History of the Popes* says that this book was as much lost as the lost *Decades of Lury*. I may observe that this volume, after a disappearance of 300 years, has again been discovered in an English version, from which it has been retranslated into Italian and printed, and again employed as an instrument in the endeavours now carried on for introducing the light of the gospel of Christ in that country; and that the seat of Romish power and idolatry may be blessed in spite of the existing persecutions, far more widely than was the case at the time of the Reformation, must be the earnest desire and prayer of all who prize the gospel of Jesus Christ and value the possession of God's Holy Word.

In the Diocletian persecution, the Christians throughout the Roman Empire, from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, from the cataracts of the Nile to Britain, were required to give up

their copies of the New Testament to be destroyed; those who refused, suffered imprisonment, tortures, slavery or death. Many refused to surrender the Scriptures, and endured the consequences; others complied with the order of the emperors, and thence received, amongst Christians, the designation of *Traditors*, as though they had betrayed the word of God, just as Judas had betrayed our blessed Lord himself. There were also some who allowed the emissaries of the government to take away any books which were not Scripture; some bishops placed books of the heathens, or of heretics, where the messengers and magistrates were likely to search for copies of the Gospel. Indeed, not a few of those employed by the persecutors had but little zeal in the cause, so that (unlike the agents of the authority in Italy, who are now so diligent in searching for copies of the Scriptures, and in arresting those who read them,) they willingly took away whatever books were delivered to them, without enquiring whether they were the Christian Scriptures or not.

In consequence of this persecution, and the light in which the *Traditors* were regarded as subject to severe ecclesiastical discipline, it became really an anxious question, *what* are the sacred books of the Christians? Hence the need of discrimination on this point. Whoever gave up any of the books received as spurious, was not subjected to any ecclesiastical discipline; but from the general feeling of the many (as stated in the passage quoted from Eusebius), any who gave up the books opposed by some, would be looked on with doubt, and by most would be condemned as *Traditors*. The importance of the question was felt as widely as was the diffusion of the Christian name.

The conclusion is manifest, that two centuries after the death of the apostle John, all the books of the New Testament

were known and used as a *collection*, that they were received as universally owned, with the exception of five of the shorter epistles and the Apocalypse, of which some doubted.*

We may trace *backwards*, from Eusebius towards the days of the apostles, so as to observe the notices which exist of the collected books of the New Testament.

In the former half of the third century, there was no church teacher so conspicuous, as an author, as Origen. He was born at Alexandria about the year 185, and he died A.D. 254, ten years before the birth of Eusebius. In his writings, he makes such extensive use of the New Testament, that although a very large number of his works are lost, and many others have come down to us only in defective Latin versions, we can in his extant Greek writings alone—(I speak this from actual knowledge and examination)—find cited at least two-thirds of the New Testament; so that, had such a thing been permitted as that the gospels and some of the other books should have been lost, we might restore them in a great measure by means of the quotations in Origen.

Origen passed a considerable portion of his time in Palestine; he had also visited Rome; so that his testimony to the books of the New Testament cannot be considered as belonging merely to his native locality.

Eusebius (1 vi. c. 25) extracted from Origen's writings such passages as mention the uncontroverted books of the New Testament. In these passages he speaks of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as received by the whole church which is under heaven. He men-

* The fact of books of the New Testament being known and used as a collected volume, at the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century, is also evident from the manner in which Lactantius, at that period, speaks (Just. iv. c. 20) of the New Testament as comprising that portion of Holy Scripture which was written after the passion of our Lord.

tions the Acts, as well as the gospel, as the work of Luke. He speaks of the epistles of Paul in a general manner, (everyone of which he cites in his writings). He mentions the Apocalypse as the work of the apostle John, who wrote the gospel, and the first epistle that bears his name. He speaks of the second and third epistles of John as held to be doubtful by some. The first epistle of Peter he calls universally owned; the second he speaks of as one about which there were doubts. In this sort of casual mention of the New Testament books, Origen does not speak of the epistle of James or Jude, both of which, however, he uses in his works. In other passages of Origen, which are only extant in the old Latin version (which is not worthy of *implicit* confidence), lists may be found of all the New Testament writings as we receive them.

I shall not now dwell on the manner in which Tertullian at Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, at the third and close of the second century, speak of the New Testament:—I shall have occasion to refer to these important witnesses when speaking of particular parts of the collected volume of the Christian Scriptures.

The earliest notice of any *collected* books of the New Testament is found in a remarkable testimony of an unknown writer. The document to which I refer is commonly called the Canon of Muratori, because it was first published by that Italian scholar and antiquary, from an MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan. This document is defective at the beginning, and throughout it is grievously disfigured by the gross errors of the copyist. The ignorance of the transcriber makes, however, the testimony not at all the less forcible. This canon, as it is called, from containing a list of our canonical books, bears undoubted marks of being a translation, made from the Greek and Latin, by some one whose

knowledge of the grammar and construction of the Latin language was very imperfect.

In the beginning the writer is speaking of the four gospels. That part which relates to Matthew and Mark is lost, except the concluding words; then Luke, the companion of the apostle Paul is mentioned as the author of the third gospel, and John of the fourth; John's first epistle is next mentioned; then the Acts of the Apostles as written by Luke; then all the epistles of Paul are spoken of to which his name is prefixed, and then the Apocalypse of John; then the writer speaks of some spurious works which were rejected, and adds, "It is not fitting to mix honey with gall. The epistle of Jude, and two of the above-mentioned of John are reckoned the general writings." In saying the two epistles, the writer may have known of but one of John's short epistles, or, as it appears probable to me, he may mean two *besides* the first epistle of which he had spoken before. He then continues in a sentence which is not very comprehensible—"and wisdom, written by the friends of Solomon in his honour." This stands in almost unintelligible obscurity; *how* it can find a place amongst New Testament writings is difficult to imagine; and also *what* book is intended is by no means clear, whether the apocryphal book or the Proverbs to which this name of wisdom is appended in the second century—a book, the latter part of which was written out by "the men of Hezekiah," and of which some chapters are the words of Agur and King Lemuel.

The writer thus concludes what he has to say of New Testament books: "the Apocalypse, also, of John and Peter alone we receive, which (latter) indeed some amongst us do not choose to be read in the church."—(Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacrae*, vol. i. p. 394.)

Thus, the ancient canon recognises four gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles

of Paul, and, in short, all the New Testament books, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, those of Peter, and perhaps the second and third of John:—it speaks of no book, as belonging to the New Testament, which we reject, except the Apocalypse of Peter, and even that is mentioned doubtfully.

The author of this list of books speaks also of some which ought *not* to be received as of divine authority. He mentions "the *Shepherd*, written very recently in our own time, in the city of Rome by Herenas, while Pius, his brother, was bishop of the see of Rome." This incidental remark supplies us with the date of the writer. Pius the first, bishop of the church of Rome, died about the middle of the second century; he appears to have succeeded to the office about the year 140. Thus the list of New Testament books which we have under consideration, cannot have been written at a much later period. And not only so, but as the writer speaks of the episcopate of Pius the first as being in his own days, his testimony reaches back as far, and probably farther. These were books known, and received, and used as divine Scripture in the former half of the second century.

It is often remarkable, when pursuing an historical enquiry of a kind wholly different, how we meet with the strongest possible evidence against the claims of the Papacy. This writer, in speaking of authentic Scripture, rests on known historic facts, instead of cutting short the investigation by appealing at once

to the infallible authority of *Pope* Pius the first. And further, he mentions the book which the brother of the same Pius had put forth during his episcopate: now, this book is still in being; and though many have treated it with undeserved respect, imagining the author to be the Herenas whom Paul salutes in Rom. xvi., yet, the absurdities, to use no stronger expression, with which it is replete, evince that it is no exposition of Christian truth. If, then, Herenas put it forth with the sanction of his brother, the bishop, it would show that the then Pope could authorise a work both unedifying and unorthodox; if, however, Herenas put forth his idle fancies *without* the authorisation of his brother, the bishop, what possibility is there that any censorship then existed? How different were the claims of Rome in the days of Pius the first from what we see in the days of Pius the ninth!

The existence of this Pius the first is a simple historical fact; the time, too, is known approximately; but in some of the lists of Popes he is numbered the ninth, in some the tenth, and in some the eleventh! Some make him the predecessor, some the successor, of Anicetus. Had the certainty of papal succession and transmission been the basis of all continued Christianity, how uncomfortable would all these doubts and uncertainties make us! It is well that the facts of the transmission of the Scriptures rests on a firm and certain basis, independent of all questions of papal succession.

(To be continued.)

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

By F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 128.

IMPORTANCE.

THERE is a tendency in flesh and blood to rejoice in that which is least important: as in the case of the seventy who returned to Jesus with joy, saying, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." Part of Christ's answer is, "In this rejoice not that the spirits are subject to you; but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven."—(Luke x. 17-20.)

There is also a similar tendency in human nature to bewail that which is of the smallest consequence; thus a great company of people and women followed Jesus to the scene of crucifixion, bewailing and lamenting him. But Jesus, turning round, bids them rather weep for themselves and their children, and not for him.—(Luke xxiii. 27.)

The case of Martha and Mary beautifully illustrates the wisdom of attaching importance to the right thing. Martha, who was distressed about much serving, was remonstrated with by Jesus, while Mary, who sat at his feet and heard his word, was commended as having chosen the good part and attended to the only really important thing.—(Luke x. 38-42.)

The man who would have gone to bury his father, as a work of the first importance, was taught a wholesome lesson by Jesus, who answered him quickly, saying, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God."—(Luke ix. 59, 60.)

Faithless Thomas, one would imagine, accounted it somewhat important that his faith and confession should rest upon a critical interviewing and handling of Jesus. But Jesus, whilst meeting Thomas's difficulty, takes care to make it the occasion of a very healthful lesson to Thomas and all who should come after, saying, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."—(John xx. 26-29.)

When Mary (Martha's sister) took the costly ointment and anointed the head and feet of Jesus, some said, "What waste," might it not have been sold for much and given to the poor? This was an indignation quite worthy of Simon's son; the

importance, however, lay in the other direction to the one suggested. "What waste," is the mere cry of covetousness, under the pretence of sympathy for the poor.

The Scribes and Pharisees attached more importance to the gold of the temple than the temple itself which sanctified the gold; and again, they made the gift greater than the altar; but Jesus fitly rebuked them, and exposed the fallacy and shallowness of their reasoning by a single stroke from the breath of his lips.—(Matt. xxiii. 16-22.)

The Scribes and Pharisees accounted the payment of tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and the superfluous washing of cups and persons as a most important thing to be done, while, at the same time, they were culpably oblivious and unob-servant of far greater matters, such as judgment, mercy, faith; while on the other hand, they were notoriously characterised by extortion and excess.—(Matt. xxiii. 23-26.)

It is needful to have a care in our own day that we do not attach undue importance to that which is least, to the detriment of that which is greater and of more consequence; thus: by which is the truth best served? by an ordinary meeting of such as are always there, or by a flood-tide created by the concurrent presence of a number of irregular or occasional attenders? There can be but one answer, viz., an unbroken, continuous, and "always there" service of the truth is of the utmost importance, in every sense; while a fitful, uncertain, and now and then attention is comparatively unprofitable.

When the teaching of Jesus was to the effect that none could be his disciples who allowed any flesh and blood circumstance to stand in the way of service to him, he doubtless knew how liable men were to give the first consideration to their own life and present well-being; and to give in to the claims of domestic ties and social influence.

The fact that Jesus commanded men to "seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness," is clear evidence in itself that people naturally, and even disciples, were wont to give the first importance to other things. Wise men and women will take warning; fools will pass on

unheeding, to their own destruction.

Where the service of the truth has the supreme place in a man's affections, and where it obtains the first consideration, and holds the largest claim upon the attention, everything else will easily take its proper and subordinate place.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 129.

CONSEQUENCES.

The way to judge of a thing scripturally, and therefore correctly, is to look at it in its legitimate consequences; saying, what will it grow to? what fruit will it bear? where will it lead? what will be the end of it?

The forbidden fruit was pleasant to the eye, and esteemed desirable as promoting the ends of wisdom, but the bitter sequence was desperation and death.

Adam was one; he sinned, and the consequences are vibrating in the world to this day.

Christ was one; he obeyed, and rose from the dead, and the power of the fact, and the lesson thereof is not yet expended; nor will its entire result be exhausted or consummated till teeming millions of immortal sons of redemption, fill the earth with glory to God, and goodwill to men. But reverse the picture and try to realize the other side, as suggested by Paul, viz., if Christ had not risen from the dead, and if the "one obedience" had been lacking, what then? why says Paul our preaching were then vain, ye were then in your sins, and those fallen asleep in Christ were perished.

The present must be viewed in the light of the future; thus: "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." This is the infallible law of "cause and effect" in divine matters.

In judging of the respective merits of methods and systems of teaching, it is necessary to take into account tendencies and results; thus: is it fruitful in the virtues of the Spirit in those who hear? Is it enlightening, comforting and confirming to the mind? Is it searching and uncompromising? Is it calculated to strengthen the heart, and stir up to diligence, purity, and modesty of behaviour, both in apparel and speech? Does it provoke to love and good works? Does it produce self-abasement, self-consecration, and the fear of God? Or is it germinative merely of contention, clamour, vain-glorying and self-satisfaction, non-subjection and spiritual bounce? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

To calculate the virtue of an action or principle, or to find out its full consequences, good or evil, it is only necessary to suppose its universal adoption by the brotherhood; thus, what one has a right to do or not to do, any number of a meeting, to the extent of the whole, are at liberty to do or to leave undone, for similar reasons. The circumstances which could justify one would justify any other member: thus one is absent from a meeting because it is a fine day; and another, because it is a wet day; and another, because the body is a little out of sorts; and another, because the mind is not in an over good humour; and another, because the next meal must be prepared. Well, some come when it is wet and when it is dry, and whether they are well or indifferent, and whether it be convenient or inconvenient; and it is well they do, or may be, sometimes there would be no meeting; but why do they come? Because, first, they please not themselves but Christ; and second, because their preference lies strongly in that direction above all other things on earth.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 130.

MANIFOLD WISDOM.

Nature is God's picture book, whence He draws His illustrations of all His great works in Christ in connexion with the facts of human experience. It would appear as if the entire creation had been constructed and constituted what it is with a view to the embellishment of the truth in all its departments. In a word it answers so admirably to the exigencies of the situation which has come by sin, and the hope by Christ, that it suggests the idea that the qualities, character, and appointments of nature in all her multifarious forms, were designed from the beginning to be the counterpart of human history, and the pictorial alphabet of the truth, afterwards to be made to speak by the Spirit the mind of God to man.—(Ps. xix.)

The sand of the sea and the stars of Heaven were made subservient to the truth when used to foreshew the multitudinous posterity of Abraham.

The grass of the field had more uses in the divine purpose than to be eaten by oxen. Surely it was well designed along with the short-lived flowers to image forth the little span allotted to human existence, and the certain termination of life as the consequence of sin.

When God created the huge mountains

and everlasting hills, surely such ideas as defence, strength, endurance, and greatness were before His mind as lessons which He would one day require to illustrate to His people by these the great works of His hands.

When God made the vapour had He no idea of the vanishing mortal life which it would afterwards so forcibly illustrate in the mouth of His servant James?

How beautifully silver, and gold, and precious stones are made to us the servants of wisdom in conveying to our understanding the truth about its incomparable excellence, and how greatly we become enriched by its possession.

What a service the sea renders to the truth in being chosen by the Spirit as the symbol of many peoples, and in its unceasing disturbance of the sand as a fit type of the waves of wickedness which cast up mire and dirt.

How useful the animals have been which Adam named, and the precious metals exhumed from the bowels of the earth as the symbols of national organization.

How often and with what effect darkness and light are made to do service to the saints in making plain to the mind the true character of ignorance, and the glorious advantages of knowledge and wisdom.

How the experience of the enlivening and cheering effects produced by sunlight, enables us somewhat to grasp the more transcendent grandeur of that day when the metaphorical sun of righteousness arises with healing in his beams.

Surely the works of nature are the type and the counterpart of the facts and revelations of God's will in the Bible; summer, and winter, seed time and harvest, lightning, rain and thunder, snow and hail, stormy winds, and rolling billows, moving clouds, and heat so dry, are all pressed into the truth's service in the enunciation of the high thoughts and ways of the Almighty, and the concurrent attitude of man.

How much of the beauty and excellence we see in Christ, would have been lost to us if there had been no vine tree, and no shepherds, and no rocks, and no birds, and no foxes, and no lambs, and no sheep, and no hens, and no lilies, and no sparrows, and no hills, and no fishes, and no salt, and no bread, and no water, and no sun, and no rain, and no fruit, and no wheat, and no wine; why the New Testament would almost fall to pieces if these things were taken out of the beautiful fabric.

How tame were the writings of David and how barren of spiritual drapery, if there had been no trees by rivers of water, no brooks, and no panting harts, no honey, and no fine gold, no bulls of Bashan, no lions, serpents, and dogs, no pits and valleys, and no great mountains, no vineyards, palm trees, and no green olives, no sweet spices and oil, no floods, waves, and whirlwinds, no rocks, no wilderness, and no ornaments of heaven. Surely God prepared these things beforehand as the chariots of His omnipotent decrees, and the vehicles of His thoughts to the children of men.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 131.

WILD HONEY.

"Christian: a word formed not after the Greek, but after the Roman manner, denoting attachment to or adherents of Christ, only occurs as used by others of them, and not by Christians of themselves. Tacitus (A.D. 96), says (annals 15, 44) 'The vulgar call them Christians. The author or origin of this denomination Christus, had in the reign of Tiberias been executed by the procurator, Pontius Pilate.'—*Bullinger's Lexicon*.

"Thou shalt take the consecration oil and anoint the tabernacle and all that is therein, and shalt sanctify it on account of the crown of the kingdom of the house of Judah, and the King Messiah who is to redeem Israel at the end of the days"—*The Palestine Targum, 6th century*.

"Thou shalt anoint the laver and its base, and consecrate it on account of . . . Messiah bar Ephraim . . . by whose hand the house of Israel is to vanquish Gog and his confederates at the end of the days."—*Ibid*.

"Forerunner.—(Heb. vi. 20.) The Athenians called the figs that are ripe before the rest by the same word, which in the above passage, is translated forerunner; that is, the first-fruits."—(*Bee-ton's Bible Dictionary*.)

"Anchor.—(Heb. vi. 19.) This is supposed to be a beautiful metaphorical allusion to the person or boat that carries the anchor within the pier-head, and makes the ship fast, although the tide will not yet admit her to come up. Swinging at her cable's length, the ship rides out the gale."—*Ibid*.

"Frankincense; a sweet smelling gum. It is called 'Frank' because of the *freeness* with which it burns and gives forth its odour."

RUSSIA AND MILITARY ELECTRIC LIGHTS.

IMPORTANT and highly interesting experiments have been made at the Alliance Works, Passy, near Paris, in the projection of electric light for military purposes, such as the illumination of an enemy's works, but which has a general interest as being applicable to industrial and scientific purposes. During the war of 1870-1, electric posts were established in Montmartre, and in the forts around Paris. These apparatus were not of great power, but they proved their ability on more than one occasion. An

instance may be quoted:—A German force was noticed on the opposite bank of the Seine, near Courbevois, preparing to cross the river in boats; the electric light was directed from Montmartre, all the guns that commanded the spot opened fire immediately, and the enemy was utterly routed. The Russian Government, struck with the importance of powerful electric lights in time of war, determined on providing them for all its forts and strong places, and have applied to the company in question.

AN AUSTRIAN BISHOP'S OPINION OF HIS CLERGY.

THE Austrian correspondent of the *London Guardian* says:—Monsignor Zsivkovics, who was last year appointed Bishop of Carlstadt, in Austrian Croatia, has just completed a visitation of his diocese, and has published a pastoral, which discloses the condition of the parish clergy almost impossible to conceive. The bishop writes that he has come across many virtuous priests during his visitation, but that the general state of the diocese was most deplorable. "There were clergy who, under the mask of humility and patriotism, employed the most unworthy means and ways to destroy all moral principles, and to ruin public authority and peace and concord in the family and in the congregations. These priests were a disgrace to themselves and their order by their immoral and licentious lives; they openly mocked their spiritual character and ecclesiastical institutions; clerical covetousness was draining the resources of the poor; they sold the most sacred office, administering the sacraments only for money, in order to indulge their scandalous drunkenness." They neglected their clerical office, and education was utterly put an end to; they paid no attention to the order or advice of their bishop; they sold dispensations which were

even out of the power of the bishop to grant; they made their own list of surplice fees, and were the causes of public scandal between clergy and people. It was no uncommon practice to marry in the dead of the night a drunken bride to a drunken husband before drunken witnesses. The priests used their official position for purposes of private revenge, and excluded their personal enemies from the sacraments. Nor is this demoralisation only evident among the lower clergy, for, as the bishop writes, "the licentious blaspheming clergy, lost to all sense of duty," are certificated by their superiors as "orderly, zealous and peaceable priests." One consequence of all this is, that there are no fit candidates for the clerical office out of such a herd. The good bishop turns up these sores to the light of day, and asserts his intention to purify by every means in his power the mass of corruption. He writes—"The welfare of the church and of my people is my aim, and the law will be my path. In accordance with the law, I will, without hesitation perform my duty and exert my rights, and shall exercise no compunction, and enter into no personal compromise with any cleric who forgets or violates his own duty."

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA, No. 76.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

PETER says, "if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." There is great need for, and advantage in, obeying this injunction. We live in a day when men speak in a style very different from

the oracles of God. Apart from the doctrines that are in universal favour, the style of speech is emasculated and thin. The ideas are few, and these in their expression are spread over an

extended surface; starvation is the result to those who feed on them. There is a famine, not of bread, but of the Word of the Lord. A conceited philosophy on the one hand, and an utterly impoverished theology on the other, have given the world a colourless language, destitute of all truly nutritive elements. The Spirit of God calls with great reason upon the sons of men to turn from their famine-stricken diet, to the fatness provided in the oracles of God, in which they may delight their souls; but the call is disregarded, the world is enamoured of its own ways and its own thoughts. In the language of Apocalyptic figure, it is drunk, and drunken men have no relish for wholesome food. This dementedness shown in the universal taste for the starvation garbage of the natural man's philosophy will continue to prevail until the day of fat things, the day of the blessing of Abraham to all nations, shall be inaugurated by the man whom God hath appointed. A few, however, amid the teeming millions will be found in wisdom's way when that day arrives. It is our privilege to have been invited to walk in this way. Let us hold fast well by this first lesson of wisdom, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."

We are helped to do this by our practice of reading the Scriptures, not only in our daily private life, but in all our assemblies as the foundation of our thoughts. This morning we are with Solomon. Some have doubted whether we ought to regard his sayings as the oracles of God; but such a doubt can only exist where there is a neglect to take into account the apostolic recognition of these sayings as the voice of God. The judgment of the apostles is an unerring guide to us on such a point; for Christ said the Spirit would be with them to guide them into all truth—(John xvi. 13.) And Paul lays it down that any man truly enlightened will acknowledge apostolic sayings to be the

commandments of the Lord.—(1 Cor. xiv. 37.) In view of this, the divine character of the Proverbs is settled by Paul's quotation of them in this character. He expressly refers to Proverbs iii. 11, as "The exhortation *which speaketh unto you* as unto children,"—(Heb. xii 5.) It is unnecessary by the side of this to refer for confirmation to the fact that Proverbs constituted a part of "the Scriptures" to which Jesus always referred as the standard of divine authority, nor to the fact that God gave Solomon "wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and his wisdom excelled all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt, for he was wiser than all men."—(1 Kings iv. 29.) What if the Proverbs consist largely of sayings previously current in Israel, and collected by Solomon. Whence came these current wise sayings? Were they not due to the presence in Israel from generation to generation of men of divine illumination, such as Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David and many others? And whatever their origin, was not Solomon's adoption of them the explicit sanction of God? Any other view is inconsistent with all the facts of the case, and would rob us of one of the most precious storehouses of wisdom accessible to man.

When we make the acquaintance of the Proverbs, we not only obtain a large confirmation of the wisdom elsewhere indicated in the holy oracles, but we find a supply of correctives of especial value in view of the extremes into which it is possible to run in the unaided endeavour to carry out some of the divine precepts. "Take no thought for to-morrow," says Jesus; "consider the lilies of the field how they grow, they toil not neither do they spin." Paul also says, "I would have you without carefulness." These exhortations, rightly applied, do not exclude providence and reasonable preparation, because they are directed against *μεριμνας*, the word translated

care, and meaning anxiety of a worrying kind. But they are capable of misapplication, and have been misapplied by some who have held them to justify absolute shiftlessness and inattention to secular contingencies. The Proverbs supply the antidote to this mistake, even if it were not to be found in the New Testament. They enjoin the exercise of a diligent foresight in our affairs. "Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks, and look well to thy herds."—(xxviii. 23.) "The hand of the diligent maketh rich."—(x. 4.) "The hand of the diligent shall bear rule."—(xii. 24) "The soul of the diligent shall be made fat."—(xiii. 4.) "Seest thou a man diligent in his business: he shall stand before kings."—(xxii. 29.)

On the other side of the question, idleness is held up to reprobation. "The idle soul shall suffer hunger."—(xix. 15.) "The soul of the sluggard desireth and hath nothing."—(xiii. 4.) "Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways to be wise, which having no guide, overseer or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer and gathereth her food in the harvest."—(vi. 6-8.) "The slothful shall be under tribute."—(xii. 24.)

The caviller might contend that this was a case in which one part of the Scriptures taught a different doctrine from another: that Solomon was contradicted by Christ. But it is not so. The principle of prudent foresight and diligent provision is plainly recognised in the New Testament, though not so prominently taught as in the Proverbs. There was more need for the inculcation of faith than industry, because the one comes less naturally than the other; and, therefore, faith is more conspicuously taught, but not at the expense of industry. Industry is also enjoined. Paul says, "If any man work not, neither shall he eat."—(2 Thess. iii. 10) "If any provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and

is worse than an infidel."—(1 Tim. v. 8.) "Provide things honest in the sight of the Lord and in the sight of all men."—(2 Cor. viii. 21.) "Let him labour with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."—(Eph. iv. 28.) Jesus illustrates these injunctions in the command to "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost" (Jno. vi. 12); and also in the words addressed to his apostles when the time had come for a suspension of the miraculous supervision under which they had laboured: "When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, nothing. Then said he unto them, but now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip, and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garments and buy one."—(Luke xxii. 35, 36)

There is a place for faith, viz., where our anxiety can avail nothing. We are to trust that God will bring to pass the provision of all we need, if we confide the matter to Him. At the same time, we are not to relax those efforts upon which He has made the provision to depend in the second place. Any man who neglects these is a breaker of the Word, however much faith he may think he have. The thing to be careful about is to see that our prudence does not degenerate to faithlessness, and interfere with the performance of duty, whether to God or man. God hath united things in certain relations, and what God hath joined, let no man put asunder. Wisdom is the putting of every thing into its right place. Faith does its best without anxiety, and trusts for the rest; the feeling that would leave all to God, is presumption. One thing is the appointment of God as well as another, and we must give all their place. In this, the book of Proverbs is a great help.

While diligence is commended in the Proverbs, diligence to achieve individual wealth is discountenanced and even

condemned. Thus we read "Labour not to be rich . . . wilt thou set thine eyes on that which is not? For riches certainly make to themselves wings and fly away as an eagle toward heaven."—(xxiii. 4, 5.) Again, "A faithful man shall abound with blessings (that is, to others) but he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent."—(xxviii. 20.) Here the spirit by Solomon prevents the prudential maxims from being carried to an extreme. The man who aims to be rich, aims wrongly. He not only aims at a result that will "pierce himself through with many sorrows" even if he succeed, but he encumbers himself with a motive which will paralyse his arm in all directions of duty and goodness, and which will at last sink him in perdition. "Neither poverty nor riches" is the condition commended in the Proverbs—(xxx. 8.) This is in strict harmony with the spirit of the New Testament. Jesus said to his disciples, "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of," and taught them to pray for their daily bread; but on the subject of pursuing riches, he used the parable of the man with the barns, described as a fool, "which had much goods laid up for many years," and whose life was suddenly required of him. Christ's comment on the case is "So is he that layeth up treasure *for himself* and is not rich *towards God*."

There are other matters in which the Proverbs afford checks against extremes. Paul recommends patience with adversaries, exhorting that in meekness we should instruct those who oppose themselves. Jesus commands kindness to all, even the undeserving; and counsels submission to evil, and compliance with request even to the double of what is asked. There is a place for the operation of all of these precepts; but they are misapplied when they are allowed to interfere with the attitude of wisdom presented in these sayings of Solomon: "Go from the presence of a foolish man when thou

perceivest not in him the words of knowledge."—(xiv. 7.) "Speak not in the ears of a fool; for he will despise the wisdom of thy words."—(xxiii. 9.) "Cast out the scorner and contention shall go out; yea, strife and reproach shall cease."—(xxii. 10.) Christ and the apostles are themselves on the side of these counsels. While exhorting us to patience, forbearance, love, kindness, &c., Christ says "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs. Cast not your pearls before swine."—(Matt. vii. 6.) "Beware of false prophets: ye shall know their fruits."—(Matt. vii. 15.) "Let him (a man refusing to reason) be unto thee as a heathen and a publican."—(Matt. xviii. 17.) So also Paul: "Beware of dogs: beware of evil workers."—(Phil. iii. 2.) "Withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly."—(2 Thess. iii. 6.) "False brethren, . . . to whom we gave place by subjection no not for an hour."—(Gal. ii. 5.) "Of some have compassion, making a difference: others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted with the flesh."—(Jude 23.) On the same principle, we are commanded to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and to have no fellowship with any who subvert the doctrine of the apostles in faith or practice. The two sets of precepts are not inconsistent though made so in the practice of some. Our kindness may abound with a plenteousness that goes beyond the requests of those who ask us, and we may exercise a patience as nearly unwearying as may be, and a magnanimity that shall be godlike towards the evil and erring, without taking fools into our bosom or suffering the highest interests of ourselves and others to be endangered by a weak friendship for those whose ways decline to death.

So also on the subject of knowledge. There is a relation of things in which "knowledge puffeth up," and in which

"if any man thinketh he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know."—(1 Cor. viii. 2.) At the same time it is true, and Solomon helps us to the recognition of it, "that the soul should be without knowledge is not good."—(Prov. xix. 2.) "A man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels."—(i. 5.) "When wisdom entereth into thine heart and knowledge is pleasant unto thy soul, discretion shall preserve thee, understanding shall keep thee."—(ii. 10-11.)

The same thing is testified by the prophets and the apostles. In Hosea we read (iv. 6), "My people is destroyed for lack of knowledge:" in Isaiah, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many."—(liii. 11.) Paul says, "ignorance" alienates the Gentiles from the life of God (Eph. iv. 18), but that the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ is a saving power.—(2 Cor. iv. 3-5.) The day of Christ is a day in which "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord."—(Isaiah xi. 9.) "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of His times."—(Isa. xxiii. 6.)

On many other subjects, there is the same clear guidance in the Proverbs on points on which men are liable and have run into extremes. There is no conflict between what Solomon says and what the Spirit of wisdom inculcates through other instruments; only some phases and matters are more distinctly put in the Proverbs, and by this, wise men are held at their equilibrium. There are those who are not wise, because they obey not the command by Solomon which says, "Incline thine ear to wisdom; apply thine heart to understanding; seek her as silver; search for her as for hid treasure." Some never are able to rightly divide the word of truth, but are always stumbling on appearances of discrepancy and conflict, and incline to the side of such as scorn the Word. Sympathising with the scorner, they experience the fate of

scorners. Solomon says, "The scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not, but knowledge is easy unto him that understandeth."—(xiv. 6.) The inability of this class to find wisdom is not altogether due to incapacity. God stands in their way as the angel did in Balaam's. "Surely He scorneth the scorners, but He giveth grace unto the lowly."—(iii. 34.) God is only to be found of those who seek Him in an earnest and diligent manner. This is testified many times in the Word. "Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to you."—(Jas. iv. 8.) "Ye shall seek Me and find Me when ye shall search for Me with all your heart."—(Jer. xxix. 13.) "If thou seek Him, He will be found of thee, but if thou forsake Him, He will cast thee off."—(1 Chron. xxviii. 9.) These features find their expression in the words of Christ: "Except a man receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." A simple, docile, childlike, disinterested, unbiassed and perfectly candid and earnest desire and search for truth is essential to the acquisition of Divine wisdom. To any other state of mind, the fountain is sealed. It is easy for God to draw the veil without a man knowing it. In this way, He has blinded Israel, and thus He blinds many a man who scornfully seeketh wisdom, but findeth it not.

The Proverbs resemble every other part of the oracles of God as regards the nature and origin of the wisdom set forth. They are not like the systems of the ancients (though by the way, Solomon is more ancient than any of them). These, who are spoken of as "the wise," made wisdom a mere matter of observing nature and speculating on the *modus operandi* of her operations. They did not know God and could know nothing of His revelation and His superintendence and purposes as the principal element of wisdom. Hence their wisdom is foolishness for all practical purposes. It is

thin, watery, tasteless, powerless stuff. There is nothing in common between the philosophers and Solomon. Solomon has nothing to say for "philosophy" - which in truth is a glorified abstraction, having no existence except in the language and brains of those who know nothing of true wisdom. He mounts as high as heaven, and puts his finger so to speak, on the only source of wisdom. "The Lord giveth wisdom; out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding." - (ii. 6) "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." - (i. 7; ix. 10.) "The fear of the Lord is a fountain of life" - (xiv. 27.) "Be thou in the fear of the Lord all the day long." - (xxiii. 17.) "It shall be well with them that fear God" - (Ecc. viii. 12.) "Fear God and do His commandments; this is the whole duty of man." - (Ecc. xii. 13.)

Here is a feature peculiar to the Bible alone. In the Bible only is God's view of the case made a practical element of behaviour and destiny. "The Lord loveth him that followeth after righteousness;" the prayer of the upright is His delight. - (Prov. xv. 9, 8) "The Lord is far from the wicked, but He heareth the prayer of the righteous." - (29) "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord." - (xvi. 5.) And surely God's view of a case is the most important fact concerning it; for with Him is the power to raise up or to cast down, to save or to kill, to confer good or render evil. Since all things are of Him and in His hand, it is no mere religious extravagance (so called), but the sober truth to say that His fear is the beginning of all knowledge and wisdom. The philosophy that excludes this is a philosophy of human pride, and a philosophy lacking the very core of truth. Men like to glorify themselves by the investigation and promulgation of what is. But the glory even of this is to Him whom they forget, in whose hand their breath is, and whose are even the little

and vain efforts by which they presume to construct a system of wisdom without God in it. And of what avail, as a matter of wisdom, is the knowledge of what is (as presented in science and philosophy), as compared with a knowledge of the pleasure of Him who has power to change what is, and who has declared His purpose so to do, as regards both the righteous and the wicked?

This is the most beautiful feature of the Proverbs, their constant fundamental dependence on the future dispensation of God's power in the destiny of man. Some think the Proverbs of a merely secular application, that is, that their wisdom depends upon considerations limited to the present life. That they are profitable for the life that now is, is true, as it is also true of the gospel (1 Tim. iv. 8), but that their chief bearing is towards that coming arrangement of things upon earth which has been the purpose of God from the beginning, will not be denied by those who have pondered the following sayings: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death." - (xiv. 32.) "When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish, and the hope of unjust men perisheth . . . but to him that soweth righteousness shall be a sure reward." - (xi. 7, 18.) "The lip of truth shall be established for ever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment." - (xii. 19.) "The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and sinner." - (xi. 31.) "The house of the wicked shall be overthrown; but the tabernacle of the upright shall flourish." - (xiv. 11) "Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed; but he that feareth the commandments shall be rewarded." - (xiii. 13.) "As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more; but the righteous is an everlasting foundation. The righteous shall never be removed; but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth." - (x. 25, 30) "The upright shall dwell in the land and the perfect

shall remain in it. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it."—(ii. 21-22)

It is an illustration of the unity that characterises the oracles of God, that all these things should be appropriate to the table of the Lord around which we are assembled. There is no breach in the divine circle. Solomon is one with Christ, even as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, who will sit down together in the kingdom of God. The reason is that it is one God, who spake by

them all. "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"—(Heb. i. 1.) This makes all the difference between the wisdom of the Bible and the wisdom of "the wise" of this world. In the one is light and harmony; in the other, darkness on the highest problems. Let us walk in the light and rejoice in the light that we may be children of light, both now and in the glorious age to come.

EDITOR.

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13. 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

OF two millions of children of schooling age in Hungary, 50,000 are Jews.

A Jew, named Moses Seligmann, has just completed his 102nd year in Altona.

The Queen has approved of the appointment of Baron A. de Rothschild as Consul General in London for His Majesty the Emperor of Austria.

DISTRESS IN JERUSALEM.—There is great distress, says the *Habuaaleth*, in the Holy City, for the latter rain has as yet failed to refresh the ground. Water rises in price, and a bad harvest is apprehended. Prayers for rain have been offered up in all the synagogues.

JEWISH APPOINTMENT.—Mr. Morris Samuel, a Jew, of Bendigo, Australia, was, on the 22nd December last, sworn in as a Justice of the Peace. A local journal observes that the "appointment of Mr. Samuel to the commission of the peace has given great satisfaction. He is one of our oldest residents, and is held in universal and deserved esteem."

ROYAL FAVOUR TO THE JEWS.—The Emperor William has just performed what the Berlin journals designate "an act of truly royal munificence" towards the Jewish community at Potsdam. The cemetery of that community, situated in the Pfingetberg, adjoins a Royal park. The cemetery urgently requiring extension, the Emperor has, on an application of the community, ordered an offer to be made to the Jews of a plot of sufficient size to be detached from the park, which the Jews may and will purchase at a nominal price.

THE JEWS OF SALONICA.—An Alexandrian paper observes: "Salonica has a general population of 100,000 inhabitants, 17,000 of whom are Jews of Spanish origin. It may be that the number of the latter is still greater. But as this community has to pay very large imposts, it has an interest in throwing a veil over its numerical force. Jewish parents there are only bound to support their children till they are thirteen years old. When they are grown up, they

are invited by the elders to marry; widowers, too, receive similar intimations. "Such matrimonial zeal" (says the *Jewish Chronicle*) produces its fruit.

THE JEWS IN ROME.—There is considerable agitation among the Jews in the capital of Italy. Although the Jews may now reside in any part of the city, yet the poorer classes among them still cling to the Ghetto, for the simple reason, that while house-rent is very high in the city, and is constantly rising, the rents in the Ghetto, in conformity with an ancient privilege, called "Jus Gazaga," (קזיקא) cannot be raised. So highly prized was this right among them, that it not rarely formed the only marriage portion of a maiden. In the year 1870 the Government appointed a commission to inquire into the nature of this right. Nothing was done at the time. Now, however, the commission charged with secularising the ecclesiastical property has reopened this question. The abolition of this privilege without a compensation, would be a heavy blow to the material interest of the inmates of the Ghetto, who might receive notice to quit from the Christian owners of the house (the Jews, under the Papal Government were not allowed to hold any landed property), or would have to pay much higher rents.

THE JEWS IN TUNIS.—In an annual consular report from Tunis, just presented to Parliament, the following passage occurs: "The bazaars of Tunis are inferior to those of Cairo and Damascus, but considerable trade is carried on in them in articles of native industry, and in Manchester goods and French silks. About 30,000 of its inhabitants belong to the Jewish community, which comprises some wealthy merchants, brokers and shopkeepers. Their affairs are generally administered by a Caid or Governor appointed by the Bey, and selected from amongst the most respectable of their co-religionists, who have sometimes been raised to the grade of a General. The community possess 111 synagogues. The Chief Rabbi receives a commission from the Bey, conferring on him extensive powers in question of marriage, divorce, wills, and successions. They are placed on precisely the same footing as the Mahomedan subjects of the State, and except in matters of police, the government abstains from all interference in their local affairs, and many of their number hold public offices of trust and confidence."

THE PRESENT CONTRASTED WITH THE PAST POSITION OF THE JEWS.

The *Inquirer* (quoted by the *Jewish Chronicle*), remarks: "No race, it has been said, better adapts itself to circumstances,

(than the Jewish,) yet no race more resists circumstances in change of character, or character or faith. The Jew makes himself everywhere at home, in great cities or small cities, in wealthy communities or poor, yet remains the same person in all, not to be mistaken for those with whom he dwells. He adapts himself perfectly to exigencies of time and place, but preserves his nationality amidst all the diversities of his lot.

The remarkable progress of the Jewish community in modern times—the striking change in their position and prospects, and in the public sentiment regarding them—is very well set forth in an interesting article in the February number of our ably-conducted contemporary, the *Unitarian Review*, on 'the characteristics of the Jewish race.' The writer informs us that nothing in our time is more remarkable than the change in the kind of interest which is taken in the fortune and character of the Hebrew race. For ages Christians have had rather an archaeological heed of the people who were their religious ancestors, and have limited their concern to the religious books and the ancient doings of a nation, once the people of God, but who forfeited their right by the rejection of the Christ, and virtually became heathen. Since that fatal act of impiety the Jews have been as good as dead to a vast majority of the Christian world, and have been known only as subjects of persecution and outrage of every kind, illustrating in their fate the sure divine vengeance upon wickedness. A hundred years ago the praise of a Jew by a Christian would have brought suspicion upon the Christian, and almost have condemned him as a blasphemer and an infidel. In the middle ages, the Jew was the type of all that was mean, false, treacherous, and infamous. His squalid garb, his cringing gait, his malignant leer, his avaricious heart, were the marks of the satirists and the proof for the preachers of the justice of an offended God. The Jew had no rights that Christians were bound to respect. He was an outlaw, only tolerated from prudence or policy. He could be abused in his person, robbed of his purse, driven like a frog from his home, could be spit upon, beaten, burned, with no one to defend him, or even to pity him. To call a Christian 'Jew' was the height of insult. The foot of a Christian was polluted in crossing the threshold of a Jew, or the barrier of his quarter in the cities. It was sacrilege for a Christian to marry the daughter of the hated race. Kings and lords might use the rich Hebrews for the necessities of luxury and war; but the convenience of their loans did not bring more consideration for their lineage. Shakespeare in the Shylock, Walter Scott in his Isaac of York, have not overdrawn

the scorn and contempt which followed the Jew in former centuries.

But all that is strangely changed. The lost honour of the Jews has been restored. The persecutions have ceased. In most civilised lands the Jews stand equal with the Christians, with the same rights, the same privileges, with as good consideration from the rulers, and less harmed by bigotry than the Christian sects around them. They are in the high places of trust and power—ministers of finance, ministers of education, peers of the realm, mayors of great cities, senators in the assembly, close counsellors of the kings. Their worship is recognised as lawful, and even supported by largess from the State as much as Catholic or Protestant worship. In the very land where they were once fiercely hated and driven, their synagogues now surpass in splendour the most costly of the Christian temples. In Berlin, the Hebrew temple to day is larger than the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, and has beauties which the Temple of Solomon could not show. In America, in New York and Cincinnati, and in many more places, the synagogues rival the grandest of Christian structures, and they stand proudly on the corners of the principal streets. The Jews now claim their full share of public duties and public rewards. They seek offices and they get offices. They supervise the doings of Christians in Boards of Trade and in Boards of Instruction. The Rabbi may be on the committee in a school where the words of Jesus and the story of the Crucifixion are read by the teachers to the pupils. The secular and sectarian journals chronicle the acts of the Jews as carefully and candidly as they chronicle the acts of any Christian sect; give abstracts of their synagogue sermons, reports of their solemn feasts and fasts, their Passover and Pentecost, and their Yom Kippur and their joyous Purim, as much as of the Christian Christmas and Lent and Easter. In the almanacs the Jewish calendar accompanies the Christian. The Jewish newspapers abound, and in vigour and variety compare favourably with the Christian weeklies, and furnish edifying reading to the disciples of Jesus. If they have in our land no university as yet, the Jews have famous seminaries in other lands, and the sons of their race bear off high honours in the Christian colleges.

So silently has this change in the position of the Jewish community of late years been brought about, that it seems to have attracted very little notice. It has been accepted as matter of course—as one of the changes of recent times, one of the developments of modern life. In this country the only marked notice taken was when the Jews were admitted to Parliament, a measure of civil justice which met with

strenuous resistance from the Christian bigotry and exclusive Toryism of the day. We can all see now that the measure, which was denounced at the time as ‘unchristianising the constitution,’ was in perfect accord with all the other changes and progress which distinguished recent times, and was a simple act of justice to the long oppressed Jewish community, and a tardy recognition of their rights, as citizens of the State, equally with all other subjects of the Queen. No one, we presume, would think for a moment of repealing the Act which gave them admission to the great council of the nation. It marked an important step in the advance of the country towards the goal of political equality.

Secure of their political rights, the Jews have been turning their attention to questions of internal reform, and to matters affecting their own organisation, as the education of their ministers and their public religious services. They are keen observers of what is passing around them, and the reforms going on in other communions led them to consider what improvements may be needful in their own church.”

THE JEWS AS A POWER IN EUROPE.

During the past month, an extraordinary assembly has taken place in France. Technically, it was “a general assembly of the Catholic Committees of France;” but actually, it was a meeting of the authorities of the Papal world to devise measures for securing the ascendancy of the Church in all the kingdoms of the Beast-dominion. The assembly was divided into nine bureaux or committees, each with a separate phase of the general question to consider and report upon. One of them was charged to deliberate on the best means of counteracting Jewish influence in the press of Europe. The Paris correspondent of the *Daily News*, speaking on this point, says:—

“A great rival to Ultramontanism in Germany and Italy, and even in Russia, is found in the Jews, who direct most of the newspapers in these countries. The Israelitish people are harder to make head against than the Protestant communities, inasmuch as they form a wealthy and strongly-knit and international body. Individual members of the great Jewish family are under the eyes of their consistories, and accept from them an impulsion hostile to the spirit of the syllabus. They are bound together by a religion at once ritualistic and rational, by a sentiment of fraternity, and by the still fresh recollection of the persecu-

tions they endured for ages, in Mahometan and Roman Catholic States. How to keep down this growing rival will be anxiously debated. The Jesuits, for many years, have promoted marriages between Jewish heiresses and the heads of ancient aristocratic families. The wealth of a Hamburg banker, of Israelitish race, gilds the strawberry leaves of the ducal coronet of the Richelieus. The daughter of Mirès espoused a Prince de Polignac. Such alliances, however, have been since the falling through of the fusion, less frequent in France than they were under the Empire. One of the reasons is that the fainter the prospect becomes of a court, the more depreciated in the market are nobiliary titles. Another is the growing power of the Jews, who, in this country, where they are under no disability, are distinguishing themselves at the bar, in literature, fine arts, and more particularly in the medical profession."

Nothing could be more indicative of the great change that has taken place in the position of the Jews than the fact that a Papal conclave should have to devise how to check their influence. Such an event is unprecedented since Jerusalem was levelled with the dust by Titus. The *Jewish Chronicle* remarks thus on the circumstance:

"The Jewish people have just been the recipient of a mark of distinction, if not of honour, such as has never before been conferred on it. A general assembly of the Catholic Committees of France under the honorary presidency of Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, has among other things also deliberated on the means to be adopted in order to counteract Jewish influence on the civilised world and Jewish opposition to the syllabus. In another column will be found the extensive programme of the conclave, which aims at nothing else than at reforming the map of Europe, pulling down empires and raising up others, and rendering the Pope virtual ruler of the universe. We need hardly add that an assembly carrying on its deliberations in the palace of the Archbishop of Paris, and under his auspices, possesses the sympathy of the clericalism of the world, the blessing of the God's vice-regent on earth, and, if needs be, their active co-operation.

We have characterised the conspicuous introduction of the Jewish people into this programme as a mark of distinction, if not of honour. A comparison of Israel's history in the past with the present will bring this out clearly. Time was—and this not so very long ago—when a good Christian would have deemed a moment bestowed on the consideration of anything connected with Jews or Judaism as a pure loss of time, as an unpardonable waste.

Attention to such matters was *infra dig.*, and quite unbecoming a true Catholic. A Jew might be kicked just as a dog is when he happens to be in the way. But beyond this he deserves no further notice.

In the Middle Ages, it is true, Jews very often formed the objects of grave and lengthy deliberations in synods, and mitred priests met in solemn conclave to take sweet counsel together how to treat the blasphemous Jew. Not because he was dreaded, for he had no more power for mischief than has the worm trodden upon. But the Christian world had to be shown with what terrible weight Heaven's revenge had fallen upon the decidual race; how it was accursed and crushed for its criminal daring in refusing to admit with its lips what it could not believe in its heart. A whipping-boy for mankind was required. The mirror was to be held up to it, that it might see what its lot would be should it follow the example of the unbelieving Jew. So means had to be devised for torturing him in body and debasing him in soul in order to be able to turn round upon him and say, you villains, you deserve your fate, for you are vile and corrupt.

But it is different with the conclave sitting now. It no longer affects to despise, but to dread the Jew. It is moved to action, not so much by hatred to him as by jealousy of him. It acknowledges in him a power capable of resisting it. This is an immense progress for the Jew. The distance intervening between contempt and hatred, and between it and jealousy, is immeasurable. The Jew must in the interval have risen immensely in public estimation, to have become an object of fear to that universal and most powerful organisation—perhaps the most powerful in the world—represented and governed by the clericals. On this rise we venture to congratulate the Jewish community, and in its formal acknowledgment by a great organisation which never desires to fight pigmies, we perceive that mark of distinction conferred on Israel to which we referred."

Having pointed out that the Jews are not so united and powerful as the enemies imagine, the *Chronicle* proceeds:

"We must await in patience the result of the deliberations, as they will manifest themselves in the conduct of the clericals against the Jews. We have only one comfort in this tribulation. We do not stand alone. We are in good company. Prince Bismark, the Emperor William and King Victor Emanuel sit on the felons' bench with us. The whole Liberal party stands behind us, of which we are only the vanguard, the thin edge of the massive wedge which it is thought to blunt. By lumping us together with the millions which are against the clericals, millions are

made our fellows and therefore our defenders.

The clericals may succeed in harassing us. They may vex, provoke and even injure individuals amongst us. They may even in some particularly benighted places rouse popular fanaticism, and incite the mass to deeds of violence against outlying Jewish congregations. They may vent their spite on the dead by desecrating Jewish burial grounds and destroying tombstones, if they cannot on the living. They may be successful in a few skirmishes. But the decisive battle they cannot win. *Nulla vestigia retrorsum.* Not even in France can what has been done be altogether undone. The rights granted to the Jews cannot again be taken from them without such a commotion as would subvert the whole social frame. The hawks may sit in council; but the doves are no longer as defenceless as they were before."

Exactly. Israel rises from the downtreading of ages to be ready for the summons which they will shortly receive from the Son of David, to return to the land of their fathers, and be once more the battle-axe of Jehovah, in conflict with the Gentiles, whose cup of wickedness is full, and whose day of retribution is at the door.

But the Jews need take no credit for the fact. Their humiliation for past generations has been the work of God, operating through human action, providentially controlled; and their emancipation by the same means is from the same hand—not, however, for their sakes—this is plainly declared (Ezek. xxxvi. 32); but for the sake of the great work about to be done in the earth, for the exaltation of Jehovah's name, and the consummation of the divine purpose, in the blessing of all mankind in Abraham. It is cheering to see Israel's rise, because it is a sign of the nearness of this great result; but if we confine our view to either Jew or Gentile in the matter, we shall reap nothing but desolation of spirit.

THE COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE.

The *Jewish Chronicle* remarks as follows on the intimation that the Turkish government is taking into consideration the application of Jewish holders of Turkish bonds, for land in Palestine in exchange:

"The news that the Porte has taken into consideration the proposal of taking in payment her bonds for land that might be purchased in Syria, has a peculiar signifi-

cancy. The suggestion was made in these columns in the name of Jews living in the Holy Land. It was made soon after the purchase of a large number of shares in the Suez Canal by a prime minister of Jewish descent, who boasts of his extraction, whereby England's spiritual and abstract interest in those regions has been greatly increased and intensified by one of great magnitude of a purely material nature. It was, moreover made at a time when the creation of the Sir Moses Montefiore Testimonial Fund had conspicuously directed the attention of the Jewish body to the land of its ancestors; and when the depreciation of the securities of Turkey, owing to her default, may induce many to convert their bonds into land in Syria, who otherwise might not have given a thought to the proposal. There seems to be something providential, by way of eminence, in all these coincidences. Devout minds will not fail to perceive in this the finger of God. And there can be no doubt that should the Porte agree to the proposal—and we cannot see why the Porte should not give consent—large tracts of land would be purchased by Jews in the Holy Land. An impulse might be given to Jewish immigration, not by those who desire to end their days in the land of the patriarchs and prophets and to mingle their dust with that of these holy personages, but of such as might wish to live in it and to establish there their homesteads. We will not pry into the designs of Providence. In due time the veil will be lifted and we shall see the fresh developments in store for us. At the present moment it appears to us that the design Providence seems to work at would be best promoted if, in the dissolution of the Turkish empire, which cannot be so very far off, England were impelled to extend her protecting hand over Syria. No contingency would be hailed by the Jewish people with greater satisfaction than such a turn of affairs in the East. England has given so many proofs of her friendly feeling towards the Jewish people, that they could not wish to see the land of their forefathers under a safer keeper than that of Great Britain. Whatever government is in power, whether it be Liberal or Conservative, there is no difference in its behaviour to the Jews. Lord Derby is just as prone to take up their cause as was Earl Granville. And if the English are not the brethren of the

Jews according to the flesh, as is contended by those who maintain that the Anglo-Saxons are descended from the ten tribes, they certainly act towards them as unknown in spirit and feeling. We have given expression to our heartfelt wishes in this matter. But

Providence will, of course, go its own way. We must quietly await the disentanglement of the complications becoming thicker and thicker in the East. The solution of the problem cannot be delayed much longer."

THE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST.

BROTHER J. J. Andrew writes: "I was glad to see that correspondence on the "Obedience of Christ" in the *March Christadelphian*, and trust that it will be beneficial in shewing some the scriptural teaching on the subject. It involves precisely the same principle as that which is contained in the long-vexed question of predestination. Where God's will ends and man's will begins may be difficult, if not impossible, accurately to define; but that they exist and operate simultaneously there can be no doubt. The nearest illustration of this subject—though that is necessarily imperfect—is to be found in the relationship existing between a father and his son. They each possess an independent will, but the former, by the superiority of his wisdom, is able to mould the latter's mind and actions, and bring his son's will into harmony with his own. How much more can He who has created the mind and knows it more perfectly than any human father, so influence and guide His children by the circumstances in which He places them, that almost imperceptibly their wills are subjected to His—not constrainedly, but voluntarily, and without depriving them of responsibility or freedom of thought. He knows perfectly the strength and weakness of every man, and can, therefore, devise the means suitable for influencing each in the required direction. This subject can be best understood by those who, like Christ, have gone through suffering for the truth's sake, and have also been

able to see the hand of God in the whole history of their lives.

The existence of a will independent of God's will does not, as one of your correspondents argues, signify the commencement of an action antagonistic to God. It simply implies the existence of a power to act either in harmony with or in opposition to the Father. This, in fact, is essential to a distinct individuality. To teach that Jesus Christ had no will of his own is, in effect, to affirm that he had no individuality distinct from his Heavenly Father's.

He encloses a cutting from the *Christian Standard*, as illustrative of the orthodox nature of the no-will doctrine. The writer quotes a statement emanating from a certain Union Conference to the following effect:—

"We teach also, that as Christ had a will *distinct* from the Father, so also has the believer; and that as Christ's will was not absorbed in His Father's will, but was subject to and acquiescent in it, so also the believer's will should be, at all times."

On this, the writer remarks: "This is a most extraordinary, and we must add, a very unscriptural way of representing the will of the Father and the will of the Son. The will of Christ, instead of being distinct from the will of God, was always, as we understand, the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject, identically the same. It was so when Christ said, 'I and my Father are one;' and

again, 'I delight to do Thy will, O my God.' Christ's will was then, and at all times, the same as that of God. The idea of a distinction between the will of the Father and the will of the Son, appears to us to be incompatible with the perfect Godhead of Christ. Viewing Christ in the perfect divinity of His nature, there must have been from all eternity, as there will be to all eternity, the most complete harmony between the will of the Father and of the Son. Hence Christ, while saying, in His mediatorial capacity, that he came to do the will of his Father, could at

the same time say, when addressing God, and speaking of His disciples: 'I will that they also whom Thou hast given me may be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory.' It appears to us a most dangerous doctrine to dwell on an assumed distinction between the will of the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. Both were, in that respect, as in all other respects, in perfect harmony together. But the subject is one on which we are afraid to enter. It is too deep for creature comprehension." So says the orthodox editor of the *Christian Standard*.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.--(Heb. ii. 11.)

JUNE, 1876.

In the absence of Christ, it is the fate of the truth to suffer the contempt of which he himself was the subject in the days of his flesh. This contempt takes many shapes, and springs from various causes. There is a contempt that will always be shown independent of particular occasions. The natural mind is alien from God and has an instinctive aversion to anything that brings Him near and involves Him. Consequently, the sure word of prophecy, in all circumstances and ages, is looked on with disfavour and repugnance by those who have neither the fear nor love of God before their eyes, but who appropriate their own existence to themselves as the beasts do.

But there are particular occasions of contempt, and these seem to be permitted, (and perhaps contrived), as part of the trial-state which prevails for true men till the day of Christ arrives. We have recently had to consider the Thurman contempt which set the buffoon on the broad grin throughout the world. The truth was in no ways responsible for the contempt, but still it comes in for a large share of it. So with the Dr. Cumming contempt, which has been brought before the world during the last

month by the *Daily Telegraph*. This is not so gross an instance as the other, but still it tends powerfully to harden the already indurated heart of a faithless generation, towards the oracles of God and the purpose announced in them concerning the nations of the earth.

Dr. Cumming was at Sheffield lecturing, and took occasion to point to the state of Turkey as a fulfilment of his prophetic interpretations. He said Turkey was doomed, and advised his hearers to have nothing to do with Turkish bonds. He said if the holders of Turkish bonds had looked into the Apocalypse, they would never have bought them. He himself had never been guilty of buying a Turkish bond; in this, the study of the Apocalypse had been an advantage to him (or something to that effect). He then indulged in some of those highly-coloured and grandiloquent generalities, in which he is more prone to indulge than in sober demonstration of the truth by the Word. They were to the effect that it was sublime to see the governments of the world unconsciously carrying out the programme of prophecy—a programme which had been sketched in advance with the minutest detail, &c.

Down came the papers on this, of course, in their highest style of sarcastic banter. If the Apocalypse has been of such use to Dr. Cumming in the matter of Turkish bonds, they crave, on behalf of a bewildered public, a little light on Egyptians, Peruvians and some other bonds that are in

doubt. We know Turkey is going, said they; anybody can see that. Let us know something about countries that don't seem particularly going one way or other. And then, they added, if all human events are so distinctly mapped out in prophecy, why is there no word about America, the Southern rebellion, the Ashantee war, &c.? all of which, of course, is very telling with the general public. It goes down with them as one of the best jokes of the day. It is telling not only against Dr. Cumming, but against the subject of prophecy with which his name is popularly identified. It helps the popular aversion against the prophetic word: not that this is a legitimate or logical result. The Scriptures are not responsible for Dr. Cumming's eccentricities and exaggerations. Prophecy is not a foretelling of everything that is going to happen. It is not a "fortune-teller" or astrologer, who proposes to gratify curiosity. So far from "mapping-out history" beforehand in the minutest detail, it takes no notice at all of the great mass of events. It deals only with God's purpose in connection with the fathers and their seed—Israel, whom He has chosen as the basis of his plan. It is confined to the channel of Christ's appointed work on earth. It deals with other nations and their doings only in so far as they bear on this work; and even these it foreshadows in general outlines only, and not with the "minutest detail." The object is to furnish those who are waiting on God with great leading signmarks by which they may recognise His hand at work, and be cheered by a knowledge of their whereabouts in the working out of the scheme, His great promised work of goodness.

It is a trial to see the matter so entirely misrepresented by those who stand before the world as its representatives; and the shout of derision that flies through the embattled ranks of unbelief is hard to bear. But we must bear it as appointed. It will not interfere with the purpose of God, while perhaps it strengthens our hold on that purpose, and at all events gives us an opportunity of meanwhile fellowshipping the sufferings of Christ—a bitter experience now, but the preliminary and preparation for a day of gladness such as has never yet caused human heart to bound for joy.

SPIRITUALISM A DELUSION.

There were great expectations among the Spiritualists when a scientific commission was appointed some time ago at St. Petersburg to investigate the claims of Spiritualism. The report of the commission has just been issued; but the result is the most damaging blow the delusion has yet sustained. The St. Petersburg correspondent of the *Standard*, writing April 12th, says: "The conclusion at which the commission arrived is not favourable to Spiritualism. They say that the phenomena produced by the imposition of hands are the result of conscious or unconscious muscular movement, to explain which it is not necessary to admit the existence of a new force. Such phenomena as the raising of tables, or the motion of various objects behind curtains, or in the dark, are evidently acts of imposture; and when sufficient means are adopted to prevent deceit, either the phenomena are not produced at all or the deception is unmasked. The same is said of sounds, of the appearance of human forms, &c. In these manifestations, says the report, the Spiritualists take advantage of the unconscious and involuntary movements of those who are present, and of the credulity of honest but superficial persons who, suspecting no imposture, take no measures to prevent it. Taking into consideration all that they had heard and seen, the members of the commission unanimously arrived at the conclusion that Spiritual phenomena are caused by unconscious movements or by imposture, and that the Spiritual doctrine is a form of superstition. The report is signed by eleven professional men, all well known in St. Petersburg, who have made a special study of physical science."

The *Jewish Chronicle* some time ago had the following good remarks on the general subject:—

"Did the code of Moses govern this country or the United States—the strongholds of Spiritualism—the Spiritualists would not be allowed to play their pranks. Spiritualism is only another name of necromancy, and necromancy is strictly forbidden by the law of God. Not because there is anything in necromancy, but precisely because there is nothing in it, the whole thing being either a deception or delusion. Every Spiritualist according to the Mosaic code is either a dupe or impostor, and every medium another witch of En-dor. Did these views generally

prevail many a soul now languishing and dragging out its dreary existence in the darkness and horrors of a mad-house would have been preserved from this abyss; and the well-known socialist and would-be benefactor of mankind, Mr. Robert Owen Dale, would not be ending a stirring yet mistaken life in the night of a lunatic asylum. Mr. Owen unfortunately having more faith in his own light than in the Word of God, allowed himself to be deluded by the performances of the impostor 'Katie King,' who as known, carried on the Spiritualistic game in the United States, Owen's adopted country. He embraced the faith of the medium with all the ardour which characterised his susceptible mind, and wrote for the *Atlantic Monthly* an elaborate article in favour of these delusions. But just before the appearance of the *Monthly* the bubble burst. The septuagenarian Owen hearing of the confession of 'Katie King,' immediately telegraphed to the editor of the *Monthly* requesting him to keep his article out. But it was too late. The article proving that 'Katie King' was a spirit, and 'Katie's' confession of imposture appeared in the same journal side by side. This was too much for the old man. The nervous shock was too great. Poor Owen's mind gave way, and he is now hopelessly insane. Spiritualism in England has also had its victims, (and we regret to add also one or two in our own community) but none so well known as Robert Owen. Will his fate be a warning to a credulous public?"

THE BREWING TROUBLES OF THE FOURTH BEAST DOMINION.

A correspondent sends an extract from an address issued during last month by Cardinal Cullen, of Dublin, styling it laconically but truthfully, "the true testimony of a liar." It is to the following effect: "The world is now filled with alarming rumours of war, and there is danger that the millions of armed men, which are so heavy a burden on the nations of Europe, will be soon engaged in deadly strife, and the earth purpled with torrents of human blood. The iniquities which abound in the world, and the recklessness with which religion is publicly assailed, and the authority of the Creator ignored, give us reason to fear these and other scourges."

During the past month, the friends of the Papacy throughout Europe have held a conclave in France, to concert measures to restore Papal influence on the Continent.

The means they propose to employ are all peaceful on the surface, yet such as are calculated to lead to revolution and turmoil. One of the principal means is the employment of an already formed society, literally called the Jesus-carpenter Society. This association has been founded with the object of substituting Catholic for non-Catholic sovereigns on all the thrones of the kingdoms. The correspondent of the *Daily News* says:—

"Prince Bismarck accordingly has his eye upon it. His agents here have brought to light certain documents revealing its aims. These papers at first were not taken seriously, but they have since been found authentic, and they are now avowed by the clerical prints. Nursery maids, chamberlains, ladies of honour, and court favourites are the choice instruments with which 'Jesus-Roi' operates in trying to convert heretical princes. When unbelieving monarchs are found incorrigible he will work with 'Jésu-Ouvrier' to pull them down and set up true believers in their stead. The experiences of 1848 and 1852 are encouraging to these societies. In the days of February the clergy hastened to bless trees of liberty. They saw with joy the overthrow of the Voltairian Louis Philippe. The Coup d'Etat rendered them jubilant. It placed on the throne a Prince whom they imagined must depend on them. When he attempted to emancipate himself they coalesced with his revolutionary enemies, and they certainly showed skill in getting a clerical assembly elected at the end of the Franco-Prussian war. 'Jésus-Roi' originated at a meeting at the Réservoirs in 1872, at which some Extreme Right deputies and Carlists had assembled to take council with each other about the speediest means of deposing King Amadeus, and giving the crown to the Legitimist pretender. An association was formed, which has extended its roots far and wide since M. Thiers was turned out of office, and a devout Catholic appointed to succeed him. Alfonso vainly struggled against the favourite of 'Jésus-Roi.' The Carlist war might still be going on had not the Countess of Girgenti been sent to Madrid to give pledges of obedience to the Clergy, and to prepare the way for Isabella's return."

One decision of the assembly was to promote religious pilgrimages as an aid to political objects. The results to which these pilgrimages lead, and indeed the bitterness and desperation of the suppressed war of which the holding of this assembly is a part, are illustrated in the following newspaper comments quoted in the *Rock*, on the latest pilgrimages in Belgium, which

Prince Bismark strove to repress. This is the language of a Catholic paper:—

“Belgium must be cured by a bath of blood. She must be scourged in order that she may return to the truth. . . . The responsibility for this state of things falls chiefly on those proud ones who, under the false name of Liberals, have cried, ‘Let Belgium perish if we cannot govern her.’ It falls also, in great measure, on the Catholics, who have too long wished to live in peace with their born enemies, and to make concessions in order to avoid conflict. Some call this prudence, but its true name is cowardice.”

To this the Liberal journals respond as follows.—

“Civil war, dost thou wish it, Loyola? Be it so, we are ready, but it is to exterminate thee. Come with thy hordes, if thou darest; we will slay thee. Return, and thou wilt see ‘*la canaille Liberale*’ at its work. Return, and blood shall flow in torrents; thou shalt bathe thy flock in it. We await thee.”

On this the *Times* remarks:—

“Recent events have more than ever brought the Papacy before the eyes of men as a political power—something which is to interfere in the lives of nations, which is to be an ally to one, a relentless foe to another. All the old conventions and compromises, by which old-fashioned Catholicism contrived to live in peace with rival systems appear to have been overthrown. Throughout the Continent people are saying that the Ultramontanes have a hand in every intrigue; that there is settled mischief in the counsels of the Vatican, and that the next war will be so far a religious war that the priesthood, and all who obey them will be found, actively or in sympathy, on the same side. The policy of the Vatican, during these later years, has brought the anti-clerical of Europe into the best company. He was formerly beyond the pale of decorous political society, but now the fierce old radical of the last generation can assail the Church under the august patronage of a German Emperor, and take inspiration from the harangues of the great Bismark himself. The Vatican has given him matter for an endless theme. Encyclical and Syllabus, Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility, La Salette and Lourdes, together with a perpetual stream of allocutions, rescripts and speeches, each more unaccountably perverse than the last, offer to the opponent of the Church an abundance of material which was wanting in the days when our own Exeter Hall resounded to the denunciations of some vigorous Protestant.”

THE JEWS AND THE FERMENTED WINE QUESTION.

The *Jewish Chronicle* says: “The Temperance Society is agitating for an unfermented cup at the communion, and has lately, for this purpose, issued a circular to a number of clergymen, in which it presses this point on their attention. The circular states that it is “now generally conceded that it was with this kind of wine it (the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper) was first administered, as the Supper was celebrated during the Passover week, at which time every Jew was careful (as he now is) to exclude from his dwelling everything fermented, so that the probability is that unfermented wine could be found in Jerusalem.” Now the Jews, to this day, drink wine during the eve of Passover as they did in the time of Jesus. No Jew in our days makes any distinction in the selection of his wine for the Passover between the fermented and unfermented liquor, although he abstains during the Passover from beer on account of its being fermented. The Biblical prohibition of ferment during Passover according to the Jews only applies to certain cereals, but not to the juice of the grape. The Jews may, in this matter, be mistaken. But such, undoubtedly, is their view at this day, and such was their view in the time of Jesus. How, therefore, can it be maintained that the wine drunk at the Last Supper must necessarily have been unfermented? It is not from the Bible that the desirability of total abstinence can be proved. The Bible teaches temperance, but not abstinence.”

MILTON’S FRIEND AND THE SABBATH.

In a lengthy and well-written letter on the Sunday question, published in the *Full Mall Gazette*, there appears the following passage: “You may remember, perhaps, how Milton’s friend, Eliwood, gives an amusing account of the trouble into which he himself fell by riding abroad on ‘the first day of the week.’ He was stopped at Maidenhead by the watch, and taken before the warden, who was the chief officer of the town. The warden was ‘a budge old man,’ and he told Eliwood that he was ‘either to pay so much money, or lie so many hours in the stocks.’ In the end, finding that Eliwood had no money, he offered to let him off if he would ask forgiveness of God. ‘That,’ said I, ‘I would most willingly do, if I were sensible that, in this case, I had offended Him by breaking any law of His.’ ‘Why,’ said he, ‘do you question that?’ ‘Yes, truly,’ said I, ‘for I do not know that any law of God doth forbid me to ride on

this day!' 'No,' said he, 'that's strange. Where, I wonder, were you bred? You can read, can't you?' 'Yes,' said I, 'that I can.' 'Don't you read, then,' said he, 'the commandment, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labour and do any work?' 'Yes,' replied I, 'I have both read it often, and remember it very well. But that command was given to the Jews, not to Christians; and this is not that day, for that was the seventh day, but this is the first.' 'Now,' said he, 'do you know the days of the week no better? You had need, then, be better taught.' Here the younger constable, whose name was Cherry, interposing, said: 'Mr. Warden, the gentleman is in the right as to that, for this is the first day of the week, and not the seventh.' This the old warden took in dudgeon, and, looking severely on the constable, said, 'What; do you take upon you to teach me? I'll have you know I will not be taught by you.' 'As you please for that, sir,' said the constable, 'but I am sure you are mistaken in this point; for Saturday, I know, is the seventh day, and you know yesterday was Saturday.' This made the warden hot and testy. At length the old man, having talked himself out of wind, stood still awhile, as it were to take breath; and then, bethinking himself of me, he turned to me and said, 'you are discharged, and may take your liberty to go about your occasions.'

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE Eastern Question is entering a new and aggravated phase. Besides the spread of the insurrection into Bulgaria, there has been an outbreak of Mussulman hatred against the "Christians" at Salonica, in the course of which the diplomatic representatives of both France and Germany have been assassinated. This is universally felt to have gravely complicated matters. A meeting of the three powers is now being held at Berlin, to decide what is to be done in view of the failure of the Andrassy scheme of pacification. We shall see shortly what this will lead to.

Meanwhile, the drift of events is steadily adverse to both Turkey and Austria, while Russia comes more and more to the front. She has declared that peace must be preserved. This sounds noble, but its real meaning is well pointed out by a correspondent of the *Standard*, writing from

Berlin, April 26th. Turkey was about to make war on Montenegro for helping the insurgents; Russia interfered to prevent it, and the Powers agreed to her action; what is the effect? Let the correspondent answer: "Montenegro is to remain what it has uninterruptedly been for the last nine months—the refuge, arsenal, and recruiting ground of the Herzegovinian insurgents. Montenegrin troops, the hardiest and most approved warriors of Southern Slavonia, are to be permitted openly to fight against the Sultan's forces in a province still forming an integral part of the Turkish Empire—not, like Czernagora, honoured with even a semblance of autonomy—without incurring the least punishment for acts of constructive treason and conspicuous violation of solemnly undertaken obligations! The unworthy shuffling and contemptible double-dealing of Prince Nikita is to be more than winked at—it is to be patted on the back; but the just indignation of the Turk is to be crushed under a weight of threats which his unfortunate circumstances incapacitate him from disregarding. In fact, looking the Russian declaration straight in the face, regardless of that in its aspect which is necessarily agreeable to ourselves and to the leading Continental powers, it will plainly be seen to mean that Turkey is henceforth to be left to the mercies of her domestic foes, with fettered hands and grievous humiliation of spirit. Russia has taken the leadership in the limited Oriental question now presented to public attention, duly authorised to do so by her allies, and fully supported by them in her line of action. Simultaneously with the inception of this new phase of affairs, certitude of ultimate success for the Rayah pretensions makes itself unmistakably manifest. By her stern inhibition of the military measures contemplated by the Porte for the chastisement of her traitor tributaries, Russia—and with her Austria and Germany, of whose governments she is the acknowledged mouthpiece on this occasion—has taken the insurgents and their cause, as well as the Padishah's rebel vassals, under her protection. There can be no reasonable doubt what the effect of this proceeding will be upon the insurrection as well as upon its aiders and abettors. Thousands of Rayahs, hitherto undecided, because lacking confidence in the prospects

of the rising, will join the standards of revolt; Nikita's and Milan's aspirations, no longer checked by prudential considerations or by fear of their still terrible suzerain's wrath, will prompt them to the commission of overt acts which no special pleading can explain away as consistent with the fulfilment of their engagements to the Porte; volunteering among the 'sympathising' Slavs of Trans-Leithania will assume formidable proportions; Children of Liberty in red shirts and dramatically significant boots will pour in from Italy; and, after a good deal of unnecessary bloodshed, Turkey will be robbed of two, three, or perhaps even four provinces, under the very eyes, so to speak, of the signatories of the 1856 treaty. It is quite plain to a number of continental politicians, diplomatic as well as journalistic, that the only trump card left for Turkey to play, by the menace just addressed to her, is to set that threat at defiance; to attack her faithless vassals with all the might that she can summon up in the extremity of desperation, and smite them hip and thigh. The immediate consequence of such a high-handed, though perfectly justifiable achievement, would be a breach with Russia, followed by active hostilities against the Osmanli by the latter power; and then other States would step forward on Turkey's behalf, resolute to save her from annihilation, and would regulate her position, probably making better terms for her than she will be able to make for herself, or, if the worst came to the worst, would fight for her. There is not the least probability that the Sultan will adopt so bold and sagacious a course; nor is it, if peace is to be kept in Central and Western Europe (as Russia vows it shall be), at all to be desired that Abdul Aziz should nail his flag to the mast, scornful of all the eagles hovering round it with whetted beaks. But if he tamely submit (as he will—I cannot for one instant doubt it) to the dictation of the statesman who is the spokesman of the triple alliance, Turkey in Europe will be, ere the coming summer pass, not a Sick but a Dead Man."

TURKEY AND THE POWERS.

The Powers, while professing to befriend the Turkish Empire, are secretly contriving her ruin. This is made very plain by a

Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, whose authority is Bismark's own paper. Bismark's paper, referring to the failure of Andrassy's peace project, says:—

"The struggle has recommenced with augmented forces, and has recently turned out to the advantage of the Slavs. In a very few weeks Serbia, after long preparation, will stand upon the frontiers ready for battle; to attempt to hold Serbia back from making war is to no purpose, for she has risked her all upon this hazard, and must fight, because she has no longer strength enough to keep the peace. According to the latest news from the seat of war, Montenegro has already openly commenced hostilities. Since the Porte has lacked any pecuniary means to pay the keepers of order in her Albanian, Roumelian, and Bulgarian territories, the disintegration of her States has made extremely rapid progress. Therefore, the moment in which the utmost debilitation and defencelessness of the Osmanli rule shall come to pass, will be pretty simultaneous with that in which the highest development of all the inimical forces to that rule shall be attained. A tremendous crash cannot be avoided—cannot any more be even hindered by the European Powers; for the very attempt to hinder it would bring about the far greater danger of dissension amongst the Powers themselves. The Padishah will, therefore, be startled out of his indolent case at Dolma-Bagtchi to offer an energetic resistance to those who are seeking to detach parts of his realm from the whole. It may well be possible that should the insurrection shortly assume proportions of greater magnitude, or should Abdul Aziz Khan find that the billows of the catastrophe dash against the very setting of the Golden Horn, he may rouse himself up, and may place himself at the head of his Moslem, even without his wonted European backers. That would be the time for Hussein Avni Pasha, and for the Sultana Valide. The empire would again be set up upon the Koran, upon iron-clads, and upon Krupp cannon. Perhaps we may shortly contemplate this drama, but it will only be a drama, nothing more, and the only question will be, when the curtain falls, whether the hero of the piece will have lost one or several limbs—whether the Old Turk retire only enfeebled, or mortally wounded."

According to the 'view' embodied in the foregoing remarks, not only is Turkey in Europe doomed to die the death, but the very day is fixed for her execution, and at no distant date will that "necessary act of justice" be carried out. I do not think I am exaggerating the gravity of the situation in saying that the German Government has pretty well made up its mind to the inevitability of Turkey's disruption, and that it is at present directing a great deal of energy

most intelligently and sagaciously exercised, to the prevention of any serious danger to the peace of Europe in general, and to the triple alliance in particular, which might accrue from differences of opinion between Russia and Austria as to which of those Powers shall pick up the greater number of pieces when the definite smash shall come off.

TURKEY INTERNALLY.

Meanwhile, the internal affairs of Turkey are as satisfactory as may be for those who desire to see the Euphrates dry. The Constantinopolitan correspondent of the *Standard* writes.—

"It would be wrong if I were to attempt to disguise from your readers that the condition of affairs here is very serious, and that it is fast becoming very dangerous. I have never been an alarmist. I have told you plainly, again and again, that it is impossible for Turkey to pay her way for some years to come, and that if equal justice be done to all the creditors of Turkey, the Turkish bondholders must prepare themselves for even a harder measure than that which has been dealt out to them. But I have never attended to, or repeated, the thousand and one wild rumours which have been very much in circulation here for some months, and which have pointed to a complete disorganisation of society in Turkey, and to the commencement of a reign of anarchy, riot and rapine. I still hope against hope that the pessimists may prove to be in the wrong; but I am forced to incline myself towards their opinion, and I am more than ever sure that the optimists have never had even a shadow of a foundation for their optimism. Our condition is, at the present moment, very bad, and it threatens to progress from bad to worse.

The financial crisis (the outward symptom of which was the postponement of the April dividends) has almost produced a Ministerial crisis. In England or in France a Ministerial crisis would have been produced; but in Turkey, the Ministerial Council, which seems to answer to the English or French Cabinet, has no *solidarite*, and is in no way shaken by the defection of one or more of its principal members. You, in England, when you think of Turkey, do not sufficiently understand that it is a country without an aristocracy, without a gentry, without a commercial community, without a press (that is, without a press which is worthy of the name), and without a public opinion. There is no public opinion here. There is public misery. There is public wretchedness. There is a public made up of individuals who groan under every form of

distress. There is hardly a man who has not to complain that he is on the verge of ruin, and that his ruin is due to the bad faith of the Turkish government. The evil is not confined to any one class. It pervades all classes of society. Poverty sits at the door of the Pacha's palace; poverty cuts down the rations of the soldiers; poverty lays waste the fields of the peasant; poverty assails the children of the artisan; poverty stops the pension of the widow; poverty compels us to leave the fields unsown, and starves at once, with her frosty hand, the harvest of the coming year."

The correspondent of the *Daily News* writes: "The Government is at its wits' end to know how to obtain money for its most pressing wants. It owes money on every hand to private merchants. The people are more heavily taxed than they have ever been, and the modes of collection are about the most irritating which could be devised. Nor is there any immediate hope of improvement. Business is almost paralysed. The monthly importations of Manchester goods is, for example, about one-twelfth of what it was twelve months ago. Many of the people have been deprived of half their revenue by the act of Government. From these and other causes it seems reasonable to anticipate that the revenue for the year will be considerably below the average. Government is not therefore able to put before its would-be creditors a fair prospect of repayment in case of loan. At the present moment the palace account, that is, the civil list of the Sultan, is 150,000*l.* in arrear, and to those who know how absolute is the control of the palace over every department in the country, no more weighty testimony is needed to show the complete emptiness of the Turkish treasury. Until lately the rule was that though every soldier and ordinary civil servant in the country should go without his pay, the Sultan's household must have theirs. Only a few weeks ago the Sultan, hearing that a sum of money had been placed on board a ship in order to be transmitted to the seat of war, sent for it, and had it taken on shore for his own private use. Every effort had been made to keep the fact of its transmission secret, in order that palace cupidity might not lay claim to it, but in vain. Nor is this by any means an exceptional instance. Whenever, any department has been in the receipt of cash, demands have come for the transmission of the amount to the Sultan. To the vultures of the palace the safety of the country is a matter of supreme indifference. I could give my examples of the interception or attempted interception of money on its way to the public treasury."

THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA AND POLITICAL PROSPECTS.

The St. Petersburg correspondent of the *Augsburg Gazette* informs that journal that a report is rapidly gaining ground in Russia to the effect that the Czar, being weary of government, proposes to retire practically, though not nominally, from the conduct of public affairs. The report which has been extensively discussed in political circles has evoked something like an official denial; yet the denial is worded in such a way as to show there is a certain foundation for the reported retirement of the Emperor, not immediately, but as a contingency on certain circumstances. The St. Petersburg correspondent of the *Magdeburger Zeitung* says "It is incontestable that the Emperor has declared that as soon as the interests of Russia should make it impossible to avoid a war between any Emperor or Power he would abdicate."

In view of the circumstances of the present hour, tending to draw Russia into war in connection with the Eastern Question, and in view of the important influence of the character of any individual Czar who may occupy the throne of Russia, this matter possesses a keen interest for those who are looking for his appointed movement upon the Holy Land as the Gog of the latter days, the following newspaper expressions on the subject will be read with interest:—

"A very serious change in European politics has been threatened during the past week. The Emperor of Russia, it was said, wearied of the splendour and the cares of a position which is truly unique, was about to abdicate in favour of his eldest surviving son. That rumour has now received a semi-official but somewhat hesitating contradiction, and we are left to infer that the Emperor Alexander does not at present contemplate the important step which was attributed to him. But, simultaneously with the contradiction of the more serious report, it has been stated, apparently on good authority, that the Czar does contemplate a lengthened retirement from the duties of the Imperial Throne. He is said to be sick at heart, oppressed by that melancholy which is hereditary in his family, and to which his grandfather was so marked a victim; and he proposes to take advantage of his daughter's temporary return to the home of her childhood, in order to seek rest and seclusion in her company, in some chosen retreat in Southern Europe. Yet though there will be

nothing unnatural or even unexpected in the temporary or permanent retirement of the Emperor of Russia from his throne, the event, if it should take place, would, undoubtedly, be a misfortune to Europe. Russia, at this moment, is filled with a fierce energy, a striving after action, a thirst for material victories, such as it has not known at any time during the last fifty years. Terribly has she suffered from the Crimean war, and great as are still her weakness and poverty, she is evidently animated by a spirit which bids her run new risks in the hope of reaping abundant compensations for the losses and humiliations of the past. That the present Emperor sympathises but faintly with this spirit has long been notorious; and his failure to throw himself into the current in which the national feeling is now moving, is one of the causes of his unpopularity with the powerful aristocracy of Russia. But it is just where he is weakest that his son and heir is strongest. The Czarewitch does not present a more remarkable physical contrast to his father than that which he offers to his father's spirit and temperament. He, at least, is credited with all the fiery-genius, the passion for intrigue and adventure, the resolute determination to impose his own will upon those around him, which have been the distinguishing characteristics of so many of the Romanoffs.

The statesmen of Europe are fully prepared to see many changes wrought in the Russian Empire when the latter is called to the head of affairs. In constitutional countries, the personal temper or sympathies of the monarch can scarcely affect the course of the government; but in Russia despotic power is still a reality, and perhaps at no period was it more real than it is at the present, when the fear of assassination, which in times past had so much effect upon the Czars, has been greatly lightened if not altogether removed. It would be difficult, therefore, to exaggerate the importance of such a change in the condition of European politics as that which would be effected if the Emperor Alexander were to surrender the supreme power which he now wields, into the hands of his daring, ambitious, and resolute son.

It is not to be supposed, however, that English interests are those which would be primarily affected by this change. The indiscreet and inexcusable speech of Mr. Disraeli last week has called public attention to one grave feature of the Russian advance, and has led to a partial revival of the old feeling of panic in this country. But it is not in Central Asia that the national party in Russia is anxious at this moment to work out its destinies. It is towards the West rather than the East that the eyes of those who believe that they are represented by the Czarewitch are turned most longingly.

We are told, however, that the retirement will be only temporary; and that in a few months the Czar will probably resume his station with recruited health and restored vigour. Unfortunately, it will be during these very months that his influence will be most necessary. The march of events in Eastern Europe has been painfully rapid of late, and no wise man will venture to declare that the catastrophe which all dread may at any moment overtake us. It is to the personal disposition of the Emperor of Russia, to his intense love of peace, his desire to deal fairly with his neighbours, that we are compelled to trust for the preservation of Europe from the evils of a great political, and possibly military, crisis. His retirement at the very moment when his services were most necessary would be an ominous event, betokening the failure of his efforts to restrain the more active party in his empire, of which the Czarevitch is the present leader. When we consider all the possibilities which are involved in his withdrawal from public life, we cannot be surprised at the fact that the bare rumour of it should have created something like a panic in the money markets of Europe."—*Leeds Mercury*.

Far be it from us to say that the Prince who would rule in his stead has views opposed to these—this would be a much stronger statement than we desire to make—but his Imperial Highness is certainly reported to have different views, and to be at the head of what may be called the anti-German and ultra-ambitious section of Muscovite sentiment. The Grand Duke Alexander Alexandrowitch could scarcely assume the personal functions of state without importing something of his own initiative into the direction of affairs, and any turn of those affairs, whether southwards towards Constantinople, or eastwards towards Afghanistan and Persia, might bring us in presence of a crisis. Without attaching, therefore, too much importance to what may still be merely the echo of court talk at St. Petersburg, or at most an impending change of rule, without any change of policy, it is nevertheless obvious that neither the German Government nor our own can afford to remain entirely indifferent to the reports at present circulating. Mr. Disraeli especially would find his idea of fortifying a frontier with a new word more ridiculous than ever, if it were the soldiers of a Grand Duke Regent and not any longer of a pacific Czar who watered their horses in the Oxus. It is not in Russia as elsewhere that changes in the palace can occur without change in the administration. The ruler for the time being of that vast empire of eighty millions of people and a seventh of the earth's soil, is actually and practically autocratic, and can set in motion by a single order all the forces of the Russias. It would

be wise, therefore, not to treat this perfectly possible design as either too doubtful or too unimportant for inquiry; especially since one reason for the retirement of the now ruling sovereign might probably be his disinclination to bear the burden of some new and striking development of the never-abandoned plans conceived by Peter the Great."—*Daily Telegraph*.

INCREASING SERIOUSNESS OF RUSSIAN ADVANCES IN ASIA.— MR. DISRAELI'S VIEWS.

The territorial advance of Russia in Asia—part of the latter-day attitude of Gog, prior to his destruction on the mountains of Israel—is becoming daily more serious, or rather its seriousness is being more distinctly recognised in official quarters. Mr. Disraeli, in supporting the bill authorising the Queen to assume a title expressive of her sovereignty over India, said:—

"I have had the honour of introducing this Bill, and I have impressed upon the House to the utmost of my power that I, at least, felt it was most important it should pass. I have said—and I did not speak without authority or reason—that there were grave political reasons why this Bill should pass. (Hear, hear.) I should have been glad if it could have been passed without adverting to these political reasons. Great changes have been going on in the very heart of Asia—greater changes than even the conquest of India itself. There is a country of vast extent, which has only been known hitherto because it has sent forth hordes to conquer the world, that has at last been vanquished, and the frontiers of Russia—I will not say a rival Power—but the frontiers of Russia are only a few days' march now from those of Her Majesty's dominions. (Hear, hear.) I venture to speak upon this subject with some frankness, because I am not of that school which view the advances of Russia in Asia with those deep misgivings that some do. I think that Asia is large enough for the destinies both of Russia and of England. (Hear, hear.) But whatever may be my confidence in the destiny of England, I know that empires are only maintained by vigilance, by firmness, by courage, by understanding the temper of the times in which you live, and by watching those significant indications that easily may be observed. (Hear, hear.) The population of India is not the population which it was when we carried the Bill of 1858. (Hear, hear.) There has been a great change in their habits. That which the Press did not do, that which other influences have failed in doing, the introduction of railways has done; and the people of India move about

in a manner which never could have been anticipated, and are influenced by ideas and knowledge, which never before reached or touched them. (Hear, hear.) What was the gossip of the bazaar is now the conversation of the villages. (Hear, hear.) Do you think they are ignorant of what is going on in Central Asia? Do you think that it is unknown to them that Tartary, the conqueror of the world, is now at last conquered? No; not only do they know what has occurred; not only are they well acquainted with the Power which has accomplished this great change—they know well the title of the great Prince who has produced these wonderful revolutions. (Hear, hear.) I have listened with surprise when, night after night, I have heard hon. gentlemen, on both sides of the House, translating the title of Empress in all sorts of languages, and indicating to us what names would be accepted. The nations and populations which can pronounce the word Emperor, and always pronounce it, will not be slow in accepting the title of Empress. (Hear, hear.) That is the word which will be adopted by the nations and populations of India, and, in announcing, as Her Majesty will do, by proclamation, that she adapts that title, it will inspire confidence in her Empire existing in that part of the world, and signify in a manner that cannot be mistaken that the Parliament of England have resolved to uphold the Empire of India. (Loud cheers.)

A writer in the *Daily News* of the same date (March 24) says: "It is no doubt within the recollection of the present generation that a few years since the Emperor of Austria laid claim to the previous title of Emperor of Germany, and assembled a great gathering in the Hall at Frankfort to confirm and celebrate the occasion of asserting his superior title to the other Princes of Germany. We all know what followed. While the Austrians were thinking of the outward show and tailoring of the army, the Germans were quietly working, and shortly afterwards conquered both Danes and Austrians, and ultimately France; and the King of Prussia was made in reality Emperor of Germany in the Hall of Versailles. To turn to another picture: the Prince of Wales has been to India, has been received with pomp and ceremony by the Princes of India, has been acclaimed as Shahzadah, and now, when that is completed, the reigning Sovereign is to assume the title of Empress. What do we suppose the Russians are doing all this time, but quietly conquering and annexing one province after another, till their frontier is within 220 miles of India? Is there not a danger there that might well justify Mr. Lowe in his vaticinations, and make even those most interested

hesitate? We all know that analogies are very deceptive, but the panic, so called, that has set in causes people to think, and this is one of the situations which has occurred to me."

The Leeds Mercury says: "It is curious that whilst Russia sees fate working on her side in Europe, she should be equally fortunate in Asia. The annexation of Khokand has come about in the most natural fashion possible, and even the English Press has been compelled to acknowledge that General Kauffman had no alternative but to incorporate the Khanate with the Empire. Nevertheless this step and the mysterious events which are now occurring in Corea, must again awaken attention to the policy pursued by Russia in Asia. The English feeling on the subject seems to swing like a pendulum between the extremes of panic and perfect security. One day we are in a fever of alarm, and the next we are satisfied that there is nothing whatever in this phase of the Eastern Question to demand even the careful consideration of the government. The folly of the latter conviction is at least equal to that of the former. If any point is certain in connection with Eastern affairs, it is that it would be an evil day for this country on which the boundaries of Russia first became conterminous with those of British India. Russia herself might be as peaceable in her intentions as she is at present, and her policy might be as free from ambitious motives as Count Schouvaloff declares it to be. But throughout Asia, from the Tartar Steppes to the bazaars of Madras, the popular mind is impressed with the conviction that England and Russia are rivals and enemies, and that sooner or later they will fight for supremacy in the East. The notion may be an utterly mistaken one, but it exists; and whether mistaken or not, it has a very important bearing upon our position in India. That we should find it very much more difficult to maintain our hold on India if Russia were at Herat is a point which no wise man will venture to question; and that of late the Russian advances have been very rapid is another fact which does not admit of being disputed. It behoves us, therefore, not to be satisfied with thinking merely of the present. We are now witnessing the effects of a *laissez faire* policy in Turkey, and it would be lamentable if we were to invite similar consequences by the adoption of a like policy in Asia. The developments of the Eastern Question, using the term in its largest sense, have been very rapid and very important of late, and we should be glad to know that the ministry had made up its mind as to the course it will pursue

in the event of occurrences which, judging by the present position of affairs, seem to be only too likely to happen at no distant date.

RUSSIAN ADVANCES.

(Continued from page 281.)

On the same subject, two books have been published—the one “CLOUDS IN THE EAST,” by V. Baker, who recently returned from extensive travels in Central Asia; and the other “SHADOWS OF COMING EVENTS; or the Eastern Menace,” by Lieut.-Colonel Arthur Cory, of Bengal. Both writers seek to rouse the British Government to a sense of the danger to which India is exposed from the advance of a power to whom the natives of India will readily desert for the sake of deliverance from British yoke. Mr. Disraeli’s speech, quoted above, shows that the Government is alive to the danger, which is one of the signs of the times.

ENGLAND AND EGYPT.

Circumstances—particularly the financial condition of Egypt, are forcing that country more and more into the hands of England; and are likely to lead to a formal and complete British occupation of Egypt. This, which is much desired by the watchers for Zion’s morning, is very forcibly put as follows by the London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury*:

“Another surprise may burst on the world some morning, when it is announced that Egypt has become a dependency of Great Britain. Events are moving forward in that direction. There are reasons for predicting another grand *coup* at no distant date. Perhaps it is a question of opportunity rather than of intention, though I might suggest certain obstacles which have been standing in the way of a bold and definite policy towards Egypt. Her Majesty’s ministers have the misfortune of knowing what they ought to do, or rather what they must eventually do, and yet being unable to act decisively. Before they act they must be of one mind. Those who see the question at a close view are asking why the ministers do not pull together in a matter so urgently affecting their credit. They, or some of them, are making too many bites at a cherry. Persons of great influence and intimate knowledge have been urging the government to justify their interference in the affairs of Egypt by completing bodily what they began so

well last November. I may say there is an impression that ministers, as a whole, are convinced of the necessity of further action, but that certain of them are so apprehensive of foreign complications ensuing that their timidity prevails. Mr. Disraeli has had to listen to some friendly grumbling on this point. He has been reminded that the four millions so courageously invested in the Suez Canal should be made to yield some appreciable political benefit, and the grumblers ask, ‘where is it?’ They answer their own query by saying we have put the Khedive into the position of a bad debtor, which so far gives a roundabout title to prop him up and proffer him good advice, but they add, ‘the only way in which we can interfere with dignity and effect is by assuming such responsibility as would give us control. At present our influence is precarious, our control is *nil*.’ The Khedive is being forced by circumstances into the position of a protected prince, wearing the honours of ruler, but exercising power vicariously, and some members of the British Government evidently hesitate to hasten the transformation by any overt act of interference in the destinies of Egypt. The dreaded Eastern Question stands behind it all. I believe Mr. Disraeli is amongst those who would grasp the nettle instead of playing with it. Hence I suggest that at some moment not foreseen, a greater surprise than the last may be in store for anxious observers of the Eastern Question.”

The connection between Egypt and the Holy Land in the course of impending events, is indirectly apparent in the following extract from a letter in the *Daily Telegraph* on the Eastern Question, by R. F. Burton:

“From Egypt we want nothing but the free right of transit; we are resolved that the highway of the nations shall not be barricaded. Why not assist her in declaring her independence, and in placing herself under the protection of the principal European powers? She will thus be free from the fetters of a heavy yearly tribute, and from what is far more ruinous, the immense ‘benevolences’ and other douceurs which perpetually find their way into the seraglio and into the ministerial pockets at Stamboul. Instead of annexing her we ought, indeed, to propitiate the manes of old Mohammed Ali by subjecting Syria to Egypt, and thus we shall do penance for

that miserable error of policy which made England the catspaw of Russia. Mohammed Ali Pasha, as Sultan of Turkey, would have given fresh life to the effete empire, and this move was regarded with the greatest fear by the northern pretenders to Constantinople. Jerusalem cannot, in the present state of Europe, become the exclusive possession of any European Power. Syria and Palestine have never, for many past centuries, enjoyed a gleam of prosperity except when connected with, or rather when placed under Egypt. Let one sentence suffice to show the difference of development between the two provinces. Egypt has several railways; Syria has none, and she boasts of only one carriageable road between Beyrout and Damascus—and that is French. Moreover, Syria is fated to become, in a few years, the great highway to British India, a consummation devoutly to be wished for, and hitherto delayed only by the activity of Muscovite agents, and by the systematic self-effacement of our own. But Tripoli, Ba'albak, and Palmyra are not played out. These main stations on the first and best of overland roads will hear before many years shall have passed the whistle of the railway, and in the evening of their days they will again be happy. The Euphrates Valley line will be to the Suez Canal what the 'Egyptian Bosphorus' has been to the Cape of Good Hope."

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

W. H. H.—The virgin's Son spoken of in Isaiah vii. 14-16, is undoubtedly Christ. The reasons for this view, and the merits of the question generally, you will find treated at length in the Jew Discussion; also in articles by the Editor which appeared in the *Christadelphian* for Feb. and March, 1868, under the title, "Who was the Father of Jesus Christ?" in reply to Mr. Charles Dealtry.

R. G.—You will find a full exposition of 2 Peter iii. 10, by Dr. Thomas, in the *Christadelphian* for May and June, 1873, under the title of "The Baptism of Fire." The brother who thinks it relates to the Roman destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth, has ground for his view.—As to whether a breaker of the law of the land, becoming enlightened and obedient in the truth, should return to any punishment from which he may have escaped, the punishments of the law are for the lawless and disobedient. A man who has ceased to be disobedient, is Christ's free man. He is bound, as we all are, to submit

to the ordinances of men, where men impose them upon us; but he need not go out of the way to invite bondage. Let him use his freedom to redeem the past, praying to God to protect him from the human consequences of sins God has forgiven, yet prepared without resistance, to submit to the evil that may come.

THE DISOBEDIENT IN THE RESURRECTION.

"Will those who have believed the gospel but refused to obey it, be raised to be punished? I believe they will; but some say they will not; that it is only those who believe and are baptized that will be raised; they say that baptism is *not* the obedience of the gospel, but a righteous walk and conversation through life. Peter mentions three classes, the righteous, the ungodly, and the sinner; chapter iv. 18, and there can be no doubt but the above class is in the list; it is knowledge or light that makes men responsible: 'this is the condemnation, that *light* has come into the world.' (John iii. 19.) 'The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not* the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.' (2 Thess. i. 7, 8.) A few words on the above in the *Christadelphian* will oblige your brother in Israel's Hope, R. F."

Remark:—The question is answered by the questioner, or rather by the testimonies he quotes. It is light that makes responsible, and disobedience is the ground of condemnation, which is reasonable and just. Baptism is the first act of obedience: but there are many commands to obey after that, the disobedience of which will make baptism of no profit.

POLITICS AND THE GOSPEL.

C. P.—Would an ecclesia be justified in accepting the services of a member of parliament, supposing they could get a person in that position to lecture for them? This seems a strange question in Britain, where such a contingency ranks among the impossibilities. But it seems not so unlikely for such a thing to happen in the Colonies, where it is comparatively easy thing for men of no rank to

become an M.P.P. (Member of the Provincial Parliament). The answer to the question is suggested in your own mode of propounding it. There can be no doubt that a person in the position in question is, as you say, a "Member of the Prince of the Power of the Air," since by their votes he is a political incarnation of the children of disobedience. There can also be no doubt that such a man is the servant of the world, who appoints him, whose interests he is bound to promote: the interests of Mammon; and it is Jesus who has said it is impossible to combine the service of God with the service of Mammon. If such a person were to offer his services to a healthy ecclesia, said ecclesia as a part of the faithful bride unspotted with the world, (waiting in virgin chasteness for the manifestation of her lord), would respectfully decline, even if the man were called brother, which is scarcely possible, surely.

THE FROG SIGN, AND WHAT NEXT?

M.P.E.—There can be little doubt that the frog sign is complete. The Franco-frog power (Rev. xvi. 13-14,) was diplomatically to inspire or excite a war-producing effluence from the three political centres symbolised by the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, viz., Constantinople, Vienna and Rome. To be equal to this effect, the political influence of France had to become potential in the diplomatic world in a personal organic form. Its influence in this form does not exist at the present moment, and has not existed since the crushing disasters of the Franco-German war. It did exist in the required form during the reign of Napoleon III. His influence on the Continent was supreme while it lasted. He was in fact the political dictator of Europe. And during his dictatorship, as a matter of fact, his influence operated on the three centres enumerated, with the effect predicted and in the very order required. French intrigue developed war, first at Constantinople (Crimean war); secondly at Vienna (Franco-Austrian war), and thirdly at Rome (the war of the Pope against the Revolution, consequent on the evacuation of Rome by the French troops in 1866). The combined effect of these military activities has been to get the world into its present state of readiness for the Armageddon gathering. It is not the frogs that gather the nations to this

gathering, but the "He" of verse 16, which is God. The mission of the frogs was to prepare them for this gathering. The mission has been executed thoroughly, for the world is now armed and organised for war as it has never been in any previous period of the world's history. The next phase is the Russo-Eastern Question, which is accordingly in a state of intense excitation at the present moment.

THE GROUNDS FOR EXPECTING A BRITISH OCCUPATION OF EGYPT.

N. Q.—Dr. Thomas has from the first taught that Britain might be expected to occupy Egypt before the coming of the Lord. You will find it in *Elpis Israel*, page 398-9, written twenty-five years ago; and also in *Anatolia*, written shortly after. The grounds of the expectation are, 1.—Britain is the power mentioned in Ezek. xxxviii. 13, as the antagonist of Gog in the latter days in the land of Israel, under the name of "the merchants of Tarshish and all the young lions thereof." 2.—According to Daniel xi. this northern invader prevails against all opposition, and therefore against the opposition of the Tarshish merchants, up to a certain point. The countries "Edom and Moab and the chief of the children of Ammon," remain in the hands of Gog's Tarshish-opponents—(Dan. xi. 41); but "*the land of Egypt shall not escape*" (verse 42), implying that the land of Egypt is in the hands of the possessor of Edom and Moab, or Britain. 3.—It is under British protection that the pre-adventual colonization of the Holy Land takes place, as is evident from various places besides Ezek. xxxviii., e.g., Isaiah lx. 9; xviii. 1.—Now referring to the future deliverance of Israel, when it will be said to the south "Give up," and to the north "Keep not back," Jehovah says "I GAVE EGYPT for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee."—(Isa. xliii. 3). This implies that the transferring of Egypt to some power, brings about or is connected with the ransom of Israel in its preliminary stage. Egypt was given as "wages" to Nebuchadnezzar, for his service as Jehovah's instrument, against Tyrus (Ezek. xxix. 18-19), without Nebuchadnezzar knowing either that he served God in the matter of Tyrus, or that he got Egypt for a recompense. So England will receive Egypt as the price of Israel's deliverance without either the

deliverance or the payment of the ransom appearing in any other light than as a natural transaction, except to those who look at the affairs of nations from the divine stand-point. The possession of Egypt has become a political necessity to England on account of her immense and valuable empire in India; and the preservation of her footing in Egypt, particularly in defence of the Suez canal, by the interposition of a territorial buffer between that canal and Russian advances from the Caucasus, leads to her occupation of the Holy Land and the settlement of Israel there. These, in brief, are the grounds of an expectation entertained for many years, and which has been partly realised in the purchase of the Suez Canal, and seems hourly on the point of a more complete fulfilment.

WHEN WAS JESUS THIRTY YEARS OF AGE?

W.R.O.—The chronological objections to Luke's account of the age of Christ, which you have copied from Grundy's lectures, all proceed on the assumption that Luke says "Jesus was thirty years of age in the fifteenth year of Tiberius." This is a mistake altogether. Luke does not say that

Jesus was thirty in that year. What he says is, "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar . . . the word of God came unto John, the son of Zecharias, in the wilderness." It was the coming of the command to John to baptise, that happened in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. True, at verse 23, Luke says, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age;" but this is to be connected with Christ's baptism and not with the date of the commencement of John's preaching, for it is connected with Christ's baptism, as you will see by reading verses 21-22 immediately preceding. How long a space of time intervened between the coming of the word to John and the baptism of Jesus, Luke, in this chapter, does not tell us; but his narrative in this chapter leaves room for any length of time that may otherwise be shown to have elapsed. He says in verse 3, "John came into all the country round about Jordan, preaching." He does not say how long time he spent in this way. It must have been a considerable time; for it is stated (verse 15) that "all men mused in their hearts whether he were the Christ or not," also that the multitude came forth to him. Matthew says (chap. iii. 5)

(To be concluded next month.)

INTELLIGENCE.

ALTRINCHAM. — Brother J. Birkenhead writes: "You will remember, last winter, we engaged a hall at Atrincham for about three months for the proclamation of the truth. Well; we have had it this winter again, from the beginning of December up to the present time (April 4th), and are continuing it for a while longer. I am glad to be able to say we get some very nice attentive audiences, and there are indications of the word of truth having taken root in the hearts of some of those who attend, and we are looking forward to fruit being yielded, to the honour and glory of our Father in heaven. As the subjects of the lecture which have been given would occupy too much space in the columns set apart for intelligence in the *Christadelphian*, I will just say the lecturers have been dealing principally with the Gospel, The Kingdom, The Signs of the Times, Baptism, Mortality of Man, &c., and much

interest appears to have been awakened.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the past month the truth has been obeyed by EMMA MARIA JONES (29), domestic servant, formerly Baptist; and ALICE BOWER (20), shopwoman, daughter of sister Bower, formerly neutral; also EDWARD JAMES WOOLSCROFT (26), puddler, formerly Wesleyan; HANNAH COLE (41), wife of brother Cole, formerly Independent; ALFRED HALL (23), electroplate worker. Brother Woolscroft is from Toll End, Tipton, and will meet with the Dudley ecclesia. Several other applications for immersion have been made, and are in process of being dealt with.

During the past six months or more, there has been a considerable addition by removal of brethren and sisters to Birmingham from other places, hitherto unreported, viz., brother David E. Williams, from Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.; bro. and sis. Jones, from Boston, Mass., U.S.A.; brother and sister Waite, from

Leicester: brother and sister Shemmans, from Leeds; brother J. P. Jones, from Mumbles; brother and sister Smith, from Worcester; brother and sister Habgood, from Stratford-on-Avon, to which they had returned, the two sisters Waddhouse, from Stratford-on-Avon; and sister Annie Withenshaw, from Tamworth.

The week-night meeting has been changed from Wednesday to Thursday, for the convenience of the brethren and sisters. The ecclesia has suffered loss by the death of sister Hall (wife of brother P. Hall, of Perry Barr), who fell asleep on Thursday, May 11th, after an illness of some duration; and was interred in the Halesowen Cemetery on the following Monday. Halesowen was her native village. A number of the brethren and sisters attended the funeral, and sang together words of hope and comfort at the grave's mouth. Brother Roberts delivered a short address on the occasion. There was a large muster of the villagers.

The lectures during the month have been as follow: April 30th. - Question Night.— (Bro. Roberts.) May 7th.—“The Saviour; God with us; Son of God.”—(Brother Shuttleworth.) May 14th.—“The glorious gospel: The New Testament narrative of Christ and wherein lies its true sweetness. Jesus in the day of his weakness and the great lessons of his life. What the gospel proposes to do for the world. Human government a blasted withering oak. Coming changes of the right sort and from the right quarter.”—(Bro. Shuttleworth.) May 21st.—“What the Kingdom of God is as a matter of faith, and what it will be as a reality in the age to come, both to the brethren of Christ and the nations of the world.”—(Bro. Hodgkinson.)

BRISTOL.—Bro. Cort reports an addition through the removal to Bristol of brother Gillies, whose immersion was reported in last month's Glasgow intelligence. He likewise speaks of a hopeful interest in the truth shown by some in Bristol. Brother Shuttleworth, of Birmingham, lectured on Sunday, May 21st.

CHELLENHAM.—Bro. Otter writes: “I have pleasure in notifying you that under God's blessing you have been the instrument of bringing one other out of darkness into great light. EDWIN CONSTABLE (41), was immersed into the glorious and sin-covering name; and now to use his own words, he rejoices in gratitude and praise to God, that He has at last permitted him to be numbered with those who have sure and intelligent hope; a manifest and practical faith, and a Christlike and fraternal love, as characteristics of their discipleship in Christ. Bro. Constable is, I regret to say, totally incapacitated from following his trade—shoemaking—from spinal disease; has a wife and five children; but the Lord will provide! (The foregoing ought to have appeared in the April number. It was too late for the

March number, and was at that time accidentally mislaid.)

DERBY.—Bro. Bannister reports: “It is with much satisfaction and gratitude to our heavenly Father that I am able to report the immersion of nine believers of the truth into the name of the anointed Saviour and King; seven on the 13th and two on the 28th of April last. Their names are WILLIAM CHANDLER (37), elastic manufacturer, and his wife, ALICE CHANDLER (40); CHARLES SIMS (24), joiner, and his wife ELIZABETH SIMS (23); WILLIAM JOSEPH PEACH (25), railway clerk; CHARLES SONES TYLER (20), post office clerk; ELIZABETH BURLEY (18); ANNIE WRIGHT (17), daughter of bro. Wright; and PHILIS MEAKIN (20), daughter of brother T. Meakin. All the above named brethren and sisters have given ample proof of their perception and loving belief of the gospel, some being delivered from general scepticism, others from the medley-religious tenets of spoiled truth; and two, with their physical growth, have grown into the knowledge of the truth leading to the obedience required for partaking with the Lord the honour, glory and immortality of his kingdom, which current signs shew plainly will soon be set up. In consequence of the additions to the Derby ecclesia, a round room has been obtained for our meetings, on moderate terms, attached to the Corn Exchange, capable of seating about eighty persons, where we have already met twice in obedience to the Christ for remembering his sacrifice for taking away our sins, and on the evening of each day expounded the Scriptures. Being now in a better position for inviting others to hear the word of the Lord, we have already had several attending the meetings to listen to it. We pray that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified.”

DUDLEY.—Brother Blount reports that the truth is steadily progressing here. The Sunday evening lectures are better attended than previously. He says he had a visit from the editor of the *Dudley Free Press*, who is one of the Wesleyan locals, but who in conversation said, he was “as liberal as the air we breathe.” In proof of which he has opened the columns of his paper for a report every week (providing he is furnished with it), and he will also state the subject and speaker for the following Sunday, for the payment of a nominal sum. I wo reports have already appeared. The subjects of lectures for the past few weeks have been as follow: April 23rd.—“The revelation of the Lord Jesus from Heaven.”—(Brother Shuttleworth.) April 30th.—“The world ruled in righteousness.”—(Brother Shuttleworth.) May 7th.—“Salvation.”—(Brother Williams.) May 14th.—“Passages of Scripture and death-bed scenes supposed to countenance popular ideas considered.”—(Brother Blount.) May 21st.—“Endless

torments."—(Brother Blount.) For particulars of an addition, see Birmingham intelligence.

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Smith reports the death of Brother McKillop who fell asleep on Sunday, April 30th. He has been a sufferer for many years. Consumption having at last carried him away very fast. At one time he was in the Leith ecclesia, where he first came in contact with the truth, having worked alongside brother Paterson who has also gone to rest for a short time.

GLASGOW.—On the 13th inst., brother Owler writes as follows, "Another follower of Christ Jesus has been committed to the dust, to await the manifestation of the power which raised up the Lord Jesus, and which will transform all who are worthy to the divine nature. Brother David M'Killop, compositor, in the *Glasgow News* Office, who has long been in delicate health, but for the last three months has been laid aside from duty altogether, died in Edinburgh on the 30th April, whither he had been conveyed on the 20th. The disease which cut him off, was consumption, and for the fortnight before he expired, he suffered much. He was interred in Rosebank Cemetery on the 2nd of May, in the presence of the brethren. Our deceased brother has left behind him sister M'Killop and two young children, one being two years of age and the other two months. From the fact that our beloved brother has been often ill and required good support and attention, while in life, the brethren will comprehend that our sister and family will require some assistance. To the household of faith therefore I appeal on their behalf, and will be glad to acknowledge through the *Christadelphian* any free-will offerings which may be confided to my care, for the support of the widow and fatherless. My address is 49, West Campbell Street, City. The lectures still continue to be well attended in the afternoons. The subjects of lectures in Govan were: April 16, "Rome."—(Brother Mulholland.) April 23, "The first and second comings of Christ."—(Brother Mulholland.) April 30, "The inheritance of the saints."—(Brother Robertson.) May 7, "Knowledge and Wisdom."—(Brother T. Nisbet.)

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother Diboll, jun., writes: "Since my last report the following lectures have been delivered. April 16th.—'The Kingdom of God an element of saving faith.'—(Bro. J. W. Diboll.) April 23rd.—'The salvation of the Bible.'—(Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.) April 30th.—'The Devil'—(Brother D. Spinney.) May 7th.—'Dives and Lazarus.'—(Brother J. W. Diboll.) May 14th.—'Paul's Funeral Sermon.'—(J. W. Diboll, jun.)

Huddersfield.—On Good Friday, taking

advantage of the holiday, brethren and sisters from Halifax, Elland, Leeds, and Sheffield assembled here, and held a tea meeting, at which a variety of addresses were delivered and anthems sung. The meeting is reported to have been edifying and encouraging. The Sunday evening lectures continue.

LEEDS.—On Sunday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, May 14th, 16th and 17th, lectures were delivered in the brethren's meeting-place, by brother Roberts, of Birmingham. The place, which is small, was uncomfortably full. Subjects: 1, Sin; 2nd, Salvation; 3rd, The Signs of the Times.

LEICESTER.—Brother Collyer reports as follows: "On the 5th inst., we had the privileged duty of assisting three others to put on the saving name of the Lord Jesus. Their names, &c., are as follow: WILLIAM BLOXHAM (25); EMILY CHRISTMAS (37); SUSAN WARWICK (32), wife of brother Warwick — all previously neutral. We should be glad to practise 'trine immersion' of this sort oftener. Our number is now about sixty: so that we are becoming quite a numerous family, and there are still enquirers. Mr. David King has been lecturing against the truth in the town. Questions were allowed, and the brethren did not fail to ask them fully. Mr. K. has not had it all his own way. He seemed to feel somewhat discontented when a brother said he preferred the judgment of Solomon to Mr. King's. This was in answer to Mr. King who observed that people are more enlightened now than was Solomon. A good deal of interest has been awakened, and we intend to make the most of it, as the following announcement will show:— "Lectures and Discussion. Central Hall, Silver Street, Leicester. It is proposed to inaugurate a Bible Discussion Class, on Thursday Evenings, at the above hall, open to all parties, which will commence with a course of four Lectures, as follow: On Thursday evening, May 18th, subject: The Gospel: what is it? On Thursday evening, May 25th, subject: The Kingdom of Heaven. On Thursday evening, June 1st, subject: Universal Resurrection: does the Bible teach it? On Thursday evening, June 8th, subject: The Christianity of the present: is it genuine as when first inaugurated? The above lectures will have special reference to the lectures delivered by Mr. David King, of Birmingham, in the Meeting House, Crafston Street. Each lecture will occupy about half-an-hour; an hour's discussion afterwards; each speaker will be allowed a quarter of an hour to reply. No collections will be made; all parties are invited. Commence each evening at a quarter past eight."

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the obedience of two others in connection with the work at Ripley, viz., THOMAS

BRIGGS (28), coal miner, who put on Christ by immersion March 26th; he was formerly a Wesleyan; also his wife, FANNY BRIGGS (23), April 16th, formerly Church of England. Brother Kirkland says these are the fruits of brother King's labours.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports that the removal to Sheffield for the Sunday Evening lectures has been a step in the right direction. A goodly company of strangers continue to attend the meetings; and a lively interest is manifested in the things that are advanced for their consideration. As the best proof of progress, he mentions that two more have been added to their number during the past month, viz, EDITH BOLER (16), brother Boler's daughter; and ELLEN LEE (26), neutral, both of whom rendered obedience to the truth May 3rd, after giving satisfactory evidence of their acquaintance, belief and love of the things concerning the kingdom of Yahweh and the name of Jesus the Anointed. Sister Lee has been looking into the truth about six months. It was first introduced to her notice by sister Ellen Rowley, of Birmingham, who has been her constant teacher since that time, while on a visit to Sheffield. The lectures for the month in the new room, have been—April 16th, Earth not Heaven the Promised Inheritance of the Righteous.—(Bro. Boler). 23rd, The Way which they call Heresy.—(Brother Skinner). 30th, Baptism, What is it? and is it necessary for Salvation?—(Bro. Boler). May 5th, Bible Teaching concerning God and Jesus Christ.—(Bro. Skinner). Other immersions are pending.

STOCKPORT.—Lectures were delivered here by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, on Sunday, Monday and Wednesday, May 7, 8 and 10. The lectures were given in the brethren's place of meeting, a building in the ecclesiastical style, once used as a church. The attendance of the public was not large—the mere curiosity at first awakened by the truth having subsided. On the Sunday there was a large muster of brethren at the breaking of bread, from Manchester, Sale, Warrington, Huddersfield, and Elland. The subjects of lecture were, 1.—“The Kingdom.” 2.—“Sin and its consequences.” 3.—“The Signs of the Times.”

AUSTRALIA.

BERCHWORTH.—Brother Tucker writes: “We cannot report progress in number, yet we can say with pleasure that we are living in peace, and trust yet to be useful to others in our day and generation. We distribute all we can among the people, but we do not see the heaven at work, only to raise objection and scoff. We patiently wait and

work. It is with pleasure and interest we watch the course of events, and see plainly upon the horizon the first streaks of the dawn of day. The Dr. saw a long way off; and were he living, his sagacity would yield now to him joy. The Euphratean power is coming to its last days; and to us it is cause of surprise that politicians should at all think it capable of reconstruction. It is even to such notoriously rotten, and will soon die and dry up, in spite of all its struggles. There are many questions now arising to test the shrewdness of the ablest of political men, and all their counsel will not avail against our King, for he will yet laugh at them and vex them in his sore displeasure. Our position and the difficulties surrounding us, prevent us from doing what we could wish for the truth. We are anxious to do, but know not how, beyond distribution of tracts and speaking to those we come in contact with. But of this we feel convinced, that the time is short, and the crowding events of our time all bespeak the speedy advent of our Master and his calling together of his household. May we be found of him in the true way, and enter into that joy prepared for the accepted ones. You probably, ere this, will have heard of our brother Pfeffer having fallen asleep in the one hope of rising to the new life. He was zealous for the truth, yet to some having a peculiar way of doing it; but every man must stand or fall to the Master, not by opinion as to how things should be done, for every gift belongeth not to all but in measure. I cannot close without acknowledging the pleasure experienced by reading your Sunday Morning exhortations of December and January *Christadelphian*, and trust that the practice of such may be the desire and joy of us all.”

CANADA.

TORONTO.—Brother Evans reports: “On Sunday the 16th inst. we had the pleasure of witnessing the baptism of MR. ALEXANDER GEMMEL (43). Bro. Gemmel is a native of Scotland, and is of the firm of Samsay, Kennedy and Gemmel, dry goods merchants, of this city. He was until recently in connection with the body known as the Congregationalists, but holding impressions in the direction of the truth for many years. Sister Wright from Detroit, has come to reside here with her father, bro. Read, since the death of sister Read, and so meets with us. Mr. J. Marples, Presbyterian Minister, having challenged us to public debate respecting the Constitution of Man and the Nature of the Punishment of Sin, the matter will come off (D.V.) early in June.”

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 145.

JULY, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND MODERN SPIRITOLGY INCOMPATIBLE THINGS.

BY DR. THOMAS.

Letter from a Correspondent.

DR. THOMAS—Dear Sir:—By your *Herald* which I receive, I find you still contend for a *de facto* Kingdom of Christ and his saints here on earth. But the people in this country hate the very name of "Kings" too much for this doctrine to go down. They might be willing for Christ to reign universally, if he would reign invisibly in a "spiritual" way—not interfering with our money and *Democracy*. And as for the kingdoms of the world, their cry is, "We will have no king but Cæsar!" So that you will have to go on as heretofore, rowing against wind and tide.

But to be serious. You are digging up the deepest question in the world; that is, *What shall we be?* And that

depends upon "what we are now!" Some say dying mortals; while others say, *dying immortals*. If we have a principle within us that cannot die, then away goes the resurrection; for the living cannot be resurrected! If the entire man die at death, then if he live again it is not a resurrection, but a creation *de novo*, as much as Adam's! The sects have to face the first difficulty, and you the last. But to a thinking mind it is the great religious question of the day.

For my own part, I am inclined to think (at times) that man is gifted with a speck of immortality *by creation*, and will go on progressing till he become perfect, through many ascending states of probation! But then, what becomes of that great

gospel doctrine, the resurrection? For surely, if man's spirit grow up and mature with his body, and burst from it at death, as a butterfly from its chrysalis, it will never again be forced back into its grub state; but go on in continual progression.

But if we hold, with you, that the entire man dies, mind and body, how can *he* arise from the dead again? You know that both the matter and mind that constitute him are in continual change. Will he rise with the mind and body of youth, mature manhood, or drivelling old age? And if he do rise again, must he not rise *a new creature*, in every sense of the word?

The idea of a "*Sky-kingdom*" is very intangible, and that of an earthly one very gross! I wish you and the Spiritualist would come up close to the question, for it is a *great one*. In the meantime, as the present material world is little understood, the future and unseen world must and will always remain a matter of doubt and debate—merely a matter of faith, or opinion. One thing, however, we all feel: that to do good and to avoid evil is pleasing to God, and profitable to man. And to contend earnestly for what one believes to be the truth, is right. For this reason, I think, I shall continue my subscription while you publish. I am, dear sir, yours respectfully, ROBERT MACK.

Columbia, Maury, Tenn., Jan. 28, 1854.

THE DOCTOR'S REPLY.

If our friend pronounce sentence upon prisoners at the bar (for I am told he is a Judge among the people) in the style of his correspondence, they no doubt forget for the time the evil he awards, in their admiration of the good-humored and facetious originality of his discourse. He finds that I will still contend for a *de facto* kingdom of Christ and the Saints here on earth; and therefore, I suppose, it seems to him best to let me have my way in the matter. Well, I don't see what else can be done. I can't help believing in such a kingdom, because

I believe the Bible testimony, and have not the least faith in the divinities of the schools. There is no other than such a kingdom promised in Moses, the prophets, and apostles, from one end of their testimony to the other. If there is to be no kingdom for Christ and his brethren in the Holy Land, with the dominion of the Gentile World annexed to it, as the pseudo orthodoxy of the day affirms, then there is no kingdom for them anywhere, and consequently the gospel is a mere fabrication. Why should such a kingdom be esteemed as "very gross?" Is a theocracy on earth a grosser idea than a theocracy in the Sun, Moon, or any other of the planets of our system, or beyond it? That God should have a visible government on earth—ruling over its inhabitants—is as necessary, as that the same system of rule should obtain in all other globes; and however gross it may be considered, if by "*gross*" is to be understood material and practical, it is both reasonable and scriptural; and therefore I should say, preëminently a refined, intellectual, and spiritual idea. But if the speculations of unenlightened brains—theological-school brains, ignorant of the prophets—be taken as the standard of seemliness, refinement, elegance, and spirituality, I do then indeed admit that it is "very gross," and rejoice and glory in its coarseness. But theological brainology is of no authority with one who understands the gospel of the Kingdom. Its pious metaphysics are of no account with such; its standards are mere optical illusions—its spiritualities, vain imaginations and absurdity. All "the deep things of God" are truly *spiritual*; because they are *incorruptible materialities*--corporeal substances that will not decay; institutions of divine origin, perfect and indestructible. Pious feeling, resulting from pulpit impressions on cautiousness, conscientiousness, veneration, and marvellousness, with a baseless expectation of meeting blood-relations and acquaintances in realms of ether, is the highest attainment of sky-

kingdomers in spirituality. To this sort of ecstacism, or intangibility, an indestructible kingdom in the land promised and covenanted to Abraham is no doubt gross, very gross indeed.

But I am glad to discern that our friend has little faith, if any, in the ambrosial realms of *blueairia*. However certain he may have once been of the floreal delights of the aerial vales and mountains of blue, I think from the penograph before me, that he has descended from those towering heights, which turn the brain, and taken up his stand upon earth's "everlasting hills" to view the landscape o'er. At least, I hope so.

I know the people of this republic, and of the West particularly, hate the very name of kings. I don't wonder at this. They have good reason to do so. All the kings and queens they know anything about, are the incarnations of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, now occupying the thrones of the Kingdom of Sin, styled in Scripture "*The Kingdom of Men*," and "THE KINGDOM OF BABYLON." These kings are just a specimen of what republicans would be if they occupied the same position. The reason is, that republicans are not therefore saints, and are as much under the dominion of sin as the kings; take Louis Napoleon, that republican of republicans, and Prince Napoleon Jerome, the heir apparent of the French Empire, for whom no republicanism could be too exalted, or too "red," as bright and burning examples! King People rejoices in his royalty, though born, cradled, and nurtured in democracy. The truth is, the people are not so much opposed to kingship and its attributes, as they are to their own exclusion from its glory, honor, power, and riches. Make them all kings, and kingliness would be highly popular in more senses than one; but in the old world this cannot be, therefore they hate the kings as monopolists of the loaves and fishes; who, as "victors," being sincerely devoted to "the spoils" of office, (and that "to the

victors belong the spoils," is a democratic sentiment,) are determined to hold on to them until a superior force shall compel them to let go. For myself, I have not a spice of admiration for the kings and other rulers of the Gentiles in my constitution. It matters not by what official name the sinner who rules is designated. He is placed in office by his fellow-sinners, to carry out their sinful purposes and policy upon sin-principles. Style him king, emperor, autocrat, sultan, shah, pope, or president, he is a sinner still, and to be trusted no farther than you can see him. Sin is concrete in him; and in this concrete form we have principally to do with sin in our sin-stricken world. My sympathies not being with sin, nor the works of sin, I have no enthusiasm nor admiration for what sets the people roaring with delight and ecstasy. I rejoice in the certainty of the subversion of all Gentile dominions before long, by whatever name distinguished. The least oppressive government on earth is that of the United States, because life, liberty, and property are amply protected, at a cost so trifling as to be scarcely felt; with unbounded scope for the energies of the people in any direction they may please.² Still it is a Sin-Power, and must be abolished as one of the works of sin. The prospect of this may be very unpalatable to republican democracy; yet to an heir of the kingdom it is a desirable and joyous anticipation; for all his hopes are wrapped up in the universal kingship of Jesus and the Saints.

It is indeed true, that the doctrine which teaches the ruling of the world in righteousness by an association of kings and priests, "will not go down" with this generation. This is a great truth, and therefore a great sign of the times. It proves that the people, with all their vain boasting about their piety and nineteenth century enlightenment, are faithless to the

This state of things has been greatly changed by the American War.—EDITOR *Christadelphian*.

gospel of the Kingdom, which is the only gospel in the Bible. They have no faith in the goodness of God as exhibited by His Spirit in the gospel. They are blind to it; and therefore sold into slavery to work under sin's lash for death, which is their hire. This is the wretched condition to which theological foolishness has reduced them. They are past feeling, being irresponsible to their great substantial, practical, and glorious truths of the gospel. A few unintelligible phenomena resulting from the operation of a hidden natural element upon sensitive nervous organizations, is infinitely more demonstrative to their minds of the constitution of the unseen world, and the nature of "the soul," than anything God has testified in Moses and the Prophets. A simple fellow in Hartford, Ct., who is a star of the first magnitude among "the Spiritualists," is said to have remarked, that not more than about twenty per cent. of the Bible is true; and that this portion is communicated by "the spirits!" The inference from this is, that the most direct means of acquiring Bible truth is to consult the spirits, who will not perplex you with the eighty parts of error by which the twenty per cent. is obscured, or rendered unintelligible! Hence, the Bible is useless to the spirit-worldists, who hold telegraphic intercourse with "immortal souls!" Nervous-system phenomena originated the immortal-soulism of Gentile philosophy, to the truth of which the Bible stubbornly refuses to testify. Hence, the natural hostility subsisting between it and the credulous Spiritists. The Bible pronounces their messages from the "spirit world" to be a mere tissue of lies (Isa. viii. 19, 20); and as a part of this tissue, the conscious existence of man in any form, between death and resurrection. This point being well established in the Bible, the explanation of all ghostological phenomena must be sought for among the natural laws, few of which, as pertaining to living flesh, are known to the most scientific of mankind.

So utterly destitute are Spiritualists of scripturally spiritual ideas, that when they observe an unusual physical phenomenon—a mere fleshly manifestation—they seize hold of it at once as an immortal manifestation from heaven, purgatory, or hell! With such cracked-brain sciolists sky-kingdomism is a demonstration of the Spirit! They know that their grandmothers, and Aunt Sukies, and little babies, and particular favorites, who were so kind to them, and made them feel so good, when here, "have kingdoms gained beyond the skies!" They know it; for have they not received messages from them direct, to tell them that *all they hoped* was true? What chance has a doctrine such as I advocate of "going down" with such shallow fleshly thinkers as these?—people whose thoughts cannot transcend the vagaries of their own day-dreams! None! They are a law to themselves, having placed themselves beyond the sphere of the divine influence of the word of God. They walk by sight, which the apostles did not; and doing so, they impose upon themselves fictions for realities, pertaining to a world which has no more present existence than 1855! No, there is no hope for such a generation. They are but a sign of the end, in which the Gentiles are to be cut off from Israel's Olive as a sapless and rotten branch. I expect, however, that as there was a remnant in Elijah's day, so there may be "a remnant" among the Gentiles "according to the election of grace"—some honest and good hearts into which the word of the Kingdom shall be understandingly and lovingly received, to the praise, and honour, and glory of God's great name; and to the preparation of the people who shall be accepted of Him at the appearing of Christ in the majesty and power of the Kingdom.

In that great day, the question will not be, whether the doctrine will go down, or whether the people will be "the Hour of Judgment," when the sentence will go forth, saying, "*Those mine enemies who would not that I*

should reign over them, bring kith, and slay before me."—(Luke xix. 27.) This will be the practical settlement of the controversy, in spite of money and democracy, which will enable no man to stand against THE STONE. The peoples of all ranks and tongues will be compelled to submit themselves with tribute (Ps. lxxviii. 30) to the Kingdom of the saints, under the terror of fire and sword. This is unavoidable. The past has proved that mankind cannot be brought into subjection to God by testimony and reason; they must therefore be subdued before they can be regenerated and blessed in Abraham and his Seed according to the gospel. Christ and the Saints ask no favors of the world. The earth is theirs and the fulness thereof (1 Cor. iii. 21, 22); and at the time appointed, they will take their own, in spite of all the Powers, imperial, regal, priestly, or republican, that now divide their divine royalty and inheritance among them.—(Ps. ii. 8, 9; Rev. ii. 26, 27.) There is something magnificent in this arrangement—an association of poor and despised people, taken from all the generations of the race, upon the principle of obedience resulting from the belief of the things promised them; that such a people of divinely-approved character, now struggling with adversity, under which they are sustained by the belief that they are the heirs, with Christ, of the earth and world with all their riches, and dying in that hope; that they should be raised from the dead, and that God should say to them, with the Lord Jesus at their head as the Commander-in-chief of their forces, "There is the world before you, which six thousand years ago I promised unto you as the Woman's Seed; the serpent holds it by his power, which is great; but there are Israel and Judah, my two-edged sword (Zech. ix. 13) and weapons of war, (Jer. l. 20,) who under your command shall become strong; for one of them shall chase a thousand Gentiles, and two put ten thousand to flight.—(Deut.—vii. 18, 22, 27.)

The world is yours; go, conquer for yourselves, and I will give you rest." Who would not rejoice in tribulation now, with a scriptural assurance of being an approved and recognized associate of such a valiant company as this? What are the honors, and riches, and powers, and dominion of the present world, or constitution of things, in comparison to this? Many have aimed at the conquest of the world, that they might gratify the lusts of their sin-flesh; but they have invariably failed. But Christ and the Saints, as commanders of Israel and Judah, will accomplish it for higher and nobler ends—that they may establish righteousness and peace on the ruins of ignorance, superstition, and the despotism of sin; and cause the will of God to be done upon the earth as it is in heaven. This will be a glorious conquest, though certainly a sanguinary one. But that cannot be avoided. The powers of sin must be broken; and if men will range themselves under its standards against Him whose mission it is to destroy the works of sin, they must take the consequences. Democracy and millionaires will be but pipe-stems; brittle as clay, and mere dust of the balance in the calculation.

Unquestionably, resurrection is "creation *de novo*;" but with this difference as respects Adam's: The resurrected are created again from materials previously existing in a former body; while Adam was created from materials that had constituted no part of a former man. Now the question is this. "*Has God wisdom, knowledge, and power enough to take a few particles of a previously existing being, having the same consciousness as the former being to whom the particles belonged?*" Agrippa, and many others in his day, as in ours, thought this incredible. This caused the apostle to enquire of him, "Why should it be thought incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Yea, why should it? We admit that He made Adam from dust, and Eve from one of his ribs; is it more

difficult to build up Judge Mack from his ashes, with the consciousness that he dwelt in Tennessee, and wrote the suggestive penograph before me? Does he require greater power to rebuild a man from his dust, however small in quantity, than to increase five loaves and two fishes to a sufficiency for four thousand, with a surplus of seven basketsful? Paul says that "God shall make alive our mortal bodies by Jesus through the Spirit."—(Rom. viii. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 14.) This is conclusive with me on the point of corporeal identity. The resurrected are to be created anew out of their mortal remains. I have nothing to do with the difficulties of the work. He that has declared he will accomplish the work, is abundantly able to encounter and overcome all the difficulties pertaining to it. When, however, it is understood, that it is not all the individuals of Adam's race that have died who are to rise again, a host of imaginary difficulties are removed. Among these, are such as different parts of a man being in divers parts of the earth; others being burned, and their ashes thrown into rivers; and so forth. All that are to be raised are in safe keeping for the purpose; for as to the righteous, it is written, "Precious in the eyes of Jehovah is the death of His saints;" and as He was watchful that not a bone of Christ should be broken; so are His eyes upon the mortal bodies, or remains, of His Brethren, to bring them forth at the appointed time.

If the entire man die, mind and body, how can he arise from the dead again? Easily enough. The personal "he" is defined by Paul to be "flesh." His words are, "In me, that is, in my flesh" (Rom. vii. 18); and when this "me" thinks, he styles the thinking, *το φρονημα της σαρκος*, to *phronema tes sarkos*, the thinking of the flesh. No flesh, no thinking. This is the law of our nature. Quadrupeds think because they have brain-flesh. When this flesh operates under ventricular excitation, "instinct" is manifested, as in the case of calves,

babies, &c.; and when stimulated to action by ideas from without, "reason" is developed in proportion to the higher or lower order of the mechanism of that peculiar kind of flesh. *Mind* is a noun of multitude, and stands for *brain-manifestations*. Press upon the brain, and there is no mind; remove the pressure, and thought and the expression of it return. If the creature die, the brain ceases to act, and mind ceases; renew his life, and its action is renewed, and mind is again manifested. Take the dust of Abraham, and in building him up again, let his new brain be formed *exactly like the old one*, and his new brain will have the old recollections, and think in the old faithful manner (Rom. iv. 18-22); in other words, Abraham will reappear as he was over three thousand years ago. After rebuilding him thus, transform him "in the twinkling of an eye," and you have Abraham as he will be forever.

The order, then, is this: first, to be born in the usual way. If, after this, the subject grow up under ordinary influences, his brain-flesh will manifest only the phenomena common to the pious metaphysics of the schools; or those characteristic of mere non-sectarianism. But we are tracking a man into the kingdom of God; therefore we shall not trouble ourselves now about the metaphysicians, pious or positive. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." This training of the brain-flesh, when conducted upon scriptural principles, moulds it to a conformity with the ideas of the Bible. It thinks scripturally, and, therefore, spiritually; and its scriptural thinking is styled *το φρονημα του πνευματος*, to *phronema tou pneumatos*, the thinking of the Spirit. Brainflesh thus trained thinks in a direction diametrically opposite to brainflesh trained under popular influences. The former is a spiritually-thinking, and the latter a fleshly-thinking brain. They are contrary one to another. Every "heir of the

kingdom" has had these two kinds of brainflesh. Before his enlightenment and subjection to *the obedience of faith*, he has a fleshly-thinking brain, which is the sport of all sorts of crotchets and vagaries, and always leaves its owner on the disobedient side of the "THE LAW OF FAITH." But in the process of enlightenment this crotchety brain becomes exorcised of the demons that possessed it; and it becomes the abode of the gospel of the kingdom, which being heartily believed, Christ therefore dwells there, and it becomes a spiritual brain. Its spirituality increases in the ratio of its increasing understanding of the word of the kingdom. In the ratio of this is its participation of the divine nature. No man, however "pious," or fervent, or devoted to "the Church," is spiritual, who is ignorant of the meaning of the word. A brain indoctrinated with the truth is a spiritual brain; and just such a brain as a man must possess who would enter the kingdom of God. It is a brain taught of God, and prepared by the operation of His Word to awake from death in His image. Such an one, then, dies the death of the righteous; and the eyes of Jehovah rest upon his ashes, as upon all such. "*He*" dies, and "returns to *his* dust." When the same dust is refashioned into a man by the Spirit of God, which pervades every atom of the earth's substance, "*he*" rises from the dust again, freed from "the law of sin and death," called by the Gentiles "the law of nature." His new brain being like the old (only freed from the said law) when it begins to think, it thinks where it left off when it fell asleep in death. It cannot think after any other fashion; for it was never any one else than itself, and if it recollect at all, its reminiscences must be of its own, and not of another's. Hence, the company that awakes from the dust are represented as singing recollections of their past history, saying, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out

of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."—(Rev. v. 9.) They remember that they are a redeemed people, and that they were inhabitants of earth before they died and rose again: and they know also for what they rise; for they say, "Thou hast made us kings and priests for God; and *we SHALL reign ON EARTH.*"

Such beings rise new creatures in every sense of the word, with the reminiscences of their new creature-condition in Christ, before they died. We must be "renewed by knowledge after the image of Him that hath created us" in this mortal state; that is, become new creatures in Christ, or we shall not become new creatures by resurrection from the dead. The moral new creaturehood must precede the physical; as the future physical condition of a man will be based upon his present moral.

Dust and ashes are unaffected by youth, manhood, or declining old age. These are states predicable only of corruptible organizations. Were the magic wand of the Spirit of God to touch the trembling body of second childhood, it would as soon stand erect and firm in the vigour of manhood, as did the dead body of Lazarus after four days of greater prostration in the grave. The saints rise incorruptible; and after ten thousand years will be as vigorous as when they heard the voice of Jesus calling to them to awake from their long death-sleep, and to come forth to glory, honor, and renown.

In conclusion, the Bible, believed and understood, delivers a man from all doubt about "the future and unseen world." It is no matter of "opinion" with him. He knows of a literary certainty, that the future and unseen world has no present existence more than next week has. He knows that it is coming as 1866 or 1910 are coming; and that when it arrives, it will be "the Economy of the Fulness of Times"—a constitution of things in which Israel and Judah will be a united nation in Palestine, under Christ and the Saints, constituting the

Kingdom of God, to which the dominion over all nations to earth's utmost bounds, will be annexed. They have no doubt about this. But to others who believe not, of course all is darkness and debate, and ever will

be till the reality opens upon their astonished ignorance with terrible and appalling effect. May my readers escape this catastrophe, by a diligent and faithful preparation for the event! —(*Herald*, 1854.)

THE TRUE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL AS ARISING OUT OF THE PROMISES MADE TO ABRAHAM.

By DR. THOMAS, THIRTY-TWO YEARS AGO.

THE expectation of this, Peter styles "a lively hope" to which we are begotten, by "the resurrection of Jesus Christ." This is "the hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into the heaven within the veil." This hope is not only the anchor of the soul, but "the helmet" of defence. It is "the hope of salvation" from the grave of that "life and immortality brought to light through the gospel," and which were promised before the world or ages of the law began.

There is a remarkable expression in Titus v. 2, which the student of the divine word ought to understand. In the exordium of this letter, Paul says "in the hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began;" in another part he styles it the "blessed hope" and associates it with "the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." From this it appears that God promised eternal life to some one before the world began. This phrase, "before the world began," cannot mean before the creation; because then there was no man upon the earth to whom the promise could be made. What then does it mean? A better translation will remove all obscurity. *Pro chronoon aionion* which occurs also in the 2nd Timothy, and in this place is properly translated before the times of the ages, or jubilees, by which all the time under the law of Moses was measured. Paul

tells us then, that God promised eternal life before the Jewish state was constituted. If so, to whom did He promise it? Did He promise it to Enoch, Noah, Shem, Japhet, or Melchisedeck? If to any of these where in the writings of Moses is the promise recorded? Nowhere, for these, were none of them "the holders of the promises." Who then can help us in our enquiry—who better than Paul, to whom was "committed the manifestation of God's word of promise through preaching?"

Paul styles Abraham *ton echontas tas epaggelias*, which is well rendered the holder of the promises. This is important information, because in searching after the promise of the inheritance and the promise of eternal life, we are restricted to the Mosaic biography of that distinguished man.

"To Abraham," saith Paul, "and to his seed were the promises made." God saith not to seeds as of many persons; but as of one individual, "and to thy seed which is Christ." Here then, we perceive a plurality of promises were made; not to Abraham alone, but his descendant the Christ in connection with him. Paul promptly disposes of the question as to what is meant by the seed of Abraham. He excludes all who have no other claim upon Abraham but their animal descent. For saith he, "they are not all children of Israel, which are of Israel; neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but "in Isaac shall thy

seed be called," that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Furthermore, "the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed (the Christ), through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they (the animal Israel) which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promises of none effect." Again, "he is not a Jew (or seed of Abraham in the true sense) who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of "the heart in the spirit (according to the gospel) and not in the letter, or according to the law, whose praise is not of men but of God."

Having determined who the seed of Abraham is, he continues, and this I say, that the *diatheekē*, will, or promise, that was confirmed before of God, in, to or for Christ, the law which was 430 years after (the promise), cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it, the inheritance, to Abraham by promise." Then saith an objector, in opposition to Paul's statement, if this be so, why was the law of Moses given, if the promise of the inheritance and its glorious attributes which constitutes "the Hope of Israel" come not to the natural seed of Abraham by obedience to the law? Ah! saith Paul, "there you misunderstand." The recompense of reward for obedience to the law was the promise of blessings pronounced from Mount Gerizzim upon the people.—(Deut. xxviii. 1-14.) This law . . . could impart no right or title to the inheritance under the administration of Messiah's reign, for, whoever under the law attains to that paradisaic kingdom, can do so only by "walking in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, who is the father of all them that believe," and whose sins are remitted retrospectively by the

death of Christ, "who was made under the law to redeem them that were under the law, that they might also receive the adoption of sons by the redemption of the body from the dust." And because "by his own blood he entered in once into the holiest, having obtained eternal redemption, he is the Mediator of the new institution, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, or Mosaic constitution, they which are called might receive the promise of (*tees*) the eternal inheritance." You mistake in this the whole matter. The law of Moses was added because of transgressions which were fast overspreading the world, and which would have soon banished the knowledge of the true God and of His truth from the face of the earth. The Mosaic constitution was given as the instrument of the national organisation of the descendants of Jacob, that they might become the depositories of the oracles of God concerning the seed of Abraham, the inheritance, and the glorious attributes of the paradisaic kingdom to be located therein. But this constitution of Moses was not to continue for ever. It was to obtain only for a special time, namely, "until the seed, that is Messiah, should come, to whom the promise (of Palestine in all its glory) was made."

Well then, my reader, an "eternal inheritance was promised to Abraham and to his seed, who is Christ," and it is one which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." But where is the promise of this eternal inheritance recorded—a promise which necessarily implies eternal life, otherwise the inheritance could not be eternally enjoyed? I answer, in Gen., the 14th chapter, where we shall find it not only promised, but as Paul says, actually "confirmed," so that it cannot be disannulled, or rendered of none effect.

But in our researches, we need not expect to find the promise of eternal life literally and verbally set forth in the history of the transaction. The things pertaining to the inheritance,

&c., were all mysteries, or secrets hid in the mind of God, until He made them known by His Spirit to the apostles, and through them to the world. The prophets who spoke concerning these things, enquired and searched diligently into the meaning of their own predictions. But it was revealed to them, that it was not for themselves, but for future generations they did minister the things reported to their contemporaries by the apostles, and confirmed by miracles performed by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; and which things the angels themselves desire to investigate. Thus speaks Peter, and Paul agrees with him, for he saith—

“Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,
Neither have entered into the heart of
man,
The things which God hath prepared for
those that love Him.”

But God hath revealed them to us by His Spirit. And in another place he saith, “The mystery of Christ, or secret concerning the Christ, in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, or kingdom, and partakers of His promise,” *en too Christoo*—“to the Christ of the Gospel.” It is, then, as a mystery we may expect to find the resurrection of the dead, eternal life, the gift of the Holy Spirit, &c., taught in the writings of Moses.—The argument of Jesus with the Sadducees is a case in point. These sectaries denied that there is any resurrection, and they admitted no oracles as authority but the writings of Moses. To convince them, therefore, to the contrary, it was necessary to prove the resurrection from the writings of Moses himself. “Now,” said Jesus, “that the dead are raised, even Moses showed.” Where, we may ask, has Moses demonstrated the resurrection from the dead? Why, saith Jesus, in calling the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. “For God is not the God of the dead who are to

rise no more, but of the dead who shall live by a resurrection from the dead, for all live to Him.” This reasoning was so conclusive, that the Scribes answering, said, “Master, thou hast well said!” There is no obscurity in the phrase “all live to Him,” when we consider the subject matter of the argument, that it is whether the dead are raised or not. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob all live to God, because all things being present before Him, He regards them as alive, though really dead, by a future resurrection from the dead. Upon this there need be no cavil or quibbling, for though palpable in itself, Paul makes the passage still plainer; for when speaking on the same topic, he saith, “Abraham is the father of us all, before Him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth or makes alive, the dead, and calleth those things or persons which be not, as though they were or did exist.” This was the doctrine of the resurrection veiled, yet taught, in the writings of Moses; and in like manner is eternal life promised in connection with the eternal inheritance to Abraham and Messiah, and to all who can prove themselves children of that Patriarch and brethren of his Seed, in the first book of Moses.

Of the facts on record there is no dispute: the controversy, if any, turns upon the meaning thereof. Abraham, a citizen of the Chaldean Ur, in Mesopotamia, according to Joshua, was a worshipper of other gods than the true one. While he dwelt beyond the Euphrates, the God of glory appeared to him, and commanded him to emigrate from his native land to a country which He would show him. He obeyed, and entered Canaan, through which he passed, and entered the plain of Moriah. While there, the Lord appeared to him, and said “Unto thy Seed (Messiah) will I give this land.” After Lot separated from him, the Lord appeared to him and said, “Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and west-

ward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever. Arise; walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee." Could any promise be more plain or positive? Nevertheless, it must have put Abraham's faith greatly to the proof. The probabilities were all against his ever being the proprietor of Palestine. The country was then possessed by warlike tribes fortified in cities walled to heaven. Before he could take possession of the country, they must be expelled; but how could he, few and feeble as were his retainers, effect it? It was impossible. Yet Abraham believed the promise of God, that He would give him the land and multiply his seed innumerable; and the Lord "counted it to him for righteousness."

Again the Lord appeared to him, and said, "I brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it." Is it wonderful that though Abraham believed God, he should ask Him for a confirmation of His promise? In the analysis of the transaction thus far, we have God, the promiser, Abraham and Messiah, his descendant, those to whom the promise is made, and the eternal possession of Palestine, in all its glory, the subject matter of the promise; but hitherto the promise had received no confirmation. Abraham had entered the country about a year before, being 431 years before the law was given to his animal descendants of Jacob's line from Mount Zion. God had then simply affirmed that his seed should inherit the land; and now the time had arrived to give Abraham a supernatural sign by which he might know now assuredly that the Lord, with whom he had become so recently acquainted, was as able as He was willing to give him possession of the inheritance at the appointed time. The events of Gen. xv. occurred precisely 430 years before the law was given; and Paul plainly styles them the confirmation of the promise which made it immutable; for God

confirms all His institutions, and when confirmed, they suffer no disannulment—*magna componere parois*—to compare great things with small, they are as unrepealable as the laws of the Medes and Persians.

The incident which brought about the confirmation of the promise was the question put by Abraham to God: "Lord God," said he, "whereby shall I know that I shall inherit," or take possession of this land. The reply was a command to Abraham to take "a heifer of three years old, a she goat of three years old, a ram of three years old, a turtle dove and a young pigeon." Having selected these, he slew them, cut them up into pieces, and laid each piece one against another; the birds, however, he sacrificed without dividing. Thus the first act of the confirmation was the shedding the blood of typical sacrifices of an age, having, I believe, an allusion to the three years' ministry of the seed of Abraham previous to the sacrifice of himself. The second act was to watch the sacrifices and to guard them from the birds of prey until the sun declined. May not these slaughtered animals have been exposed from the time of the future morning and evening sacrifices under the law, and thus typify the exposure of the crucified seed of Abraham upon the accursed tree? Be this as it may, this was the occasion chosen by the Lord God to reveal to Abraham his own destiny and that of his descendants as animal men. He predicted their sojourn in Egypt as servants to its people; the judgment of the Egyptians; their deliverance from Egypt with great substance; and their introduction into Canaan when the iniquity of its inhabitants should be full; and as to himself, the Lord told him that he should die in peace, and be buried in a good old age. Thus ended the second part of this extraordinary interview.

From the declaration, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age," all expectation of possessing Canaan

during his animal life was utterly banished from Abraham's mind. He would instantly perceive that the promise had reference to a time for its fulfilment, which was "afar off," to a period considerably removed from the time of the temporary residence in the land. "He died in faith" that he should receive the country for an inheritance; and though not under the constitution of things with which he was then contemporary, yet he should actually possess it when God had organised the State of Palestine by giving it a constitution from heaven, and in this way becoming its maker and preparer, making it a better country than it then was, that is, truly a heavenly one. In view of this, then, he was unmindful of Mesopotamia, from whence he came out, and was contented to remain a foreigner and wanderer in the land; and in this he plainly declared he sought a country whose constitution was of another and a future age.

To the men of that generation who were wise in their own conceit, Abraham, as well as Moses, must have been the subject of contumely. To hear a feeble shepherd declare that the time would come when a descendant of his, in company with himself, would possess the country of which they were then seized, must have appeared to them as the hallucination of a deft old man. Doubtless in his wanderings he would diffuse widely the revelation that a descendant of his would be born in a future age, in whom all the nations of the earth would be blessed. This expectation would be fostered by all his family, and by all who believed his proclamation, and would be handed down from generation to generation until the seed should come. Thus we find that 400 years after, this hope became a matter of reproach to all who cherished it. Hence Paul says of Moses, that though he might have been honoured by the title of the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and thus recognised as the grandson of the King of Egypt, he chose rather to suffer oppression with God's people, who were the slaves of

the Egyptians, than to enjoy the gaities of the court of Egypt; esteeming the reproach of Christ, or seed of Abraham, greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, the most learned, powerful, polished, and wealthy people of the age. He was actuated to this by the regard he had for the "recompense of the reward." Thus he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of Pharaoh; for he endured, as seeing him for whom he suffered reproach and who was invisible.

Having instructed Abraham that he was not to expect to possess the land in his natural or animal lifetime, the Lord God then gave him the sign "whereby he might know that he should inherit it" at the proper time, "the times or seasons" being reserved to himself. Darkness having veiled the earth, fire from heaven consumed the sacrifice, as it is written, "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp, or flame, passed between those pieces." Thus by blood, and fire, and a cloud of smoke, the Lord confirmed or established to the faithful and distinguished patriarch, the renowned and noble "friend of God," the promise that he and Messiah should inherit the glorious land. For in connection with this sign "in that same day," 430 years before the law was given, "the Lord made a covenant or promise with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed—the Messiah—have I given this land of Canaan, from the river of Egypt unto the great river Euphrates, inhabited by the Kenites, &c., &c."

And here we would enquire, was the promise fulfilled when the animal descendants took possession of the country under Joshua? To say nothing of Paul's definition of "the seed," and his limitation of it to one person and to those "in him," we would remark, that if the twelve tribes believed that the promise contained in it no more than the occupation of Canaan under judges, animal kings, or Roman pro-consuls, they would not in Paul's day, nor in our time "instantly serve God day and night" that they might attain to "the hope of the promise made of God to the fathers,"

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Put Paul says plainly that Joshua did not put them in possession of the land in the promise. For God by the mouth of David spoke of the rest some centuries after Joshua; now if they had obtained the rest under Joshua God would "not have spoken of another day." "There remained, therefore, a rest to the people of God," which is inheritable only by those who can prove themselves to be of that number. Besides, after enumerating a list of worthies of all ages from Abel to the last of the prophets, he winds up by saying "these all, having attained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us under the gospel than the possession of the land under the Mosaic constitution, that they without us should not be made perfect by a resurrection of the dead."

"And God gave Abraham," says Stephen in his eloquent address before the Jewish Sanhedrim, "no inheritance in this land in which ye dwell, no, not so much as to set his foot on, yet He promised that He would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." From this testimony of Stephen it is plain that he and his countryman did not consider God as having redeemed His word to Abraham in establishing their nation in Palestine. No! say the apostles, the inheritance, the seed of Abraham, eternal life, incorruptibility, honour and glory, are still our hope; we still earnestly look for them, for God, who has promised them, "cannot lie." Seeing, then, that the veracity of God is eternally and indisputably firm, yea, sure as the everlasting mountains, what must transpire to eventuate the fulfilment of His promise to Abraham and Messiah, so solemnly confirmed by His mighty power. There is but one answer that can be given, to wit, first Messiah must come again, and second, Abraham must rise from the dead. Thus, we find, under the promise of the inheritance to Abra-

ham and to his seed for ever, eternal life as one of its necessary accompaniments, it being impossible to possess the one without the other. Hence, my intelligent readers, the object of the second coming of Messiah is as obvious as it is necessary. He comes to place Palestine under a heavenly constitution, to raise Abraham to the possession of the land, to take possession of it himself, and to give "all the seed" a share in the rights, honours, glories, privileges and immunities of the inheritance "for ever."

This view of the subject offers a solution of the passage where it is written, "He came to his own land, but his own people did not receive him." What constitutes Palestine the land of Jesus, and the Jews his subjects more than the land and people of his dignified forerunners? Because God gave the land and all its appurtenances to him as the seed of Abraham. But like his patriarchal progenitors, he departed this life, nay even left our planet, without obtaining so much as to place his foot upon. "The foxes have holes," said he, "and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head;" he was even indebted to a stranger for a decent burying-place. Jehovah's promise, therefore, to him has never been fulfilled; but "God cannot lie," says Paul; hence to fulfil His word, He must re-introduce Messiah to the world with power and great glory, that he may subdue the enemy and take possession of the country himself.

But are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Messiah to be the sole occupants of Palestine? No; for though Jesus is the seed of Abraham, he stands the representative of a multitude. This, however, is a first principle, namely, that to share in the splendour of Messiah's kingdom, of which Palestine is the regal promise, a man must be of the seed of Abraham, for they alone are heirs of the promise made to him.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERN-
ING A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 15.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

TRUE THEOLOGY NOT INCOMPATIBLE WITH "SCIENCE."

THE *Jewish Chronicle*, commenting on a case in the West of England, where the question was recently raised, under a trust, whether the study of science was likely to promote theology, says,—“We confess we are deeply interested in the important question: Is science antagonistic to theology? With theology, as taught by Christianity, science no doubt is incompatible. There is hardly a Christian doctrine which does not directly or indirectly place itself in opposition to some established principle, departure from which would involve a logical contradiction or a physical impossibility. We are not referring to miracles. For nobody believing in an intelligent First Cause, the Author of Nature, will maintain that it is beyond the power of this Being, for the attainment of any special purpose which He may have in view, to

suspend or modify the working of the laws established by Him. Miracles, in fact, cannot be a question of power, but of expediency. And human intelligence is too restricted to be able to judge in how far the special purpose in the divine view could have been attained by any other agency save that employed. . . . What we refer to, are such doctrines, for instance, as that according to which millions of human beings are being consigned to everlasting perdition, in consequence of either not having heard of Christianity, and, therefore, not having had an opportunity for examining it, or having had such an opportunity, have from weakness of intellect not been able to convince themselves of its truth. We are not speaking of individual Christians, many of whom are, no doubt, as horrified at this doctrine as we ourselves, but we speak of Christianity as a religious system for the formation of which in the existing shape, neither they nor we are responsible. Now this doctrine necessarily involves

the belief that God, the supreme fountain of justice—which He has indeed laid down as the foundation of man's moral nature—violates this principle by pouring out His vials of wrath on the heads of those who simply did not do what they were not able to do by having been placed by Him in a position which absolutely prevented their doing what He wished them to do. Is there any mind with the slightest tincture of logic that could give its assent to a theology part and parcel of which this doctrine forms? The trustees of the Huish Scholarships are, therefore, not wrong in excluding from the curriculum adopted by them, all studies except that of theology. Had they included those of science, the object of the pious founder would have been frustrated. There is only one theology in existence which is not antagonistic to science—this is Jewish theology."

By Jewish theology, the *Jewish Chronicle*, doubtless, means Rabbinical theology. Whether Rabbinical theology is truly in harmony with science, may be open to doubt, but there is no question that "Jewish Theology," in the full and correct sense of that phrase—viz., the doctrines taught in the Jewish Scriptures by those celebrated Jews, Moses, the prophets, Jesus, the prophet like unto Moses, and his apostles—is in no degree, form or sense inconsistent with the facts existing in nature. They have nothing to do with the tormenting of the millions referred to by the *Jewish Chronicle*, nor with the notion of native immortality from which the other notion springs. They teach man to be the mortal being which nature shows him to be, and death to be the destiny which the same authority testifies. They add a hope—"sure and certain"—which is extra to nature but not inconsistent with it. So with all their other teachings. When the Bible is understood, the scientific 'difficulties' that

embarrass orthodox theologians vanish like the mountain mist before the sun.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

(Continued from page 252.)

"Observe, now, from the creation on, what definiteness of statement characterises this history. Beyond comparison with all other ancient histories, the Bible abounds in names and dates and places. The flood came in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, the second month, the 17th day of the month. Isaiah's vision occurred 'in the year King Uzziah died.' So Haggai says: 'In the second year of Darius the king, in the sixth month, in the 1st day of the month came the word of the Lord by Haggai, the prophet, unto Zerrubabel, the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah.' From first to last, the record has this statistical character.

The Spartans derived their institutions from Lycurgus, but their historians cannot tell within two hundred years when he lived. The Jews have their lawgiver, but they tell us when he was born, the names of his father and mother and brother and sister, the age at which he began his public career, his age when he died. The children of Israel no sooner set forth on their wanderings than their census is taken. Another is taken before they enter the Promised Land, with the unexpected result that the host has diminished during the interim of thirty-eight years. The record is filled with dry chapters, full of names and repetitions, which no one reads, just as no one goes to the Recorder's office for light reading, but which become valuable when we examine them critically, as legal documents are valuable in courts of law. Read these dry chapters, and you cannot avoid pronouncing them genuine, but if they

are genuine, how much interwoven with them must also be genuine.

We have, side by side, two distinct histories concerning the same period, the Kings and Chronicles: the first being contemporary biography, written by various prophets, and the other a priestly record made long subsequently. This priestly record begins its genealogy with Adam, but being made at a later day, uses, in many cases, a different spelling, Sheth for Seth, Enosh for Enos, Kenan for Cainan, Tilgath Pilneser for Tiglath Pileser, etc. Would a forger have woven into his history this two-fold record with these variations in orthography? Would he still further have supplemented the two-fold history with a volume of poetry, such as the Psalms, referring to the same events? Would a writer, who had forged the account of the landing of the Pilgrims, have also forged Mrs. Hemans' hymn: "The breaking waves dashed high," etc. Would Jewish pride have suffered a forged record of David's crime and then have forged the fifty-first Psalm to go with it? In one word, is it credible that we have here a forged national literature, forged genealogies, forged State papers, forged priestly records, a forged ritual, forged triumphal songs for forged national victories, forged prophecies of actual events, a forged growth of language, involving the use of various orthographies of obsolete words and new grammatical forms? If any man would know just what work the Jews would make in attempting such a forgery, or such a compilation from floating traditions, let him read the Apocrypha and study the Talmud. The uninspired Jewish narratives regarding Moses, for example, are as unnatural and incredible as are the Greek legends regarding Hercules.

Observe, too, that these early Scriptures are intensely Jewish. They are indelibly stamped with the nationality of a nation that was peculiarly exclusive.

They ignore all other nations, except when those other nations are necessarily interlinked with their own. They take no notice of the pyramids of Egypt or the hanging gardens of Babylon, but find space for the very curtains and tent pins of the Jewish tabernacle. The book is intensely Jewish.

Yet it is the world's book. It goes the earth around. It is a book of the common people, a fireside book, held to be a priceless treasure in the Alpine fastnesses, and the Scottish Highlands—on the New England hills and the islands of the Pacific. The stories of Joseph and Samuel and Daniel are as popular with the children of Boston and of Honolulu as they were with the children of Hebron and Bethlehem. The Puritan is at the farthest remove from the Jew. He belongs to another race, another civilisation. Cold, stern, unimaginative, severely logical, he represents himself in his meeting-house, bare of ornament and utterly simple in its service. The Jew, child of the Orient, with a tropical nature, delighting in gorgeous imagery, builds a temple resplendent with gold and matchless in its elaborate ceremonial. Now, how shall we account for the fact that the Jew's book is the very substructure of the Puritan's faith? Nay, more; it is the corner-stone of our Occidental civilisation. The American ideas, of which we shall hear so much during this Centennial Year: the equality of the race, the brotherhood of man, the nobility of woman, the hatefulness of slavery, the dignity of labour, the value of education, came to us not from Thomas Jefferson and John Hancock and John Adams; their seed germs were planted by Moses and Isaiah and Paul. How happens it that this book, so intensely national, is, at the same time, so incomparably universal? Make the experiment with any other oriental

book. Try the Rig Vedas of India. Could you, by any possibility, make them a household book in America? Translate Plato and Aristotle: a few scholars will notice them, and that is all. They cannot live except in the atmosphere in which they were born. Like plants, they have their *habitat*, and are confined to it. The Bible, like the air we breathe, belongs to every clime. It is like the air we breathe, because God has breathed His own breath into it. It is all men's book, because it is God's book. It inspired men, because it is itself inspired of God.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 256.)

"We are thus able to trace back lists of New Testament books almost to the apostolic age. The author of the *Canon in Mynatori* from which I have been quoting, lived in the days of some who had been in part contemporaries of the apostle John. We know from the natural course of events, that this *must* have been the case. And we need not rely on deductions, however certain, for we know as a fact that Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had himself personally known John, laid down his life at a very advanced age, as a martyr for Christ, about the year 168.* Polycarp visited Rome, the place at which the author of this fragmentary list seems to have lived and written, after the middle of the second century—a visit memorable for the amicable contention between him and Anicetus, the Roman bishop, about the proper time for the celebration of Easter—each remained unconvinced by the other, and each left

* He had been a Christian 86 years. When invited to reproach Christ, he said, "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he hath never wronged me, and how can I blaspheme my King who hath saved me?"—*Miner*.

the other to the exercise of his individual Christian liberty:—what a proof that the claims of infallibility and universal jurisdiction were as yet unknown!

We have thus proof that the New Testament books, in general, were in use as authoritative Scripture in the days of those who lived in the apostolic age—that they were ascribed to the same writers to whom we attribute them, and that several of them were classed together as being, though not as yet *one* collected volume, yet at least in some measure a collection.

For ancient writings we ask no more distinct proof of genuineness: it is commonly regarded as quite sufficient if a work is mentioned by one or more writers of the succeeding age, in such a way as to show that it was then known and used as the work of the author whose name it bears.

With regard to the New Testament books, however, we can go much farther with our proofs, when we consider, not the volume as a *collection*, but the distinct parts of which the volume is composed.

In the second century, *two* collected portions of the New Testament were known and used by Christians, as read in public assemblies; the one of these contained the Epistles of Paul, to which his name is prefixed—the other comprised the four gospels as a *collected* volume. Besides these, there were other writings used separately.

I will now first consider the evidence which relates to Paul's epistles,—then that which bears on the authenticity of the gospels,—then the other books must be considered separately: in this part of the subject a distinction must be made between those books of which Eusebius speaks as universally received, and those which he says were opposed by some."

PAUL'S EPISTLES.

In the latter part of the second century we find testimony to the knowledge and

use of thirteen epistles of Paul, as certain and indubitable as we have that they are now known and used. The fact is alike admitted by friends and foes of revelation, that the church then had these epistles, even as we now have them, and that they attributed them to the apostle. Proofs of this will be given presently.

Now, the evidence by which letters are authenticated to future ages is often of a peculiar kind; a letter has not only a writer but also a party to whom it is addressed. If I wish to bring forward a letter as an evidence, it is often sufficient if I can prove that such letter has been preserved in proper custody; if the party to whom it was addressed preserves it as genuine, this is a presumption of the strongest kind that it is so; the business of proving that it is *not* so rests with the opposite party.

Thus, those epistles which were addressed to *churches* may be attested in a manner peculiarly strong, from the fact that such churches preserved them and read them publicly and habitually.

The collections of Paul's epistles is sufficiently shown by the manner in which they are mentioned in the *Canon in Muratori*; that this reception of those documents was no private or local peculiarity is manifest from the fact that they are equally used in Alexandria, in Carthage and Gaul.

This is proved by the citations of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Irenæus. This Clement, in the latter part of the second century, was the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria; he speaks of Paul's several epistles by name, and cites them, with the single exception of the short epistle to Philemon; this too would doubtless have been mentioned had he anywhere given a list of the epistles. He speaks of the gospel collection under the name by which it was often designated, of *Evangelium*, and the collection of Paul's epistles by name

of *apostolos*, or apostle, which was early appropriated to them. This name seems to have originated in the circumstance that the collection of epistles then contained the writings of *one* apostle.

Contemporary with Clement was Irenæus, bishop of Lyon, in Gaul; he gives as explicit a testimony as possibly could be borne to the same collection of epistles; he mentions each of them and cites them as familiar writings, with the same exception of the short epistle to Philemon.

Tertullian was a presbyter in the north of Africa; he used all the thirteen epistles to which Paul's name was attached, of that to Philemon he speaks as distinctly as the rest.*

Now the manner in which these early writers used these epistles does not merely prove that they themselves knew them to be genuine documents, but it does a great deal more, for it shows that Christians in general so received them at the time in question. These writers appeal to the epistles as familiarly as a modern author would do; they habitually quote them as though their authority were as much admitted by other Christians as by themselves.

Now, such a testimony as this carries us, of necessity, a long way further back than the mere point of time at which these men *wrote*: it takes us, at least, to the earliest period of their knowledge as Christians. It shows that even then this collection of writings, bearing the names of the apostle Paul, was in circulation amongst the churches both in the east and the west. It shows that this must have been the case, at least in the former part of the second century; that is, in the

* The following references show passages in which Irenæus cites the different epistles:—Rom. i., iii. 16 § 3; 1 Cor. i., iv. 27 § 3; 2 Cor. i., iii. 7, 1 §; Gal. i., iii. 16 § 3; Ephes. i., v. 2 § 3; Phil. i., iv. 18 § 4; Col. i., iii. 14 § 1; 1 Thes. i., v. 6 § 1; 2 Thes. i., iii. 7 § 2; 2 Tim. i., i. 1 § 1; 2 Tim. i., iii. 3 § 3; Titus i., iii. 3 § 4.

days of the many who were then still living, who had belonged to the church while it was still possessed of apostolic training.

The weight which the diversity of the locations of these writers gives to their evidence can hardly be over-estimated. We have not a trace of such a thing as one part of the church knowing this collection and another not possessing it. It was the common possession of the Christians, with which the teachers and the communities which they taught were alike acquainted.

And, further, it was not the Christian community alone which was acquainted with the collected epistles of the apostle Paul. In the second century, one of the most remarkable Separatists from the Church, Marcion of Pontus, formed out a religious system for himself: he considered that Paul only fully understood the principles of *true* Christianity, and to his teaching he professed to adhere exclusively. Marcion's leading opinions were an entire rejection of the *incarnation and sufferings of the Son of God, and a rejection of the Old Testament*, as something that was not from the true God. He used as authoritative Scripture one gospel, which contained the narrative of Luke, with the omission of all that related to the birth, &c., of Christ, and a collection of Paul's epistles, from which he excluded (as we learn from Tertullian) those to Timothy and Titus; he retained that to Philemon, so that Marcion's knowledge of this short epistle is so far valuable as an early acknowledgment of its existence, and that it was owned to be Paul's. The time when Marcion began to spread his peculiar opinions, from Pontus to Rome, was about the year 130; so that we have thus a further proof of Paul's epistles having been collected and used in that form before that time.

I said that the testimony which connects any particular document with a

community to which it was addressed, possesses a peculiar force. In this point of view, an appeal of Tertullian has no small value; by this allusion we learn, amongst other things, that Paul's epistles were read in the second century, in the Christian assemblies, as authoritative Scripture.

He says: "Come, now, thou who desireth better to exercise thy curiosity in that which relates to thy salvation: go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the chairs of the apostles preside in their places, in which their authentic letters are recited, resounding the voice and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast Thessalonica. If thou canst direct thy course into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority is ready at hand for us also (at Carthage, where he was writing, the authority is that of the apostle in his epistle to the Romans). How happy is that church on which apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood; where Peter suffered in the same manner as the Lord; where Paul was crowned with the death of John (the Baptist); where the apostle John, after he had been cast into the fiery oil and had suffered nothing, was banished to an island! Let us see what it learned, what it taught: it accords with the Churches of Africa also. It knows one God, the Creator of all things, and Christ Jesus, born of the Virgin Mary, the Son of God the Creator, and it knows the resurrection of the flesh; it mingles the law and the prophets with the writings of the evangelists and apostles."—(*De præes. Hoer.*, cap. 36.)

This last clause refers to the practice of reading equally in the Christian assemblies the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

It may now sound strange to hear Tertullian connecting what the Church of Rome had learned from the apostles with that which it taught others: *now* we see the sad and solemn contrast. Paul taught it the free grace of the gospel—justification through the faith of Christ: “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” Does Rome teach this *now*? It was to this Church that Paul addressed the warning to the Gentiles, who had been grafted into the good olive tree: “If thou continue in His goodness—otherwise thou shalt be cut off.” Was there not a solemn prophecy veiled under this conditional threatening?

The testimony of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus, connected as they all were with the apostolic age—(especially Irenæus, as I shall have occasion to show), might suffice, as proving conclusively that from the apostles days and onwards, these epistles were used and read as Paul’s, that the churches to which most of them were addressed owned them as such, and that their genuineness was a fact of common knowledge. In *opposition* to this, there is *no evidence* whatever; it is not in fact a *balance* of testimony, for all is on one side; if, then, anything be said in opposition, it is only surmise and conjecture: of what weight are they in comparison with proved facts?

If these epistles were not genuine *when* could the falsification have taken place? It could not have been later than the early years of the second century; and then we must suppose that either it was a common conspiracy of all Christians to give currency to false epistles—a conspiracy in which Italy, Gaul, North Africa, Asia, and Egypt, and further, the heretic Marcion, in part, combined—or else that the whole sprung from the pen of daring forgers, who not only persuaded all

Christian communities that these epistles proceeded from the apostle Paul, but who even succeeded in causing Seven Churches to believe that they had received epistles from Paul which they never had received. Such are some of the difficulties which must be grappled with when conjectural endeavours are used to set aside the force of clear evidence.

But we are able to carry our line of evidence to some of these epistles yet further back.

In the first century of our era lived Clement of Rome; we possess one genuine epistle which he addressed to the Church at Corinth. The Church of Rome ranks this Clement as the first of her Popes of that name; it is, however, by some writers said that he was the *second* Pope; others, the third; others, the fourth; and others, the fifth.* So doubtful is the alleged papal succession at the very beginning.†

But leaving the advocates of Rome to settle such knotty points, the fact is indisputable that in the first century Clement addressed the Corinthian Church thus:—“Why do we rend and tear in pieces the body of Christ, and raise seditions against our own body? . . . your schism has perverted many; it has

* The early pontifical lists agree better in the names than in the order; some give the succession: 1, Peter; 2, Linus; 3, Cletus (or Anencletus); 4, Clement; others place Clement between Linus and Cletus; others again divide Cletus or Anencletus into two persons (thus introducing a fictitious bishop) while others place Clement immediately after the apostle Peter. This last opinion is not common in the Church of Rome; it is, however, maintained by the R. Cath. Prof. Hefele, of Tübingen. See his *Patres Apostolici*, ed. 3; *Prolegg*, p. XXXVI.: “Colligimus . . . S. Clementem ipsi, S. Petro successisse.”

† In the beginning there was “no bishop of Rome.” Paul’s epistle was written to “the saints in Rome, called of Christ Jesus,” constituting “one body in Christ.”—(ch. i. 6, 7; xii. 5); and over this body were not one mortal bishop but several, having gifts differing according to the grace given to each, “fitting them for prophesying, ministering, teaching, exhorting, imparting, ruling and showing mercy.”—(xii. 6, 8.) Over all these “elders” was “the Chief Shepherd and Bishop,” Jesus Christ.—(1 Peter ii. 25; v. 4.)—EDRROR.

discouraged many; it has caused diffidence in many and grief in us all: and yet your sedition continues still. Take the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle into your hands: what did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel? In truth he wrote to you by the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that even then ye had made party divisions."—(Ep. ad Cor. cap. 47.)

Thus, in the first century, did one whom after ages have designated as a Pope, write to a contentious church; he uses no anathematizing threats; he even writes, not in his own name, but in that of 'the Church that sojourneth at Rome,' and the authority that he yielded was the Scripture written by Paul. Would that Clement XI., who professed to be the successor of *this* Clement, had been actuated by a similar spirit, instead of fulminating direful anathemas against any who maintained that "the reading of Holy Scripture is for all."—(*Constitution 'Unigenitus.'*)

This epistle of Clement seems to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem (see *Hefele*, p. xxxv). At all events, it was in the first century, and not more than from thirty to forty years after that of Paul to the Corinthian Church, so that not a few would, in the ordinary course of things, be still living at that place to whom the rebuke of the apostle had been addressed.

Now, Paul's first epistle in the Corinthians was one of solemn reprobation, and yet that church held it fast as genuine—a plain proof that they *knew* it to be such; the nature of the case, even if there were no other impossibilities, would

preclude the thought of forgery. *The epistle was an evidence that condemned them, and yet they preserved it.*

We find too, from a letter of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to the Roman Church in the second century, that the Corinthians publicly read also this epistle of Clement; so that it, too, receives its attestation from those whose practical conduct it condemned.

It is not my object now to speak directly of the authority and inspiration of the New Testament books; this epistle, however, attested as it is by strict lines of evidence of the strongest kind, as actually written by Paul to the Corinthian Church, may call for a passing notice from the peculiar nature of its contents.

The writer speaks of the miraculous powers in the gift of tongues which he himself possessed. He mentions this as well known by those to whom he wrote; and their reception and preservation of the epistle is a proof that such was the fact; as, endued with such powers, he claims such authority as to say, "If any man judge himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." He claims authority from God which the Corinthians *knew* to be confirmed by miraculous powers. And further, he speaks of such powers as bestowed upon some of the Corinthians themselves—a plain proof of the reality of the whole statement; to imagine the contrary would not only include the supposition that the writer had lost his reason, but that also his readers at Corinth were *all* similarly affected.

(*To be continued.*)

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

BY F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 132.

WORKS AND MAXIMS OF MEN.

MEN say "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever." The Bible says "Beauty is vain."—(Prov. xxxi. 30.)

What men call "the dignity of labour," is a kind of dressing up that will only do for people who are ignorant of the truth. To "eat bread by the sweat of the face" is an experience introduced by sin; and in view of the fact noted by Solomon, that a man has to leave the result of his labour to another (who may be a wise man or a fool), it is a vanity to be despaired of; while in the light of Christ's exhortation, to "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life," it is clear that the grinding toil of a mortal sin-stricken existence has no dignity beyond that which may be obtained for it by the consecration of the endeavour to the obtaining of an imperishable inheritance, and an enduring substance in the life to come.—(Gen. iii. 19; Eccles. ii. 11, 18, 19, 22; John vi. 27.)

Men counsel one another to "self-reliance" in the battle of life; but not so the Scriptures: their exhortation is, "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding." And again, "The children of Israel prevailed because they "relied on the Lord God."—(2 Chron. xiii. 18.)

Men exhort one another to "self-help;" but the Bible says rather, "Happy is he who hath the God of Jacob for his help, and whose hope is in the Lord his God;" and again, "Bear ye one another's burdens;" and again, "As ye have opportunity, do good unto all men."

Poor short-sighted men sing proudly how "Britons never shall be slaves," not discerning that he who is a servant of sin, though free from a forced servitude, is by far the greater slave than he who, though bodily subject to another, is the servant of righteousness. The only truly free men are Christ's bondsmen.

It is generally supposed to be a great virtue to be provident, and to lay by against a rainy day; but this mostly means look out for yourself; lay up for yourself

treasures upon earth; but we have a better principle than that, by Paul, viz., "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth."—(1 Cor. x. 24.)

Self defence is considered a very noble art; but the Bible shews us a more excellent way; for whilst it allows a man to shield himself from unjust procedure, by claiming the right of protection which any just law affords, as in the case of Paul (Acts xxv. xxvi.), it, at the same time, enjoins that we "resist not evil;" and again, "If a man strike thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also."

"Forward" is considered a capital motto to head a pushing business with; but it is only expressive in that connection of the untiring zeal with which men pursue the perishing objects of their ambition. A higher motto is that of Paul, "Go on unto perfection," or again, "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."—(Phil. iii. 14; Heb. vi. 1.)

Men account patriotism a noble virtue; but if they understood Moses and the prophets they would be much differently minded. Their love of fatherland would find a much higher object of affection, and one greatly more worthy of their zeal in the land which God has chosen, and wherein He will yet place His glory for the enlightenment of the nations. If they understood this, they would "pray for the peace of Jerusalem;" or like Joseph of Arimathea, "wait for the kingdom of God."

Some men think that to reclaim men from drunkenness is about as great a work as they could well engage in, but where the facts of the case are seen, there is a better and more profitable work than this to which a man may more wisely and usefully devote himself. The facts are, that the benefits obtained in the reform of a drunkard are confined to the present mortal life, whereas, on the other hand the mass of professed religionists who crowd the popular conventicles have mostly drunk deep into the drugged wine of Rome's intoxicating cup. To make such sober by the belief and obedience of the truth is a work which includes "temperance in all things," and has for its end everlasting life.—(Rev. xvii.)

The popular cry for "liberty, fraternity and equality," is abstractly a good idea, but it is in bad and incompetent hands. And if it were the possible and permanent attainment of any mere human administration (which it is not,) it would only amount to the establishment of mutual human rights and privileges to the exclusion of the law of God, and the overthrow of His purpose in Christ to break the nations to shivers, and to rule the world in righteousness. This accomplished freedom, brotherhood, and equal rights will be developed upon a divine and immovable foundation of true goodness.

The cry for education, just seems to indicate the general feeling as to the desirability of increased facilities for general instruction in connection with compulsory measures as applied to the juvenile portion of the population. The mistake, however, lies in supposing that increase of general knowledge is the cure for the world's evils. Whereas, if people were really scripturally enlightened, as indeed they profess to be, they would know for certain that the work of giving the nations a complete state of culture has been assigned to the kingdom of God. Till that come it is an utterly hopeless case, the only wise thing to be done now is to make the necessary personal preparation by faith and obedience, which God requires as the condition of life and inheritance in that more glorious and competent administration.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 133.

BIBLE SUMMARIES.

Psalms 133.—The teaching of this Psalm in the light of the New Testament may be defined as follows:

1.—That it is a truly good and delightful thing to behold brethren dwelling together in the "unity of the Spirit," having the hope of "the blessing of life for evermore;" and altogether characterized by "brotherly love."

2.—That such an holy fraternity, being anointed with the truth, are a spiritual priesthood, and comparable to Aaron and the precious anointing oil, which being poured upon the head, ran down his unmarred beard, even to the skirts of his garments.

3.—That they answer to the fructifying dew of the night, in due time to be exhaled by the rising of the sun of righteousness.

4.—That death will be swallowed up in victory, and eternal life manifested with glory and honour, upon the mountains of Zion, in fulfilment of Jehovah's promise. —(Isa. xxvi. 6-8.)

Ecc. vii.—The lessons of this chapter may be set down as under:

1.—That a good name is a sweeter perfume than the precious smelling anointings of the apothecary.

2.—That sorrow and mourning are better calculated to do the heart good than feasting and laughter.

3.—That to consider the "end of all men," exercises a salutary and chastening influence upon the mind.

4.—That a wise man is known from a fool, by what circumstances he seems to be most at home in, and what best ministers to his taste.

5.—That oppression is a sore vexing evil, to an enlightened man.

6.—That bribish gifts destroy the integrity of a man.

7.—That fools are characterized by anger and haste.

8.—That a patient man is a more excellent person than his proud neighbour.

9.—That it does not belong to a wise man to set his heart on former days; but to profit by whatever be the circumstances of the fleeting present.

10.—That wisdom giveth life to those who possess it.

11.—That God has balanced the day of prosperity by the day of adversity, to the end that men may see that it is the work of God.

12.—That it is a vanity of this present evil time that a just man should perish, and a wicked man prolong his days.

13.—That righteousness and wickedness are not to be judged by present results, seeing that over-zeal in either direction yields the same consuming result as regards the flesh.

14.—That it is good to realise that he who feareth God shall finally come forth, delivered from all the fretful vanities incident to this present mortal existence.

15.—That there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not.

16.—That it is not good to give heed to all that you hear.

17.—That whoso pleaseth God shall escape the snare of the evil woman.

18.—That God made man upright, but He hath invented many crooked ways.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 134.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF
LIFE.

The necessity for Christ's brotherhood to Israel, is well set forth in a statute by Moses, viz, "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; *thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.*—(Deut. xvii. 15)

The man-slayer fleeing for safety to the city of refuge under the law, affords a forcible illustration of our own case, who have also fled for the refuge provided in the hope of the gospel.—(Heb. vi. 18.)

The power of popular religion resides, more in the dread of the devil, than the scriptural fear of God.

The conclusion that Solomon arrived at as the result of all his studies and experiences, was that to fear God and keep His commandments, is the whole duty of man.—(Ecc. xii. 13.)

The Bible possesses all the interest that attaches to the most thrilling novel; but none of the deleterious influence exercised upon the mind by the same.

Obedience is a sweet thing; it represents every thought brought into captivity to Christ; rebellious human passion subdued; the citadel of the heart surrendered to a higher presence; the whole of the mind's desires in peaceful and thanksgiving acquiescence to the divine will.

When God chastises us it is our own profit that He has in view; without it we cannot be His sons and daughters, because it is the way by which we become partakers of His holiness, and without holiness no man shall see the Lord.—(Heb. xii. 5-14)

The soldiers of the cross are commanded to arm themselves with the mind of Christ, which in both cases consists in living to the will of God. This is the only kind of armour that is adapted to all the exigencies of the battle.—(1 Pet. iv 1-2.)

What a chapter of I's we have in the last chapter of Joshua, and how illustrative of the words of Isaiah, "I am the Lord and beside me there is no Saviour."

"I took your father Abraham."

"I gave unto Isaac."

"I gave unto Esau."

"I sent Moses."

"I plagued Egypt."

"That which I did among them."

"I brought your fathers out."

"What have I done in Egypt."

"I brought you unto the land."

"I destroyed them."

"I delivered you."

"I sent the hornet."

"I have given you a land."

Christ is suggested to the mind in many ways and in many places in the Old Testament where, perhaps, there is neither prophecy nor type, but where the words express some feature in his character or office, or may be, where words which he used or which others used of him; or which are associated with some circumstance of his history. Thus, take a run through the sixth book of the Bible, and we meet with such Christ-suggestive words as "Joshua," "minister," "sun-rising," "early in the morning," "covenant," "Jordan," "the Lord mighty," "came out of Egypt," "pass-over," "captain," "shout," "cursed," "third day," "the stone," "flee," "ten cities," "two cities," "witness," "blessed," "trespass," "vineyard," "tribes," &c.

In the land where God planted Eden, there He placed our first parents, and there He settled the children of Israel and established His kingdom; there Christ was born, and there he lived and died and rose again; there the gospel was first preached; there will Christ come again to cast out the heathen and make the place of his feet glorious; there Paradise will be restored; there again the children of Israel will be gathered; and there will yet be seated the victorious Sovereign of the world; and from thence will yet go forth the law that is to knit the nations together in blessing and universal brotherhood.

A CONGREGATIONALIST MINISTER BECOMES OBEDIENT TO THE TRUTH, UN-"REVS." HIMSELF, AND GIVES UP A SALARY OF £400 A YEAR.

"HAVE any of the rulers believed on him?" Such was the question by which the Pharisees sought, in Christ's day, to impress the common people with an idea of the absurdity of his claims. It was not possible, at that time, to answer the question affirmatively, neither was it necessary that it should be so answered in order to establish the truth of Christ's character as the Son of God. Still, it would have been an advantage if "Yes" could have been retorted to the question, with the proof of cases. It was possible afterwards; for at last "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."—(Acts vi. 7.)

In our day, a similar question has been asked with regard to the truth revived in our day under the current name of "Christadelphianism." Have any of the clergy or ministers believed? Hitherto, it has not been possible to give to this question such an answer as the challenge seemed to call for—not for want of cases where clergymen and ministers admitted the scripturalness of Christadelphianism, but for want of cases where such an admission has been followed out to its logical conclusion in the abandonment of the clerical office, and identification with the despised and unprofitable cause of the truth in fellowship and co-operation with the brethren of Christ in the general work which Christ has left his brethren to do "until he come." The want of such cases was, doubtless, due to the greatness of the temporal sacrifice involved, or rather to the want of men with clear-mindedness, consistency and courage enough to encounter that sacrifice in the loss of honours, friends and livelihood. The possibility

of such men being found seemed doubtful.

At last, a case turns up to disprove the impossibility and to illustrate the strength and reality of the truth. Of the genuineness of the case our readers will judge when they have all the facts before them. Those facts are intrinsically interesting, and calculated to encourage the friends of the truth everywhere. Therefore, we make no apology for giving them *in extenso*.

Some time before the date spoken of, a Captain Robertson, for many years resident in India, had put into his hands in Calcutta a copy of *Twelve Lectures* which a brother of his had bought from a hawker of old books in the streets of that town. Reading it, it commended itself powerfully to his mind as a scriptural exegesis of divine truth. He returned to England about the time in question, and finally settled at Rock Ferry, about three miles from Liverpool, on the other side of the Mersey. He there connected himself with a fashionable congregation assembling at Highfield Chapel, under the leadership of the "Rev." R. Ashcroft, a minister of rising reputation. The chapel is a new and handsome building in a picturesque and fashionable neighbourhood: and Mr. Ashcroft was the first to take charge of the congregation in the new place. Captain Robertson selected this chapel because he heard Mr. Ashcroft had lately embraced the "life in Christ" views of the White and Minton school. These views (indefinite and contradictory) are only a feeble advance towards the truth. Nevertheless, they were the nearest to anything Captain Robertson could as-

certain to exist anywhere, and therefore, he identified himself with Mr. Ashcroft. To Mr. Ashcroft, he gave the *Twelve Lectures* to read. Mr. Ashcroft read them with a like result to that which ensued in the case of Captain Robertson. Mr. Ashcroft began to introduce the truth in his sermons. This excited hostility in the congregation. Mr. Ashcroft, doubting if he could hold his position comfortably with the trust deed of the chapel, wrote to the "Rev." R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, knowing that he had embraced similar views on the subject of immortality. Mr. Dale replied there was nothing in the original trust deed in his (Mr. Dale's) case to preclude him from teaching the truth on the subject of immortality, and in any case, it was not for a minister to raise the question. Mr. Ashcroft went on teaching the truth as far as he knew it, with the result of increasing the hostility of his friends. During this time Captain Robertson called on the editor of the *Christadelphian*, at Birmingham, and stated the foregoing facts. Knowing something of the spiritual abortiveness of White and Mintonism, the Editor did not feel his sympathies or confidence engaged, and gave the captain no particular encouragement, telling him, in fact, that the Christadelphians could not accept fellowship with any but those who received and professed the truth in its entirety, and who stood apart from a compromising association with error.

Afterwards, Mr. Ashcroft saw baptism as a duty, and availed himself of Baptist friends to be baptised. This increased the feeling of hostility in his congregation to such an extent that Mr. Ashcroft determined to resign his position. His resignation caused great sorrow. There was a harrowing scene in the chapel. Two-thirds of the congregation wished him to stay; but he would not withdraw his resignation. Then the friendly

majority offered to build him another chapel, and allow him to teach them what he liked. Mr. Ashcroft replied he would never again preach for hire, and declined their proposal. He left the chapel for some months, and remained inactive, in a state of suspense and progression.

During this time, Captain Robertson wrote as follows to the Editor of the *Christadelphian* :—

9, George's View, Rock Ferry, Cheshire,
12th April, 1876.

Dear Sir.—The writer will (D.V.) be leaving here for London in a day or two, and if it can be managed, will be accompanied by Mr. Robert Ashcroft, formerly minister of the Congregational Church here. Mr. A. not long since resigned his charge of the above church, having felt it his duty to be immersed, into the "sin-covering name," and being well conversant with your own and the doctor's works, he feels he would like to make your acquaintance.—Dear sir, Yours respectfully, R. D. ROBERTSON.

To this letter, the editor made answer in substance as follows:—(He did not keep a copy and cannot at present obtain access to the original.)

Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row,
Birmingham.
13th April, 1876.

My dear Mr. Robertson,

I am sorry that my engagements take me away from Birmingham this week and the next, and that consequently I will not be able to see you when you call. I shall be lecturing in Nottingham and Grantham, and if not inconvenient to you, I should be glad to see you there.

Mr. Ashcroft's case is certainly an extraordinary one, and one calculated to excite sympathy. There have been cases of ministers and clergymen changing from one denomination to another before now. In fact, such a thing is not unusual, but in these cases it is merely an exchange of one set of temporalities for another; of one circle of friends for another. But in the present case there is no such exchange. There is no "denomination" to change to, and no machinery

affording scope for livelihood. In the providence of God, the truth is in the hands of a few very poor men, who are nobodies in the world; and in many cases they are such as to repel rather than attract the cultured mind seeking the solace of noble society, and give occasion for the exercise of patience and endurance rather than the experience of consolation. The consequence is that a man of good position embracing the truth, especially when, as in Mr. Ashcroft's case, he is dependent on that position for a livelihood, makes a sacrifice as great as it is possible for a man to make in our day of toleration and liberty. He says goodbye to the honours and comforts that the world can give and which the world is willing to give to the prophets who prophesy smooth things, and in a social sense, has to embrace a dunghill and make adversity his companion. Well, it was so in the early ages. Jesus himself made the poor his companions and was without where to lay his head, and if Mr. Ashcroft is made of the stuff from which the true friends of Christ are produced, he will not quail at the prospect before him, but will be glad of the opportunity of fellowshipping the sufferings of Christ, that he may share in the great glory that will be revealed in the day of his coming. Praying he may be guided into all the truth and strengthened to endure even the loss of all things, if like Paul, he should be called upon to suffer such for Christ, I remain, sincerely your friend, ROBERT ROBERTS.

To this Captain Robertson replied that the interview must be postponed, and time went on. The Bradlaugh discussion approaching, the editor retired to Hoylake, on the sea coast, about twelve miles from Rock Ferry. On the day of his departure from Birmingham for that place, a letter arrived at Birmingham from Mr. Ashcroft, and was forwarded to Hoylake. The following is the letter:—

Rock Ferry, Cheshire,
May 17th, 1876.

My dear Mr. Roberts.—Please send me one of those ecclesiastical bombshells of yours which you call *Twelve Lectures*, in leather, if you have any copies so bound. I have had some in my possession but have given them away to interested parties. Can you also furnish me with *Dr. Thomas's Life*, incomparably the greatest man since the days of the apostles.

My name and recent history have, I believe, been referred to in a communication from Capt. R. D. Robertson to yourself. We have both long purposed a trip to Birmingham that we might know more of you and your affairs. He first met with *Twelve Lectures* in Calcutta I fancy along with some other productions that were offered for sale. I received my first copy from him, and I do not feel inclined to kick down the ladder by which I have climbed to such heights of saving knowledge. It must be gratifying to you to hear that your labours constrain to belief and obedience of the truth. The Master has highly honoured you.

I am at present bearing testimony to the truth in two public rooms hereabouts, and do not intend ever to accept a stipend for what I may be enabled to do. I may tell you that I have left a fashionable and wealthy congregation, value to me over £400 per annum. This I consider a small sacrifice.

And now let me say that I have given your literature a deal of unprejudiced attention of late, and I must say that you are strictly logical throughout. The only point I should be disposed to differ from you upon is that of the non-resurrection of infants. But even here I go with you a great way. I have five little ones, but were it my misfortune to lose one of them, I think I should trust in the Christ to give it me back in the regeneration, supposing I then should desire it. The seed of the righteous are cared for, I think. For the rest I can well imagine that nothing but corruption remains. This, however, would not, I imagine, prevent you from extending cordial recognition to one who is in accord with yourself in so much that is vital; and if every time you are this way, you will elect to make my house your home, I shall be honoured to have your company.

Yours in a common heirship,
ROBT. ASHCROFT.

To this, the Editor returned the following answer:—

May 23rd, 1876.

My dear Mr. Ashcroft.—Yours of the 17th was forwarded to me in the seclusion to which I have been ordered for rest and preparation for the coming discussion with Bradlaugh—(Leicester, June 13th and 14th; Birmingham, June 15th, 20th, 21st and 22nd.) The things you order would doubtless be duly sent to you, except, perhaps *Dr. Thomas's Life*.

I rather think it is sold out. The printer has promised a further supply for some time, but takes his own time, as he prints at his own risk. If you have not seen the Dr.'s life I would try and get it you to read. Let me know.

I need not say what pleasure it gives me thus to make your acquaintance with pen and ink. Your case is an extraordinary one and unique, in our age at all events. There have been abandonments before, of what is called the "one man system," "hired ministry, &c.," but in no case that I know of has the position abandoned been exchanged for one of submission to the hope of Israel. It has generally been an exchange for some other form of human tradition. The truth, as oracularised by the prophets and apostles in ancient days, is a stranger to the entire circle of modern religious profession. Its revival in our day is due to the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas whom you correctly describe, according to my way of thinking, as "the greatest man since the days of the apostles." In its resuscitated form, it is known for the sake of distinction only, as "Christadelphianism." Mr. Robertson told me you were more of a Christadelphian than he. Paul speaks the language of prudence when he says to Timothy, "Lay hands suddenly on no man." I have experienced the wisdom of this precept in its modern application, and therefore wait till men disclose themselves, not as regards their mental qualities, but as regards their attitude towards the truth. The friend of the truth, having no aims in the present evil world, can abide with patience the operation of this rule. It keeps his company small and undistinguished as the present world goes, but he is content to accept a position which is not of his own creating, but which was occupied before him by the great head of the family of God, who said "I am not of this world." "He that is of the truth heareth My voice." "Narrow is the way that leadeth unto life."

There are many who would welcome the Christadelphians to their fellowship and co-operation, from whom, however, the Christadelphians are compelled to stand apart by reason of the obligation laid upon them by the apostolic law to which they are subject. How it stands between them and Mr. Ashcroft, I would judge most hopefully from Mr. Ashcroft's letter. If the divergence indicated be the only one, I should say we mutually

approximate to the line at which fellowship ensues. The divergence relates to a speculative point which is outside the testimony, and in no way affects those general principles which constitute the basis of fellowship, unless indeed the suggestion were that children given back were given back for life eternal. This would be a nullification of the revealed law of access to eternal life. But if the suggestion be a giving back for the life and probation of the age to come, we simply can say nothing about it, but wait and see. I have four children in the grave, and I should be glad to see positive ground for expecting their restoration. Doubtful thoughts must be held in abeyance, especially where they have the least tendency to trench upon revealed truth. It is written, "the Lord knoweth the thoughts of man that they are vain."—(Psa. xciv. 11.) Consequently it is safe to distrust our thoughts on divine things.

I thank you for your kind invitation to your house, and may on some future occasion avail myself of your kindness. Meanwhile, you might send me your exact address, and also the address of the rooms where you give a testimony for the truth.

I pray it may not be long before all the friends of Christ are gathered into his glorious presence to be invited to a work of power and glory. Meanwhile it is theirs to do their best in and with the "few" and poor things of this present miserable dispensation.

Hoping we may be recognised and accepted of Him in that day (which the signs of the times tell us is not far off—Gratefully and sincerely, your friend for his sake, ROBERT ROBERTS.

My kind regards to Captain Robertson.

A line to the "Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham," with "Please forward," written outside will find me.

After the despatch of the foregoing letter, the Editor and sister Roberts (who was with him) determined to pay a visit to Rock Ferry, *in cog.*, on the Sunday, for the purpose of listening to Mr. Ashcroft, in the position of unknown attenders in the audience—hoping Captain Robertson would be absent so that they might escape detection. They had not received the address asked for, and had to find out the whereabouts of Mr. Ashcroft's "two rooms" as best they could. While looking about, they were

fortunate enough to see a placard on the wall, announcing that for the present, "the Rev." R. Ashcroft was preaching in the morning in the Drill Room, Holt Hill, Tranmere; and in the evening, in the Albert Rooms, Rock Ferry. By this direction, they were able to find their way to the latter place, the time of their visit being the evening. (The Editor had written to Birmingham for the address of the Liverpool brethren for the purpose of breaking bread with them in the morning, but not having received it, he and sister Roberts had broken bread together at Hoylake). When they got inside Albert Rooms, the very first man they met was Captain Robertson, who, stunned with surprise, wanted to march the Editor straight off to Mr. Ashcroft. The Editor besought Captain Robertson not to let Mr. Ashcroft know of his presence till the close. Captain Robertson consented and the "service" proceeded. There was a large company (perhaps 120) of ladies and gentlemen. A hymn was given out: they sang: Mr. Ashcroft read two selections: then prayed: then gave out another hymn; then proceeded to discourse on the words, "We have not followed cunningly devised fables." His address was intended to prove the truth of the Bible as against the sceptic. It was delivered in a calm, impressive manner, with considerable inflexion of voice and animation of gesture. The hearers were listening to a decidedly good speaker, an intellectual-looking man, approaching middle age, of grave aspect, with sonorous voice: a man who could not only marshal evidence, but who by his own evident earnestness and conviction, could impress his hearers with the importance of his words. But there was a clerical aspect to the situation in general that was depressing. The people assembled evidently thought themselves acceptable worshippers of God and heirs of the glory to be revealed, and Mr. Ashcroft appeared to be confirming them in their delusion instead of letting them know that all men are unjustified sinners without hope, apart from the belief and obedience of the gospel? Did Mr. Ashcroft understand and recognise this? If so, was he prepared to enforce it in precept and practice? If he was, the congregation listening to him with sympathy would, doubtless, soon walk no more with him when the novelty of the situation was over, and was he prepared

for this?

These were the doubtful and discomforting thoughts that passed through the minds of at least two of his listeners as they heard otherwise with great pleasure the clear demonstration of the truth of Jehovah's Word. At the close, Mr. Ashcroft came towards the door, and the Editor and sister Roberts were introduced, and they walked together to Captain Robertson's, with other friends. Mr. Ashcroft said the meetings at the rooms had only been in operation three weeks, and that they were a "tentative movement" merely. A brief and hurried interview was all that transpired, but it sufficed to increase the uncertain feelings indicated, particularly after Captain Robertson declared that Mr. Ashcroft was aiming to establish an "unsectarian" position and that he would never identify himself with the position taken by the Christadelphians. The Editor and sister Roberts returned home sad. Next day, the Editor, after a disturbed night on the subject, sat down and wrote the following letter:—

Mrs. Pendleton's, Lauderdale, Hoylake,

May 29th, 1876.

My dear Mr. Ashcroft.—You have been much in my mind since I saw you. I returned home sad. It is impossible you can know the nature of my sadness, and I will not attempt the analysis of it. Sufficient that I yield to the impulse of writing you concerning your position. That position is unique and painful. I believe you are not only an honest man, but have a far higher appreciation of divine things than those around you can know or understand. I assume that along with this, you see and accept the truth as the Christadelphians see it. On this assumption, my thoughts and remarks are based. Were it not for this, I would not feel encouraged to burden my thoughts with your case; because I am convinced that apart from the revealed system of divine truth, devoutness and intellectual and moral aspiration are exercised in vain.

It is probably impossible you can realise your position in the light in which it presents itself to me. You will do so afterwards if you follow out the course begun. Meanwhile, it may not harm you if I try and convey to you my view. You have begun nobly in giving up, at a great sacrifice (greater than you now know), a position incompatible with the

profession and service of the apostolic faith. You are in danger of gliding into a position equally incompatible with that service, while lacking the advantage of the former position. I refer to the 'tentative movement.' You are working with these people on a false assumption so far as they are concerned. You encourage them to regard themselves as the children of God, qualified to approach God acceptably in worship, and possessed of a well-grounded hope of inheriting the kingdom of God. It may be difficult for you to look at them in any other light: yet in another light they must be regarded if we are faithful to the truth. The gospel that Paul preached (and for none other need we care in the least degree) teaches us that men are either justified saints, through the faith and obedience of the gospel; or they are unjustified sinners, without hope. There is no middle ground. *In Christ only* is there hope for any son of Adam; and there is only one revealed way of getting into Christ—the belief of the gospel Paul was sent to preach to the Gentiles, and baptism in water for the remission of sins. Under the name of 'charity' (falsely so called) this doctrine is repudiated; and men are falsely stigmatised as 'uncharitable' for faithfully declaring this testimony of God. In judging of its truthfulness, let me ask you, my dear Mr. Ashcroft, to discard the systems and opinions that are now extant in the earth. Imagine yourself, if you can, living in the middle of the first instead of the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century. Accompany Paul in his visit to Ephesus, Corinth, or any other of the cultivated cities of Greece. Would you have hesitated for a moment to endorse his proposition concerning them that "at that time they were 'strangers from the covenants of promise, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, without Christ and having no hope and without God in the world?'"—(Eph. ii. 12.) Furthermore, after the belief and obedience of some hearing the Word, suppose a question had arisen whether others knowing of the gospel in a general way, but not baptised, were also in Christ and heirs of the promises, would you have held back from Paul's decision, "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ . . . and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise?"—(Gal. iii. 27.) Now,

what is the difference between respectable Gentiles in Rock Ferry and respectable Gentiles in Ephesus? None in the sight of God. There is one gospel and one baptism for them all, and if they are not subject to these, they are unjustified sinners, "having a zeal of God," it may be, but, like the Jews, "not according to knowledge: for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God."—(Rom. x. 2, 3.)

Your own baptism and your secession from the Congregationalist congregation are logically declarative of these truths: but I am strongly impressed with the feeling that your present position is suffocatory of them, and that Paul's question to the Galatians may at last be not inapplicable to you, "Have ye suffered so many things in vain, if it be yet in vain?" I would say, follow Paul, who said "I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God."—(Acts xx. 27.) Come out in a straight, clear, and unmistakable manner. Let the people know that there is but one safe way and that they are not in it—viz., the way of the ordinances delivered by Paul, and corrupted and destroyed as he foretold, by the mighty and respectable apostacy which has ruled the earth for dark and godless centuries.

Mr. Robertson gives me to understand that you have a great repugnance to "sectarianism," by which he means identification with the Christadelphians as a sect. With this feeling I can sympathise from a certain point of view, and indeed were I to be governed by my feelings as a natural man, I should stand aloof from collective association and retire into the congenial rest and meditation of seclusion. But there is a point here to reconsider, my dear Mr. Ashcroft. We are not our own. Christ is our Lord and Master, and he has given commandments which we disobey at the peril of hearing him say on the great day of decision, "Ye called me Lord, Lord, but did not the things that I say." He has said, "Ye are my friends if ye do *whatsoever things I have commanded.*"—(Jno. xv. 14.) Now the apostles are to us the interpreters of his will on many things on which he has not spoken expressly himself, so far as we have any record; for he told them in sending them forth to the nations, "teach them to

observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. 20); and further, "He that *heareth you* HEARETH ME." Now Paul, who is the apostle to whom pre-eminently we as Gentiles have to look, makes this the ground of commendation of the Corinthians, that they "*kept the ordinances as he had delivered them to them.*"—(1 Cor. xi. 1, 2). Now was it not one of those "ordinances" that they should "forsake not the assembling of themselves together as the manner of some was?"—(Heb. x. 25.) This was on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread, which Paul says he "received of the Lord."—(1 Cor. xi. 23; xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7.) It is recorded in commendation of the Pentecostian believers, that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers."—(Acts ii. 42.) Those who submitted to these commandments could not help being a "sect"—a sect which was everywhere spoken against" (Acts xxviii. 22) as at this day. The modern outcry against sectarianism has no weight with those who desire above all things to be in the narrow way that leadeth to life. In fact that outcry, at the bottom, is founded on aversion to apostolic teaching. Men delight themselves in their own "liberal" thoughts, never dreaming that "there is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

But the objection is to the name "Christadelphian." Is this well-founded? Things must have names if we are to be understood in talking about them. What is understood in our day by a "Christian" and "Christianity" are different things from the "brother" and "the truth" of Paul's discourse. How then shall we cause the latter to be recognised in distinction to the former? Christ's own name for his friends is "my brethren" (Heb. ii. 11-12), and Paul always speaks of the believers as "the brethren."—(See Acts xxviii. 15 and many other places.) We cannot do better than speak as they do. We do this by the name "Christadelphian," while at the same time we make the distinctiveness of the truth apparent in a way that excludes misconception or misrepresentation. All who believe and obey the truth are brethren of Christ or Christadelphians: and all Christadelphians are identified one with another,

and bound to assemble for the breaking of bread by virtue of the law of Christ, from which they cannot if they would deliver themselves.

I might say much more, but feel I must draw to a conclusion. I commiserate you exceedingly. As my wife expressed it last night, on reaching home, we felt as if we could cry, and we would not have been ashamed of our tears. It is so rare a spectacle to see a man of intellectual parts honestly lay hold of the truth with full purpose of heart, that we rejoiced greatly as we listened to your words last night; yet we could not shut our eyes to the peculiar embarrassments of your present position, tending to prevent your full recognition of the truth, or your declaration of it to those whom you may wish to retain around you. Nor could we help realising the temporal adversities to which a faithful course will expose you. I pray God He may open your way, and that, a way of usefulness to the truth in our dark day, in which it is a stranger cast into the street. But I am persuaded that anything short of a full and thorough committal to the cause of the truth in the form in which it has been providentially developed in our day, will be a mistake resulting in failure. Far better have retained the countenance and support of a fashionable congregation, than having sacrificed them, to stop short of a full, brave, and out and out imitation of Paul, who, in somewhat similar circumstances, "consulted not with flesh and blood," but declared the whole truth, as pleasing not men but God who trieth the heart. I cannot ignore the perils of such a course, but I would invite you my dear Mr. Ashcroft and your dear partner, to commit your cause to Him in well-doing, who knows all who are suitable for His purpose, and puts them through the trial requisite for each individual case. We have happened on an evil day, when apostacy is in the ascendant; but the orient brightens with many a token of the dawn which will at last burst into the glorious morning when tears will be wiped from every pilgrim's weeping face, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. If we suffer with him we shall reign with him. Hoping it may be our happy portion to obtain this great goodness through our Lord Jesus Christ,—I remain, your sincere friend and well-wisher.

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Next day, Mr. Ashcroft came down to Hoylake. A long interview followed. Mr. Ashcroft said the editor's letter exactly represented his views. He had felt there was something difficult and doubtful in his position, but did not know how to proceed to extricate himself. He had not felt comfortable in the "tentative movement," but he had not seen his way to any other form of action. He had been groping his way; but the editor's letter seemed to shed the light he wanted, and that in fact, he had made up his mind to take the course recommended and to "come out" in a distinct and definite manner, and identify himself with the brethren of Christ under the name which the circumstances of providence had forced them to adopt. "And whatever odium the name may bring upon me," said Mr. Ashcroft, "I must bear it." He then asked about his baptism eight months before. "Will it be necessary," said he, "for me to be baptised again?" The editor replied "Not if your faith was a scriptural one at the time of your immersion." "My faith, then," said Mr. Ashcroft, "was exactly what it is now." "In that case," replied the Editor, "re-immersion would be a work of supererogation. It matters not in any case who the baptiser is. Jesus baptised not: nor did Paul to any extent. The great question is the mental state of the person baptised." This matter settled, Mr. Ashcroft said he would make a full statement of his position to the people who came to listen to him, let the consequences be what they might. After much intercourse of a gratifying character, Mr. Ashcroft departed, remarking as he stepped into the train, "You may rely on my being faithful to the truth, with the help of God."

Next day, the Editor received the following letter:

Wood Hey, Rock Ferry,

May 31st, 1876.

My dear Mr. Roberts.—Since our interview yesterday, it has occurred to me that the wisest course in making the public announcement will be to have a large number of copies of the *Declaration* ready for gratuitous distribution at the close of the meeting. Do you not think the truth would be admirably served by such an innocent and inexpensive device? The plan would obviate the necessity of making a long series of explanations, &c., and lead me by a swift and easy course

to the point at which I have determined to land myself and as many more as can be induced to follow me. The *Declaration* embracing as it does all that we consider necessary to faith, and being furnished with such copious and unanswerable proofs, &c., would be sure to arrest the attention of interested persons if introduced to their notice in this peculiar way. I would take care to make the most of the occasion—intimating of course, my purpose to be one of an ecclesia formed on the basis of the truth therein presented and embodied. Then matters would begin to shape themselves after a correct model, and our movements would need no subsequent tinkering and repair.

Should the plan here suggested commend itself to your more matured judgment I will send to the depôt for, say 20s. worth of copies. This number I imagine would be sufficient. Doubtless some will withdraw themselves straightway. But I am sanguine enough to hope that we shall not be left entirely without the nucleus of what will become an important ecclesia. Its formation would be a question of after arrangement between you and me. I came away from your company full of gratitude to God. And I begin to experience that strange kind of affection towards you both, which I can well imagine was characteristic of apostolic times, and which it is surely the province of the truth alone to inspire.

The intimacy now begun will, I doubt not, ripen into the closest and most sacred of all human relationships, and be perpetuated in the age beyond. "For this cause" I know you will "bow the knee before the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." My dear wife seems much impressed with your letter; but there are lingering prejudices which an interview with Mrs. Roberts would, I believe, suffice to remove. We hope to have the pleasure of your company as soon as you can arrange.

Praying that you may be fully strengthened for the approaching encounter with the Satan, and with all good and generous sentiments from us both, I remain, dear Mr. Roberts, yours faithfully in the hope,

R. ASHCROFT.

Hoylake, Cheshire,

June 1st, 1876.

My dear brother Ashcroft.—(For I do not see now I can any longer hesitate to

greet you thus in the Lord). I have to acknowledge your gratifying letter received this morning. I was purposing writing to you on the same subject, though it did not occur to me to make the same proposal. I think your proposal is the best adapted to the circumstances. In fact it is without doubt the very thing required. The form of placard announcement will be the next thing to consider . . . I should like to be present on the occasion. This would be possible if either of the next two Sundays were chosen. If your address be written beforehand, I should much like a copy for the *Christadelphian*, and if not, I would ask your permission to allow me to take it down, as I am an old short hand writer, (that is if the meeting is arranged for on a day when I can be present). I should also like to be at liberty to publish extracts from what correspondence has taken place. I always find that a matter presented in this form is much more vividly and correctly appreciated than by the most full and polished statement. If you concur, it would be necessary for me to be furnished with my letters or copies, (including those to Captain Robertson), as I kept no copies, not allowing myself to hope the matter would ripen into anything serviceable. Your letters and Captain Robertson's I have. I cannot yet name a day for Woodhey, sister Roberts may come by herself on Saturday. I require to be careful much more so than one would judge from my appearance. God hath made choice of weak things. Personally, I could wish it were otherwise. It would make the work a full delight, whereas, it is full of burden and weariness to me. But the day of release is at hand.

I shall hope to be hearing from you in a day or two. Meanwhile, with much love in the glorious gospel of the blessed God, I subscribe myself

Your brother in the Lord Jesus (in thanksgiving for his mercy),

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Woodhey, Rock Ferry,
June, 2nd 1876.

My Dear Brother Roberts.—Just a few lines in grateful acknowledgment of yours now received.

Sunday week, the 11th instant, will best suit my convenience. This will give me abundance of time for the preparation of an exhaustive statement. I will

do this in writing, so that if you cannot be present on either occasion to take it down, I can let you have it for such uses as you may think it worthy of. . .

Dr. Thomas's Life came yesterday, and I have read nearly half of it with profound interest and delight. I am much obliged by the loan of it. Mrs. Ashcroft would like to read it. When she has, I will return it to your address in Birmingham.

And now, dear brother Roberts, I shall need the prayers of all brethren and sisters in the Lord. I do not underestimate the great difficulties which belong to the task I have taken in hand. But my old friends know me to be most uncompromising and faithful to my convictions of what is right in the sight of God. I have counted the cost, so that there is no imprudence in going to war or beginning to build. May Israel's God be my shield and helper. With holy pride and gratitude, allow me to write myself your brother and fellow-worker in the Lord,

R. ASHCROFT.

Rock Ferry,

June 5th, 1876.

My dear brother Roberts.—Don't you think it would be much more satisfactory if I were to be re-immersed? I am not quite content, although I was baptised for the remission of sins, and in the belief of the things of the kingdom and name. I have advanced in knowledge since then; and it is just a question with me whether I ought not to have had my present convictions, in points of detail, at the time. However, all doubt or misgiving can easily be settled if you will consent to put me under the water, after receiving answers to such inquiries as you may judge necessary. There are several immersed persons connected with me, and such action on *my* part might lead them to reconsider the validity of *their* immersion. Appoint a day and an hour, and I will come over, provided with all necessary things for you and me, and the matter shall be accomplished in a way that will need no further thought.

My love to you both, and with earnest prayers for your perfect restoration, I am yours in Israel's hope,

ROBERT ASHCROFT.

We hope to see you on Sunday. Walk from Birkenhead to Drill Hall, Tranmere.

In answer to the foregoing letter, the Editor promised compliance on the occasion of visiting him to hear his public declaration on Sunday, June 11th. Meanwhile, placards were extensively circulated in Rock Ferry, Birkenhead and Tranmere, worded as follows:—

IMPORTANT!—"Let God be true, but every man a liar."—(Romans iii. 4.) The

"REV." R. ASHCROFT

(who, in future, will drop the use of the title "reverend," as a title not warranted by the Scriptures to be used by, or applied to, any man) requests all who are interested in the supreme question,

WHAT IS THE TRUTH?

to meet him on Sunday next, June 11th, in the morning at 11 o'clock, in the Drill Hall, Holt Hill, Tranmere; and in the evening, at half-past six, in the Albert Room, Rock Ferry, to hear from him an Explanation of the reasons which have led him to relinquish his recent pastorate, and to take up a (to him) wholly new position, founded exclusively upon the Scriptures of truth, and involving his renunciation of the Robed and Salaried "Ecclesiasticism" of the day, as things pertaining to an abominable apostacy from the primitive order. Mr. Ashcroft will, on the same occasion, lay before his hearers the leading features of the new position, in the hope that every listener will at least examine the matter in an unprejudiced spirit; and with the earnest desire that many honest minds—searching the Scriptures—will be induced to unite themselves with him in the profession and obedience of the gospel of Christ in the way he has required—a way which Mr. Ashcroft is now convinced has been much corrupted in the course of the centuries that have elapsed since the departure of Christ from the earth. At the close of his discourse, Mr. Ashcroft will present his hearers with a printed statement of the ancient apostolic faith, with numerous quotations from the Scriptures in proof of it. Mr.

Ashcroft hopes that on future occasions the whole subject will be presented in a complete form, in a series of lectures, to be delivered by others as well as himself. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."—(1 Peter iv. 11.)

On the day appointed, a large and respectable congregation assembled in the Drill Hall, Holt Hill, Tranmere, and listened to the following

ADDRESS.

My dear friends.—The position I have assumed is one in no respect analogous to the one I have abandoned. It would be impossible to mention a single point of resemblance between the two—except indeed that it is the same voice which now addresses you that was wont to speak in the hearing of the congregation assembling at Highfield Church. For such remarkable changes of thought and sympathy there must be reasons, which will more or less commend themselves to the judgment of pious and discerning minds. "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness."

A few sentences will suffice to convey to you my reasons for relinquishing the pastorate of the Congregational Church in this neighbourhood. At the time this step was taken, my perception of the truth was not so definite and clear as it now is; and therefore I yielded with considerable reluctance to the pressure that was brought to bear. Now, I regard the gentlemen who were co-operative in bringing about my resignation, as having, in the providence of God done me the highest form of service. Had all been willing that I should remain, I might at this time have been speaking from a position which I am persuaded it is impossible to identify with the profession and service of the apostolic faith. Therefore I am thankful to the Deity that I was not entirely surrounded by friends in that distressing experience—although I fully appreciate, and shall never forget the sympathy that was manifested by many who wished things to abide as they were.

My present position is one of direct and uncompromising hostility to the Papal and Protestant Christendom of the period.

It is based—not upon confessions of faith or human formularies of any sort, but—upon those Scriptures which alone “are able to make men wise unto salvation, by faith which is in Christ Jesus.” In abandoning one form of church organisation, one naturally looks around to see if there is not some other which he can conscientiously and profitably join. During the past four months I have had abundant opportunities for testing the merits of the various ecclesiastical systems extant. Being outside the whole of them, I have been in a likely way for arriving at an impartial decision. Having had no deacons to fear, and no seat-holders to favour, I could look at things without prejudice.—And the question of self-interest was not allowed to interfere. And will you believe it? there is not one of the whole legion of names and denominations who support their respective ministers at salaries varying from £15,000 to £60 per annum—that I could possibly identify myself with. I did think that I would retain my connection with the Congregational Union of England and Wales; but I have since ascertained that the rules of that association render this impossible. Members of that body must be favourable to pædo-baptism or infant sprinkling—a form of clerical foolishness, which, I thank God, I have utterly and for ever renounced. But why not join the Baptists? Well, partly because they would not have me, and partly because I would not be identified with them if they were willing. I should require all Baptists to be re-immersed that were ignorant of the kingdom of God and the things concerning the name, &c., at the time of their immersion. But of this more will be said presently.

It is a common form of objection to the position I have taken, that it by implication at least, condemns as unscriptural the beliefs of multitudes of intelligent and devout persons, both in the present day, and in centuries preceding. It is considered incredible that so many earnest and pious souls should have been mistaken with regard to the first principles of the oracles of God. I am by no means indifferent to the force of this objection. At first sight it appears most formidable. But there are a few things to be taken into the account. There can be no doubt that unanimity was a characteristic of the early Christian believers. Our Lord prayed for it. “That they all may be one, as Thou Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they

also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.” Was that prayer ever answered? Let us turn to the Acts of the Apostles and see. There in the 6th chapter we read, “And the multitude that believed were of one heart, and of one soul.” Was it considered desirable or necessary that this state of unanimity should continue? It certainly does not exist in our day—but did its perpetuity form any part of Apostolic desire? There can be no doubt that such was the case. In writing to the Romans Paul said, “Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be *like-minded* one toward another, according to Christ Jesus, that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” To the Corinthians he writes as follows, “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgments.”

Clearly enough Paul never contemplated as a thing to be tolerated the existence of a multitude of wrangling denominations, all claiming to belong to the body of Christ. He had but little patience with those that caused divisions contrary to the doctrine which was apostolically delivered. But the spirit of prophecy was in him, and under its guidance he foretold the exact condition of religious affairs which we see among us to-day. Delusion and confusion were to arise and the mystery of iniquity was to work until the re-appearance of Jesus Christ. Even in Paul's own day, believers had ceased to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. And things were not likely to improve when the apostles were removed from the scene: nor did they. Schism once introduced into the body, spread with an appalling rapidity, and there arose one after another, the various conflicting religious orders which exist at the present time, and which can only be called “Christians” in irony, or by a mistaken charity.

Sundry anomalies of the most glaring type are every now and then exhibited by these polemical antagonists. Their accepted motto is “in things essential unity—in things doubtful liberty—in all things charity.” But who is to decide what things are essential, and what things are not? The statement is a very loose one. Some people may be perverse enough to believe in the *essentiality of all that God*

has revealed for human faith. We find Baptists, however, coquetting with other religionists who laugh at *their immersion*, and arranging to present them with the congratulations which are deemed appropriate to certain special occasions. Here are two parties separated in opinion and in practice, concerning one of the first and plainest of all the Christian requirements, yet meeting each other as fellow believers and disciples of the *one* faith and the *one* Lord. And that is presumably their version of Augustine's motto. In things essential *unity*. Oh, but someone will say baptism is not essential, and therefore the question need be no barrier to fellowship, whichever way it is regarded. But, my friend, Where did you get this information? Baptism a nonessential, doubtful, unnecessary ordinance! Then are we to believe that Christ commanded anything that he might just as well have said nothing whatever about! It is generally admitted that *repentance* is essential to salvation. "Hardness of heart and contempt of God's word and commandment" are, by common consent things to be avoided and prayed against. But as for baptism, well you may "follow the devices and desires of your own heart." And yet when the multitude at Pentecost said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what must we do? the answer was, "Repent AND be baptised every one of you for the remission of sins." Modern theology says, You are bound to *repent*, but you may please yourselves about being baptised. And so in a sense you may. You are not *compelled* to obey a single commandment of Christ, or to have any part in whatever you do not exactly relish. At the same time it would hardly be fair for you to expect the results of compliance and obedience to follow upon your non-compliance and disobedience. I might turn round upon such a party and say, Now it is very necessary that you should be baptised, but as for repentance, that is an open question about which "divines" are not agreed, and in things doubtful we must exercise charity. Yet the "Christian" world would be shocked by such a deliverance; for what reason logically I fail to see. If it was necessary for the people at Jerusalem to be baptised as well as to repent in order that they might obtain the remission of sins, surely it cannot be unnecessary for people in this region, who are candidates for the same blessedness, to do the same.

Relieved of all the polemical rubbish that has accumulated upon the subject, it stands in this fashion—Immersion is necessary to baptism, as various scriptures and all Greek lexicons will testify; baptism is necessary to *obedience*, for when Christ ordained it he said, "teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Obedience is necessary to salvation. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" He is "the author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him." If, therefore, men who consider that they have obeyed Christ in this matter can give the right hand of fellowship to those who have not, they may do so, but "my soul, come not thou into their secret: unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united."

It will not be news to most of you that my severance from my recent pastoral charge was owing partly to my having followed the example and precept of Christ in the matter of baptism, and partly to my having believed and taught that there is no immortality for mortal man apart from resurrection at the reappearing of Christ, who is the source of it. I renounced the idea that man was two or three personalities run into one, or that he himself was an immortal essence or entity, inhabiting a body of flesh and blood. It seemed to me absurd to suppose that while a blow on the head renders a man unconscious as though he had never been, a yet more terrible blow scattering his brains about, generates brisker and more vigorous thought than he ever experienced before. The Scriptures informed me that "the first man was of the earth, earthy;" and I could not persuade myself that he had grown, by the lapse of ages, into anything more magnificent and durable. Milton's definition of human nature seemed to me to be consonant alike with the Bible and with the dictates of common sense: "Man is a living being, intrinsically one and individual; not compound or separable; not (according to the common opinion) made up or framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body; but the whole man is soul and the soul man—that is, a BODY or substance, individual, animated, sensitive and rational." This I consider a most complete and satisfactory answer to the question, "What is man?" It follows that when this "individual" dies, he lapses into a state of perfect unconsciousness, in which he remains

until the resurrection. Nothing but the animating principle which gives life to all creatures that live by breathing, and which is called in Scripture "spirit" or "breath of lives," departs from him at death. "His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." So spake one of the Holy men of old, as he was moved by the Holy Spirit. Hence the absolute necessity that exists for resurrection, if a dead man is ever to live again. This truth was preached by the apostles wherever they went. How is it that we hear so little of it from pulpits claiming to set forth apostolic truth? The answer is not far to seek. The heathen dogma of the immortality of the soul has been allowed to supplant the Christian truth for which we contend. What do men already immortal want with resurrection? To such persons it seems altogether an awkward and unnecessary arrangement. Good people, when they die, are supposed to have immediate conveyance upon the downy wings of ministering spirits to the heaven of heavens. Their "souls" do immediately pass into glory, and enter into the presence of the Redeemer. In a funeral sermon delivered not along ago, there were some extraordinary things said about the deceased. "David Thomas," declared the preacher, "is not dead! He is risen! risen to the heaven of eternal light." Now either the preacher, in this case, must have been in the wrong, or Peter's words on the day of Pentecost are not possessed of all the authority which we have been accustomed to attribute to them. For of another man, whose name was David, he unambiguously affirmed that *he* "is not ascended into the heavens." Hear, too, the words of Christ to his disciples: "As I said unto the Jews, so say I now to you: whither I go ye cannot come. . . . But if I go away, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." For lack of discerning the necessity of Christ's return to this earth, preachers, as a rule, say little or nothing about it, and the majority of pious people do not care to have the subject mentioned. Thus the blind are leading the blind, and the ditch is the probable destiny of both.

It is impossible for any ray of saving light to gain access to a man's mind so long as he cherishes the fable of his own natural immortality. It nullifies Christ's gospel so completely, and substitutes for it

a gospel so entirely different from that which he commanded his disciples to preach, that we confess our inability to see any hope of salvation for him who labours under the mighty delusion. It is possible for even good and pious people to be "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, and because of the blindness of their hearts." Our moral sentiments, however excellent, operate to no saving result, unless they are in harmony with the truth that God has revealed. "Sanctify them through Thy truth: Thy Word is truth." "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth." "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by *these* ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." Now it is vain for us to expect to become partakers of the divine nature by anything that God has not promised. And His promises must surely be understood before they can do us any good. Has He, therefore, promised to abstract from me an immortal ghost at death, and translate it to astronomical regions? He has promised nothing of the kind. But He *has* promised that the meek shall inherit the earth; that he who overcomes shall have power over the nations; that a crown of righteousness shall be given *in that day* to all who love Christ's appearing; that they who sleep in Jesus he will lead forth together with him. Such promises are exceeding great and precious, and well qualified to make all who believe them partakers of the divine nature, and to serve as inducements for them to make good their escape from the corruption that is in the world through lust.

Then my teaching concerning the kingdom of God proved very distasteful to many composing my former charge. I have maintained that this kingdom is not already in existence; the Lord God has not yet given unto Christ the throne of his father David, nor set up the monarchy which shall break in pieces and destroy all existing forms of government and stand for ever. Believers, I have spoken of, as *heirs* only of that kingdom, and Christ I have represented as being about to judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and *his* kingdom. These views are antagonistic quite to popular conceptions upon the subject, according to which the kingdom of God means the Christian church. One of our hymns begins thus:—

"I love Thy kingdom, Lord,
The house of Thine abode;
The church our blest Redeemer bought
With his own precious blood."

So that according to this, wherever you find the phrase "Kingdom of God" in the Scriptures it will be perfectly proper for you to substitute the word "church," since they are regarded as convertible terms—just two different modes of expressing one and the same thing. Very well, let us read a few texts in the light of this information.

"Fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the church."

"Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the church which He hath promised to them that love Him."

"Thy church come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven."

"It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the church." (A statement this, which facts abundantly disprove.)

"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the church."

"Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on Thy right hand and the other on thy left in Thy church."

What say you, friends, to this style of reading the Scriptures? It is perfectly proper if what men are taught is true.

You are at liberty, (on this theory) to turn the words and expression up and down, and reverse them in any way you please. For further example, what is there to prevent you reading the following texts in this fashion:—"Paul sent into Ephesus and called the elders of the Kingdom of God." "John to the seven kingdoms of God in Asia." "It is a shame for women to speak in the kingdom of God." And so on. Had we not better take things as we find them in the Scriptures, and pay less attention to the false interpretations of men?

Moreover, I have raised a storm about my head in consequence of having ventured to suggest and teach that Paul means what he says when he declares that "The wages of sin is death." My doctrine (which, however, is not mine), is that men are born "children of wrath"—liable to the penalty which followed upon the sin of Adam. "By one man's disobedience the many were constituted sinners." And out of Christ they can establish no claim to an interest in God's covenant of eternal life, nor expect exemption from the operation

of the law of sin and death, which consigns all who come beneath it to the dust of the ground. "So death passed upon all men." No unjustified sinner sustains any relation to the gospel of salvation that is of any value to him. He is simply related to Adam and in Adam all die. Resurrectional responsibility arises only from contact with the truth. "This is the (ground of) condemnation that light came into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." "Where no law is there is no transgression," and therefore no responsibility. "Man that is in honour and understandeth not is like the beasts that perish." "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law."

Consequently there is no room in the divine economy for the endless tormentation of the lost. They are to be punished (if they know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ) with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. Yet how tenaciously men cling to the delusion that well-nigh everyone but themselves and their friends is doomed to the endurance of endless, motiveless, vindictive suffering! The affection with which this tremendous error is regarded is most extraordinary. It, and the notion of an omnipotent devil, kept in chains of darkness, and yet roving about at perfect liberty, scheming and plotting against God, and trying, in all sorts of ways to compass man's damnation, are forms of superstition which even otherwise intelligent Bible-loving men are most reluctant to abandon.

My friends, it is written, "The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away." What is it to perish? Oh! said one in this neighbourhood, not long ago, "What it is to perish is not for me to say. But it is something awful!" One is disposed to assert that "it is something awful" for a professed guide of the ignorant to say that he knows not the meaning of a simple word like "perish." Some kinds of bread *perish*; but there is another kind which *endureth* unto everlasting life. The political heavens are to perish, but thou *remainest*. To perish, then, according to Scripture, is, not to *endure*—not to *remain*. God gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not *perish*, but *live*. But the exigencies of some men's theology, together with the temporal

interests of themselves and their families, interfere with their candour, and dispose them to "darken counsel with words without knowledge."

I am entirely convinced that the only true and safe method for a man to adopt in these days, is to re-model his faith and practice, after the ancient apostolic design. He will of necessity find this course most inconvenient, and may make up his mind to lose many friends in the process. It requires some resolution to "come out from among them and be separate." No saint can fellowship a lie, and remain a saint—or one *separated* from all that is not of the truth. The apostles were most explicit on this point. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son; if there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your houses, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." So that you see the truth is on no account to be compromised for the sake of a *supposed* charity. Charity, it should be remembered, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth. That man is *uncharitable*, therefore, who knows what the truth is, and yet has communion with error. Paul has left us without choice in the matter, for the following are his words, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the *doctrines* which ye have learned and *AVOID* them." That may seem a wretchedly narrow and exclusive policy—but it bears the sanction of an inspired apostle. I have been asked to become a party to the formation of a church which should embrace all shades of religious opinion—to cultivate what is called large-heartedness, and to eschew all well defined and contracted arrangements. This, dear friends, is simply impossible. Black is black, and white is white—and not "either the one or the other according to circumstances." "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

The rule that is to guide us is not what we or anyone else may *think*, but what the Scriptures *say*. Our business is simply to accept what God has been pleased to reveal to us in simple words. To refuse to do this, out of a spurious and mistaken charity, is to make Him a liar, and to render ourselves liable to condemnation for contempt of His word.

I have called you together for this special purpose to-day, that you all may

perfectly understand my position, and then take such action as you may resolve upon. Better it is that this should be done boldly and at once than later on. I saw there was a danger of my drifting into a position from which I should subsequently have felt it my duty to extricate myself. And painful though it is to me to make this statement, it would have been much more painful later on. Therefore, I have summoned courage, and done the necessary but disagreeable thing at once. I am not sanguine enough to believe that you all will see things as I see them, or follow me in what I hold to be the only safe and scriptural way. For let me assure you that it means reproach, and there is no money to be made out of it, nor any friendships on a very large and influential scale.

Now let me indicate to you the leading features of my position. What constitutes a church, so called, on New Testament principles? And who are qualified to worship God acceptably "in Spirit and in truth?" Is there not a danger lest someone should imagine themselves Christians when they are not? And if their right to this designation can be disproved from Scripture, is it not an act of true charity and unfeigned kindness on the part of any who will venture to direct their attention to the circumstance?

The way in which men are made Christians (?) now-a-days differs in all essential respects from the apostolic plan. What is the position of a man who listens for the first time to the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ? Paul shall answer us. Writing to the Ephesians, he reminds them that at that time they were without (or out of) Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Now, how is a man who is thus circumstanced to get *into* Christ, and be included in the covenants of promise? This is the question of questions, and it requires an apostle to answer it aright. It is presumed that the person has become acquainted with God's covenants of promise, and is aware of the nature of the declaration that God made to Abraham, and renewed to his descendants, when he preached the gospel to them. The promise was that a certain tract of country should be given to Abraham for an everlasting possession, and that in his seed all nations of the earth should be

blessed. It therefore amounted to a guarantee of immortality, for certainly no mortal man such as was Abraham at the time, could retain possession of anything for *ever*. For the promise to have its fulfilment, it will be necessary for Abraham to be raised from the dead. He died in the faith not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off. Now God has arranged that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. The law was a hindrance to this, and stood in the way of our attaining the desired immortality. But Christ hath rendered infirm the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. The object of his obedience, his death and his resurrection, was thus to do away with the evil consequences resulting from Adam's sin, and to give us a legal right to eternal life. *In* him we are blessed with faithful Abraham. But how are we to get into Christ? By what arrangement or process are we inducted into the covenants of promise? Paul shows us how all this transpires: "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ . . . And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." "Ye are complete in him which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also 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 in *baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him through the *faith* of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

All persons thus brought into relation to Jesus Christ are qualified to worship God. They are "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people (particularly in these days); that they should show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvellous light." As living stones, they are "built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

In apostolic times these people "met together on the first day of the week to break bread," in obedience to their Lord's commands; and thus shewed forth his death in anticipation of his coming again. This is a duty binding upon all who have been baptised into Christ. They are required not to forsake the assembling of

themselves together as the manner of some is. No change of circumstances or country can furnish a legitimate excuse for the neglect of this ordinance. If only two or three can meet thus in Christ's name, there he will be in the midst of them. The early disciples continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread* and in prayers.

The testimony they delivered to the outside multitude was another affair altogether. It is quite a mistake for a man to suppose that because he goes to hear some other man preach he is, therefore, religious. Christians, in apostolic times, did not meet together to hear oratory, but to exhort one another, to provoke one another to love and good works, to publish, by word and deed, the death of their Messiah until he come.

And whatever others may do, I intend henceforth to follow their example. Herein I shall be in union and sympathy, with a considerable number of the Lord's brethren in the British Empire and America and elsewhere, who have cast aside the traditions of men and betaken themselves to the law and the testimony instead. At the time of the American war, these brethren were liable to be drafted into the army, and as Christ forbids his disciples the use of the sword, they petitioned the government and claimed exemption from military service. This necessitated their adoption of a name whereby to distinguish themselves. Their choice fell upon two Greek words *Christou adelphoi*, or brethren of Christ, which Anglicised is "Christadelphian." If there is any special reproach connected with such a name, I for one am quite willing to bear it. "Christ is not ashamed to call his followers brethren." Therefore I am not ashamed to have the designation applied to me in its original form. These brethren have men amongst them whom it is no light thing for others to meet in open disputation concerning the truths they maintain. Their beliefs are set forth in the pamphlet which I have provided for gratuitous distribution at the close of this service, and which I hope all of you will accept, suspending your judgment till you have read, marked, learned and inwardly digested what it contains.

After the delivery of the address, viz., in the afternoon of the same day, in his own bath room, and in the presence of

devout witnesses, ROBERT ASHCROFT (34), formerly Congregationalist minister, was immersed into the saving name of Christ in the appointed way; and at the same time and place, WILLIAM REUBEN YEARSLEY (29), clerk, formerly a member

of the same congregation, was also baptised, after giving evidence of his understanding of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

JULY, 1876.

THE Editor's time and strength have been largely given, during the last month, to the six nights' debate with the Atheist leader, Bradlaugh, arrangements for which were announced in the last number of the *Christadelphian*. In consequence of this, we are obliged to appear this month without several usual features. This may not be altogether a drawback. The matter of which we have been glad to avail ourselves in filling space will be found to possess a peculiar interest, and to be more than a substitute for the matter we have not had time to prepare. We refer to the article entitled "A Congregationalist Minister becomes obedient to the truth, 'un-revs.' himself, and gives up a salary of £400." This speaks for itself so distinctly that we must refer our readers to the article itself for the illustration of our meaning. Suffice it to remark, in this place, that the case has strangely blended, as an element of comfort and sweetness, with the rigours and asperities of an encounter with the arch blasphemers of the nineteenth century. The mixture was, doubtless, of God, who does not put upon any of His servants more than they are able to bear.

The Bradlaugh discussion, now a thing of the past, will, doubtless, prove of good service in the work of the truth. The extent of this service is not to be measured by the effects produced on the immediate listeners. The reading of it, when published, and the moral influence of the fact of the principal adversary of the Scriptures having been met, will, doubtless, strengthen the confidence and faith of those who desire to put their trust in the holy oracles of God,

in a day when, as in Samuel's childhood, there is no open vision, and when the word of the Lord is precious.

There is no occasion, however, to be dissatisfied, even if the effects were limited to those who listened. Mr. Bradlaugh did not prove the formidable antagonist we anticipated. He found it more difficult to make headway against the Bible in the hands of a Christadelphian than in the hands of its usual defenders. In one or two cases, his embarrassment was amusingly visible, particularly when he attempted to bring the Editor into collision with Eccles. iii. 18.

Those brethren who have opportunity of feeling the public pulse, say that the feeling among neutrals is that the advantage was on the side of the truth; and that even Bradlaugh's friends (except the most rabid and unscrupulous) only claim a drawn battle. Mr. Bradlaugh himself did not claim more. In his last speech, he said, while not allowing his opponent had gained a victory, he could not claim the victory himself, and that he (Mr. Bradlaugh) was not the best man that could be put forward against the Bible—an admission of extraordinary significance to come out of the lips of a man like Bradlaugh. Our readers will judge, when they read the discussion, what ground he had for allowing so much.

There are many acquainted with the truth who admit its beauty and its scripturalness, but who, having a doubt as to the Scriptures themselves, are never able to rise to the position of faith and acceptance. Part of their difficulty lies in the fact that such men as Bradlaugh go about the country like roaring lions, before whom the clergy are helpless. It will be a help to such to know that he has been met in a manner that has baffled his usual tactics and made manifest the truthfulness of the Bible, by a variety of lines of evidence which Mr. Bradlaugh neither touched nor sought to touch, because it is out of his power to do so. In any case, the discussion was, on the

part of the truth's friends, a struggle on behalf of the best interests of God and man; and, therefore, an event to be satisfied with, quite apart from results, as part of the good fight which will, one day, end in glory and victory in the presence of the Lord at his coming.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

WE regret having to curtail our notice of these. The circumstances mentioned in the last paragraph compel us. Events are fast approaching a phase of the most thrilling interest. The four weeks that have elapsed since our last writing have been crowded with events intrinsically startling, and all tending to that disruption of the Turkish empire, which is the immediate prelude to the Lord's advent amongst the nations. No sooner had the three Emperors, at the meeting referred to last month, resolved upon a new dictation to Turkey, involving an actual interference on behalf of the insurgents, than Britain protested, and hurried a large naval force into Turkish waters. While every one was wondering what would be the effect of this demonstration of British power, the diplomatic situation was entirely changed by the dethronement of the Sultan and the elevation in his place, of his uncle Murad, against whose succession to the throne, (though the legal heir) the Sultan had been plotting for years. In a few days followed the announcement of the suicide of the dethroned Sultan, not without reasonable suspicion that the reported "suicide" was but the cloak for murder. Great rejoicings were indulged in, nevertheless, from the expectation that the new Sultan would be a reformer, and that a new way out of the difficulties of Turkey would be found by the new and energetic ministers who had been raised to power. In a very few days, those hopes were dashed to the ground by the assassination of two of the principal ministers while actually sitting in council. The first event damped Russian ardour because seeming to frustrate Russian intrigue. The second revived Russian hopes and dissipated the expectations of those who wished Turkey well, among whom despair and apprehension now prevail. The new government, we are told, is fast becoming

as unpopular as it was welcome in the first instance. The insurgents disdain the offered amnesty; the strife between Turks and Christians is more wide-spread and intense. Even in Jerusalem, we read of fear and excitement, and the camping of soldiers in the public squares. The second Berlin memorandum is shelved, the British government is in an attitude of observation, and Servia and Montenegro, long held back, are on the point of bursting all bounds of restraint, and springing at the throat of their Turkish oppressor. The situation is of that fiery character that no one can tell what may happen next. The violent events of the last month have taken the question out of the province of cool diplomacy. The powers are losing the reins of events. The new Sultan is ill and closely guarded in his palace. Russia, checked by the downfall of the old Sultan, who was her tool, is likely to be more stimulated to take advantage of the helpless disorder that is overspreading the Turkish empire, and to employ Servia and the other "Christian" vassals of Turkey in breaking up the fast decaying power of the Moslem.

What great strides have been made during the past two years! The situation is intensely interesting. We are evidently in the throes of a crisis that will bring about a re-arrangement of the political forces for the last tableaux. So let it be. Come Lord Jesus, come quickly.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

WE defer these till next month. Meanwhile, according to promise last month, we give the finish to the answer "When was Jesus 30 years of age?" which we were obliged to leave out last month. For the sake of completeness, we reproduce the first part as well.

WHEN WAS JESUS THIRTY YEARS OF AGE?

W.R.O.—The chronological objections to Luke's account of the age of Christ, which you have copied from Grundy's lectures, all proceed on the assumption that Luke says "Jesus was thirty years of age in the fifteenth year of Tiberius." This is a mistake altogether. Luke does not say that Jesus was thirty in that year. What he

says is, "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar . . . *the word of God came unto John, the son of Zecharias, in the wilderness.*" It was the coming of the command to baptise to John, that happened in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius. True, at verse 23, Luke says, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age;" but this is to be connected with Christ's baptism and not with the date of the commencement of John's preaching, for it is connected with Christ's baptism, as you will see by reading verses 21, 22 immediately preceding. How long a space of time intervened between the coming of the word to John and the baptism of Jesus, Luke, in this chapter does not tell us; but his narrative in this chapter leaves room for any length of time that may otherwise be shown to have elapsed. He says in verse 3, "John came into all the country round about Jordan, preaching." He does not say how long a time he spent in this way. It must have been a considerable time; for it is stated (verse 15) that "all men mused in their hearts whether he were the Christ or not," also that the multitude came forth to him. Matthew says (chap. iii. 5) that "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan," went out to him; also that *many of the Pharisees and Sadducees* came to his baptism. Now for a single man, without miracle, to produce a universal attention like this, and to lead all men to speculate whether he were the Messiah, he must have preached for a considerable time, especially in an age and country not possessing the means of rapid circulation of news that distinguish our day. We know how long it takes, particularly in a Conservative community like the Jews, to produce an effect amongst the masses. The mention made of his personal habits and attire (Matthew iii. 4) favours the idea that he had been before the community as an object of interest and curiosity for a considerable time before the baptism of Christ. The same conclusion is confirmed by Christ's allusions to John in the course of his own preaching. He shut up the Pharisees on one occasion, by propounding a question to them concerning John, as concerning a public and widely-known matter (Matt. xxi. 25), which John and his preaching could not have become in the

nature of things, without some years' operations before the baptism of Christ. Paul in his speech at Antioch in Pisidia plainly says, (Acts xiii. 24), "John first preached before his (Christ's) coming." He also speaks of John's career being nearly at an end before Christ was manifested, that is, before Christ's baptism. He says, (verse 25) as John fulfilled his course, he said, Whom think ye that I am? I am not he. But behold there cometh one after me whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to unloose." To talk of a man "fulfilling his course" is to intimate that he had been at work some time. This is confirmed by John's own self-allusions: "He (Christ) must increase: but I must decrease.—(John iii. 30). Here we have a waning and a waxing career—John on the wane, Christ on the increase, which is inconsistent with the notion that John's course and Christ's course began in the same year. Luke does not say they began in the same year. He gives the year of *John's beginning*, and then tells Christ's age at Christ's baptism. In point of fact, Christ was baptised three and a half years after the beginning of John's preaching. This is shown by the following consideration. The "seventy weeks" of Daniel, which terminate with the cutting off of the Messiah, or the crucifixion of Christ, begin with "the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem," in the reign of Artaxerxes B.C. 456. Four hundred and seventy three years after this date, (that is, sixty-nine weeks of years) bring us exactly to the 15th year of Tiberius, reckoning from the beginning of Tiberius' joint reign with Augustus, which was the year John began to preach, as Luke states. Christ's crucifixion happened seven years after. He had been preaching three years and a half at the time of his death; consequently he was baptised when John had been preaching three years and a half, from which it follows that Jesus was not thirty in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (reckoning from the beginning of his joint reign with Augustus) but 26½. Confusion has been caused by the assumption that Luke's date applies to Christ's baptism; and further, by understanding that date to relate to Tiberius's sole reign, instead of to his actual reign, which began before

Augustus died.

Do not be too much impressed by the difficulties raised by those who desire to get rid of the Scriptures or some part of them. It is easy for ingenuity to raise difficulties from the complications of historical antiquity. Always give the Scriptures the benefit of any doubt that may exist. They are proved by too many evidences to admit of their being wrong. In many cases, where they appear at first to be wrong, patience and research will result in the recognition of intricate details which modify the argument and show them to be right after all. This has been the case in many instances. It is instructive to observe how the enemies of

the Bible tacitly accept profane testimony in matters of history and chronology, as infallible. If there is an apparent conflict between the Bible and profane historians, it is assumed as a matter of course that the profane historians are right. Why should this be? If the enemies of the Bible are right, the Bible is of course the work of profane historians too, and if so, it is a conflict between profane historians and profane historians. In that case, is there not as much chance of one being right as the other? But in point of fact, conflict is alleged to exist where there is really none when all the facts and details are taken together.

JEWISH AFFAIRS.

THE MONTEFIORE COLONIZATION SCHEME.

The Committee of the Montefiore Fund advertise for "an agent to superintend, under their orders, the following works in the Holy Land: the purchase of ground, the building of houses, the establishment of a Loan Fund, the aiding of able-bodied inhabitants in agricultural and trading pursuits, or such of those objects as the Committee may deem expedient." The salary will be about £200, according to qualifications.

IMPROVED COMMUNICATION WITH JERUSALEM.

The German colonists, in order to facilitate the communication between Jaffa and the Holy City, have formed a society which has been joined by many Russians. The society has purchased 25 wagons and 50 horses, by means of which the tedious journey between the two cities, now altogether free from danger, will be performed with greater regularity and comfort.

LETTER FROM JERUSALEM.

A "Friend of Zion," writing from Jerusalem, in the *Jewish Chronicle*, objects to the proposed erection of a new synagogue which is in contemplation there. He says:

"Dear brethren, the institution which the honourable Board of Deputies in London are about establishing in honour of Sir Moses Montefiore in the Holy Land, present to you a ploughed field wherein to sow the seeds of mercy and righteousness, which will take root and be productive, and which will bring considerable assistance for the inhabitants of Zion. To what advantage is the increasing of synagogues, in addition to the exceeding number already in existence, when the poor are starving, when their young ones are going astray without learning, without knowledge and secular education, and without consideration on the part of their misleaders for their permanent good?"

THE JEWS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The number of Jews in Great Britain has long been a source of doubt. No means are afforded to ascertain the exact number. We have, however, obtained from official sources certain figures which enable us to arrive at an approximate estimate. The total number of interments in Jewish congregations in Great Britain during 1875 was 1,230: of this total 956 interments took place in London. The annual rate of mortality among the general population of London is 24 per 1,000. Assuming this to have been the death-rate among the Jewish population of Great Britain—and we apply this rate rather than a lower one for Jews

mostly reside in towns—we ascertain that the approximate number of Jews in Great Britain is 51,250, and that of this number 39,833 reside in London.—*Jewish Chronicle*.

PALESTINE AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

A Canadian paper says:—"Palestine, though at present far from being an Eden, still throws the spell of a charm over Jew and Christian alike, and over every enlightened mind of whatever faith or nation. When the Empire of the Ottoman bursts, as it must sooner or later, one of the most difficult questions for diplomatic solution, will be—"What shall be done with Palestine?" It is very evident that this ancient land, the cradle of Christianity, cannot remain for ever under the sway of the Mussulman, who has trodden it so long, and turned the garden into a desert, and changed the "land flowing with milk and honey," into a wilderness. But what can be done? The struggle for the possession of the country will, probably, not be so bloody nor so ferocious as that which took place for the possession of the old imperial seat of the Crescent, the romantic city of

Stamboul; but there will be no want of suitors and rivals. Although, perhaps, at present, not of equal importance with Egypt, yet for any great power that would get it under thorough control and develop the immense resources of soil and commercial position, it would be a most valuable acquisition.

The thought of the resurrection of the Jewish government still lives and works in many a brain. Some little time ago, a friendly Englishman proposed in the interest of all concerned, that Turkey be dismembered, and that Germany undertake the protectorate of the new Jewish power to be established in the old land. Not a bad idea to have Bismarck and Von Moltke playing the role of reconstructors of the "Wandering Jew," and the patrons of Judaism—not so bad for an Englishman. And now the Sultan has got an idea into his head, of selling the whole affair out. Of course he will expect a good round sum, to fill up the terrible deficiencies of his squandered treasury. The proposition is said to have already been made. A company of capitalists, consisting of Jews and Christians, are to undertake the colonization and improvement of the country."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The following cases of obedience have occurred during the month: May 23rd, MARY MARIA SMITH (19), daughter of brother and sister Smith; EMILY LEA (18), daughter of sister Ann Smith; June 8th, HARRIET HARDY (33), wife of brother W. Hardy; CAROLINE RICHARDS (64), wife of brother Richards, of Montgomery; KATE WILLETS (19), a member of the Sunday School Senior Girls' Class; June 17th, FANNY BAIMEY (28), daughter of sister Bailey. [ERRATUM: The "two sisters Waddhouse," spoken of last month ought to have been "Waddhoupe."] On Whit Monday, there was a large and spirited open tea-meeting, at which the signs of the times formed a prominent topic of discourse.—The great feature of the month has been the discussion between brother Roberts and Mr. Bradlaugh, the editor of the *National Reformer*, on the question: "Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation?" A great many brethren came together from various parts of the country. The discussion occupied six nights, during two of which the discussion was at Leicester. The audience throughout was large and animated—the unbelieving party preponderating of course. These expressed their

varying feelings in the usual variety of style; the brethren, as a body, refrained from all manifestations, and listened silently to the argument, the logical advantage of which could only be on one side. The general reader will have an opportunity of judging, when they read the report, which is being printed. So far as human judgment can determine, the discussion will tend greatly to the advantage of the truth, not only in the sense of confirming the faith of those who believe, and, perchance, inducing conviction in some, heretofore sceptical minds, but in the increased publicity it will give to the truth as a fact in the midst of the community. This is important, as in many cases, the truth only needs to be known to be joyfully accepted. Mr. Bradlaugh proved a much less formidable antagonist than the Editor expected. What strength he had lay more in the power of his voice and the readiness of his ridicule, than in the logic of his argument. Take away the sound, the sarcasm, the banter, the sophistical reasoning and the fierce denunciation of things the Editor did not defend, and which had no connection with the Bible, and there was very little, if anything, left. The weakness of his case was particularly manifest in that

part of the discussion which was devoted to the Socratic method of question and answer. Had he been perfectly candid in his answers, instead of diplomatic and evasive, his discomfiture would have been complete. But even as it was, he could not conceal the untenable character of his position, as the reader will see on reading the shorthand writer's report. He aimed at affecting the audience; the Editor kept the audience out of view, and aimed at logical results; a difference which, though it sometimes told at the moment in favour of Bradlaugh, will work to the benefit of the truth in the long run.

BRISTOL.—Brother Cort reports the obedience of JOHN HEATH (27), on May 21st, and on May 29th, HENRY LONEY (32), both formerly Congregationalists; and Mrs. ANN PALMER, sister in the flesh to brother Bellamy. The Bristol ecclesia which only came into existence a short time back, now numbers seven. Brother Cort acknowledges several sums sent to him in response to the notice appearing on the cover of the *Christadelphian*.

CANNOCK.—Brother James Marsh, painter, of Brierley Hill, has removed from that place to Cannock, and would be glad of a visit from any brother passing. His address is High Town, Platt's Building, Hednesford, Staffordshire.

DUNDEE.—Brother Mortimer reports: "We have changed our meeting room from Waverley Hall to the Operative Plasterers' Hall, Tally street. We sometimes have visits from travelling brethren and sisters, which we value very much. The Operative Plasterers' Hall, where we now meet, is a nice little place (holds about 80) for our own meetings, but is not large enough, nor in so good a locality as we wish for a lecture room. We expect to have a more suitable place by the end of summer, if we may be still waiting till that time."

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Smith reports: "The annual meeting of the ecclesia was held on the 21st of May. The reports of the treasurer and secretary were submitted and accepted. Brother William Grant (whose address is care of Mr. Howie, 72, Buccleuch Street,) was appointed secretary. Sister Murray and sister Mary Andrew have removed from here, the former to Wick, and the latter to York."

GLASGOW.—Writing on the 14th ult., bro. William Owler says: "I have to report an addition to our number by the immersion of MARY HILL, sister in the flesh to sister Robert Bell, Govan. Brother and sister James Howatson, their daughter Jane and son John and his wife, have removed from Langholm to Glasgow, and will in future meet with us. The lectures on Sunday afternoons continue to be very well attended and may yet produce good fruit. The

subjects for the past two months were: April 16th.—The Reward of the Righteous.—(Brother Robertson.) April 23rd.—The Believer's Hope.—(Brother Ritchie.) May 7th.—Delusive Hopes.—(Bro. Mulholland.) May 14th.—Facts and Fancies.—(Brother J. Nisbet.) May 21st.—The House of Many Mansions.—(Brother Owler.) May 28th.—The End of the Present Age.—(Brother T. Nisbet.) June 4th.—Those Who Sleep in Jesus.—(Brother Robertson.) June 11th.—Faith and Hope.—(Brother Mulholland.) Brother Owler also acknowledges receipt of several offerings for the case of need reported last month, which probably he has privately acknowledged.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother J. W. Diboll reports: "Since my last report lectures have been delivered here on the following subjects:—May 21st.—The House of Many Mansions.—(Brother D. Spinney.) May 28th.—The Way of Salvation.—(Brother A. Harwood.) June 4th.—The Promises to Abraham.—(Brother J. W. Diboll.) June 11th.—Baptism.—(Bro. J. W. Diboll, jun.) Brother and sister Harwood, formerly of Yarmouth, who for the last few months have been resident at Great Grimsby, have just removed to Norwich.

GRANTHAM.—Brother Hawkins reports the return to the world of John Wright, who after a long process of gradual apostasy, with which the brethren have forborne in hope, has finally through drink and other causes, abandoned the life of godliness.

LONDON.—Brother Elliot reports: "Once again I have to announce that death has been in our midst, taking from us, after a painful illness, sister Culley, wife of brother Culley; leaving her husband and three little ones, with ourselves, to mourn her loss—a second time in so short a space. Several of the brethren and sisters visited the Finchley Cemetery, on this occasion, to lay our sleeping sister in her silent resting-place; and although not without sorrow, still with sorrow lightened by hope. I must also acquaint you of what has happened to us here in relation to the controversy, which, as you know, has been agitating us of late. On Sunday, the 21st of May, after months of patient and careful investigation, and after the fullest opportunity offered to those who differ, to maintain their position, we resolved to discontinue fellowshiping such as believe that the descendants of Adam were not condemned to death on account of his sin, or that Jesus Christ's death was not necessary to redeem himself as well as others from that condemnation. During the past month we have had the satisfaction of seeing two more "planted together in the likeness of Christ's death," in the hope of being also in the likeness of his resurrection. Both immersions took place on May 24th, viz., of Mrs. MCKILLOR, wife of brother Mc-

Killop, formerly Baptist; and EMMANUEL POTTER, previously attending the Church of England. Brother Potter is from Bewdley, and expects to return thither again shortly, to have communion with the brethren there. The lectures here for June have been as follow:—June 4th, The Slain Lamb; his Past Shame and Future Glory. —(Brother A. Andrew.) June 11th, The Royal Marriage Feast: the Invitation, the Happy Guests and the Robeless Outcasts. (Brother J. C. Phillips.) June 18th, Jesus Christ the Future King of the World. (Brother J. J. Hadley, of Birmingham) June 25th, The Seven-sealed Scroll seen by the apostle John. Why he wept before it was unsealed. What are its principal contents. What part refers to the present time. (This lecture was illustrated by a diagram.) (Brother J. J. Andrew.)

NEWARK.—Bro. Hawkins, of Grantham, reports from brother Hage, of Newark, that ROBERT WILDSMITH (56), who has been enquiring into the truth for some years, has finally accepted and obeyed it in the face of opposition at home. Brother Wildsmith is a farmer, and lives in Swinderby, a village about nine miles from Newark. Obedience in his position of isolation, which dwellers in cities and towns cannot realise, is a marvel, and an illustration of the power of the truth.

NEW PITSLIGO.—Brother James Ferguson reports the immersion on the 11th of June, of MR. HEPBURN (71), husband to sister Hepburn; also MR. STEPHEN (45), and MRS. STEPHEN (30), whose enlightenment brother Ferguson says is due to the instrumentality of brethren Reid and Sinclair.

ROCK FERRY.—See article on page 313 in present number, entitled "A Congregational Minister becomes obedient to the truth, un-'rev.'s' himself and gives up a salary of £400 a year." Since the writing of that article, brother Ashcroft has announced the obedience of his wife, CLARA ASHCROFT (32), to whom with the brethren there the event is a joyful one. Brother W. Hughes, of Liverpool, also sends a communication on the subject. There is already an ecclesia of five at Rock Ferry, including bro. and sister Gee.

SALE.—Brother Calderbank reports the obedience, on May 13th, of Miss ANNIE RAYNES (35), formerly of the Church of England; also on May 17th, of Mr. JOHN GREENHALGH, of Blackpool, formerly of the Plymouth Brethren. He also reports the removal of sister E. Birkenhead, to Manchester, where she has become sister Wareham by marriage to brother Wareham of that place.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports the addition of two more to the number of the brethren here, viz.: DAVID LANSPEARY (44), and his wife MARTHA LANSPEARY, both formerly Baptists. They had been looking into the truth for twelve months, and were

both immersed on the 29th day of May. The attendance at the Sunday evening lectures continues to be very satisfactory. The subjects during the past month have been: The Soul.—The Devil.—The Holy Spirit and Salvation.

STOCKPORT.—Brother Waite announces the addition to the Stockport ecclesia of Mrs. ELIZABETH MARY BEELEY (25), sister in the flesh to brother Boote, of Liverpool. She was immersed into Christ on Sunday afternoon, the 4th inst., in the presence of a goodly number of brethren and sisters, after an intelligent confession of the truth.

WICK.—See Edinburgh.
YORK.—See Edinburgh.

CHINA.

HONG KONG.—Brother Hart writes as follows: "There is no loop-hole into which the truth can enter, as yet, in any society in Hong Kong. The whole minds of the public are craving after pleasure. There is a sad cry when no theatricals are in the place, and to take their place amateurs perform; want of pleasure seems to drive the people mad. A mania for drinking clubs has got up lately, and these are got up by the Protestant and the Catholic clergy and priests. There is the Royal Navy Club, got up by the Chaplain of H.M.S. *Audacious*, established in a building owned by Roman Catholic priests. The drunkenness and language used is dreadful; a lady living next door complains bitterly. There is the Roman Catholic Club, got up by the priests, on premises belonging to themselves. The police force have two drinking clubs and two canteens; the Protestant clergy have organized a temperance club for merchant seamen, but it might as well be a drinking saloon; these same clergy organised a canteen for them in the Sailor's Home. There are four drinking and billiard clubs for the English public, one for the Germans and one for the Parsees. The Chinese seeing this, have established about thirty: these have all been established about a year. For some time there has been two English theatres, one German theatre, one Garrison theatre and three Chinese theatres; also twenty hotels and beer shops, so that, dear brother Roberts, with the fact also that there are nearly one thousand Government licensed brothels, about one thousand private Chinese brothels and over a thousand other unmentionable dens, you will see what sort of a place Hong Kong is, and I alone in it. If Sodom and Gomorrah were worse than this, they were bad indeed. This is a true picture of the place; society is rotten in every direction. Ministers and their church committees all work hard for what they term the "almighty dollar."

UNITED STATES.

ADELINE (Ogle Co., Ill.)—Bro. S. W. Coffman reports the sudden and unexpected death of his wife, sister Coffman, at the age of 62. She contracted a congestive chill from exposure in farm work. She was not, however, supposed to be in any danger till the last moment. She came home from her work, and went to sleep, and was supposed to be getting on favourably. It was not till within ten minutes of her death that any apprehension was felt. She passed away peacefully. She was buried in the family burying ground on the farm. She was associated with the work of Dr. Thomas from the very earliest period. She emigrated with her husband from Maryland in the spring of 1840, and settled in Illinois at the time that Dr. Thomas lived in that region. Her husband says she laboured more for the support and encouragement of Dr. Thomas in his service of the truth than any other woman except the members of his own family. Sister Lasius, of West Hoboken, (Dr. Thomas's daughter), writing on the same subject, says, "the influence of her deeds of kindness and love was felt far beyond her own immediate family circle." The following local newspaper notice appears: "Mrs. Coffman came with her husband from Washington county, Md., in the spring of 1840, and settled on the then wild prairies of Illinois. With only the wealth that could be wrested from beneath the sod of the prairies by hard labour, she commenced the life of an Illinois farmer's wife. A large family very soon gathered about her hearthstone. The constant labour and increasing care of those situated like her, was sweetened by the reflection that soon her little ones would be able, first to assist, and finally to free her from toil and care. These hopes were never fully realised. About thirteen years since, that terrible disease, diphtheria, appeared in Mr. Coffman's neighbourhood, her family was attacked, and when the work of death was done, one-half of her children were in the grave. Since then other afflictions have been met and bravely borne, although until now the family circle has not been invaded by death. Disease has given her many days of toil and anxiety. Mrs. Coffman was a woman of fine personal appearance, with quiet motherly dignity that won the hearts of all who met her. Partial deafness made conversation difficult, and lessened her influence socially. She leaves a husband four years her senior, much broken in health, and to whom her loss comes with crushing force, as he has looked more than most men to his wife as a solace and counsellor. Five children have survived her, all of whom have arrived at adult age."

BURNET, (Tex.)—Brother J. Banta announces the obedience of **GEORGE EDMUNDS** (30), formerly Church of England, and originally a resident in Birmingham, England; and **JAMES EPPERSON**, brother in the flesh to J. L. Epperson, of San Fernando Valley.

(He mentions trouble from a case of disobedience of the law of God and man. The offence is confessed and repented of; but some think there ought not to be restoration to fellowship. There is needless difficulty created. All manner of sin shall be forgiven unto men, except the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit; and where God forgives, we ought to have no hesitation. It is only where sin is defended, &c not acknowledged in all its heinousness, that sin erects a barrier.—EDITOR.)

CENTRE POINT (Tex.)—Brother Corbell writes to say that the fraternal gathering fixed to take place here on the first Sunday in August, will take place on the second Sunday in that month and not on the first. (A question is asked, to which the answer is—that we should do wrong to refuse the return of any brother who may confess and forsake a course of wrong-doing. "Restore such an one in the spirit of meekness" is the apostolic command. It is only where a brother becomes a blasphemer and positive adversary of the truth, as described in Heb. vi. and x., that it is impossible for him to retrace his steps.—EDITOR.)

ELMIRA (N.Y.)—Brother Hall reports the obedience of the **SON OF BROTHER SYKES**, who, though young in years (16) has a good understanding and love of the truth.

EAGLE CREEK (Ark.)—"A sister" writes to say that her anonymous signature was, in a recent communication from this place, appearing in the *Christadelphian*, mistaken for "brother A. Lister." She says there is no one of that name in the ecclesia.

ROCHESTER (N.Y.)—Brother J. D. Tomlin reports the obedience of **JAMES LEASK** (24), formerly Presbyterian, of Aberdeen, Scotland; and **THOMAS BODDY** (57), father of brother Boddy, originally of London, England, where he at one time attended the services of the National Church, and at another time the Baptists. Several interested strangers are in regular attendance at the meetings of the brethren, and those brethren who have laboured for many years feel encouraged.

WATERLOO (Iowa.)—Bro. Adams reports that brother Goodwin has returned to live in this part again, greatly to the comfort and joy of the brethren, by whom he is esteemed as one whose daily walk and conversation is such as becometh the gospel.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 146.

AUGUST, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

THE GOSPEL AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

DUTY AT THE PRESENT CRISIS.

THE purpose of God in fitting up the earth, as described by Moses, and in bringing the world to its present constitution, by checking and restraining the full manifestation of the evil that exists, is that He may found a kingdom and empire, literally “universal” (Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14), under the government of which all nations may be blessed.—(Gen. xii. 3; Psalm lxxii. 11.) The Hebrew nation established in the Holy Land will be the kingdom (Ex. xix. 5, 6; Mic. iv. 6-8; v. 2; Ezek. xxxvii. 21-28), and all other nations the empire attached to that kingdom. The Jewish and other nations will constitute *a family of nations*, of which Israel will be the firstborn; Abraham, the federal patriarch; and Christ, his seed, the

King. This divine family of nations will be so highly civilised that the present state of society will be regarded as intensely dark and barbarous; for then “the knowledge of the glory of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.” The blessedness of this divine civilisation is detailed in “the gospel,” which is, therefore, styled “the glad tidings,” or “*gospel of the kingdom of God*” (Matt. iv. 23), while the divine civilisation itself is “*The economy of the fulness of the appointed times*” (Eph. i. 10, 21), or “world to come,” styled also “*the age to come.*” The Bible is full of the glorious things pertaining to this, the real “*golden age*” of the world.

The government of the nations in

that period, which will continue a thousand years without change, will be such as their necessities demand—*just laws and institutions, civil and ecclesiastical; and perfect and righteous men to administer them.* To fulfil these requirements, the government of mankind will be committed to Christ, and to those whom he may account worthy of association with him. The Bible expressly declares that the rulers of the world shall then be immortal kings and priests (Rev. i. 5, 6; v. 9, 10; ii. 26, 27; xxii. 5), and however sectarian or religious infidelity may cry out against the idea of mortal and immortal men living contemporaneously upon the earth, no truth is more plainly and abundantly revealed in the Bible. This family of "many nations," of which God has constituted Abraham the "father" (Gen. xvii. 5; Rom. iv. 13), will continue under one and the same constitution a thousand years, at the expiration of which there will be a change.—(Rev. xx. 6, 7; 1 Cor. xv. 24-26.) SIN, and, by consequence, religion, priesthood and death, will be universally abolished; and the earth will be inhabited by immortals only; for it is written, "THE WICKED SHALL NOT INHERIT THE EARTH;" but, on the contrary, "The meek shall inherit the earth." Hence, the final state of things upon our planet will be a *divine monarchy of everlasting continuance*, under which there will be *but one nation* (Jer. xlvi. 28), and that nation holy, immortal, and comprehensive of all redeemed from among the descendants of the first human pair. When this consummation obtains, the purpose of God in terrestrial creation will be accomplished, even the *peopling of the earth with an immortal race, which shall have attained to immortality, on the principle of believing what God hath promised, and doing what He hath commanded.*

In the gospel there is an invitation to all who believe what God has promised, to share with Christ in his kingdom, glory and joy, *on certain conditions well defined.*—(1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 9-11; Matt. xxv. 21.)

These are, *faith* in the things covenanted to Abraham and David, and in those taught concerning Jesus, in the Old and New Testaments; *immersion* into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and thenceforth, a life of "holiness to the Lord," without which none will be approved and promoted to the honour and glory of the kingdom.—(Col. i. 21-23.)

Now, it is evident, that the establishment of this divine civilization among the nations necessitates the abolition of the present civil, ecclesiastical, and social constitution of the world. The nations and the earth to its utmost bounds are "deeded" to Christ; they are an inheritance and possession made *his*, by a deed registered in the Bible (Psalm ii. 8), but, for the time being, in the hands of regal, imperial, republican, and ecclesiastical thieves and robbers. This patent fact and Bible truth makes a contest between Christ and "*the Powers that be*," variously symbolised in the Scriptures by Beasts, Horns, Frogs, Dragons, Rivers, &c., the heraldry of the Bible, an unavoidable necessity. The divine oracle is: "*These shall make war upon the Lamb, and THE LAMB (Jesus, 'the Lamb of God') SHALL OVERCOME THEM; in other words, 'He shall destroy them that destroy the earth.'*"—(Rev. xvii. 12-14; xix. 11-16, 19, 21; xi. 15, 18.) This is the doom of the world's tyrants: destruction, not by popular fury, which is merely an embarrassment, but by the military power of Jehovah's Servant, even of Jesus, the future Lord of armies, whom He has prepared, and whom He will send into the world again for this very purpose. He will take possession of the kingdoms, empires and republics of the nations "under the whole heaven," and blend them into one universal empire, which will constitute the secondary dominion, "the first dominion" consisting of the "kingdom restored again to Israel" in the Holy Land.—(Mic. iv. 8; Acts i. 6.)

For a man, though a divine man, to take possession of the civil, military, naval and ecclesiastical power, commerce and riches of the world, implies *co-operation*. The Bible teaches emphatically that this co-operation for the wresting of Christ's inheritance from "the powers that be," appropriately and summarily styled by Jesus, "*The Devil and his Angels*," will consist of "the called, and chosen, and faithful." (Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 14; xiv. 4), raised from the dead, or, if living at the crisis, "transformed in the twinkling of an eye;" these will be "with him" as his "joint-heirs," and companions in arms, commanding the operations of the armies of Israel, whose mission will be, like that of their fathers under Joshua, to subdue "*the Powers*" combined to prevent their restoration, and the establishing of the new and divine order of things. (Jer. li. 19, 20; Isai. xli. 8-16.)

The accomplishment of this mission is the Bible solution of "THE GREAT EASTERN QUESTION" now pending, and which causes so much anxiety to the Powers, and excites so much hope in the revolutionary heart of the world. I have proved in *Elpis Israel*, that the "secret diplomacy" which has, contrary to its own wish, created an *imbroglio* from which there is no issue but a war that shall change the face of the world—that the Diplomatic Imbroglio is the apparent "sign of the Son of Man in the heaven," which indicates to the intelligent believer that he is about to "come as a thief." (Matt. xxiv. 30; Rev. xvi. 13-15.) Before it came to pass, even five years before, I showed by the interpretation of the remarkable prophecy of the Eastern Question contained in the prediction of the "*Three unclean Spirits like Frogs*," that a policy emanating from the Frog-Power, or Imperial Military Democracy of France, would operate upon the Constantinopolitan "*Dragon*," whose present "mouth" is the Sultan; upon the Germano-Roman "*Beast*," whose mouth is the Austrian Emperor; and upon the papal pseudo-prophet, whose mouth is the Pope—and cause to issue forth from each of

them an unclean spirit, a belligerent spirit—which three spirits, in their combined working upon the governments of the whole Romanized world should involve them in a general war, which shall continue, with dreadful and truly wonderful effect, till the furtive in-coming of the much-to-be-desired of all nations, (Hag. ii. 6, 7,) who will roll back the tide of devastation and death from the Holy Land upon the peoples of the papal west. Now, as far as this sign has manifested itself, it has come to pass according to my interpretation.

The confirmations of my interpretations of the "*sure word of prophecy*" by current events in the Old World, is demonstration strong, that prophetic Scripture is intelligible; that the future may be known before it comes to pass, and that the principles of interpretation by which I expound the word are correct. Alexander Campbell, William Miller, Dr. Cummings, John Wesley, *et id genus omne*, with the innumerable crowd who have adopted their religious *opinions*, have never been able to appeal to such a test, confirmatory of the scripturality of their positions. Six years ago, in my lectures, and four years since, in my *Elpis Israel*, I showed by interpretation of the prophecy of THE FROGS in Rev. xvi., what has actually evented in the Orient, and the part France, Turkey, Austria, and the Pope were to play in the affair. It is therefore no presumption to say that the interpretation given by me is *the only true one*. No other writer on the Apocalypse ever caught a glimpse of its signification. *It is the great Sign in the Heaven foreshadowing the appearing of the Son of Man as a thief*. The evolution of the Sign is continuous with existing diplomatic working until they have involved all the Powers of "*the habitable*" in war. When this result is consummated, "*the Sign*" or symbol, will no longer be seen "*in Heaven*." Manifestations from Austria and the Pope are yet wanting to complete the Sign.* Austria will prove

* These manifestations have since taken place—Austria declared war against France in 1859, under the excitation of French diplomatic

treacherous to the Western Powers; for with France she must come in to collision at last. The Pope will not be an idle and indifferent spectator of events. His policy will expedite hostilities between the French and Austrian Horns of the Lamb-Horned and Dragon-speaking dominion; and then "the House that Jack built" will be wrapped in flames. "Seeing, then, we know these things before," let us be mindful of the exhortation which says, "Beware lest ye, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."—(2 Pet. iii. 17.) "Blessed is he that watcheth," and prepares for what is sure to follow soon—prepares, by belief of the gospel of the kingdom, and obeying it in love of the Lord's appearing.

Europe and Asia, from the German and Atlantic Oceans to the eastern confines of Persia, will (are destined to) be Russianized.—(Ezek. xxxviii. 2-7.) The Russian Empire will become a Colossus, and bestride the world. Its head will be of gold, its breast and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of brass, its two legs of iron, and its feet and toes part of iron and part of clay. When it attains to the magnitude of this image, its last Czar will be the last representative of *the power* styled "The king of a fierce countenance, doing according to his will," (Dan. viii. 9, 23; xi. 36-39,) hence *autocratic*. The last object of his ambition in the extension of his dominion will be the conquest of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, which will be the last field of battle for "the Powers," among themselves, for the dominion of the Old World. The invasion of Palestine will bring Russia and Britain face to face, as the last principals in the war. Ere this, the French empire will have vanished,* and France be again Bourbonized under Russia. In the end Russia will

overrun Egypt and Syria, and take Jerusalem.—(Dan. xi. 42; Zech. xiv. 2.) The Holy City will be her last conquest. She will have acquired the Holy Places her ambition veiled by her superstition now prompts her to covet, while Britain will still hold the countries anciently styled "Edom, Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon," on the west and south of Jordan and the Dead Sea. The relative position of Russia and Britain in the Holy Land forms *the prepared situation* of affairs recorded in the Bible by Moses and the prophets. The *crisis* is the destruction of the Russian and British hosts, which "cover the land as a cloud," by pestilence, hail, fire, and sword, after the example of Sennacherib's; so that of the Russian forces only "*one-sixth part*" escapes to proclaim its mysterious disaster. This extraordinary overthrow is the shattering of the Colossus by the stone of Israel, as set forth in Dan. ii. 34, 44, 45. Jerusalem and the Holy Land being thus delivered by the breaking of the military power of the Dragon, Christ and his associates proceed with the work before them, of setting up the kingdom of God in the restoration of Israel, the annihilation of the Papacy, and the subversion of "the Powers that be."

The things presented in this outline will be regarded with incredulity by those who know not the gospel of the kingdom, or who imagine that nothing can be known of the future till it has become the past. In other words, as this notion has taken such deep root in the theological mind as to be almost universal, and the gospel is known to so very few, scarcely any will believe what is herein exhibited. Who is there believes that the Bible contains a revelation of God's purposes to mankind? That it is a sure word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place? Let him examine the references and see if anything else can be fairly and reasonably made to shine out of the prophetic word. If this word be unintelligible till after the events predicted, it cannot be "a

intrigue, and the Pope declared war against the democracy in 1868, under the same inspiration.—EDITOR *Christadelphian*.

* This was written twenty-two years ago. The French Empire has vanished. The rest of the programme is in process of being realised.—EDITOR *Christadelphian*.

light," neither can any one "take heed" by its assistance. But the *gospel is itself a great prophecy of what shall be in the age to come*. To deny the intelligibility of prophecy is therefore to deny the possibility of understanding the gospel. God says, "My purpose is," "I will do," "It shall come to pass that." This is His mode of speech; yet mankind are so stupid, that when He says what he will do, in the plainest language, they say they cannot understand Him. The fact is, that they do understand the words and the ideas the words convey, but they treat God as if He were like themselves, who speak so as to conceal their thoughts. If God were to speak according to this rule, it would be absurd to say that the Bible contains a revelation of things to come; for there is no concealment in revelation. I hope my readers are not of this class, but that they have faith in God, and in His word, and will take heed thereto. The sign of the appearing of the Son of Man in power is in the heaven, and may be discerned by every one not blinded by the foolishness of the worldly-wise. It is the sign of the Sixth Vial, concurrent with the drying-up of the Euphratean power, preparatory to Christ's coming as a thief. Look, then, to your garments. If you have upon you only the filthy old rags of immersed sectarianism—*baptised human tradition*—get quit of it, I beseech you. Faith in college divinity, or in Millerism, or in Campbellism, is not justifying. No matter how much they talk about Jesus, *they do not believe what Jesus preached*, and he preaches justification, or salvation, on the belief of his word and immersion—and the word he preached for three years and a half was "THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD." *If you would invest yourself with "the wedding garment," you must be immersed in the belief of this.* A gospel that delivers a tradition which makes the kingdom impossible, such as that it is beyond the skies; or that the Lord has cast away His people Israel, and will therefore never restore them; or that the

nations are to be wholly destroyed at Christ's coming; or that the earth is to be burned up, is a gospel not worth a pinch of snuff, because it nullifies and stultifies the truth. There is a harmony and consistency in the truth, which makes it *the truth*; and where these are wanting, it reduces it to an error which is neither purifying nor justifying. The marriage ceremony will not unite two men or two women in the bonds of matrimony. And why? Because one of the parties is an *unfit subject*, not answering the requirements of the law and institution. Now, immersion into the Divine Name (pouring and sprinkling, the subterfuges of ignorance and disobedience, are out of the question,) is the marriage rite which unites a constituent of the Bride to Christ. But it does not unite a Latin, or a Greek, or a Mahomedan, or a Protestant to him, though all these may be immersed, and the Divine Name invoked over them. And why? The Latin, Greek, and Protestant all profess to believe that he is the Son of God! Because Christ does not dwell in their hearts *by faith in what he preached*. They are *unfit subjects*, not answering the requirements of the baptismal institution. This demands and will be satisfied with nothing short of a believer of the gospel of the kingdom of God! Christ was sent to preach to Israel. Be honest, then, in your practise, O ye who accept the theory of the kingdom's gospel as the truth—be honest to yourselves, and do honour to God in obeying from the heart that mould of doctrine into which the apostles delivered those whom they enlightened. There is no other way of putting on the wedding-garment. Adorn yourselves with this, and then "watch and keep your garments, lest you walk naked, and you be exposed to shame," for he that cometh is certainly at the door.—DR. THOMAS in the *Herald*, 1854.

WHO WILL RISE FROM THE DEAD?

BY DR. THOMAS.

THE design of resurrection is, not only to re-organize the dead, but to re-organize and make them alive again; and the reason why they are to be thus re-ushered into life is, that they may stand before the tribunal of Christ, and give account of themselves to God, (Rom. xiv. 10-12,) that they may receive the things in body according, be they good or bad.—(2 Cor. v. 10.) These testimonies stand side by side with Rev. xx. 12. The dead referred to there must of course become living, or they cannot give an account of themselves, or receive recompense, good or bad. If those spoken of in the fifth verse lived not again until the thousand years were finished, it follows that when that time expires, *they will live again*, but with a terminable life.

The tenth verse of the chapter completes the prediction of the destruction of the postmillennial *Gog and Magog* power, styled "*the Devil*," which will be exterminated on the same territories, and by similar means, as "*the Powers*," (represented by "the Beast and the False Prophet,") were a thousand years before.—(Rev. xix. 20; xiv. 10.) The eleventh verse presents a new scene. Its description carries us back to the beginning of the Millennium, when the "*Great White Throne*," the throne of David, is established, "*the earth and the heaven*," or present Gentile constitution of the world, having "*fled away*," and the glory of Jehovah pervading the earth as the waters do the sea. Jesus reigns upon this throne until he has put down all enemies under his feet, when the last enemy, Death, shall be destroyed; an idea which is symbolically described as the casting of Death and Invisibleness (*ἀόρατος*) into the Lake of Fire. ver. 14. (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26.) The prophecy then embraced in Rev. xx. 11-15, is descriptive of resurrection matters, pertaining to the beginning and ending of the thousand years. The dead who are raised are those who stand related

to the opened books—persons who have died under times of knowledge, and whose works, therefore, will be adjudged as good or bad, according to the light revealed from heaven, as it is written in John iii. 19. They all live again who rise; but all mankind are not raised, because all mankind have not lived under times of knowledge, or in relation to the books.

Divine knowledge classifies mankind. One class is composed of those who have lived under times of ignorance which God winks at.—(Acts xvii. 30.) This is comprehensive of those whose ignorance is involuntary and helpless. They are born and die under the sentence pronounced upon Adam: "Out of the ground thou wast taken, and unto the dust shalt thou return." This is the end of their beginning. "They remain in the congregation of the dead," being helplessly *sinners by constitution*.

A second class includes those to whom God sends the light, but who shut their eyes against it, loving darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. These are not only sinners by constitution, but *wicked sinners*, who refuse to come under a constitution of righteousness to God. These are "the rest of the dead who live not again till the thousand years are finished." At the end of that period they rise, and, commingled with the *Gog and Magog* rebels, are with them "tormented day and night to the ages of the ages," *εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων. eis tous aionas ton aionon*, in the postmillennial "lake of fire" which "devours" those adversaries.

The third class of the dead is comprehensive of those who, when previously living, came under a constitution of righteousness, and are therefore "*saints*." Sinners who have intelligently obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, by so doing become saints. Thus they begin to do well, and for a *patient continuance in well-doing* they receive glory, honour, incorruptibility,

and life at the first resurrection as the first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb.—(Rom. ii. 7.) These are "the just," who rise to the life of the Age, and possess the kingdom.

The fourth class includes those saints who did run well, but did not continue in well-doing; way-side, stony-ground, and thorn-choked professors. These are "the unjust," who with "the just" rise at Christ's coming, but to the shame and contempt of the Age. (Dan. xii. 2.) They are driven by the decree of the King into the territories of the Beast and False Prophet, and kings of

the earth, styled "the devil and his angels," (Matt. xxv. 41;) where they are tormented with fire and brimstone in the premillennial lake of fire, (Rev. xix. 20,) in the presence of the holy angels, (the saints,) and of the Lamb, (2 Thess. i. 7-10,) [the Lord Jesus;] who give them no rest day nor night to ages of ages, *eis aiōnas aiōnōn*, (Rev. xiv. 10, 11,) that is, till the destruction of those dominions is completed, which ensues before the thousand years begins.—*Herald*, 1854.

THE REASON WHY POPULAR "DIVINES" DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE APOCALYPSE.

BY DR. THOMAS.

Apocalypsis is the first word of the Greek copy of the book styled "*The Revelation of St. John*," and signifies a revelation. Hence, many have adopted the Greek word as the title of the twenty-two chapters into which John's book is divided, to distinguish it from other parts of Scripture which are revelations also. The English title does not express the truth. The Apocalypse is not John's Revelation; but "*A Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.*" This is the title given to the book by John, to whom Jesus sent and signified it through his messenger.

Revelation is the *unveiling* of hidden things. "*The Apocalypse Unveiled*," then, is a very objectionable title, signifying "*The Unveiling Unveiled*." The unveiling was performed by God when he gave the revelation to Jesus Christ. God unveiled the future to him; and He unveiled the future to his servants by showing what had been made manifest to him. How is it, then, that this book is not understood? It is *the Future Unveiled*; yet it baffles all the learned, all "the divines of Christendom," and all their disciples who rush into print upon the subject,

to form even a rational conjecture upon coming events! The enigma is not difficult to solve; nay, the question is answered in John's title, which informs us, that the Apocalypse is a revelation to Christ's servants, to show *them* the future. It is not an unveiling of the future to those who are not his servants—to the wise, the prudent, the scribes, the princes, the disputers of this world*—who have been almost exclusively the baffled expositors of apocalyptic truth. These are not Christ's servants, not having the seal of God in their foreheads.† They neither understand, believe, nor have obeyed, the gospel of the kingdom; and therefore their foreheads are unstamped with the seal of God. How can men ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom, expound a revelation which unfolds *the formation of a situation of human affairs*, the predicted resolution of which is the *re-establishment of the Twelve Tribes of Israel in the Holy Land, under the government of "THE KINGS OF THE EAST," or Christ and the Saints, with dominion over all nations to earth's utmost bounds?* They who do not understand and believe this,

* 1 Cor. iii.—li

† 2 Rev. vii. 8.

and the manner in which the setting up of this theocracy is to be effected, and who cannot scripturally define "the Saints," are utterly incapable of giving a scriptural, rational, demonstrative, or intelligible explanation of the Apocalypse. The Hengstenbergs, the Tregelleses, the Elliots, the Cummingses, the Bickersteths, the Fabers, the Cunninghames, the Bp. Newtons, the Keiths, the lords, and all the commons, who have written upon it, too numerous to mention, can no more interpret the vision, than could all the wise men, the astrologers, the magicians, and the soothsayers, of Nebuchadnezzar's court his dream of the latter-day catastrophe of the Kingdom of Babylon. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him"—with them "who keep His commandments, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." *

This is the reason of such universal failure. All these writers occupy theological stand-points from which the revealed future cannot be seen. How can a man possibly expound correctly the seventeenth and nineteenth chapters, whose theology inculcates the introduction of the Millennium by the influence of "the benevolent institutions of the day" upon the governments and peoples? Or a peace society man who dreams of war ceasing from the earth before Christ comes? Or one

who believes in the triumph of republicanism over monarchy? Or how could divines of the Church of England, or of Scotland, or of their sectarian offshoots, expound the saying concerning God's servants, "*These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins;*" † seeing that they are all defiled by these "*Women,*" being ministers of the "*Harlots,*" which recognize "*Babylon the Great*" as the "*Holy Mother Church,*" though corrupt in many things?

Divines say that the Apocalypse is a dark book. If, then, you put a veil over a dark book, what do you accomplish? You make it darker! Suppose then you afterwards unveiled it, what is the result? You make darkness visible! It is such trashy books as theirs that have darkened, and brought into disrepute, one of the most interesting and important portions of the Scriptures. An exposition of the Apocalypse is still a desideratum, ‡ which can only be fulfilled by one unspoiled by scholastic theology, independent of authority, intelligent in the political constitution of the Gentiles, and who understands the gospel of the kingdom, and has obeyed it.—*Herald*, 1854.

* Rev. xii. 17; xiv. 12

+ Rev. xiv. 4.

‡ This was written before the publication of *Eureka*.—EDITOR *Christadelphian*.

ECCLESIASTICAL PHRASES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF APOSTOLIC IDEAS.

BY DR. THOMAS.

If the ecclesiastical words and phrases of this century were representative of the spiritual ideas of the apostolic age, there could be no ground of debate. But there is nothing more distinct than Bible things and modern phrases. The language and ideas of Scripture are inseparable as sign and thing signified. Not so, however, with the dialect of the schools and systems of this expiring age—it expresses one thing, but really means another. Thus we hear of "an evangelist of the Christian

Church." In Paul's day, an evangelist (*ευαγγελιστης*, from *εὖ*, *good*, and *αγγελω*, *to deliver a message*), was one who had to announce glad tidings, or good news, and had received a spiritual gift, or gifts, by the laying on of the hands of the eldership, by which the gospel he announced was confirmed. But in our day, men have the official name of such an one, without the qualification. *The Christian Church* and *the Church of God* are scripturally identical: but here we have them in

our day rival and antagonistic. What is this Christian Church? From things exhibited in the debate (between Dr. Field and the "Rev." Mr. Connelly) we are able to strip it of all phraseological disguise. It is nothing more nor less than the *Campbellite Brotherhood*; so that Mr. Connelly is not "an evangelist of the Christian Church;" but, one who is commissioned by the Campbellite community to announce to the people as gospel, the opinions inculcated by the Professor of Sacred History at Bethany College. Among these opinions is the purely carnal notion, (so carnal that the old pagans, who were utterly ignorant of the things of the Spirit of God, entertained it,) that when man dies, he is not only conscious, but beatifically glorious beyond the skies! This is the bright side of the conceit; the dark one is, that if he have been wicked before "shuffling off his mortal coil," he descends into the bottomless

pit burning with fire and brimstone, where he remains as fuel for the burning to infinity.

The preaching of such foolishness as this destroys entirely Mr. Connelly's claim to be regarded as a scriptural evangelist. Every student of the word, whose brain is not addled by pulpitology, knows very well that Paul, Timothy, and Titus, never preached anything like it. They announced life and incorruptibility in the kingdom of God to all who believed the glad tidings concerning that royalty, and became obedient to the law of faith in word and deed. They proclaimed the attainment of this on rising from the dead; and hence their own anxiety to share in the resurrection. They taught *immortality of body*; that is, *life endlessly manifest through an incorruptible body*: so that no body, no immortality, was the idea that stultified all the notions of the Greeks.—*Herald*, 1854.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

GOD'S EXISTENCE APPARENT FROM THE
THINGS THAT ARE.

THIS is the argument of David and Paul,

that the things which are, and which have not always been, prove a source equal at least to the powers which they manifest. Thus David says "He that has formed the

eye, shall not He see? He that hath formed the ear, shall He not hear?" There is profound and conclusive reasoning in this, though it is not at all times apparent to the understanding with equal force, because belonging to the higher efforts of thought. The existence of the eye proves the existence of a seeing power higher than the eye. Things to be seen existed before the eye, and the eye is contrived to see them. Therefore, a power equal to seeing all things, and to the contriving of the eye, must also have existed, otherwise things would have remained as they were before the eye was formed to see. Paul's declaration on the subject is, that "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by *the things that are made*"—(Rom. i. 20). The argument is forcibly put in a letter to Mr. Bradlaugh, appearing in the *National Reformer*. The letter is as follows: "Sir,—You think 'the universe is sufficient for all its phenomena.' I sent you, last week the reported saying of Voltaire, that 'I do not know but in the course of time there may be found someone crazy enough to assert that 'matter' without thinking produces for itself beings which think. In that case I would maintain that, following this beautiful theory, 'matter' could produce a God.' Voltaire's surmise has literally come to pass! There is one who has the impression that matter without thinking has produced beings who think! You think that the universe, without sensation, has brought into existence many animals with senses, ranging from one up to five. You think that the universe, without love or hatred, has produced beings who hate or love. You think that the universe, without consciousness, has produced beings who are conscious. You think that the universe, without will, has produced beings who have the power of will. You think that the universe, without knowledge, has produced beings with knowledge. So far Voltaire is

undoubtedly a true prophet. What, then, is to prevent this same universe producing a God? It has got so far on with its work that man, who resembles a God in the estimation of some, walks the earth. 'As certain also of your own poets have said,' in the *National Reformer*, if we stand by a God, 'see one where Bradlaugh stands!' We live under the power of evolution, and no one dreams that the power has done its work. Having infinite time before it, a being with all the perfections generally attributed to God, will be brought into existence. So, if there was no God in the infinity past, there will be one in the infinity to come. You will be more 'crazy' (to use Voltaire's strong term), in thinking that the universe will produce a God in the future, than that it has already produced man. The difficulty with me is, that if evolution never *began*, and has always gone on, that it has not brought things to greater perfection ere this. If it had a beginning, it is no less a difficulty how it could start. The saying of a great thinker is correct, that 'Nothing can be evolved but what is first involved.' Consciousness is, and I cannot think the unconscious has produced it.—G. W."

The existence of God is not dependent upon reason for its proof. Still it is a collateral help to see that reason establishes it.

MIRACLES NOT INCONSISTENT WITH THE ORDER OF NATURE.

We reproduce the substance of some good remarks on this subject in one of William Mullan's anti-sceptical publications, entitled *Miracles and Prophecy*. The writer says: "There are those who strenuously maintain that nothing can happen which is not in accordance with the established laws of nature. They appeal to the universal experience of men in evidence of its truth. They make bold to say that no amount of evidence in favour of a miracle could counterbalance

the antecedent unlikelihood of the thing itself,—that it is easier to believe in the untrustworthiness of the most intelligent, honest and unanimous testimony, than in the actual occurrence of that supernatural event on behalf of which the testimony is brought forward.

“There is an obvious answer. If the countless forces which are at work in the world have been forged upon the anvil of the divine purpose, and if, by their manifold play and counterplay, they produce the existing constitution of nature, it is obvious that the Creator of these forces can supplement them or arrest them in whatever way may be pleasing in His sight.

“Let me seek to illustrate the point before us by a sort of sliding scale of instances.

Suppose a world in which *gravitation* is the only force at work—a world the separate particles of which exert no more complex influence upon each other than the heavenly bodies do in their widely-divided revolutions through the sky—a world for which a rough resemblance may be found in the aspect of some desolate sea beach, or some huge heap of *debris* lying at the mouth of a mine. Introduce now into this world of atoms, loosely thrown together, the force of *chemical attraction*. A remarkable agitation immediately ensues. The old places and relations of things are thoroughly disturbed by the play of the new powers. Whatever is peculiar to chemical force stamps its distinctive character on the whole system. The old solitude and desolation is broken up into wild insurrection and revolt. A great natural leaven works within the mighty mass, and the dark and formless void cakes into solid land and cleaves into seas, ferments into mountains and steams into atmosphere, breaks into light and bursts into thunder.

“Introduce, again, into the world we are supposing, the fresh element of *vital force*. Let the organic principle lay hold upon the gravitating and chemically-propriety elements, and dissolve and blend and compact them according to its own distinctive

forms. The world forthwith receives a new character and aspect. Forests clothe the hills; grasses grow along the brooks; ferns creep out into the air in moist and shady places; mosses wrap themselves round the stones; seaweeds flap to and fro with the swaying waves against the bases of the headlands; not the coming and going of the white snow only, but the coming and going of the green foliage also, serves now for a distinction between the wintry and summery world. And these organic forces tell mechanically, as well as chemically, upon earth and water and atmosphere. They act in the capacity of natural ploughshares, aqueducts and ventilators. Results follow, therefore, in the realm of organic life, which could not have been possible under the reign of naked chemistry, just as results followed in the chemical sphere which could not have been possible under the reign of naked gravitation.

“Introduce, in the next place, into the world we are imagining the element of *animal instinct*. Let beings endowed with sense and impulse, and the power of movement from place to place in response to some instigation from within, be set at large upon its surface. Thereupon nature is invested with a new character and aspect. As gravitating force was grappled with and moulded to ends outside of itself by chemical force, and as these two forces in turn were grappled with and moulded to ends outside of themselves by organic force, so all these successive forms of force are grappled with and moulded to fresh ends by the force of sentient and self-impelling life.

“Introduce once more into the world before our thought the element of *human reason*. Let beings endowed with intelligence and conscience and freewill make a place for themselves in the pre-existing system of things. Straightway the world assumes a new character and aspect, in correspondence with the new infusion of force. Perception, foresight, self-

restraint, calculation of the use and value of existing forces, employment of these for the production of fresh effects, the pictorial power and constructive power of the imagination, the faculty of distinguishing between true and false, right and wrong, beautiful and ugly, beneficial and harmful, transient and permanent—a group of powers such as these, placed under the control of a single will, must necessarily effect a marvellous transformation upon the face of nature. The existing life, whether sentient or non-sentient, becomes but the handmaid of this higher life that has broken into the midst of it. Forests are cleared; mountains are mapped off into sheep walks or shooting-grounds; valleys are cultivated; oceans are navigated; rivers are spanned with bridges, swept with dredging-machines, strained through fishing-nets; lands are honeycombed with mines and tunnels, and scored with roads and railways and telegraphic systems. The new force of free intellectual and moral life, playing in among the pre-existing system of forces, checks or extends, neutralises or amplifies the action of these in ways that were otherwise unprovided for and impossible.

Let me then make one more supposition. Introduce into the world under our view the play of some superior power, producing results which transcend the operation of the whole catalogue of forces already enumerated, from that of gravitation up to that of the human will, and those results are what we call *miraculous*. He who called into existence, whether successively or in one grand moment of originating power, the gravitating force, the chemical force, the vital force of the vegetable, the sentient and instinctive force of the animal, the intellect, conscience, and will of the man, can carry on His interfering agency to any extent, either by the introduction of still higher intelligences and energies, or by the forthputting of His own undelegated might among the complicated system of existing things. There is no region within the range of the universe at which it could

be reasonably said to the advancing tide of the Divine omnipotence, "Hitherto, shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall Thy proud waves be stayed." There can be no partition wall between the power of God and any imaginable amount of Divine intervention, except the saving clause of some Divine promise of non-intervention."

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 309.)

"It is also worthy of notice how Paul speaks of the leading *facts* of Christianity as matters of common knowledge. His appeal to the then surviving majority of a company of more than five hundred, who had themselves seen the Lord Jesus after his resurrection, carries with it the greatest force: it presents to us the evidence of a body of persons who knew from their own eyesight the truth of the leading miracle of the gospel. Clement of Rome does not make it his practice to quote the books of the New Testament expressly, although, as in the present case, it is evident that he was acquainted with them. I will, however, give one sentence of his; he says, "Casting away from ourselves all unrighteousness and wickedness, covetousness, debate, malignity and deceit, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, despiteness and pride, vaingloriousness and inanity. For those that commit such things are hated by God, and not only those that commit them, but those also that have pleasure in them."—(Ep. 1 ad Cor., cap. 35).

"It would be a mere waste of words to seek to *prove* that Clement had Rom. i. 29-32 in his mind and memory. Such sequences of words and thoughts cannot be fortuitous. He is writing in the name of the Roman Church, which thus acknowledges the Epistle to the Romans.

"I turn from Clement to Polycarp, whom I have already mentioned. This ancient

witness of Christ addressed, in the early part of the second century, an Epistle to the Church at Philippi, in which he speaks of the Epistle which Paul had written to them.—(cap. iii.) A large part of this letter is such an interweaving of sentences from the New Testament books, as evinces plainly not only the knowledge of them on the part of the writer, but also the perfect familiarity as great as that which we should find in any modern sermon.

“The following are specimens: ‘The love of money is the beginning of all sorrows; we brought nothing into this world, neither have we anything to carry out.’ (cap. iv.) In another place he says, ‘Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?’—(cap. xi.) In another passage he says ‘We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and each one must give an account of himself.’—(cap. vi.) Again, ‘Be ye angry and sin not, and let not the sun go down upon your wrath.’—(cap. xii.) How distinctly do we see that Polycarp uses the first Epistle to Timothy, that to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians! The use of the last mentioned book is all the more striking from the sentence of the Old Testament being combined with the same addition. He also in another place refers to the same Epistle, saying, ‘Knowing that by grace ye are saved, not of works’*—(cap. i.)

“We are thus able to trace the common use of a collection of epistles bearing Paul’s name to an *early* part of the second century. We can show that no possibility of *mistake* could be admitted in such a case, for the testimony is given alike by many

* In speaking of the Epistles, which bear Paul’s name, as received in the former part of the second century, it is proper to state that the Epistle which the Church writers received as to the *Ephesians*, was styled by Marcion to the *Laodiceans*. Our copies call it to the *Ephesians*. The question, however, is not one of authenticity, but only of name in the address—both parties were equally agreed that it was written by Paul.

countries. Imposture is equally impossible, for that could not be supposed without believing that all Christians everywhere were so possessed with a spirit of falsehood as to put forth holy writings as those of the apostle Paul, and that for no imaginable reason, and that this could be done without any trace of such an imposition being recorded, and without any voice being raised against it, either in the Church or amongst the bodies separated from it. No proof is more mathematically certain than that by which the contrary is proved to be absurd or impossible. The testimonies which bring us back to the time of contemporaries of Paul, as to some of these epistles, have no small cogency when we compare these epistles together; they bear so thoroughly the impress of the same mind. Now, there are no ancient works possessed of greater weight of evidence than these writings before us. We receive Cicero’s letters as genuine, and yet no one supposes that we could find *each* one severally mentioned by an ancient writer; the quotations from some are considered as evidence to the collection as such. Here how much stronger is the case! These epistles are all mentioned severally as existing in the former parts of the second century—as being then known as documents of established credit, but each bearing on its front the certificate of its origin which was then, and had previously been, regarded as authentic. It would be impossible to be more absolutely certain even as to the letters of Romaine or of John Newton.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.

I now pass on to the collected gospels. There is, to some minds, a difficulty in grasping the events of ages long past as definitely as if they had been of more recent occurrence. Let us, then, consider the collected gospels, not as living in the nineteenth century, on the shore of the English Channel, but as those might do,

who, in the second century, dwelt on the banks of the Rhine.

"We find there a venerable teacher Irenæus, the bishop of the Church of Lyons; from him we may ask for information on the subject. What can he tell us of the collected gospels which the Christians used ?

"Irenæus says that the gospels were *four*, and he gives most elaborate illustrations to show (as he thinks) that their number could neither be greater nor less. He illustrates his opinion by comparing the four faces of the cherubim with the four Evangelists; and he rests so fully on the gospels, being then known *as a collection*, that he calls the volume *A Fourfold Gospel*. He describes them severally thus: "That which is according to John narrates Christ's princely, potential and glorious generation, saying, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,' and 'all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.' Wherefore that gospel is full of all-confidence, for his person in such. Now, that which is according to Luke, having a priestly impress, commenced with Zacharias, the priest, burning incense to God. For now was the fatted calf prepared, which should be slain, because of the finding again of the younger son. Matthew preached his birth according to man, saying, 'The Book of the Generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham;' and again, 'Now, the birth of Christ was in this wise.' This gospel, then, is of a human form, on which account, throughout the whole of the gospel, the meek and lowly *man* is kept up. Mark commenced from the prophetic spirit descending from on high upon man, saying, 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet.'"—(1 ii. c. 11, § 8.)

"He speaks so repeatedly and habitually of the Four Gospels and their authors, that no doubt can exist as to *his* testimony

on the subject.

"But could this reception of these four Gospels be a mere local peculiarity?—we may, in reply, look from the shore of the Rhine to the land of Irenæus's early life: his testimony relates, not merely to the West, but also to Asia Minor, for that was the land of his Christian training. We may turn also to Egypt, where Clement of Alexandria, gives at the same time an according testimony to the same four Gospels. So too, we may look at Carthage, where, as we learn from Tertullian, who at this time had arrived at man's estate, the same Gospels were used as the works of the same authors.

"But did this unity, in the reception of the Gospel collection, originate in papal authority? Have we no traces of such claims at dominion over consciences, and may not this have influenced Irenæus and others? Now, we *have* at this very time a remarkable claim made by the Bishop of Rome—a claim, however, which this very Irenæus, to whom we refer, *resisted*. The differences in the Church, as to time of celebrating Easter, still continued; and Victor, bishop of Rome, usurped the authority of excluding from the fellowship of the Church the Asiatic bishops and communities that did not accord in judgment with him as to this point.

"This caused Irenæus to write to Victor in terms of earnest remonstrance, so that he clearly shows that as yet no one church possessed such dominant power over others, as that books of Scripture, or anything else, could be received on its authority.

"We may thus look around from the shores of the Rhine, and in whatever direction we turn, at the latter part of the second century, we find the Christian communities holding the same gospels which they considered that they had received from the Apostolic age.

"But in what relation did Christian teachers then, such as Irenæus, stand to the times of the Apostles? Irenæus himself shall tell us. He says, in addressing

Florus, who had introduced erroneous doctrines,—"Thou didst never receive these doctrines from the elders who preceded us, who themselves had associated with the Apostles. When I was yet a boy I saw thee in company with Polycarp, in Asia Minor, for I remember what took place then better than what happens now. What we heard in childhood grows along with the soul, and becomes one with it, so that I can describe the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and spoke, his going in and out, his manner of life and the form of his person, the discourses which he delivered to the congregation, how he told of his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, how he reported their sayings and what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, his miracles and his doctrines. All these things were told by Polycarp, in accordance with holy Scripture, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. Through the grace of God, given to me then, did I listen to these things with eagerness, and wrote them down, not on paper, but in my heart, and by the grace of God I constantly revive them again fresh in my memory; and I can witness before God that if the blessed and apostolic presbyter had heard such things he would have cried out, stopped his ears, and (according to his custom) have said, 'O my good God! upon what times hast Thou brought me, that I must endure this?' and he would have fled away from the place where, seated or standing, he had heard such discourses."

"Such was the simple and definite line of information that connected Irenæus with the age of the Apostles.

"From Justin Martyr we learn something of the sacred books of the Christians, in which the history of our Lord was contained, which were in use amongst them in the former half of the second century.

"This early Christian writer was born at Shechem, in Palestine, about (as is supposed) the year 90. After a vain

search in the schools of philosophy he became a Christian. In his first Apology, addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, he describes the worship of the Christians, and after having mentioned what was written by "*the Apostles in the Memorials*, which they have made, which are called *Gospels*," he says that on Sundays the Christians, whether in cities or in country places, held a united assembly, in which "the Memorials of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, as time may permit."*

"In another place he describes these Christian writings more exactly; he says, "the Memorials which were drawn up by the Apostles and their companions."

"Now I wish to direct your attention to the manner in which Justin speaks of the public and habitual reading of the gospels

* The following is Justin's full description of Christian worship in the second century:—

"On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell in the cities or in the country, and *Memorials of the Apostles* or the writings of the Prophets are read, as time may permit afterwards, when *he who reads* has ended *he who presides* admonishes and exhorts by word, to imitate these good things. Afterwards, we all stand up together and pray; and, as we said before, when we have made an end of prayer, bread is brought, and wine, and water, and *he who presides* offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people add their assent, saying, *Amen*; and those things for which thanks were given are distributed, and are partaken of by each one; and they are sent by the deacons to those who are not present. Those who are well off, and *who wish it*, contribute, each one according to his own purpose what he wishes, and the collection is deposited with him who presides; and he assists orphans and widows, and those who are in need, through sickness or other cause, and those who are in bonds, and strangers who may be sojourning in the place; and in fact he takes care of all who are in need.

"We all hold this united Assembly on Sundays, since it is the first day, in which God turned aside darkness and matter, and made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day arose from the dead; for they crucified him the day before Saturday; and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, he was manifested to his disciples, and taught them things which we have offered, likewise for your attention."

in the Christian assemblies. He mentions it to the emperor as a fact open to the knowledge of all. Justin's testimony is good enough to prove it; but it rests on a stronger ground of evidence, for it *must* have been habitually true if it could be thus mentioned.

"Thus when Melancthon said, in the Augsburg Confession, 'The Churches amongst us teach, with general consent, . . . that men cannot be justified before God by their own powers, merits, or works, but that they are justified freely for Christ's sake, through faith,' the statement carried with it the guarantee of truth. Now, Justin was well acquainted with the Christian communities in many parts: he had sojourned at Ephesus, Alexandria, and Rome; and it is evident that the Memorials called Gospels, written by the Apostles and their companions, were thus used in all the churches of which Justin knew aright. Justin's writings contain repeated citations which substantially accord with our Four Gospels; so that these citations might show that the books which the church universally used in the days when Irenæus wrote, were the same that were in the hands of Justin. It is true that Justin cites loosely enough, and that he quotes from the Gospels two things that are not

in ours; he cites, however, the Old Testament just as loosely, and refers to the Pentateuch for *two* facts which it does not contain; no one would, therefore, think that *his* Pentateuch was different from ours.

"And yet some have said that Justin only used apocryphal gospels: if so, they must have resembled ours most marvellously, and they must have been attributed to authors who might be similarly described; and besides this, the whole of the churches must have used the *same* apocryphal gospels; and this must have been the case in the boyhood of that very Irenæus, who is so explicit a witness to *our* Four Gospels. It certainly would require some degree of credulity to believe that all the churches everywhere did, between the years 150 and 175 *change* the gospels which they read publicly every Lord's-day. Had they done this, how could they have received the newly adopted documents with such reverence as they did? In fact, the identity of Justin's gospels with those mentioned by Irenæus is more strongly evinced by the moral impossibilities implied in the contrary supposition than it could be in any other way.

(To be continued.)

SIN; ITS ORIGIN, EFFECTS AND DESTRUCTION.

"FOR this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." So says the Spirit of God through the apostle John, in his 1st epistle, the 3rd chapter, and the 8th verse; and the statement, viewed in a comprehensive manner, embraces the *whole* of the mission of Jesus Christ: for what was the work which he accomplished during his life upon earth but a constant endeavour to destroy the works of the devil, whether by the preaching of the truth, to remove from men's minds the error which was the work of the devil, or by the curing of diseases which had resulted from sin, which is therefore termed "healing all that were

oppressed of the *devil*."—(Acts x. 38)? What was the object of the death that he suffered on the cross but to "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the *devil*"—(Heb. ii. 14)? What was the object of his resurrection but to deliver him from the power of the *devil*, which—as "him that had the power of death"—had brought him into the bondage of the grave? What is the object of his present mediatorial work but that his brethren may obtain the forgiveness of their sins, which are, in however limited a sense, the work of the *devil*? What is the first part of his mission on his return from the right hand of the Father but to deliver his

faithful brethren *completely* from the power of the devil, from whose clutches they are not entirely free as long as they are in mortal flesh? What will be the next part of his work but "to bind the kings with chains, and the nobles with fetters of iron" (Ps. cxlix. 8), or, in the language of the Apocalypse (xx. 2), to bind the *devil*, for a thousand years? What is the object of his thousand years' reign but to "put *all* enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. xv. 25), and to deliver the nations of the earth from the power of error and disease, which are emphatically the works of the devil? and what is the object of that reign but to destroy "the last enemy"—"death" (1 Cor. xv. 26), which is one of the works of the *devil*, and to "cast" the *devil* into "the lake of fire and brimstone" (Rev. xx. 10), so that he and all his works may be for ever destroyed from the face of this beautiful earth, which, because of sin, has been cursed and blighted, and its inhabitants alienated from their Creator, for six thousand years?

Thus we see that the destruction of the devil, or, in other words, of sin and its consequences, includes the whole work of Jesus Christ from beginning to end. It is not, however, with his mission in this extended view that we purpose to deal in our present remarks, but rather with that part of his work which relates to the destruction of sin in its moral and physical aspects in regard to himself and believers in past and present dispensations. Before dealing with the taking away of sin, however, we will consider the *origin* and *effects* of sin; for we cannot rightly understand the former until we understand the latter: it is impossible to understand how sin is taken away unless we understand what sin is.

There are two kinds of sin—moral and physical. There is no dispute about the former; all believers of the Bible are agreed that it is the transgression of the law. But it is asserted by some that there is no such thing as *physical* sin. The fallacy of this assertion will, perhaps, be best evident from the following passages:—Rom. vii. 16, 17: "If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me*;" verse 20: "Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me*."

How can transgression of a law be said to dwell *in* a man? Rom. vi. 12: "Let not *sin* therefore *reign in your mortal body*, that ye should *obey it in the lusts* thereof." To "reign" and to be "obeyed" are the same thing: for *sin* to reign in the body, and the *lusts* to be obeyed, are the same thing; therefore "sin" is here used as synonymous with "lusts." No doubt James (i. 15) says, "Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin," but he is there speaking of transgression; and the fact that lust is there spoken of as the cause of sin is no proof that lust itself is not elsewhere, and from another point of view, termed "sin." Would it be correct to say, "Let not *transgression* reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it (*i.e.*, obey transgression) in the lusts thereof?" Evidently not; and if so, "sin" must, in this passage, signify something other than transgression; and what can that be but what we have termed "physical sin?" The lusts of the flesh can appropriately be termed "sin" because they are the result of sin, and also the cause of sin, and "sin in the flesh" has, not inappropriately, been termed "constitutional sin," because it is what the Scriptures term "sin," in the organization or constitution of man.

In order to simplify the matter, we will divide our remarks on this part of the subject under four heads, viz.,

1. That sin in the flesh was not in existence before "the Fall."
2. That it originated with the Fall.
3. That it is the cause of actual transgression.

4. That it has the power of death, or, in other words, leads to, or is the cause of, death, even apart from actual transgression.

1. "*That sin in the flesh was not in existence before the Fall.*" It is stated in the last verse of the first chapter of Genesis, after God had finished the creation, *including Adam and Eve*, "and God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was *very good*." Thus Adam and Eve, after their creation and before they had sinned, were pronounced by Jehovah "very good." To what element or aspect of their being did this refer? It could not refer to character, for at that time they had developed none: it must therefore have had reference to their *mental and physical constitution*. Let us now turn to what the Scriptures say of the flesh, or, in other words, of

the mental and physical constitution of one in whom dwelt sin in the flesh. In Rom. vii. 17, 18, the apostle says: "Now then it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me*: for I know that in *me* (that is, *in my flesh*.) dwelleth *no good thing*." By his flesh he of course meant his mental and physical constitution, his whole being, for he uses it as synonymous with "*me*;" and he thus states it to be the opposite extreme of "very good." This is quite in harmony with the language of the rest of the Scriptures concerning sin, which, whether moral or physical, is throughout spoken of as a *bad* thing, as something which cannot by any possibility be correctly described as "very good." Seeing, then, that Adam and Eve are described before the fall as being "very good," it is evident that *they could not have had sin in the flesh at that time*.

2. "*That sin in the flesh originated with the Fall*." Seeing that it was not in existence before the Fall, and that it is in existence now, it must have originated either at the Fall or since that event. It will not be contended by any one that it has come into existence *since* the Fall; and indeed if such a suggestion were made it would be sufficiently answered by pointing to the fact that actual transgression—which, as will hereafter be shown, results from sin in the flesh—has existed from the very beginning. Therefore if sin in the flesh did not exist before the fall, and it has not come into existence since, we are shut up to the conclusion that it originated with that event.

It may be well, however, to deal somewhat minutely with the facts connected with the transgression of our first parents, in order to show the difference between their condition before that event and the condition of their descendants ever since, and also—as far as is recorded, or as far as we may infer from the facts stated—to point out the change that took place in Adam and Eve through their transgression.

The most important point of difference between the condition of Adam and Eve before they sinned and the condition of their descendants is in regard to the *cause of temptation*, and this difference may be thus defined—that in the case of Adam and Eve before their transgression temptation *originated* solely from *without*, whilst in the case of their descendants it originates from *within* as well

as from without, and indeed chiefly from within. It may be objected that all temptation has relation to things which are external to us, and therefore that all temptation comes from without. But even if it be the fact that all temptation *has relation* to things external to us, does this prove the fallacy of our statement? By no means; for the question is not whether that which forms the *subject* of the temptation is within or without, but whether the *suggestion* comes from within or without. It is true we are sometimes tempted to sin by the suggestion of another person, but all must admit that the suggestion, in most cases, comes from ourselves, from the sinful lusts within us; as we read in James i. 14: "Every man is tempted, when he is *drawn away of his own lust, and enticed*;" and, as Jesus says, in Mark vii. 21-23: "*From within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness*;"—oh! what a catalogue!—"all these evil things *come from within*." Our experience and observation fully confirm the truth of these words, for we know that from day to day men do these things of their own idea, without any suggestion from their fellow-creatures. Paul, in Gal. v. 17, says, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit," and James (iv. 1) says, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" And again, verse 5, "*The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy*." We do not need any external *suggestion* to raise within us *envious* feelings: they arise within us in consequence of our sinful nature. And so in regard to other things in relation to which we are tempted, such as those enumerated by Christ in the passage quoted from Mark: the *object* to which the temptation has relation may be outside us, but the *suggestions* or prompts to commit sin almost invariably come from within.

Now let us look at the temptation of Adam and Eve, or rather of Eve, as the details in her case are recorded more minutely than in that of Adam; and we shall find that in her temptation the suggestion to sin came *not from within*, but from *without*. That this must, of necessity, have been the case is appar-

ently indicated by the fact of God placing the serpent there, and giving it the power of speech to enable it to tempt or try her. As God's plan of operation is—as may be gathered from His own records of His dealings with mankind—to use just such means as are necessary to effect His purposes, we can hardly suppose that, if there had been something within Eve which would have tempted her, God would have placed such a creature as the serpent there for that purpose. Hence we might infer, from this circumstance alone, that before the Fall Eve's nature was not such as to tempt her, apart from the suggestion of an external intellectual being.

When we come to the facts of the case, we find them in complete accord with this inference. There is no record of either Adam or Eve having had any idea of disobeying God's command before the suggestion was made by the serpent. They apparently never thought of doubting the truth of the statement that if they ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge they would die, and they had therefore abstained from eating of it. Consequently, upon the first remark of the serpent, Eve replied by quoting the statement of the *Elohim*: she said, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die."—(Gen. iii. 2, 3.) Up to this point she appears to have had no idea of doubting the truth of that statement, or of disobeying that command. It was only when the serpent approached her with his subtle and deceitful reasonings—"Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil"—that she seems to have entertained the idea of eating of the fruit, for the narrative proceeds (verse 6), "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." Thus it was when she saw these things that she transgressed, clearly implying that she had not perceived them before. She had believed the *Elohim* before; but the Serpent, by making these statements, deceived her, for, as the Apostle Paul says in 1 Tim. ii. 14, "The woman,

being deceived, was in the transgression;" and then "she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." How was it they had not eaten before? The fruit—the *object* to which their temptation and sin had relation—was there before their eyes: why did they not partake of it? The answer is, that up to that time they were "very good:" they had no "sin," or sinful lusts, in their nature. Undoubtedly they had faculties which rendered them *capable* of sinning, but there was evidently no *impulse, tendency or inclination* to commit sin until another being came and made the fatal suggestion to which they yielded.

Here, then, we see the difference between our first parents and their descendants: that while the former needed an external tempter before they had the inclination to sin, the latter are tempted by the sinful lusts in their nature. How is this great difference to be accounted for, except on the hypothesis that through the transgression of our first parents there was implanted in them that principle which in the Scriptures is styled "sin in the flesh," and which has been transmitted from them to all their descendants, so that it has become a law of their nature?

A question has been raised as to whether Adam and Even had sin in the flesh at the time they *mentally resolved* to eat of the fruit, or whether it was implanted in them *by the eating of the fruit*. This question is not one deserving of much discussion, especially as it is not defined in the Scriptures, and as a solution of it—were it possible to arrive at a positive conclusion on the point—would not materially affect the general question under consideration. If sin in the flesh existed *before the eating of the fruit*, it is evident that it must have originated with the *mental yielding to the promptings of the serpent*, inasmuch as it was not in existence before the temptation, as we have already seen. If, on the other hand, sin in the flesh originated *with the eating of the fruit*, it is still more evident that it originated with the Fall. It appears to us that the two things—*i.e.* the mental resolve and the actual transgression—should be viewed as one act. Sin—*i.e.* such sin as takes the form of outward action, as in the case in point—is *action begun in the brain*; and there cannot be actual transgression without there being first of all a mental resolve to sin. The

suggestions of the serpent set at work the mental faculties of Eve, and gave them a sinful direction, and she then resolved to eat of the fruit. She would not have eaten of the fruit unless she had first resolved to do so: therefore the eating was but a carrying-out or continuation of the mental resolve.

But although we have not distinct evidence as to *the exact point* at which sin in the flesh first existed, we have evidence that a mental change was produced in Adam and Eve by the eating of the fruit, for it is stated that they had a sense of nakedness after that act, and nothing is said about it before. Moreover "the Lord God"—or the Elohim—attributed their sense of nakedness to that act, for when Adam said (Gen. iii. 10) "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, *because I was naked, and hid myself.*" the Lord God said, "*Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?*" clearly implying that the eating of the tree would actually produce that feeling. Observe that it was not simply that they were *ashamed* to face the Elohim after their transgression, which might be ascribed simply to the knowledge that they had disobeyed God; but they had also a consciousness of nakedness, a feeling of shame at being naked, which manifested itself in their making clothing of fig-leaves to cover themselves with; and *this feeling is specifically ascribed by God to the eating of the fruit.*

Seeing, then, that this change was produced by the transgression, we may fairly conclude that other changes were produced by the same means, and that the implanting of sin in the flesh was either produced or completed by the eating of the tree, the serpent's suggestions first setting in motion or inflaming the faculties, and the transgression fixing in them that inclination, tendency, or impulse to sin which is called "lust," or "sin in the flesh," and which has been hereditarily transmitted to their descendants. The question whether sin in the flesh is a literal physical element, which was introduced into the human organisation at the Fall, or whether it is simply a disturbance of the balance or inflaming of the mental faculties, giving an inclination to sin, is not a matter of vital importance, for, whichever it be, the things we have

affirmed of it are equally true.

3.—We now come to the third point, viz., "*that sin in the flesh is the cause of actual transgression.*" This has been to some extent demonstrated under the second head, in showing that we are tempted by the lusts of the flesh; but it may be well to deal with the matter a little further. In Rom. vii. 11, Paul says, "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, *deceived me*, and by it slew me;" and hence, in verse 13, sin, that is, sin in the flesh, not actual transgression, is said to be "exceedingly sinful," or, literally, "an exceedingly great sinner." Again, in Rom. vii. 17, "Now then it is no more I that do it, but *sin that dwelleth in me;*" and the apostle reiterates the statement in verse 20: "Now if I do that I would not, *it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*" Here the apostle speaks of something in him, called sin, which led him to transgress. Whence came this physical sin but by inheritance from our first parents? Paul was no different from other men in this respect: all the descendants of Adam have inherited it, and all who have attained to years of knowledge have been tempted by it, and, with one exception, have yielded: it has been the cause of their transgressing. To such an extent has it become bound up with flesh and blood—part and parcel of human nature, that the apostle calls it a law: he says, in Rom. vii. 21-23, "I find then a law that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another LAW *in my members*, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the LAW of sin which is in my members;" and again, verse 25, "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the LAW of sin." Thus sin has become *corporealised*, and in that respect so inseparably connected with flesh and blood, that it may almost be used as an interchangeable term for flesh and blood, or human nature. Hence we find flesh and blood, or human nature, in its present condition designated "sinful flesh" or "flesh of sin" (Rom. viii. 3), "the body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6), and "body of death" (Rom. vii. 24); whilst sin in the flesh is variously designated "the lusts of sin" (Rom. vi. 12), "the motions of sins" (Rom. vii. 5); "the law of sin in the members" (Rom. vii. 23, 25), "the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2), "our old man" (Rom. vi. 6), and

"the old man."—(Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9.) In the latter passage we find the phrase, "*the old man WITH his deeds*," showing the distinction between physical sin and the actual transgression of which it is the cause. If sinful acts are the "deeds" of "the old man," "the old man" cannot signify the same thing, but must be that which is the cause of the "deeds," viz., the lusts of the flesh, or sinful flesh.

It is of great importance, in considering this question, that we should apprehend the fact that by the Fall of our first parents sin became—what it was not before—*corporealised*, that it obtained a body, so to speak, and thus that it became inseparably connected with the human race whilst under its present constitution, which has been appropriately termed "the constitution of sin." Hence men are by their very nature and constitution out of harmony with God, so that their thoughts and ideas are opposed to His, as we read in Rom. viii. 7: "The *carnal mind* [and all men are carnal at first] is *enmity against God*: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (The mind of man requires to be subjected to the truth before it can be brought into harmony with God.) And so, as this arose through the sin of Adam, it is said that "By one man's disobedience many were made (or constituted) sinners."—(Rom. v. 19.)

A recognition of this will throw considerable light on the subject of the condemnation of the human race in Adam. As Adam after his Fall possessed this fallen nature, it was inevitable that all his descendants would also, they being but a perpetuation of himself, what we may call "chips of the old block." God of course foreknew this, and therefore decreed the condemnation of the whole race federally in their head, while still leaving the way open for the redemption of some of them through one in whom the power of sin should be destroyed, and from whom the condemnation should be removed.

4.—"*That sin in the flesh has the power of death, or is the cause of death, even apart from transgression*," that is, either that the human race is condemned to death because all are contaminated with it, or that it works death by a physical operation in the human frame. Let us turn to Hebrews ii. 14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood he also himself likewise took part

of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, [literally, him *having* the power of death,] that is the devil." It is here stated that *the devil* has the power of death. Now what is this devil, or, as it is in the Greek, *diabolos*? we reply that it is sin in the flesh. It has been suggested that it is actual transgression, or that it is the jurisdiction or condemnation of the law. These latter definitions, however, are assumptions, for which no Scriptural evidence has to our knowledge ever been adduced. Let us examine its use in other parts of Scripture, to see what it generally stands for, and if we find that it is not in any other passage applied to transgression, but always signifies either sin in the flesh generally, or some particular embodiment of it either in individuals or systems, we may fairly conclude that it should be so understood in this passage. We would just premise that as we are here writing principally for those who have discarded the popular belief of a superhuman, immortal devil, we shall not stay to consider that idea, but *assume* (what has elsewhere been abundantly proved) that as the very notion of the very existence of such a being is unscriptural, and incompatible with the revealed purposes of God, no passage in Scripture can refer to such a being.

The word *diabolos* occurs 38 times in the New Testament. It is generally, though not in every case, translated *devil*.

1. We have it applied to a system six times, namely,—

- Matt. xxv. 41, everlasting fire prepared for
the *devil* and his angels.
Rev. ii. 10, the *devil* shall cast some of
you into prison.
" xii. 9, that old serpent called the
devil and Satan.
" xii. 12, the *devil* is come down unto
you.
" xx. 2, that old serpent which is the
devil and Satan.
" xx. 10, the *devil* that deceived them
was cast into the lake of fire.

2. We have it applied to an *individual* or *individuals* ten times, namely:—

- John vi. 70, one of you [Judas] is a
devil.
Eph. vi. 11, the wiles of the *devil*.
1 Tim. iii. 6, fall into the condemnation
of the *devil*.
" " 7, fall into reproach and the
snare of the *devil*.
" " 11, not *slanders* (*devils*)
[speaking of deacons' wives]
2 " ii. 26, recover themselves out of the
snare of the *devil*, who are

- taken captive by him at his will.
- 2 Tim. iii. 3, *false accusers* [referring to "men."]
- Titus ii. 3, not *false accusers* [speaking of "aged women."]
- 1 Peter v. 8, your adversary the *devil* as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.
- Jude 9 Michael the archangel contending with the *devil*.

3. We have it in two passages used in such a way that it may be understood in reference to either individuals or sin in the flesh, namely:—

- Matt. xiii. 39, [in the parable of the tares] "the enemy that sowed them is the *devil*."
- Luke viii. 12, [in the parable of the sower] "then cometh the *devil*, and taketh away the word out of their hearts."

But although the precise meaning here is not very clear, there can be no doubt that it refers to either individuals or to sin in the flesh, and not to actual transgression.

4. In the remaining 19 places we think it will be apparent that *diabolos* does not mean either actual transgression or the condemnation of the law. We have it nine times in the account of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, namely:—

Matt. iv. 1, 5, 8, 11.

Luke iv. 2, 3, 5, 6, 13.

Now it would be absurd to speak of anyone being tempted by actual transgression, and especially Christ, "who did no sin." Therefore the devil here, whether it was an individual or the impulses of sinful nature, with which Christ, in common with the rest of the race, was tempted, was clearly not transgression, which conclusion is sufficient for the purpose of the present argument.

The remaining ten passages are as follow:—

- John viii. 44, "Ye are of your father the *devil*, and the lusts of your father ye will do." The word "lusts" here, as well as the context of the passage, points to sin in the flesh as the devil referred to.
- John xiii. 2, "And supper being ended, the *devil* having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him."
- Acts x. 38, Jesus healed "all that were oppressed of the *devil*," that is, suffering from diseases pertaining to sinful flesh, not oppressed with *transgression*.
- Acts xiii. 10, Paul says to Elymas, "Thou

child of the *devil*," that is, one obeying the lusts of the flesh, just as a child of wisdom is one who obeys the dictates of wisdom.

- Eph. iv. 27, "Neither give place to the *devil*." This is synonymous with Rom. vi. 12: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body," *i.e.*, let not the lusts of the flesh reign in you: do not give way or "give place" to the workings of sin in the flesh.
- James iv. 7, "Resist the *devil*" is akin to the previous passage, (Eph. iv. 27,) and means, subdue the lusts of the flesh.

- 1 John iii. 8, *Devil* occurs three times here: "He that committeth sin is of the *devil*; for the *devil* sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the *devil*."

The first clause "He that committeth sin is of the *devil*," is similar to John viii. 44, "Ye are of your father the *devil*," where we have seen that devil signifies sin in the flesh. In the second clause, "for the *devil* sinneth from the beginning," it cannot refer to transgression, for it would be absurd to say that transgression sinneth. And as to the last clause, "that He might destroy the works of the *devil*," from what has already been said on this passage we may take it that it signifies sin in the flesh in individual or corporate manifestation.

- 1 John iii. 10, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the *devil*."

Here *devil* evidently means sin in the flesh, as the Apostle contrasts those who obey its lusts ("the children of the *devil*") with those who obey the precepts of God ("the children of God.") If *devil* meant *transgression*, the contrast would rather be between the children of the *devil* and the children of *righteousness*, inasmuch as transgression would be more appropriately contrasted with righteousness than with God; whilst if *devil* means sin in the flesh—that which prompts to the doing of the very reverse of what God enjoins—we can see great appropriateness in the contrast between children of *God* and children of the *devil*. The fact, then, of the contrast being between the children of *God* and the children of the *devil* indicates that devil here signifies, not transgression, but sin in the flesh.

The foregoing are the whole of the

passages in the New Testament where *diabolos* occurs, except Hebrews ii. 14, and we thus see that in every other place where the word is found, it signifies, not transgression, but either sin in the flesh or some embodiment or manifestation of it, and that in no instance can it be clearly shown to signify transgression. In the face of this, can it be contended that in Heb. ii. 14 it has quite a different meaning? Even were there any ground for such a conclusion in the passage itself, we might well hesitate to give it a meaning there which is nowhere else attached to it in Scripture. But even an examination of the passage itself will show that there is every reason for giving it the same meaning here as elsewhere.

Let us suppose for a moment that *devil* does here mean *transgression*, and examine the passage on that supposition. But, first of all, let us look at verse 16: "For verily he took not on *him* the nature of angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham." (We have put the italics as in the Common Version.) This translation is clearly defective. It is open to doubt because of the many italics supplied; and as it stands it implies the pre-existence of Christ. The marginal translation—"For verily he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold"—is clearly the correct one. The "he" here must therefore refer, not to Christ, (as the Common Version makes it), but either to *death* or *the devil* (in verse 14). That it does not refer to *death* is evident from the fact that *death* is there a subordinate member of the sentence, the principal member of the sentence being *the devil*. The phrase, "him that had the power of death" is only an explanatory clause qualifying "devil," and it can be omitted without affecting either the grammatical or real sense of the passage, as will be seen by reading the verse omitting this clause: "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy the devil." If, then, "he" does not refer to death it must refer to "devil." The application of the word "he" to *diabolos* is explained by the fact that in the Greek *diabolos* is either masculine or feminine, but not neuter, and therefore it would be incorrect to speak of it as "it," and thus, when used in a general sense, the masculine pronoun *he* (in preference to

the feminine) is necessarily applied to it.

Having so far cleared up verse 16, let us turn back to verse 14, to see whether "devil" there can mean transgression. Let us read verses 14 and 16, on the supposition that it does (omitting verse 15, which is not necessary to the connection):—"Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is *TRANSGRESSION*; . . . for verily *TRANSGRESSION* taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham *TRANSGRESSION* taketh hold." This would be equivalent to saying that Jesus Christ (for it is of him the apostle is writing) was made in flesh and blood for this reason,—that transgression takes hold of the seed of Abraham, and therefore, that *because* he was one of the seed of Abraham *transgression would take hold of him!* If it be said that transgression took hold of him in the sense that the transgressions of others were laid on him, we reply that even if this were a correct way of putting the matter, the transgressions of others did not take hold of him *as one of the seed of Abraham*, but *as the Lamb of God*. Now, whatever it was that "took hold" of Christ, it took hold of him *as one of the seed of Abraham*; therefore it cannot be transgression.

Now let us read the passage on the supposition that *devil* has the other meaning suggested, namely, "the condemnation (or jurisdiction) of the law;" thus: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, *the condemnation of the law*; . . . for verily *the condemnation of the law* taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham *the condemnation of the law* taketh hold." This would be equivalent to saying that Jesus Christ was made in flesh and blood for this reason, that the condemnation of the law takes hold of the seed of Abraham, and therefore that *because* he was one of the seed of Abraham the condemnation of the law would take hold of him, and that it would take hold of him not simply for others, but *personally as one of the seed of Abraham*. The condemnation of the law, however, came upon him, not as the seed of Abraham but as the Lamb of God, for he was free from it all his

life until he hung upon the cross. But the devil that took hold of Christ, took hold of him as the seed of Abraham; therefore devil here does not mean "the condemnation of the law." Thus we see that neither of the alternative meanings suggested for the word *devil* will stand even upon a mere consideration of the passage itself, and we are therefore driven back to the conclusion already arrived at, that devil here as elsewhere must mean either sin in the flesh or some particular embodiment of it in individuals or systems; and as it cannot here refer to the latter, it must mean sin in the flesh. This conclusion is very strongly confirmed by a consideration of the meaning of the word *diabolos*: for, according to lexicographers and its Scripture use, it does not mean a slander, a false accusation, but a slanderer, a false accuser,—not something done, but one who does; not an act, but an actor; and therefore (in relation to the matter under consideration) not a transgression, but a transgressor,—that which transgresses or leads to transgression. And, in view of this, to what can the word be more appropriately applied than to sin in the flesh?

In the light of this definition we may read the passage as follows:—"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is *sin in the flesh* . . . for verily *sin in the flesh* taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham *sin in the flesh* taketh hold." We have it established, then, that *sin in the flesh* has the power of death. In what way does it possess that power? It may be suggested that the only way is by leading men to commit transgression, and thus bringing upon them the punishment for sin, which is death. But although sin in the flesh has the power of death in that way, that is not the way referred to in this passage; for just as it has been shown that, if *devil* here means transgression, it amounts to a statement that transgression took hold of Jesus, and therefore that he was a sinner, so the same conclusion follows if we say that the way in which sin in the flesh is here stated to have the power of death, is by leading men to commit sin. Any interpretation which would involve the conclusion that Jesus was a transgressor must of course be instantly rejected, and

for that reason we must reject the suggestion that the sense in which sin in the flesh is here said to have the power of death is by leading men to commit transgression.

With a view of making the matter still plainer, let us put the argument in another form. The statement in verse 16, that the devil or sin in the flesh takes hold of the seed of Abraham, signifies, in the light of verse 14, that sin in the flesh has the power of death over the seed of Abraham; and, as Jesus was one of the seed of Abraham, this statement must apply to him. To put the argument in the form of a syllogism:

(1.) The devil or sin in the flesh has the power of death over the seed of Abraham;

(2.) Jesus was one of the seed of Abraham;

(3.) Therefore sin, the flesh, had the power of death over Jesus.

Now, as it cannot be said that sin in the flesh had the power of death over Jesus Christ by leading him to commit sin, the only way in which it could have had this power over him must have been because he was, as verse 14 states, a partaker of the same nature as "the children," that is, either because sin, the flesh, is the means of death by a natural operation producing physical decay ultimating in death, or else because men are condemned in Adam on account of their fallen nature, and that, as the reason of the condemnation of the nature is its being tainted with sin in the flesh, sin in the flesh is said to have the power of death over the nature.

It is objected that as the Apostle only mentions "the seed of Abraham," and not the seed of Adam, he cannot be referring to something which affects the whole of the race, as sin in the flesh does, but that he must be dealing with something which has relation to none but the seed of Abraham. Let us then see why, though referring, as we contend, to something which affects the whole of the race, the Apostle only mentions *part* of the race. What is meant by "the seed of Abraham?" It must mean either, (1) the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, or (2) those who become the seed of Abraham by faith.—(Romans iv. 11.)

(1.) If it is the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, we have a sufficient reason for the Apostle mentioning them rather than the seed of Adam, in the fact that he was writing to some who were the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, for the epistle is addressed "to the

Hebrews;" and we have another reason in the fact that it was to the Jews that Christ came, and that his mission had in the first place special relation to them.

We may remark, in passing, that if by seed of Abraham the Apostle means the *Jews*, it cannot be maintained that "devil" means transgression, for amongst them there were many infants, and, as they did not commit sin, transgression could not be said to have had the power of death over them; neither can it mean the jurisdiction or condemnation of the law, for there were many amongst the fleshly seed of Abraham who were never under the jurisdiction of the law, and did not come under its condemnation, as, for instance, those who lived and died in Egypt before the law was given. But if "the seed of Abraham" here referred to are the *Jews*, it must include both infants and those in Egypt, for the Apostle speaks of the seed of Abraham generally, and not of a part only.

(2.) Supposing, on the other hand, by "the seed of Abraham" are meant those who are such by faith, we can still see a reason why the Apostle refers to them, and not to the seed of Adam, namely, *because it was the seed of Abraham by faith that Jesus died to redeem.*—(Gal. iii. 29.) And to such we believe the Apostle refers. This is quite in harmony with the whole passage, as an examination of both the preceding and subsequent verses will demonstrate. As this may be a point of some importance in a subsequent part of our argument, we will endeavour to prove it before proceeding further. If we refer back to the 10th verse, we shall see that the Apostle there commences to speak to those whom God purposed to redeem through Christ: "For it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." In verse 11 he speaks of them as "they who are sanctified" and as "brethren" (of Christ.) In verse 12 they are again spoken of as "my [Christ's] brethren," in a quotation from Psalm xxii. 22, where we read: "I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." This psalm is eminently a Messianic one: see verses 1, 7, 8, 18, all of which are in the New Testament applied to Christ. The first part of the psalm, down to verse 21, refers to his sufferings, whilst the remaining verses evidently refer to his

future glory when amongst his ransomed brethren as "the governor among the nations."—(verse 28.) The 22nd verse, then, has reference to the Messiah praising God, not amongst his brethren after the flesh (the Jews), but amongst the seed of Abraham according to faith. Again, in the 13th verse of Heb. ii. they are referred to as "the children which God hath given" to Christ; in verse 14 as "the children," and in verse 17 as "his brethren." From all these expressions it is abundantly clear that it is of the brethren of Christ by faith that the Apostle is writing. It will also be apparent that those referred to as "children" and "brethren" are the same as those termed "the seed of Abraham;" for in verses 14 and 15 the Apostle states that Jesus "took part" of "flesh and blood"—the same nature that "the children" are "partakers" of—in order that he might destroy the devil, and "deliver them who were subject to bondage," that is, "the children;" and then he continues, in verse 16, "For verily he (the devil) taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold." The fact of this verse commencing with *for* indicates a connection with the preceding verses; and the statement it contains is a reason for what is previously stated. The logical connection is evidently this, that Jesus destroyed the devil, in order to redeem "the children," *because* the devil takes hold of the seed of Abraham, or, in other words, *because* the "seed of Abraham" are under the power of the devil. Now if "the children" and "the seed of Abraham" are not the same, there is no meaning in the Apostle's argument. The brethren or children and the seed of Abraham are therefore precisely the same, and, as we have seen that "the brethren" are those who are such by faith, it follows that "the seed of Abraham," of verse 16, are not the fleshly descendants of Abraham, but those who are his seed by faith.

Seeing, then, that in the whole of this passage the Apostle is discoursing on the redemption effected by God through Christ, and of those for whom Christ died, we can see a very good reason—without resorting to the assumption that "devil" means "transgression," or "the condemnation of the law,"—why the apostle refers to "the seed of Abraham" rather than to the seed of Adam, and that there is no reason to conclude that

the devil to which he refers is something which has relation *only* to the seed of Abraham, and not to *all* the descendants of Adam. Sin in the flesh affects all the latter, and the seed of Abraham being part of them, it necessarily affects them. What affects the whole must affect any part of that whole. Therefore, to understand "the seed of Abraham" as being those who are such by faith, in no way affects the conclusion already arrived at with regard to Jesus Christ, for he was pre-eminently the seed of Abraham by faith, and he is, therefore, included in those of whom the apostle is speaking in verses 14 to 16.

The argument of the apostle is this: that the seed of Abraham were affected by, or under the power of, sin in the flesh, and therefore, that Christ was made of the same nature—exactly like them, in order that he might be so affected by it, or under its power, and thus be in a position to destroy it in himself, and then deliver them from its power. Moreover, seeing that it was, as stated in verse 14, the *purpose* of God that the devil, or sin in the flesh, should be destroyed *through the death of Christ*, it must be admitted that this was actually done *by that means*. Indeed, if sin in the flesh has not been destroyed actually in Christ, it has not been destroyed at all, for it has not been destroyed in any others; therefore it must have been destroyed *in him personally*. But unless it had had the power of death *in him* it could not have been destroyed *in him*; therefore it must have had the power of death in him. But if it be that sin in the flesh has the power of death only by leading to transgression, then it is clear it had not the power of death in Jesus Christ, but only in others. Moreover, Jesus could not have destroyed that which had the power of death in others, but not in himself. *by his death*, and therefore on that supposition we should be forced to the conclusion that he has not destroyed it at all. But it is clear from this passage that Jesus has destroyed it by his death; therefore the logical conclusion is that sin in the flesh had the power of death in Jesus Christ, and that as it had not that power by actual transgression, it was by virtue of the law passed in Eden, which affected, not Adam only, but all the race; and therefore that sin in the flesh has the power of death in all Adam's descendants, even apart from their individual transgressions.

This was the statement we made at the head of the present division of our remarks, and it is a truth the recognition of which entirely removes a difficulty felt by some in connection with the doctrine of condemnation in Adam, namely, in regard to the death of infants, of which no consistent explanation can be given in harmony with a denial of that doctrine, inasmuch as it cannot be said that *they* die on account of their own sins, for they cannot commit sin. It has been said that they die because they are mortal, through a natural law operating in their constitutions; but then no consistent explanation is given for the existence of this natural law. It also explains the death of those outside law, as to whom the same difficulty arises as in the case of infants. If it be said that those outside law die because of things they do which, though not a transgression of any given law, are nevertheless undoubtedly displeasing to God, this is a direct denial of the Apostle's statement that "sin is not imputed when there is no law."—(Rom. v. 13.) If, on the other hand, it be said that they die on account of a natural physical law of decay, this brings us no nearer the primary cause than in the case of infants, for it gives us no reason why God has set in motion, or permits the operation of, this natural law; it gives us no consistent reason for its existence, but represents God as acting, if not in a haphazard and chance way, at least in an unsystematic manner. These difficulties, however, are, we submit, entirely removed when we look at the matter in the light in which we have presented it, namely, that the death of all the descendants of Adam is the direct result of his sin, they having inherited his fallen nature, and being condemned federally in him. In connection with the apostolic exposition of this matter in Romans v., we have the death of those outside law specially accounted for. After saying, in verse 12, that "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that (margin, *in whom*) all have sinned," he says (verse 13) "for until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law." If the Apostle had paused here, some might have said that those who have no law given to them ought not to die, as God does not impute their sins to them; but he continues, (verse 14,) "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not

sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that is, those who had not transgressed any law given to them. The explanation of this statement is evidently that given in verse 12, that because of Adam's sin "death passed upon all men," both those under law and those not under law. In the remainder of the chapter the Apostle states the matter still more definitely in a series of contrasts between Adam and Christ; but as those verses have been made the subject of extended comment in previous numbers of the *Christadelphian* during the present year, we need not dwell upon them here.

It may appear that we have laid too much stress on *physical* sin, and that this tends to lessen the heinousness of actual transgression. But this is not really so, and, so far as it may appear to be so, the appearance is only due to the fact that the existence of physical sin is denied by some. We would not in any degree diminish the enormity of the offence of transgressing God's commandments, and indeed the view we have presented does not by any means do this, for it shows the evils that have resulted from the sin of the first

man, and how his transgression made a breach between man and his Creator which has existed ever since, and which can only be repaired by the Deity Himself, by the means provided in "the last Adam." All admit the existence of moral sin, which is primarily a transgression of a given law (1 John iii. 4), and secondarily, things committed by those not under law, which, if they were under a law, would be a transgression thereof, in which sense it is used in Romans v. 13. It would be useless to set to work at any length to prove this, which is so generally admitted; but as physical sin is denied, it was necessary to demonstrate its existence, origin and effects; and we have dealt with it at this length before dealing with the putting-away of sin, because it is impossible to thoroughly understand the abolition of sin, unless we know exactly what sin is: before we can thoroughly understand the redemption effected by Christ, we must understand exactly what we need to be redeemed from.

London.

A. ANDREW.

(To be continued.)

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN ECOLESIA, No. 77.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

It is an apostolic exhortation to "behold the goodness and severity of God." Both these sides of the divine character have to be recognised before we get a wholesome and scriptural view of Him with whom we have to do. Both are amply illustrated in the operations of nature and in the historic doings of God with His people Israel. It is with the latter illustration we have more particularly to do on the present occasion. The chapter read from Isaiah (lviii.) brings before us the severe side of God's character, and at the same time reminds us of some important lessons we are liable to forget, and upon the remembering and carrying out of which depends our ultimate individual accept-

ance with Him. The prophet is commanded to "cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet and shew *My people* their transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins." The prophet was not sent to the surrounding heathen to tell them of their sins, but to Israel: God's own people. Sin is by no means confined to those who know not God. The need for condemning sin exists as much, and in a certain sense, more, within the house of God than in the outer darkness. The outer darkness is insensible to appeal; wickedness is its normal condition so to speak. It knows not God and cares for none of His ways, and reproof would be altogether object-

less. But the house of God is professedly founded on submission to the expressed and enjoined will of God. And the people composing it are in danger of resting on this collective profession while individually acting inconsistently with it. Thus it was with Israel: "They seek me daily," says the Spirit of God by Isaiah, "and *delight to know my ways* as a nation that did righteousness and forsook not the ordinance of their God." They crowded the temple at the appointed times: they brought the sacrifices and kept the feasts, and took a certain delight in these things, but privately, they acted in opposition to the spirit on which the whole institution was founded. Jesus tells us what this spirit was. He says "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for *this is the law and the prophets*" (Matt vii. 12). Or as he on another occasion expressed it, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul and all thy strength and thy neighbour as thyself: *on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets*" (Matt. xxii. 40). That is, the whole framework of the divine work on earth hitherto, owes its form to the need there is for these two principles obtaining the ascendancy. The whole object of the law and the whole end of the things revealed to the prophets is the establishment on earth of "Glory to God in the highest; peace on earth, goodwill among men." In view of this, we can comprehend the odiousness in the divine eyes of religious exercises, devoid of the double-sided animating principle which is the very root and spirit of "pure religion and undefiled." Israel gloried in the temple; boasted of their law, attended with a certain delight on the divine institutions connected with them; but they gave not God the glory: they took it all to themselves, which is the universal weakness of human nature. Their boasting was carnal: their pride

was a fleshly pride altogether as it is at this day; their satisfaction was with themselves. Therefore God took no pleasure in their approaches to Him. "To what purpose," saith he (Is. i.) "is the multitude of your sacrifice unto me? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts. . . . Bring no more oblations. Incense is abomination with me. The new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with. It is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble to me. I am weary to hear them" or again, (Zech. viii. 5). "When ye fasted and mourned in the fifth and seventh months. . . . did ye at all fast unto me? When ye did eat and when ye did drink, did ye not eat for yourselves and drink for yourselves?"

So that as regards what Jesus declares to be "the first and the great commandment," Israel's approaches to God were lacking of the one element which above all other makes God take pleasure in the worship of His people. With their lips they drew near: but *their heart* was far from him. Consequently, their attendance at the temple and offering of their sacrifices, though actually required of them, were in vain. Their rendering of them was to an extent obedience, because they had been required, but it was obedience without the right intention. There was no intelligence or love towards God. It was salt without savour.

And as regards "the second commandment which is like unto it," their religious observances were equally devoid of the acceptable spirit. They were not controlled by a benevolent regard for their neighbour's case. "Behold, ye fast for strife and debate and to smite with the fist of wickedness. . . . Is not this the fast that I have chosen: to loose the bands of wickedness, to *undo the heavy burdens*, and to let the oppressed go free,

and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked that thou cover him: and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"

Now, is there no lesson for us in all these things? Doubtless there is. Paul tells us that these things were "written for our learning." And is it not plain as the noonday that like Israel, we may deceive ourselves as regards our standing towards God, if we content ourselves with a merely technical compliance with the instructions of the house of God? Is there no possibility that we may presume too much upon our knowledge of the truth, and our baptism, and our breaking of bread from week to week? These ways are divine, and in their right place indispensable: but what if at the same time it is man more than God that is before our eyes in the doing of these things? What if we sing and pray merely as the right sort of thing to do without opening the heart to God in all sincerity and fervency and fear? What if the glory of God be but a phrase on our lips, and a sentiment in reality foreign to our hearts? What if we shut up the bowels of our compassion towards those who suffer? What if with plenty in our hands, we think only of our own need, and our own comfort, and our schemes are shaped and burdened only and continually with our own cares and our own interests? What if we never help the heavy burdens under which so many around us are staggering to the grave? What if we practise a habit of absolute indifference to the yokes, and the oppressions and difficulties which are crushing to the earth our neighbours on every hand?

Is it not obvious that in that case, we are in the exact position of Israel, "delighting in Jehovah's ways" after a fashion, but to no profit, because He takes no pleasure in us? It is a frequent

thing in the New Testament for reference to be made to the experiences of Israel as affording lessons for those who have come into the bond of the covenant through Christ in baptism. A Calvinistic and unscriptural theology has destroyed the force of all such allusions for the majority of persons; but it is our privilege to have been delivered from this as well as other corrupting forms of human tradition. Let us therefore seek to realise the full import of Israel's experiences as bearing on ourselves. Paul says (1 Cor. x, 6), the things that happened unto them were "our examples to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted . . . All these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. *Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he should fall.*" This last sentence is the whole point of Paul's allusion to Israel in writing to the Corinthians. In writing to the Romans (xi. 20-22), he says something substantially the same: "Because of unbelief they (the Jews) were broken off, and thou standest by faith. *Be not high-minded, but fear.* For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity: but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue in His goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" Again, in writing to the Hebrews, he says (iii. 12; iv. 1.) "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God . . . for some (Israelites) *when they had heard did provoke . . . so we see they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us, therefore, fear* lest a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it."

With these apostolic instances before

us, we see how warrantable and wholesome a thing it is to judge ourselves in the light of what God has said so largely in the prophets concerning Israel's position and behaviour before Him. From this source, we shall be able to draw large supplies of practical guidance and instruction on points that even the "New Testament" may have left dim; and in this treatment of the prophetic Scriptures, we shall see new force in Paul's declaration that all Scripture (by which he referred particularly to the prophets) given by inspiration of God, is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—(2 Tim iii, 16.)

Returning to the point which I introduced this to illustrate, it is very possible for us to be in the position of Israel. We may be zealous of the divine ordinances in the same way. We may have a liking for the gospel theoretically; we may attend and even enjoy the meetings; and in a manner be as strongly in love with the Christadelphian position as the Jews were with their temple, and yet be lacking in the spiritual element that makes these things acceptable to God as part and parcel of a faithful service. They are good in their place: divine in their place: indispensable in their place: but if unaccompanied by the sentiment toward God which sincerely offers all to Him, and that disposition toward man which prompts to deeds of blessing and mercy, it may be all in vain, for on these two commandments hang all the law and prophets, and, therefore, all the gospel and all the meetings and the whole machinery of the divine service of our day. Therefore, what can we say more to the point than what Paul says? "Let us, therefore, fear."

Jesus says "Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltiness, it is thenceforth good for nothing but to be trodden under

foot of men." The connection in which he said this shows his meaning, and his meaning strengthens the idea before us. He was being followed by a large multitude of people.—(Luke xiv, 25.) "And he turned to them and said, If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.

. . . Salt is good, but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land nor fit for the dunghill;" which was as much as to say, "This coming after me is good, but not if it is disconnected from the state of mind which I require in my disciples." This state of mind is the savour or saltiness of the salt. The appropriateness of the simile must be apparent to all who have any experience of men in spiritual things. The man of spiritual understanding in whom this understanding has developed spiritual affection or a decided, pronounced, and fervent affinity for the things of God, in all their relations and manifestations, is a man of saltiness, pleasant to the taste. But how often it is that with a knowledge of the truth, there has failed to come the loving espousal of divine views of men and things. The man knows the gospel intellectually and has a faint desire to be saved, but his affections are with the thoughts, ways, aims, movements, men and things of the present evil world. There is no fervent submission to God; no adequate appreciation of Christ. Dull and unresponsive to spiritual things, he is quick, active, intelligent and enterprising in all directions of self-interest. The salt is there in the profession of discipleship, but it is a mere powder without taste, of no use for the King's table.

The great object of the gospel is to bring men into the well-salted state in which their relation to God is a very thorough, hearty, pronounced and uncompromising thing. Christ is the illus-

tration of what is wanted. He is the first-born among many brethren, to whom all the rest are pre-required to be conformed as to the likeness of an image. Now, there is no mistaking his case, and we are in no danger of going beyond him. He declared in simple but expressive terms, "I am not of this world," and his whole course illustrates the meaning of the language. He stood aloof from men in so far as they stood away from the divine foundation. He took no part in their movements, patriotic or otherwise. The duties of citizenship he discharged passively, as in the case of paying taxes. His attitude towards the world was that of protest and disassociation. He "testified of it that the works thereof were evil," by which he earned hatred and destruction. He had no apologies or spare sympathy for the enemies of God. He pursued a perfectly independent course, as insensible to the censure of the world as he was above their favour. He never took public opinion or public criticism into account. His one simple aim was to do the will of Him who had sent him—a will utterly inconsistent with popularity and favour.

Now his testimony concerning his disciples is, that their part is to try and follow in the course he has pursued before them. "I have given you an example" "Ye are not of the world even as I am not of the world." "It is sufficient for the disciple that he be as his master." "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you" "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." "No man is worthy of me

who loves himself or his friends more than me." Consequently, there is no room for the contention of those who are vain to think that Christ's case is no standard for us to go by. Christ's case is the standard and the only standard; and those who speak of it as too high, are speaking against the word. There will be no other standard in the great day of Christ which will shortly come upon us all. The so-called "churches" have so lowered and bedraggled the gospel in the mire of human sentiment, that it has become almost constitutionally difficult with many to receive the truth on this point. Well, there were disciples in Christ's own day who, when they heard him on certain topics, said "This is an hard saying: who can hear it!" and from that day, turned back and walked no more with him. It is not wonderful if in our deserted day, there should be a similar resistance to the claims of the Eternal Spirit, speaking in the holy oracles. It will be found at last a terrible thing to fight against God. The only course of sane men is to receive and follow Christ without the least reservation, regardless of disadvantage to themselves or misconception on the part of others, knowing that it is written "Let them that suffer according to the will of God commit their souls unto him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator" They cannot do more than lose their life for Christ; and thousands have done this before us, concerning whom Christ says, they shall be saved in the day of his power when all merely human hopes and schemes and honours will be wrecked for ever more

EDITOR.

 THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

At a recent Jewish service in America, in connection with the opening of a synagogue at Washington, President Grant and several other celebrities were present. This is the first time a President of the United States has honoured the Jews in this way.

 PROSPECTS OF JEWISH RESTORATION
TO THE HOLY LAND.

"The idea of ultimate restoration to the land of their forefathers is one which, during long centuries of wandering and exile, has ever exercised a strong influence upon the Hebrew mind. Notwithstanding the decadence of the old feeling of prejudice entertained towards them in Christian countries, and the opening of the highest political and social position to men of Jewish origin and creed, the majority of the race cling to the hope of a restored Israelitish nationality in Palestine. Of late years an eminent movement thither has set in. Numbers of German and Polish Jews have established themselves in Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine. Many of them are men of learning and intense devotion to the national cause, and many are strenuously endeavouring to improve their condition by engaging in agriculture and other industrial pursuits. But there is a large and undesirable pauper element, which has located itself in the Holy Land, apparently with the object of living in idleness upon the charity of wealthy Jews, which has been poured out with lavish hand in aid of the movement. The problem for the solution of the promoters of the colonization enterprise is

extended needed aid to the deserving emigrants, while rigidly repressing the vagabondism and idle dependence on outside assistance which is rapidly becoming chronic among the Jews of Palestine. — *Boston Traveller*.

 PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE
JEWISH RACE.

The *Toronto Globe* has the following article:—

"The Jews are the healthiest and longest-lived people on the face of the earth. Their immunity from diseases of all forms is remarkable. Even the great epidemics pass them by with the infliction of a much lighter scourge than falls upon other races. It is declared that the cholera never chose one of them for its victim, and, in fact, the deaths from this malady have been so few as almost to bear out the assertion. Suicide is seldom practised among them. It has also been computed, from statistics returned in certain provinces of Austria and Germany, that, in a population of 1,000,000, the proportion of suicides between the Jews and the mixed white races was as one to four.

"From data carefully studied, Hoffmann found that, between the years 1823 and 1840, the number of still-born amongst the Jews of Germany was as 1 in 39, and amongst other races as 1 in 40. Mayer ascertained that, in Furth, the proportion of Jewish children who die between the ages of 1 and 5 years is 10 per cent., and of Christian children of the same age it is 14 per cent. M. Neville, calculating from the statistics of Frankfort, shows even a greater vitality existing among the children of the Jews. He also finds from his data that the average duration of the life of the Jew is 48 years and 9 months, while of the Christian it is 36 years and 11 months. "In the total of all

ages, half of the Jews born reach the age of 53 years and one month, whilst half the Christians born attain the age of 36 years only." One-fourth of the Jewish population live beyond 71 years, but the same proportion of the Christian population live only beyond 59 years and 10 months. The official returns of Prussia give the Jews a mortality of 1.61 per cent., and the whole kingdom 2.62 per cent. While the Jews double their numbers in 41½ years, others require a period of 51 years. In 1849 there was in Prussia 1 death for every 40 Jews, and one death for every 32 of the remaining population.

"Commenting upon these statistics, which are brought together by Dr. Richardson in "*Diseases of Modern Life*," that author ascribes the high vitality of the Jews to their sober way of living. 'The Jews drink less than his 'even Christian;' he takes, as a rule, better food; he marries earlier; he rears the children he has brought into the world with greater personal care; he tends the aged more thoughtfully; he takes better care of his poor; and he takes good care of himself. He does not boast of to-morrow, but provides for it; and he holds tenaciously to all he gets. To our Saxon eyes and Celtic eyes he carries these virtues too far; but thereby he wins, becomes powerful, and, scornfully boisterous mirth and passion, is comparatively happy.'

"It is a fact in the history of the Jewish race, that they now here have paid especial attention to the development of physical capacity. They do not from choice enter a military life, they establish no public games, are not given to athletic exercises, and pursue no definite means for attaining great corporeal strength and stature. As a people they do not reach a high physical standard, and still their vitality is greater than that of any other civilized race. In applying these facts to the question of the effects of severe physical exercise, Dr. Richardson remarks:—"It would be impossible, and in truth unnecessary, to enforce any stronger argument as to the negative value of expressing physical exertion in sustaining the vital power of a race. In the course of centuries the most powerful nations have died out, and empires of perfect physical beauty and chivalric fame have passed away. But through all

these vicissitudes, one race, cultivating none of the so-called athletic and heroic qualities, and following none of the exercises popularized as 'bracing,' 'hardy,' 'invigorating,' has held its irrepressible own, to remain a more numerous people, in its totality, than ever; a people still presenting a more tenacious life than its neighbours, and showing the continuance also of mental force and of commanding genius in art, in letters, in politics, in commerce, and in science."

Scientific men always manage to find theories for facts, and if the facts change, the theory undergoes new adaptations. As a rule, theory is the pretence of an understanding that does not really exist. The great explanation of the racial phenomenon presented in the Jewish nation is one that scientific men scout. God has chosen that nation for His purpose. He says, "This people have I formed for myself, and they shall show forth all my praise." They do so, even in their dispersion. They are the living witnesses of God, the monuments of the truth of Jehovah's word, and even in this mild way, they keep His praise alive in the earth. But of course His praise will not be fully seen till the age to come, when He will "perform that good thing which he has promised to the house of Israel and the house of Judah," (Jer. xxxiii. 14), in causing Jesus, the righteous branch of David, to flourish in the land of Israel as their king, and to reign to the utmost bounds of the earth. Because of this purpose, the Jews are an indestructible race. God has sworn that though He will make an end of all nations, he will not make an end of Israel, but merely correct them in measure by dispersion and affliction for an appointed time. This is the true explanation of the physical character which gives them tenacity, &c. The cause is not to be found in any hygienic propensities or surroundings, but in the hand of God, which preserves them from destruction.—EDITOR.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

AUGUST, 1876.

THE times grow hard and better in all directions. Failing trade brings want of

work; want of work brings acquaintance with poverty; poverty makes friends fly; and the embittered soul in most cases turns to hatred and cursing, which are only too freely reciprocated in a widening circle of mischief. Of course many (yet those few compared with the bulk) are well off, but even they are affected by what Mr. Bright, the other day, in introducing

a deputation to Lord Derby, described as "the gloom" which was overspreading all classes.

The friends of the truth cannot expect to be exceptions to the distress which belongs to the close of the Gentile dispensation. There was a similar state of things at the close of the Mosaic dispensation, and Jesus gave the disciples to understand that its rigours would come upon them for their trial. In fact he led them to expect a principal share of the bitterness; for while the community in general was to experience "great distress in the land and wrath upon this people," the disciples were in addition to be "hated of all men for his name's sake," (Matt. x. 22) and they were to be "delivered up, afflicted and killed." The effect of this on the great proportion of believers Jesus himself thus describes: "*Then shall many be offended* and shall betray one another and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise and shall deceive many. And BECAUSE INIQUITY SHALL ABOUND, *the love of many shall wax cold.*"—(Matt. xxiv. 10.) He adds, "He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved."

We cannot too severely apply the case to our own day. Things will go from bad to worse; and many afflictions will arise, including the strife, iniquity and hatred which embittered the apostolic age and from which ours has never been free. The effect of this is upsetting to some; perhaps to many. What shall we say? Just this: If the confusions of the first century, which witnessed the Lord's resurrection and the ministry of the Spirit, "offended" many, and cooled their love, and led them ultimately to betrayal and hatred, it cannot be very marvellous if a similar result ensue in the nineteenth century, when we are without any guidance beyond what is contained in the written word—apprehended by some and by others not. But it is only the surface class that are ever upset. Such things cannot upset those who have set their hope on God, and set themselves to the doing of His commandments; without any regard to man. There will in our day, as in the apostolic, be those who "endure to the end," through all the troubles that may arise, whether without or within. Those

who are upset are self-evidently planted on the surface only: they are not "rooted and grounded." They are of the wayside class spoken of by Christ who when they heard the word, "anon with joy receive it, but by-and-bye, when trouble ariseth, they are offended." "It is written blessed are they who love Thy law: *nothing shall them offend.*" This is true from the nature of things. Friends may fail, and the work of God may be marred and destroyed by carnal men; but nothing can displace the confidence, or destroy the purpose, or invade the serenity of the man who trusteth in God and maketh not flesh his arm; because his aims are beyond and his strength on high. He is using the present merely as a ladder. He may not be understood; he knows he cannot be, except by fellow pilgrims who are such in reality, and therefore he is content not to look for it but to go in the teeth of the wide-sweeping current of carnal sentiment, which is carrying the world and all its sympathisers to certain destruction. The clouds may gather in their thickest; the storm rage to its fiercest; destruction prevail to its worst. When all is over, and the sun of righteousness shines, while the rotten twigs and branches of superficial professorship will strew the ground with wreck and ruin, the righteous who put their trust in the Lord, having outlived the storm, will be found planted as everlasting trees in the garden of the Lord, when all will be rest and gladness for evermore.

THE OLD LESSON.

Everyone admits that human life under the conditions now prevailing on the earth, is a vanity—uncertain as to the time it may last, and certain as to its at last collapsing like a bubble. The difficulty is to get people to give practical effect to their knowledge on the point. Nearly every one lives as if he would live for ever, and admits in his calmer moments he is not living wisely. If there were no purpose of God and no revelation from Him as to how He would have us walk, the general folly would be excusable. If it were certain that nothing but death was before us, nothing could be wiser than the motto "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" but with the certainty that Christ lives and that "it is he whom God hath

appointed to be the judge of the living and the dead," it is sheer madness for men to act in this way. It appears so at the last in every case. As men drop off one by one, survivors realise the lesson as applicable to the man that is gone, if they never realize it in their own case; particularly is this the case in an instance where a man has known and professed the truth, and abandoned it for the present world. Such an instance as this transpired not very long ago. We mention no names, but the instance itself is too pregnant with the lessons of wisdom to let it slip. He now rots in the ground. Is the record of his life such as will be of any lustre in the presence and judgment of Christ, when he comes forth at the resurrection? What is it? The newspaper tells us. "He was anxious to build up a reputation and a position in the town," and at the time of his death, we are told "the attainment of the object of his early aspirations was *fairly within view*. In religious and social movements he took a lively interest: in politics he was a Liberal. He was mentioned as a probable candidate for — ward. And we believe was prepared to enter into the contest at the present election." But now, saith the newspaper scribe, he has "passed away—his life's work ended." And the only consolation offered to bereaved friends is "the genuine sympathy of a very large number of the inhabitants"—people who in a hundred years will themselves be mouldering in the land of forgetfulness.

In what a ghastly light, as you stand by the side of the dead, appears the glory which they have sought for themselves in the land of the living? "A reputation and position in the town!" What is that to a dead man for whom only Christ remains—a friend or foe as the "account" may stand. Ah! what is it even for a living man? A thing that no faithful brother of Christ could obtain, for a man must speak well of the world to be a friend of the world: and to have the friendship of the world is a sign we are cloaking the truth which testifies of the world that its works are evil. No wonder "the friendship of the world is enmity with God." No wonder Jesus said "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." Those who know what human nature is and what the divine requirements are, have no difficulty in fully comprehending those

sayings of Christ which are so unintelligible to carnal men.

And the "religious and social movements," and the "politics:" "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" These things are elements of the present evil world with which the saints of God have nothing to do. The saints are strangers and pilgrims like Abraham, like Christ, like Paul, waiting for the promise. Did these take part in the movements of the ungodly generation around them? Did Christ or Paul mix themselves with the politics of the Roman State? None but those who love the praise and desire the honour of men could be found (knowing the truth) to take part in the politics, and religious and social movements of Gentilism. And as for being "a candidate" and contesting an "election," such a thing is a simple matter of impossibility for a son of God. "He that saith I know Him, and walketh in darkness, is a liar." The officials of the present system are by Paul styled "the rulers of *the darkness of this aion!*" and for a man saying "I know God," to walk into the rulership of darkness, is to walk into the very midst of the darkness.

But the grave opens her mouth and cuts short the aspirant's career, and takes away the opportunity of retrieving the day that might have been unto honour. What brightness is there in the prospect of meeting Christ, after putting the hand to the plough and looking back? The grave is a short cut to judgment; for the "dead know not anything." A man is hurried, as by a side door, out of scenes of self-glorification to meet Him who will be terrible to all who say "Lord, Lord, and do not the things that he says." How different a place is the grave to those who have taken upon themselves the toil and dishonour of Christ in the days of their vanity. Death to them is a brief repose; a sweet rest, from which they seem to instantly wake refreshed, to find Christ on the earth returned from heaven to give to every man according to his work, the sweet reward of friendship, joy, honour, and everlasting strength to those who have accepted the sorrows and dishonours of Christ, in the days of Gentile greatness.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY.

The *Friend of India* (quoted by the *China Mail*) speaks as follows on the character of the Papacy, as affecting the attitude of its friends and enemies:—"Were it possible to regard the Papacy as a purely religious institution, we should feel it wrong to attack it in these columns. But the Papacy is a religious power only in the sense in which the Roman Cæsar was. The Papacy is simply the development of ancient Cæsarism under a new form. The institution is essentially the same. The Imperial purple has simply put on the cloak of Christ. Its ambassadors for ages past, and in every Court of Europe, have been purely political personages, through whom the modern Cæsar has sought to rule the world. The gift of sovereignty, or its withdrawal, the creation of kingdoms and their subversion, the rights of princes, the rights of nations, the possession of remote lands, the despotism of the whole earth, and the decrees of peace and war—are the (claimed) prerogatives of this modern Cæsar. And we should see them all in active exercise to-day, but for the emancipation of the human mind from the delusions of past ages. It is this power that they are to-day fronting in Germany, and that is steadily urging the Latin nations upon a war against the new Empire."

The truthfulness of this sketch will be recognised by those who have studied the question. It is the historic illustration of Paul's prediction that the faith established by himself and his co-labourers would degenerate and actually change and expand into a system of iniquity which should stand before the world, and receive its homage under the pretence of a divine character. The efforts to sustain this pretended character have developed hosts of "lying wonders." One of them is thus unearthed by the *Rock*:—

"In 1670 a plague of caterpillars came to trouble the inhabitants of these regions. Thereupon a legal document was made out, by order of the bishop, summoning the caterpillars to appear in court before him; and, under penalty of excommunication, they were commanded to leave the neighbourhood. The words of the indictment are as follows:—"We admonish the caterpillars, under pain of curse and excommunication,

to leave the vineyard within six days. And if by that date our order is not obeyed, we, by virtue of the authority committed to us, do anathematize and curse them." (Signed) "CRANIER, Official."
Poor caterpillars!

SPIRITUALISM DECLINING.

A newspaper cutting says:—"Spiritualism appears to be dying out in its chief stronghold. Boston, in the United States, may be called the Spiritualists' head-quarters, yet the Spiritualist newspaper is obliged to confess that the new religion is losing its adherents, and whereas 'there was a time when two or three thousand Spiritualists attended the Sunday services in the Boston Music Hall, now only a hundred or two are to be seen there.' This change seems to be partly due to the imposture of the Holmeses and 'Katie King,' the discovery of which drove poor Mr. Dale Owen out of his senses. In France the trial of the photographers has been another very serious blow, the force of which is not lightened by the fact that the French Government has pardoned one of the convicted impostors, or rather has remitted a portion of his term of imprisonment. *The Spiritualist* newspaper is carried on at a loss, and in order to relieve the editor—Mr. W. H. Harrison—from the burden of the loss a Harrison testimonial fund has been started, and leads off with three subscriptions of £50 each. Sir Charles Isham gives £10 and Prince Emile Saga-Wittgenstein gives £6. A ray of light comes from Russia. The University of St. Petersburg is considering whether it shall take Spiritualism in hand and teach it as a science. Meanwhile Mr. Morse—once a servant at a London public-house, now a great Spiritualist authority—has lately returned to this country from the United States, and is giving an account of the movement there."

RELIGION AND WAR.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* having scouted the idea that there was any connection between a nation's attitude towards God and the question of peace and war, the *Rock* well remarks: "The notion itself (that war and religion are connected), is one not to be lightly eradicated. Hitherto, whether in sacred or profane history, it has been the prime mover and chief factor in national quarrels. The inhabitants of Canaan were dispossessed of their territory because of their vices and idolatry. The fortunes of Israel waxed and waned precisely as she was true or false to Jehovah, her Lord. Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, was permitted to march against Jerusalem and take it, because "the (once) faithful city

had become a harlot," while Cyrus, although he "knew it not," was "raised up" for the special "purpose" of overturning the Babylonian dynasty, and setting the Jewish captives free. The Roman eagles swooped down upon the Holy City before the generation had passed away which shed the Saviour's blood. And when Christianity, which Constantine had adopted and proclaimed, lost its simplicity and fell into the worshipping of demons and idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood (Rev. ix. 20), the Moslem power arose like a blast from the bottomless pit, swept over Judea—the very cradle of their faith—and possessed itself of Constantinople, where that faith was lifted into imperial power. And what—but a chronicle of religious or religio-dynastic wars—has been the history of Europe from that day to this? Since England turned Protestant the Pope has never ceased to shower curses on our heads, while he has ever had a blessing ready for any and every power that was willing to attack us. But these curses of the false prophet were invariably converted into blessings by the good providence of Him who watched over this Protestant land. In the wars of the French Revolution—bred of that infidelity which was itself the child of Popery—the final victory over the great destroyer of the nations was reserved for and shared by England and Prussia on the plains of Waterloo. In the tremendous Franco-German war, the echoes of which still linger in our ears, the issue was mainly raised by the anxiety of the Pope to break the Protestant power of Prussia; the conflict being really between God, Protestantism, and the Germans on the one hand, and the Pope, the Virgin, and Saints, and the French on the other. We know the result. And now we see the Roman Pontiff not only fretting and fuming under the loss of his temporal power, but striving to light up a European conflagration, with a view to its recovery. In this unholy object the League of St. Sebastian is helping him in all it can; and everything, not excepting holy prophecy, points to the next great war as likely to prove intensely religious in its character and aims."

BELIEF IN A PERSONAL DEVIL ON THE WANE.

A newspaper thus remarks on two recent cases involving the question of whether there is a personal devil. They are satisfactory in so far as they show the decline of popular belief on that subject. It would be more satisfactory, however, if there was evidence of the decline of the real devil himself—the Satanism of human nature towards the institutions and precepts of the Almighty.

For this we need not look; for it cannot take place apart from God's own revealed purpose to chain the monster and hurl him with all his pomp, political, sacerdotal, social and individual—into the abyss from which he will no longer be allowed to stray for the affliction of the nations till the thousand years are finished. Meanwhile, these are extracts from the remarks in question:

"Our American cousins are just now very much exercised by the question whether or not the Devil has a distinct personality. The question is one which has exercised many serious minds both before and since the days of Luther. Mr. Moncure D. Conway, who is a Yankee by birth, but who has for some years back been known as a popular preacher in London, has undertaken to disillusionise the world in regard to this little matter. He began a lecture in New York with the following neat little story:—'An English lady said to a friend of mine, both being mothers of families, 'Do you make your children bow their heads whenever they hear mentioned the name of the Devil? I do. I think it is safer.'

"The devil theory, he said, not only relieved God of the responsibility, but it relieved man by giving him somebody to lay the blame on for his own misdeeds. Such is Mr. Moncure Conway's opinion; but really it is too bad that our belief and time-honoured traditions should receive shocks so rude. What shall we have left by and bye if we are to be told that the devil is merely an excuse which we have invented for our own bad conduct? And the worst of it is that this heresy regarding the personality of his Satanic Majesty is by no means confined to such circles as those in which Mr. Moncure Conway moves. Mr. Matthew Arnold, the son of the great Master of Rugby, is quite as heterodox as the Yankee preacher. In this latest book the foe of Philistinism sarcastically remarks that 'Sir Robert Phillimore seeks to tie up the Church of England to a belief in the personality of Satan, and he might as well seek to tie it up to a belief in the personality of Tisiphone. Satan and Tisiphone are alike, not real persons, but shadows thrown by man's guilt and terrors.' And yet Mr. Arnold is a firm believer in the value of the Bible and in the beauty of Christianity. In reply to Professor Clifford, who a short time since made such a bitter attack on Christianity, Mr. Arnold does not hesitate to affirm . . . that the 'The indispensableness of the Bible and of Christianity cannot be exaggerated.' Men are shipwrecked or saved on conduct—or, to give his words more freely, 'So it is with perfection and salvation in conduct,

men's universal concern, the way of peace; they are not to be reached without the Bible and Christianity. By the Bible and Christianity,* though not by what our missionaries now offer as such, the non-Christian nations will be finally won, and will come to regard their old religions much as a Christian, wide-minded, reverent, and profound, would regard them now. When we find men so earnest repudiating the Devil yet believing in the Bible, what are we to do? Are men no longer to have a convenient plea of temptation by the Devil to excuse their weakness and wickedness? The subject is one not to be rashly decided. This much is clear, that a very great change must take place in the world before the personage of whom Messrs. Moncure Conway and Mr. Matthew Arnold speak so familiarly, can safely be left out of the reckoning."

*Enforced by the judgments of God who will teach the world righteousness at the coming of Christ.—EDMON.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE EASTERN QUESTION ON FIRE— TERRIBLE EVENTS IN THE EUPHRA- TEAN TERRITORY.

WAR has at last broken out in the East, and the war is in Turkey. It is not, in form at least, between Turkey and a foreign power, but between the Turkish Government at Constantinople and the two provinces of the Turkish Empire—Serbia and Montenegro—a form of the matter favourable to the hastening of that internal exhaustion of the Euphratean power which is the leading sign of the Lord's re-appearing. Had war been upon Turkey from without, England might have been compelled, for the defence of her own interests, to take Turkey's part, which would have tended to the support of the Turkish power: but the war is between different parts of Turkey itself, and in such a war England has decided she cannot intertore. Consequently, Turkey is left to the full effect that comes upon a house divided against itself—a form of war that brings exhaustion and ruin on whichever side victory is achieved.

Serbia and Montenegro have declared war against Turkey under the leadership of the prince of the former. His excuse is that if he had not declared war, his own people—

violently excited in favour of the Christian insurgents—would have destroyed him, and that if he must lose his crown, he preferred losing it in a war against the oppressor of the Christians than in a revolution among his own people. There seems little reason to doubt the sincerity of this representation. Not only do the Servians sympathise with the cause of the insurgents in the abstract, but their indignation, and the indignation of all Europe, has been stimulated to the highest pitch by the horrible methods to which the Turks have resorted in the endeavour to suppress the insurrection. The correspondent of the *Daily News* gives a

DESCRIPTION OF THEIR ATROCITIES.

"When the insurrection broke out, regular soldiers were at first sent to put it down. Turkish soldiers are always a rough, undisciplined lot, but they had to deal with men who were not very much better, and who were in rebellion. Leaving out of consideration the provocation and justification which the insurgents had for rebellion, the systematic oppression of years, the numerous cases of individual cruelties and hardships, the long imprisonment in the foul dungeon, which out of the capital serve as prisons for men unconvicted and untried, but suspected, it may be admitted that in any country a rebel takes his life in his hands, and has no great reason to complain if when he fails he has to pay the penalty of death. Mercy towards belligerents was never expected, and has certainly never been shown, in Turkish warfare. But the atrocities complained of are not the work of soldiers, but of Bashi-Bazouks. It will be remembered that in the Crimean war the reputation of more than one Indian officer was destroyed because it was found impossible by men even with Indian experience to keep order among these irregular troops. Military organization or discipline they can scarcely be said to have. Composed of the dregs of the Turkish and Circassian population, with gipsies and gaol-birds let out for the purpose, and under no responsible command, they have been let loose upon a large portion of central Bulgaria, to put down the insurrection in their own fashion. The result is what everybody acquainted with the materials composing such a force might expect—the plundering of all movable property, the burning of the houses and villages of the peasantry, without the slightest regard to the question whether the occupants have taken part in the insurrection or not, and the almost indiscriminate slaughter of old men, women, and children. One of the most fertile and productive provinces of the

Turkish Empire is thus being laid waste. It is estimated by those who know the country well that the district which has yielded to the Government an annual revenue of about eight hundred thousand pounds will not be able, this year, nor for years to come, to produce a quarter of this sum. It is too soon yet to attempt to ascertain, with any degree of exactness, the number who have been killed. An intelligent Turk, who has just arrived, estimates it at 18,000. Bulgarians speak of 30,000, and of the destruction of upwards of a hundred villages. I pass over the stories of the burning of forty or fifty Bulgarian girls in a stable, and the massacre of upwards of a hundred children in the village school-house, surprised by the Bashis, because though they are repeated everywhere in Constantinople, I have no sufficient authority to enable me to express an opinion on their truth. The places where these atrocities are said and generally believed to have occurred have been utterly destroyed, and possibly also the evidence of the cruelties which preceded their destruction. I have, however, trustworthy information of a number of other outrages, many of which are altogether unfit for publication. . . . I have made out the following partial list of names of villages which have been thus destroyed. Where I have been able to obtain accurate information as to the number of houses in those villages I have given the figures. District of Philippopolis, judicial sub-district (Nahia) of Koyun Tepe—the villages Leshnik, Uzun Geren, Krasovo, Saryabol Nasva-Koyun, Yurundjili, Aivadjik, Pastusha, Saradja, Perushitzta, Yontchular, Ereli, Stavonovo-Selo. In the judicial sub-district of Gionsa—the villages Sindjirli and Klisura. In the judicial sub-district Ruptchos—the villages Diedovo, Biokovo, Zhdrebitchka, Yasakur. In the district of Pazardjik—the villages Dimkata, 75 houses; Isernovo, 70; Shallar, 65; Kalugerovo, 300; Lesitchovo, 65; Kalatchlar, 60; Djumaya, 50; Popintzi, 100; Butya, 45; Banya, 60; Vietren, 400; Batak, 600; Radilovo, 100; Alikotchovo, 60; Kozarsko, 70; Petritch, 60; Ichanakdjievo, 60; Eshikli, 70. These 37 names will suffice to give an idea of the horrible work which is going on. As to the number of women and children who have been massacred, one can only judge from the number of refugees, which is comparatively very small. One thing is very significant, not a girl over 10 years of age is to be found among those who have escaped. In one of the above-named towns, Perushitzta, 1,500 persons, mostly women and children, are known to have been killed.”

SERVIA DECLARES WAR.

It is no wonder that the neighbouring Christian provinces should be roused to uncontrollable anger at these atrocities in the Bulgarian province, even if Bulgaria had joined the rebels; but she was not in revolt, and her only offence was her sympathy with the Bosnians and Herzegovines. This made the matter worse, and wrought up Servia into a warlike temper. She had no quarrel against Turkey herself, having achieved her independence years ago; but she could not resist the temptation to help her sister provinces in their efforts to obtain the same privilege. Prince Milan, of Servia, finding himself unable to repress the war-like impulses of his people, sought a pretext of war against Turkey. He sent a proposal to the Sultan that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be annexed to Servia, and placed under his rule, he undertaking to pay tribute to Constantinople. The proposal was, of course, indignantly spurned: and Servia having obtained the alliance of Montenegro, thereupon declared war.

Though the war is thus, in its immediate form, the result of popular indignation against the iniquities of Turkey, its connection with Russian designs is too apparent to be concealed. The Commander-in-Chief of the Servian forces is a Russian General, who has obtained distinction in recent Asiatic campaigns. Legally, he is a Servian, having removed from Russia to Servia, and “domiciled” shortly before the war; but this, of course, is a mere blind, and an answer to British demands that were certain to be made, for explanation—demands which have since been made and answered in the way that was ready. Then the great body of the officers of the Servian army are Russian officers, who have volunteered with the consent of the authorities. These facts speak for themselves. They show that Russia has taken Servia in hand, and is making use of her to make war against Turkey without the responsibilities and inconveniences of making war openly. The Russian General declared, in his opening proclamation, that if Servia was beaten, Russia would come to her aid. Politicians everywhere feel that the war is really a war between England and Russia,—Russia behind Servia, England having Turkey. Russia, besides supplying Servia

with officers, has several army corps massed on her southern frontier: and England has a powerful fleet in Bessika Bay.

THE REAL OBJECTS OF RUSSIA.

The *Liverpool Mercury* says:

"It is the firm belief, not merely of the Turks, but of the British and the Austrian Governments, that the real object of the Russians is to obtain possession of Constantinople and the two great straits which unite the Black Sea with the Mediterranean. So far as mere commerce is concerned, we have not the slightest reason to object to the fullest and freest use of these straits and seas by Russia; but our Government has hitherto resisted, and would probably continue to resist, any attempt by Russia to obtain possession of these seas and straits for naval and military purposes. This is one reason which has induced her Majesty's Government to send a powerful fleet to the entrance of the Dardanelles. As far as it is possible to judge from probabilities, at least two of the three Northern Powers, as they are now called—namely, Austria and Germany—would agree with England in resisting any attempt of Russia to obtain possession of the straits. Constantinople is the key of the Austro-Hungarian empire quite as much as it is of the southern provinces of Russia; and if it once passed into the hands of the latter, the great rivers which water the valley of the Danube would go from the control of Germany and Hungary into that of Russia. At the present time the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus are really a neutral territory and strait, the Turks not being strong enough to close them against any of the Powers of Europe interested in their use. But once in the hands of Russia they would not only give her the control of the greatest rivers of southern Europe, but would also enable her to exercise a pressure on all the countries on their shores which no Mediterranean power could resist. The possession of Constantinople, of the Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles, is therefore the great point involved in the Eastern quarrel."

The *Leeds Mercury* says "There can now, at any rate, be no doubt that the Russian Government does intend, if possible, to precipitate the catastrophe in Turkey. Even the *Times*, and the other great organs of public opinion in this country, which fondly dwelt upon the virtues of Russia and the extreme honesty of her intentions towards the Porte a few months ago, are at last compelled to adopt another tone. The Berlin Conference has given Europe a chance of peeping behind the mask, and we know now that it is the settled purpose of Prince Gortschakoff and General Ignatieff to

hasten the fall of the Sick Man and the distribution of his effects. It is said, indeed, that the Emperor of Russia is opposed to the schemes attributed to his Chancellor, and the partial defeat of the latter in the Berlin Conference is believed to be due to this circumstance. But there can be no doubt that the Czar is being gradually driven towards the course from which he has hitherto shrunk: and it is to be feared that he alone will never be able to withstand the pressure brought to bear upon him by his ministers."

BRITAIN'S INTEREST IN THE MATTER.

The same paper of a later date says (and unconsciously foreshadows the issue to which events are drifting in accordance with the prophetic programme): "Why should England be interested in any degree in the present state of affairs in the East? The answer, of course, is to be found in the fact that not only our purely selfish interests—such as our prestige in Europe and our continued possession of India—but the interests of peace throughout the world, are affected by the condition of affairs in Turkey. The ownership of Constantinople must always be one of those vital questions as to which statesmen of every party in England can hold but one opinion. The English Minister who allowed the finest naval station in the world—a station the possession of which ensures the absolute command of the Levant and the Canal route to India—to pass into the hands of Russia, would deserve impeachment as a traitor, for he would have taken the first step not only towards the dismemberment of the British Empire *but towards the conversion of Syria and Egypt into a cockpit in which all the nations of Europe would contend for supremacy.*"

British public opinion is deeply exercised by the crisis. A gloom overspreads all classes. A deputation, headed by Mr. Bright, waited on Lord Derby to get some declaration on the subject of whether or not England was likely to become involved in the conflict. Lord Derby, of course, spoke words of comfort, and expressed his opinion that there would be no extension of the war: but the preliminaries of previous wars have shown how utterly unreliable ministerial prognostications are. Much more to the point is the following newspaper

utterance:

"The truth is, and the conduct of the Northern Powers shows they are quite aware of it, and intend to act fully upon it, that the time is fully approaching when this Eastern knot will have to be cut by the sword, and when, therefore, all real influence over it must rest with those who have the power of the sword, and are ready to use it. Everyone must feel that the apparent moderation of Russia and Austria has no deeper root than inability to agree upon a solution of the problem, and indisposition to risk a collision so long as the evil day can be put off. That it can be put off for ever, or even for long, no one believes."

A French paper truthfully remarks, Turkey is "an edifice the fall of which is expected, yet of which everybody fears the crash, as it would cover the world with dust and blood."

Russia is reported to be gathering war ships at Sebastopol.

THE RUSSO-ENGLISH ANTAGONISM, EAST AND WEST.

A Vienna correspondent writes: "The progress of the Russians in Central Asia and the position England occupies in India are always studied with the greatest interest here, as according to the general opinion the decision of the future Asiatic struggle is in close connection with the Turkish question. 'The way to Delhi is via Constantinople, and the way to Constantinople, as General Fadejeff confessed, is via Vienna'—wrote one of the journals of here last week, in discussing the affairs of the East. Of late attention has been especially directed to Asia by a pamphlet written by an Austrian, Captain Debelak. The captain (as his name proclaims, a Slave) prophecies the extension of the Russian power to Singapore. He grounds his assertion, which is in direct contradiction to the generally-received opinion, on an over estimate of the Russian power, on the extraordinary aptitude of the Cossacks for colonisation, and the inability of the English to become assimilated with any other nation.

In an article on the subject of Russia's advance in Central Asia, the *Constitutionnel* remarks that when Napoleon, who was then simply General Bonaparte, carried with him the army which had been confided to his attention, was to reach India by this Continent, his mind was beset by those immense projects which he confided to the

Emperor Alexander during the interview at Tilsit, and which tended towards a renewal of the Macedonian empire. The Czar was to reach India by Affghan, the Emperor Napoleon would join him with a formidable army. The two monarchs would then have shared the world between them. The fact must be observed that Napoleon had a marked predilection for campaigns on land; the sea was not his element, and he was destined to be beaten on it by Nelson on the Nile and at Trafalgar. The present Emperor Alexander contemplates attempting a work which his grandfather refused to accomplish. He is advancing slowly and surely towards India, and is also menacing Constantinople. He was, therefore, bound to excite the hatred of England on the same ground, and for the same reason as Napoleon. India and Egypt are the two sacred arks of England, the double palladium which must not be touched. One is the seat of the Oriental Power of the great European nation; the other is the road by which that Power may be menaced. The Czar threatens India. A singular fact is that we should talk of India when only Constantinople is concerned; that we should refer to Egypt when there is only a question of Herzegovina. We may appear to be displacing the question, but such is not the case. Russia and England are much more in conflict with each other than Turkey and Herzegovina, only it is the Eastern question which serves as the pretext for the quarrel. Russia, a European and Asiatic Power, can no longer extend herself westward. She is stopped by Germany, by Austria, by Roumania, and by Turkey. In order to enlarge her territory she must extend herself in Asia, which she is now doing. Watch her progress in the Caucasus and Turkestan. Her army advances slowly as an indefatigable pioneer, and gradually European civilisation becomes developed in those wild countries, softening those rude and barbarian populations. But what Russia requires is the head of the Ottoman Empire; it is Constantinople; and her policy has never ceased for a century to prepare the downfall of Turkey in order to open that Oriental succession of which the Czar hopes to be the universal legatee. But for the reason that Russia, barred on the European side, wishes to extend in the East, England, an Oriental Power, having at her head an Empress of India—and there the cleverness of Mr. Disraeli is revealed—opposes the progress of Russia with all her might. The Czar wants Constantinople because it is the seat of the Turkish power, and because the prestige which attaches to the possession of that city will raise him in the eyes of the Orientals.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J.C.—The matters you speak about have all been the subject of previous exposition. For the parable of the labourers, who received each man a penny, see *Christadelphian* for August, 1874, page 382. There will be no grumbling in the kingdom of God. The grumblers of the parable represent the Scribes and Pharisees, who being first in the days of Jesus' first appearing, are to be last at his second appearing, "seeing Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, but they themselves thrust out."—(Luke xiii. 28). For the evidence that this is the scriptural view, see the *Christadelphian* referred to. So the parable of the virgins. It has been treated of before. The midnight cry will not occur in its final form till the intimation is angelically made that the Lord has returned. Parables should not be pressed to an exact application in all their details. Christ's object in uttering them should always be kept in view; this will generally be found to be of a broad and general scope, and of a character excluding the application of some of the details. Known truth—as plainly revealed in the unparabolic parts of Scripture, should always govern the interpretation of parable.

PAID PREACHING INEXPEDIENT THOUGH NOT WRONG.

By what Scripture do you prove it wrong to receive pay for preaching? (Jno. R.)

ANSWER—Things may be lawful but not expedient. This Paul teaches. And he applies the principle to this very question. He admits that according to the abstract operation of justice, a qualified man devoting himself to the spiritual interests of a body of people is entitled to be maintained; but he adds "we have not used this power, but suffer all things lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. . . . The Lord hath ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. But I have used none of these things, neither have I written these things that it should be so done unto me, for it is better for me to die than that any man should make my glorying void.

. . . What is my reward then? Verily that when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge." In our day, preaching is a trade, and if any good is to be done in the way of commending the gospel to the affections of men, it must be disconnected from the hiring system. Salaried service is liable to become a corrupt service from various points of view. It attracts to it men who are content to use it as a means of making a living in a respectable way. Unpaid service has no attraction for this class, and consequently they are not to be found in it. They are to be found where the pay is. And even there, they are slaves to those who support them. They dare not go against their patrons in matters of either doctrine or practice. Intrepid independent and pure minded service thrives best where Paul put it in his own case—where it is voluntarily rendered without fee or reward. The moral power of this service is great. When it is seen that there are no temporal objects being served, men feel that earnest conviction exists. And if they be of the earnest sort themselves, they are induced to look into the matter which can command for itself such disinterested service. Of course, this does not exclude a voluntary, informal unstipulated co-operation on the part of those who have the pecuniary means at their disposal. But a voluntary co-operation of this sort is a different affair from a salaried system, and does not bring with it the hindrances and impurities that grow out of that system.

THE MAN WITHOUT A WEDDING GARMENT.

E.J.L.—In one of the parables, a guest at a marriage feast is found without a wedding garment, and is expelled to the outer darkness. What does this wedding garment represent? The question is answered in another simile, which compares the saints in their aggregate at the marriage supper of the Lamb, to a bride "to whom it was granted that she should be arrayed in *fine linen, clean and white*" (Rev. xix. 8), to which it is added, "The fine linen is the righteousness of the saints." There can be no question that though every one is invited and will be made freely welcome to guestship on the great occasion referred to, there are conditions which must be complied with,

which are very fittingly represented by attire appropriate to the festal gathering. Christ will "give to every man according as his work will be." "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." These are divine specifications of the conditions of acceptance on the part of those who accept the invitation to the marriage feast of the king. It is revealed that some will present themselves in that day full of expectation of passing muster among the guests. They say "Have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?" But the King shall say unto them, "I never knew you: depart from me ye workers of iniquity." They were destitute of the garment of personal righteousness. This is, without doubt, the class represented by the man without the wedding garment. Those who think that he represents the class uninvested with the righteousness of Christ in the belief and obedience of the truth, have only to remember that the majority of those so invested will be rejected at the judgment seat of Christ for not having walked worthy of their privilege in Christ. Christ is righteousness for a believing sinner unto his justification: but the believing sinner having become a saint has to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling; and must, with all the saints, appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to receive in body according to what he hath done, good or bad. If he sow to the flesh, he will reap corruption: if he sow to the spirit, he will reap life everlasting. Christ says he will give to every one of them according as their work shall be. A man having no good account to render, is a man without moral fitness for a place in the kingdom of God, and therefore may be parabolically said to be without the dress which the etiquette of the great occasion requires.

JESUS NOT IMMORTAL IN THE DAYS OF HIS FLESH.

John v. 26: "As the Father hath life in Himself, even so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself." Does this teach that Jesus, in the days of his flesh, was immortal? Did eternal life die?—(C.C.M.)

ANSWER.—Jesus said many things of himself that were hard to be understood, but which become easy of understanding when we apply the key which he himself, on more than one occasion, supplied. One particular case will suffice for all. He had said: "Except a man eat my flesh and drink my blood, he hath no life in him;" and again: "This is that bread which came down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."—(John vi. 58.) It is added: "Many, therefore, of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying; who can bear it? . . . and from that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him." Before the disciples "went back," Jesus tried to show them his meaning. He said, "It is THE SPIRIT that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are life."—(verse 63.) This was as much as to say that when he spoke of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, he did not mean his literal flesh and blood which would profit them nothing, but the doctrine which emanated from him as the mouth of the Spirit, concerning the mystery involved in his sacrifice. It was on the Spirit he concentrated the emphasis of his argument and the attention of his audience. God had given him the Spirit without measure (John iii. 34), and it was to this Father-presence he constantly referred all his wisdom and power, saying, "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works."—(xiv. 10.) When, therefore, he said the Father had given the Son to have life in himself, he did not mean to say that, as the Son of Mary, he was immortal in his own nature, but that there dwelt in him the power of the Father to raise the dead and do other wonderful works. This was a power that dwelt in no other man, and which warranted the description which Jesus applied to it; but it did not make him, in the days of his flesh, immortal, for he was compassed with infirmity and death as we are (Heb. v. 7-9; iv. 5.) "He was crucified *εξ* out of weakness, but liveth through the power of God."—(2 Cor. xii. 4.)

CAN THE FRIENDS OF CHRIST GIVE
THEMSELVES TO SAVING MONEY?

Do you think a brother of Christ can consistently save money, by almost slavish labour, to buy houses or land, with the idea of some day being able to live independently of work?—(JNO. R.)

ANSWER.—A brother of Christ is one who not only says, "Lord, lord," but who does the things Christ has commanded. Christ speaks very plainly on this point. He says: "He that doeth the will of my Father, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Also that the man who listens to and approves his teachings, but does not act in accordance with them, is one who is building his hopes on a foundation of sand. The question, therefore, is, "Can a brother of Christ consistently follow a course which Christ has forbidden?" Put this way, the question would receive but one answer from any quarter. But some might object to the question being put in this way, and would prefer asking, "Has Christ expressly forbidden slavish labour for the possession of houses or lands, with a view to ease in his old age (which may never come)?" No one who is acquainted and in love with the teaching of Christ will hesitate to answer the question, even in this form. Christ has forbidden such a thing in more ways than one. Take one of the strongest cases in point.—(Luke xii. 13.) A man in the crowd, on one occasion, requested Christ to interpose between himself and his brother on a question of dividing their deceased father's property. This is a common everyday question; and what Christ said on the occasion, lets us into his mind on the subject as distinctly as if he were on earth in our day, and had the question propounded to him. The common view would have sympathised with the subject as an important one, and the man's grievance as a real grievance, but Christ runs counter to the common view. Having told the man he was no judge or divider among them, he bases the following discourse on the incident: "Take heed and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things he possesseth. The ground of a rich man brought forth plentifully. And he

thought within himself saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits. And he said, This will I do. I will pull down my barns and will build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul: SOUL, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself and is not rich toward God." If Christ had said nothing more, he here puts forth a distinct discouragement against saving up for one's own comfort, honour, or protection. But he applies the thing in a direct manner. He says, "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life what you shall eat, neither for the body what ye shall put on. . . . If God clothe the grass which is to-day in the field and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more will He clothe you, O ye of little faith? And seek not what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind; for all these things do the nations of the world seek after, and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." If Christ could have spoken more plainly on the subject, the plainer speaking is perhaps to be found where he says, "*Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven. . . . No man can serve two masters. . . . Ye cannot serve God and Mammon*"—(Matt. vi. 19—24). Paul is equally pointed: He says, "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which some having coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, FLEE THESE THINGS."—(1 Tim. vi. 8—10.)

The answer which the smallest capacity

can see in these sayings, to the question at the head of this paragraph, is greatly strengthened by the fact that Christ was a poor man, and that God has been pleased to find the heirs of the kingdom among "the poor in this world, rich in faith." Any man setting his face in earnest to enter the kingdom of God would prefer to be in the class of whom God has made choice, especially when the very head of the house himself belonged to that class. "Labour not to be rich" is an express inculcation of the spirit (Prov. xxiii. 4). Riches are a great burden in the race which men are called to run in the gospel. So great, that Christ said "It is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."—(Matt. xix. 23.) Not impossible, but difficult, with the chances all against him. Paul indicates the course by which the rich man may set aside the difficulties and turn them into helps for the kingdom of God. "Charge them that are rich in this world . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold of eternal life." (1 Tim. vi. 17)

One of the reasons given by Christ for his command to "lay not up treasure upon earth," is "where the treasure is, there will the heart be also." There is this great cogency in this reason. It is the lesson of universal experience that if a man have a portion in this life, his heart is in bondage to this life, whereas where there is no portion in this life, the heart is free to be set on those things that are above, viz., all the things pertaining to Christ as he now sits the priest over God's own house, shortly expected forth with a blessing. On the

principle that a man should *lay aside every weight*, and run with patience the race set before us in the gospel (Heb. xii. 1), it is well that no man aiming to enter the kingdom of God, should devote himself to "save money by almost slavish labour." A man who does so is living for a present result; and he has all the reward he will ever get when he succeeds, by his slavish labour, in scraping together a sufficiency of filthy lucre to enable him to live without work—a sufficiency he may never live to get and which if he get, may prove a curse. Such a man sows to the flesh, and will reap corruption. Even now, it shuts up the bowels of his compassion towards the poor whom we are commanded to help, and dries up the fountain of all enterprise in which we are commanded to be diligent. It withers the higher faculties and kills faith, and brings a man to a level with the creatures of a mere hoarding instinct. God has promised to provide food and raiment for those who seek first the kingdom and the righteous doing connected with it, viz., the doing of the commandments of Christ. A man who pursues the course indicated in the question shows that whatever he may profess with the lip, he has no faith in his heart, but is a miserable slave to the animal instincts, which will assuredly drag him at last into a dishonoured grave. To such as are tempted to consider this standard too high, we have merely to say the standard is Christ's, and it is better to stand aside with the world, and have nothing to do with Christ than profess to be subject to him, while making his commandments of non-effect through our own traditions.

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—The brethren here order one hundred copies of the Bradlaugh Discussion, with the address of the ecclesia on the cover. On the subject of terms, see note at the end of Glasgow intelligence.

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month,

obedience has been rendered to the truth by **MISS MARY HANNAH OCKFORD** (34), sister in the flesh to sister Hamilton, of Birmingham: also by **EDWARD JACKSON** (22), son of sister Shuttleworth; **ERNEST MEAKIN** (21), son of brother Meakin;

ALFRED PEPLOE (19), son of brother Peplow; HENRY SMITH (25), jeweller, formerly Wesleyan local preacher; SARAH ELIZABETH DURANT (17), daughter of sister Durant; LOUISA JANE BUTLER (20), daughter of brother Aaron Butler. During the same period, brother Thomas Davis has returned to fellowship; and brother Alfred Hall, brother in the flesh to sister Hardy, has fallen asleep, after a long illness. At the Quarterly Meeting on July 6th, satisfactory progress was reported. There had been fourteen additions during the previous three months, and the total number in fellowship was 253, about 20 of whom are resident in outlying districts.

BRISTOL.—Brother Cort reports that the small company of brethren here have received notice to leave the room (a "Church Mission" Room) which they had succeeded in obtaining. They were not surprised nor altogether sorry, as they did not feel at home in such a place. The immediate cause of notice to leave was the manifestation of the truth in lectures by brother Veysey of Taunton, who showed that orthodox religion was the great infidelity of the age. The brethren are looking out for another room; meanwhile they have been joined by brother and sister D. Clement, who have left Mumbles and settled in Bristol.

EDINBURGH.—Brother Grant reports: "On Friday, June 30th, WILLIAM ANDREW (20), son of our brother and sister Andrew, was immersed into the sin-covering name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and now waits with us for the manifestation of the sons of God."

GLASGOW.—Brother William Owler, writing on the 13th instant says: "During the past month we have lost, by removal, four of our number: viz., brother and sister Johnston and brother and sister Breckenridge, to Manchester. We have, however, four additions to take their place, which leaves the ecclesia the same, viz., fifty-five. The names of those who have obeyed the form of sound doctrine, by being immersed in water are: June 18th, GEORGIANA MACDONALD, domestic servant, who resides some distance from Glasgow; THOMAS MAXWELL, and GEORGE JOHNSTON, engineers, Govan; and on the 25th June JANE HOBART, fellow servant of sister MacDonald. The Lectures are still continued on the Sunday afternoons, and the attendance is very encouraging. The subjects treated on were—June 18th, 'Will all the Dead Rise Again?'—(Brother James Nisbet.) June 25th, 'God One, Not One in Three.'—(Brother I. Ritchie.) July 2nd, 'The approaching manifestation of the Golden Age.'—(Brother W. Owler.) July 9th, 'The Fate of those who never heard the Gospel.'—(Brother T. Nisbet.) (Brother Owler asks what would be the price of a thousand copies of the Bradlaugh

Discussion, with the address of the Glasgow ecclesia printed on the cover. The brethren want to put them in the hands of book-sellers. Not yet knowing what the price of a single copy will be, we cannot answer the question; but Bradlaugh's partnership having been bought out, we can promise that the terms will be as low as it is in our power to make them, subject to one or two others who have a voice.—EDITOR.)

KEIGHLEY.—An interesting incident connected with the case of brother Ashcroft is associated with this place. A certain good while ago, the authorities of the Keighley Independent Chapel extracted from him a promise to preach the Sunday School Anniversary sermons on the 18th of June, this year. The promise being hurriedly and informally given, it slipped from brother Ashcroft's memory. After the events described last month, he received a letter from the chapel people, reminding him of his appointment, which they had in the meantime duly advertised by placard on the walls of Keighley. Brother Ashcroft instantly recollected the appointment he had made, and felt embarrassed in the new circumstances in which he stood. He wrote to the chapel people, informing them of his change, and of his consequent disqualification to do what they wanted, and what he had undertaken to do. They, of course, accepted the explanation, but the bills having appeared, they were bound to explain to the public the cause of brother Ashcroft's failure to keep his appointment. They did so in no very accurate form, and the brethren took advantage of the incident to send for brother Ashcroft to lecture to the Keighley people in explanation of the matter. Brother Shuttleworth, of Keighley, reports the result. The bill issued by the brethren "specially and kindly asked those who had expected to hear him in the chapel on June 18th," to come and hear the reasons which had led to their disappointment, and to judge for themselves "between the present and the past." A good audience came together in the Keighley Temperance Hall.—Brother Shuttleworth says that in a forcible, yet kindly way, with all logical plainness, brother Ashcroft described the circumstances which had led him to his present position, showing to the people how the truth in its fullness had come in upon him, and compelled him to withdraw from the pulpit of an apostacy, and declaring it impossible for one to preach the Gospel of the first century and keep his position amongst men. He then gave a clear scriptural answer to the question how it is so many are in the dark and why those who know dare not speak what they know, let alone come out. He let the people know that there were many of this class; after which he turned to the scriptural doctrine of man, showing that he is but grass, and then more clearly bringing

in the Gospel news of the resurrection, showing from a logical way of talking, the foolishness of popular dogmas. He kept the audience spell-bound for about an hour, quoting from pulpit divines, and then contrasting their sayings with Scripture in masterly illustrations. He concluded by a fine run of Scripture truth, in a good appealing tone combined with scriptural argument. "I never listened," says brother Shuttleworth, "to such a discourse before, It was somewhat like Apollon of old." About forty minutes were afterwards spent in answering questions.

LONDON.—Brother Elliott reports the immersion (on the 21st of June), of Miss FLORENCE JANNAWAY, being the seventh member of the family of this name, who has embraced the truth. The Lectures for the month have been as follow: July 2nd, 'The Promises'—(Brother Boshier.) July 9th, 'The Battle of Armageddon.'—(Brother J. C. Phillips.) July 16th, 'The New Heavens and the New Earth.'—(Brother A. Andrew.) July 23rd, Palestine; its approaching transfer from Mohammedan to Jewish Rulership.'—(Brother J. J. Andrew.) July 30th, 'The Mother of Harlots; her birth, education, wicked career, ecclesiastical offspring, and approaching doom.'—(Brother J. J. Andrew.)

MIDDLESBOROUGH.—Bro. Charles Barber has returned to this place, where brother and sister Smithers (late of Leicester) now sojourn. They are a source of comfort one to another. Visits from brother Sanderson, of London and bro. Armstrong of Leicester, have been very cheering. A short time ago, Middlesborough, with a population of from 70,000 to 80,000 souls was without a witness of the truth in their midst. "But now" says brother Barber, "things wear a much brighter aspect. There are now five who are walking in the apostles' doctrine here. Brother and sister Smithers, brother and sister Clarkson and myself. We meet every First Day of the week, in obedience to our Lord's command, and we feel our meetings to be a source of refreshing to us all. Last Sunday we organised ourselves as an ecclesia, and trust by our upright walk and earnest effort, some may be led to the right way, ere the door is shut."

MUMBLES.—Brother Michael reports the obedience of RUTH JENKINS, sister in the flesh to sister Elizabeth Lewis. She has for a long time been impressed with the truth. Brother D. Clement has removed to Bristol, which the brethren regret.

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland writes: "I have no doubt that the brethren will be glad to know that brother John Pepper is again united with us. We left him at Mr. Farmer's Synagogue at the time of division caused by Renunciationism. He repudiates the doctrine taught by the Renunciationists concerning Jesus Christ, and desires to be

in fellowship with us, whom he believes to teach the truth concerning Christ.

"Sister Lockton has returned to Nottingham and will be numbered again with us. After moving from the Mechanic's to the People's Hall there was a marked falling off in the numbers attending the Sunday evening lectures, but we are glad to see lately a steady increase. On Sunday evening, July 2nd, we had the largest number we have seen during the last three years. The lecture was by brother Shuttleworth, subject, 'Signs of the times; impending downfall of the Turkish Empire; the certainty and the reason for it, from a Bible point of view.'

"We have just had four lectures by brother Roberts, of Birmingham, as follows: Sunday evening, July 9th, 'Is the Bible true?' Tuesday July 11th, 'If a man die shall he live again?' July 12th, 'Is there any real foundation for the universal tradition of a 'good time coming?' July 13th, 'Is there any, and if so, what connection between present actions and future destiny?' These lectures have been well attended, considering the time of the year, when lecture rooms are often very uncomfortable on account of the great heat. We noticed many strangers who are not in the habit of attending Christadelphian lectures. We prayerfully leave results in the hands of our heavenly Father, who knoweth the hearts of all men."

PETERBORO'.—Brother Hodgkinson reports that there were "Immersed into Christ, June 23, 1876, at Peterboro' CHARLES WOOLLARD (33), coach builder, formerly neutral; also EDWARD FOGG (40), gentleman, formerly neutral; both steady attendants at the lectures, almost from the first united to Christ through 'the foolishness of preaching' persistently."

ROCK FERRY.—Brother Ashcroft writes: "You will be gratified to learn that Captain Robertson has identified himself with the Lord's brethren. I found him (on his return from the Continent) full of regret at the step I had taken, but when he received his *Christadelphian*, and became acquainted with the whole facts, he at once softened down. On Sunday morning he made known to me his desire to join us. I questioned him as to his faith at the time of his immersion, and he appeared quite satisfied with what he then believed. He regarded the ceremony as a veritable transfer from Adam to Christ, and declared that he was Christadelphian in all but name at the time. Brother Waite, from Stockport, was over in the afternoon, at the breaking of bread, and was prepared to give brother Robertson the right hand of fellowship in the name of the brethren. In the evening I assisted his niece, JENNIE ELIZABETH ROBERTSON (22), wife of James U. Robertson, ship broker, Liverpool, to put on the saving name. With her acquaintance with the truth in its

various branches I was especially delighted. She is a most intelligent sister; and HER HUSBAND (whom I am authorized to call brother James Robertson), has been for a long period in full sympathy with the truth as we see and teach it. He is familiar with *Eureka*, *Twelve Lectures*, and most Christadelphian works, and casts in his lot with us. Like his uncle, he affirms that such was his faith at the time of his immersion—so I suppose we cannot do other than receive him. There was another immersion on Sunday evening, that of ABEL ANDREWS, mechanic, formerly Wesleyan. He and I have been much in each other's company of late, and few of his social standing are beyond him in clear apprehension of the truth. There are several others who are searching diligently whether these things are so; and whose obedience will not stand over very long.

Brother Waite, of Stockport, also sends an interesting account of the same matters.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler reports the obedience of AGNES BLAKELBY (41), formerly of the Church of England. She has been looking into the truth for about six months. Sister Lanspeary (47), whose immersion was mentioned last month, is sister in the flesh to sister Boler. The subjects for last month have been "The promises to the Fathers," "Burning of the Earth," "Traditions of Men," "Belief in Christ;" the lecturers, bro. Skinner and bro. Boler.

TEWKESBURY.—Brother Horton reports that the brethren here, being a long time at a disadvantage, in consequence of the unsuitableness of the private room in which they have been accustomed to hold their meetings, and unable to get a better, they determined some time ago, to build one. The building has been going on for some time, and is now approaching completion. They hope to open it in September, and are desirous of following up the opening with a succession of Sunday Lectures. They therefore ask brethren from a distance, able to speak the word of the kingdom, to help them in the work they have undertaken for the Lord's sake. Communicate with the secretary, James Horton, 2, High Street, Tewkesbury.

WATCHET (Somerset).—Bro. Veysey being at this quiet seaport, with his family, for a few days' rest, before recommencing his scholastic duties, hired the Assembly Rooms for July 9th, to give an address at 3 p.m., on "The Signs of the Times," (Rev. xvi. 11, &c.) and at 7.45 p.m., on "The Gospel preached by the Lord and his Apostles, For whom did Christ die? What is Salvation?" The seats (holding 120 or more), even to the speaker's chair, were occupied, and many

stood. Great interest was evinced. "Bible Questions" were distributed. Books ordered had not arrived in time, but some persons gave their addresses to be supplied. The "co-pastor" of one of the chapels was present at both addresses, and continued his enquiries privately until 10 o'clock. May God give rich blessing.

C H I N A.

HONG KONG.—Brother Hart writes: "I believe I made the remark before to you that notwithstanding the great circulation I try to give Christadelphian publications in China around, and the exposition of the truth on every opportunity, nothing, so far as I know, comes of it. Strange to say, there is some one else in China, whom I cannot find out, who is also circulating Christadelphian tracts. I am inclined to think he is the one who has corresponded with the *China Mail* in reference to "Russia and Constantinople," reproduced in the *Christadelphian* for April. It is strange he cannot find me out nor I him; whoever he may be, he must have got some from me, for I have sent to every one up and down the coast: to Japan, Philippine Islands, Cochin China, Malaya and Borneo, Singapore, and even to India, where I thought the truth was established. No fruit have I reaped, no jewel to decorate my crown."—[Do not despair. A stray copy of the *Lectures* at Calcutta was the means of enlightening a captain who came home and gave them to a Congregationalist minister, who also became enlightened, gave up his congregation, and took to preaching the truth in another place, with the result of bringing several already to a knowledge of the truth. God must have a purpose to accomplish, as yet unseen, or He would not have planted a brother Hart with so lavish a hand to diffuse the truth's literature in Hong Kong.—EDITOR.]

UNITED STATES.

CAUPELTON (Mo.).—E. B. Wright thus writes: "You may report the immersion of myself and brother THOMAS SMITH. Brother J. L. Wallace came to our assistance May, 1875. The seed had been sown six or more years ago, by brother W. S. Speer. Brother Smith and I are alone. The nearest ecclesia is fifty miles from where we reside. We read the Scriptures daily, and shall endeavour to perfect our faith by our works after the example of Abraham, the friend of God. There are others interested, and I hope ere long to be able to report some additions to the saving name."

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 147.

SEPTEMBER, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

SACRIFICE IN THE FUTURE AGE AND CHRIST'S ACCOMPLISHED WORK.

QUESTION BY A CORRESPONDENT, AND DR. THOMAS'S ANSWER.

DEAR BROTHER.—My attention has been lately called to certain testimonies of Ezekiel and Paul, relating to the re-establishment of Israel in Palestine under the New Covenant, between which there is an apparent discrepancy. Paul's argument, in the tenth of Hebrews, that the remission of sins promised to them therein, removes the occasion for further propitiatory offerings, seems to militate against Ezekiel's representation of the restoration of these at the period referred to. Paul argues, in the eighteenth verse, that "where remission of these (sins) is, there is *no more* offering for sin;" whilst Ezekiel shows, in chapter forty-five, and verse seventeen, that at that epoch, sacrifices shall be offered by the Levitical priests, the sons of Zadoc, "the sin-offering, and the meat offering, and the burnt offering, and the peace offerings, to make reconciliation for them." "Their sins and iniquities will I remember *no more*," says the Lord. In the subject which Paul illustrates by this citation from the New Covenant, he is showing how the one offering of Christ excelled and superseded all the shadowy sacrifices of the Mosaic

institution—how, in putting away at once and for ever the sin of those sanctified by it, “it perfected them for a continuance,” or so long as they should abide in Him; and even thus, his teaching indicates that God’s pardoned Israel will be perfected in conscience by the blood of a new and “everlasting covenant,” by which they seem to be placed, at the period of their re-institution, into his favour, in the position of the baptised believer now, to whom in Christ Jesus there is no condemnation. Wherefore, then, the re-institution of those “sacrifices which can never take away sins?” And that the sacrifices Ezekiel speaks of are not simply *commemorative*, is evident for their being “to *make reconciliation* for the house of Israel.” Again, the Levitical “service” Paul distinctly states to have been imposed until the time of reformation (Heb. ix. 10), thereby intimating its discontinuance then. He appears to indicate its *abolition* in the future age by the establishment of the “*better*” covenant; whilst Ezekiel exhibits it as *restored* at that epoch.—E.M.

THE DR.’S ANSWER.

The apparent discrepancy—and it is only apparent—has originated in the old leaven of antiquated theology, which, in its interpretations, or rather glosses, has no regard to the prophetic teaching concerning the re-building of the tabernacle of David “*as in the days of old*” (Amos ix. 11-15; Acts xv. 16), by the Lord Jesus, Israel’s King, who is *The Repairer of the breach, THE RESTORER of paths to dwell in.*—(Isaiah lviii. 12; xlix. 5, 6-8.) This is an element, in its exegesis, hidden from its view, and, therefore, entirely omitted. Being ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom and, consequently, of the nature of that kingdom, it has denied, in the face of the most palpable and positive testimonies, that sacrifices are to be restored at all; and taking refuge in the assumption that Ezekiel’s doctrine was either figurative or fulfilled at the restoration from the captivity in Babylon! Thus the difficulty was got rid of, but not explained; and, by a bounding leap in the dark, it came to the conclusion that the sacrifice of Jesus was the final and entire abolition of “the sin-offering, and the meat-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings, to make reconciliation for Israel.” Our beloved sister in the faith, and friends for whom she speaks, are hearty believers in the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel (Acts i. 6); and having mastered many difficulties in their way, by which they have been enabled to attain to the understanding of the gospel of the kingdom, are desirous of going on to perfection, in divesting their minds entirely of the miserable traditions which have been imposed upon them by the Gentilisms in which “they happened to be led.” They see that a temple for the third and last time is to be erected in David’s tabernacle, when Jerusalem shall put on her beautiful garments, and Zion shall arise and shine because her Light has come, and the glory of the Lord has risen upon her.—(Isai. lx. 1; lii. 1.) They know that this temple is to be built by the man, whose name is the Branch (Zech. vi 12), and that it will then be a house of prayer for all nations (Isai. lvi. 7); and they are well assured that the rams of Nebaioth shall come up with acceptance as burnt offerings and

sacrifices on the altar of the God of Israel (Isai. lx. 7): they believe all this with full assurance of faith, because it is written as with a sunbeam on the sure prophetic page. But then their difficulty is, how can it be reconciled with the received interpretation of Paul's saying, that the Levitical service was imposed only until the time of reformation? It cannot be reconciled, for truth and error are irreconcilable. Paul and the prophets are in harmony; for he declares that he said none other things than what they testified (Acts xxiv. 14; xxvi. 22); but Paul and the prophets are at antipodes with the Gentile interpreters of their testimony. We shall abandon the idea, therefore, of attempting to reconcile them; but by the undeviating magnet of the truth, which ever points to the kingdom as the Polar star in the voyage of faith upon life's stormy sea, we shall shape for ourselves a new course, which we doubt not, will conduct us without wreck or disaster into the haven of desire.

The Bible is *the Book of the Kingdom of God*, and teaches us that it has already once existed for 1024 years under Moses, Joshua, the Judges, and Kings. With the exception of the two years of Ishbosheth's reign, it was a united kingdom for 92 years of this millennium under Saul, David, Solomon, and the first four years of Rehoboam. From the 4th of Rehoboam it was governed by two dynasties. Ten of its tribes were ruled by kings whom they set up over themselves without regard to the authority of Jehovah, to whom the kingdom belonged.—(Hos. viii. 4.) Thus they raised the standard of rebellion, and rejected the sovereignty of the house of David, which God hath chosen to the royal house of His kingdom as long as the sun and moon should endure throughout all generations. This usurped royalty of Ephraim, or of the Ten Tribes, continued 256 years; but Judah yet ruled with God, and was faithful with the Most Holy (Hos. xi. 12), whose dynasty of the family of David they still continue to acknowledge. In the sixth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, the Ten Tribes were "removed out of God's sight" (2 Kings xvii. 18), that is, they were driven out of His land or kingdom, and the Tribe of Judah only remained. In a few years, however, Judah became unmanageable. "The chief of the priests and the people transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen; and polluted the temple of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by His messengers, continually and carefully sending; because He had compassion on His people, and on His dwelling place: but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised His words and misused His prophets, until the wrath of Jehovah arose against His people, till there was no remedy. Therefore He brought upon them the king of the Chaldees."—(2 Chron. xxxvi. 14-17.) This event happened 134 years after the removal of Ephraim out of His sight, or 390 years from the rebellion against the house of David; so that during 474 years of this millennium of the kingdom of God, David and his lineal descendants reigned over the house of Judah.

The kingdom of God thus brought to a temporary conclusion has never existed since under the sovereignty of a king or kings of the house of David. Its existence ceased even as a Commonwealth during the captivity

in Babylon which lasted seventy years. At the end of this period the kingdom reappeared in Judea; but it was no longer governed by Jewish monarchs, exalted to the throne either by God or the people. Jehovah permitted His kingdom to be subject to the lordship of the Gentiles, until the end of 430 years from the burning of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. For 122 years after the interposition of the Roman Senate, God's kingdom was ruled by Jewish princes of the tribe of Levi, that is, until the Gentile of Idumea, named Herod, became king in Jerusalem, in the 37th year of whose reign Jesus, the Son of God and of David, and the rightful heir of Jehovah's kingdom, was born of the Jews. From the commencement of Herod's reign till the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, a period of 111 years, the kingdom of God was possessed by the Gentiles; in other words, Israel did not possess the kingdom. From the knowledge of this fact, the reader will be well able to appreciate the force of the question put by the apostle to Jesus after his resurrection, and as the result of their conversion for forty days upon the subject of the kingdom, saying, "*Lord, wilt Thou at this time RESTORE AGAIN the kingdom to Israel?*"—(Acts i. 6.) They knew that he was "THE RESTORER;" and believing that "all power was given unto him in heaven and upon earth," they thought the time had certainly come for the Restitution of all things to Israel spoken of by all the prophets from the days of Moses.—(Deut xxx. 1-10.) This supposition prompted the question. But they were too fast. Messiah the Prince having come, the kingdom could not be "restored *again* to Israel" so long as the Mosaic Covenant continued in force. This must be "changed," the kingdom must be suppressed and desolated, and Jerusalem, the city of the Great King of Israel, be trodden under foot of the Gentiles until their times be fulfilled. They had forgotten these things, and that the kingdom of God was not immediately to appear under the sovereignty of the Son of Man; but that he was first to take a journey into a far country (Luke xix. 11-12), where he was to be detained until "the times of the restitution" (Acts iii. 21), called also "the Regeneration" (Matt. xix. 28,) should arrive. In the year 74, after the birth of Jesus, the kingdom was broken up, and the Mosaic covenant trampled under foot—not *finally abolished, but temporarily suppressed, that it may be "changed" in certain essential and highly important particulars.* God has had no organized kingdom upon earth since its overthrow by the Roman power. The kingdom in the sense of its territory is where it always was; and its children, or subjects, "His people Israel," are to be found in every land, still in hope that the time will come when the kingdom will be restored again to them; and "God will subdue the people under them, and the nations under their feet" (Ps. xlvii. 3); for they do not forget the testimony, that "the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem," and that "nation and kingdom that will not serve Zion shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."—(Mic. iv. 7-8; Isai. lx. 12.) The Heir of the kingdom is at the right hand of the Divine Majesty; and his joint-heirs, the most of them, mouldering and sleeping in the dust, with a few surviving stragglers still existing in the Protestant section of the globe, enduring reproach and tribulation in the hope of its speedy and triumphant restitution. These are the dissolved and scattered fragments of the kingdom of God.

Their re-union is a matter of promise, and consequently of hope. The Gentile must be expelled the territory; the twelve tribes must be re-planted upon the land; the sleeping heirs of the government must be awaked, and the living believers in this kingdom changed: and to effect all this, God's Heir, the Restorer of the Kingdom, must come and subdue all things to himself. When these things shall come to pass, God will have "accomplished to scatter the power of the Holy people" (Dan. xii. 7), that is, their power shall be no more scattered, but shall be restored to them: and He will have come whose right the kingdom is, and God will give it him.—(Ezek. xxi. 27.)

Having thus presented the reader with a few ideas concerning the kingdom that he may have something tangible and definite before his mind when we refer to it, we shall proceed now to make a few remarks in answer to the inquiry

WHAT IS A COVENANT?

The kingdom *as it was*, and the kingdom *as it is to be*, although the same kingdom, is exhibited in the Scriptures under Two Covenants, or constitutions. But before adverting more particularly to these it may be necessary to say a word or two in answer to the inquiry, "What is a Covenant?" It is a word of very frequent occurrence in Scripture, and the representative in our language of the Hebrew *berith*. In English, *covenant* signifies "a mutual agreement of two or more persons to do or forbear some act or thing." This, however, is not the sense of the word *berith* when used in relation to the things of the kingdom. Men's compliance or acceptance does not constitute the *berith* of the kingdom a covenant. It is a covenant whether they consent or not, and is enforced as the imperious enactment of an absolute king. It points out God's chosen, selected, and determined plan or purpose, entirely independent of any one's consent, either asked or given, and is equivalent to a system of government fixed by the Prince, and imposed on the people without the slightest consultation between them. Accordingly what is called the covenant in one place, is denominated the law in another. As, "He hath remembered His *covenant* for ever, the word which He *commanded* to a thousand generations; which *covenant* He made with Abraham and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a *law*, and to Israel for an everlasting *covenant*." "These are the words of the *covenant* which the Lord *commanded* Moses to make with the children of Israel. Thus saith the Lord, cursed be the man that *obeyeth* not the words of this *covenant* which I *commanded* your fathers." It is evident from this that covenant and law are used as synonymous and convertible terms.

The statements of the New Testament conduct us to the same conclusion. It may be proper to remark here that a *berith*, or covenant, is expressed in Greek by *diatheke*. This is the word used in the Septuagint as the translation of *berith*. It signifies an *appointment*; not a mutual compact, but the arrangement, settled plan, or institution of one party alone; and is the term used to denote the testamentary deeds of the deceased, in which the will and pleasure of the legatees is never consulted. "For where a *diatheke* is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator; for a testament (*diatheke*, covenant or will) is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no force at all while the testator liveth."—(Heb. ix. 16.)

THE COVENANTS OF THE KINGDOM.

The *beriths*, *diathekes*, or *covenants* of the kingdom of God are absolute decrees, which make, or constitute things *what they were*, and *what they shall be*. Hence "the Builder and Maker (or constitutor) of all things is God," "for whose pleasure they are and were created." But though these covenants are absolute, and the necessity to observe them imperative on all who are placed under them, they are replete with blessings to Israel and the nations, being founded upon "exceeding great and precious promises." Hence they are styled "the covenants of promise."—(Eph. ii. 12.) One of them is styled "the covenant from Mount Sinai; and the other, the covenant from Jerusalem which is above and free—*he ano Ierousalem*.—(Gal. iv. 24-27.) The Sinai Covenant is synonymous with *the Jerusalem Covenant which now is*, that is, as it existed in Paul's day; while the other covenant is *the Jerusalem Covenant which is to be*; and because Jerusalem, which is now "desolate," will then be "free," and "above" Jerusalem in her greatest glory under the Sinai Covenant, she is styled "*ano*," that is, above, higher, or more exalted; and is "the mother of all" who believe the things of the kingdom of God, which will come, or be restored, to her, when as "the city of the Great King," she shall have awaked from her present non-vinous inebriation, and have put on "her beautiful garments."—(Isa. li. 21; lii. 1.)

Strictly speaking, the Sinai Covenant, although based on promises, is not one of "*the covenants of promise*" Paul refers to in Ephesians. These are the Covenant of promise to Abraham, and the Covenant of promise to David; both of which are elemental principles of the Covenant of the Free Jerusalem, which is to go forth from Zion in the latter days.—(Isai. ii. 3.) The Sinai covenant is styled "*the first*;" the one to be hereafter proclaimed to Israel, "*the second*," although the latter is more ancient than the Sinai law in promise by 430 years, yet as a national *berith* constituting the kingdom of God in its civil and ecclesiastical appurtenances under Messiah the Prince and the saints, it is second in the order of proclamation to the Twelve Tribes. The promises of the *first* covenant, which was added (Gal. iii. 19) to the ancient covenant, were the blessings of Mount Gerizzim consequent upon their hearkening to the voice of Jehovah their God. (Deut. xxviii. 1-14.) In these there was no promise of eternal glory* and life; of an everlasting, individual and national inheritance of the land; of universal dominion under Abraham's seed; of everlasting righteousness from one atonement; and of no possible evil coming on them as a nation. On the contrary, the promises were accompanied with terrible threatenings, which have resulted in all the curses Jehovah pronounced upon them for not observing to do all His commandments and statutes.

But the second covenant of the kingdom of Israel is established, or ordained for a law (*nomothetein*,) upon better promises; and is therefore styled "a better covenant."—(Heb. viii. 6.) *It abolishes the remembrance of national offences every year*. Under the Sinai covenant these accumulated notwithstanding the yearly atonement, until the magnitude of its guilt crushed the nation, and caused its dispersion into all the kingdoms of the earth, as at this day. The better covenant, however, promises to Israel a great and

* Yet the obedience of them was essential to the attainment of eternal life and glory.—(Luke x. 25-28; Rom. ii. 25; vii. 10). Christ, who brought life and immortality to light, was made under the law, and obedient.—(Gal. iv. 4; Rom. v. 19.)—Ed. Christadelphian.

everlasting amnesty for all past national transgressions (Jer. xxxi. 31-34), not by virtue of the sacrifice of bulls and goats, which cannot take away sins, offered up by a sinful priest of the order of Aaron; but by a purification that shall be vouchsafed to the repentant tribes, issuing forth from "a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1); the blood of which has been carried into the presence of Jehovah Himself by Jesus (Heb. ix. 24), a High Priest of the tribe of Judah, consecrated after the power of an endless life (Heb. vii. 16), who will then have appeared the second time (Heb. ix. 28), having returned from the Most Holy to proclaim to his nation that God has been merciful to their unrighteousness, and will henceforth remember their sins and iniquities no more. This great national reconciliation being consummated, and the Twelve Tribes grafted into their own olive again, they will then enjoy the better promises of the second covenant. A new heart and a new spirit they will then possess. They will be God's reconciled people, and he will be their God. He will call for the corn and increase it, and lay no famine upon them; and they shall receive no more reproach among the nations. Their land that was desolate will then be as the garden of Eden.—(Ezek. xxxvi. 25-38.) Jerusalem will be a rejoicing, and Israel a joy. Their lives shall endure as the days of a tree, and they shall wear out the works of their hands.—(Isa. lxxv. 17-25.) These are a few incidents of the national blessedness that awaits Israel, when the kingdom of God shall be restored to them, and established in the *second millennium of its independence* under the new and better covenant.

(To be continued.)

THE WORK OF THE TRUTH VERSUS THE WORK OF SECTARIANISM.

BY DR. THOMAS.

IF what we demonstrate from the prophets and apostles be the truth (and where is the man that can convict it of error?) the theories of all sects without distinction must be fabulous. This is the ground we stand upon; this the impregnable position we occupy: it may be assailed, but it cannot be carried by assault. If we are right, then all else are wrong. There is no middle, no neutral ground between us and those who differ from us. If the things they preach for gospel be indeed "the gospel of the kingdom of God," we are altogether out of the way—we are blind darkeners of counsel by words without knowledge. If one understand the things we teach, how can he rationally confess that we advocate the truth, and fraternize with those who believe and teach the opposite? This is at once to declare that truth is error, and error truth. That is, with his tongue he confesses we are right, but in his deeds declares his conviction we are wrong. This is the faith of Demas, who believed with the apostles and walked with their

enemies, having a heartfelt devotion to the present world, and a disrelish for the reproach which is inseparable from a valiant profession and defence of the truth. Such amiable fainthearts are neither wise nor prudent before God; and whenever the wounds of the enemy are found upon them they are invariably in their backs, for which there is no defence in "the whole armour of God;" for "no man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."—(Luke ix. 62.) Such timid "lovers of the truth," who would follow Jesus, if he would only let them first go bid them farewell who are at home, adjudge themselves to be unworthy of eternal life.—(Acts xiii. 46.) When, therefore, they go over to the enemy, they go, like the money-loving soul merchant who sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver, to "their own place" where kindred spirits dwell. Thus the circumstances which grow out of the truth and its relations to men and things, make manifest those who are on the Lord's side, and who are against Him.

Sectaries imagine that "no good" is done unless men, women, or children are dipped in water, or brought to "join the church," as the result of "a big meeting!" Such a consequence of preaching is styled "the progress of the gospel," which is supposed to have made astonishing advance if a few tens, under the excitement of the hour, can be persuaded that they have "got religion," or religion has got them, which is probably the same thing in the vocabulary of Ashdod! These fervid specimens of "piety" labour to subdue the moral wilderness upon a principle of instantaneity, that is, of hewing down the trees, grubbing up the land, burning the logs, sowing, reaping, and harvesting all at once. A farmer who would piously or seriously expect to accomplish this would be esteemed a fool; yet such is the expectation of those who affect to judge of the good we do by the results that immediately follow. They exercise their reason so little upon spiritual things that they do not discern that there must be the cultivation and improvement of the human mind as well as in that of the soil, "a time for all things;" a time to plough, a time to sow, a time to grow, and a time to reap what is sown. Society must be prepared for the casting in among them of the incorruptible seed (1 Pet. i. 23, 25) or word of the kingdom.—(Matt. xiii. 19; James i. 18; ii. 5.) It is the nature of this seed to vegetate to perfection only in honest and good hearts; and even when it falls into these, it must have time to grow *that the increase may be of God.*—(1 Cor. iii. 6-7.) A congregation of a thousand may not contain an honest and good heart in all the multitude; yet it may contain many way-side, stony, and thorny-hearted hearers. You might sow the word of the kingdom among such as these for ever, and no good could by any possibility result; but sow tares, and the soil being well adapted to their growth, they would in a night spring up luxuriantly. The production of such a crop would be styled "doing good," the progress of the gospel and so forth, by the taresowers themselves; while they could only be regarded as the work of an enemy by those who understood the truth. This is the difference between our doings and the deeds of our opponents.

We sow the word of the kingdom in declaring the testimony of God (1 Cor. ii. 1), and reasoning with the people concerning it.—(Acts xvii. 2; xviii. 4.) Having done this, we exhort them to search the prophets and

apostles to see if the things presented be not as we have declared them. If we can get them to do this in earnest, we have no anxiety for the result. The increase will come, in some cases sooner, in others, later; and when it comes it will be God's increase, and not ours. The process, we grant, is slow and undazzling; but it is sure, and the fruit is worth gathering when matured. Conviction does not usually blaze upon the human mind like a flash of lightning; it steals upon us, as it were, like a thief in the night. By keeping the mind upon the truth, it is at length taken captive by it. You cannot take man's intellect and heart by storm. It is hardened by the tempest, but is melted by the genial influences of the truth.

We teach the doctrine of baptism indeed, but we urge no man to be baptized, knowing assuredly, that when one comes to understand the word of the kingdom, and that word has acquired the ascendancy, and exerts a proper influence over him, he will demand to be baptized, that he may be united to the name of Jesus, through which name alone he expects to receive (Acts v. 31; x. 43; xi. 18) repentance, remission of sins, and a title to eternal life—(John xx. 31). A man who needs goading into the water, as "evangelists" and "pastors" work upon them, is not fit for baptism, any more than a daughter of Eve is fit to be wedded to a man, who has to be dragged to the altar of Hymen to pronounce the words "I will." Were she left to her own purpose she would never meet him there, and therefore ought not. If a man have faith, he will cast away his crutch and walk, leaping and praising God; and according to his faith, so will it be to him hereafter, when he shall receive the sentence of Christ. If he have believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, and walked worthy of it, he will possess the kingdom with everlasting life; but if he have received some other "gospel" which is not of God, he will get nothing; for what a man sows that He will assuredly reap in due season. If we believe in an unpromised nonentity, we shall reap nonentity; but if we believe what God has promised, and conform to the conditions He has proposed, we shall obtain the things believed. This is "sowing to the Spirit" of whom we shall reap everlasting life.—(Gal. vi. 8.)

But sectarian theologians do not operate upon these principles. Their work is to enlarge the borders of their several "Zions," upon the supposition that they are "saving souls." With them "to do good" is to prosper in this labour. If it be a Zion in the midst of the water, the great effort is to get men, women, and children into the water that they may enter the kingdom, that is, the church! In listening to such "labours in the vineyard" you would suppose that there was nothing in the gospel but water; while another set of "labourers" would leave you to conjecture whether water had anything to do with the gospel at all! That men are sinners, and will be damned in hell fire and brimstone at death, if they don't repent and believe the traditions they teach, is the burden of their proclamation. They emblazon the damnation with "tongues set on fire of hell," and with their death-bed tales, and dreams of torment, scare the weak and timid of both sexes and of all ages into "the horrors," from which they are taught there is no escape except through the instrumentality of their prescription. And what is the remedy? Prayer for the Holy Ghost, that they may be baptized with it and with fire, so that by its influence they may get religion,

or be converted! And how do they know that they have "got religion" in answer to this prayer? By feeling or "experiencing a hope" that their sins are forgiven them! Animal excitement having subsided, the tranquillity that ensues is construed into conversion, and thus the subject deceives himself and is deceived. But all the clerics do not agree in the prescription. The dissidents tell their patients that prayer is unnecessary in the case; and that all they have to do is to believe that Jesus is the Son and Christ of God, and be baptized for the remission of their sins. This throws cold water upon "the horrors" and does away with the uncertainty of an answer to prayer. It also converts the patient into a combatant; and the "high-minded," "intelligent" "nature's nobleman" is immersed off-hand to show his contempt for the Revival excesses of his contemporaries!

This is the general scope of religionism in this country, and constitutes "the good" so much trumpeted throughout the land. Yes, you hear of the multitudes that are dipped in water, but you hear nothing of the apostates, whose name is legion, who run for a few weeks or months, and then return to their own place two-fold more the sons of capture and destruction than before. The country abounds in such religionists as these, whose immersions were published to the world as conquests to the gospel, aye! of the ancient gospel; as moss gathered around the stone that began to strike the image on the feet on Pentecost, and which still rolling onwards conquering and to conquer, is heaping Ossa on Pelion, and will soon become a great mountain and fill the whole earth! Nonsense. If the stone never become the mountain until it have attained that magnitude by the ministration of gossellers who are the producers of such fruits as we have indicated, that glorious promise will never become a fact, and God's truth will be impeached. The "good" these men plume themselves in doing is downright *evil*. Instead of moving heaven and earth to get men into the water, and then leaving them to themselves, their great aim ought to be to enlighten them in the testimony of God, which would then do all the rest. But this is a work impracticable for them. Being ignorant of the truth, and too wise in their own conceits to learn, they follow after their own ways, and glorify their own thoughts which are only evil, and that continually.—*Herald*, 1851.

DR. THOMAS AND THE JEWISH BOY.

IN his account of his visit to the Continent, Dr. Thomas narrates how, in Rotterdam, on his way to visit the Protestant Cathedral, he was overtaken by a Jewish boy, who offered to show him the cathedral. "Not being in need of his services," says Dr. Thomas, "I declined them. He then proposed to sell me some cigars. But I did not wish to buy. Perceiving that he was a Jew, I turned his attention from trade to the subject of Messiah, by asking him if he were not an Israelite. At first he denied his nation; but when I declared my certainty that he was, he confessed it. I told him that I was also a Jew, but not in Moses, though I believed in that great prophet. This sounded strangely in his ears, and gave rise to the following conversation:

Boy.—Are you not a Christian ?

Editor.—Yes ; but neither a Protestant nor a Papist.—(having arrived at the cathedral, I continued,)—I do not believe in Cathedral religion.

Boy.—But you believe in the Bible, don't you ?

Editor.—Yes ; and for that very reason I do not believe in the religion of Europe ; for neither Protestantism nor Romanism are taught in the Bible.

Boy.—The Jews believe in Moses.

Editor.—Not so, or they would believe in Jesus, for Moses wrote concerning him.

Boy.—Ah, but we look for Messiah who will be a God. Jesus was nothing but a man, whom our people hanged. Jesus is not Christ.

Editor.—Yes, Messiah must be a God in the sense of being the Son of God, and consequently more than an ordinary man. Jesus was this, and more. He was also Son of David, as your own genealogies prove, and is therefore the King of Israel. Your fathers hanged their king ; but God raised him from the dead, and by this proved his claims to be just and true. He is the Messiah, and you need look for no other.

Boy.—No, Jesus is not Christ. When Christ comes, he will restore Israel, and make all nations Jews. Jesus did not do this.

Editor.—Simply because the time had not then come. Israel will be restored as you say, and will become the greatest of all nations. God will do this ; but he will also do it by Jesus Christ, and —

Much of this conversation occurred in the cathedral while the people were collecting for their observances. On the clergyman rising to begin, the boy interrupted me by saying, “We must go, or we shall be shut in ; for there he is just going to begin his *liar* !”—he meant “his lying.”

MY DEAD COMPANIONS.

THOUGH dead they speak ; but yet they cannot hear,
And neither have the pow'r to see or feel ;
They speak not in the tones of Sin'i's Mount,
But like the still small voice Elijah heard,
They softly whisper unto those whose ears
Have been attuned to listen to their speech :
But these are few ; unknown to worldly fame,
And separated from their fellow-men
By wall more real than stone, although unseen,
They seek among the dead for that pure joy
Which they 'mong living men have failed to find ;
For all the rest of hrman kind are deaf
To spirit sounds which, could they understand,
Would give to them untold delight and make
Them free from bondage of a world of sin.
“Get joy and comfort from the dead ?” Ah ! yes,
Such consolation and such peace of mind

As cannot be described, but must be felt
Before their priceless worth can valued be.

My dead compan'ons speak forth solid truth ;
And never utter words to lead astray,
Beguile, deceive, or give a false idea
To those who hear and heed what they may say :
Their precious word can ever be relied.
How diff'rent this from those who live around !
Who seldom speak on things 'bove human ken
Without combining falsehood with the truth !
Not always will 't be so ; the time will come
When those whose voice is drowned by this world's din
Will thunder forth in tones so loud and strong
That all the world will be compelled to hear,
And then obey on pain of judgment's rod ;
This done, they'll teach all then of childlike mind
The lessons they've so long disdained to learn :
The truth will then the place of falsehood take,
And righteousness the place of slavish sin ;
All wars will cease, all broils come to an end ;
The human race will then enjoy that peace
For which they long but know not how can come.

My dead compan'ons, all these future boons
For man describe in language which doth thrill
The yearning hearts of those who understand,
Believe and hope for that time long foretold,
When cov'nants made by God, and ratified
By sacrificial death of His dear Son,
Will into operation surely come.
To Jews they'll give the land which long in waste
Hath lain—since they became accursed of God,
Condemned to roam in foreign lands and be
The subjects of oppressive Gentile pow'rs ;
Their fatherland will then its fruitfulness
Resume, and they in plenty and in peace
Will happy live the remnant of their days.
To Gentiles will be giv'n, thro' Abr'am's seed,
Those cov'nant blessings never yet enjoyed,
In which the fathers of the Jewish race
Had faith so strong that they did die in hope
Of future restoration unto life,
To witness that great day of good to man.
The kingdoms of the world will then become
The kingdoms of Jehovah's blessed Son.
Instead of rulers reigning for their own
Behoof, to gratify their fleshly lusts,

The nations of the earth will be endowed
With priestly kings who'll show to all mankind
How ruling with an iron hand can be
Combined with righteousness and perfect peace,
With justice to the needy and the poor,
And with the teaching of the way to gain
That life which men have falsely thought their own.

My dead compan'ons tell of him who, once
A man of woe, did tread this sin-curs'd earth,
Whose griefs his closest friends could neither share
Nor fully comprehend: unknown to all
The wise of Gentile fame, rejected by
The faithless Jews, despised by all who sat
In Moses' seat, derided by the sects,
Distrusted by the ruling pow'r, estranged
From next of kin, neglected by the band
Of men who left their all his steps to tread,
Appreciated by but very few,
A wonder unto some, misunderstood
By all—he lived for three and thirty years
A life of spotless righteousness: alone
Yet not alone; with Him who slumbers not,
Whose unseen presence ev'rywhere is felt,
He held commun'on sweeter far than all
That ever could be found 'mong best of men.
From this pure fount he gained the strength by which
He overcame temptation's subtle pow'r,
Resisted all the darts of serpent seed;
And then at last, with resignation, gave
Himself to godless men to suffer what
His Father did command to give release
From grasp of death to each of Adam's race
Whose speech and walk are ruled by godly fear.
Emmanu'l dead, a Saviour could not be,
For in the grave there is no praise, no life,
No thought, nor pow'r to save; the chains of death,
Though strong to hold the whole of sinful man,
Were far too weak for more than three brief days,
The righteous Son of God in bonds to keep.
The tomb once burst, he left this earth for sphere
Of perfect bliss, and love as pure; but yet
Not always there to be; for sure as he
Was for a time a homeless wand'rer here,
So surely will he come again ere long:
Though not with nature weak, unclean, defiled
By others' sin, and under death's fell doom.
He'll come, endowed in body and in mind
With strength divine, to take away the pow'r

Which God permits frail man awhile to wield,
 To show that he for six long thousand years
 Has failed to rule with wisdom and with love :
 A time far less than this will be required
 To demonstrate that Christ is man's best king,
 That where the Son of God doth reign, the just,
 The right, the true, in all things are supreme.

My dead compan'ons met with varied fate
 At hands of those whose sinful conduct they
 Condemned with fearlessness of man, but fear
 Of Him whom they with godly zeal did serve,
 In hope of promised life in world to come.
 Their pilgrim paths were strewn with many thorns ;
 At times their burden did so weigh them down
 They almost fainted ere their journey's end.
 Around them all was one vast dreary waste,
 And few did travel on that lonesome way
 To comfort and to cheer their drooping soul.
 Thus left alone they looked for aid and strength
 To Him who is the fountain of all pow'r ;
 Whene'er they asked 'twas not in vain ; their cry
 Was always heard by uncreated ears ;
 And though not answered as they might desire,
 Was sure to bring relief in such a form
 As only truest wisdom can devise.
 Though troubled oft on ev'ry side, perplexed,
 Cast down by suff'rings caused by godless men,
 And persecuted with relentless hate,
 They were not in despair, distressed, nor yet
 Destroyed ; but Gideon-like, with humble faith
 And courage based not on their own frail strength,
 They still did journey on their toilsome way
 In weakness, which did serve to show their help
 Was from above ; for weak things of the world
 Have been Jehovah's choice to manifest
 His wisdom and His pow'r upon the earth ;
 That thus no flesh should in His presence boast,
 And all the praise be unto Him whose grace
 Hath giv'n to man a hope beyond the grave.

My dead compan'ons teach me how to walk
 Through this wide world, instructing me which path
 To take, its many pitfalls to avoid :
 They each and all with one accord do say,
 Uprightly walk, in line as straight as doth
 The arrow take ; turn neither to the right
 Nor left ; fear nought by day, fear nought by night ;

Commit thyself and all thou hast to Him
Whose pow'r all things hath made, in hollow of
Whose mighty hand this universe is held.
They teach me also how to see—to look
Not on the things of which this sinful world
Is full, the lust of flesh, the lust of eyes,
And also pride of life, for nought that these
Can give will last beyond the vital pow'r
Of this frail flesh. They promise what they can't
Fulfil—contentment, joy, and happy mind ;
To be by them deceived is certain loss
Of life and kingship in the world to come,
With bondage under death's relentless grasp.
To save me from this shameful, fearful doom,
I'm counselled not to look with lustful eye
On pleasant things now seen, but fix my mind
On things, which though unseen by nat'ral man,
Can be discerned by all whose mental sight
Has grown by use to penetrate thus far.
To keep the ear in health, in readiness
To catch the Spirit's sounds, I'm cautioned not
To listen unto him who, by smooth words
And speeches fair, doth oft seduce with craft
Of serpent seed the careless child of God.
My speech I'm told should seasoned always be
With salt of truth, combining courteousness
With gravity, sincerity and love ;
In various ways, by precepts plain as words
Could be, examples too to imitate ;
By exhortation, warning, and reproof,
My dead compan'ons clearly show me how
These virt'ous graces may become my own.

My dead compan'ons daily I consult ;
Their words of truth so precious are that I
Esteem them as my needful food—indeed
Far more ; without the wisdom they impart
This life would worthless be, and I should soon
Like all who've known them not be written in
The earth : but now, through introduction to
Their converse sweet—so vitalising it
Doth make the heart to burn—my name has been
Inscrib'd in book of future life, and if
I sully not the name of one above
All others under heav'n, my name will there
Remain until he come to give to me
That life—so undeserved—by his blood bought.
However oft I hear them speak their thoughts

No weariness produce; though speaking all
 Alike, and many times repeating what
 They have to say, the varied form in which
 Their heav'nly wisdom's clothed infuses life
 And freshness into truths and laws divine
 Which, set in words and phrases all the same
 Would shortly cease to strike the list'ning ear:
 As 'tis, so sieve-like is the human mind,
 That repetition and reflection, day
 By day, throughout each long and changing year
 Alone secure to mem'ry's fading pow'rs
 The impress of ideas not native to
 The thinking flesh of dust-created souls.
 Amid the busy hum and whirl of this
 Fast-living age their sacred voice is like
 The sound of distant harbour bell when tossed
 About 'mong foaming waves by stormy wind;
 It tells me that there is a shore quite free
 From all the winds and storms of this brief life,—
 A shore of safety where no grave is known,
 Nor minor ills to mar the longest day.
 And if, perchance, or rather by the will
 Of Him who ruleth all things well, one's laid
 Aside by illness which prevents the mind
 Attending unto aught beside the wants
 Of this frail mortal flesh, how precious 'tis
 Once more to hear their words of peace and truth;
 'Tis like the first sweet songster's notes in spring,
 Or earliest gleam of genial sunshine's rays,
 When winter's cold, dark night has passed away:
 Thus will it be when this life's o'er, when that
 Long life of which my dead compan'ons oft
 Do speak, its endless course has well begun,
 When all disease of body and of mind
 Has been quite cured, and all the springs of life,
 Of pow'r, and thought, are energised from source
 Divine, without the danger or the fear
 That any link will ever snap in twain.

My God-inspired compan'ons, who now lie
 In death's embrace, will then no longer be
 Enchained by that grim foe: in ages past
 Partakers of the sufferings which pertain
 To truth of God, they'll share in age to come
 The glorious throne of His Anointed One,
 And be the brightest gems in that fair crown,
 Devised and wrought by Him whose workmanship
 So far exceeds the puny skill of man

As doth the meanest living flow'r surpass
The golden tinsel of a mortal king ;
And they in turn will be adorned with crowns
Of joy—the fruit of labour carried on
Amid rebuffs and taunts from those who failed
To comprehend their motives and their work ;
Rejoice indeed will they to find that all
Their travail has not been in vain, for by
The mercy and design of Him whom they
Did serve, their words have been preserved for such
Of other days and climes as would receive
With grateful humble hearts their goodly news.
And thus it is that in the latter days
Of Gentile times some seeds of Spirit truth
Have taken root in fruitful soil, and by
The blessing of the Giver of all good
Developed into strong and healthy plants
Which daily thirst for dew and rain from heav'n :
What untold bliss 'twill be for these to make
Acquaintance with companions whom they oft
Have heard, but never seen before, to find
By actual converse, face to face, that all
Their hopes and fears, temptations, sorrows, joys,
Their ard'ous fight—its conquest and mistakes—
Their steep and rugged walk, 'mid mist and gloom,
Their gradual growth in faith and things divine,
Their tasting of th' Almighty's care and love,
Have been exper'enced by their teachers, each
And all before their honored course was run.
What blessed privilege 'twill be to form
A part of such a glorious throng, each one
Of whom has passed beneath the chast'ning rod,
To purify their minds from folly's taint,
And bring them into harmony with Him
Whose nature they will wear for evermore !

J. J. ANDREW.

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

By F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 135.

WAR AND ARMS-BEARING.

WAR on the part of men represents the strife of carnal and opposing interests and ambitions, in which the questions in dispute, or the object to be attained, is sought

to be settled or accomplished in favour of the conquering nation by an appeal to arms.

War from a divine point of view represents the infliction of national judgment and the over-ruling of human animosities in the direction of a fore-declared purpose, the working out of which

meanwhile requires the setting-up of one king and the putting-down of another, until the eventful era has thus been precipitated when the kingdoms of this world shall become the possession of Jehovah's anointed, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

The only defensive armour allowed to saints is that styled by the apostle the "armour of righteousness," or the "armour of light," and the only offensive weapons permitted them during the period of their probation is the "sword of the spirit, which is the word of God."

The kingdom of Christ is not of this *kosmos*, else would his servants fight, but it is a kingdom to come, for which, meanwhile they wait in faith the appointed time when, Christ returned, they will be endowed with power, and receive a commission to "break the nations with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel."—(Rev. ii. 26-8.)

Saints are not at liberty to take part with, or against the potsherds of the earth in carnal strife during the absence of Christ as priest over his own house. During that interregnum, the wicked are the sword of the Lord upon his enemies.

The principles binding upon Christ's brethren in respect of war are defined by Paul in the following words, viz., "We do not war after the flesh," and again, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal," and again, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood."—(2 Cor. x. 3-4; Eph. vi. 12.)

There are two systems of religion in the earth, one represented comprehensively as a "chaste virgin waiting for the appearing and kingdom of the Lord;" and the other symbolically portrayed as a drunken prostitute on the back of a beast." Now, whoever takes the sword joins himself to this harlot ecclesiasticism, whose interests are identical with the political power of the period. But whoever would please Christ stands aloof during his absence from all political objects whatever.

The principles of the brethren of Christ as expressed and enforced in the New Testament require of them the most complete neutrality in all political questions, in all countries of the Gentiles wheresoever they may dwell.

Christ's brethren recognise themselves bound to respect the laws and requirements of the powers that be in all things not in contravention of the law of Christ, of which they only are judges.

The principles of Christadelphians require them to abstain from either promot-

ing or hindering the interests of the constitution further than that may be done by living a peaceable and quiet life, and exhibiting a dutiful and respectful recognition of all the laws and commandments of the state, only excepting such as may require them to take the life of a fellow-creature, or compromise their faithfulness to Christ.

Christ's brethren are not at liberty to avenge themselves; because it is written "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

Saints and faithful brethren are neither at liberty to smite their fellow servants, nor to resist evil, but on the other hand they regard it as their duty to "do good unto all men as they have opportunity," and to pray for those who would despitefully use them and persecute them.

Faithful believers of the "gospel of the kingdom" have no desire to make martyrs of themselves, yet nevertheless they would feel called upon to resist unto death any commandments of man which should require them to violate the law of peaceful and unmolested neutrality, which is the divine statute of their religion.

For Christadelphians to engage in carnal warfare would be to defile their conscience, disobey God, and to render themselves liable to exclusion from eternal life in the kingdom of Christ, and to the pains and penalties of the second death. "They who take the sword shall perish with the sword." (Matt. xxvi. 52.)

The New Testament definition of the position and attitude of Christ's brethren makes it impossible that they can bear arms or go to war, viz., "Ye are not of the world;" again, "If any man smite you on one cheek turn the other also;" and again, "follow peace with all men," and again, such are described as "strangers and pilgrims on the earth."—(1 Pet. ii. 11; Heb. xi. 13; xii. 14; John xv. 19; Luke vi. 29.)

That so called Christians take the sword is due to their entire misunderstanding of the "things concerning the kingdom of God," and hence as a result of that, a complete misapprehension of the practical attitude of gospel believers. In one word, the kingdom of God established on the earth being the divine remedy for all present evil, the enlightened are content to wait for it as the only hope of the nations, in preference to expending useless energy in the upholding and upbuilding of any mere human institutions, seeing they are all destined in due time to be broken

up, that place may be given for the righteous and invincible theocracy of the divine purpose.

Fighting is incompatible with New Testament saintship, and with that character for meekness, forbearance and love for which believers are to be distinguished

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 136.

TEXT ELUCIDATIONS.

Acts xxi. 15.—The term “carriages” in this passage meant baggage at the time the Bible was translated. Carriage, luggage, and baggage were originally synonyms, baggage being that which is bagged, luggage that which was lugged, and carriage that which was carried. Carriage is evidently used also as synonymous with baggage in Judges xviii. 21; 1 Sam. xvii. 22.

2 Sam. xii. 31.—The Hebrew word *beth* which is here translated “under” does not mean under (that is placed beneath), but means *to* (in the sense in which we say in ordinary language, “I put him to the plough,”) the literal meaning is that David put them to saws, and to harrows, and to axes, and to the making of bricks.

Ex. iii. 21, 22.—The Hebrew word here rendered “borrow” signifies to ask, to require, to demand. In the three passages relative to the transaction (iii. 22; xi. 2; xii. 35.) the Septuagint has “shall ask,” and in the two former the Vulgate has “shall demand,” and so indeed it was in the English Bible till 1549.

John xiv. 2.—“The words ‘prepare a place’ is a figure taken from one who goes before his companions on a journey to provide a place to lodge in.

Eph. iv. 22.—“The injunction to ‘put off the old man,’ is an allusion to persons of the drama who change their dress with their character.”

Matt. ix. 36.—The literal translation of this is “all his bowels were agitated and trembled with sympathy and compassion.” The Greek word here used to denote compassion is the most expressive that human language is capable of employing.

Prov. xxv. 11.—“Apples of gold in pictures of silver,” refers to golden-coloured citrons served at table in silver net work baskets.

Phil. iii. 7.—The word rendered ‘loss’ in this passage denotes that loss sustained in storms at sea, when goods on which mariners before set a value are thrown overboard for

the sake of saving the ship and people. The word is so used in Acts xxvii. 21.

Col. ii. 14.—The words “nailing it to his cross” is explained by the fact that laws were so abrogated, a nail being driven through the table on which they were written, and it was hung up to public view.

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 137.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF
LIFE.

A man’s enemies are sometimes more serviceable to him in the true sense than his best friends.

What the world terms wisdom, that God calls foolishness.—(1 Cor. iii. 19.)

The thoughts of reputedly wise men are vain in the estimation of the Almighty.

Many things which are greatly esteemed and appreciated among men are highly abominable in the sight of God.

The audible reading of the Bible may be compared to singing by notes, the words answering to the notes and the meaning and general sense to the tune. A proper reading gives expression to a whole octave of sounds.

Concerning Christ’s mission upon the earth, we have part second to come on yet. The first instalment of the work occupied about 33 years. At another and future advent he is to resume his personal operations amongst men, with a view to the completion of the glorious scheme committed to his execution by the eternal Father; when having put under his feet all the thrones, principalities and powers, he will proceed to the last and crowning work of the thousand years, viz, the abolition of death and every curse.

In the coming times of the Messiah there will be a glorious family gathering as it were of those divine principles and results which will have entered into the working-out and perfecting of the great salvation: then—

Glory like a great king will dwell in the land. Righteousness as the clear shining sun will look down from heaven. Truth like a flower will spring out of the earth. Peace and righteousness will greet each other with a holy kiss. Mercy and truth will meet together to part no more.—(Psalms viii. 5.)

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 138.

WILD HONEY.

"Approach as near as possible to Constantinople and its outskirts. HE WHO SHALL REIGN, THERE WILL BE THE TRUE SOVEREIGN OF THE WORLD."—*Will of Peter the Great.*

Turkey in Europe might be made the garden of the world. It was fair, fertile, fruitful, rich in fruits that were ripened by the sun, rich in treasures of the soil.—*Daily Mail.*

The city of Jerusalem has undergone more sieges than any other in the world. Its first siege is mentioned in Jud. i. 8, about 1400 B. C., and its last and twenty-eighth took place in A. D. 1244. Almost all nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa have trodden Jerusalem under foot.

A prince once asked to be furnished with an evidence of Christianity, but to do so in few words, as he had no time to listen to lengthy arguments. The reply was brief but convincing, "*The Jews*, your majesty."—*Lauge.*

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 139.

BEAUTIES OF THE BIBLE.

Psalms lxxii.—What a magnificent and refreshing picture of Messiah's glorious reign is unfolded in this Psalm. It surely equals all that ever could be desired by any nation. Its great value however, lies in the fact that it is a faithful prophetic outline of the character of the coming age.

Isaiah xl.—What sublime illustrations of Jehovah's greatness are here brought together. The best human genius pales to a sickly glimmer before the virgin purity of inspiration.

Isaiah ix.—How charmingly replete this chapter with the golden beams of righteousness and gladness, which will issue forth from the throne of universal dominion in that blest day, when a conquered world shall bask in the sunshine of undisturbed peace and loving allegiance to the shepherding of Israel.

Prov. xxxi. 10-31.—How admirably the praises of a virtuous queen are set forth here. The time is coming when no other characters shall rule the world.

Prov. xxxi. 1-9.—What a splendid address to a king; the principles exhorted to in this Scripture will be the law of royalty throughout the earth in the coming change.

Ephesians.—Just mark the beautiful alternations of teaching, prayer, thanksgiving, and exhortation, which run through this epistle, and let them put grace in thine heart.

John xiv.—xvii.—What a divine speech this passover address of Christ: how replete with comfort, how faithfully persecution is unveiled, how tenderly their coming bereavement of his company is portrayed, and what sweet assurances of another comforter, and what a pure and parting commendation of them to the Father, concludes one of the sublimest utterances in any language.

Isaiah xxxv.—What a sweet hymn of gladness rises here; how incomparably grand to contemplate the day when the ransomed children of Jacob shall be jubilant before the Lord, and when excellency and strength, holiness and redemption, joy, singing, and godly courage shall for ever take the place of trembling submission to present evil.

Matt. v.—vii.—Whatever man since the earth stood spake like the man who uttered the discourse on the Mount; the people might well be astonished at his doctrine, and they will be yet more astounded when the precepts therein inculcated become the universal admiration and practice of all men, as they assuredly will be in the coming triumph of Christ in the earth.

Job xxxviii., xli.—What a solemn indictment of creature capacity we have here: who can stand before God? Who amongst the sons of the mighty can answer Him? or, who may reply to the four-score notes of interrogation in this speech of the Almighty? How little is man, and how vain the tumult of his words; listen, Jehovah speaks—"Be still and know that I am God."

IS IT PERMISSIBLE TO BELIEVERS TO BEAR ARMS?

Notes from a Lecture at the Christadelphian Synagogue, Rochester, New York.

By A. SINTZENICH.

THERE seems to be a leaning on the part of some in favour of the offices and political honours, and consequent responsibilities of Cæsar's institutions. I therefore send you a few notes on the subject of war, seeing that it has now again broken out in Europe, and Christadelphians may be called upon to bear arms. Certainly, if it is right to hold political offices and honours under human governments, it follows that those who do so, cannot consistently refuse to support them by arms, if necessary.

The advocacy and support of war as a duty, demanded of the Christian believer, is something which must be regarded by Christadelphians as a startling inconsistency. How can those who profess the faith of the gospel, and have put on the name of the Son of God, and become followers of the Prince of Peace, professing a religion whose ultimate aim and purpose is the establishment of permanent peace over all the earth—lend their connivance, if not active support to a war system that contradicts every one of its peculiar principles and occasions even in time of peace an amount of evil, crime and suffering, which no arithmetic can fully compute? Let us examine these positions, and see how far they stand justified by that word of God, which is truth, and liveth and abideth always, and which is given to us as our only rule of faith and practice.

When Jesus was born, "a multitude" of the heavenly host sang, "Glory to God in the highest, on EARTH PEACE, GOOD-WILL toward men." This is the official interpretation of Messiah, in His moral teaching and mission which was, always has, and now builds up the "new creature" in holiness in the Christ. It is the ultimate, and the "end to the means" of the Christ as "a man of war." These tidings of great joy it is the duty of his brethren to accept as a condition of His teaching, and an incipient fulfilment of the promises uttered seven centuries before by Isaiah and Micah: "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" This is the doctrine of the new covenant,

which we are in and under. It is our law, our faith, our life; and ought to be the guiding principle of our actions. It is God-like; it is to us peace and righteousness through the gospel, to all men—our brethren and sisters especially. How, then, can the brethren of the Prince of Peace countenance or endorse a war system, which although endorsed, approved, and blessed by the apostate christianity of the day—is a libel on the religion of Jesus; a system which so far from preaching "peace on earth and good-will to men," spends, according to good authorities, not less than a thousand millions of dollars every year, and drags into its service 5,000,000 men to sustain a system of human bloodshed, but little less revolting than the abominations of paganism.

Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, exhorts his brethren to "follow peace with ALL MEN, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord . . . looking diligently lest any root of bitterness springing up, trouble you, and thereby many be defiled." Lest any professed believers should so far nullify this sound injunction of apostolic teaching, and depart from the essence and simplicity of truth as to become advocates of, or command as a duty, the support of human governments by force of arms, or mere brute force—taking the lives of their fellow-men with whom they are commanded to be at peace—it becomes us to examine these words of the apostle and to ascertain by the light of the word what the Deity really enjoins as duty, on those who desire to live in all godliness and fear, looking for that great day, even the coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus "anointed," who "shall render in the body to every man according to the deeds done." The lawfulness of a brother of Christ bearing arms ought to be to him a subject of serious investigation, inasmuch as I believe it involves a violation and denial of the injunction to "follow peace with all men and holiness;" nay more, it involves a violation and stultification of all that constitutes Christian character.

In the two great divisions of mankind from the immediate posterity of Adam to the present time, designated in Scripture as the sons of God and the sons of men—

the former class never took upon themselves, unless under the immediate direction of Deity—the liberty to avenge and redress wrongs or injuries by physical means and brute force, but on the contrary, left the wickedness, violence and wrong-doing of their enemies to the judgment and arbitration of Jehovah. A true son of Deity has always recognised that great truth that men are now so slow to comprehend: “*Vengeance is Mine, and I will repay, saith the Lord.*” On the other hand, nations and individuals uninstructed in the Divine teaching and disobedient thereto, have assumed to so take “the sword of justice” into *their own* hands, and rectify their wrongs by shedding innocent blood, punishments, fines and penalties. The first advocate of this doctrine of whom we have any account in the Scripture is recorded in the 4th chapter of Genesis (read verses 1-15). It appears that Cain, because God had respect to Abel’s offering in preference to his own, became wrathful to his brother, and his “countenance fell,” though he had been expressly told by Jehovah that if he, Cain, “did well” he should be accepted, “And if thou doest not well sin lieth at the door.” But Cain, like our modern “Christian” war advocates, was not content to leave his fancied grievances to Deity, and look to Him for redress. Like them, he thought he must take up the “sword of justice,” and avenge his supposed wrongs; and so this executioner of the fleshly or human will, in opposition to God’s will, became at once a “war Christian;” or, in plain words, in executing human ideas of justice and right, he became the *first murderer*; and from this beginning has proceeded that dire principle of vengeance and retaliation, called the war power or power of the sword, which has swept on in its insane fury, till it has fairly dyed the earth with the blood of its inhabitants.

Again we find Jehovah moved to destroy man from the earth by a deluge. What for? Because, says the Spirit, “The earth was corrupt before God; all flesh had corrupted His way upon the earth; the earth is filled with *violence* through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.” But to Noah Jehovah said “Come thou, and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.” Yet, even to this righteous man and his sons, Jehovah immediately on his going forth from the ark, commanded “At the hand of every man’s brother will I require the *life*

of man.” Now mark the words which follow, without any qualification or reservation whatever: “*WHOSOEVER sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man; for HE will give the wicked to the sword.*”

The advocates of war as a Christian duty, cite us the case of the four kings against five (Gen. xiv.), in which Lot was taken a prisoner. These were Gentile or heathen nations (and all Gentile nations and governments are heathenish in their very nature). It is the first instance of the use of arms by the sons of God; for we are told that “When Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his house (318), and pursued them unto Dan, and he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobah, which is on the left-hand of Damascus. And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot and his goods, and the women also, and the people.”

Now, on what principle was it that Abraham thus “armed,” and “smote” the enemies of God—heathens—whom Paul has photographed mentally to us when he says, “When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and *changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, four-footed beasts, &c.* And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do things that are not convenient, being filled with all unrighteousness, full of envy, murder, implacable; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” But, why in the providence of God was Abram allowed to arm and smite? Was it to avenge private injury? Was it to sustain or maintain Gentile governments? Deity had determined that Lot should be saved from the destruction that was shortly to overtake the kingdoms of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Lot being in captivity, it was necessary that he should be rescued in order that the miraculous interposition of God might be manifested in the destruction of these wicked nations, “for the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and their

sin is very grievous." "And Abram got up early in the morning, in the place where he stood before the Lord; and he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace; and it came to pass when God destroyed the cities of the plain that God remembered Abram, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when He overthrew the cities where Lot dwelt." Had Lot remained a prisoner in the hands of the hostile kings, he could not have been the recipient of God's subsequent mercy and salvation from death; and thus Abram in "arming," and "smiting," became a commissioned servant of the Most High, wielding the sword as "a terror to the evil-doers," God being his director—but on no account on his own behalf, authority, responsibility, or for private or public aggrandisement.

We now come to that portion of the Scriptures chiefly dwelt on and most often quoted to sustain the practice of war, viz., the wars of Israel. It is true that Israel did as a nation bear arms and fight—that they did in taking possession of their land, drive out and decimate the nations in whose possession it then was.

It is also matter of divine record that the people of Israel did maintain offensive and defensive wars against the surrounding nations. Moses, their chosen leader of God, inflicted the ten plagues on Egypt, Joshua, his successor, did marah God's people as *men of war* into the promised land; Shamgar did kill 600 Philistines with an ox goad; Deborah and Barak did defeat the Canaanites; Gideon with 300 men defeated the Midianites; Jephtha the Ammonites, and became a judge or ruler in Israel; Samson slew 1,000 Philistines with the jawbone of an ass; David subdued the Philistines, Moabites, and others, and extended his dominions to the Euphrates on the east, the Red Sea on the south; Lebanon on the north. Then we have the wars of Judah and Israel:—Asa defeated Zerah king of Ethiopia with a million of men, Ben-hadad, king of Syria was repulsed by Israel; Sennacherib invaded Judah; the ten tribes were carried into an armed captivity, Judah was likewise humbled; Jerusalem was taken, its people led into captivity and the covenanted land of promise became a Roman province, and the nationality of Israel destroyed. Upon these historical facts of the Old Testament Scriptures that Israel was an armed and warlike people, modern so-called "Chris-

tians" seek to justify the use of arms and the practice of war. In reality this is no justification at all, and the precedent is entirely inapplicable. The people of Israel had a *national covenant from and with God* given to that people exclusively, and to no others, empowering them to establish themselves as *God's chosen nation*, and the custodians and instruments of His revealed will on the earth; hence it was necessary that they should be commissioned to use physical force to carry into effect the purpose of God through their instrumentality, surrounded as they were by idolatrous and heathen nations, who were utterly inaccessible, as their modern copyist, to any other argument but the sword. Let it be also remembered that when their existence as a nation ceased by reason of disobedience to God, their war-power ceased with it. Again, if we seek to justify war because of Israel's example, we must on the same principle conform to all the institutions of the Mosaic law, sacrifices and all. If one part is binding the whole must be, and this would show us to be not under grace but law. The fact is no part of the Jewish laws and customs are applicable to a people like the Christadelphians, possessing no nationality, but who are called out *from among nations*, scattered in all the habitable, enduring tribulation, unpopularity and contumely for the truth's sake.

It has been well observed that if we look at the wars of Israel in the same light as other miraculous displays of divine power as attestations of the purpose, the power and the supremacy of God, we shall find no example for imitation, when the nations of the earth, "not liking to retain God in their knowledge," had devised each to itself false gods of wood, stone, &c., Deity in His own wise purpose saw fit to raise up a "people to His name," by and through whom to manifest His purposes, power and perfection; and the history of these ages is handed down to us for our instruction and profit. David fought with Goliath who defied the armies of the *living God* and cursed Him in the name of his gods; and he succeeded by the Divine power. Shall we find in this a reason for renewing the ordeal? Samson, by miracle, slew the Philistines when their champions set the power of the God of Israel at defiance. It is simply absurd, as well as unscriptural, to refuse to recognise the difference between Divine and human agencies.

The wars of Israel were not all of

Divine approbation. When Israel, through Samuel, desired a king who should go before them and fight their battles (1 Sam. viii. 20), Jehovah was displeased, and He said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but Me, that I should not reign over them." They rejected the Divine leadership in war and peace; and trusting in their own physical strength, their wars proved disastrous, and the most tremendous of all military disasters culminated at the destruction of their capital city and their national dispersion for their rejection of Deity. While the direction of their military operations was expressly reserved by God, their individual duty to strangers and foreigners in their law was one of kindness: "Ye know the heart of a stranger; be kind to a stranger." "The stranger that sojourneth among you shall be as one of your own people, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

The example of Israel affords no license for modern warfare. God, in this case, used it in accomplishing His purposes just as He can properly do many things which are not permitted to us. The wars of Israel were made the means of permanent good—but the result was not due in any case to man, *per se*, any more than the beneficent results of our Lord's crucifixion are due to the wickedness that betrayed him or to the guilt of our first parents by rendering, by their disobedience, such an event or process necessary for the salvation of our race. Rather let us enlarge our minds and the nobility of our faith by remembering the nobler inspirations of the prophets of that Israel whose every aspiration is in harmony with the teachings of Jesus, "Peace and goodwill to men." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for those which despitefully use you and persecute you." "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." "Then said Jesus unto him. Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall *perish with the sword*." "And when ye stand praying, forgive if ye have aught against any." "My kingdom is not of this age; if my kingdom were of this age, then would my servants fight." The teaching of the apostles is equally emphatic and condemnatory; hear it: "Recompense to no man evil for evil—live peaceably with all men. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour. Follow after the things which make for peace. As we have, therefore,

opportunity let us do good unto all men. When angry, sin not; let not the sun go down on your wrath. Be patient to all men; see that none render evil for evil to any man. The servants of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men; apt to teach, patient. The wrath of men worketh not the righteousness of God. Where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these . . . hatred, variances, wrath, strife, murders and they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God; but the fruit of the Spirit is *love, joy, long-suffering, gentleness, &c.*" "Finally, brethren, farewell, be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace and the God of love and peace shall be with you." Space forbids any further quotation of the divine testimony. It is abounding, convincing, and conclusive. Please therefore turn to your Bibles and carefully ponder the following, which is given for our guidance and instruction that we may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works.—(Matt. v. 2, 46, vii. 12; Luke vi. 27, 36; Matt. xxii. 35-40; xxvi. 51-52; Mark xi. 25-26; John xviii. 36; Luke xxiii. 33-34; Rom. xii. 9-21; xiii. 8-10; xiv. 17-19; Gal. v. 14-22; vi. 9-10; Eph. iv. 1, 32; Col. iii. 8, 14; 1 Thess. v. 14-15; 2 Tim. ii. 24-25; James i. 19-20; iii. 13, 18; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

We trust we have by its own testimony vindicated the word of God from the responsibility of countenancing this twin-sister of idolatry and paganism. War in all its bearings is nothing more, nothing less, than legalised murder, and is so repugnant to every principle of the gospel that the very mention of it should be a loathing to every Christadelphian, and bring the tinge of shame to the cheeks of any who would so pollute the teachings of our redeemer by either advocacy or apologising for its abominations. Think of these sad facts of man's abuse and misgovernment of the sword. Think of the terrible fact that 6,860,000,000 of men have perished by battle on our globe, seven times as many as its present population, and in our own day and in our own country* it is estimated that over 1,000,000 of men perished in the late civil war. Many such facts and figures might be given to exhibit in all its hideousness this monstrous moral deformity a fallen world, but time forbids.

In conclusion, can any intelligent Christadelphian countenance or have any part in a system so entirely antagonistic to

and so effectually nullifying of those God-given and peaceful injunctions of the spirit of righteousness and mercy which we have read to-night? I ask, in all truth and candour, can we harmonize the two systems? If not, let us obey God, rather than man at all sacrifice, and put away from us the profession and very name of the military principle. It is a blot on the Christian profession and a defiance of the teachings and commandments of Christ and his apostles. History tells us that none of the early churches, unless they were disobedient or anti-Christ, ever departed from the one faith. On this point our duty is plain. Our profession is faith in a gospel of peace and goodwill to all alike—brother or sister—alien or enemy. Let us become more deeply imbued with the spirit of love in the ecclesia, in our families, in the world, everywhere. Let us in our private and public duties manifest the principles of goodwill and peace and love, just as we do the great principles of faith and repentance. "Love not the world (*kosmos*) nor the things that are in the world (*kosmos*). If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds, that ye may prove what is that good, acceptable, and perfect will of God." Let us walk in the path of the anointed of God, and we shall learn to keep ourselves aloof from all the abominations of men in their civil and ecclesiastical developments. We shall then be able to bless them that curse and injure us, and do good to them who hate and spitefully use us. If we would be the children of our Father, we must walk even as Jesus walked. "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?" May we all be so effectually engrafted into the true vine that we may always and at all times show forth the fruits of the spirit—love, joy, peace, long-suffering, meekness, gentleness, goodness," &c. If we have this spirit, it will not be so difficult to love our enemies—not only the household of faith but the vast mass of mankind around us, who in their present condition are without

hope and God in the world. These we should show our love to by striving to bring them to the obedience of the gospel, that believing and obeying the same, they may be made nigh unto God through the blood of Christ, always remembering that God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, that whosoever believeth might not perish, but receive that everlasting life, even the anointing of Holy Spirit substance, through and with the Prince of Peace, who will shortly return to our earth to administer to fallen man a divine government which shall eventually speak peace to the nations—who shall fill the earth with the knowledge of *Yahweh* as the waters cover the sea. Then shall nation not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they *learn war any more*. And John, in a vision, describing this heavenly government, says, "And I have heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold the tabernacle (dwelling place, as in the typical temple of Solomon,) of God is with men, and He will dwell with them and they shall be His people, and God, *Himself*, shall be with them, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither *sorrow* nor *crying*, neither shall there be any more *pain*, for the former things (the governments of the world, with their armies and institutions) have passed away." "He that overcometh (the world and the flesh) shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful and *unbelieving*, and the abominable, and *MURDERERS*, (legal or otherwise, life-takers) shall have their part in the second death." Lord of all, heavenly Father, in the name of Jesus, help us to understand and to do Thy will more perfectly, so that as Thy children we may day by day, in peace, and with peace and love to all, pray to Thee, "Thy kingdom come, and Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven," and finally when all the trials and sorrows of this life are ended, bring us into that everlasting kingdom of Thine, where peace and righteousness shall for ever find a dwelling place, and Thy glorious character and name shall fill the whole earth from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, and to Thy great name shall be the praise. Amen.

SIN; ITS ORIGIN, EFFECTS AND DESTRUCTION.

WE now come to the subject of the
DESTRUCTION OF SIN.

This may also be termed "the taking away of sin," or "the putting away of sin." Either of these expressions is quite scriptural: for John the Baptist, pointing to Jesus, said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the sin of the world," and the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 26) says that Christ "appeared to *put away* sin by the sacrifice of himself." The word *destroy* is also applied to this subject in two passages already quoted (Heb. ii. 14; 1 John iii. 8), and, being more emphatic and comprehensive, is perhaps more appropriate in a reference to the subject as a whole.

The principal question for consideration is, Did Christ by his death put away sin as a moral, or as a physical thing? that is to say, Did he simply bear away the sins of others in a figurative manner by having them imputed to him, or did he put away sin as a physical thing—meaning by physical sin what we have already defined in our previous remarks? And in looking at this question we cannot do better than refer to the animal sacrifices offered up under the law of Moses (as well as in previous dispensations), seeing that they were types of Christ's sacrifice. When an Israelite had sinned, and brought a sacrifice to be offered as an atonement for his sin, he placed his hand on the head of the animal before it was slain. For instance, in the commands given respecting a sin-offering for a priest, we read, in Leviticus iv. 3, 4, that he was to bring "a young bullock without blemish; . . . and he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; *and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the Lord.*" In the same chapter, in the injunctions respecting the offering of a bullock for a sin of ignorance on the part of "the whole congregation" (verse 13), we read (verse 15), "*And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord: and the bullock shall be killed before the Lord.*" The significance of this act will be apparent

from the directions in reference to the scapegoat: "And Aaron shall *lay both his hands upon the head* of the live goat, and *confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel*, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat*, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and *the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities* into a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."—(Lev. xvi. 21, 22.) From this passage we see that the putting of the hands upon the head of the sacrifice signified the transference of the transgressions of the individual or community to the sacrifice. Of course as a matter of fact this could not actually be done, for it is impossible to transfer an act to a person or animal: it was only a figurative ceremony, and derived all its efficacy from the fact that God had been pleased to appoint it, and to attach a certain significance to the act, that significance being that the sin was imputed to the animal, and therefore the effects of, or the penalty for, the sin were executed upon the sacrifice instead of upon the sinner. The sinner by the ceremony in effect said: "I have committed a sin worthy of death, I acknowledge my guilt before God, and I avail myself of the means He has graciously appointed for obtaining the forgiveness of my sin, by bringing this animal, and yielding it up to death, that by its suffering the penalty to which I have rendered myself liable, I may escape the infliction of that penalty." When an offering was made for a sin of the congregation, the elders—probably one out of each tribe—in effect said the same thing on behalf of, and as the representatives of, the congregation; and, in the case of the scapegoat, the high priest did the same thing as the representative of the nation.

Now the question is, Did Christ by his sacrifice put away sin in this way? and, even if he did, was it in no other sense? Let the apostle answer: "For the law having a *shadow* of good things to come, and *not the very image* of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect."—(Heb. x. i.) We have it here, on Divine authority,

that the law was only a shadow of the things to come afterwards, and not the very image of them; and observe that this statement is made specially in connection with the subject of sacrifices, and that the apostle proceeds immediately afterwards to contrast the Mosaic sacrifices with the sacrifice of Christ. Now a "shadow" or figure is that which represents something else of a *higher* character, not something on the same level: a shadow only gives a *general* idea of the form of the object of which it is the shadow, not an exact representation of it. We must therefore, in considering the taking-away of sin by Christ, look for something, in the mode of taking it away, of a higher character than in the case of the animal sacrifices. We shall find these elements in this passage, for the apostle continues: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. *Wherefore* when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, [that is, of the kind hitherto offered: see verses 8-10] but *a body hast thou prepared me*: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) *to do Thy will, O God.*"—(Heb. x. 4-7.) Here we have two features set forth in regard to Christ as a sacrifice, which were absent in the animal sacrifices, viz., obedience, and "a body prepared." The animals could not *obey*, having no moral or sufficiently intellectual faculties; and they were not specially *prepared*, as was the case with Christ: they were not made in the same nature as those who had sinned. For these two reasons, "the blood of bulls and of goats" could not take away sins. We may notice, in passing, that it was not that God had "no pleasure" in *any* kind of sacrifice: it was only that He had no pleasure in those "which are offered by the law" (verse 8), in comparison with the greater sacrifice to come; and hence, although "He taketh away the first," it is "that he may establish the second," (verse 9); and so "we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ."—(Verse 10.) "The first" were imperfect in their operation; therefore "the second" was provided. But if the second took away sin in only the same way as the first, viz., figuratively, by bearing the transgressions in an imputed sense, how could

"the second" take away sin better than "the first," and what need for alteration in the sacrifice? It must be evident, then, that Christ put away sin in some other way, and the clue to that way is to be found in what was stated in the first part of the present article, viz., in the fact that sin in the flesh had become an element of human nature—a physical thing—and that Jesus was made in precisely the same nature (Heb. ii. 14, 17), and therefore possessed sin as a physical thing, though entirely free from it morally. Being in this nature, he could put away the sin-nature by means of the "body prepared." The animals put away sin figuratively or imputatively; Christ put it away physically. They were the shadow; he was the substance. They only sufficed to put away sin typically; in Christ God went to the root of the matter, and destroyed that which is the *cause* of transgression and death, viz., sin in the flesh. Sin in the flesh produces transgression and death; and this, to our mind, is the reason why the sin-nature needed to be put away as the basis for forgiveness and redemption.

The principle of the plan upon which redemption is effected through Christ may be briefly stated thus: Christ was made in sinful flesh, which was under condemnation to death, and hence his death was necessary on that account. Having died, the law of sin and death had obtained all it could exact of him, and then, because of his righteousness, he was raised from the dead. He was thus freed from the power death had had over him through sin, and the power of sin and death was thereby destroyed in him. On the basis of this, others may obtain the same benefits by association with him: they may now obtain the forgiveness of sins (which is necessary in order to introduce them to the favour of God), and the removal of the condemnation resting on them; and, afterwards, at his appearing, they may obtain actual (physical) deliverance from the power of sin and death.

Let us now turn to several passages of Scripture, in which the putting-away of sin by Christ is described as a physical thing:—

Rom. viii. 3: "God . . . condemned *sin in the flesh.*"

Heb. ii. 14: Through death Christ destroyed *the devil.*

Rom. vi. 6: *The body of sin* was destroyed.

In these passages, sin is said to have been condemned or destroyed as a physical thing. There is another class of passages, however, in which *sins*—the sins of others—are spoken of as being borne by Christ, viz. :—

Isaiah liii. 6: "The Lord hath *laid on him* the iniquity of us all."

Heb. ix. 28: "Christ was once offered to *bear the sins of many*."

1 Pet. ii. 24: "Who his own self *bare our sins* in his own body on the tree."

1 John iii. 5: "Ye know that he was manifested to *take away our sins*; and in him is no sin."

These two classes of passages, however, though they may appear, on a superficial view, to teach different things, can be perfectly harmonised, and each put in its proper place in the scheme of redemption. The passages in the first category describe what Christ did actually in relation to himself; those in the second describe the effect of his work in relation to others. We will look first at those which speak of sin as being put away physically, and we shall find that it was put away physically in Christ as the basis for its being put away morally and physically in others.

Rom. viii. 3: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God [did] sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (*margin: by a sacrifice for sin*) *condemned sin in the flesh*." It has been suggested that this means that God condemned sin in the flesh of others, that is, that by the death of His Son. He condemned the sinfulness of others. This, however, had already been done, by the messages God had sent through the prophets and Christ, and it had been done *practically* by the righteous life of Christ, as it had been previously, though less perfectly, by the prophets and others; for example, in Heb. xi. 7, it is said: "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; *by the which he condemned the world*, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Noah, by his obedience to God, irrespective of his preaching, condemned his contemporaries, and in like manner have the prophets, and all who have served God by their very actions condemned the

conduct of the disobedient; and most of all was this done by Christ during his life. But this was simply a moral condemnation. It was not necessary for him to die in order to condemn his contemporaries or, in other words, to condemn their sin—morally. Moreover, what necessity was there, in order to condemn sin morally, that the one in whom it was to be condemned should be made in the likeness of *sinful* flesh? Surely any other kind of flesh would have answered the purpose, so long as he had obeyed God; but here we have the fact stated in such close connection with the condemnation of sin, that we can only conclude the sinful flesh to be a matter of necessity to that condemnation. And, if it was to be condemned physically in him, we can see the reason for his being made in sinful flesh. Therefore, it must have been physical condemnation—the destruction of the power of sin in the flesh. Its destruction was effected in Christ in this way: God allowed it, so to speak, to have all it could claim of him in his being brought into the death-state, and then, on account of his righteousness, He raised him from the dead without any violation of His law. Thus sin had power over him, but as he was released from its power without any violation of law, that power was destroyed. Moreover, as sin has not yet been physically condemned—its power destroyed—in any but Christ, the sin in the flesh condemned by his death could only have been in relation to himself. He is the only one in whom this has been accomplished, and, as sin in the flesh has had its power destroyed in him, it must first have had that power in him, as otherwise it could not have been destroyed: there would have been nothing to condemn or destroy. In that case, it would simply amount to putting him to death, without there being any necessity for death in him, and then releasing him—a mere matter of form. Unless sin in the flesh was really a reason for his death, it was not destroyed by his being raised from the dead. But in the light of the conclusion that sin in the flesh had the power of death in Jesus personally, the matter is perfectly clear. We see that his resurrection was, so to speak, effected legally, that is, in strict harmony with God's law, viz., because of His righteousness; and, on the above conclusion, we

see that his death also was brought about on what (for want of a better phrase) we may term a legal principle. Sin obtained a temporary victory over him, bruising him in the heel, but he obtained a complete victory over it, bruising it in the head, in being raised from the dead, no more to return to corruption; and death, and therefore sin, have now no more dominion over him.

Let us now consider the connection in this passage between the condemnation of sin in the flesh and our redemption. The Apostle says that God "condemned sin in the flesh, *that* the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us."—(Rom. viii. 3, 4.) The righteousness of the law is fulfilled in believers *imputatively*, that is, by Christ's righteousness being imputed to them, and their sins being forgiven. These two things may be illustrated by the two most prominent features in the Mosaic system, the priests; the offering of the sacrifices of types, viz., the sacrifices and typifying the carrying-out of the law on Christ, on the basis of which, (in conjunction with his resurrection, &c.,) the forgiveness of sins is sought and granted, and the clothing of the priests typifying the clothing of believers with the righteousness of Christ. Both these things may be included in the righteousness of the law which is fulfilled in believers; and, in having their sins forgiven and being clothed with the righteousness of Christ, they are justified morally, and receive a title to be completely freed from the power of sin and death physically, as Christ has already been. Now, as the apostle says, that "God condemned sin in the flesh *that* [*i.e.*, in order that] the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," it is equivalent to saying that our redemption is effected *on the basis* of the condemnation of sin in the flesh of Christ. Of course the righteousness of Christ was the first thing necessary, and without that God could not (on His principles of operation) have condemned sin in him physically; but the condemnation of sin, or the destruction of the power of sin and death in him physically, was the climax of his mission, and it is on the basis of that completed work that the redemption of others is effected. He obtained a complete victory over it in himself, thus laying a basis for vanquishing it in others.

Hebrews ii. 14, 15: "Forasmuch then

as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." We have already seen that the devil destroyed by Christ was *sin in the flesh*. He destroyed it by his death; therefore the sin he put away by his death was *physical*. He did this as the basis for the deliverance of others: see the connection between verses 14 and 15: "that he might destroy . . . the devil, and deliver them" &c. He delivered others, not by suffering a condemnation due to others, and which had no hold on himself, but he was a partaker of flesh and blood—the nature of those he was to redeem—because the devil or sin in the flesh has the power of death over flesh and blood, so that *he* might come under the power of the devil and death; and, having died and been raised from the dead, its power in him has been destroyed, and he is able to deliver those who become associated with him in the appointed way. Here again, then, the destruction of physical sin in Christ is represented as the basis for the deliverance of others from its power. Hence we see the necessity for his being in precisely the same physical condition as others. That necessity, however, is inexplicable apart from the doctrine for which we are contending. Hence it has been said more than once by those who have opposed that doctrine, and who have denied the existence of sin in the flesh, or that Jesus was under condemnation—whether by attributing to him a "free life," or by denying the condemnation of the race of which he was a member—it has, we say, been admitted by some of such, that so far as the taking away of sin was concerned, (*i.e.*, apart from the prophecies which required that the Saviour should be one of the race, such as that he should be the seed of Abraham and David), there was no necessity for him to be born of a woman, and to be a member of the Adamic race—that a being created direct from the ground, such as Adam, would have answered the purpose equally well. And, indeed, this admission is perfectly consistent with a denial of the foregoing doctrine, being a logical result of the theory that there is no such thing as sin in the flesh, and that the sin that Christ

took away was not "the body of sin," but only the actual sins of others. That this is the logical result of that doctrine, however, must be almost its greatest condemnation in the eyes of those who have so far apprehended the teaching of the divine oracles as to see that even simply in regard to the taking away of sin it was an essential feature of the divine plan of redemption that the Saviour should be "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), and that he should "be made like unto his brethren" "in all things."—(Heb. ii. 17.)

Rom. vi. 6, 7: "Our *old man* is crucified with him, that the *body of sin* might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." This passage, which is a very forcible one even as it stands in the Common Version, is still more so in the light of three other translations which we here append. First, Dean Alford, in his translation of the New Testament, renders it thus: "Our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, in order that we might no longer be in bondage to sin. For he that hath died hath been set free from sin." Second, Sharp's Translation, which reads thus: "Our former man was crucified with him, that the sinful body might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not be slaves to sin." Third, *The Emphatic Diaglott*: "Our old man was crucified with him, so that the body of sin may be rendered powerless, that we may no longer be enslaved to sin; for he who died has been justified from sin." We might adduce confirmatory evidence of the correctness of the rendering "was crucified,"—which is the chief point for which we quote these translations,—but as they all agree on that point, the foregoing will be sufficient. We would ask our readers, before proceeding further, to read the whole passage from which this verse is quoted,—say from verse 1 to 10, as they will then more readily apprehend our argument.

Now here is a destruction of the *body of sin*, and that as the result of the crucifixion of the "old man." In Colossians iii. 9, which has been already quoted in reference to sin in the flesh, we read of "the old man with his deeds." The old man and the deeds are distinct; therefore the old man cannot be the same as the deeds, and must be either the

sinful nature or sin in the flesh. The phrase "old man" refers not to individuals *as such*, but is applied in a comprehensive manner to the flesh or sin in the flesh, of which *all* are partakers. Hence the statement "our old man was crucified with him," means that in the crucifixion of Christ the sin nature or sin in the flesh was crucified, and as all those to whom the Apostle was writing were also partakers of that nature, he says "our old man [our nature] was crucified with him." And then he states the object of this crucifixion of the nature: "that the body of sin might be destroyed." The matter is stated in another way in verses 7 and 10. In verse 7, "For he that is dead is freed from sin;" or "he that hath died hath been set free (or justified) from sin." This clearly refers to Christ. Now Christ was never set free from sin morally, for he was never under its power in that sense, but he was physically, and, having been freed from it by his death, and raised from the dead, he is not now in bondage to sin. Verse 10, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Or, according to Alford, "For the death that he died, he died unto sin once; but the life that he liveth he liveth unto God." *Diaglott*: "For [the death] which he died, he died by sin once; but [the life] which he lives, he lives by God." Christ's death was "by" or "unto" sin, and thus he was freed or justified from it, and it has no further claim on him, and, having been raised from the dead, he has been "justified in the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii. 16) by change to spirit-nature.

The condition upon which others may obtain a title to the redemption to which Christ has attained is clearly stated in this passage, viz., by submitting to a symbolic death, burial, and resurrection. In Gal. iii. 27, the Apostle says: "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." This induction into Christ confers upon the subjects of the ceremony many titles or positions which pertain to Christ: they become "Abraham's seed," (Gal. iii. 29,) "children of God," (Gal. iii. 26,) "circumcised," (Col. ii. 11, 12,) spiritual Israelites, "the seed of the woman," and so forth. In like manner they become figuratively dead and resurrected, as the apostle says in the passage before us: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptised into

Jesus Christ were baptised into his death? Therefore we are *buried with him* by baptism *into death*."—(Rom. vi. 3, 4.) Again, verse 8: "Now if we be dead with Christ," or, according to Alford and *The Emphatic Diaglott*, "If we *died* with Christ." The teaching of these verses is that those who are immersed into Christ are considered to have died *with him*, that is, died in him as their federal head. Moreover, as their symbolic burial in water necessarily involves a symbolic resurrection from that watery grave, so they are also looked upon as having risen with him on the same federal principle. They could not each be redeemed by dying as he did, for, having no perfect personal righteousness of their own, there would in that case be no resurrection for them; and so he dies, and rises from the dead, and they, being associated with him by being immersed in a similitude of his death and resurrection, they obtain a title to the benefits to be obtained by his death and resurrection. Hence the apostle says (verse 5), "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the *likeness of his resurrection*," and (verse 8), "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also *live with him*." The apostle further carries out the figure, in the 4th verse and in the 11th verse and onwards, where he exhorts them to walk in newness of life on account of the favor extended towards them in Christ: he exhorts them, in effect, to foreshadow in the present that real new spirit-life to which they hoped to attain in the future. In Col. iii. 9, 10, he writes in the same strain: "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have *put off the old man* with his deeds, and *have put on the new man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." Men "put off the old man" figuratively, in having their federal relationship with Adam severed, and their sins washed away, and they at the same time figuratively "put on the new man" by being immersed into Christ, and thus being clothed with his righteousness as a garment. The figure is based on what Christ has done *in fact*, viz., put off the old man, the flesh, the sin-nature, and put on the new man, the spirit-nature.

We thus see that there are two features in the apostle's argument in the 6th chapter of Romans: the actual and the figurative, and that between the two there is the most intimate connection.

1. The actual—in relation to Christ. Our old man was crucified with Christ; he has died unto sin; he has been freed or justified from sin; the body of sin has been destroyed in him; he has been raised from the dead, and freed from the power of death, so that death has no more dominion over him. In short, he has put off the old man, the flesh, and put on the new man, the spirit.

2. The figurative—in relation to believers. They die, are buried, and rise from the dead, symbolically, and thereby die unto sin, and obtain the forgiveness of their sins, or are "freed (or justified) from sin" morally, and, their condemnation being thereby removed, (Rom. viii. 1, 2,) they are henceforth not "in bondage to sin" (as Alford gives it). In short, they "put off the old man" Adam, and "put on the new man" Christ Jesus.

Thus those who are immersed into the name of Christ do in figure what Christ has done in fact, and thereby become heirs to—and, if they keep their connection intact, will ultimately attain to—the benefits he has actually obtained by his death and resurrection, that is, they will have the body of sin destroyed in them,—including a resurrection from the dead if they die,—they will be "freed from sin" physically, and be completely freed from the power of death. But all this is on the basis of what Christ has done actually, as will be seen by observing the connection between verses 5 and 6: "knowing this," &c. and again between verses 8 and 9: "knowing that," &c. Their expectation of being "planted in the likeness of his resurrection"—that is, obtaining a real resurrection to eternal life—is based on the fact of the destruction of the body of sin in him; and their hope that they will "live with him" is based on the fact that "Christ . . . dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him."

Our exposition of Hebrews ii. 14 and Romans vi. 6 appears to be confirmed by what seems to us a somewhat remarkable parallel between the two passages, for not only is the substance of them the same, but the very terms used, although the phraseology differs, appear almost exactly to correspond in meaning. This will be best manifested by placing the passages in parallel columns, first as a whole, and then in detail; thus:—

"Forasmuch then "Knowing this, as the children are that our old man is partakers of flesh and (*was*) crucified with

blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."—(Heb. ii. 14, 15.)

him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve [or "be in bondage to"] sin.—(Rom. vi. 6.)

ANALYSIS.

"flesh and blood"	"old man."
"through (his) death"	"crucified with him."
"him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," (sin in the flesh.)	"the body of sin."
"might destroy."	"might be destroyed."
"deliver them who . . . were subject to bondage."	"that henceforth we should not serve sin" (or, be in bondage to sin.)

Thus the terms in each passage seem to be mutually explanatory of the corresponding terms in the other passage.

It is evident, then, from the several foregoing passages, that the sin which Christ put away was physical sin, and with this agrees the statement in Hebrews x. 10, "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ once for all." It is also in harmony with the Apostle Paul's statement in 2 Tim. i. 10:—"Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality (*aphtharsia*, incorruptibility) to light through the gospel." Here it is asserted that Christ hath abolished *death*. Now unless death actually had a claim on him individually, how could he have abolished it? If it be said that the actual power of death has been abolished only in a prospective sense, that is, only in regard to the faithful, in whom, on account of sin, it has a real claim, and that, having no such claim on Christ, it cannot have been abolished in regard to him personally, we would simply point out that the other things mentioned have been actually accomplished in him: the "life (eternal) and incorruptibility" have been "brought to light" in him personally, and, so far as the record goes, in him alone. Therefore the only conclusion is that the other thing (the abolition of death) mentioned in the same

connection has been also accomplished in him personally, and in him alone. Moreover, as the abolition of death is mentioned first, we are justified in concluding that it took place either before, or at the same time as, the bringing to light of life and incorruptibility, and therefore that it is not a yet future event, simply relating to believers, but was accomplished in Jesus himself by his death, resurrection, and change to spirit-nature. Now unless death had a real claim on Jesus—unless the real cause of death existed in him—we are at a loss to understand how he can have abolished it as a thing actually done, for he can only have abolished death by destroying that which caused death in himself: until the cause of an evil is removed, the effect cannot be abolished. Whereas, if he was under condemnation to death on account of Adam's sin, and therefore under "the power of death" personally, it must be evident that by his death and resurrection the power of death was destroyed in relation to himself individually, and thus a way opened for its destruction in others at the appointed time.

Let us now look at the passages, already incidentally referred to, in which Christ is spoken of as *having iniquity laid on him*, and *bearing sins*, viz., Isaiah liii. 6; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Peter ii. 24, and 1 John iii. 5. The question is, if Christ did not bear the sins of others in the sense of having them actually imputed to him, why is he said to have had them laid on him, and to have borne them? We reply, because he did that which was the basis for the forgiveness of the sins of believers. The expressions in these passages are not by any means inconsistent with the statement that the sin Christ put away by his death on the cross was the sin-nature, or sin in the flesh. If we recognise that he destroyed "the body of sin," and that the redemption of believers, which of course includes the forgiveness of their sins, is effected on the basis of that destruction of the body of sin, we can see a very good reason why the destruction of the body of sin should be spoken of as the putting away of actual transgressions. To put it in a syllogistic form:—

1. The body of sin was destroyed by the death of Christ.
2. The sins of believers are forgiven on the basis of that destruction of the body of sin.
3. Therefore the sins of believers are

said to be put away by the death of Christ.

In addition to this general explanation, however, there are some special considerations which throw further light on one or two of the passages.

Isaiah liii. 6: "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" and verse 11: "he shall bear their iniquities." This is probably an accommodation to the language which would be used by the Jews to describe the typical putting away of sin by the Mosaic sacrifices, and which would therefore be easily understood by Jews, for whom, be it remembered, the prophet in the first place wrote. This suggestion is borne out by the marginal rendering of verse 6: "The Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on him," referring, perhaps, to the offering for a sin of the congregation, or to the scapegoat, in the manner already adverted to. If, then, the prophet's language be an adaptation to the Jewish typical sacrifices, we ought not to construe it as being an exact literal description of the fact which they typified—the taking away of sin by Christ. The prophets did not write to explain the exact mode in which the Messiah was to put away sin: they only predicted in general language—and that not frequently—that he would do it, leaving the principle of the matter, and the exact mode, to be explained by those who should come after, when the event had actually taken place. Moreover, much of this 53rd chapter of Isaiah is figurative, although at first sight it may not appear to be so; as, for instance, the words in italics in the following verses:—"Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground," (verses 1 and 2); "All we like sheep have gone astray" (verse 6). In view of this figurative language, and of the other considerations, we must not look here for a literal description of the mode of taking away sin, but to such passages as those already adduced from the New Testament.

Hebrews ix. 28: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." This also was written to Jews, and therefore probably, like the foregoing passage, an adaptation to their language in reference to the typical sacrifices. The general principle just laid down, however, apart from this consideration, fully explains the apostle's language.

1 Peter ii. 24: "Who his own self bare

our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." The same principle also explains this passage, but it may be observed that the sins were borne "in his own body." Now our sins could not be put into the body of Christ; therefore the statement must have reference to the sin-nature which he bore. It would not, however, be correct to say that our sins were his nature—for it would be manifestly incorrect, if not absurd, to speak of certain acts and a certain tangible thing as synonymous,—but, as already explained, inasmuch as, in bearing that nature as a sacrifice on the tree, Christ did that by virtue of which our sins were forgiven, it can appropriately be said that he "bare our sins in his own body on the tree." We may illustrate the matter thus: Supposing in a certain country a number of persons were held in slavery, and the king of that country issued a decree that, on complying with certain nominal conditions, those slaves were to be liberated; they would not obtain their freedom until they had complied with those conditions, but still it could be said that the king had given them their freedom. So in the case of eternal redemption: Christ did that—viz., destroyed the body of sin—by virtue of which others may obtain the forgiveness of sins on complying with certain conditions, viz., belief and immersion. They cannot obtain that forgiveness (or "freedom") until they comply with the conditions; but inasmuch as the sacrifice of Christ was the basis of that forgiveness, he is said—but only in that sense—to have borne their sins when crucified on the tree. If Christ bore our sins simply by bearing the specific condemnation due to them, and not by bearing any condemnation resting on himself, it simply amounts to this, that our sins were imputed to him. But with that point we will deal presently.

1 John iii. 5: "Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." The language here is even less pointed than in the passages already noticed, and therefore the explanations given respecting them will cover this also.

Rev. i. 5: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." The remark made on the last passage is true of this one. The shedding of Christ's blood being the basis for the

remission of sins, we are by a figure said to have been washed from our sins in his blood.

We trust it will now be apparent to any to whom it may have appeared otherwise, that the foregoing passages which speak of Christ bearing our sins are in no way inconsistent with those in which sin in the flesh is said to have been condemned, the body of sin destroyed, the devil, or sin in the flesh, destroyed; inasmuch as those in the latter class describe literally what was actually done, whilst those in the former category describe *the results of Christ's sacrifice in relation to others.*

Thus Christ put away sin by putting away the sin-nature. By being crucified in that nature, sin in the flesh was condemned, for, although it obtained a temporary victory over him, by necessitating his death, its power was destroyed by his resurrection. After sin had got all it could claim of him, God could consistently release him from its power, and thereby its power over him was completely destroyed, as there was nothing by which he could again be brought under its power. It has been objected that the putting-away of sin cannot have been the putting-away of the mortal nature, *because Christ rose with the same nature*, and it is said that the same infirmities clung to him until he was changed to immortality. There is no evidence, however, that Jesus rose from the dead with the same infirmities that he had before he died: it is simply assumed, and we have quite as much reason for assuming the contrary; but as we do not desire to base any argument on a mere supposition, we pass it by. As to Christ having risen with the same nature that he died with, this of course is admitted, but this fact is no proof that the sin he put away was not sin in the flesh, for the necessity for destroying sin in the flesh lay in the fact that it had the power of death, and that power had been destroyed in him when he rose from the dead. So that even though he rose in the same nature that he had before his death—and even if his nature was in precisely the same condition—the power of sin over him had been destroyed, and God could then change him to immortality, so that his victory over sin might be thus perfected or perpetuated. The body of sin, or the devil, having been destroyed, a way was thus opened for its destruction in others on their availing themselves of

the appointed way, viz., immersion into the death and resurrection of Christ, by which they obtain the remission of sins, and a title to the redemption he obtained by his death and resurrection—using “resurrection” here in its fullest sense, as including resurrection to immortality. The consistency of this plan may be seen in view of a principle exemplified in certain passages of Scripture, namely, that the removal of the punishment for a sin implies or involves the forgiveness of that sin. For instance, when God had decreed the death of Hezekiah, and then, in answer to Hezekiah’s prayer, permitted him to live, Hezekiah said, “Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; for Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back.” *i.e.*, blotted them out.—(Isaiah xxxviii. 17.) The case of David also is perhaps to the point. When he had sinned “in the matter of Uriah the Hittite,” and God sent Nathan to charge him with it, “David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord.” And Nathan said unto David, “The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die.”—(2 Sam. xii. 13.) Then, again, when Christ was about to cure the palsied man, he said to him, “Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee;” and when some of the Scribes said, “This man blasphemeth,” Jesus said, “Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine house.”—(Matt. ix. 2-6.) This would imply that the disease from which this man was suffering was a punishment for sin, and that the removal of the disease carried with it the forgiveness of his sins. Let us now apply this principle to the matter in hand. Death is the punishment for sin; Christ has “abolished” death, and therefore on men associating themselves with this abolition, by union with Christ, death is accounted as being prospectively abolished in them, and this therefore carries with it the forgiveness of their sins.

In bearing the condemnation resting on the sin-nature, of which Christ, in common with the rest of the race, was a partaker, and in being raised from the dead, the power of sin was destroyed, while at the same time God’s law was not set aside, but was upheld in him, and therefore, on the basis of that destruction of sin, God

can consistently forgive those who, believing "the truth," recognise that the evils resulting from the breaking of His law have been removed in Christ, and that they can obtain redemption through him alone—on their manifesting their recognition of this fact in the appointed way. Hence we read in Col. ii. 10-13:—"Ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power: in whom also 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 in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him* through the faith of the operation of God, who has raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened (or made alive) together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Here we have circumcision used as a symbol or type of what is termed, in Romans vi. 6, the destruction of the body of sin; and an appropriate symbol it is, for just as the circumcision of Jewish infants was a cutting-off of a portion of flesh—"sinful flesh" or flesh of sin—so the crucifixion of Christ was a cutting-off of sinful flesh or the body of sin, in order that it might be destroyed. The apostle in effect says that the Colossians were circumcised with Christ by their connection with him: "*in whom ye are circumcised,*" and it was "*by the circumcision of Christ.*" The means of their obtaining this circumcision is found in the phrase "*buried with him in baptism,*" or, more correctly, and according to Alford, "*having been buried with him in your baptism,*" which connects it more clearly with the preceding verse, showing that they had obtained this circumcision by means of their symbolic burial. There was something else they had obtained by baptism, for the apostle says (verse 12): "*wherein also ye are risen with him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." What were this circumcision and rising in regard to the believers? We have a clue to what the rising is in the same sentence: "*ye are risen with him through the faith of (or through faith in) the operation of God.*" They had risen prospectively through faith in God's power, that power which had already raised Christ from the dead. Their rising, then, is apparently their future rising from the dead, in the likeness of the resurrection of him who was "the first-born from the dead,"

(chap. i. 18), to which rising their faith had relation. This being so, we may infer that the circumcision has reference to a future operation, viz., the destruction of the body of sin in the faithful by their change to immortality. This "circumcision made without hands"—in contrast to the Jewish circumcision which was made with hands—might be understood in two ways in relation to the saints, viz., the forgiveness of sins at immersion, or the future destruction of the body of sin in them; but as the Apostle refers to the former in verse 13, it seems more probable that he refers to the latter in verse 11; and this is borne out by the fact that the words "of the sins" in verse 11 are, according to Alford, "omitted by all the oldest MSS.," and they are omitted by Griesbach and others; so that it would read "in putting off the body of the flesh." This we say, would indicate that this circumcision of believers is the future destruction of the body of sin by their immortalisation at the hands of Christ. There is, perhaps, a little difficulty in "rightly dividing the word of truth" in this passage, owing to a possible blending of the literal and the figurative; but this much, at any rate, seems clear from it: that the circumcision of Christ was the destruction of the body of sin in him, and that by immersion into him believers obtain the forgiveness of their sins, and a title to a resurrection and to be circumcised by the putting-off of the body of the flesh, i.e., to have the body of sin destroyed in them. Therefore when a believer submits to immersion, he in effect confesses certain things: that he is dead in his sins and in the uncircumcision of his flesh, (verse 13), that because of this he is alienated from God and under condemnation to death, and therefore cannot obtain redemption through himself, and individually has no claim on the favour of God; but that Christ, having suffered the racial condemnation which rested upon him in the days of his flesh, and having been raised from the dead, has been freed from that condemnation, and that the only way for others to be freed from the same condemnation, and to obtain the forgiveness of their personal sins, is by being immersed into his covering name.

Having examined the teaching of Scripture as to the mode of putting away sin, and explained the way in which we hold that it was effected, we will now

look at the opposite theory on the subject, that theory, viz., which represents that the sin that Christ put away was not in any sense physical, but simply the transgressions committed by others, and that he put away those transgressions by simply bearing the condemnation due to them.

This theory amounts to this, that Christ bore away the sins of others figuratively by having them laid on him, or *imputed to him, in the same sense that the sins of Jews were laid on or imputed to the sacrifices they offered.* It therefore in this respect brings the antitype on a level with the type, instead of pointing to something of a different and higher character in the mode of putting away sin, which, from the apostle's words in Hebrews x. 1, we are warranted in looking for. This idea of imputation is, however, only the logical result of the theory, for if Christ did not bear any condemnation for himself, but only the condemnation due to others for their sins, that must be equivalent to actually taking away those sins. If the condemnation for certain specific sins is borne, surely the law must, so to speak, be satisfied, and the sinner must go free, on the principle expressed in the "orthodox" lines:—

"Payment God cannot *twice* demand,
First at my bleeding surety's hand,
And then again at mine."

Therefore if the condemnation Christ suffered was simply the specific condemnation due to certain sins committed by others, those sins must be considered to have been borne away, just as was the case (typically) with the animal sacrifices.

In answer to this we say—

1st. *That sins cannot be put away before they are committed.* The Jews under the law offered sacrifices only for past sins, not for future ones. Neither was the sacrifice of Christ for the actual putting away of sins before they were committed; see Romans iii. 25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness *for the remission of sins that are past*, through the forbearance of God."

2nd. *The New Testament states that sins are forgiven or remitted at immersion.*

Acts ii. 38: "Repent and be baptised everyone of you in the name of Jesus

Christ for the remission of sins."

Acts xxii. 16: "Arise, and be baptised, and wash away thy sins."

Col. ii. 13: "Having forgiven you all trespasses," (in connection with immersion: see verse 12).

The theory we are combatting leaves no room for the remission of sins at immersion, for it represents them as having been taken away by Christ long before, and thus it in a sense nullifies Scripture teaching that immersion is for the remission of sins.

3rd. *The New Testament teaches that the forgiveness of sins committed after immersion may be obtained through the mediatorship of Christ.*

1 John i. 7, 9: "If we walk in the light, as He (God) is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."

If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

1 John ii. 1, 2: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins."

But if our sins were actually taken away by Christ at his death, there would be no need for our praying for their forgiveness, and there would be no room for his mediation. Thus this theory, in its logical results,—though its supporters may not intend or even perceive its effects,—nullifies Scripture teaching concerning the mediatorship of Christ, just in the same way that it nullifies Scripture teaching concerning immersion. But if we regard His death as the *basis* for the *subsequent* remission of sins, at immersion and upon confession, the matter is perfectly intelligible and harmonious throughout.

4th. *The sins of believers are nowhere in the New Testament said to have been imputed to Christ.* Were the theory in question true, we might fairly expect such a statement, especially as righteousness is spoken of as being imputed, and the righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to immersed believers. In Romans iv. 6, the apostle says:—"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God *imputeth* righteousness without works." Again, (verse 11), "that righteousness might be *imputed* unto them also," that is, Gentile believers. Again, (verses 22-24), "And therefore it (faith) was *imputed* to him (Abraham) for

righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was *imputed* to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be *imputed*, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." And in Phil. iii. 8, 9, he says: "for whom (Christ) I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Thus we find righteousness spoken of as being imputed to believers.

In 2 Cor. v. 19, it is said that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Now if it were true that the trespasses of others were imputed to Christ, what an appropriate place to say so! The apostle might had said, "not imputing their trespasses unto them, but imputing them to Christ;" but not a word of the sort do we find; nor is there any passage elsewhere containing such a statement. This idea, however, is an essential part of the theory referred to, even though it may not be stated by its supporters in that form.

5th. If Christ bore away the actual sins of believers, there is no scope for forgiveness. If he did not suffer any condemnation for himself, but simply the condemnation due to others, why should their sins still require to be forgiven? Either Christ must have borne the condemnation of believers, and thus taken away their sins, or else he must have borne a condemnation that rested on himself personally, and they are forgiven and redeemed on the basis of that. It cannot be that he did not bear any condemnation for himself, but only for them, and that they are forgiven on the basis of that: there would be no basis on which to do anything if he had not been under the condemnation himself, and been redeemed from it. And, on the other hand, if their

sins were imputed to him, and he took them away in that sense, there would be nothing to forgive. We find, however, that forgiveness is an essential part of God's plan of redemption, as witness Rom. iii. 25, Col. i. 14; ii. 13, and many other passages too numerous to mention; therefore on this point also the theory under consideration and the teaching of the Scriptures do not agree.

Having thus seen, for the five reasons here enumerated, the erroneousness of the idea that Christ put away actual transgressions, we are brought back to the fact that he put away sin by putting away the sin-nature or the body of sin, which is in fact the sinner—by destroying the devil or sin in the flesh, which is the cause of sin—as the basis for the forgiveness of sins. In view of this we can understand the following statements in regard to the mode of reconciling man to God. Eph. ii. 16: "And that he might reconcile both" (*i.e.* both Jews and Gentiles: see verses 11-15, 17, 18,) "unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (*margin, in himself*). It is difficult to see how "the enmity" here could be transgression, seeing that there was none in Christ, or how the mere suffering of the condemnation could be the slaying of the enmity, if sin in the flesh was not "the enmity." Col. i. 19-22: "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto Himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight."

A. ANDREW.

(To be continued.)

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

SEPTEMBER, 1876.

THE time required for the preparation of the review of the Bradlaugh discussion,

which is to appear at the end of the printed report (to which Mr. Bradlaugh consents) and attention to several other duties in hand, have interfered somewhat with the getting-up of this No. of the *Christadelphian*. We have, however, with help from others, been able to fill it with interesting and profitable matter, according to our judgment, which the experience of readers

will probably endorse. There will, therefore, be no disadvantage from the pre-occupations of the past month. The times are intensely interesting, and our day is shortening. There is, consequently, greater need for attending to the exhortation which tells us to redeem the time by good and profitable works, and to work while it is called to-day.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE WAR IN TURKEY.—PROGRESS OF THE EUPHRATEAN EVAPORATION.

THE war has made considerable progress during the past month. Its course, so far, has been adverse to the Servians. The Turks have forced the first line of the Servian defences; and the Servians have fallen back on their second line with many circumstances of suffering and horror. It is said, and not without seeming foundation, that the failure of the Servians is due to their Russian general Tcherniaeff. A good and wise plan, proposed at the beginning of the war, was set aside because he opposed it, and a plan proposed by him was adopted, though opposed by all the Servian generals, and condemned by military critics in general. The suggestion is that he proposed a bad plan with political objects. Russia is opposed to the formation of a strong Servian state, which would have resulted from Servian success. The formation of such a state would place a barrier between herself and Turkey. Her policy, therefore, has been to procure Servian defeat, and leave the way open for Russia to take up the hopeless Servian cause if it otherwise seems her interest to do so. This she has accomplished by obtaining the appointment of a Russian general to the supreme command, and the adoption of military measures intended to fail up to a certain point.

This success, of Turkey, however, does not tend to Turkish regeneration. It is rather hastening the exhaustion by which she is slowly coming to ruin. This is very clearly pointed out in the following remarks of the *Daily News* :—

“While the cannon are roaring and brave

men are stricken down in the ranks, and victory is claimed now for this and again for that belligerent, there will be some among our countrymen inclined to ask what is to be the result of the triumph of either party. Hitherto, it has been too generally assumed that this question could only arise, in the event, deemed improbable, of Servian success; it is from the Servian side that the demand for change comes, the Turks having taken up arms merely to defend the *status quo*. A moment's reflection, however, suffices to show that this view is superficial and untenable. The future government of Turkey would be quite as problematical, in case of the success of the Ottoman generals as in the contrary event. The present situation of the Porte, and the contingencies to which it is exposed, will not be understood unless it is recognised that, apart from the exigencies of the war, the question presses at Constantinople, how is the Sultan's Government to be carried on? Difficulties of every kind, personal, financial and political, beset the Ministers of the Porte, and may, at any moment, bring about a crisis more alarming than any that has hitherto been reported. The derangement of affairs begins in the Imperial Palace itself. Except as a name, the Sultan has ceased to exist. His mind is almost a blank; his remaining intelligence being only just enough to enable him to bewail his unhappiness. The Sultan can receive no ambassadors and ratify no engagements. We hear of demands for satisfaction as likely to be presented at Constantinople by a powerful neighbour, but there is now no one who could either admit or reject them in a final and authoritative manner. Of course, in such circumstances, no “reforms” can be introduced with any pretence of stability. Even if the proposals attributed to Midhat Pacha were acceptable to the entire Ministry, there is no one to proclaim them and make them binding on the country, while it is credibly stated that Abdul Hamid, the next in the order of succession to the throne, is obstinately opposed to any such changes as those with which the ear of Europe has been beguiled.

“The financial difficulties of the Empire are again pressing as hardy at Constan-

tinople as they did last autumn, with the important difference that money is now wanted, not for public creditors who can be put off with fair words, but for soldiers, contractors, provision merchants and owners of transport. The money found in the private treasury of the late Sultan has all been spent, as well as the proceeds of his saleable property. The best English journal at Constantinople describes the financial state of things there as "a monetary famine." Ministers have resorted to the old resource of absolute Governments, and have decreed an issue of paper money. This measure might have done no great harm a few years ago, but it comes immediately after a great act of repudiation, which has left the Government without any kind of credit. It may serve a temporary purpose, but prices will adjust themselves to the newly-inflated currency, and make a repetition of the expedient more difficult. The Turkish Government has in the state of its finances an obstacle which it can neither evade nor surmount. It finds its revenue insufficient for its expenditure, even after the just claims of the public creditors have been set aside, and it has not taken any steps to increase the national income. In the elaborate statement published by the Foreign Minister of Turkey last year, in excuse of the October decree, the impossibility of increasing taxation, and indeed the absolute necessity of lightening the burdens of the people, were set in a striking light. Since then, the Government has been doing nothing to increase the public resources and everything to destroy them. The revenues of Herzegovina and Bosnia having been swept away by war, those of Bulgaria have been just as effectually disposed of by the acts of the Circassians and Bashi-Bazouks. Six months ago, Bulgaria was the most prosperous of the provinces subject to the Sultan: what it is now the public have had ample opportunity of learning. The "suicide" against which Lord Derby told a deputation that he could not undertake to protect Turkey has begun; every source of wealth is disappearing under the hands of the Government and the agents it selects with so little judgment, and the end of such a course of conduct is inevitable. Of course, no foreign aid can be given to such

a Government. A few years ago Egypt would have been called upon in one form or other to aid the Sultan, but now the ruler of that country is as poor as his Suzerain.

"A Government reduced to such straits as that of Turkey is in a state of disintegration. The evils under which Turkey is suffering are such as cannot be cured by the sword. No matter what victories may be won in the field, the disease which has fastened on the vitals of Turkey is incurable."

A TURKISH VIEW OF THE CASE.

The force of these sentiments appears to be felt by the government of Turkey itself. A telegram from Constantinople informs us that at the last Ministerial Council the Grand Vizier showed profound depression, approaching to despair. He said: "In 1854 Europe was with us; now she is against us. We have no money, and cannot even bring forward our reserves for want of money. The situation is so difficult that whether the war be successful or not, we dare not look forward to the future."

TERRIBLE ATROCITIES OF THE TURKS.

Meanwhile, the atrocities that are being perpetrated by the Turks are rousing the indignation of all Europe, and alienating the sympathy of England in particular, whose political interest in the maintenance of Turkey constitutes her (Turkey's) only friend. No marvel that indignation should rise. Such things have scarcely been paralleled in the worst passages of human history. They were at first contradicted, and the *Daily News*, which was the means of bringing them to light in the first instance, sent a man to the spot, who reports thus in that paper, on August 5th:

"I have just seen the town of Batok, with Mr. Schuyler. Mr. Baring was there yesterday. Here is what I saw. On approaching the town on a hill there were some dogs. They ran away, and we found on this spot a number of skulls scattered about, and one ghastly heap of skeletons with clothing. I counted from the saddle a hundred skulls, picked and licked clean; all of women and children. We entered the town. On every side were skulls and skeletons charred among the ruins, or lying

entire where they fell in their clothing. There were skeletons of girls and women with long brown hair hanging to the skulls. We approached the church. There these remains were more frequent, until the ground was literally covered with skeletons, skulls, and putrefying bodies in clothing. Between the church and the school there were heaps. The stench was fearful. We entered the churchyard. The sight was more dreadful. The whole churchyard, for three feet deep, was festering with dead bodies, partly covered—hands, legs, arms, and heads projected in ghastly confusion. I saw many little hands, heads and feet of children of three years of age, and girls, with heads covered with beautiful hair. The church was still worse. The floor was covered with rotting bodies, quite uncovered. I never imagined anything so fearful. There were three thousand bodies in the churchyard and church. We were obliged to hold tobacco to our noses. In the school—a fine building—two hundred women and children had been burnt alive. All over the town there were the same scenes. In some places, heaps of bodies buried in shallow holes had been uncovered by the dogs. The banks of the little stream were covered with bodies. Many bodies had been carried to Tatar Bazardjik, a distance of thirty miles. The town had 9,000 inhabitants. There now remain twelve hundred. Many who escaped had returned recently, weeping and moaning over their ruined homes. Their sorrowful wailing could be heard half-a-mile off. Some were digging out the skeletons of loved ones. A woman was sitting moaning over three small skulls, with hairs clinging to them, which she had in her lap.

“The man who did all this, Achmed Aga, has been promoted, and is still Governor of the district. The newspaper accounts were not exaggerated. They could not be. No crime invented by Turkish ferocity was left uncommitted. Seven thousand bodies have been lying here since May 12th, rotting in the sun, preyed upon by dogs; and Sir Henry Elliot has never heard that the authorities demand a war contribution from the remaining inhabitants of one hundred thousand piastres. The town formerly paid a million. The harvest is rotting in the fields. The owners are in the churchyard. The survivors' cattle have been taken by the Turks, who refuse to restore it. It is impossible to get in the harvest. It is not true that the Turks are sending help.”

The same correspondent furnishes further particulars, from which the following are selections:—

“The village of Novo Selo was attacked by Bashi-Bazouks and Circassians. More than four hundred women and children

took to flight, and, worn out with fatigue, huddled themselves together in the open fields near Kalofer. They sent to the head men of the latter village for food. After some negotiations to obtain the permission of the neighbouring Mussulmen, they received permission to take refuge in the Convent of the Holy Trinity. During the negotiations, a band of two hundred men burst in upon the poor wretches, took from them everything of value which the Circassian troops had left them, and carried off forty of the young women. These men, returning to their village with their captives, were met by the Turkish women, who objected to receive any giaours. They were thereupon driven to a neighbouring farm, and, after a scene, which the *Courier* describes, but an English paper dare not, they were shut up in a straw loft and burnt.”

“The system followed by the Bashi-Bazouks has been this. As soon as they perceived, on their way to the insurgent district, a Bulgarian village, they deputed emissaries to demand the arms of the inhabitants. If the demand was agreed to, as was generally the case, the arms were collected, the houses plundered, and the inhabitants tortured for money; if not, if the least sign of resistance was shown, the village was attacked, taken by assault, the inhabitants massacred or dispersed, and the houses pillaged and burnt. Some sixty large and small villages were burnt in this way; about 4,000 families have been left houseless and penniless, to beg in the towns, to feed upon grass in the mountains, or to starve. While life and property suffered in this terrible way, honour fared no better. Many are the young women who have been carried off from the destroyed villages—in some cases for a few days only; in others, perhaps, for ever—to form part of their captors' harems. A good many children have been also carried off, to be converted to Mohammedanism and kept as drudges. All these horrors, all these wanton massacres and outrages, were committed, in many cases, under the very eyes of the civil and military authorities.”—(*Extract from Private Letter.*)

“The devastation of the province of Philippopolis is still going on. The flames which have encircled us since the breaking out of these troubles are assuming still greater proportions. Every Bulgarian feels that his life is in peril, and awaits his death from minute to minute. The Turks are extremely enraged, and the massacres continue. Thousands of innocent people are awaiting a bitter death in the prisons. The Bulgarians seized in the towns and villages by the troops and Bashi-Bazouks, or by individual Turks, whether guilty or not, are being brought half-dead, and

subjected to indescribable tortures and sufferings, under which very many of them are dying. The prisons, warehouses, baths and khans (inns) of the city are full of these unfortunate people. On the 3rd inst. 450 prisoners were brought here from Tatar-Bazardjik. Their arrival caused such a horrible scene as to throw the whole city into consternation. These prisoners had been arrested in different parts of the district of Tatar-Bazardjik, and sent to Philippopolis to undergo their trial for their complicity in the recent troubles. They were bound with chains, handcuffs and ropes and where escorted by 200 soldiers. The populace prompted, some by compassion and others by curiosity or fanaticism, came out to see their entry into the city. As the sad procession approached, cries and groans were heard from a long distance off. When they reached the bridge near the Government House I witnessed a most horrible spectacle. A mob of Turks armed, some with stones, and others with clubs, fell upon and began to beat and maim the poor manacled prisoners. At the head of the procession of prisoners was a number of priests and teachers, all heavily ironed. Then came four wagons filled with dead and wounded. Almost all of the prisoners were peasants On the morning of the 4th inst. sixteen dead were carried out of the prison, and the next night six more. Complete anarchy reigns throughout the towns and villages of this province. The Governor seems to be the only one who has at heart the true interests of the Government, and he is unable to restrain the fanaticism of the Turks. The idea is current here among the Turks either to annihilate or to materially weaken the Bulgarian element, so that they may rid themselves of every fear of European intervention. In the space of twenty days more than one hundred villages have been burned in the province of Philippopolis and of Tatar-Bazardjik. Many other villages have been partly burned, pillaged, and many of their inhabitants massacred. Others of the inhabitants are wandering about begging, or are awaiting a miserable death in the dungeons.”—(Extract from private letter.)

INDIGNATION OF THE BRITISH
 PUBLIC.—POLITICAL EFFECTS.

A large and influential meeting was held in London on the 27th of July, to concert measures for enabling the British people to express their indignation at these atrocities, and for bringing public opinion to bear on the British government, with a view to preventing any support from being given to Turkey in the present struggle. The Earl

of Shaftesbury presided, and in the course of his opening remarks, he spoke as follows:

“We are assembled here to-day not to express a strong national feeling in respect of Turkey and her atrocious misdoings, for we have not yet ascertained the feeling of the country, but we are here to-day to take a line of action that will elicit an expression of that feeling throughout the country which we believe to be universal in every part of the kingdom. We hail with satisfaction the declaration made by Lord Derby, that the Government of this country would pursue a policy of non-intervention in the present dispute between Turkey and the insurgent provinces. It is becoming a question, and I fairly confess to you it is a very serious one in my mind, whether it is not a disgrace and a shame that we should continue any longer in alliance with such a power as Turkey. I think that it will not be necessary for us to discuss the policy or impolicy of the Crimean War, and of the advances we then extended to the Empire of Turkey; but it is necessary that we should just look at the state of Turkey at that time, and the state of Turkey as it is now. At that time Turkey seemed capable of fulfilling every obligation, and, moreover, she seemed willing to do so. She promised to all her people good government, and more especially to her Christian population, to whom she extended by treaty very large privileges. She was not then encumbered by an overwhelming debt, nor was she stained by a series of undeniable atrocities. But what is her position now? She is not able to fulfil a single obligation; she is utterly bankrupt; her people are oppressed beyond description—(hear); her Christian subjects are slaughtered by thousands and tens of thousands—(hear, hear); her women are dishonoured, and her children sold into slavery. Whole provinces are desolated, and the whole of these provinces will become a great wilderness—provinces the finest for the industry of man and his mental resources—the finest on the face of the earth. Here we are threatened with the extermination of a noble race; and I confess I think the time has come when all the Powers of Europe should rise as one man, and in the name of common humanity say that this shall not be permitted in their midst, and that Turkey has proved wholly unfit to have any authority over any portion of the human race. I confess, looking at the present state of things, I believe the future will be much more terrible than the present, and I am deeply convinced that the Turkish Government is beyond remedy, and utterly incorrigible, and not in accord with the views of humanity. Looking to the interests of the commonwealth of mankind, I for one would rather see the Russians on the Bosphorus than the Turks at home.”

The other speakers, one and all, indulged in the same line of remark. Since then a great meeting of a similar character has been held at Manchester, at which the strongest reprobation against Turkey was indulged in. We notice these facts as indicative of the great change that has taken place in British sentiment towards Turkey. This change will probably have a checking effect on the action of the British government, and open the path of Russia. The national feeling was pressed home upon Mr. Disraeli's attention in the House of Commons on the 11th of August, in the following words by Sir W. Harcourt.

"The cries of these murdered men, of these slaughtered women and children, would not go up to heaven in vain; and as the moral of these transactions, perfidity, and mendacity, he would only say that he hoped to God we had at last done with the Turks. (Cheers.) If we could not control their ferocity—and it had been shown that we could not—then we had no right to prop up their power, but should let them, in the name of humanity and civilization, sink beneath the weight of their own wickedness. What was this Government of Turkey which they were invited to support? They had replaced one Sultan by another—a Sultan who was to inaugurate an era of reform. What an era, and what a reform! It was a government tempered by assassination, and maintained by massacres. What a spectacle did these successive Sultans offer to the world. A dynasty of worn-out and impotent debauches, who let loose upon mankind a horde of wild beasts. (Cheers.) They could no longer accept complicity with a detested and detestable government, or with an abominated and an abominable race. The handwriting is already flaming on their walls, they had been weighed in the balance of Europe, and their scale had kicked the beam. For five centuries they had been the curse of Europe, of Asia, and of Africa, occupying the fairest portions of the globe, the cradles of genius and art, but wherever their hoof had trodden the grass had never grown. Those famous classic spots dear to the memory of mankind, had become under their hands the haunts of wild beasts, and the worst of those wild beasts bore the human form. For his part, he hoped that the indignation of Europe would become uncontrollable—as uncontrollable as the ferocity of the Turk, and that interference in a sense hostile to Turkey would inevitably follow. The tide of European opinion was rising on this question; it would sweep away the sand castles that diplomacy was building on an unstable beach, and it would carry onward on its vast and resistless waves the fortunes of that power or of those

powers, whoever they might be, who would emancipate Europe from the curse which afflicted her, and redeem Christianity from the shame by which she had been too long dishonoured."

Mr. Disraeli's response indicates the embarrassment of the British Government in having to prefer the safety of her Indian empire above even the reputation of England for benevolence and sympathy with the down-trodden. In the course of his speech he said:—

"What may be the fate of the Eastern part of Europe it would be arrogant for me to speculate upon, and if I had any thoughts, I trust I should not be so imprudent or so indiscreet as to take this opportunity of expressing them. (Hear, hear.) And I am sure that as long as England is ruled by English parties who understand the principles upon which our empire is founded, and who are resolved to maintain that Empire, I am sure that our influence in that part of the world can never be looked upon with indifference. If it happen that the Government that influences the greater part of these fair lands proves to be incompetent for that purpose, neither England nor any of the Great Powers will shrink from fulfilling the high political and moral duty which will then fall upon us. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, we must not jump at conclusions so quickly as is now the fashion. There is nothing to justify us in attacking in such a fashion all Turkey at this moment. The state of affairs requires the most vigilant examination and the most careful management, but those who suppose that England ever, or at this moment particularly, is upholding Turkey from a blind superstition, and from a want of sympathy with the higher aspirations of humanity, are deceived. (Hear, hear.) What our duty is at this critical moment is to maintain the empire of England. Nor will we ever agree to any step, though it may obtain for a moment comparative quiet and false prosperity, that hazards the existence of that empire."

THE FUTURE.

The nature and uncertainties of the present situation are well expressed in a letter appearing in the *Daily News*, on July 29th. It is signed "E. A. Freeman." In the course of his remarks, the writer says:

"No one can tell what will happen. To judge from past experience, diplomatists of all kinds are even less able to tell than other people. The formulæ of their craft hinder them from reading those signs of the times which, though they do not make future events certain, do make them

probable. And those who understand that there are in the world nations as well as sovereigns and their ministers, will see that the chances of the war spreading, the chances of Russia interfering, are very great. No one thinks that the Emperor of Russia wishes for war. But there are bounds even to despotism. The Czar himself could not withstand the universal wish of the Russian people. And, should the Servians and Montenegrins be hard pressed, it is very likely indeed that the heart of the Russian people—for the Russian people has a heart—may be so stirred that their demand will be stronger than the power of the Czar. We have seen signs of this already. Even the strong hand of military discipline has found it hard to silence the generous feelings of the Russian army. The Slavonic and Orthodox millions of Russia are not a force to be trifled with. If they demand with one voice to be led on to what in their eyes would be the holiest of crusades, the Czar himself could not dare to say them nay.

"Then comes the question, If this very probable thing does happen, what will England do? Are we again to fight on behalf of the barbarian oppressors of South-Eastern Europe? That is the plain question. A Liberal Government once unhappily had a Russian war; so Mr. Disraeli may think it the right thing to have a Russian war also. Anyhow, if there is the faintest chance of another war with Russia on behalf of the Turk, we cannot be wrong in letting the mind of England be unmistakably known on the point.

"The last Russian war was popular. As always happens, the instincts of the people were generous; but, as often happens, they were led away as to facts. The people make sound, perhaps not always, but almost always generous, inferences from its premisses; but it very often has false

premisses set before it. The mass of Englishmen were made to believe that, in helping the Turk against the Russian, they were helping the oppressed against the oppressor. By this time they surely know better. The question is, Shall we or shall we not go to war on behalf of the foulest of tyrannies, the darkest spot on the face of Europe, be the enemies of that accursed tyranny whom they may? That is the question on which the Government must be pressed; that is the question on which the people of England must, while there is still time, answer with a voice that cannot be mistaken."

"No one can tell what will happen," says this correspondent. The statement, while true as to details, is not true as to general and ultimate issues. Turkey must be overrun at the last, and that by Russian armies, and England will have to fight, and will in fact be at the point of being crushed, when the King of the Jews will appear on the scene and inflict a destructive blow on the assembled hordes of the North, and set proud Tarshish too on one side, and unfurl his own divine banner of universal conquest and dominion. These events are near, as the decrepit state of Turkey among other things, shows; but exactly how near is not known. Meanwhile, it is cheering to see the quiet of nations at an end, and the world in the fierce throes of that dreaded "Eastern Question" which contains within its bosom the solution of all the questions that do or can perplex and afflict mankind. Seeing these things coming to pass, we may reasonably lift up our heads with joy at the prospect of redemption drawing nigh.

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—Brother Craigmile in the absence of the secretary, brother Anderson, announces the death of sister McPherson, who fell asleep on May 15, after a fourteen days' illness. She had been immersed at Glasgow some time previously. Brother Craigmile also states that the division which occurred some time ago on the question of birth of the spirit is now at an end; also that a Sunday school for the instruction of the children of the brethren has been started with every prospect of success.

BEWDLEY.—Brother Betts writes:—"Al-

though I can neither report additional number to our little flock, nor success in obtaining a place for the public proclamation of the truth in Bewdley, yet I had the pleasing satisfaction of inducting another into the covering name in the river Tame, on the 13th inst., after giving proof that he had grasped intelligently the knowledge requisite. The new brother's name is LOR GODRON (19), a carpenter, residing at Warborough, who has been carefully searching for the truth several years through the instrumentality of my brother, now in

Australia, who will now see the Deity did not send him to Warborough for nought, but gave the increase in His own good time."

BIRMINGHAM.—During the month several immersions have taken place.*

On Sunday, July 23, the brethren were gratified by a visit from brother Ashcroft, of Rock Ferry, who delivered an excellent and telling lecture to a large audience on the reasons which led him to abandon the Congregationalist ministry. This has been one of the most pleasing incidents of recent months. The brethren desire further services from brother Ashcroft, and it is brother Ashcroft's desire and intention to place himself at the disposal of the truth so far as business may allow. He has opened a shop at Waterloo, (on the opposite side of the river from Rock Ferry), in a line of business—drysaltery—to which he was brought up in his boyhood. This will enable him to "provide things honest in the sight of all men," but will also interfere, for a while at least, with the service of the truth in other parts of the country which he would like to render. He lectures on the Sundays at Rock Ferry to the people who come to hear, in the Albert Rooms. They are a goodly number.

On Tuesday, Aug. 8, the usual midsummer treat occurred. The Sunday scholars to the number of 195 (including teachers and a few accompanying brethren and sisters) went to Sutton, a wooded park, eight miles from Birmingham, and spent a few hours in the open air, returning at 5.30 to tea in the Temperance Hall. After tea, prizes were distributed—(one in each class—eighteen classes in all)—to those who had given the best answers in a written examination held two weeks previously. The subject of the examination was the history of Christ. A number of brethren and sisters attended in the evening, and witnessed the distribution of prizes which was preceded by an address by brother Roberts, on the answers given to the questions.

The usual tea meeting was held on the Bank holiday, Monday, August 7, when, after tea, many edifying addresses were delivered, interspersed with hymns and anthems. There was a large meeting on the occasion.

During the past month the ecclesia has lost two of its number by death, viz., brother Waite, father to brethren Waite, of Leicester and Stockport: and brother Philip Black, a young man of 22, whose short probation was characterised by zeal and diligence. The former was buried at Witton and the latter at Coleshill, where his father (also in the faith) resides. At the grave of brother Waite, at his own request, expressed on his death-bed, a chapter was read from Isaiah (xxv.) and the anthem, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," sung.

During the last three months the subjects of lecture (omitted through inadvertence)

have been as follow:—May 28th, "Question night" (brother Hadley). June 4th, "New Testament Baptism" (brother Shuttleworth). June 11th, "Turkey. Signs of the times; impending downfall of the Turkish Empire. The certainty, and the reason for it, from a Bible-point of view" (brother Shuttleworth.) June 18th, "Christ" (brother Sulley, of Nottingham). June 25th, "Question night" (brother Roberts). July 2nd, "The recent discussion; some of the fallacies underlying Mr. Bradlaugh's objections to the Bible (brother Hodgkinson). July 9th, "The Blasphemies of the times" (brother Shuttleworth). July 16th, "The Eastern question: the events now transpiring in Eastern Europe in their relation to the signs of Christ's re-appearance in the earth" (brother Roberts). July 23, "Important Explanation: why I gave up the ministerial office and the profession of the faith preached in the churches and chapels of the day" (brother R. Ashcroft, of Rock Ferry). July 30th, "Question night" (brother Roberts). August 6th "Mary's choice" (brother Roberts). August 13th, "War: coming troubles; Is it right for Christians to bear arms and go to war?" (brother Shuttleworth). Aug. 20th, "The powers of the world to come" (brother Shuttleworth). August 27th, "Question night" (brother Meakin).

BRISTOL.—Brother Cort announces that the brethren here have succeeded in obtaining a meeting room (17, Stokes' Croft), capable of holding three hundred people, and have commenced public lectures on Sunday evening at 6.30, the lecturer being brother Clement. The rent of the place is heavy for a small and poor company, but they hope to be enabled to bear the burden. Brother Cort also reports that another has been added to their small number by the obedience of EDWARD CHANDLER, formerly a local preacher amongst the Congregationalists. Brother Chandler has had a good deal to overcome, having been actively engaged in the religious world from his boyhood, he also having had great opposition from his relatives and friends.

DUNDEE.—Brother Mortimer reports: "Our young brother, Alexander Rennie, fell asleep on the morning of June 29th, after about eight weeks of severe suffering, with a diseased throat and general consumption. He has left a young widow to mourn his early death. He, along with his wife, was baptised on December 15th, 1875, so that his race in the way of eternal life has been a short one. We hope, however, that it may meet the approval of the Lord when he cometh to raise the dead saints and give rewards to those who have feared his name, both small and great. Brother Rennie was buried in the Western Necropolis on July 1st, in the presence of the brethren and a few relatives and friends."

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Grant reports:

* Particulars next month.

—“On Tuesday, 25th July, WILLIAM CULBERT (32), after giving evidence that he understood ‘the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ’ was immersed into the saving name of Jesus Christ. The Bible class had their annual trip on the following Thursday. A number of brethren and sisters spent a pleasant day at Borthwick Castle, some ten or twelve miles from here. Our lectures for the month have been as follow:—Sunday, 16th July, ‘Moses and Christ.’—(Brother Smith.) July 23rd, ‘The Earth the future abode of the Saints.’—(Bro. Grant.) July 30th, ‘Christ as a Man of War and as a Prince of Peace.’—(Bro. David H. Smith.) August 6th, ‘The time of trouble coming upon the earth.’—(Brother Smith.)”

EXETER.—On Sunday, June 25th, two lectures were given in this city by BROTHER F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH, of Birmingham; on the Truth, and the Signs of the Times. Brother Clark, who was then living there (but who has since removed to London) was enabled to carry out the arrangement in conjunction with assistance received from Frome. The audience numbered about 60 in the afternoon and about 120 in the evening, and was composed of attentive listeners.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Bro. Diboll reports the lecture subjects since last communication as under:—June 18th, “Spiritualism.”—(Brother D. Spinney.) June 25th, “The Kingdom of God.”—(Brother J. W. Diboll.) July 2nd, “Fables (2 Tim. iv. 4).”—(Bro. J. W. Diboll, jun.) July 9th, “The Holy Spirit.”—(Brother D. Spinney.) July 16th, “The way to be saved.”—(Brother J. W. Diboll.) July 23rd, “The Kingdom of Heaven.”—(Brother A. Harwood.) Aug. 6th, “Modern Conversion.”—(Brother J. W. Diboll, jun.) August 13th, “The Soul that sinneth it shall die.”—(Brother D. Spinney.)

GRANTOWN.—Brother Grant reports: “We have to report the sad death, by accident, of brother Alexander Smith, New Mills, Keith. It happened on Monday evening, July 31st, through injuries sustained in endeavouring to extinguish a fire which broke out in his smithy the morning of the day mentioned. Brother Robertson, of Grantown, presided at the funeral, and in connection therewith, took occasion to make some remarks about the state of the world in consequence of sin, the hope of life through Christ, and the blessed state of existence after his return, calculated to show the bystanders the difference, to a certain degree, betwixt Christadelphian grounds of hope and orthodoxy, and to comfort the mourners. Brother Smith was 60 years of age at his death. He leaves a widow and grown-up family to mourn, for a time, his departure. Sister Smith was fairly prostrated by the event; but, in the words of a sister writing from a distance, ‘all his troubles are now over with him, if he was a

‘faithful servant.’ But his poor wife is truly to be pitied. May He who has promised to be a husband to the widow be her comfort and stay.’ We are visited, just now, by brother Cameron, Tulloch; brother and sister Gascoyne and brother William Grant, Edinburgh. Brother and sister McIntosh, late of this place, have removed to Newcastle-on-Tyne. Brother Gordon has resumed fellowship in consequence of a settlement of the difference which led to its suspension.”

Huddersfield.—Brother Drake reports: “We had the pleasure, on July 16th, of assisting into the sin-covering name, CHARLES RHODES (21), a woollen operative, who has been looking into the truth for upwards of eighteen months. The brethren intend commencing a Sunday School. The lectures for August, in the Literary and Scientific Lecture Room, South Street, have been on the following subjects: Aug. 13th, ‘The Birth of Water and the Birth of the Spirit;’ Aug. 20th, ‘Why was Paul bound with a Chain?’ Aug. 27th, ‘Peter and the keys, and how he used them.’”

KEIGHLEY.—Brother Peel reports the addition of two, namely, MOSES WALBANK (42), wool sorter, formerly neutral, and ANNE ELIZABETH, his wife (34), who were both immersed into the saving name on July 28th, having previously given evidence of their understanding and belief of the truth.

LEEDS.—Brother Willis reports three immersions on July 23, viz., GEORGE YOUNG (41), formerly neutral, ROBERT PEACOCK (33), formerly Wesleyan, and GEORGE PICKLES (22), formerly neutral, who after a good confession of the one faith, put on the saving name by being buried in baptism. They have been looking into the truth over twelve months. There were present on the occasion brethren and sisters from Heckmond-wike, Halifax, Huddersfield and Elland. Others are deeply interested. (A great desire exists for a termination of the personal difference which separates these from some esteemed brethren and sisters in the same town, but all attempts are yet failures. There ought to be no division, but things that ought not to be sometimes are. Christ will judge shortly; but if we judge ourselves there will be so much less for him to do and us to fear.—EDITOR.)

LEICESTER.—Brother Burton reports that on the 18th of July, being a town holiday, the brethren in accordance with their usual wont availed themselves of the opportunity to hold their quarterly tea meeting, when a goodly number of brethren and sisters were present. After tea, the evening was spent by the brethren speaking one to another concerning that glorious salvation yet to be manifested in the earth and our relationship thereto, and in singing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. A great sorrow had been laid upon

our bro. and sister Weston (and therefore upon us) in the loss of their little boy, a bright intelligent little fellow of some six summers. The blow is heavy, but the Father rules, and although we may not be able to trace the wisdom of His providence in some respects, yet "that day" will reveal it. On July 15th, brother Burton further reports the obedience of ANNIE MARY SUMMERS (22), formerly member of the Church of England, who having made a good confession, was immersed into the all saving name, July 26th. Our sister has not, however, continued long with us, for having to leave her situation, she has gone to her friends in Maldon."

LONDON.—Brother A. Andrew writes: "In the absence of brother Elliott, I have the pleasure to announce three immersions this month: Aug. 2nd, Mrs. SUSAN PHILIPS, formerly a member of the Church of Scotland; Aug. 13th, GEORGE PHILIPS, husband of the former, and also previously of the Church of Scotland, and WILLIAM COOPER. It was omitted to be stated last month that brother and sister Clark, formerly of Frome, have removed to London, and are in fellowship with the ecclesia here. The August lectures were as follow: Aug. 6th, 'Turkey. Signs of the Times. Impending Downfall of the Turkish Empire: the certainty and the reason for it, from a Bible point of view.'—(Brother F. R. Shuttleworth.) Aug. 13th, 'Seed-time and Harvest in relation to Divine Things; the Sowing-time now; the Reaping-time not at death, but at the Second Appearing of Jesus Christ.'—(Bro. A. Andrew.) Aug. 20th, 'The Resurrection from the Dead.'—(Brother Thomas Bosher.) Aug. 27th, 'The three Unclean Spirits like Frogs (Rev. xvi. 13), and what they did.'—(Brother Thomas Bosher.)"

MANCHESTER.—Brother Trueblood reports the loss of brother and sister Davies and sister Mary Davies, by removal, to Morrision, a short distance from Swansea, where they will, in future, meet with the brethren there. The loss has been made up by the arrival of brother and sister Johnston, and brother and sister Breckenridge, from Glasgow. There has been a further addition to the ecclesia by the immersion of JOHN TALBOT (38), joiner, formerly a Unitarian. Brother Trueblood says: "brother Talbot has attended at our lectures for a very considerable time, which, after a very careful investigation of the things therein dealt with, and comparing them with the Word, resulted in putting on the Saving Name on July 23rd last.—We had a visit from brother Ashcroft, who lectured to good audiences on the 6th and 7th instant. Subject on Sunday, "Why I abandoned the Congregational ministry," and on Monday, "What is man? The answers of Scripture and Orthodoxy compared." We had a very good gathering of

brethren and sisters at the Table on the Sunday afternoon, over 50 being present, when we were very suitably exhorted by our brother Ashcroft. The rest of the lectures during the month have been as follow:—August 6, "Christ's return" (brother Enipsall.) August 13th, morning, "The One Hope" (brother Sixsmith); evening, "The Lamb of God; his Origin and Constitution; how he bore the sins of men in his own body; the way in which he takes away the sin of the world" (brother Wareham). August 20th, morning, "The state of the dead" (brother Holland); evening, "The woman of Samaria; the water offered to her" (brother Wareham). August 27th, "The man of war; his present position, and future appearance to subjugate the world" (brother Trueblood); evening, "Heaven's Programme" (brother Wareham).

NEWTONSHAW.—Brother Durrie reports another addition here, by the obedience of WILLIAM FRASER (21), mill-worker, formerly neutral. He was immersed into the sin-covering name on Sunday, July 16th, after making a very intelligent confession of his faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ, as they are detailed for us in the pages of the "Living Oracles."

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports the withdrawal of brother J. Harrison from the Nottingham ecclesia; also the withdrawal of the brethren from brother Hoe, for disorderly walk and conduct. Brother Kirkland adds: "The attendance at the Sunday evening lectures is good. Some are instructed, who we hope will go on to obedience. We have started a Sunday School during the month, taken charge of by sister Sulley. This has been earnestly longed for by some of our children for some time, but we have not been able to meet their wishes, through not being allowed to use the Lecture Hall for such a purpose. But to meet this difficulty, brother Sulley has given the use of his house."

PETERBORO.—Brother Royce reports the obedience of his brother in the flesh, JOHN WILLIAM ROYCE (28.) He was formerly an attendant at the services of the Plymouth Brethren, and, says brother Royce, "would, no doubt, have joined that sect, if the Christadelphians had not opened out the 'one faith, one hope, one Lord and one baptism,' &c. My brother wanted to unite himself to the Baptist denomination, and asked Mr. Barras, the minister of that sect in that city, what the kingdom of Christ was. Mr. Barras replied that he did not know whether it was a temporal or spiritual kingdom. This my brother thought spoke not well for his scriptural light with regard to other matters." (The kingdom will not be "temporal" in the strict sense of that word, which means pertaining to this temporary order of

things. It will, however, be real and and literal. It will, in the true sense, be a spiritual kingdom, but personal and actual and visible.—EDITOR.)

RIPLEY.—Brother Kirkland, of Nottingham, writes, "I am requested by the ecclesia, meeting in brother King's house at Codnor Park, to report the immersion (July 16th) of WILLIAM SMITH (20), formerly neutral. I also enclose a copy of his letter to brother King, which brother K. at once sent to Nottingham, asking for one or two of the brethren to go over and take part in his examination. He also sent to brother Smith, informing him as he (bro. King) was but young in the truth, he had sent to Nottingham for some of the brethren to be present. Brother Richards and myself went. We found brother Smith intelligent in the first principles, and, therefore, at once went to the neighbouring river, and there brother King assisted him to put on the saving name by immersion. We afterwards broke bread with the brethren (now numbering 6) in brother King's house. We were all much cheered by seeing the power of the truth. His letter is as follows:

Farley, Darley Dale, July 9th, 1876.

MR. KING, MY DEAR SIR,—You will no doubt be surprised at receiving a note from a perfect stranger to you, but I doubt not you will excuse me when you hear what has led me to do so. Last summer I was working at Ripley, and there heard several Christadelphian lecturers and was much struck by the scripturalness of them. Shortly after, having to leave town, I was unable to attend them any longer, but having before so doing heard of the obedience of W. RADFORD, of the Elms, I continued to search for the truth, and by means of the reading of various works, I have been enabled to believe and accept the truth. And seeing the responsibility it has brought to bear, I have decided to obey it as shortly as possible. With this in view, being at Ripley yesterday, July 8th, I had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Radford, who advised me to write to you, saying that on Sunday next he would meet you at Codnor Park, and that as I cannot possibly arrive at Ripley before noon, would you put off your meeting until afternoon, when, if the Lord will, I shall come with Mr. Radford to hear what you have to say with regard to my immersion into the saving name, which is the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Hoping soon to be enabled to subscribe myself your brother in Israel's hope, I remain yours truly,—WILLIAM SMITH.

ROCK FERRY.—See paragraph in Birmingham intelligence.

SHEFFIELD.—Bro. Boler reports another candidate for the rulership of the *aión* of the *aións* taken out from among the Gentiles at Sheffield, viz: GEORGE THOMAS WALLIS (24), formerly neutral, by trade a plumber and

gas fitter. He has been an interested enquirer for ten months. The subjects of the lectures for the past month have been:—"Alpha and Omega," "Scripture passages supposed to favour popular teaching," "The restoration of the Jews," "The truth and the few."

SWANSEA.—Brother Messenger reports the immersion of WALTER RENDELL (23). The all important choice of putting on the the saving name of Christ was made early on Sunday morning, the 8th inst., in the presence of several brethren and a few interested friends. Brother Rendell was formerly connected with the Baptists, among whom he was an earnest and regular Sunday School Teacher, and a zealous and popular open-air preacher. The channel through which God's blessing in bringing brother R. to the knowledge of the truth was conveyed, was the sincerity and constancy of brother Evans' advocacy of the truth. We hope the truth in his hands will command a fair hearing among the crowds who listened so willingly and patiently to his advanced views whilst a Baptist.

From another communication it appears that the division caused some time ago, by the refusal of certain to consent to the adoption of a complete definition of the faith on which they stood, (a division which had been recently healed,) has again ensued from an attempt on the part of those who objected to the statement, to get rid of the statement which had been adopted. Those who abide by the whole truth stated and professed as the basis of the fellowship, are associated with brethren Randles and Evans. The others cannot complain if the friend of the truth elsewhere takes sides with the truth where unmistakably professed, to whatever personal issues it may lead. For people to say they make the Bible their basis, is not in this day of religious confusion to say enough as regards indicating their whereabouts. Every religious person says he makes the Bible his basis: we find out the truth of his profession by putting to him a definition of what it teaches, and where people are against either putting or submitting to such a definition, it is a sign there is something unsatisfactory at the bottom. At all events, those who take such a position cut themselves off from the faithful friends of the truth.—ED.]

NEW ZEALAND.

INVERCARGILL.—Brother W. G. Mackay, who has safely accomplished his return voyage from England, writes of the obedience of Mr. and Mrs. Laing, of Invercargill. He says: "They were immersed by myself, assisted by brother Brown of Matama, on May 27th (last month.) Their names and ages are as follow: JAMES LAING (67); ELIZABETH, his wife (66.) They are both very intelligent in the Scriptures, having

heard the truth first expounded by brother Holmes, six years ago, when he paid a visit to Invercargill for the purpose of assisting me to put on the name by immersion, since which time they separated themselves from all the Gentile churches, and betook themselves to the study of the gospel of the kingdom of God, which has proved, in their case, as that of many others when the soil is favourable, 'the power of God to make them wise to salvation.' Their addition to the Southland ecclesia is to sister M. and myself, a source of much joy. We have hopes of others."

UNITED STATES.

BURNET, Burnet Co. (Tex.)—J.B.—To fellowship those who walk in darkness, by habit and profession, is to make ourselves part-takers with their sin. You cannot maintain too stout an attitude on this point. But we should do wrong if we were to refuse to receive back brethren who may have wandered out of the way, and who, confessing and forsaking their sins, desire to return to paths of righteousness and love. We have before referred to the evidence. 2 Cor. ii. 6-10 is conclusive if there were nothing else. Unpardonable sin is where there has been a complete apostasy and a wilful and presumptuous sinning against light. It is best to reserve doubtful cases to the Lord's judgment at his coming, that is, by receiving them in compassion while repudiating all complicity with their sin. We make it a rule not to publish the discussion of personal disputes in the *Christadelphian*. It would be best to try to come together again. If all are zealous against iniquity, there ought to be no difficulty in dealing compassionately with penitent and reformed perpetrators of it.

ELMIRA (N.Y.)—Brother J. F. Sykes reports the obedience of MARTHA KERNEY (30), in the service of Mr. T. K. Beecher, pastor of Elmira Congregational Church, and brother of the notorious Henry Ward Beecher. The event has given great satisfaction to the small ecclesia. They have, however, to lament a loss by the death of brother W. Hisom, whom though an old man, they will miss. He was born in 1796, in Charlton, Northamptonshire, England, and was, consequently, 80 years of age. He saw and received the truth only four years before his death. Before his death, he said, "I must die; but I shall not lie in the grave long."

LANESVILLE, King William Co. (Va.)—Bro. J. S. Weale writes:—"It may be, after all, in this, our almost barren soil, where the golden seed of the kingdom has been sown so long, that it may bring forth a harvest

unto the Lord! We had well nigh fagged beneath the opposing elements of world and pagan faction; and scarce did more than wait, and watch, and pray—"Thy kingdom come"—so dead the worldly heart!—so low the vulgar thought that wallows in slimy depths far, far beneath the sphere of the Great Eternal! But happily we have known of better things, and our pen is but to tell 'Tis not in vain to sow! nor yet but leaves the harvest yield.' The opening of our new church at Lanesville (Va.) took place on the first Sunday in July. Brother Albert Anderson, of Goochland, (co-labourer with brother Thomas), spoke first with his wonted zeal and devotion. In the afternoon our promising brother T. C. Weeks, of Baltimore, gave, in beautiful language, the history of Israel that was, and ended with a rich description of the glory that awaits the faithful in the future, not very far off, we trust. Brother Jas. Luxford, of Richmond (Va.), was also with us, but being feeble in health, he contributed only in private conversation. The meeting was kept up at night through the week.—Brother Wiley Jones, of Norfolk (Va.), speaking principally; and on Sunday following, our own shepherd, brother Samuel Edwards, administered baptism to some seven individuals, two of whom had been members of the Campbellite faith—a goodly number, we think, when we know of the surroundings which on all sides conspire to captivate the shallow mind. God grant that things are not so bad as we think, but rather that the word sown may (even sooner than we expect) bring into the fold the last one of the 144 thousand, that the time of our Lord and Master may come to plant his throne in the new heavens, on Mount Zion, and to rule and judge the world in righteousness—Amen." [The "church," as defined by Paul, is "the pillar and ground of the truth"—the thing that holds up, the thing that gives foundation to the truth. No community is entitled to this character unless it performs this function to the truth *in its entirety*. Dr. Edwards has a good character in this connection: it may be that the community described above shares it in fact if not in reputation. We hope the best; but if the doctrine of the judgment is compromised, there is a flaw in the title deed.—EDITOR.]

WEST HOBOKEN.—Sister Lasius writes:—"The brethren have lately had the pleasure of baptizing brother P. P. LEARNED, who now resides in Poughkeepsie (N.Y.). He formerly attended the Dr.'s discourses, in 1856, when the meetings were held in New York city; but only of late years felt the truth a motive power, prompting the obedience of faith." She also mentions an encouraging visit and discourse from brother Gunn, of Walkerton, Canada.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 148.

OCTOBER, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

SACRIFICE IN THE FUTURE AGE AND CHRIST'S ACCOMPLISHED WORK.

BY DR. THOMAS.

THE MOSAIC CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM IMPERFECT.

THE kingdom of God is the Twelve Tribes of Israel existing in the land promised to Abraham and Christ. When it existed of old time, the Mosaic covenant was its civil and ecclesiastical code, which appointed and defined all things. But since the appearance of Jesus in Israel, certain things have come to pass in connection with him, which necessitate a change or amendment of the covenant, or constitution, that provision may be made, or scope afforded, for the exercise of his functions as high priest and king of Israel; and for the carrying out of the principles which emanate from the edification or purification of the new covenant by his blood. This is the necessity which existed for a change of the law; “for the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.”—(Heb. vii. 12.) The Sinai constitution of the kingdom established a changeable priesthood of the tribe of Levi, the chief of which was an hereditary prince of the family of Aaron, called the High Priest. The high-priesthood is an office divinely created; and no man of Israel was allowed to assume it

unless he was called of God as Aaron. It was appointed^c for the offering for men both gifts to God and sacrifices for sins; so that the officiating party becomes a mediator between God and men. But the priesthood of Levi and Aaron was imperfect, and therefore could not impart perfection, so as that he who did the service, or the worshippers should have no more conscience of sins, and thereby become heirs of eternal life. This being the nature of the priesthood under which Israel received the law, or covenant, the Mosaic institution was weak and unprofitable, and could make nothing perfect.—(Heb. vii. 11, 18, 19; ix. 9; x. 1.) This imperfection resulted from the nature of the consecration, or blood of the covenant. Aaron and his sons, the altar, and nearly all the things of the law were purified by the blood of bulls and goats, &c.; which, however, could not sanctify to the purifying of the heart, or the flesh from the evil within it which makes it mortal. It was necessary to perfection that sin should be condemned in the flesh of the high priest, which could not be effected by condemning sin in the flesh of the animals sacrificed under the law. This necessity would have required the death of a high priest at the celebration of every annual atonement at least, being themselves sinners; but as this was incompatible with the nature of things, animal sacrifices were substituted. So that Aaron and his successors could not under penalty of immediate death enter into the most holy without this substitutionary blood. But then this blood was deficient of the necessary sin remitting qualities. The blood required was that of the peccant nature—the human; for it was man, and not the creatures, that had sinned. But even human blood would have been unprofitable if it were the blood of one who was himself an actual transgressor, or a victim that even if an innocent person had not come to life again. The Messiah in prophecy asks the question, “What profit is there in my blood, if I go down to the pit? Can the dust praise Thee? Can it declare Thy truth?”—(Psa. xxx. 9.) The answer is none. For if the Christ had died, and not risen again, he would not have been a living sacrifice, and could not have imparted vitality to the things professedly sanctified by it. The blood of the Mosaic sacrifices was weak and unprofitable because it was not human; because it was not *innocent* human blood; and because it was not the blood of one innocent of the great transgression, who had come to life again through the power of the Eternal Spirit. For these three important reasons, the blood of the Mosaic covenant could not take away sins, and therefore the high priest and the nation, individually and collectively, were all left under the curse of the law, which was death.”—(Rom. vi. 23.) The law could not give them life who were under it (Gal. iii. 21), being weak through the flesh (Rom. viii. 5), and deriving no vitality from the blood peculiar to it; if it could have conferred a title to eternal life, and consequently to the promises made to Abraham and Christ, then righteousness, justification, or remission of sins would have been by the Covenant of Sinai.

But it may be inquired, if the Mosaic institution could not perfect the conscience, nor give a title to eternal life and the inheritance, but left its subjects dead in trespasses and in sins, by what means will the prophets and those of Israel who died before Christ came, obtain salvation in the kingdom of God? The answer is, that what the law could not do,

the bringing in of a better hope accomplished.—(Heb. vii. 19.) The Mosaic sacrifices were provisional, substitutionary and representative. They pointed to the sacrifice of Christ, which in its *retrospective* influence was to redeem those from death, who when living had not only been circumcised, but had walked also in the steps of *that faith* of their father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised. For the promise that he should be THE HEIR OF THE WORLD was not to Abraham, nor to his seed (Gal. iii. 29), through the law, but *through the righteousness of faith*.—(Rom. iv. 12, 13.) The object of Christ's death is plainly declared to have been "for the transgressions under the first testament;" or as elsewhere expressed, "to redeem them who were under the law."—(Heb. ix. 15; Gal. iv. 5.) "By his stripes," says Isaiah, "we are healed. Jehovah hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all. For the transgression of his people was he stricken." The "*we*," the "*us*" and the "*people*" in these texts, are the ancient worthies before and under the law, as well as those who have believed the gospel, and after his second appearing shall offer "sin offerings, and meat offerings, and burnt offerings, and peace offerings for reconciliation" under the new covenant consecrated by his most precious blood.

Under the first, or Mosaic covenant, the priests were said to "make reconciliation with the blood of the sacrifices upon the altar, to make atonement for all Israel" (2 Chron. xxix. 24); so under the second, or new covenant of the kingdom, Ezekiel speaks of "one lamb to make reconciliation for them."—(Ezek. xlv. 15.) But withdraw from the premisses the death and resurrection of Christ, and faith in them and the promises, and the reconciliation under both covenants is imperfect and vain. Animal sacrifices are necessary to the service as types or patterns, and memorials. The Mosaic reconciliation was typical; the Ezekiel reconciliation, memorial or commemorative. The typical Mosaic could not perfect the conscience of the worshippers, because Christ had not then died and risen again; nor could they when he had risen, because they were offered by high priests, whose functions before God were superseded by a high priest of the tribe of Judah after another order than that of Aaron, then in the presence of Jehovah Himself. The Ezekiel reconciliation, however, will perfect the conscience, because Christ has died and lives for evermore; which death and resurrection connected with the reconciliatory offerings by faith in the worshipper, and offered to God through the Prince of Israel, the High Priest upon his throne after the order of Melchizedec, will constitute sacrifices of a character such as have not been offered on the earth before.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE KINGDOM UNDER THE NEW COVENANT.

We demur to our beloved sister's declaration, that "Paul distinctly states that the Levitical service was 'imposed until the time of the *reformation*,' thereby intimating its discontinuance then." The sectarian idea of "the time of reformation" in this text is, until John and Jesus proclaimed repentance, after which there would be no temple service performed by Levites that God would accept. But this is contrary to the sure word

of prophecy, which testifies that "the Messenger of the Covenant shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto Jehovah an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord *as in the days of old and as in former years.*"—(Mat. iii. 3, 4.) And again the prophet records Jehovah's declaration, that "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel: neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before him to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. Thus saith the Lord, if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, that there should not be day and night in their season; then (and not before) may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests my ministers." From this it is manifest, that the perpetuity of David's throne, and the perpetuity of the Levitical ministrations, are parallel. Some say that David's throne is now occupied in heaven; will these same visionaries affirm that the Levites are offering sacrifices there, for the testimony says, "they shall do sacrifice continually?!" The truth is that this testimony has regard to the time when the kingdom shall be restored again to Israel. At the time the prophecy was delivered there were unbelievers who, like the Millerites of our day, declared that the Lord had cast off the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Therefore said Jehovah to the prophet, "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, the two families which the Lord hath chosen He hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them. But, if my covenant be not with the day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth: then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: *for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.*"—(Jer. xxxiii. 17-26.) It is from the time of this return, then, that the perpetuity begins in relation to David's son, and the Levites. Both houses of Israel are still in captivity; therefore the return is yet future. When that return is accomplished, then henceforth even to "the end" appointed, shall these gracious promises obtain as notable realities in the land of Israel.

It is therefore a principle of the kingdom of God that the Levites shall be priests in that kingdom under the New Covenant, or constitution, as well as under the Old. As it is written, "Thus saith the Lord, they shall be ministers in my temple, having charge of the gates of the house, and ministering to the house; they shall slay the burnt offering and the sacrifice for the people, and they shall stand before them to minister unto them. They shall not come near unto me, to do the office of a priest unto me, nor to come near to any of my holy things in the most holy place. But I will make them keepers of the charge of the house, for all the service thereof, and for all that shall be done therein." The reason given why they shall not do the office of a priest before God, but shall act as menials in the service, and in relation only to the

people, is because under the Mosaic Covenant "they ministered to the people before their idols, and caused the house of Israel to fall into iniquity."—(Ezek. xlv. 9-14.) This is the ground of their future degradation from their former rank to that of the lowest class of the priesthood under the New Covenant.

The class of priests above them is to consist of the Levites, the sons of Zadoc.—(Verse 15.) These will have no immediate communication with the people in performing the service, but will officiate intermediately between the people's priests and "the Prince," who is then High Priest, and Jehovah's anointed for ever. It is probable that "the sons of Zadoc," are the sons of the Just One: Zadoc signifying *just* or *justified*. Zadoc, who was contemporary with David and Solomon, is their representative father in the priesthood, as David is their representative father in royalty, and Abraham their representative father in the faith. Hence in the priesthood, the saints are "the sons of Zadoc," in the royalty, "the sons of the Prince"—(Ezek. xlvi. 16), and in the faith, "the seed or sons of Abraham." Eli and his sons were rejected as representative sacerdotal men, because the sons were wicked, and Eli honoured them above Jehovah. Therefore Jehovah said to him, "I will raise me up a faithful priest, who shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind; and I will build him a sure house; and *he shall walk before mine ANOINTED for ever*."—(1 Sam. ii. 29, 35.) He must therefore become immortal. Now under the Mosaic Covenant this "faithful priest" was Zadoc, who walked before David and Solomon. When Absalom and Israel rebelled against the Lord's anointed, Zadoc and Abiathar remained faithful with Jehovah and his king. But when David was about to die, Abiathar, who was descended from Eli, conspired to make Adonijah king instead of Solomon; while Zadoc continued faithful to David. Solomon, however, being established on the throne "he thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord; that he might fulfil the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh." He told him he was worthy of death, but he would spare his life for his father's sake, because he suffered with him in Absalom's rebellion: he therefore exiled him to Anathoth, and promoted Zadoc to the high-priesthood in his room.—(1 Kings i. 7, 39; ii. 22, 26, 27, 35.) Now these were representative events. Jehovah will raise up the faithful of the house of Levi, even Zadoc and his sons, and they shall walk before the "greater than Solomon" when, in "the city of the Great King," he sits and rules upon his throne as a priest, bearing the glory (Zech. vi. 12, 13), as Prince of Israel for ever. This superior class of Levites "shall come near to me," saith the Lord, "to minister unto me, and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the blood: they shall enter into my holy place, and they shall come near to my table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge." From the seventeenth verse to the end of the chapter are the ordinances from the lowest class of Levitical priests.

AMENDMENT OF THE OLD COVENANT OF THE KINGDOM.

Here then is a change in the Levitical arrangements, and not an

abolition of them. The "service" will be amended, not abolished. In the service under the Mosaic Covenant there were "divers washings;" but in the service under the New Covenant of the kingdom "washings" are omitted; for in the Ezekiel Temple there is no laver, or brazen sea provided. But sacrifices remain; for eight tables are appointed to be set up in the entry of the north gate on which the lowest class of the priests are to slay them for the people. Paul, therefore, did not mean that the Levitical service was absolutely and finally discontinued—that it should be revived no more; but that it should be amended to adapt it to the new circumstances created by the sacrifice and high priesthood of Jesus, which was to supersede the priesthood of Aaron.

If we be asked the reason for the conclusion that Paul meant amendment, and not final discontinuance of the Levitical service, we reply, that it is found in the phrase "until the time of reformation" used by him. His words are *mechri kairou diorthoseos*. The Levitical service continued unchanged for forty years after the proclamation of "reformation" by Jesus; so that the *kairos* or definite time for discontinuance was not at his preaching, or even the rending of the temple veil. The Mosaic service was not "imposed until the time of *metanoia*," which is the word signifying the "reformation" preached. *Metanoieite* "repent ye," said Jesus. No; it was "imposed until the time of *diorthosis*," which is not "repentance," but *emendation*, *amendment*; from *diorthoo* to correct, or make right. The subject of the *diorthosis* is the Mosaic Covenant, not the disposition of men. The Mosaic Constitution must be amended to make way for a new order of priesthood, and a service which shall show forth the perfection of its character. The work of amendment in regard to its foundation was laid in the death and resurrection of Jesus. It then became necessary to gather out of Judah sons of Zadoc, and the Prince. "Behold I and the children whom God has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel."—(Isai. viii. 18; Heb. ii. 13.) These children being separated to Jesus from the tribe of Levi and the nation for the purposes to be accomplished through them at "the restitution of all things," nothing remained for the epoch, but to give the Mosaic constitution a thorough shaking. This is called *shaking the heaven*, and was the fulfilment of the prophecy by Haggai (Hag. ii. 6), reproduced by Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews.—(Heb. xii. 26, 27.) "Yet once, *it is a little while*, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will shake the heavens and the earth." The "little while" was 587 years from the delivery of the prediction; and about ten years from the date of the epistle. It was the last time the nation of Israel and the constitution of their kingdom were to be shaken. Their commonwealth was to be shaken that "the things made," or constituted, by the Mosaic Covenant, which were incompatible with the rights of the Lord Jesus founded upon "*the word of the oath*" (Heb. vii. 21, 28), might be "removed;" and that "those things which" were in harmony with that word, and which "cannot be shaken might remain." This then was the first stage of the "emendation," or as the Gentiles would say, of "the amendment of the constitution."

The next work in carrying out the purpose of emendation is thus expressed in Haggai—"I will shake the sea and the dry land; and I

will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." When this was spoken the temple was in ruins, the foundation only being laid. The people then returned from Babylon said, "The time has not come that the Lord's house should be built" (Hag. i. 2, 4, 9); that is, the 70 years that it was to lie waste from the time of its destruction are not yet accomplished, 66 years only having elapsed. But Haggai was sent to them to stir them up to the work, and in four years after, even in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, it was finished.—(Ezra vi. 15.) When, therefore, Haggai said, "this house shall be filled with glory" he did not refer to the temple which Jesus frequented; but to the temple to stand upon the same site which is described by Ezekiel, into which "the glory of the God of Israel," even the Son of Man in the glory of the Father, "shall come from the way of the east," and cause the neighbouring earth itself to shine.—(Ezek. xliii. 1.) This is the only interpretation the prophecy will admit of; for when Jesus came, he was neither "the desire of all nations," notwithstanding the fanciful gloss upon Virgil's Pollio, nor was he in glory. The glory of the God of Israel left the temple when the Chaldees were about to destroy it; and it will not return until Jesus shall sit upon the throne and bear the glory in the era of "the regeneration."

The shaking of the heavens and the earth, as we have said, refers to "the end of all things" (1 Pet. iv. 7), constituted by the Old Covenant; but the shaking of the sea and dry land, to the kingdoms of the Gentiles, and is thus explained: "I will overthrow the Throne of Kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen, &c. In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, the son of Shealtiel, and will make thee as a signet; for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts."—(Hag. ii. 22.) This period of overthrow is "the time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation, to that same time," when Michael shall stand up, the Great Prince who standeth for the Israelites, who at that time shall be delivered, even all that shall be found written among the living in Jerusalem.—(Dan. xii. 1; Isai iv. 3.) This is the era of resurrection of "the heirs" of "the kingdom which cannot be moved." Michael (*Mi* who, *cha* like, *el* God) the great power of God, even Jesus the great Prince of Israel, appears at this crisis "to subdue all things to himself," and to complete the work of emendation. He smites the image of Nebuchadnezzar upon its feet (Dan. ii. 34), and grinds its fragments to powder.—(Mat. xxi. 44.) He brings the king of the north, who is Head over an extensive region, (*rosh al-eretz ravbah*) to his end.—(Dan. xi. 45; Ps. cx. 6.) He causes Gog to fall upon the mountains of Israel; and expels the Gentiles out of his land (Ezek. xxxix 4), that they may tread his holy city under foot no more. Having made the nations lick the dust like a serpent (Ps. x. 16), and bound their power as with a mighty chain (Mic. vii. 16, 17), he proceeds in the building again of the tabernacle of David, and in the setting-up of its ruins—that is, in the restoring again of the kingdom of God to Israel, or in "the restitution of all things" belonging to the Mosaic law, compatible with the exercise of the functions of High Priests

in Israel. When this work is accomplished the *diorthosis* or emendation will be complete.

If the Mosaic Covenant of the kingdom has been found faultless, then should no place have been sought.—(Heb. viii. 7.) The priesthood of the Mosaic was *changeable*, passing from father to son. This was deemed by the Lord a very important defect, which must therefore be amended. He determined therefore that the priesthood should be changed—that it should no longer “be left to other people;” but should be unchangeable in the hands of the Messiah and the saints, or Zadoc and his sons. But this purpose could not be carried into effect so long as the Mosaic constitution of the kingdom was in force; for this restricted the priesthood to the tribe of Levi, and made no provision for a priest of the tribe of Judah. Now Jehovah purposed that the High Priesthood of the nation should be changed from the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron, to the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Hence this change of the priesthood being determined, there was decreed of necessity a change also of the law.—(Heb. vii. 12.) As Christ’s priesthood was not authorised by the Mosaic Covenant, something was necessary on which to found it. This necessity was provided for in the Word of the Oath which runs thus—“I have sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.” This oath was uttered by Jehovah upwards of 500 years after the law was given from Sinai; and constitutes the right of David’s son to the priesthood of the kingdom; as the oath sworn to David also entitles his son to its throne for ever. The grand peculiarity, then, of the New Constitution of the kingdom over the Old is, *the union of the High-priesthood and kingly office in one person, of the tribe of Judah and family of David unchangeable, or for ever.* Under the Mosaic, the priesthood and royalty of the kingdom were separate, and restricted to two distinct families and tribes—the priesthood, to Levi and Aaron; the royalty, to Judah and David. But this will be amended, and the Lord Jesus, in whose veins once flowed the blood of Levi, Aaron (Luke i. 5, 36. Elizabeth and Mary were cousins; and Elizabeth a daughter of Aaron; their mothers were sisters. Hence Mary’s blood was Aaronic from her mother, and Davidic from her father Heli, Jesus therefore partook of both maternally), Judah and David, will unite in himself the kingly and priestly offices, when he sits and rules upon his throne, and bears the glory.

Well, Jesus of Nazareth was manifested to Israel as Son of God at his baptism. It was clearly proved that he was the Christ, and therefore entitled to the things defined in the word of the oaths to himself and his father David. But “he was made under the law” (Gal. iv. 4), to which he yielded a perfect obedience in all things. He never entered the Court of the Priests, nor the holy place, nor attempted to do service at the altar. Being of the tribe of Judah, the law forbade him to advance beyond the court of the Israelites, or to minister in holy things. So long as the Mosaic law continued in practical operation, and he inhabited the land, he must have remained among the people. Had Israel continued in their country under the law to this day, and Jesus had remained with them until now, and they had been willing to acknowledge him, and submit to his government, he would not

have ascended the throne until the constitution was dedicated and amended: "For," says Paul, in view of this condition of affairs, "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law."—(Heb. viii. 4.) The emendation of the covenant must have been preceded by its dedication. This could only be accomplished by the death of the mediatorial testator; for no testament or covenant is of force while the testator liveth."—(Heb. ix. 16, 17). Jehovah is the testator, but being incapable of death, his will, or covenant, was ordained in the hand of a mediator, who became Jehovah's substitutionary testator. As Jesus, the heir of God, was to inherit under the new, or amended, covenant, having root in the promises, his death was necessitated; for the covenant in which his rights were vested was of no force till he died and rose again. His death was therefore the dedication of the covenant in his blood; as he himself said, "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20); and to show the connection between the covenant and the kingdom, said, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." But when he came to life again after this dedication, he could not even then inherit the kingdom. The Mosaic covenant must have been changed; an emendation, however, to which the party in power would by no means consent, as the amendment would have put them all out of the government. Pilate and Herod, Caiaphas and the Council must have surrendered their offices into the hands of Jesus, who would have promoted in their place his own disciples and friends. But they would not hear of such a thing; therefore it remained only for Jesus to absent himself, and to abolish the kingdom until the time appointed in the wisdom of the Father for its restitution to Israel under a better, more permanent and perfect order of things.

JEWES AND GENTILES IN RELATION TO THE NEW COVENANT AND THE
BLOOD THEREOF.

We come now to the consideration of the difficulty seemingly involved in Paul's doctrine when regarded in the light of Ezekiel's testimony. Jesus is now the High Priest of God, and the only one that exists, or will ever exist in relation to man. He has had no rival since the Mosaic covenant "vanished away." He is God's high priest for those, both Jews and Gentiles, who have been reconciled to God through his name—that is, who believe God's promises concerning the kingdom, and the things concerning Jesus, and have been united to his name by baptism. This is equivalent to saying, who have been reconciled through the belief and obedience of the gospel of the kingdom—through the obedience of faith. Of the things concerning Jesus are the things pertaining to his divine sonship, his spotless and unblemished character, his sacrificial death and resurrection, &c., constituting him God's Lamb, holy and without blemish, having neither spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, of his own free will once offered to bear the sins of *many*. Thus he was at once the sacrifice and the priest; for "he offered up himself;" as he said, "I lay down my life for the sheep. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it up again. No man taketh it from me, but

I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of my Father.”—(Heb. vii. 27; John x. 15, 17, 18.) Being thus the lamb slain, he resumed his life, and entered into the presence of God before whom he stands as the blood-sprinkled ark of the covenant (Rev. xi. 19). in whom is deposited the law hereafter to go forth from Zion, and the life of his sheep (Col. iii. 3), whose sins he bears away (Heb. ix. 28); and thus they are sanctified by the dedicated covenant through the once offering of his body: so that “by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”—(Heb. x. 10, 14.)

Now these sanctified ones are a purified people, whose “hearts,” or minds and dispositions, have been “purified by faith”—(Acts xv. 9), faith in the promises of God, and in “the blood of sprinkling which speaks better things than the blood of Abel.” The blood of Jesus is the blood of sprinkling which gushed forth from his side as “an offering” or purification “for sin.” The poor in spirit and the meek, the honest and good hearts, that by faith appreciate the virtue of this sprinkled blood, and have become the subjects of repentance and remission in his name, are said to be “sprinkled from an evil conscience,” and to have “washed the body with pure water.”—(Heb. x. 22.) They are “the children of the promise,” or covenant; because in becoming Christ’s they have believed the promises, and been purified by the “the blood of the covenant.” As yet they walk by faith in the things believed, and not by sight. Faith, which is “the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things unseen,” is the mirror which reflects the things of the approaching future, and presents them to the believer’s mind as though he were beholding, and personally in the presence of, the very things themselves. Hence, it is said to such, “Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the City of the living God, to Jerusalem the heavenly, and to myriads of angels, to a general convocation, even to an assembly of firstborns enrolled for the heavens (*en ouranois*) and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaks better things than that of Abel”—(Heb. xii. 22); *ye are come by faith* to these things, which at present ye do dimly contemplate; but which ye shall see no longer as through a glass darkly, but face to face in the presence of the Lord.

Now these, whose hearts are sprinkled and their bodies washed, are the only people on the earth since the entrance of Jesus into the presence of God, for whom he officiates as “High Priest over the House of God.”—(Heb. x. 21; iii. 6.) They are “God’s temple,” “the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.”—(Heb. viii. 2.) For forty years this temple co-existed with that in Jerusalem; but since the destruction of the latter it is the only temple of God upon the earth where gifts and offerings, called “spiritual sacrifices” (1 Peter ii. 5, 9), are offered acceptably to His name. They become acceptable in being presented through Jesus Christ. They who do the worship (and they are all the faithful) enter into this holy place, or heavenly, which as a whole they constitute, with the sprinkled blood of the covenant upon their hearts. Purified once through faith in the blood-sprinkled covenant of promise,

hereafter to become the law of the Kingdom, there is in their case no more sacrifice for sin; "for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Yet, though thus sanctified, they continue to offer spiritual sacrifices. All this is worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth; which is the only service acceptable to Him while His kingdom is in ruins, and prostrate at the feet of the Gentiles.

But this worship in spirit and in truth, expressed in confession of the hope, (Heb. x. 23. *Homologia tes elpidos*, confession of the hope, and not "profession of our faith," as in the king's version. Rom. x. 9, 10) &c. praise, and prayer; in baptism; and in eating and drinking of the symbols on the table of the Lord, is the unburdensome privilege of those only who through faith in the covenant and its blood have become "heirs of the kingdom." When this is set up in Palestine, the service is changed *in form but not in principle*; and from social becomes national. In the national service, the higher priesthood, which consists of Jesus and the "children God has given him," all immortal by resurrection or transformation, though they offer the fat and the blood, it is for the people and not for themselves. They need no more sacrifice for sin; but "being priests unto God" (Rev. v. 10), there needs must be something for them to offer on account of the worshippers for whom they officiate. The new covenant, which we now accept as a matter of faith and hope has not yet been made with the house of Judah and Israel. If it had, they would now be a united nation in Palestine. It will be made with them when they are grafted into their own olive and not before. At the engrafting, there will be a great national celebration, called "*a delivering of the covenant*" (Ezek. xx. 37), *be-masoreth ha berith*—A delivering of the new covenant from Zion (Mic. iv. 2), with a glorious, but not such a terrible, display of power as when the covenant was delivered from Sinai. The nation, or Twelve Tribes, having been brought at length to acknowledge Jesus as High Priest and King, are received into favour; and being under the new covenant, as in former years they were under the old, Jehovah becomes merciful to their unrighteousness, and proclaims everlasting oblivion of all their past individual and national offences by virtue of the royal blood of the covenant, the preciousness of which they then perceive and appreciate. This amnesty, however, benefits that generation only to which the covenant is delivered and by which it is accepted. It affects not the generation of Israel's rebellious dead; they are the "cut off from the people."

Now, the question remains, when thus reconciled to God through the blood of His Son, is the nation to have a religious service or worship; and if they are, what is to be *its principle*, and what *its form*? No one who understands the Bible would affirm, that the Twelve Tribes of Israel were to live in their own land under the new covenant for 1000 years without any national religious worship. To affirm this would be to say in effect, that God had prepared a royal priesthood for His kingdom, but had provided no service for them to perform. This is inadmissible for a moment. There will be a service under the new covenant as there was under the old. Its principle will be memorial, not typical; even the extension of the principle upon which is now celebrated the death and

resurrection of Jesus. Hence, the "reconciliation" will be *a memorial reconciliation made perfect by the blood of the covenant which institutes it*. The reconciliation of the old covenant was typical and imperfect; because the dedication blood, being merely that of bulls and goats, could not perfect the conscience in taking away of sins. When the Prince under the new covenant "prepares for himself, and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin-offering" (Ezek. xlv. 22), it is memorial of his own sacrifice of himself, and memorial of the reconciliation which the people enjoy through the blood of the covenant with which, through faith in it, their hearts will be sprinkled then, as the true believers are at present.

Such is the principle of the amended "service which pertains to the Israelites."—(Rom. ix. 4.) The form thereof is detailed in Ezekiel more at large than we can present it here. It is a service not of spiritual sacrifices, but of bloody sacrifices of spiritual significance. The lower order of the priesthood, mortal Levites, slay them for the people, and pass the fat and blood from the tables at the north gate to the altar, where they are burned and sprinkled by the higher or immortal priests, "the seed of Zadoc," before the Lord. The past sins of the nation having been amnestied at the delivering of the covenant, there is thenceforth no more remembrance of sins once a year. The old Mosaic annual atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month, at which the tribes were to "afflict their souls," is not revived under the new covenant. It will form no part of the service then. It was one of those things made or appointed that was removed when the Lord shook the Mosaic heaven by the Roman power. There will be no laver of water between the temple and the altar for the seed of Zadoc to wash themselves before they enter the temple. These washings and carnal ordinances are also abolished; for those who approach the altar and enter in, are like their Prince, holy and undefiled, being devoid of evil in the flesh.

Much more might be said upon these interesting and important matters, but we must at present refrain. Knowing the ignorance which prevails upon the subject here exhibited, we did not feel at liberty to answer our beloved sister's letter in fewer words. We have endeavoured to unfold what has been revealed as the best exhibition of the agreement between the prophets and the apostles. The reader being now, therefore, in possession of the premisses will be able to draw many more conclusions for himself than at present occur, or can be conveniently reported at this time.—*Herald*, 1851.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

PROFESSOR BRUGSET, while accompanying the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin on an expedition to Siani, has discovered in a library of the monastery nine hitherto unknown portions of the *Codeæ Siniaticæ*, the oldest extant MS. of the New Testament.—(*Scotsman*.)

HISTORICAL VERACITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The following is an extract from a work recently published, *Studies, Biblical and Oriental*; by W. Turner:—"Of the two divisions of the sacred volume, the Old Testament is that which has drawn forth, in largest measure, unfavourable criticism, and of which we are farthest from the full comprehension. Its history, remarkable even if denuded of the miraculous element, is at the same time so interwoven with prodigy, that it ought to be recognised as the most reasonable procedure either to receive the whole with unquestioning faith, or to reject the whole

as a tissue of uncertainties and fables. Not a few who receive the New Testament as a revelation from God, find nothing in the Old but uncertified Jewish traditions. Large scope has been allowed to such sceptical views by the almost entire absence, till lately, of independent and authentic records wherewith to test the veracity of Old Testament Scripture. The work of Herodotus, the oldest extant of the historians of Greece, dates about the probable age of Malachi, and his allusions to matters bearing upon Jewish history are scanty. Berosus, the native historian of Babylon, and Manetho, of Egypt, are known by a few fragments, invaluable, indeed, but lamentably scanty. The native records of the Phœnician States have mostly perished. What remains of these ancient historical writings, and of a few others that might be named, may be shown to coincide, when fairly interpreted, with the statements of the Old Testament. But even when all had been received as true which was thus confirmed, there remained a wide field for the play of

unbelief. Nor has it been content with this. It has sometimes ventured to call in question what rested upon a general coincidence of testimony. It has said—Perhaps these old historians, including the Jewish, only embody in their common statements some vague Eastern traditions. Perhaps Assyria, with its long duration of empire and its mighty metropolis, and Babylon, with its wonderful edifices and ancient renown, were but the current myths of the Orient when these writings were composed, resting, it may be, on some meagre basis of indiscernible fact, but swollen out into proportions ridiculously beyond reality. By the discoveries which are above described and indicated, this style of speculation is conclusively quenched, and the margin left for unbelief immensely contracted. We can now refer to records that run parallel for many centuries with the writings of Jewish historians and prophets—records of unquestionable authority, pertaining to nations with whom the Israelitish people were more vitally related than with any other. And, from the ordeal of comparison with these new sources of historic proof from the severe test of the public monuments and royal records of Assyria, Babylon, and Persia, the Bible comes forth not only unscathed, but with the lustre of its veracity greatly brightened.”

— — —

MIRACLES NOT INCONSISTENT WITH
DIVINE WISDOM AND IMMUTABILITY.

— — —

The following are further remarks from the publication *Miracles and Prophecy*:—“It is said that the idea of miracle is inconsistent with the idea of the Divine wisdom. While the possibility of it is not challenged, its propriety, its conformity to any good purpose, its compatibility with a system of things emanating from a Being of perfect prescience and perfect might, is called in question. The laws of nature, if not absolutely immutable, it is urged, must be morally immutable, as being the ex-

pression of the will of Him who is without variableness or the shadow of turning.

“This criticism may be most effectually dealt with by being counter-criticised. In the first place, then, there is a fallacy involved in the statement that the laws of nature are the expression of the will of God. The laws of nature, as we employ the phrase, are not the expression of the will of God; they are only our own account of the way in which the will of God expresses itself. They are, in the last resort, but human generalisations. They are the *ex cathedrâ* utterances of a mind that at its best is not infallible. They are the ultimate deliverance of a never-exhaustive analysis of natural phenomena. There is a chasm, which can never be crossed from the human side, between the counsel of the Creator and the works and workings of His hands.

“In the next place, it is illegitimate to argue from the unchangeableness of the Divine mind to the unchangeableness of the attitude and action of that mind. Unchangeableness of mind is one thing; unchangeableness of attitude and action is altogether another thing. It may be the very unchangeableness of a man's mind which is the cause of the incessant variation of the modes in which he gives expression to his mind. A general enters the field of battle with the unchangeable purpose of gaining the victory. Yet on that very ground he changes his tactics with every new vicissitude in the events of the day; and it is by the promptitude, variety, and soundness of his successive evolutions that he drives back the enemy, and bears away the palm of triumph. A shipmaster puts to sea with the unchangeable purpose of weathering the storm and gaining the haven. Yet on the very ground of the fixity of his purpose he flings forth orders, hot and frequent, to the mariners with every fresh change in the relations of ship and atmosphere and ocean; and it is by the variety and promptitude and timeliness of these particular

forthflashings of his will that he snatches his craft out of the white teeth of the tumbling billows, and carves for himself an avenue through the tangled wilderness of wind and wave, and reaches the port in peace.

“ Now what holds good of man holds good of God, if we superadd the considerations that God foresees and pre-arranges from the beginning every change of attitude and action to which He may see good to resort. In the course of the world’s history; and that, whenever the power of God is put forth afresh among the forces of nature, it is not to supplement the imperfection, but to secure the perfection of His work.

“ And the combined force of these considerations is amply sufficient to establish the probability of the miracle as an engine in the moral government of the world. For consider the motive of the miracle. The miracle is for man, and for man alone. There must be a man to behold, as well as a God to do, in order that there may be a miracle. Now it is obvious that moral impressions could be produced upon the mind of man by direct interventions of Divine power, which could not be produced by an everlastingly unbroken routine of natural laws and processes. These interventions, for one thing, would tend to withdraw man from the danger of offering that homage to nature which is due to God. A world so constructed that the example and expectation of supernatural power were totally excluded, could scarcely escape becoming hopelessly godless and immoral. The miracle, rightly interpreted, is like the tender tone of the voice and touch of the finger by which friend endears himself to friend. It tells us God is near. It teaches us, by rare and transient glimpses of His glory, that His glory is always hovering around. It is the flash of His eye bent full upon us for one brief moment to bespeak the perpetual remembrance of His presence and His sympathy.

“ We conclude, therefore, that the moral

government of the world by God, establishes the antecedent likelihood of the miracle. Granted that God retains any connection with and superintendence over the world He has created—granted that God has left Himself as free to deal with the forces of nature as He has left man free to deal with these—granted that God is disposed in any measure to control and educate the intellectual and moral nature of the crowning work of His hands—granted that He is in anywise sympathetic with the need and responsive to the faith of His creatures, and the probability of miraculous intervention is established.”

—
 AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW
 TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 352.)

“ We have, however, direct evidence also: for Tatian composed a kind of harmony to the gospels, which was known by the name of *Dia Tassarou*, i.e., ‘of the four,’ from its being an interwoven narrative from the four gospels. We learn from Irenæus himself that this Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, and that he fell into doctrinal errors, such as the condemnation of marriage, after his teacher’s death. Tatian’s gospels were then evidently identical with those of Justin. We may also notice that the writer of the canon in Muratori speaks of the gospels of Luke and John by name, as the *third* and *fourth*; those of Matthew and Mark must undoubtedly be described in the lost part of this fragment.

If, then, we see that the churches everywhere used our four gospels immediately after the apostolic age, and in the lifetime of the tens of thousands of Christians who had been contemporaries of the apostles, it follows that this was nothing newly or suddenly adopted, but that it sprung even from the time when the apostolic guidance still continued. And what could have caused all Christians everywhere to read in public these four narratives as the

work of the apostles Matthew and John, and of Mark and Luke, two companions of apostles, except that they knew, as a fact, that these were their real authors.

I have dwelt long on a very plain case, simply because, in the present day this is the very point of Christian evidence which is specially opposed. It is said that our four gospels are not historical narratives, but that they came into existence at a later period than the times of the apostles: that the accounts of Christ were first *myths*, and that they were gradually embodied in a definite form. By a *myth* they seem to mean the personification of an idea: a *mythic* person would be the supposed character of a fable; and to this they would bring down all that we know of the life and actions of our Lord. They say that if we hold the Christ of our apprehension aright, it matters little whether we retain the belief in an *historical* Christ.*

It is difficult to analyse such vague

thoughts. This, however, I know, that *if* the New Testament possesses one particle of authenticity, then the historical Christ is the person to whom it points. I can apprehend no Christ, no deliverer of guilty men, except that historical person—the Son of God, who became man, to redeem us men by the shedding of his blood, and who has risen again, and now sitteth at the right hand of God, from whence he shall come to be the judge of living and dead. Our warrant for believing in *this* Christ is the record which we possess in the New Testament.

It is, indeed, marvellous how any imagination can have run so wild as to think that a *supposed* Christ can have become embodied in four narratives so simple and definite, and that a *real* fact of Christianity can have sprung out of such fancied dreams.

But it is said that, at this distance of time, the greatest uncertainty must, of

*The process of supposed ratiocination, by which historical facts and persons in Scripture are reduced to mere *myths*, is something of the following kind. It is assumed that man had an intimate consciousness of his own want of a deliverer: that this want led to the process of thinking out what sort of a deliverer was suited to the need, and *how* this redeemer should act in order to work out man's salvation; these ideas (it is then assumed) led to the *thought* of the incarnation of a divine person—to his being *supposed* to have died, and risen, &c.; and then it is assumed that the gospels sprung into existence at a later period, when these supposed thoughts had assumed a concrete form in the minds of those who had received them. But does man *naturally* know his need of such a salvation as that which God sets forth, through faith, in the blood of Jesus Christ? So far from this being the case, the scheme of Christianity runs directly counter to man's preconceived thoughts. The cross of Christ was, indeed, to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness. The *mythic* theory is a present proof how little minds now like the mode of salvation set forth in the New Testament.

It is in vain to endeavour to set aside the existence and acts of historic personages by calling them *myths*. Julius Cæsar would make (on the novel theory) a thorough

myth. The recorded events of his life are so peculiar—his connection with such varied countries, his actings from Britain to Egypt, might all be pronounced as proofs that he was not an *historic* person; he might thus be easily explained away into the embodiment of the idea of the transition of the Roman state from a republic to an empire—of the spread of Roman institutions into the West and East, and the institution of Roman civilization into barbarous countries such as Gaul and Britain. It might be suggested that some British writer gave the *myth* its form; for otherwise, why should his military success in Britain be represented as so incomplete? It might be argued that the accounts of Cæsar's death show the whole to be *mythic*; for how else could the Roman Senate solemnly confirm all Cæsar's acts, and yet proclaim an amnesty for those who had assassinated him? Might not the facts also of the name of *Cæsar* being used in all succeeding ages as a title, be taken as a proof of the absence of historic reality to the alleged Julius Cæsar?

These points are strong when compared with what the mythic theory has to object to the reality of Jesus Christ. What shall be said of a system which owns that man needs a saviour, and yet deprives him of the historic reality of that Saviour to whom the Scripture testifies!

course, spread over the scene. Nay, but lapse of time makes no difference with regard to *proved facts*: that which is proved to have been known truth eighteen hundred years ago, is known truth still. It is as certain *now* that Julius Cæsar invaded Britain, as it was at the Christian era. But we have no occasion to look at these things from a long distance. We can take our stand in the latter part of the second century, and look back from that era to the apostolic age.

The opponents admit that our Four Gospels were in general use A.D. 175. They suggest, however that they came into existence, at least in their present form, between the year 150 and that year; that is to say, by some unknown and unrecorded cause, the Christians were induced everywhere, in twenty-five years, to adopt our gospels, and also to *believe* that they had possessed them from the apostolic age. This is mythic and unhistorical with a vengeance.

It presents difficulties enough to be explained. The number of the copies of the gospels which were in use at the admitted date, A.D. 175, would be, at a very moderate computation, *sixty thousand*, amongst the Christian communities throughout the Roman Empire; and all these copies must have been received and used without any opposing voice being raised.

Standing at the year 175, we might find enough individuals living who still remembered the apostolic age: they had only to look back seventy-five years—as long as we have to the American war;—it was not six month's ago* that Dr. Routh, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, was speaking to me, with clear memory, of events which occurred then and before, when he was a student at that University. It is thus of importance to trace our gospels, step by step, backward through the second century,

for thus we show the baselessness of the mythic, unhistoric theory. And now, as to *single gospels*, we can go yet farther in our notices than we can of the collected volumes.

At the close of the first century, there were living at Ephesus, besides the apostle John, two others of the immediate disciples of our Lord when on earth,—John the presbyter and Aristion.* Now, we know from Papias, bishop of Hirapolis, what John the Presbyter stated concerning the gospels of Matthew and Mark. Of Mark he says, that he was the interpreter of Peter, and though not a hearer or follower of our Lord himself, he wrote down very carefully what Peter had narrated, so that (he adds) "he erred in nothing." This testimony of an immediate disciple of Christ is deeply interesting. He speaks as clearly of Matthew's gospel, mentioning that it was written in Hebrew.

The endeavour to evade the force of this evidence is made to rest on the singular theory that John the Presbyter, and Papias who records his words, did not mean *our* gospels of Matthew and Mark, but some other books of which we have no account whatever, which bore the same names.

Suppose we were to suggest that the history of Thucydides, which we possess, is not that which the ancients cite as such, but another book bearing the same name. What would be said of this idea?

I have already shown how Polycarp

*The words of Eusebius (iii. 39) are, "Aristion, and John the presbyter, the disciples of the Lord." In the *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1851, page 37, note, it is said that the words, "the disciples of the Lord," are probably an interpolation. No reason is given why we should so regard them; and in looking at Dr. Burton's critical edition of *Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History*, it appears there is no authority whatever for expunging them. Not only is all external evidence in their favour, but also, if they were omitted, there would be no purpose in mentioning John the Presbyter and Aristion in the passage, had they not been like Andrew, Peter, and others, whose names are introduced, themselves immediate disciples of Christ when on earth.

*That is, when this lecture was delivered, October, 1851.

interweaves in his epistle words and sentences from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. We find a similar introduction of words which exist in our Gospels. He writes thus :—"The Lord said, Judge not that ye be not judged; forgive and ye shall be forgiven; be merciful that ye may obtain mercy. With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again. And, Blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God."—(cap. 2.) In another place, "The Lord said, the spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak."—(cap. 7.)

Clement of Rome, also, in his epistle has this statement :—"The Lord said, Be merciful that ye may obtain mercy; forgive that ye may be forgiven; as ye do so shall it be done to you; as ye give so shall it be given to you; as ye judge so shall ye be judged; . . . with what measure ye mete, therewith shall it be measured to you."—(cap. 13.)

These sentences, especially those of Polycarp, appear like references, more or less exact, to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: the only reason for doubting is that these writers might have some *oral* knowledge of this teaching of our Lord—they refer, however, to what he said, as if *those to whom they wrote* knew of these things likewise.

Paul, in this first Epistle to Timothy, speaks thus :—"The Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth on the corn;" and, "*The labourer is worthy of his reward.*" This latter sentence is found only in Luke x 7; it appears to be linked by the apostle with the citation from the law under the common term of Scripture. There is, I believe, in the New Testament, no instance of two sentences, joined by the copulative, being introduced

with such a phrase as "the Scripture saith," when the latter is merely an addition. I have no doubt myself that Paul gives us the earliest testimony, and that of authoritative kind, to the Gospel of Luke his companion.

Besides the evidence of writers who belonged to the Church, we may (as Irenæus himself did) appeal to the Gnostic sects, who made more or less use of *our* gospels. Thus Marcion's gospel was a truncated copy of Luke's, from which he extruded what struck him as inconsistent with his notion that our Lord possessed no real humanity; he left, however, unamputated quite enough to refute his strange ideas. Indeed, while the different bodies separated from the church showed they were acquainted, in the second century, with all our Four Gospels, it is pointed out by Irenæus that *each* gospel, separately, was upheld by some one particular party—a plain proof of their existence before these bodies quitted the communion of the church.

Celsus, the heathen philosopher, who wrote at some length against the Christians and their religion, is an important witness to the early existence and use of our gospels.

Thus, then, we have distinct historic grounds for holding fast the epistles which bear Paul's name as being his genuine works, and for ascribing the Four Gospels to the authors whose names they bear, that is, to use the words of Justin Martyr to the "apostles and their companions."

I have not rested on other evidence, such as that of undesigned coincidence by which Paley demonstrates so satisfactorily that the epistle of Paul and the book of Acts are able, genuine works—that they *could not*, in fact, be forgeries; this evidence is of a kind extremely cogent.

(To be continued.)

SIN; ITS ORIGIN, EFFECTS AND DESTRUCTION.

(Concluded from page 421.)

THE uncleanness of the nature, the alienation of man from God thereby, and the consequent necessity for its being put away, in order that man might be reconciled to God, appears to have been continually foreshadowed by the law of Moses. For instance, the enjoining of circumcision as a thing to be done in order to introduce the Jews into covenant with God, that is, into a position of favour with Him as His people, seems to have been designed to teach them that by nature they were alienated from Him. Then, again, the uncleanness associated with birth. In Leviticus xii. 2-8, it is stated that when a woman had given birth to a child she was to be unclean for a certain time, and after her days of purification she was to bring a burnt offering and a *sin* offering. And there was a difference in the time of uncleanness, according to whether it was a male or female child: if the former, she was to be unclean seven days, but if the latter, fourteen days; and there was to be the same difference as to "the days of her purifying:" they were to be thirty-three or sixty-six days respectively. This difference in the length of time shows that the uncleanness had reference, not simply to the mother, but also to the child. If it were connected simply with the mother, the uncleanness and necessity for purification might be ascribed to the fact that she was a sinner, but this could not apply to the infant, and it seems to us that in regard to the latter this ordinance can only point to the defilement of the nature. Again, on the great day of atonement the high priest was required to "make an atonement for the holy place, because of the *uncleanness* of the children of Israel, and because of their *transgressions* in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their *uncleanness*."—(Lev. xvi. 16.) Here we have not only transgressions, but uncleanness. And did not all the merely ceremonial defilements under the law typify the defilement of nature which attaches to us all by descent, and which has come to us, not by our own transgressions, but in a way which we could no more have averted than could the children of Israel

have averted many of their ceremonial defilements?

The teaching of Scripture as to the necessity for putting away the body of sin by death involves the conclusion that it was necessary for Christ to die for himself, he being one of the race, and, though not yielding to the impulse of the nature, yet possessing that nature in its defiled condition, as much as the rest of the sons and daughters of Adam. The same conclusion is also pointed to, not only by many Scripture statements concerning him, but also by certain circumstances in his life showing the necessity for his being justified. 1stly, his circumcision; and 2ndly, his immersion. Both these were means of justification—typical, truly, but pointing to a subsequent actual justification; his circumcision typifying his death, which was a cutting-off of the flesh, a destruction of the body of sin; and his immersion in, and rising out of, the waters of the Jordan symbolising his death and resurrection to immortality, by which he was cleansed from the defilement of sin. After he emerged from the tomb, he was changed to spirit-nature, and this is termed by Paul being "justified in the Spirit."—(1 Tim. iii. 16.) He was first justified typically, by circumcision and immersion, then anti-typically by the shedding of his blood, being thereby "purified," as one of "the heavenly things" referred to in Heb. ix. 23; and his final justification, or seal of acceptance with God, was physical, namely, justification in the Spirit.

There is also a statement with reference to the resurrection of Christ which points very strongly in the same direction, viz., Heb. xiii. 20, 21: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ." This passage states that Jesus was brought from the dead through the blood of the everlasting covenant, which, of course, was his own blood, and therefore signifies that the shedding of his blood was necessary on his own

account, being the means of his purification or justification, and (together with his righteousness) the basis on which God could raise him from the dead and exalt him to immortality. Endeavours to escape the force of this passage have been made in two ways. 1st, By the suggestion that the blood of the covenant has relation—not to the resurrection of Christ, but to the latter part of the passage, viz., the making perfect to do the will of God. But such a construction is contrary to the whole of New Testament teaching on the subject, for, although the blood of Christ is certainly the means of attaining and retaining perfection of position or standing in the sight of God (1 Cor. i. 30; ii. 2, 6; Heb. x. 1, 14), it is never given as the means of perfection in knowledge and character—in the doing of God's will. The Spirit-gifts and the truth are spoken of as the means for attaining that end.—(See Eph. iv. 8, 11-16; Col. i. 9, 10; 1 Peter v. 10.) Therefore that construction is untenable. Another, however, has been offered, on the basis of Sharpe's translation of the passage, which runs thus: "And may the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the Shepherd of the sheep, great *by* the blood of the everlasting covenant," &c. The meaning according to this rendering would be, not that Jesus was brought from the dead through his blood, but that he was *great* on account of it. Now we are always glad to receive help in the elucidation of the meaning of Scripture from any scholar who can furnish us with an improved rendering, provided, of course, that he be reliable; but we would point out that though Sharpe's rendering is in many places an improvement on the Authorised Version, yet, as he is a Unitarian, his translation of passages bearing on the sacrifice, &c., of Christ must be received with caution, for, however conscientious a translator may be, his translation will sometimes lean in the direction of his belief. And, so far from there being any reason to accept his rendering in preference to the Authorised Version, there is a manifest lack of force and point in it; for it was not simply the blood of the covenant that made Christ "great:" he was great quite independently of that—by his divine paternity, by his life, by his whole mission as the Messiah. If we depart from the Common Version of this passage, we may turn to Alford's, which

gives it even more pointedly in the direction we are contending for: "But the God of peace, that brought up from the dead, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, the great Shepherd of the sheep, even our Lord Jesus," &c.; and there seems to be no reason for doubting the correctness of Alford's and the Common Version. On the contrary, we may say we have a kind of confirmation of them in a passage in the prophecy of Zechariah, who, looking forward to the resurrection of the saints, says, "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water."—(Zech. ix. 11.) The apostle seems to have had this prophecy in his mind when writing to the Hebrews—and we know how constantly he quoted from the prophets—for, although he does not quote the exact words throughout, yet the ideas are the same, connecting the blood of the covenant with the resurrection, the difference being that while the prophet is pointing to the resurrection of the saints, the apostle applies it to the resurrection of Christ himself. No consistent explanation of Hebrews xiii. 20 has been, or can be, given apart from the idea that the shedding of the blood of Christ was necessary to his resurrection, and therefore that the shedding of his blood was necessary to his own salvation as well as to the salvation of others, that necessity arising, not from any personal transgression, but from the defilement of his nature.

Some people hold up their hands in horror at the least hint that Christ was in an unclean or condemned nature, and say that it is dishonouring to him; and the phrase "condemned Christ" has more than once been used as a scarecrow to frighten timid minds who are sometimes influenced by words and phrases without fully considering the significance to be attached to them. It is so with those who contend for the immaculateness of Christ's nature, and think it dishonouring to him to say that he was tempted with the lusts of the flesh, forgetting that as he overcame the temptations that arose from those lusts, it really exalts him, and adds to the lustre of his crown. So also in regard to his having been under condemnation: there is nothing dishonouring in this statement, seeing that it is not alleged that he came under the condemnation through any transgression of his own; and, as the removal of the condemnation, and his

deliverance from its consequences, was on the basis of his perfect righteousness, the very mention of the fact that he was once under condemnation draws our attention to his righteousness. But in truth whatever the Scriptures say concerning Christ—whatever God arranged in regard to him—cannot be dishonouring to him; and it is not for us to judge certain ideas in an independent way by our own pre-conceived notions of what is just or unjust, honouring or dishonouring, but simply to sit down with humility to ascertain the exact facts of the case, and receive what God has been pleased to reveal to us; and, having done that, we are then at perfect liberty to point out, as far as we can see it, wherein God's wisdom, and justice, and mercy, and goodness, are exemplified, and, as one of our poets has said, to "justify the ways of God to men."

The necessity for the typical sacrifices under the law being free from blemish has been very much misapplied in regard to Christ. In Lev. xxii. 20-24, we read: "Whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer: for it shall not be acceptable for you. . . . Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the Lord, nor make an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto the Lord. . . . Ye shall not offer unto the Lord that which is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut; neither shall ye make any offering thereof in your land." Here are certain impurities or blemishes which disqualified the animals subject to them from being offered as sacrifices, &c.; and that in this respect they were types of Christ there can be no doubt, for, in 1 Peter i. 19, Christ is referred to as "a lamb without blemish and without spot." In what respect was Christ without blemish and without spot as the antitype of the Mosaic sacrifices? It has been said that it was in regard to his nature, or as to his freedom from condemnation. But that conclusion would land us on a rock we have already several times had occasion to avoid in the present argument, viz., bringing the antitype to the level of the type, which is certainly not according to Paul. Seeing that the purity of the types was a physical thing, we must not look for Christ's purity as the Lamb of God in a physical direction, but in a higher sense; and where can we look but to his moral purity—his perfect righteousness, which was the ground of

his acceptance with God, and also of his exaltation to His right hand?—(Heb. i. 9; Phil. ii. 8, 9.)

Although the sacrifices were thus required to be spotless in the sense defined in the passage quoted from Leviticus, the same sacrifices, or at least some of them, were at the same time ceremonially defiling. In the 19th chapter of Numbers we have the commands respecting the offering of the "red heifer," and it is stated (verses 4-10) that the priest who sprinkled its blood, the man who burnt the heifer, and the man who gathered up its ashes, were to be reckoned unclean until the even. The ashes were to be used to make "water of separation," by which Jews could be cleansed from certain ceremonial defilements, by this water being sprinkled upon them by a clean person; and yet the clean person who sprinkled the water, or one who touched the water, was by his contact with it made unclean until even (verses 11-21). Thus the very blood which was used for purifying, and the water of purification which was used for the like purpose, were themselves ceremonially defiling. Therefore even if we were to apply the typical sacrifices to Christ in a physical sense, we should not in this case be led to the conclusion that his nature needed to be immaculate, pure, undefiled, or free from condemnation. If this teaches anything in regard to Christ's nature, surely it teaches this: that the purification effected by his sacrifice was not due to any physical purity or freedom from condemnation, but that he could be an acceptable sacrifice whereby others could be purified from their defilement of nature and their transgressions, while at the same time his nature was itself unclean and under condemnation.

The necessity for Christ to die for himself of course entirely excludes the idea that redemption is effected on the principle of substitution, a principle which is the very core of the "orthodox" creed. The popularly received idea is that on account of the sin of Adam all his descendants were condemned to suffer eternal torments, and that Christ, then in heaven, came down to the earth, assuming a mortal body, and died for man, and that the Father accepted his suffering and death as an equivalent for the eternal torments to which those for whom he died were condemned; and thus that Christ, not being under that condemnation, and voluntarily suffering for those who were, was a substitute for them.

On seeing the truth concerning Christ, that he had no "pre-existence," but was really a man who, though begotten by God, was made out of, and was essentially one of, the race, we are enabled to set aside this unscriptural theory, and we might naturally have thought that we had quite turned our backs on the doctrine of substitution. But even those who have received the truth of God have started ideas which bring us back to that doctrine, though not in the same repulsive form as the "orthodox" one. This has been effected in two ways: 1st, by attributing to Christ, as a consequence of his divine begetting, what has been called a "free" or "unforfeited" or uncondemned life, the possession of which would have rendered it unnecessary for him to die to obtain redemption for himself; and secondly, by denying the condemnation passed on the Adamic race on account of Adam's sin, (as laid down in Romans v.,) and stating that condemnation is passed on individuals only for their own personal transgressions; and thus, as Christ committed no transgression, here again he is represented as beyond the reach of condemnation. The result in regard to Christ, though arrived at by a different route, is on the latter theory precisely the same as in the case of the "free life" theory: the latter effects it by (so to speak) lifting Christ above the rest of the race in regard to condemnation, and the former by lifting up the whole race, and Christ with it. The difference between these two modes of arriving at the result, is however, of comparatively little importance, seeing that the effect is the same in both cases, for both theories represent that Christ was free from any hereditary condemnation, and that therefore there was no necessity for him to die *for himself* in order to obtain redemption from the effects of Adam's sin. Now if that were the principle of redemption—that an uncondemned one laid down his life in the place of condemned ones, and was accepted as a substitute for them, none of those for whom Christ died ought to die: if he took their place in that sense, they ought to go Scot free. But as we see that the majority of them do die, that cannot be the principle. It may be said that some—viz., the faithful who are alive at Christ's second appearing—will not die, and therefore that for them he must be a substitute. But if so, the principle of redemption must differ in regard to different individuals, and in the same

dispensation, which is inadmissible; and besides, that even they are not redeemed on the substitutionary principle is evident from the fact that their escaping death is not made a matter of necessity or certainty, but is merely a matter of time, and due to their being alive at the particular time when Christ returns. The question of substitution must be looked at more in regard to the redeemer than the redeemed—more in relation to Jesus Christ than to his brethren. The question is whether he died as an uncondemned one to redeem condemned ones, or whether he died as a condemned one, through whom, when redeemed, others might obtain redemption by the favour of God; and we unhesitatingly affirm the latter to be the teaching of Scripture. The same principle applies to Christ's relationship to the curse of the Mosaic law. Those who hold the two theories referred to find it necessary, in order to carry out their ideas, to treat Christ's suffering the Mosaic curse in the same way, viz., as being only for others, and not for himself; though the Scriptures teach that as one hung on a tree was cursed by the law of Moses, irrespective of innocence or guilt, (Deut. xxi. 23: Gal. iii. 13,) Jesus, though innocent, being hung on a tree, was cursed personally. But as this conclusion would be fatal to the substitutionary theory, it is denied that he was cursed personally, and asserted that he only suffered the curse instead of others. It is urged that he must have suffered it as a substitute for others because those under the law who were redeemed by him, and who had transgressed the law and incurred its curse, escaped that curse by virtue of his suffering it. But here, again, it is not a question of the redeemed escaping it, but of whether the redeemer had to suffer it personally,—whether those cursed by the law were redeemed by one who was never personally under its curse, or by one who was personally brought under its curse, and, having been freed from it on account of his righteousness, was then constituted the means through which others might escape the consequences of that curse. If it be said that he was a substitute in some sense, because others escape it through him, all we can say is that to that kind of "substitution" we have no objection. Christ was not a substitute in the sense of having the very condemnation due to others imputed to him, and bearing it *instead* of them, but—

if he can properly be called a substitute at all, though we do not admit that he can—in bearing the *same* condemnation that was due to them, but bearing it for himself, so that, having been redeemed from it himself on account of his righteousness, others might be redeemed through him. The main idea, and what it is important to firmly grasp, is this, that redemption is not effected in any sense on the principle of a commercial transaction, of an equivalent, of so much received in exchange for so much given, but by the creation of one in whom sin and death have been destroyed, as a covering head for those who accept the salvation offered through him. The former view sets aside God's law; the latter honors and exalts it. According to the former view, God redeems certain ones whom His law has condemned by accepting in their place one whom the law has not condemned. According to the latter, God required that his commands should be obeyed, and His decree carried out, as the basis for the manifestation of His favour, and, that decree or law having been carried out on one who was personally under it, but who was redeemed from it because of his righteousness, as God offers salvation only through and by association with that one, He thereby, instead of setting aside His law, exalts and magnifies it before His creatures. The matter was stated so clearly and beautifully by our late brother Robert Paterson, that we cannot do better than quote his words: "It is not that a condemned one redeemed condemned ones, but that *God* first redeemed *one* of the condemned family, upon a certain principle, and next made the Redeemed One a means of escape for those of the others who were willing to put on his saving name; and the principle upon which God proceeded in the development of this One was that in him should be exhibited a personal holiness by which a *great moral foundation would be laid, without the just demands of the broken law being ignored.*"

This is in harmony with the statement by Paul in Rom. iii. 19-26. In verses 24 to 26, he says: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteous-

ness: that He might be *just, and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.*" God destroyed the effects of the breaking of his law by working, in the case of Christ, upon the most just and righteous principles; and then, in setting him forth as the means of salvation, He declares His (God's) righteousness, that righteousness comprising not simply the obedience of Christ, but the whole of God's work in him, including his death and resurrection. God had previously been manifesting his righteousness in His dealings with men, in connection with the typical sacrifices, &c., in the Mosaic system of things, but in Christ He manifested it perfectly; hence the apostle says, in verses 21 and 22, "But now the righteousness of God *without* [or *outside*] the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." And so those who acknowledge the righteousness and justice of God worked out in Jesus Christ can obtain forgiveness and redemption through him. It was because Israel after the flesh did not submit themselves to that righteousness (Rom. x. 3, 4, 9) that they were cast off. Thus God was first "just"—i.e. in regard to Jesus—and on the basis of that He can consistently be "the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus."

The principle underlying the whole subject of the sacrifice of Christ was very well stated in some remarks made by a brother not long ago at a meeting at which the subject was under consideration, and we think we cannot do better than give them here, as it is of great importance not only to believe doctrinal truth, but to apprehend the reasons underlying God's arrangements for the salvation of men, and why He requires their submission to certain conditions before He will bestow that salvation. The following is the substance of the remarks referred to:—

"There is a principle underlying the sacrifice or atonement which God requires at the hands of the descendants of Adam, which we require to take into account, and which is the solution of many difficulties connected with the law of sin and death, the taking away of sin, &c., some of which difficulties can never be settled on mathematical principles, but which become perfectly clear when we take into account the principle I am referring to. It is deep though trite,

and the principle is that God is very great, and very holy, of too pure eyes to look upon iniquity (Hab. i. 13), and that He will be sanctified in them that approach unto Him; that He is a Great King, a Great Majesty, who will not be approached in any way but that which He appoints. In the beginning of our history as a race, His authority was insulted, His majesty was set aside, and, as the result, we have all been contaminated with death through Adam, everybody being agreed upon that. The result is that we are all unclean, for who can be clean that is born of a woman? the Scriptures say.—(Job xiv. 1, 4.) We have the effects of sin in us, and before there can be any return to friendship between us and God, before we can approach Him, He demands the healing of the original breach, and He has prescribed His own terms: He requires that death originally decreed shall be violently endured. That decree is evident in the garden of Eden, or just outside of it, for Abel was commanded to offer up sacrifices as the means of approach to God. Abel would not have been accepted if he had not offered that slain lamb. The law of Moses in its entirety Paul describes to be a schoolmaster, the very function of which is to teach us that first lesson of our approach to God. And what is the first lesson the law of Moses teaches? That all men are unclean. The tabernacle and all its appurtenances were made by mortal men, and although they were of divine workmanship, yet because they were so made they had to be atoned for: sacrifices had to be offered: the tabernacle had to be sanctified, the altar had to be sanctified, everything in the tabernacle had to be purified with blood: "almost all things are by the law purged with blood."—(Heb. ix. 22). And these were all typical of the fact that there could be no approach to God on the part of condemned man—who is marred and steeped in the effects of sin, beginning at the Garden of Eden—without the shedding of blood; for that the heavenly things had to be purified with better sacrifices than these, is Paul's own declaration.—(Heb. ix. 23.) Christ is the illustration of the will of God in the matter. Christ was made of our nature in order that he might be offered in sacrifice in the very condition in which we are in all these relations. We cannot criticise God: we cannot ask why this was necessary. He, as the outraged,

insulted—if we may use such a term—Lord, Majesty, self-existing Possessor of heaven and earth, had the right to dictate the terms upon which He would receive the members of a fallen race into fellowship with Himself again: and we see Christ crucified pointed to by all the sacrifices; we see him raised from the dead, justified in the Spirit, exalted to the presence of God, and given to us as a sacrifice through whom we approach in mental humiliation and subjection before God. Therefore the matter should be looked at in a broad manner, and not discussed in the light of hair-splitting terms, which only throw dust over a most beautiful and holy matter, but which do not enlighten the understanding, which rather exalt human reason against the very plain declarations of the Scriptures—because the Scriptures are exceedingly plain—that death hath passed on all men by Adam, that we are all in the unfortunate condition that he brought on himself, and therefore in his position and relation to futurity, apart from God's favour. His favour comes to us through Christ. It is entirely of His mercy that He has devised this arrangement, that He has given us a ceremony of apology in our hands; for that is what it comes to. When a gentleman in high position is offended, he prescribes the terms of forgiveness. In this case it is the holy, omnipotent Creator of heaven and earth, and He has given us the ceremonial vindication of His authority, the ceremony of subjection in Christ, *who stood as the representative of us all*; and it is our privilege to avail ourselves, with humility of mind, of the means He has thus graciously provided for obtaining reconciliation with Him, the forgiveness of our sins, and life eternal to be bestowed at the appearing of Christ."

Let us now turn, by way of drawing the whole matter to a focus, to an earlier part of the 2nd chapter of Hebrews than we have yet noticed. Having contrasted, in the 1st chapter, the position of the angels with the position and dignity of Christ, and shown the great superiority of the latter, and therefore, by implication, the superiority of the "great salvation" "spoken by the Lord" over "the word spoken by angels" (verses 2 and 3), i.e. the Mosaic law (Acts vii. 53) the writer says in verse 5, "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak;" but he has (prospectively)

put the world to come in subjection to the saints, as joint-rulers with Christ. The apostle continues, "But one in a certain place [the 8th Psalm] testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?"—"Son of man" here does not refer to Christ, although the expression is frequently applied to him, but is synonymous with "man" in the previous clause, and signifies man in a general sense, of whom God is "mindful," and whom He "visiteth.") "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." What things? If we turn to the 8th Psalm we get an answer: "All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." These were the things put in subjection to Adam before he sinned, as we also find from Gen. i. 26, 28. When Adam fell from his primitive, sinless condition, he partially lost this "dominion." Previously, the animals were doubtless tame (Gen. ii. 19); since then, as far as we have any record, they have been wild. They are not, however, always to remain in their present condition: a time is coming when they will again be tame (Isaiah xi. 6-9; lxx. 25), and when the curse will be partially removed from the earth; and then man will regain his dominion over the earth and the lower creation. To this time, which is during the millennial reign, as well as to the period beyond, the apostle was evidently looking forward, for he gives the words of the Psalmist a future application: he continues (verse 8), "For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him." And then he goes on to treat of the death of Christ, and the destruction by him of the devil and death. But what connection is there between the dominion originally given to man, and ultimately to be restored to him, and the destruction of death? Just this. The dominion given to Adam did not include death, inasmuch as he did not then sustain any definite relationship to death: he was not under the power of death, neither had death been put under his feet; but when he sinned he came under the power of death, and therefore before "all things"

can be put under his feet it is necessary that, in addition to the things included in the original dominion, death also should be put under him. Hence, in 1 Cor. xv. 25, 26, we read: "For he (Christ) must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." The "dominion" of man, then, though partially acquired during the reign of Christ and the saints, is not obtained in its fulness until the end of that reign, for it is not until then that death is destroyed.—(1 Cor. xv. 24-28.) The reason for the introduction of death into the apostle's argument in Hebrews ii. is therefore apparent; and so he continues (verse 9): "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." The sense of this verse will perhaps be more apparent by slightly transposing, without altering the meaning of, the phrases, their arrangement as in the common version—though doubtless according to the Hebrew style—being different from the modern style of composition, and hence the meaning is to us slightly obscured. Thus: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death—that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man—crowned with glory and honour." The argument is this: "Now we see not yet all things put under" mankind, for death still has dominion over them; "but" we see something done towards that end: we see Jesus, one of that race, a partaker of flesh and blood (verse 14), made in all things like unto those who were to be redeemed (verse 17), having suffered death, and overcome it, now crowned with glory and honour. And this surely is a great step towards the complete putting of death under the feet, seeing that he is the one through whom all others who are destined to overcome it will do so—"the captain of their salvation" who will lead them to glory—(ver. 10.) Hence the apostle says he tasted death "for every man,"—*ὑπερ πάντων*, on account of all: not every human being, but "all" who are to be redeemed, whether Jews or Gentiles. And by what a beautiful yet simple arrangement he was enabled to redeem both Jews and Gentiles! It was necessary that he should come under both the curses or

condemnations under which they respectively rested—the Edenic or racial condemnation for both classes, and the condemnation of the law specially for Jews. And yet, to prevent his being held under the condemnation, he must be brought into this position without any personal transgression; and such we find was the case: he came under the former by birth, which he could not avoid; and he came under the latter by being hung on a tree, by the act of others; and, having been raised from the dead, both these curses were destroyed in him, and a way opened for the escape of others from under the same curses. “He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.”—(Phil. ii. 8-11.) This name has been given as a means of salvation, so that all who unite themselves with the name, by being immersed *into* it, may obtain the like redemption. And thus in the preaching of the apostles *the name of Christ* was continually set forth as a name of salvation, a refuge or covering into which all—whether Jews or Gentiles—might flee and find safety:—

Luke xxiv. 46, 47: “Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached *in his name* among all nations.”

Acts iv. 12: “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is *none other name* under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”

Acts v. 31: “Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.”

Acts x. 43: “To him give all the prophets witness, that *through his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.”

Acts xiii. 38, 39: “*Through this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.”

The only means of being covered by the name of Jesus Christ is by immersion into it. We have already dwelt upon that point at some length in regard to

men generally, irrespective of whether they be Jews or Gentiles; but we may further point out that the same principle applied to Jews in their relationship to the Mosaic law. Christ came under the curse of the law, and Jews obtained freedom from its curse or claim on them by being immersed into him. This is evident from Acts xiii. 39, just quoted, as well as from Romans vii. 4. The Jewish believers became “dead to the law” by being immersed into “the body of Christ,” and thus they were freed not only from the condemnation resting upon them on account of their disobedience to the law, but from all obligation to obey the law; and they were at the same time “married (or united) to another”—Jesus Christ—“even to him who is raised from the dead.”

The principle upon which men are united to, and justified through Christ, is correctly termed the *federal* principle; and it is both appropriate and just that God should effect the salvation of man on that principle. He dealt with man thus in regard to condemnation, for when Adam sinned God treated the whole race as being in him, as in fact they were physically; and, as they are but a perpetuation of him in the same fallen nature, God condemned them federally, in Adam, to return to the dust from which he was taken. And salvation comes on the same principle, by the creation of a federal head in whom the breach is healed, the reconciliation effected, and man restored to his original position. Hence the apostle says, “Therefore *as* by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.”—(Rom. v. 18.) But it is not merely a restoration to man’s primitive unfallen state, for that would be simply to have existence in a flesh and blood nature, free from the power of death. It is something more than that: it is existence in an incorruptible spirit-nature, not only free from the power of death, but incapable of ever coming under its power—it is immortality. Hence the apostle says, “The grace (or *favor*) of God, and the *gift* by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath *abounded* unto many;” and again, “But where sin abounded, grace did *much more abound*: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace

reign through righteousness unto *eternal* life by Jesus Christ our Lord."—(Rom. v. 15, 20, 21.) This shows in the clearest possible light that redemption is not simply the payment of a debt, not simply a buying back, but a pure manifestation of the favour of God through one in whom He was well pleased, and whom He has constituted a federal head for the development, out of the old creation, of a new and better creation.—(Rev. iii. 14; Col. i. 15, 18-20.)

We see, then, how the Deity is proceeding upon a gradually unfolding and expanding plan. It is so in regard to the Kingdom of God: the promises are first given in outline, and His purposes gradually unfolded by the filling in of the details; and in the establishment of that Kingdom it begins like "a grain of mustard seed," and increases until it becomes like "a tree," and covers the whole earth. So also in the destruction of sin. God first redeems one of the condemned race, and then offers redemption to others through him, and all of them who accept it and are found worthy will be changed to the same immortal nature when the time arrives for the establishment of the Kingdom. And these, again, being made the rulers in this Kingdom, are the means of bringing others into the way of salvation, though these others will in all probability be saved through the same covering name. The exact terms on which salvation will be offered to them has not been revealed, but the principle will doubtless be the same—faith and obedience, in connection with the slain but resurrected Lamb of God. Those who, during the thousand years, accept this salvation, and are at the end of that period accounted worthy, will also in their turn be made immortal, and will sustain towards those immortalized at the commencement of the 1000 years the relationship of harvest to "first-fruits."—(Rev. xiv. 4.) Then will sinful flesh be completely cut off from the earth, at the commencement of the eighth day of 1000 years, as the complete antitype of the circumcision or cutting off of the flesh on the eighth day in the Mosaic pattern of things. Thus there are three principal stages in the actual destruction of sin: first, Jesus Christ himself; secondly, those who are Christ's at his coming; thirdly, the great harvest at the end of the thousand years. Then will the earth be the habitation of a righteous and immortal race of beings, who will show forth the praises of God

to all eternity. In contemplating this wonderful scheme, may we not well exclaim with the apostle Paul, in Rom. xi. 33-36, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out. For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been His counsellor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

Various questions have from time to time been raised with respect to the relationship to death of those for whom Christ died, especially in connection with the doctrine of substitution; and, as those questions are intimately connected with the foregoing, it may not be out of place to append here a few remarks on one or two of them, which we will put in the form of question and answer.

1.—QUESTION: If we are condemned to death on account of Adam's sin, and Christ died for us, and we are freed from condemnation through him, why do we die?

ANSWER: Because Christ did not die *instead* of us—to prevent our dying—but to open up the way to immortality. If Christ had died instead of us, as a substitute pure and simple, no doubt we ought not to die, but we have already seen that such was not the case. Redemption has two principal stages—the moral and the physical. First, there is moral justification, which is by faith, (Rom. v. 1); secondly, there is physical justification by change to spirit-nature.—(1 Tim. iii. 16.) Between these two acts of justification there is an interval, which is necessary in order to afford an opportunity for probation. When an individual is justified morally, the condemnation previously resting on him, whether racial or individual, is removed (Rom. viii. 1), and he is placed on a new footing, and it depends upon his conduct during his probation as to whether his redemption will be completed by physical justification. To an individual who is not justified morally, there is no possibility of a resurrection to eternal life, but one who has been justified morally, even if he die, will be raised from the dead. His racial condemnation, and any condemnation for sins committed previously to his moral justification, having

been removed, are no barrier to his resurrection from the dead or to his receiving eternal life: he is judged simply for the things done after his moral justification, and receives "according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." But although our racial condemnation is legally removed when we are morally justified, the *consequences* of that condemnation, or of our connection with the first Adam, are not removed immediately, for we still continue to suffer the evils brought into the world by the sin of Adam. This, however, is quite in harmony with the Divine procedure in regard to *individual* sins. For instance, a man before embracing the truth may have injured his health by drunkenness or some other course of wrong-doing, but although such sin is forgiven at his immersion, God does not work a miracle to remove at once the consequence of the sin, and He may suffer its evil effects until the end of his mortal life. So also in regard to an immersed believer, who may commit some sin or foolish act by which he brings upon himself some evil; his sin may be forgiven, but still the ill effects may remain. He is forgiven in having removed from him the condemnation for his sin, but the taking away of the consequences is distinct from the removal of the moral or legal condemnation. This will serve to illustrate the matter in regard to Adamic condemnation. That condemnation is removed at immersion, and this renders it possible to escape dying, by making death not an absolute necessity, and our moral justification gives us a title to a resurrection to eternal life if death should ensue; but still the consequences of our condemnation in Adam are not actually removed until after the Judgment. As has been aptly said, "Our relationship to the second Adam comes from our receiving the truth, which is a principle extraneous to flesh and blood; and our reception of it does not alter the deathful condition we inherit by our descent, but gives us a title to another life and state of being;" and our physical connection with the first Adam is not terminated until we are made physically like the second Adam at his appearing. It is for want of recognising that redemption is a process in which there are different stages, and through looking upon the matter too much in the light of a commercial transaction, and trying to adjust it mathema-

tically, that many mistakes have been made on this subject. It is not that God requires something as an equivalent for the redemption He offers, for nothing that man could give Him could be an equivalent for so great a gift, or of any value to Him; but He is working upon a principle involving the development of character in those to be redeemed, and this necessitates that there should be various stages and processes in the work of redemption.

2.—QUESTION: If men are condemned to death, and Christ did not die *instead* of them, how is it that some *escape* dying? (This question of course has reference to the faithful saints who will be alive at the appearing of Christ, and who will be changed to immortality without dying, and also to Enoch and Elijah, assuming them to be still alive, which there seems to be no reason to doubt.)

ANSWER: Because God removes the condemnation resting on them and forgives them, through Christ. They become legally related to him by immersion, and, having died in him as their federal head—as already shown from the 6th of Romans—it is not necessary that they should die to fulfil the Edenic penalty, although, were it not for the circumstance of their living at the particular time when Christ returns to bestow immortality, they would suffer the *consequences* of the Edenic condemnation by dying. (See answer to question 1.) Having become so related to Christ according to God's appointment, He removes the condemnation, and is pleased to allow them to enter upon a future life without passing through the death-state, and we cannot deny the Almighty the right to do this if He pleases, even in view of the fact that He has decreed the condemnation of the race. Some say it is inconsistent with the character of God to suppose that He would make a decree and then revoke it; but they surely forget that the law-giver is higher than his own laws, and that one who makes laws or issues decrees has the right to revoke or suspend them at his pleasure. And we have a case in point in the story of Jonah. After the decree had gone forth that the city of Nineveh should be overthrown (Jonah iii. 4), on the people turning from their evil way, God revoked the decree (verse 10), on the principle stated in Jer. xviii. 7-10; and if in that case God revoked a decree which had actually gone forth, shall we

say that it would be inconsistent with His "ways" to revoke the racial condemnation, and prevent its full consequences coming on those who accept the means He has provided for the purpose in the person of His Son? for it is through Christ, and Christ alone, that any will escape dying. The only difference between the cases of Enoch and Elijah and the faithful living at Christ's second appearing, is that the former lived before and the latter live after the death of Christ, and therefore that while the latter will escape death through their relation to the death and resurrection of Christ as an accomplished thing, the former escaped it through their relation to Christ prospectively by means of the sacrifices they offered.

3.—QUESTION. Seeing that some escape dying through the righteousness of Christ, why could not Christ himself escape the necessity of dying by the same means?

ANSWER.—Because they escape it through him as the result of his *completed* work. Believers are not immersed into an unresurrected Christ, or—if we may

use the term—an unsacrificed Christ, but into a resurrected Christ.—(Rom. vi. 3-11; 1 Cor. xv. 14, 17, 18, &c.; Col. i. 18; ii. 12; iii. 1.) The righteousness that is imputed to believers includes the death of Christ.—(Rom. iv. 22-25.) Therefore the righteousness necessary for Christ must have included his death, and hence it could not have saved him from dying. Death must be suffered by one, and he a perfectly righteous one, as the foundation for any others escaping dying. As Christ was this one, it was impossible for him to escape dying through his own righteousness. The only way in which he, being under the Edenic condemnation, could have been saved from dying, would have been through another redeemer, who would have had to die; but this was impossible, as there was no such one.

London.

A. ANDREW.

ERRATA IN FIRST PART OF ARTICLE,
IN AUGUST NUMBER.

Page 360, lines 21 and 30, for "sin, the flesh," read "*sin in the flesh.*"

THINGS NEW AND OLD FROM THE TREASURES OF THE SPIRIT.

By F. R. SHUTTLEWORTH.

REFERENCE TABLE NO. 140.

EXPOSITORY SUMMARIES.

1 Sam. ii.—Hannah's song yields the following edifying ideas:—

1.—The occasion of Hannah's so rejoicing before Jehovah was the birth of Samuel, whom she had asked of God, as his name signifies, and whom she had lent to the Lord for life according to her promise.

2.—Hannah regarded this divine interference in answer to her prayer as a manifestation of salvation towards her, inasmuch as it delivered her from the reproach of her adversaries, who had provoked her sorely, to make her fret, because the Lord had not given her offspring.

3.—Hannah rejoices in the justice, strength, and favour of Jehovah; declaring that He knows men, weighs their actions in the balance, and rewards them according to their works.

4.—Hannah records the following pro-

vidential reverses of experiences, viz. that they who were full are empty; that they who were hungry are replenished; that they who were barren have brought forth to perfection; and that she who hath many children is waxed feeble.

5.—Hannah particularises some of the glorious providences of Jehovah, declaring that He both killeth and maketh alive; that He bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up again by resurrection; that He maketh poor and maketh rich; that He bringeth low and also lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill to give him glory among princes; that He keeps the feet of His saints, and finally will break all His adversaries to pieces.

6.—Hannah predicts a time when the mighty wicked shall be silent in darkness, because by mere strength shall no man prevail.

7.—Hannah's prayer and thanksgiving are evidently also prophetic of the time when Jehovah will judge the ends of the earth by His anointed; while Hannah's

experience of God's justice and goodness is a faint type of the glorious riches in store for saints the like of this holy woman, who pray in adversity and give thanks in prosperity.

Prov. viii. : Wisdom's doctrine as unfolded in this chapter may be summarised as follows :—

1.—Here we have a personification of wisdom as the handmaid of Jehovah, and His messenger to men.

2.—Those verses where wisdom is poetically represented as being with God when the heavens and the earth were created, are explained literally in Psalm cxxxvi. 5 : "Him that by wisdom made the heavens;" and again, Psalm civ. 24 : "In wisdom hast Thou made them all."

3.—The wisdom of the Divine thoughts is well represented by the Spirit, which is Jehovah's effluent energy by which He accomplishes His wise designs, either in the garnishing of the heavens (Job xxvi. 13), or in the communication of His will to men, or in the embodiment of his glory and fulness in Christ.

4.—Wisdom represents the sum total of the Divine ways and principles, which are defined as follows : truth, righteousness, or "right things;" instruction, knowledge, prudence, godly fear, counsel, understanding, love, favour, and blessing.

5.—Wisdom embodies also the perfection of the Deity's purpose in Christ Jesus : thus, it represents strength, for whose is wise is strong; again, it represents the kingly administration of justice, and the attainment of durable riches, honour, and life for evermore in the kingdom of God.

6.—The revenues of wisdom are better than choice silver, or fine gold; and rubies or whatever the heart may desire are not to be compared to the fruits of wisdom : her ways lead in the end to filled treasure, and the inheritance of substance.

7.—Wisdom like its divine archetype is everlasting, and knows neither beginning nor ending : when the "glory of Israel" returns, "wisdom will be the stability of the times;" meanwhile, blessed is the man that watcheth daily at her gates; and, on the contrary, they who neglect so great a salvation, wrong their own souls; and all who hate her, solemnly love death.

Acts xx. : The following are the noteworthy points of this chapter :—

1.—That the disciples created by the

personal labours of the apostles broke bread together on the first day of the week.

2.—That upon a certain Sunday Paul broke bread with the brethren at Troas, ready to depart early on the Monday morning : upon the same occasion he preached unto them until midnight, and further continued talking with them till break of day. It was also upon this same night that he restored young brother Eutychus to life, who, being overcome with sleep through Paul's "long preaching," had fallen down from the gallery and been taken up dead.

3.—That Paul, taking leave of Troas, journeyed on foot to Assos, whither he was preceded by brethren in a boat, who also took him in at that place according to appointment, from whence they proceeded to Ephesus; whereupon, arriving there, Paul called together the elders of the ecclesia that they might receive his farewell instructions, prior to his departure for Jerusalem, against the day of Pentecost.

4.—The elders of the ecclesia assembled, Paul takes them to witness after what an exemplary, humble, faithful, and self-sacrificing manner he had gone in and out amongst them from the first; how that his service to them had been with tears and many trials, and without covetousness; and how that he had kept nothing from them which was profitable, nor shunned to declare to them in anywise the whole counsel of God; wherefore he also took them to record that he was pure from the blood of all men.

5.—Paul reminds them how that for the space of three years he had never ceased to warn and admonish them with tears; and he now takes occasion finally to forewarn them, particularly as to how, after his departure, they should be subjected to the rapacity of devouring wolves, who would make their way into the sheepfold; and that also of their own selves perverse-speaking men would arise, seeking to lead away the disciples.

6.—Paul finally commends them to God and the up-building word of His grace, which he attests has power to confer upon them the inheritance; again, he reminds them what a pattern he had set them, as to how they should labour with the object of supporting the weak.

7.—Paul having knelt down and prayed with them all, this parting fraternal interview was ended in tears, kisses, and the farewell embraces of the sorrowing brethren, amongst whom he had gone preaching the kingdom of God, but who should now see his face no more.

REFERENCE TABLET, No. 141.

GODLY RESOLUTIONS.

"I will hear what God the Lord will speak."—Ps. lxxxv. 8.

"I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live."—Ps. civ. 33.

"I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way."—Ps. ci. 1.

"I will run the way of thy commandments."—Ps. cxix. 32.

"I will never forget thy precepts."—Ps. cxix. 93.

"I will meditate on all thy works, and talk of thy doings."—Ps. lxx. 12.

"Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil."—Ps. xxiii. 4.

"Though he slay me yet will I trust in him."—Job xiii. 15.

"I will freely sacrifice unto thee."—Ps. liv. 6.

"I will be glad and rejoice in thy mercy."—Ps. xxxi. 7.

"My tongue shall speak of righteousness, and of thy praise all the day long."—Ps. xxxv. 28.

"I will say of Jehovah, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God in whom I trust."—Ps. xci. 2.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 142.

GOSPEL PRAYERS.

"Show me thy ways, O Lord; teach me thy paths, and lead me in thy truth."—Ps. xxv. 4, 5.

"Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men."—Ps. xii. 1.

"Keep me as the apple of the eye; hide me under the shadow of thy wings from the wicked."—Ps. xvii. 8.

"Oh! let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end; but establish the just."—Ps. vii. 9.

"Arise, O Lord; let not man prevail; let the heathen be judged in thy sight."—Ps. ix. 19.

"Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem."—Ps. li. 18.

"Oh! that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion."—Ps. liii. 6.

"Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered; let them also that hate Him flee from before Him."—Ps. xviii. 4.

"Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations."—Ps. lxxxii. 8.

"Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou hast made strong for thyself."—Ps. lxxx. 15.

"Peace be within thy walls (O Jerusalem) and prosperity within thy palaces."—Ps. cxxii. 7.

"Arise. O Lord, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness, and let thy saints shout for joy."—Ps. cxxxii. 8, 9.

"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

"O satisfy us early with thy mercy, that we may rejoice and be glad all our days."—Ps. xc. 14.

"O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth."—Ps. lxxvii.

"O send out thy light and thy truth: let them lead me; let them bring me to thy holy hill."—Ps. xliiii. 5.

"Come, Lord Jesus."—Rev. xxi.

REFERENCE TABLET No. 143.

INFORMATION.

ANGELS.—There are human angels as well as divine, hence the Hebrew word *malach*, rendered angel in the Old Testament, is also translated ambassador and messenger. The following are illustrations of both:—Ambassador: Prov. xiii. 7; 2 Chron. xxxv. 21; Isaiah xxx. 4, xxxiii. 7; Ezekiel xvii. 15. Messenger: 1 Kings xix. 2; 2 Chron. xviii. 12; Job i. 14; Prov. xiii. 17; Isaiah xliiii. 19; Ezekiel xxiii. 40; Mal. ii. 7.

DEVIL.—The only word properly rendered devil in the New Testament is in the Greek *diabolos*; this word is compounded first of *dia*, which means *through*, and is so translated in upwards of ninety places, and second of *ballo*, which signifies cast, and is the word so rendered in about eighty places. As further illustrative of the latter, we have *ekballo* rendered cast out; *periballo*, cast about; *apoballo*, cast away; *kataballo*, cast down; *emballo*, cast into; and *epiballo*, cast upon. Then further illustrating *dia*, we have *diabano*, to pass *through*, and *diablepo* to see *through*; and *diagnosis*, *through* knowledge; and *dia-katharizo*, to purge *thoroughly*; and *diakrisis*, to see *through*; and *diaphanes*, transparent, which again is to see *through*. Then we have *diaporeuomai*, to go *through*; and *di-angazo*, to shine *through*; and also *diutheke*, a covenant which was anciently made by

passing *through* the halves of a divided animal. The literal idea whence *diabolos* is derived, is the casting of a stone for injury, or the thrusting through of a beast with a dart (*bolis*, Heb. xii. 20). The New Testament uses the word in a figurative sense; hence, the "fiery darts of the wicked" (Eph. vi. 16); and hence the translation of *diabolos* by "false accusers" (2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3), and "sland'ers" (1 Tim. iii. 11); these cast poisoned arrows and burning darts, they stabbed men through in a metaphorical sense, and therefore were devils, or collectively the devil, "the accuser of the brethren."

SATAN.—Satan is a Hebrew word, sometimes simply transferred to the English Bible, and sometimes translated adversary, which word well expresses the meaning of the original. The signification comes out very characteristically in the words of Paul, who, speaking of who or what had prevented his visiting the Thessalonians, says, "Satan hindered us."—(1 Thess. ii. 18.) Writing to Rome also, he speaks of having been "much hindered" for many years from visiting them.—(Rom. xv. 22; i. 13.) The same idea comes out in the opposition of Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the Jews against Christ (Acts iv. 27), or again it is illustrated in the words of the angel to Balaam, "I went out to *withstand* thee" (Num. xxii. 32), which same idea is also expressed thus: "The angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him," which word adversary is *satan* in the Hebrew. Several satans are mentioned by name, thus: Peter is so named by Christ, because he savoured of the things which he be of men; and Hadad and Rezon are styled satans in the Hebrew, because they were the adversaries of Solomon—(1 Kings xi. 14, 23.) Again, a daughter of Abraham is described as having been bound of *satan* for eighteen years, because she had been bowed together by a spirit of infirmity which hindered her lifting herself up.—(Luke xiii. 12, 16.) Again, it was to some such kind of *satan* Paul delivered Hymenæus and Alexander, that they might learn not to blaspheme.—(1 Tim. i. 20.)

SONSHIP.—The idea of sonship was of very extensive application among the Hebrews; thus, sparks of fire were called sons of heat, or burning coals (*Benai-resheph*, Job v. 7); men of high degree were called sons of virtue or valour (*Benai-eesh*); men of power were called sons of strength; a steward or butler was called a son of drink (*Benmeshek*, Gen. xv. 2); a

man of humble station was a son of low degree, or a son of earth; hostages were sons of pledge; a man doomed to be destroyed was a son of destruction; a man destined to perish was a son of death; and a man bringing comfort was a son of consolation. So, also the hope of the truth makes men children of light and sons of power.

EAST.—East in the Hebrew signifies sun-rising, and west means sunset or the evening side. In the east the sun of righteousness will arise with healing in his beams; in the east the day-spring of glory will begin. In the east the "rose of Sharon" will bloom, and the "plant of renown" will send forth its sweet smelling fragrance; in the east, Messiah will shine forth as the glory of Israel restored; in the east is the promised land; in the east the judgment of quick and dead will take place, and the award of immortality; to the east Christ will come to make the place of his feet glorious; to the east the ransomed of the Lord will return with everlasting joy; in the east it will be said, by and bye "the Lord is there."

REFERENCE TABLET No. 144.

SPRAY FROM THE WATER OF LIFE.

The Lord is with men while they are with Him; He loves those who love Him, but if they forsake Him, He will forsake them; and if they walk contrary to Him, He will walk contrary to them; and if they forget Him, He will also forget them. And again, He is merciful to the merciful and upright to the upright, and pure to the pure, and froward towards the froward.—(2 Chron. xv. 2; Ps. xviii. 25-27; 2 Sam. xxii. 26, 27; Lev. xxvi. 23, 24; Jer. xxiii. 39; Pro. viii. 17.)

Christ has not merely hired us as his servants, but he has purchased us from the direst slavery, and made us his friends and freemen.—(1 Cor. vii. 22; vi. 20.)

The apostle requires brethren both to affirm and deny—to "*deny* themselves of all ungodliness and worldly lusts;" and also "*to affirm* constantly that they which have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works."—(Tit. ii. 12; iii. 8.)

The gospel teaches us to live for Christ, to work for Christ, to look for Christ, to wait for Christ, and to pray for Christ's reappearing as the only truly blessed hope for the sons of men.—(Tit. ii. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; Jas. v. 7.)

The New Testament teaches us not only to accept Christ as our example, but to take also the prophets and all those who have spoken in the name of the Lord.—(Jas. v. 10.)

By the example of the righteous we are encouraged; while by the history of the wicked we are forewarned. We are sup-

plied with both in the Bible, that so we might be thoroughly furnished unto all good works—(1 Cor. x. 6)

Promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south; but God is the judge. He putteth down one and setteth up another.—(Ps. lxxv. 6, 7.)

NOW READY, *Seventy-two pages, in Printed Cover, Eureka Size, price ONE SHILLING;*
POSTAGE, THREE HALFPENCE.

INDEX TO EUREKA.

PART I.—*An Alphabetical List of all the subjects treated of by Dr. Thomas in the course of his Exposition, with the references to the volume and page.*

PART II.—*A complete list of all the passages of Scripture explained or referred to in the said Exposition, with a reference in each case to the volume and page where the explanation is to be found.*

How often it happens with those who are acquainted with *Eureka* that in conversation, or on other occasions, they recollect and would like to refer to what Dr. Thomas has written on some particular subject or passage of Scripture, but are unable to do so for want of the almost superhuman memory necessary to fix on some particular page out of over 2,000 pages. At such moments the value of a full alphabetical index is appreciated. Such an index has till now been wanting. The index in the book itself is a mere catalogue of chapter headings, which, while of some use, is very little of a guide in the cases we have referred to.

The want that has existed so long is now supplied in the publication of the pamphlet of 72 pages described above. This pamphlet is an Index to *Eureka* in the fullest sense. Every subject treated in the three volumes is set forth, with a reference to every page in every volume where it is treated, so that the reader is able to refer to every place in *Eureka* where the same point is treated. All the subjects are arranged in alphabetical order, so that the reader can find his way to any subject at once. The number of subjects is something extraordinary, as may be imagined from the dimensions of the pamphlet, and as is well known to every loving reader.

In addition to the index of subjects, there is a most valuable section, occupying the last 22 pages, viz., a complete list of all the passages of Scripture explained or referred to in *Eureka*, with a reference in each case to the volume and page where the explanation is to be found. In this list, the books of the Bible are arranged alphabetically and not according to their order in the Bible. This will make them more ready of reference to all classes of readers. It is astonishing how largely the list covers nearly the whole of the Bible. This proves more than anything that *Eureka*, though nominally an exposition of the Apocalypse, is really an elucidation of the whole divine testimony, commencing with Genesis.

This part of the Index will have a value peculiar to itself. Suppose a Bible reader comes across a passage that he may think obscure, and would like to know if Dr. Thomas has said anything about it, he has but to turn to this part of the Index to be able (if the Dr. has written on it in *Eureka*) to put his finger at once on the place or places where what he has said is to be found.

We cannot better commend the appendix to our readers than by giving a specimen of each of the two parts.

SPECIMEN OF PART I.

- AARON, as a type of Christ, vol. ii. 28.
 Abaddon, vol. ii. pp. 462, 463.
 A B C Manuscripts on the rendering of "The Coming One," "He who is coming," in Rev. chaps. i. xi. xvi., vol. iii. pp. 501, 502.
 Abomination of Desolation, vol. iii. pp. 544—546.
 Abominations of the Earth, vol. ii. pp. 599—601.
 Abraham, seed of, vol. iii. pp. 291, 292; heir of the world, vol. ii. p. 729; his age at Terah's death, vol. ii. Appendix p. 11.
 Absent from the Lord, vol. i. p. 367.
 Abubeker, successor to Mahomet, A.D. 362, vol. ii. pp. 470, 471.
 Abyss, the, vol. ii. pp. 454, 455, 462, 463; the Pit of the, vol. ii. pp. 452, 453, from which the Beast ascends, vol. iii. pp. 165, 166; key of, or "Bottomless Pit," vol. iii. pp. 663—667.
 Account, the Giving of, at the Judgment-seat, vol. iii. p. 539.
 Achor, Valley of, vol. ii. pp. 562, 563.
 Adam, Second, vol. ii. pp. 19, 20; New and Old Adams, vol. ii. pp. 146, 147; Adam and Eve, Temptation and Fall of, vol. iii. pp. 50—58; the covering provided by Deity for, vol. iii. Appendix p. 32.
 Adrian I., Pope, vol. iii. pp. 306, 310.
 Adrian IV., Pope, vol. iii. pp. 145, 337, bestows kingdom of Ireland upon Henry II. of England.
 Advent of Christ, Second, vol. i. pp. 134—139; vol. ii. pp. 545—554, vol. iii. pp. 584, 585; *where* He first comes to, *when* it takes place, vol. ii. pp. 585—588; vol. iii. pp. 9, 457, 458, 581—584; *how* He appears, vol. iii. pp. 585—590; position of Russian and British Forces at the time, vol. iii. Appendix p. 100.

SPECIMEN OF PART II.

Chapter and Verse in the Bible.	Volume and pages of <i>Eureka</i> .	Chapter and Verse in the Bible.	Volume and pages of <i>Eureka</i> .
Acts i. 7.....	i. 11.	Acts x. 38.....	ii. 291.
11.....	i. 137; ii. 10, 563.	43.....	i. 286.
" ii.	i. 121, 122.	48.....	i. 282.
" ii. 19.....	i. 132.	" xiv. 22.....	i. 221.
30.....	i. 137.	" xv. 1 to 5.....	i. 71, 195.
36.....	ii. 124; iii. 383.	9.....	i. 281.
38.....	i. 229; ii. 239, 626.	13.....	iii. 292.
46.....	ii. 480.	14.....	i. 227, 282; iii. 412
" iii.	i. 121, 122.	16.....	i. 376; ii. 16, 576; iii. 404.
iii. 21.....	ii. 563; iii. 441.	18.....	ii. 311.
" v. 12.....	i. 280; iii. 276.	" xvii. 6.....	ii. 585.
32.....	ii. 480.	7.....	i. 137; ii. 585.
" v. 28.....	i. 70.	8.....	ii. 585.
" vi. 7.....	i. 70.	31.....	i. 120, 137, 158; ii. 586.
" vii. 55.....	i. 352.	" xviii. 10.....	i. 22.
56.....	i. 352.	" xx. 17.....	i. 191.
" viii.	i. 121, 122.	" xxii. 16.....	i. 283.
" viii. 1.....	i. 37.	21.....	i. 192.
2.....	i. 121.	" xxvi. 6.....	i. 121, 122.
12.....	i. 225; ii. 225, 351, 626; iii. 380.	7.....	i. 121, 122.
14.....	i. 70.	10.....	i. 315.
15 to 17	ii. 203.	18.....	i. 20, 127; ii. 591.
" x.	i. 121, 122.	" xxviii. 20.....	i. 121, 122.
" x. 28.....	ii. 593.	23.....	i. 121, 122.

The brethren are indebted for the Index to the long labours of a sister of leisure, who appreciates *Eureka* perhaps as much as anything, and who desires thus to make its advantages as accessible as possible to all. We hail its

appearance as an event calculated to increase the acquaintance already existing with a work of priceless value, and to extend it to many who are not yet awake to the benefit within their reach. We thank God for it as a help and an encouragement during the last midnight hours of darkness that hang heavily though fast speeding away.

EDITOR.

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren... (Heb. ii. 11.)

OCTOBER, 1876.

THIS is the month when it is usual to ask subscribers to the *Christadelphian* to arrange for the next volume. The arrangement is very simple, and consists of an intimation of intention to take the *Christadelphian* during the year ensuing after December next, accompanied with the remittance of *seven shillings and sixpence* for every copy required, if resident in Britain; *three dollars* if resident in the United States; *nine shillings and sixpence* if resident in Canada; and *ten shillings and sixpence* if resident in Australia and New Zealand. ☞ Where this cash-accompanied intimation is not made, the *Christadelphian* ceases to come at the expiration of the year.

It is with no less reluctance than ever that we call attention to this matter. We should be glad if it could be dispensed with. It would be entirely to our taste to proceed with the publication of the *Christadelphian* from year to year without the least allusion to matters of finance, and without the necessity of making any change in the list of subscribers. But we are obliged to conform to necessity. The printer will not print without payment; and as we lack the wherewithal to pay him, the subscribers must, or else the *Christadelphian* must cease to appear. The subscribers have chosen to find the money for twelve years, and as time goes on, the signs of the times, with increasing distinctness, tell us of the nearness of the Lord.

Of course, the subscription list varies from year to year. All do not continue friends that start friends, though a wonderfully large proportion do. Some for one reason, some for another, drop off, lose their interest

and withdraw their support. This is always matter of sorrow, particularly in some cases. But we cannot help it. The *Christadelphian* has pursued one policy from the beginning; and in that line of things it is found to-day; and therein, please God, it will be found steadfast even unto the end. Its aim is to serve the truth in its entirety—as a symmetrical whole, free of crotchets, with the practical end in view with which it was associated in the hands of the apostles, viz., the enlightenment, purification and comfort of such as receive the word into honest and good hearts, and desire in all simplicity and sincerity to walk in the truth, rejoicing in the hope, and walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.

The pursuit of this policy brings it into collision with persons sometimes. It confines it in the use of literary matter. It necessitates the exclusion of much that it would be a pleasure to use if merely personal considerations ruled. Edification first, is the rule; and, of course, the Editor is obliged to use his own judgment in the application of the rule. It is a thankless duty, but will never be grumbled at by those who have the interests of the truth truly at heart.

As for those who are not in earnest about the matter, who are governed merely by the desire for intellectual amusement, perhaps without being distinctly conscious of it; who under the specious plea of fair play, would publish anything and everything without regard to consequences, we must choose to leave them to their liberty and use our liberty in consulting wiser ends. There are consequences, of course, not to be considered for a moment; but there are consequences greatly to be considered by every man who aims to be approved of Christ at his appearing. Whatever tends to discourage or bewilder the earnest toiler for eternal life; whatever tends to raise personal controversies or destructive strife about abstractions; whatever tends to

raise a stumbling-block in the way of the enquirer ; whatever tends to give occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, are all things to be avoided by the servants of the truth. The man of earnest conviction and faithful concern for Christ in his day and generation, will never be reckless in these particulars. Such a man will never identify himself with a machinery for circulating the insipid uncertainties of speculators, who gratify themselves and benefit nobody by wishy-washy outpourings that tend only to dreariness and demoralisation.

At all events, the *Christadelphian* will be found in the old channel as heretofore. The genuine article or none is its motto, to which we have adhered, with temporal disadvantage and much odium, for a long time, and from which we shall not diverge until the end of this labour, which cannot be far off. The company of those who sympathise with it, we shall be glad of ; the censure of those who disapprove, we must endure. The coming of the Lord will justify the narrow way in all its disagreeable applications in the present evil world.

FREEMASONRY INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE TRUTH.

This proposition is incidentally proved in connection with a controversy being carried on in America. The question debated is : "Should the name of Christ be mentioned in Masonic prayers ?" Some prominent members are in favour of it ; others who do not believe in Christ, object to it on the ground that Masonry is an undenominational league of friendship on the basis of human brotherhood merely, and ought not to be embarrassed by religious recognitions offensive to any of the members. An Atheistical journal naturally sides with the latter, and observes : "The problem must remain insoluble how a prayer can at one and the same time be undenominational and yet Christian." No better evidence can be furnished of the impossibility of a brother of Christ being a Freemason.

THE TOPSY-TURVEYISM OF CLERICAL THEOLOGY.

The clerical dogma of immortal-soulism forces the believer of it to look at things upside down, in "darkness-light : light-

darkness" fashion. This was never better illustrated than in the following extract from a recent utterance of the notorious Henry Ward Beecher. Speaking of death, he said : "And now, when another and another drops, I do not stand and weep for the withered stem, but I rejoice when you die, for then you live. I rejoice at your death ; and I give you head, mother, child, companion, friend, my well-beloved. I give you warning, I shall shed no tears of sorrow when you go ; and if those you leave behind call me to your funeral, I shall go a cheerful minister, believing that you who are dead live ; and if I die, and am buried in Greenwood, let nobody stand there and say, 'Here lies Henry Ward Beecher !' for God knows I won't lie there. Look upward ; and if any of you love me, stand with your feet on my turf and look upward, for I will not hear anybody who will not speak with his mouth toward heaven." Poor Mr. Beecher, when he is buried in Greenwood Cemetery, there he will lie. Nowhere else will he be. His heats and theological eccentricities will be at an end for ever ; it will matter nothing to him which way people set their mouths ; a voice of thunder will fail to rouse his irresponsive and rotting sensorium.

CHURCHYARDS PARSONIC MEADOWS.

It was foreshewn that the ecclesiastical mistress of the world, whose daughters in every land carry on the same traffic, should traffic among other things in the bodies of men. A recent ecclesiastical lawsuit has brought to light the character or at all events the legal right of the Anglican clergy in this particular. In the case, *Keet v. Smith*, in which a Wesleyan minister claimed to have the title "rev." on his daughter's tombstone in the common churchyard, the Dean of Arches, in denying the claim, laid it down, says the *Liverpool Mercury*, "That the parish churchyard—about which so many hallowed memories cling—is not, as was fondly thought, 'God's acre,' but legally and actually the parson's meadow. 'The churchyard,' he says, 'is the freehold of the incumbent, subject only to the right of parishioners or a stranger dying in the parish, to simple interment, but no more. Indeed the incumbent has the right to pasture in the church-

yard animals which do not injure the bodies interred therein. Every gravestone, of course, interferes with that pasturage; and the incumbent, for this as well as for other more important reasons, has a *prima facie* right to prohibit altogether the placing of any gravestone, or to permit it upon proper conditions, such as those which relate to the size and character of the stone, the legality or propriety of the inscription upon it, or the payment of a proper fee.' So that," says the *Mercury*, "while we are permitted to bury our dead to feed the parson's sheep, we are not at liberty to mark the spot, except by his special permission, and by payment of a fee which he may consider an equivalent for the space occupied. And this is the church of the nation, whose claim to exclusive state recognition is based upon the allegation that its doors are open to all comers, and its graveyards free to the whole population."

HELL AND THE DEVIL FROM A JEWISH POINT OF VIEW.

Commenting on the decision of the Dean of Arches (that the denial either of the eternity of punishment, or of the personality of the evil one, is sufficient to justify a clergyman in refusing the "Holy Communion" to a parishioner), the *Jewish Chronicle* says, "We Jews may congratulate ourselves upon the different reading of our own Scriptures. Our God is mercy itself. He inflicts punishment for the expiation of sin, not from revenge. With the expiation of the sin the punishment ceases. The object is attained, why continue the torture? Further, what else is the belief in God and Satan, but the belief of the ancient Persians in Ormuzd and Ahriman, the former the god of light and all that is good, and the more powerful of the two; the latter the god of darkness and evil. Surely the name does not make the difference. Yet the God of Israel declared, 'I form the light and create the darkness; I make peace and create evil. I, the Lord, do all these things.' Here we alight upon another of the errors of Christianity, which even as it personified the Spirit of Holiness, transforming this abstract noun into the Holy Ghost and the *memra* (מַמְרָא) of the Targum; the *logos* of Philon into the Son of God, so it took a mere figure of speech—a poetic abstraction

called the adversary—Satan—for a real being, converted him into a kind of rival god, always fighting with the second person of the Deity, just as Ahriman is constantly in antagonism with Ormuzd. Has a Jew not occasion to thank God for having been born in a community free from these darkening and mischievous errors?"

ROME AND "THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST."

The *Rock* says: "This expression, as we need scarcely tell the erudite reader, is found in the Book of Revelations (xiv. 18), where it is distinctly applied to 'the beast, and is said, at the same time, to be 'the number of a man—six hundred, threescore and six.' We must, therefore, in order to discover the Beast's name, resolve the Greek numerals, which make up 666, into their equivalent Greek letters. This mystical numeration was common enough in New Testament times (with the Jewish Cabalists and others), when it was called 'Arithmology,' or the science of numbers. As the Beast's 'name' and 'number' must necessarily be associated with the Beast's 'seat,' we may put aside any attempted solution of the riddle which does not suit the 'seven hills' of 'the great city' (Babylon—Rome), which, when John wrote, 'ruled over all the kings of the earth.'—(Rev. xvii. 18.) There—since the days of the Waldenses—good Protestants have never doubted that 'Satan's seat is,' or hesitated to point out anti-Christ's throne.' Nor has any sensible commentator, since the days of Irenæus, felt uncertain as to the Beast's 'name.' That early father suggested ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ (*Lateinos*), which, if we assign to the Greek characters their proper numerical value, exactly gives the required number, viz. .

Α	.	.	.	80
Α	.	.	.	1
Τ	.	.	.	300
Ε	.	.	.	5
Ι	.	.	.	10
Ν	.	.	.	50
Ο	.	.	.	70
Σ	.	.	.	200
TOTAL				666

"In this name (*Lateinos*) there is a total concurrence of whatever circumstances could tend to identify the Latin (or Roman) Church with the subject of prophetic denunciation. It is no mere abstract quality but 'the number of a man;' it is associated with the seven-hilled city, the capital of the Latin Empire; it points to the Latin or Western, as contradistinguished from the Greek or Eastern Church; it aptly expresses the most characteristic feature of that idolatrous communion, viz., its Latin services, which are reproduced in every part of the globe. To quote Dr. More's memorable words, 'They Latinise in everything—mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, decretals, bulls, are conceived in Latin. The Papal councils speak in Latin. The Scripture (*i.e.*, the 'Latin Vulgate,') is read in no other language under Popery than Latin. In short, all things are Latin. It is the Latin world, the Latin kingdoms, the Latin patriarch, the Latin clergy, the Latin councils! But clear as is all this to the unsophisticated Protestant mind, we may be quite sure that the Roman harlot would never be content to sit quiet under such a fearful brand; hence, all kinds of ridiculous attempts to find some alternative solution. Luther—if you add the letter *l* to his name and make it *Lulther*—comes to 666; and so does Mahomet, if you add the feminine termination, and make it *Mahumetis*. But these absurd attempts to shift the burden only render the terrible stigma more clear and damnatory."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE EASTERN QUESTION—BRITISH OPPOSITION NEUTRALISED—RUSSIA ABOUT TO INTERPOSE.

Events have made a large advance towards a new phase of development during the past month, and that new phase is in the direction of increased conformity to the expectations of those who watch the situation from the divine point of view. The first of the prominent features of the situation is the change that has come over British views of the Eastern question. Hitherto, all parties have, for more than fifty years, regarded the

maintenance of the crumbling Ottoman empire as a matter of necessity for the protection of the British empire in India from Russian encroachment. Russia, knowing this, has been compelled to proceed warily in her tactics. An open attack upon Turkey has been rendered impossible, and Russia has been compelled to pursue her sinister designs through other agents and under the cloak of diplomacy. But now the British obstacle is nearly at an end. God has made use of the iniquities of the Turk to remove the lion from the path of the bear.

The newspaper recital of the atrocities committed by the Turks in Bulgaria, confirmed, as it has been, by the official report of M. Schuyler, the American Consul-General, has roused an intense feeling of horror in all classes of society, and led to the national resolution that, under no circumstances, shall Turkey again be defended by British blood and treasure, and that even Russia shall not be interfered with should she interpose to suppress the Turkish barbarism. This change of feeling has found expression in the shape of public meetings in every town of any consequence throughout the united kingdom. The movement—so extensive, so spontaneous, so unanimous, and so earnest, is said to be unparalleled in British history. It has occurred while (and probably because) Parliament is not sitting, and at a time of the year when holiday occupation has taken the natural leaders of public opinion to all parts of the world.

Of course it is not diplomatically binding on the Government, but in a country where Government is based on popular representation, such a rising has almost the effect of a Parliamentary decision. Government has been officially made aware of it by a perfect avalanche of resolutions and petitions, and even her Majesty has been personally petitioned to interfere, and convoke Parliament and prevent any support being given to Turkey. The effect of it is well described by the London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury*, when he says: "This widely prevalent feeling almost paralyses Lord Derby in his efforts to prevent Russia from gaining a foothold in Turkey. Englishmen are fast coming to the conviction that better the Russ on the Bosphorus than the Turk on the Danube; and of course Russian statesmen know this, and will turn this change of

feeling to their own advantage." The *Warrington Guardian* (Sept. 9) thus distinctly states the case: "On every side are the symptoms of a rising tide of opinion against Turkey. The dreadful story of her cruelty, the shocking details of her barbarities, have roused English feeling well nigh beyond control. Earls, and bishops, and canons, Churchmen, Catholics, Dissenters, and Friends, vie with each other in preaching this new crusade, and in exciting popular indignation against the barbarous Turk. The storm of opinion leaps over all barriers of party, and carries along with it friends and foes of the Government alike. Popular feeling will evidently no longer permit the remotest and most indirect though neutral countenance of Mussulman cruelty. A great many moderate people are so wrought upon by the current sentiment as to declare they would rather have Russia at Constantinople than the murderous Turk."

At a meeting, at which the "Rev." New-man Hall was present, that gentleman said: "The first thing they were to do was to go to headquarters, and memorialise the Queen.—(Loud cheers.) They must not be satisfied with resolutions, which go for nothing. They must go to the Queen, and beg her immediately to convene Parliament, that the voice of the people might be heard in its constitutional way.—(Cheers.) And when Parliament had met, they should demand, first, a national renunciation of any participation in or sanction of these atrocities; next, the punishment of the evildoers, and restitution to those who have been robbed; and last, that those whom the Turkish Government had shown themselves so utterly unable to govern, should be free from such government in future. These must be the sole conditions on which they would have any terms with Turkey. If their terms were refused, and these atrocities continued, and Russia interfered, should they interfere? ('Yes, and help her.' Cheers.) Yes, they would say that they would not interfere, but they would cry, 'God bless her.'—(Cheers)."

The prevalent feeling was well illustrated at another meeting. A resolution was proposed, calling upon the British government to restore peace between Turkey and Servia as soon as possible. A gentleman, not satis-

fied with this mild proposition, proposed as an amendment: "That this meeting emphatically protests against any farther attempt being made, by diplomacy or arms, to maintain the hateful and tyrannous ascendancy of Mahomedanism in European Turkey."

The amendment was seconded by a gentleman who said, amid cheers, "Let the Turks (brutes as they were) be kicked into the Black Sea." The Mayor took a show of hands, and declared the amendment carried; after which the amendment and resolution were incorporated with each other.

The sentiment is not confined to private persons. Public men have spoken out. Mr. Robert Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer under Mr. Gladstone's Government, has delivered a public speech in which he said:—

"We found in him (the Turk) an instrument which we could play off against our great terror, the Emperor of Russia; and it has been a tradition with the statesmen of England, for a long time, that we were bound to support the Government of Turkey, in order that we might put a stop to the ambition of the Emperor of Russia; and it has been with this object that we have shed torrents of blood and squandered a hundred millions of money, only to have to begin over again the same thing, and to be tolerating and supporting abuses at which the blood curdles. Turkey has had some success in her conflict with Servia, as it was likely that she should, but do you think that Turkey, who has made such slow progress against the Servian militia, would be a very formidable bulwark against Russia? Do we think that we shall get any compensation from her for the millions we have advanced her—millions that have gone to the bottom of the sea? Do you think that the power of Turkey, which has been bungling so long over this little Servian campaign—people whom they ought to have walked over in a week—do you think that such a nation as this is really a support upon which it is worth our while to lean at the expense of every possible degradation to which a proud and honourable nation like England can submit?—(cheers.) Gentlemen, I do feel, with a strength I can hardly express, that we are in the last degree degraded and disgraced by our union with Turkey—(loud cheers). I believe the wish of England is to cut herself loose from this unholy alliance—she wishes to break off all connection with Pandemonium, she has no desire to fill the place of sin and death who keep the doors of it no longer; she wishes, in fact, to break with the whole policy of the integrity of the Turkish Empire. What I would advise as a right and proper policy would be that we

should, instead of setting up this antagonism to Russia which we have worked at so long, throw all that to the winds—(cheers)—and not only keep the weight in the scale which is on the side of Turkey, but taking it out, and putting it into the other, thus doubling our power and force. I think the true and wise policy would be to seek for a cordial understanding with Russia—(loud cheers)—and join heart and hand with her in emancipating these enslaved and miserable races.”

Mr. Gladstone, the ex-premier, has also come before the public in the same outspoken manner. First he has issued a pamphlet on the Eastern Question; secondly, he has delivered a public address in which, speaking on the question, what was to be done to settle the Eastern question, he said:

“Upon the concord and hearty co-operation, not upon a mere hollow truce between England and Russia, but upon their concord and hearty, cordial co-operation, depend a good settlement of this question. Their power is immense. The power of Russia by land for acting upon these countries as against Turkey is perfectly resistless. The power of England by sea is scarcely less important at this moment. For I ask you, what would be the condition of the Turkish armies if the British admiral now in Besika Bay were to inform the Government of Constantinople that from that hour, until atonement had been made, until punishment had descended, until justice had been vindicated, not a man, nor a ship, nor a boat, should cross the waters of the Bosphorus, or the cloudy Euxine, or the bright Aegean, to carry aid to the Turkish troops?—(loud cheers.) These armies that are now desolating Servia, and endeavouring to reproduce the horrible portraiture they have left behind in Bulgaria, are armies of Asiatic hordes; and were we to stop the passage from those countries, we should at once cut off the vital source of what is called Turkish power, and that of itself would be almost enough to reduce it to inaction—(hear, hear.) Such is the power of those two States. I rejoice to think that the people of this country have lifted themselves up to a level far higher than that of ancient recollection of blood and strife. Why, gentlemen, we fought with Russia in 1854, and a gallant defence she made, though she was beaten. Why should not we respect her as a foe? Why should not we act with her for good? Why should not we reserve suspicion and resentment for the time when it is justified by some act of hers, and not merely by old and invidious recollections? I for one, for the purposes of justice, am ready as a humble individual to give the right hand of friendship to Russia; and when the objects are just and righteous, to say, in the name of God, ‘Go on and prosper.’”

Thirdly, Mr. Gladstone has addressed a letter to the *Daily News*, in answer to a speech of Lord Derby's. Lord Derby, in reply to a deputation, said the Government had nothing to unsay, and would protest and remonstrate and demand security from Turkey against the recurrence of the Bulgarian outrages. Mr. Gladstone says: “In the present most critical circumstances, it is time to protest against these protests, and remonstrate against these remonstrances, which are in serious danger of degenerating into a system no better than an organised imposture on the nations of Europe. As well remonstrate with a pestilence or a flood. The time has come for saying ‘you must.’ Let Europe define carefully what is just, and then enact it; and let Great Britain be the guide of the chariot of Europe, and no longer the drag upon the wheel. The nation has shown its desire, but has yet to show that its desire is its will, and that it shall be done.

“When I published, ten days ago, it was my hope that the mind of the Government might receive the requisite impulse from the national movement, without involving any other aid than that of its assembled wisdom. This hope has disappeared; and I now cordially follow Lord Hartington in the judgment he has given—that the circumstances of the time demand the early reassembling of Parliament.”

PROSPECTS OF RUSSIAN INTERVENTION.

Meanwhile the attitude of the nation is not without its effect on the action of the Government. At a meeting at Wakefield, Mr. Sanderson, M.P., stated that a telegram had been received from Constantinople that our Ambassador had told the Turkish Government that, unless they consented to an armistice, they must not expect any assistance from England in the event of an armed intervention by Russia, the atrocities in Bulgaria having greatly changed the feeling of the English nation towards the Turks. Russia comprehends the opportunity. Accordingly, we read a telegram from Berlin, dated September 15, that Russia has notified the Powers that, if the pending negotiations lead to nothing, she will take the cause into her own hands. Another telegram of the same date states that a Russian declaration

of war and invasion of Turkey are inevitable. From St. Petersburg it is stated "that the Emperor Alexander has taken the initiative of a Congress, and, having put his hand to the plough, will not turn back. His Government is hourly awaiting the Austrian and Italian Envoys. Lord Derby has signified that if the Porte does not consent to lay down its arms and accept the European conditions, England will abandon Turkey to her fate. If the attempt to convene a Congress does not succeed, General Ignatieff will at once start for Constantinople with an ultimatum. The Czar will address a manifesto to the Power, loyally declaring that his only object is to protect the Christians. Everything is ready for a military intervention, which, however, Russia will only make in the last extremity."

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

Russian volunteers are passing into Serbia, and the fighting there has reached a point not unfavourable to the Servian (*alias* the Russian) cause. For the moment, a cessation of hostilities has taken place to allow the negotiations to proceed. The *Daily News* remarks:—"Every day that now passes without some sensible approach to a community of views between the Powers is a grievous loss to the cause of peace and civilization. Vast forces have been called into play which it may soon be beyond the power of Chancellors, Cabinets, Czars, and Emperors to control. Alexinatz is in danger of becoming the meeting-place of the pent-up jealousies and animosities of Powers greater than Serbia, greater than Turkey; and the fighting there cannot be stopped too soon, provided terms can be agreed on which will commend themselves to Europe as just, and of a nature to serve as a basis, not perhaps of a lasting peace, but of an acceptable truce."

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* says:—"It is thought that if the Turks should attempt to follow up their victory at Alexinatz by attacking Deligrad, they will find that they have another army than the Servian to reckon with. Russia, which has sent officers by the hundred into Servia—Russia, which although semi-bankrupt, has taken up the whole of the Servian loan, has so deeply committed herself on Prince Milan's side that she cannot suffer

him to be further worsted, and will back up her generals by regiments. It seems to me that, at this moment, the danger of a general war is greater than it has been at any time since hostilities began; and the contingency becomes almost a certainty if Turkey refuses to allow the condition of Bosnia and Bulgaria to be taken into consideration by the mediating Powers."

TERRIBLE INTENTIONS OF TURKEY IF DESERTED.

The terrible possibilities resulting in Turkey being left to fight alone, are shadowed forth in the *Vakit*, the leading Turkish paper, in the following manner:—

"We can see from the newspapers that in consequence of the news spread from Sclavic sources of the pretended atrocities in Bulgaria, the English Government has not only become dissatisfied with us, but will no longer be on our side: will be neutral, which means will be against us."

Then, after discussing the attitude of Russia, the writer continues:—

"But whether Russia be on good terms with us or not, English interests in India will be endangered. Whatever may come, we must consider what we shall do when remaining alone. We shall do our utmost in order to keep England's support; but at last, if we do not succeed in it, then it is very easy to know what we have to do. When Europe will not look at us, then we shall lay aside all the European customs which we have lately adopted, and shall enter on our old way. From the boy of 13 years to the old man of 75, every one of us will be armed, and we shall defend by the aid of God, and by the daring of old days, the country which we have held for 500 years. And if the issue should come to this, as Islamism is not limited only to Turkey, then we will blend all the different Moslem races into one. The Moslems of India, of Central Asia, of the Caucasus, of Africa, and of Algeria will come forward, and we shall again take the measures which we adopted once for the conquest of Jerusalem. We shall send proclamations everywhere, and declare a war against the whole world. This is a very easy matter for his Majesty the Sultan to do. From the preparations we have made against a country like Servia, one can easily judge what we can do in circumstances such as we have contemplated

Then it will not be possible to subjugate 120 millions of Indians with 90,000 soldiers—a million will be insufficient. If the English government takes these points into consideration, and if Prince Gortschakoff brings before his eyes this

result, both will doubtless desist from pushing into war the entire world. If, which God forbid, things reach this point, and if the Moslems rise in order to defend their sacred religion; and if the treasure accumulated every year at Mecca is disposed of for the protection of the Mohammedan faith, then the scenes of the ancient European wars, where the Moslems were both victorious and destructive, will be repeated, and will destroy the progress and the civilization of an entire century."

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* says: "What we have most to fear is a general Mussulman rising throughout Turkey—a rising which would be accompanied by the perpetration of horrors of a kind like those at Batak, but on a far larger scale. The well-informed correspondent of the *Daily News* believes that such a rising is imminent. Should it take place, Europe will see such a war of races and creeds as has not been seen for many a century. Nor can we be sure that it will be confined to Europe. The followers of the prophet hang together, and in India there are millions of Mahomedans who would be ready to join in any fanatical outbreak against the Christians, against us and our rule—that is, if their co-religionists on the Bosphorus gave them the *mot d'ordre*. It is this, far more than the fear that Russia will be able to impede our approaches to India, which makes English statesmen so slow to renounce the old tradition of their Foreign Office, that the integrity of Turkey must be preserved."

RUSSIA AND SERVIA.

The *Standard* Belgrade correspondent telegraphs that matters are rapidly coming to a crisis. Russia through her consul at Belgrade has identified her cause with that of Serbia, and is evidently prepared to throw off the very apparent mask she has hitherto worn. The banquet celebrating the Emperor's birthday, on Monday, was followed by a torchlight procession, addressing which the Russian consul said he was glad to be able to say that Russia and Serbia would march against their common foe. In Belgrade the belief is that Russia's open participation in the war is only a question of days. Russia will not allow Serbia to accept the terms offered by Turkey, and Serbia's object is to negotiate

to gain time for the Russians to complete their preparations.

THE WAR BETWEEN SERVIA AND TURKEY.

The present military situation is thus lucidly summarised by the *Daily News*:—"At the Turkish headquarters it is acknowledged that the operations against Alexinatz cannot be prosecuted on account of material difficulties which are found insurmountable. An English correspondent with the Turkish army wrote on Saturday, before the news of a suspension of arms was known: 'We are too weak to hold our present position, maintain connections with Nisch, and attack Alexinatz and Deligrad.' A fortnight ago we knew that the Turkish forces across the Servian frontier were only subsisting with difficulty, owing to the inadequacy of the means of transport. The fact is the war has continued so long that the resources of the Ottoman Government have been strained to the utmost, and are not equal to the demands upon them. There is nothing in the condition of Turkey which promises a recovery from this weakness. The taxes have been collected in advance wherever that was possible, and in some of the provinces they will not be collected at all this year. Money is being borrowed at Constantinople at ruinous rates. The volunteers that have been called up from the remotest parts of the Empire to swell the army must be fed, and the means of meeting the inflated expenditure of the Treasury are not forthcoming."

The correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* speaks in the same strain as follows:—

"There is every reason to believe that the Turkish commissariat is exhausted, and in the present state of Turkish exchequer it will be difficult to supply what is wanting. It appears from the *Times* correspondent at Constantinople, that speculation has been going on worse than ever during the brief reign of the late drink-maddened Sultan, and the marshal of the palace has accumulated a fortune in so short a period as to scandalise even the inhabitants of Stamboul. There is not much chance for a country when its chief officials rob it in this shameful way, at a time when money means existence. The Servians, on the other hand, are getting from Russia all the supplies they need, and will soon be in a far better condition to carry on the cam-

paign than they have been at any time.

It is inevitable that under such circumstances the belief in the speedy restoration of peace is very faint. Serbia, we are told, is preparing for a winter campaign. Russian officers and Russian privates cross over into Serbia (through Austria) in larger numbers than ever. In Berlin a war on a large scale is confidently expected. If that very influential journal, the *National Zeitung*, is to be believed, Russia has been making proposals to Austria of a very serious character—far more serious than those proposed by Mr. Gladstone and approved by Lord Derby. Instead of making Bosnia an autonomous state, Russia has invited Austria to annex it; and we may be sure that this proposal of an acquisition to her neighbours was not made by Russia without some intimation that Russia would expect some adequate advantage for herself. The position is very critical."

THE EFFECT OF THESE EVENTS IN THE HOLY LAND.

"The 'Rev.' Dr. Jessup, of Beyrout, in a letter to a friend in London, dated 16th August, says, 'Syria is in a state of semi-paralysis, morally, politically, and financially.

The Moslems are despondent, depressed and despairing. Their young men and strong men are all gone to the war; thousands of families among them left dependent; patriotic and voluntary loans called for; the new Sultan reported mad, and the material of which Sultans are made about run out; paper money expected by next steamer; trade utterly prostrated; public confidence destroyed; no light ahead, whether the war lasts a longer or shorter period, and a universal conviction among them (the Moslems) that these are their last days; no wonder that they have lost heart and hope. The only ray of comfort among them is the friendship of England. It buoys them up; and seems to be providentially ordered as the great potential motive which restrains them, or rather the worst class among them, from violence towards the Christians. Mr. Dale met a Moslem Sheikh near Hermon, one of the worst characters in that evil region. 'May heaven give the Turks and the English the victory,' said he. 'But for the English we could not exist.' Almost the same words were used by a detachment of the Redifs on the Damascus road, to Dr. Metheny, of Latakia, now summering at Aaleih. The Turkish officials and the Moslem populace are all labouring under the same enchantment.'"—(*Daily News*.)

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

THE JEWS IN SERBIA.—Of the 29,000 inhabitants of Belgrade the capital of Serbia, about 2,000 are Jews, constituting 400 families. In the interior of Serbia there are no Jews, as they are not permitted to take up their residence in any rural district.

THE JEWS AND THE BULGARIAN ATROCITIES.—The Jews are being compelled by the Turkish authorities to purchase of them the booty at a price fixed by the authorities themselves. At Sofia they were compelled to purchase 4,000 sheep which the Bashi-bazouks had driven away from the

neighbouring villages. The Pasha convened the Jewish butchers and ordered each of them according to his means to buy a certain number at about six francs the couple. They sold them afterwards at half this price. Had they refused to make the purchase ordered, they would have been charged with favouring the insurrection and would have had to take the consequences of this suspicion.

CANAAN BEFORE AND SINCE THE CONQUEST BY JOSHUA.—In the temple o Karnak, there is a list of 119 geographical

names, all referring to Canaan as it was at the time of the conquest of Thotimes the Third of Egypt, which date previous to the Hebrew invasion. Of these 119 names 88 have been identified with places mentioned in the Bible, Talmud or early Christian writers. They are all contained in the quarterly statement of the current month of the Palestine Fund. In one of the papers contained in this statement by Lieut. Conder, it is maintained that the whole of the Bible nomenclature still lives unchanged in this country, and the names of Hivite, Hittite, Horite, Amorite, Prizzite and Ammonite still survive under newly-formed names. He also shows that *Yakmur* (יַחְמֹר) translated into the Anglican version "fallow deer," means the ordinary roebuck, the existence of which in Palestine was already suspected by Dr. Tristram. It now gives its name to a valley in the wildest thickets of the Sheikh Iskander range. Among the places identified are Ebenezer and Mizpeh.

THE JEWS AND THE EASTERN QUESTION.

A work has just been published, entitled *New light on the Eastern Question*, in which the author discusses all the projects directly or indirectly connected with the Eastern Question. The *Jewish Chronicle* reviewing it, says: "In the conclusion arrived at by the writer we, Jews, are deeply interested. He says that in the inevitable fall of the Ottoman Empire it would be a fit time for Western Europe to get a foothold on Syria, which would then become one of the great centres of the commerce of the world. The natural advantages of the position of Syria for obtaining this position are succinctly pointed out. The writer does not indulge in any references to prophecy, but in a practical sententious manner he argues that the Jews should be given the opportunity to form in Syria an independent neutral nation. Our author says:

'A conference could decree that no European power should possess Syria, and instead create a new nation, who should hold the country under the combined pro-

tection of all the powers, without being subject to any—making that community the medium of the commerce of Asia. The examination of this subject points directly to a people scattered over the face of the earth, who in justice ought to occupy such a position, and are practically more fitted than any other to do so. It will be at once apparent to the reflective reader, that allusion is here made to the Jews, whose right to possess the land is indisputable, if rights can be regarded after the lapse of so long a period of dispossession. Naturally the land is theirs, and the powers would be justified in building up this people, possessing as they do such wonderful intelligence and capacity. In every business, craft, profession, or trade, we find the Jew, and this too in every land, so that, as a people they are acquainted with the language of the whole earth, and if it is needful to have another nation handling the commerce of the world, here they are, of all the most capable, needing no training, for experience in the business of the world, has grown into their very lives. It is the Jew who can trade, from the value of a pin to the debt of a nation.

We firmly believe that in the direction we have indicated lies the whole solution of the puzzling Eastern Question. Conferring such a position on the Jews might render them objects of envy, in the same way that our own country has been envied by all nations, but such a thought must be dismissed as foolishness where the good of all is concerned. Palestine should be made the keystone of all nationalities, and an Empire or Commonwealth founded on so substantial a basis must necessarily be great and lasting.

For the aggrandisement of nations were the Jews dispossessed of their own land, and for the aggrandisement of nations will they be restored, and all honour to the statesman, of whatever land he be, who shall have the wisdom to plan, and the strength to carry out, an Eastern policy broad enough to harmonise all existing interests worth preserving, and far reaching enough to embrace the rapidly widening area of the world's civilisation.'

INTELLIGENCE.

ABERDEEN.—Brother Craigmile reports the obedience of WILLIAM CAIE, tailor, previously neutral; and the addition to the ecclesia, of sister Lucas, who has come from London to reside in Aberdeen.

BIRMINGHAM.—The immersions referred to last month are as follow: Mr. BARLOW (29), clock dial writer, formerly Church of England; JAMES ARTHUR HARRINGTON (19), clerk, formerly Church of England. During the month, the following further immersions have taken place: ALMA RE-

BECCA SCOTT (20), EMILY MANDER (23); LIZZIE SOPHIA MANDER (20), and AMELIA MANDER (16), daughters of brother and sister Mander, and formerly connected with the Church of England.

In consequence of the increase of the ecclesia, too much time is occupied in the mere passing of the bread and wine in two cups—(served from one each in the first instance). It has therefore been resolved to provide other two plates and cups—all to be served from one cup and plate. In this way,

more time will be available for the other duties of the meeting, the need for which has been felt for some time.

It has been resolved to give an autumn course of week-day lectures in the Temperance Hall, for the benefit of many who think it an impropriety to come and hear a lecture on Sunday. For other reasons also, it is felt that the proposed effort will be timely. The lectures will be given once a week for a month or so.

During the month, the Sunday evening meetings have been occupied as follows:—Sept. 3.—“The World’s Crisis: coming vengeance upon the civilised world; modern ecclesiasticism a refuge of lies; the false security of those who trust in the smooth prophesying of conventional religion.”—(Bro. Shuttleworth.) Sept. 10.—“The Bible Account of the Creation: science and revelation not truly antagonistic—pre-adamite races—the appearance and history of Adam—our own relation thereto—the curse and the promise.”—(Bro. Roberts.) Sept. 17.—“Evil Spirits:” reviewing a pamphlet by the “Rev.” J. Barnes, of Dudley, on “Satan, his attributes, his work, and his doom.”—(Bro. Shuttleworth.) Sept. 24.—Question night.—(Bro. Meakin.)

CHELTHENHAM.—Brother Otter reports: “I have much pleasure in advising you that on the 13th August, at the Baths, Cheltenham, I aided at the immersion of a very intelligent young lady Miss H. G. MORRIS (19). She is a resident of Reading, Berkshire, and is a relative of our respected brother Horton, of Tewkesbury, by whose instrumentality, under God, she has attained to a satisfactory knowledge of the truth, after two years’ enquiry and examination thereof. May she be successful in the race.”

CODNOR PARK.—Brother King reports that a few are interested in the truth and likely to become obedient in this locality, to which the truth was only recently introduced. The small company of brethren meet in brother King’s house for the breaking of bread. He says they are as strangers among their neighbours since their acceptance of the truth. They have obtained a room at Pinxton (three miles from Condor Park and six miles from Ripley), in which to give lectures on Monday nights. Brother Richards, of Nottingham, lectured Aug. 21 and 28, and Sep. 4 and 11, on the main features of the truth.

CREWE.—Brother Booth reports: “There is a lively interest manifested here by some few who have attended a Bible class I have held throughout the summer months. I trust that our efforts may cause them to declare on the Lord’s side. Much good would, I think, be done if we could make a more public declaration of the truth, but we lack the means to arrange for such a course of lectures, as would be likely to

thoroughly awaken the interest of the people. We must, however, wait and see what can be done.”

GLASGOW.—Bro. Owler reports: “Since my last communication, one has witnessed the good confession, and been immersed into the all-saving Name,—namely, on September 3rd, MARY KENNEDY, daughter of brother and sister Kennedy. The subjects treated on at the Sunday afternoon lectures have been as follows:—July 16th: “Paul’s Funeral Sermon contrasted with Clerical Orations.”—(Bro. Mulholland.) July 23rd: “When shall War Cease?”—(Bro. Robertson.) July 30th: “The Future of the Earth in its Social, Religious, and Political Aspects” (a contrast).—(Bro. Owler.) Aug. 6th: “Origin of Popery and Protestantism Foretold.”—(Bro. J. Ritchie.) Aug. 13th: “The Infidelity of the Age.”—(Bro. James Nisbet.) Aug. 20th: “A Soul’s Worth.”—(Bro. T. Nisbet.) Aug. 27th: “The Westminster Confession and its Teaching concerning the Dead questioned.”—(Bro. Robertson.) Sep. 3rd: “The Strait Gate and Narrow Way.”—(Bro. Mulholland.) Sept. 10th: “The Gospel: What is it?”—(Bro. J. Ritchie.)

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Bro. Diboll reports that, since his last report, addresses have been delivered as follows:—Aug. 20th: “Truth *versus* Tradition.”—(Bro. J. W. Diboll.) Aug. 27th: “The Prophetic Testimony concerning Christ.”—(Bro. J. W. Diboll, Jun.) Sep. 3rd: “Difficulties and Inconsistencies arising out of the Immortal Soul Theory.”—(Bro. A. Harwood.) Sep. 10th: “Extinction of Evil essential to the fulfilment of the Covenants.”—(Bro. D. Spinney.)

GRANTOWN.—Brother J. Grant writes:—“You will be glad to hear of the obedience, on Sunday, August 20th, of two individuals belonging to this district, viz., PETER GRANT (48), farmer, Achnagall, about five miles from here, and Mrs. JESSIE GRANT (40), wife of the same. They have been enquirers for seven or eight years, and were at one time connected with the Baptist denomination. I may mention that bro. Peter Grant was inclined to believe in the kingdom, and doubted the immortality of the soul before he ever heard of Christadelphians.”

KEIGHLEY.—Brother W. Peel reports the obedience of Miss ANN WAITE (45), formerly Wesleyan, who, having seen the error of popular teaching, has been led to abandon it for the one faith taught by the apostles.

KING’S BROMPTON (Somerset).—Brother Horsman reports:—“Bro. Down and myself, spending a holiday at this village, availed ourselves of the opportunity of setting forth the Truth by giving four lectures on the afternoons and evenings of August 13th and 20th, to an attentive though comparatively small audience numbering about 25. Some

slight opposition was offered during the third lecture by a Wesleyan class leader, who had brought several members of his class with him from a village a few miles distant, but the meeting was very satisfactory, as others said that the answers to his questions had removed difficulties from their minds. He remarked at the close that he 'was not satisfied, and was going away more confused than he came,' an evidence that the Truth had had the effect of shaking some of his former views. There are several at this place enquiring into the truth, and a brother, having the time and opportunity, might be the means of bringing them into the bond of the New Covenant by paying a few visits."

LEEDS.—Bro. W. H. Andrew writes :— "I have pleasure in announcing the obedience of CHARLES SAMUEL BRIGGS (20), cabinet-maker, son of brother Briggs, of Nedderton. He was immersed into the sin-covering name on September 5th, having previously made an intelligent confession of the things necessary to be believed before obedience.—On Sep. 3rd, bro. A. Andrew lectured to a good audience on 'The Marriage Supper of the Lamb.' The other subjects were—Sep. 10th: 'The Way of Salvation'; Sep. 17th, 'The Resurrection'; September 24th, 'Schismatic Teachers.'"

LEICESTER.—Brother Burton reports :— "Our sister, SARAH OAKLEY (51), was immersed into the Name of Christ August 17th. She has been all her life a zealous member of the Wesleyan body, though latterly admits she has felt a certain undefinable dissatisfaction with them, her mind being thus prepared for the reception of the truth. She has been a regular attendant at the lectures for some time, and with us rejoices in hope of the kingdom of God."

LIVERPOOL.—Brother Millman reports :— "Our small number has been added to by the obedience of ELLEN ANN SMITH, wife of brother Smith. She went over to Rock Ferry, and brother Ashcroft assisted her to put on the saving name. She had not attended our meetings very much, but she has been patiently instructed by Bro. Smith, which, coupled with reading, brought her to a decision. She, like Brother Smith, was formerly connected with the Campellites in this town. I have also to inform you that Brother John Dobson, late of Leeds, but now in the Post-Office here, is united with us. He broke bread with us for the first time about a fortnight ago. We have watched with much interest and delight what has taken place at Rock Ferry, and we should be glad if brother Ashcroft could see his way to come over and help us. Our prayer is that God may bless and prosper his labours."

MUMBLES.—Brother E. Michael writes to say that, notwithstanding the removal of three of their principal speaking brethren to other parts, the brethren continue to hold meetings on Sunday evenings. They have

been cheered by visits and lectures from bro. Phillips, of Birmingham; brother Elliot, of London; and brother John P. Jones, of Birmingham, formerly of Mumbles. They would be glad of the visits of others.

ROCK FERRY.—Brother Ashcroft writes :— "I have to report the obedience of ANNIE ASHCROFT, sister in the flesh to my beloved wife and sister in the Lord. She put on the saving name last Saturday in our bath-room, together with the wife of brother Smith, of Liverpool, who came over to have the advantage of greater convenience in attending to the ceremony. Our numbers at the public meeting are steadily increasing, but we have very few of our old adherents, as yet. Nevertheless, we shall not give place to hopelessness. The truth is getting an entrance into the town of Ormskirk, near Liverpool. *Twelve Lectures* are being freely lent about. I hear that the Congregational minister has obtained a look at the volume, and is much disquieted within him in consequence. My brother-in-law, Arthur Garside, is deeply interested, and he desires me to order for him six copies of the lectures, in leather, and one copy of 'Defence, &c.'"

The Editor adds to the foregoing that bro. Ashcroft opened his shop at Waterloo on Tuesday, Sep. 5th, with fair prospects of success. Under advice, he has opened a different sort of shop from what he intended. Instead of drysaltery, he has gone into the white cooper and fancy goods line, for which the situation of the shop seems admirably adapted. Many prayers ascend for his success. The editor and sister Roberts, on the occasion of a lecturing visit to Rock Ferry (Sep. 3rd), went to see the shop at Waterloo on the Monday before the opening. It is something new for brother Ashcroft to be seen taking down shutters, opening parcels, arranging articles behind the counter, &c.; but he addresses himself to his new vocation with a brave heart in the desire, with his own hands, like Paul, to provide an honest livelihood in the sight of men, and yet with the hope that the leisure he will have behind the counter for study will enable him to qualify himself for the service of the truth, and that the way for this service will be opened in due time. He has many invitations, but cannot at present accept them.

SWANSEA.—Brother Randles writes: I am pleased to say that, after strenuous effort, we have been successful in procuring a very nice and comfortable room on the ground floor of the Agricultural Hall, which is not only central and commanding, but is situated in one of the most respectable and leading thoroughfares of the town. The brethren

having a twofold object in view, viz, that of spreading the truth, and giving as much publicity to the occasion as possible, announced the opening by posters. The brethren now constituting the Swansea ecclesia, and being in fellowship with the faithful brethren wherever they may be found, met the first time on Sunday, Aug. 20th, for breaking of bread, as follows: B. Lowe, T. Randles, H. Harding, R. Peters, Susan Peters, Jas. Evans, sister Evans, W. Rendell, R. Langrave and sister Langrave. The foregoing brethren and sisters are determined to fellowship only those who adhere to the faith as defined, in opposition to all its enemies—the Renunciacionists, No-Willists and and Trine-immersionists and all others who make the truth void. In doing this, they reject the fellowship of those who deny the free-will and voluntary obedience of Christ—who was placed under trial, tempted in all points like his brethren, made perfect through suffering, whose prayers were heard in that he feared, and having overcome, he obtained salvation, is exalted to the right hand of the Father, where he appears as our high priest and intercessor. We wish our position to be unmistakably understood. On Sunday evening, Aug. 27th, brother Elliott, of London, discoursed on the gospel. The room was comfortably filled by a respectable and attentive audience. On Sunday, Sep. 3rd, brother J. P. Jones, of Birmingham, discoursed on the kingdom. During his lecture there was a slight interruption, but by a gentle rebuke from the speaker silence was restored. The attendance was more than expected, the room being crowded to excess, many not being able to gain admittance. The brethren are cheered much with their meetings."

[In answer to a question, we beg to say that no brother, comprehending his position as a saint in the midst of an evil world to which he does not belong, could be found giving "an amusing and instructive literary entertainment," least of all in conjunction with "jubilee singers" under the "patronage" of any honourable sinners, however "distinguished" in the jargon of this aion of darkness. Such an occurrence could only be due to the ignorance of babyhood in Christ.—Ed.]

SCARBOROUGH. — Brother G. H. Kidd writes:—"It is always refreshing to see brethren from a distance in this far-off nook, but it has not been our fortune to see many this season. Yet we are thankful for having had the fellowship of a few. Sister Andrew, sen., of Leeds; brother Sawden, of Hull; brother and sister Edwards, of Huddersfield; brother W. Hage, of Newark; and the latest visit has been from brother and sister Frank Hodgkinson, of Norman Cross, whom some of us had not seen for nigh six years, and it was encouraging to see brother

H. so ready and willing to buckle on the armour of the man of the spirit, and in so courageous a manner to storm the ramparts of the enemies of all truth and righteousness. We engaged St. George's Hall for two Sunday evenings, viz., the 20th and 27th August, and issued placards headed 'A Free Lecture by a Visitor, subject, The Angels of the Bible,' and 'Another Free Lecture by a Visitor, subject, What is meant by the Kingdom of God?' Brother H. afforded opportunity for ladies or gentlemen to ask questions, which several availed themselves of. We might have expected much larger audiences, but the word 'free' is more than the pride of the old man can put up with. Free indeed! He doesn't want anything given; he is for naught but that which costs the most. Father Ignatius at 5s. a seat had a good audience of course. Town full of bishops, canons, and fathers of the apostacy, overflowing audiences, plates filled with 'jink,' pealing organs, everything nice. The truth prostrate; men know little now-a-days about buying wine, as saith the prophet, without money and without price. On the Monday and Tuesday evenings following, brother Hodgkinson gave two more lectures in our own room, King Street, which were but thinly attended, yet the audiences were intelligent. Thursday evening, August 31st, we made a watery grave, and buried CHRISTOPHER WEST (33), traveller, of London, formerly Protestant Church of England. His mind had been previously occupied with the things of the kingdom of God, and, singular to relate, he was minded to go south, but journeyed northward, and came even to Scarborough to obey the truth in the only way appointed. This case ought to encourage us all to sow beside all waters, morning and evening, not knowing which shall prosper, or, maybe, all shall prove alike good. Bro. W. says, 'My attention was first arrested on receiving a Christadelphian pamphlet, *What is Truth?*' This was in a chemist's shop, at Halifax, where brother W. was a casual visitor. On the night previous to the departure of brother and sister Hodgkinson and brother West, we celebrated the event with a tea meeting at the room where we meet on Sundays. About thirty, men, women, and children, partook, and the night was far advanced ere we took the last farewell of each other." Two letters by a friendly critic, describing the lectures, appeared in the *Scarborough Weekly Post*.

TAMWORTH. — Brother Wood reports withdrawal from brother Bird. He adds, "You will be pleased to hear we have received an addition in the person of WILLIAM DEAKIN (23), weaver, formerly a Methodist, but for the last two years neutral, during which time he has been attending our lectures. He was immersed into the saving name on Sunday morning last, Sep. 10th."

TAUNTON.—During August, bro. Roberts,

of Birmingham, visited and lectured here twice. There were fair audiences and good attention both times: subjects, the Kingdom of God and the Nature of Man. Brother Saunders and brother Atkins were present from Barnstaple. The small company of brethren and sisters at Taunton are progressing in scriptural enlightenment, and acquiring increased ability to discern between the truth and its plausible imitations. God grant them progress unto perfection: for they seem sincerely desirous of only knowing and doing the things that are right in the sight of God. A local paper noticed the lectures, but the notice had evidently been written by one who was not present, but who thought he knew what was likely to be said. It was rather a bold specimen of speculative reporting. Brother Veysey, whose excellent boarding school was much injured, as regards the attendance of pupils, by his acceptance of the truth, is being safely guided through the crisis. Any brother having a son to educate, and desiring him to be educated well and under spiritual influence, could not do better than confide him to brother Veysey's care. The Editor's son is enjoying that advantage.

WHITBY. — Brother Clegg reports the withdrawal of the ecclesia from brother Mankin for persistent absence from the table; and from sister Tiplady, for the same reason, aggravated by attendance at and identification with the Church of England. He details the facts and correspondence, which it is not necessary to publish.

CANADA.

HAMILTON. — The brethren freely advertise their meetings by placards and announcements in the local press. Whatever the result may be, they feel a satisfaction in doing their duty.

PETERBORO'. (Ont.) — Sister Jessie Turner writes: "I enclose you one dollar from Mr. W. Harrison and one dollar from myself, for which I want two copies of the *Bradlaugh Discussion*. One of them is for a person who has read *Elpis Israel* and *Twelve Lectures*, and I lend him the *Christadelphian* every month. I know that he believes with us, but whether he will confess Christ before the world or not I do not know. He is one of the high ones in the church. He was exceeding pleased with brother Ashcroft's case, as I am sure every one who knows the truth would be. His was a great sacrifice. I pray that he may be kept by the power of God unto salvation, and that he may be the means of bringing many to see immortality that is alone in Christ Jesus. I am acquainted with Mrs. — here, who has a brother in Liverpool, a minister. I wonder

if brother Ashcroft knows him. He told his sister that he had to preach things he did not believe. He wrote to her about a seet in Birmingham, but she did not then know what he meant. She knows now, for she is busy reading the *Lectures*, and is a Christadelphian in all but name. She would write to her brother but don't know his address. She says she will ever be grateful to you for the glorious light you have shed on the Scriptures, for they were a sealed book to her. She first heard of the truth in the far backwoods of Haliburton. I am sorry for her sake that I have to leave her. I have to go to Auburn, in the States, in about two months. Almost everybody is on the move here. There is nearly 1,000 people less in this town this year than last, and yet the times are hard and likely to be worse. It is well for us that we can see to the end of these judgments, and can behold by faith the time when all nations shall be blessed in Abraham and in Christ. May we all be accepted in him in my prayer."

CENTRE POINT (Texas). — Brother J. A. Corbell reports paying a visit, with brother S. H. Oatman, to the brethren in Llano and Burnet Counties. The difficulties in the latter county have been arranged, and the brethren are looking forward in peace to the Lord's return. Sister SUSAN BANTA was re-immersed, on account of the defectiveness of her faith at her first immersion, and LAVONIA C. RIDLEY and HELEN SURBER, formerly Campbellites, were obedient to the faith. [To J. C. — A brother or sister marrying an alien places himself or herself out of fellowship, to the extent to which their own act connects them with the fellowship of the world from which brethren and sisters have come out. Whether the brethren should withhold fellowship from them is a moot question. It is probably better to tolerate their act under protest, and leave the Lord to deal with them. — EDITOR.]

ELMIRA (N. Y.) — Brother J. F. Sykes reports the obedience of MARGARET STERLING (51), wife of brother Sterling, after a long and careful consideration of the truth. Bro. Sykes adds that the ecclesia commenced about five years ago with brother Hall, since which time there have been twenty-five additions, one death, and one lapse.

HARVARD (Ill.) — Brother J. Soothill reports the induction into Christ, on Aug. 13th, of WILLIAM FISH (43) and his wife MARTHA JANE (34), who have been studying the truth for several years. William Fish is son of brother Henry Fish, of Beloit, Wisconsin, to whom they chiefly owe their enlightenment. Brother Soothill says our new brother and sister will be isolated in the locality where they live, and he asks the prayers of the brethren that they may be preserved.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

“For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD.”—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 149.

NOVEMBER, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

DR. THOMAS ON SOLDIERING IN RELATION TO BRETHREN.

A CORRESPONDENT (J. Moffat, Midway, Pa., U.S.A.) says: “The *Christadelphian* is a welcome and refreshing visitor to me, as I think I might safely say to all the brotherhood. After reading the articles in the September No., particularly as to its not being permissible to brethren to bear arms, I was reminded of an article of the Dr.’s in a small pamphlet I have, entitled *Our Position in respect to War*. I thought I would like to see it in the *Christadelphian*, as it is exactly suited to the coming trial. Here it is:—

OUR POSITION IN RESPECT TO WAR.

“The wars between Britain and Russia, between France and Austria, between Germany and Denmark, between Russia and Poland, and between Federals and Confederates, are wars between Church people of divers and chameleon hues of piety; the most superstitious being the most devout. ‘From whence,’ in the words of James, ‘come wars and fightings among you,’ church people, who call yourselves ‘Christians?’ ‘Come they not hence even of your lusts that war in your members?’—of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life?’ ‘Ye lust and have not; ye kill and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not; ye ask and receive not, because ye ask

amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity against the Deity? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of the Deity; 'for that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in His sight.'—(James iv. 1; Luke xvi. 15, 16.) These things being incontrovertible, do ye expect ANTIPAS, the Spirit's faithful witness (composed of all in every place who hold the Spirit's name and faith) to co-operate with you in your sanguinary and iniquitous wars, in which you pious professors of religion go forth with your heathen chaplains (and who but a heathen and a publican could be chaplain of a troop?), plundering and devastating the goods, mutilating the limbs, destroying the lives, and reducing the wives and children of your co-religionists, as pious as yourselves, to weeping and wailing widows and orphans? Call ye this Christian morality, O ye clergy, that hound your peoples on! and all for what? That you may consume your plunder on your lusts! We tell you, with the voice of a thousand tongues, that we will have no part nor fellowship with you in this iniquity. We will 'render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,' in all his dominions; we will obey the powers that be for the time, in all things not in contravention of the letter and spirit of the truth, of which we, not they, are alone competent to judge; we will 'render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, respect to whom respect, honour to whom honour are due;' but for us, 'the weapons of whose warfare are not carnal,' to fight for Cæsar, or the powers that may happen to be, no never! Let Satan fight his own battles; he will get no 'aid and comfort' from the faithful Antipas. Until the manifestation of the 'glorious and fearful name, *Yahweh Elohim*,' 'the wicked are the sword of *Yahweh*' (Psalm xvii. 13); He uses them as the blind instruments of His will, to punish one another for their crimes against heaven. Antipas does not belong to you Church peoples, who are emphatically 'the wicked,' and will, therefore, not give aid to help you in your bloody work. This is your hour. Our time is not quite yet. We look for our summons to 'the war of the great day of *Yahweh Elohim*' (Apoc. xvi. 14), at any time within the next five years. We shall then put on our harness for the work of punishing the wicked in all the earth; and, forbid it, heaven, that when Thy trumpet sounds, any of us should be found in the obscene, profane and polluting cesspools of the Gentiles, doing battle in the service of their spiritual and blind guides, who are leading them into the pit Thou art causing them to dig for their own destruction.—(Psalm ix. 15, 16; xciv. 13.)

THE 1260 YEARS: ARE THEY LUNAR OR SOLAR?

OBJECTION.

"IN computing the duration of the Beast, its interpreters fail to recognize the difference between *solar* and *lunar* time. It is agreed that the duration of the Beast is 1260 lunar years. The commencement of the period is

generally dated A. D. 606, and the end in 1866; but, eighteen years must be subtracted, being the difference between solar and lunar time, the period thus ending in 1848. Thus dating the 'civil constitution of the Beast' from 531; and the *ecclesiastical* from 606, the former ending in 1773, and the latter in 1848, the great battle of Armageddon should, therefore, have been fought twenty-seven years ago.

ANSWER BY DR. THOMAS.

The Apocalypse is not a dark book, but one that shines brightly on the perfect day. The darkness is in the mind of Saurin, and of those who respond to his dogma. It reveals the times with great precision; but nowhere justifies the conclusion that its 1260 years are to be reckoned as 1242. The years of the prophets are solar years, their whole number being reduced from a solar time to a *lunar time of solar years*, as expressed by months. If the whole number of the Beast's duration had been represented by a solar *time* of solar years the figures would have been $1277\frac{1}{2}$, which would have been seventeen years and a half too long; for $365 + 730 + 182\frac{1}{2}$ are equal to $1277\frac{1}{2}$. Hence, to give the reader the precise number of solar years the Beast is to prevail, they are expressed in months; as, "they (the Gentiles) shall tread down the Holy City *forty and two months*." This is written in Rev. xi 2. The "Holy City" in this place represents "the saints," who are to be trodden down so long as Jerusalem is trodden under foot of the Gentiles. Those Gentiles that tread them down are represented in their political organization in Revelation xiii, by "a Beast having seven heads and ten horns," whose triumph over them is also stated at *forty-two months'* duration. Now the "Holy City" and the "saints" are of the same category as the "two witnesses," "two olive trees," "two candlesticks" and "two prophets," who are to exercise their mission in a period of war between them and the Gentile governments. The saints of the holy city are to be prevailed against until the Ancient of Days comes, when judgment against the enemy is given to them. This is at the end of the Beast's power to make successful war upon them—that is, at the end of forty-two months, which, in Daniel, is styled "a time, times, and the dividing of times." This is "the *last* end of the indignation," when the power of the holy people, now scattered, shall be reconcentrated.

In Rev. xii, the two witnessing prophets are represented by a fugitive woman, "the remnant" of whose seed is made up of the saints of the holy city, "who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Now, of the woman, it is said in one place, "they should feed her in the wilderness a *thousand two hundred and threescore days*;" and in another place, "she is nourished in the wilderness for a *time, and times, and half a time*." It is clear, therefore, that 1260 days are representative of a time, times, and half a time. These were "the days of the prophecy of the witnesses" against "the powers that be;" and to which must be added their death-period, ending in their resurrection and ascension to power, by which we are brought down to a *first* end of the indignation. Now forty-two months being interpreted in Daniel by "a time, times, and the dividing of

time;" and this by John as significant of 1260 days, it follows that the forty-two months are equal to the same period. "Months" are a lunar symbol, and when forty-two of them are divided into "times," the solar years they represent are necessarily compressed into times of 360 instead of 365 solar years; for $360 + 720 + 180$ are equal to 1260, and not to $1277\frac{1}{2}$.

It is a mistake to suppose that the years are lunar because the "times" and "months" are lunar symbols. A lunar time of solar years is 360 years; and a month of solar years is thirty, which, multiplied by twelve, gives the "year" *ενιαυτος* that which returns upon itself.—(Rev. ix. 15)—a circle of 360. But 360 common days are not equivalent to a Bible or Mosaic year. This consists of 365 years, as appears from the enumeration of the days of the deluge. The Hebrew years had eleven months of thirty days, and the twelfth of thirty-five. Three circles and a half of these years are called for by the prophecy, neither more nor less.

THE NEW COVENANT: ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE RELATIONS.

QUESTION BY A CORRESPONDENT.

SOME anxiety prevails among us here respecting the Covenants—*Whether we are now living under the Old or the New?* If under the Old, is not the Sabbath of the fourth commandment still obligatory upon us? If we Gentiles are not under the Old, *how do we get under the New?* Have the days come as yet when the covenant mentioned in Jer. xxxi. 31, is made with Israel and Judah?

These subjects have weighed heavily on my mind for some time back. I cannot see that we are yet under the Old Covenant, which was made with Israel when they were brought out of Egypt; and yet I do not fully understand how we enter into, or are brought under, the New.—C. H.

DR. THOMAS'S ANSWER.

Primarily and generally, there are two covenants—the Abrahamic and the Mosaic. These are styled "Old" and "New," not with reference to the order of their record on the page of history, but in relation to the time of their *coming into force*. The Mosaic, styled in Jer. xxxi. 31: "the covenant which I made with Israel's fathers, when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt"—this was instituted at Sinai 430 years after the *typical*-confirmation of the promise to Abraham.—(Gal. iii. 17; Gen. xv. 18.) The Mosaic continued in force for sixteen centuries, a period that brings us down to the time of Jesus and the apostles. About six hundred years before their day, the Spirit of Christ in the angel Gabriel, informed Daniel, as recorded in chap. ix. of his book, that Messiah the Prince should confirm a covenant; and in the last half of the seventieth week of years from a certain decree, should cause to cease from sacrificing and offering. This teaches that Messiah was to effect a change respecting

the law as the result of his confirmation of a covenant, and consequently another covenant than the Mosaic.

This being the purpose of God, the apostolic writings record the fulfilment. Paul, who had made greater progress in the Jews' religion than any of his contemporaries, who were more learned in Judaism than any Rabbi now living; and consequently Paul, even if he were not a Christian, is better authority in constitutional questions concerning the Hebrew Commonwealth than all Rabbis of our day—this same constitutional Jewish lawyer—Paul saith that the Mosaic covenant had been made old by the promise of a new one, and that in his time it was ready to vanish away.—(Heb. viii. 13.) Furthermore, he tells us that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to CONFIRM the promises made unto the fathers.—(Rom. xv. 8.) These promises are the truth of God, and Jesus Christ was the confirmer thereof as Gabriel had foretold to Daniel. But, *when did he confirm this New Covenant?*

This question is answered in the words of Jesus recorded in Luke xxii. 29, 30, and elsewhere, saying, "And I am covenanted for you, as my Father covenanted for me a kingdom; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit upon thrones, ruling the twelve tribes of Israel." "I am covenanted"—*διαθηματ*, yes; yes; and in so doing, he said, "This is my blood of the covenant, being poured out for many for remission of sins."—(Matt. xxvi. 28.) "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father;" and, therefore, it was not *felo de se*.—(John x. 17.)

Now, having accomplished this decease and taken up his life again in rising from the dead, the covenant with Abraham was *antitypically* confirmed. The antitypical Isaac was offered up, and received again by the Father by resurrection from the dead. This offering of Isaac's seed, the Christ, was the death of the mediatorial testator of the New Covenant; for where a Testament or covenant is, there must also, of necessity, be the death of the testator. If there had been no covenant, new or old, there would have been no occasion for the death of Isaac's Seed. The Abrahamic Covenant, then, is called New, because it did not come into force till the resurrection of Jesus, which happened in the vanishing period, "the last days" or "end of the" Mosaic "Aion."

This covenant, confirmed by Jesus as its Mediator (Heb. xii. 24) is the covenant to be made with Judah and Israel, according to Jeremiah, Ezekiel and other prophets. It has not yet been made with Israel and Judah; that is, they have not been brought into the bond, or a delivering of the covenant.—(Ezek. xx. 33-37.) At the period of confirmation it was offered to Israel and Judah's brotherhood; but they rejected it with scorn, because it was offered in the name of Jesus. This brotherhood, which then existed in the commonwealth of Judah, is represented in Zech. xi. 14, as a staff in Jehovah's hand, named "bands." They were in the *bands* of the Old Covenant, which bound them together as one nation. Now, the prophet teaches, in this place, that the cutting asunder of the staff, Beauty, or the cutting off of Messiah the Prince, in whom no fault was found,

would be the disruption of an existing covenant (verse 10); and that, after this, the other staff, bands, should be cut asunder, indicating the dissolution of the commonwealth of Israel and Judah. This came to pass accordingly in the apostles' days, when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Little Horn. This was the epoch of breaking the Old Covenant, not of making the New, with Israel and Judah. When the New is made with them, the law of Jehovah will be in their inward parts and written in their hearts; and all Israelites will know him, from the least of them to the greatest. This is yet to come to pass.

The Old Covenant was never given to the Gentiles. A man of another nation never came under it, unless he became an adopted citizen of the Hebrew Commonwealth. The Gentiles were not even called by the gospel until Beauty was cut asunder, or the Mosaic covenant was broken "*with all the people.*" There is no obligation on Gentiles to keep the Jewish Sabbath. There is no one on earth, Jew or Gentile, that keeps it according to law, and any other observation of it only brings into condemnation. Gentile Sabbatarianism is a fig-leaf of the apron devised by the Old Man of the Flesh for the concealment of his shame. His teaching concerning it is mere twaddle.

The New, or Abrahamic, Covenant having been brought into force by the death of Jesus, Gentiles are invited to avail themselves of it, though for the time being Israelites rejected it. The last eighteen hundred years has been a period of *individual acceptance* of the Abrahamic Covenant, and of *national rejection* of it. Multitudes of individuals have embraced it joyfully, and at the hazard of property, liberty and life; but not a single nation has received it. It offers to individuals remission of sins, and inheritance among the sanctified through faith that leads unto Jesus Christ. In other words, it confers the right of life for ever of dominion over the nations in Messiah's aion, commonly called "*The Millennium.*"

When the day of Christ's power arrives, the Israelitish nation will be willing and glad to receive it even from the Nazarene they now so cordially despise. Many other nations will also receive it, and rejoice with Israel in its blessing. This is the testimony of Moses as well as of all the prophets and apostles. But they do not, and will not, accept it in the absence of Jesus from the earth. They will, therefore, be *subjects* not *rulers*, mortals not immortals, people not princes, in the age to come.

"How do we Gentiles get under the New Covenant?" Individually? Yes. The answer to this question is, "By taking hold of it." But what does taking hold of the Covenant consist in? In believing the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ: and then being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.—(Acts viii. 12; Mat. xxviii. 20.) In other words, believe the exceeding great and precious promises covenanted to the fathers Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David, and confirmed by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ; and having this faith, put on Christ by baptism into him, for in Hebrews, Paul says, "By the new, or second, will (covenant or testament) we are sanctified through the offering of Jesus Christ once." *We are sanctified by the Abrahamic Covenant, which is made sanctifying by Jesus, the seed of Abraham, its mediatorial testator, having dedicated it by his*

blood. IGNORANCE OF THE PROMISES COVENANTED TO THE FATHERS EXCLUDES FROM THIS COVENANT-SANCTIFICATION, WITHOUT WHICH THERE IS NO SALVATION. "Alienated from God's life," says Paul, "through the ignorance that is in them."—(Eph. iv. 18.) Let those who cannot get beyond the faith and trembling of the demons, who as well as they believed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, think on these things. Read James ii. 19; Mark i. 24, 34.

With the hope that sufficient has been adduced to relieve our correspondent of her difficulty, we conclude, wishing her and her friends a glorious participation in the consolation, in the expectation of which she patiently endures.

THE HOLY LAND AND ITS PROSPECTS.

LECTURE BY COL. GAWLER.

THE portion of the surface of the globe to which our attention is to be directed in this address, is known to Europeans in general by the name of Syria.

Phœnicia, of which the principal sea-port and capital was the renowned city of Tyre, *Zor*, or *Soor*, was the great commercial, manufacturing, ship-building, colonizing and science-spreading nation of antiquity. Her "merchants were princes and her traffickers the honourable of the earth" (Is. xxiii. 8). Her emigrants formed settlements in the then uttermost west. Of these evidences remain in the traditions of Ireland and the Irish language itself, in Punic relics found in the south of England, and in the enumeration of "tin" by sacred (Ezek. {xxvii. 12) and profane historians as articles procured from the western Tarshish, "the metal islands," the "end of the earth."* There are, moreover, strong reasons for believing that in the then far east the Phœnicians traded with the islands of the Indian Archipelago, and that sailing from the Red Sea to the south, they performed the marvellous exploit of circumnavigating the whole of the vast continent of Africa, returning to Tyre by the Straits of Gibraltar.

Phœnicia was evidently to the ancient world what Great Britain has become to the world as it now is, the Queen of the Ocean, the great mart of nations, and the principal maritime carrier for the human race. The resemblance runs most momentously close, in the fact that Tyre was the great preparatory instrument in the establishment of that temple at Jerusalem, in which Deity, usually invisible, appeared in visible glory. Hiram, the faithful friend of David and of Solomon, hewed down the cedars of Lebanon, transported them in floats to Joppa, and sent besides, carpenters, quarrymen, stone-masons, and artificers for the work.—(1 Kings v.) His hardy sailors, also, showed the Jews the way to Ophir, for gold, silver and

* The celebrated Abraham Aben Ezra, writing his "Epistle on the Sabbath" in England, in the year 1158 (4919), dates it from "a town of the towns of the island, which is called (Ketzon ha Aretz), the End of the earth."

ivory (1 Kings ix. 26-28; x. 22), to increase the glory of the temple and the wealth of Israel.

It is a satisfactory recollection, that in sacred writ few forerunning types are complete likenesses of their subsequent antitypes. So far as we have gone, may the resemblance between ancient Phœnicia and modern England be perfect; but may England never sink into the pollution and degradation of that tyranny (the word "tyrant" is derived from "Tyre"), pride, luxury, contempt of God's laws, and idolatry, that have turned the once gorgeous, "crowning city" into a bare rock, upon which fishermen spread their nets—an eternal mockery for men and angels.

It is natural that the name of the splendid centre of that ancient marvellous mercantile prosperity should have been extended among foreigners to a large surrounding district. From the eastern name of *Zor* or *Soor* was derived the appellation of Sooria or Syria, which in process of time has been stretched to include the whole of the extreme eastern boundary of the Mediterranean Sea, from the Bay of Scanderoon to El Arish, on the river of Egypt.

Eastern tradition, however true to its primitive antiquity, overlooks the comparatively modern splendour of Tyre, and gives to the country a more venerable title. The whole Arab race see in it, with especial reference to Damascus, the territory which Shem, the favoured son of Noah, selected for his own personal residence, and with simple pertinacity in their ancient creed, still call it "Esh Shamy"—Shem's country.

I would now beg you to fix your eyes on this large general map of the ancient world, and to observe the remarkable central situation that Syria occupies in it. With Europe, Asia and Africa around her, the extraordinary inland channels of the Mediterranean, the Black Sea, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf, diverging from Syria as a general focus, give her ready maritime communication with all the sea-coasts of the world. Her northern, eastern and south-western borders, also, run in proximity with those vast districts of Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Media, Persia, Assyria, Babylonia and Egypt, which bore the earliest and heaviest populations of primeval society.

In no visible circumstance on the surface of the globe, can right-minded persons discern more clearly the forerunning design of the invisible Creator. Syria, with especial reference to Jerusalem, was created—*was created*—to be the centre from which divine truth should radiate to the whole human race, Do you wish to see a visible footprint of the invisible God?—behold it *there*.

Though in some sort anticipating the subject, I would also at this point call your attention to another very remarkable forerunning arrangement of the Creator in creation itself. Great Britain, manifestly designed to perform in these modern times a work similar to that which her maritime mother, Tyre, accomplished in the days of David and Solomon, was also most signally prepared in creation for her high commission. Though lying in near proximity to the civilized nations of the old hemisphere, yet her girdle of waters has become in the hour of need, a wall of preserving fire against the frightful evils with which they have been too often, and that too recently, desolated. Those waters have also given to her sons the maritime

experience through which she has become the mistress of the seas, and those facilities of communication, by which, in resemblance of ancient Tyre, her colonies and dependencies have been spread to the very ends of the earth.

Remarkable as are these creative arrangements, they are surpassed by the further fact that under her surface were laid in profusion altogether unequalled elsewhere, the very materials which are above all others essential to modern maritime superiority, and commercial and manufacturing pre-eminence. Her inexhaustible beds of coal, combined with ironstone, are gifts from God. Do you desire to see another footprint of the invisible Creator?—it is certainly *here*.

These extraordinary advantages were not bestowed (as Sidney Smith would remark) for the mere purpose of “building up the walls of flesh of her comfortable” denizens, but for the more exalted object of furnishing her as the honoured instrument of preparing the way for God’s beneficence to the whole world through the Jewish people.

In the lecture to which you invited me soon after my return from Syria, I described the general geography and present condition of that country. I will now, after a necessary brief sketch of its present history, proceed to its future prospects. These shall be first considered in themselves, without reference to time; and evidence shall then be produced that the stupendous events included in them are so near at hand as to have already commenced their operation.

All present will bear me witness in their hearts that the subject is as difficult as it is momentous. I, therefore, beg from you forbearing consideration, with the confidence that I hold unchanged the principles which some of you will remember were declared to be the regulator of my former lecture, *that the highest duty and advantage of man is in all things to discern, to grasp and to impart REALITIES*, and, moreover, that I do not hazard a single opinion which, in a checkered life, has not been tested by very long and very close observation. There are some here present who know that when I first entered this town about thirty-four years ago, my mind was directed to this very subject. God in His mercy had brought me a short time previously, when with the Duke of Wellington’s army in France, from the wretchedness of French infidelity and scepticism, to a permanent practical conviction that the invisible God is the God of revelation. Nothing confirmed me more fully in this confidence that the standing miracles of the state of Syria and the Jewish people; and nothing, even then, gave me a brighter hope than the sure and certain knowledge that in God’s good time both would be delivered, as well as the whole human race after them, from miserable degradation. I have, therefore, at least well considered the points at issue.

In pursuing them it is of intense importance to discern and grasp the REALITY, that the eternal invisible Being with whom we have to deal, is as infinite in *minuteness* as He is in *magnitude*. Perfection requires Him to be a minute God as well as a great God. “Where are you going?” said a vexed sceptic on a Sabbath morning, to a poor man whom he met every week walking in a direction opposite to his own. “I am going to worship God.” “To worship God—what do you know about an invisible and inaudible

God?" "I know that He is a great God and a little God. A great God, for He fills the universe with His majesty; a little God for He dwells in my heart." Dr. Chalmers beautifully expresses the same reality in the words, "Magnitude cannot overwhelm Him, variety cannot perplex Him, minuteness cannot escape Him."

To apply these realities to our subject. God who in His greatness controls with the same laws which regulate the movements of our own planetary system, the worlds that Lord Rosse's monster telescope has defined; worlds so distant that their light, travelling at the rate of twelve millions of miles in a minute, may take ten thousand years to reach our eyes, in His minuteness has selected this ball of earth to be the scene of one of the most marvellous of His moral works—the raising of a fallen race from guilt to glory. Having chosen for this object our globe from among the myriads of creation, He selected (as has before been observed) the land to which our attention is this night directed, Syria, from among all the countries of this earth to be the centre and focus of His beneficence.

Do the minds of any of you revolt from this idea of the pre-determined arrangement and control of God—go to one of our great dockyards, and see the pre-arranged lines by which the floating leviathans of the deep are precisely formed, and the machinery by which stubborn beams and planks are twisted exactly for their determined places. Shall the God of heaven be less in design and in power of control than one of Britain's master shipwrights?

PAST HISTORY OF SYRIA.

Syria having been formed by creation as the especial centre of the ancient world, became possibly a portion of the first glorious demesne of the parents of the human race. We are disposed to limit the dimensions of Paradise to something like those of an English park, while the reality may well have been, that, embracing whole countries, it extended from the Mediterranean to perhaps the Caspian Sea; the river Euphrates, especially named as belonging to it (Gen. ii. 14), thus flowing through its centre. Arab tradition, for whatever it is worth, makes Adam to be formed from the red earth of the plain of Damascus, and refers to Syria other events in the history of the antediluvian age.

Descending to the period subsequent to the flood of Noah, the same tradition ascribes (as has been already observed,) Damascus for the residence of Shem, the greatly honoured servant of God,* and the favourite son of Noah; and before his death and during the comparative youthfulness of Abraham, there appeared in another portion of Syria, Melchisedec, the king of Salem, the priest of the Most High God.—(Gen. xiv. 18.) The peculiar divine selection of the country being thus early maintained, possibly by the residence in it of Shem, and certainly by the reign of Melchisedec and the advent of Abraham.

That extraordinary land which we see before us was then stamped with a seal which every man who truly grasps realities, must believe the principalities and powers of earth and darkness cannot disannul. The most ancient, the most solemn, and the most wonderful conveyance of land on

* "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem."—(Gen. ix. 26.)

record, is to be found in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis. The gift is Syria, "the land from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates." The donor was the eternal God, the legatees were the seed of Abraham, the marvellous and mysterious witnessing signs and seals were "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp that passed between the pieces" of the victims, which, according to the custom of those days, Abraham had divided.

Who can show such a title-deed to any estate in the wide world? Abraham cannot for the field and cave of Macphelah. His covenant for that property with "Ephron the Hittite," (Gen. xxiii.) so celebrated among English jurists as an ancient example of land conveyance, was nothing like so solemn as that for Syria from God himself; and yet the covenant with Ephron *remains unbroken*. Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob and Leah, have remained undisturbed through thirty-six centuries in their most honoured possession. Veneration has even fenced it round with a high wall of massive stone, of which intense jealousy even now keeps the narrow portal. WILL THE COVENANT ARRANGEMENT OF A MAN BE MORE LASTING THAN THAT OF THE MOST HIGH GOD?

After a preparatory period of humiliation and suffering in Egypt and in the desert, the children of Abraham were planted as a nation in Syria. God "remembered His holy promise, and Abraham His servant, and brought forth His people with joy and His chosen with gladness."—(Ps. cv. 42, 43.) The immutability of His purpose was vindicated to the uttermost by suspensions of those majestic laws of gravitation and centrifugal force, which ordinarily reign omnipotent from this our solar system to the most distant sun in the nebula of Orion. The waters of the Red Sea and of the Jordan stood in heaps. ("What ailed thee, O sea, that thou fleddest, and thou Jordan that thou wast driven back?") and the sun stood still on Gibeon, and the moon in the valley Ajalon. The ruler of a deeply learned and most powerful nation, who ventured to array the unchangeableness of his puny purpose against the "I change not" of the Eternal, lives for ever as a monument of consummate folly—another laughing-stock for men and angels. Oh, that among the rulers, the line of infatuated Pharaohs had ceased forever with the ancient kings of Egypt.

The massive and gorgeous temple of the living God, was at length built upon the very hill on which Abraham had, by the highest act of devotedness grasped the REALITY of God's existence, character, power and faithfulness; the visible glory of that God "filled the house" (2 Chron. vii. 1-3), and, upon the throne of David and Melchisedec, Solomon reigned supreme from the torrent of Egypt to the banks of the Euphrates.

For nearly eighteen centuries, that temple and the glory, the high priest and the sacrifice have ceased;* and the Hebrew nation has been "scattered and peeled" (Isa. xviii.) in and throughout every country in "the wide, wide world." What of that? Has not the condition of Syria and of the Jewish nation throughout this (humanly speaking) immense interval borne a witness to the faithfulness of God's covenant deed to Abraham and his descendants, more mighty, miraculous and marvellous than if the Jews

*"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice . . . Afterwards shall the children of Israel return."—(Hosea iii. 4, 5.)

had remained in Palestine? Despite the fiercest and most energetic efforts of men, and, no doubt, of more than men, the land through eighteen centuries has been kept for the nation, and the nation for the land.

Since the ejection of the Jews from Syria, the Franks have settled as a nation in France, the Anglo-Saxons in England, the Goths in Spain, and others elsewhere; *but no nation has been able to establish itself as a nation in Syria.* Up to this day, there has been no nation, no national union, and no national spirit. The motley impoverished tribes which have occupied it, have held it as mere tenants at will, temporary landholders, wasting, and manifestly waiting for them whose permanent right it is. The land "devouring up men" (Ezek. xxxvi. 13), in desolation has enjoyed her sabbaths,* waiting for them, in truth, whose right it is, by that "WORD OF OUR GOD WHICH ENDURES FOR EVER." Every eye that has seen Syria, its moral divisions, its wastes, its ruins and its depopulation, has received mournful but joyful testimony to the fact.

*"I will scatter you among the heathen . . . And your land shall be desolate and cities waste. Then shall the land enjoy her Sabbaths. . . . And yet for all that I will cast them away . . . But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors."—(Lev. xxvi. 35-45.)

(To be continued.)

A CHRISTADELPHIAN'S DREAM.*

Children, harken to my dream: as vivid
 To my mind as tho' 'twere life. "I slept
 And heard upon the threshold of my door
 A footstep light and hurried, and upon the door
 A knock, not loud, but unmistakable.
 'Twas summer night, nigh on towards autumn,
 When Judah keeps the feast of tabernacles.
 I roused me up and asked the stranger's mission.
 In gentle words he called me 'Brother,'
 And bid me give him lodgment for the night.
 As 'Some have lodged angels unawares,'
 I gave him entrance, and questioned him
 Upon his right to brotherhood. Neatly dressed,
 Yet somewhat travel-stained, his face did seem
 Not altogether foreign to my memory;
 To anchor it to any special epoch of my sojourn here
 I was at fault.
 His speech betrayed the mind of Christ, and as we journeyed
 In the path of conversation, I called to mind
 At times, both thought and words oft heard before,
 Connected with this wanderer. Being hungered,
 I set on meat and wine; and as he tendered thanks to God
 For home and shelter, found him by His guiding hand,

*A portion of this appeared in the *Children's Magazine* some years ago.

Mine eyes like lightning flash discovered brother M——,
Whose well-loved form we laid beneath
The dismal snows of bleak and frigid winter
But few years past, in sorrow, yet in hope.
I staggered back and asked him 'Whence he came,
And whither he was bound?' He calmly answered:
'To the bar of him who spake as never man
Before did speak, and who from Sinai
Had sent two angels with white Abrahamic beards,
To wrest him from the grip of death and hades.'
By that same power of God that crumbled down the walls of Jericho.
They'd sent him forth to notify his brethren
To come to judgment; and 'Lo,' he said to me,
'Brother, is thy lamp well trimmed,
And brightly burning? for the gospel door
Is shut, and locked, and Jesus holds the key?'
And as we gazed at one another,
And wondered at the fact of this great miracle,
Briefly taking retrospect of that which could not be recalled,
The door which stood ajar was gently opened full,
And two such forms as never yet had been
My lot to gaze upon, stood in our midst.
Stunned at first, when I beheld
My wondrous guests in spirit form,
Yet men of manners, tranquil, bland,
And kind, I begged them, reassured,
To bid me serve their every want,
"Go, bring thy wife!" for side by side
Thy names we oft have read,
I' th' book of life, and still more oft
Have stood beside thee both, when thou
Didst little dream, on thy behalf, our great solicitude,
The great apostle Paul did write of this.
Then wherefore didst thou ever doubt? Behold,
The Judge and Master hath returned,
And at this moment hosts of heaven attend him,
While others like ourselves are sent
Grape gleaning, from earth's clusters,
Growing on the only vine of truth,
Whose roots run backward far
Into the bosom of the faithful Abraham;
All must now appear before the bar
Of Him, who hath pre-eminence!
This Hebrew pass will give thee
Transportation free, across the ocean

To the Tree of Life !
 I called to her who shared with me
 The heaped reproaches for the Christ, and as
 She entered and beheld these men so great,
 So fair, so mild, and bowed down, to give
 Them homage due to messengers of Christ,
 They vanished from our sight, and left us
 Wondering, in the light of their effulgence.

F. H., 1872.

DEITY MANIFEST IN THE FLESH.

DR. THOMAS IN HARMONY WITH HIMSELF AND WITH THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES.

BY DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER.

IT may perhaps be considered a work of supererogation to attempt to add anything to what has been said and written in demonstration of this subject. But no subject, however clear and plain, can be damaged by an increasing amount of testimony in its favour, and it may not be altogether uncalled for when the number of those who affirm the contrary may be increasing. In reference to the subject of "Deity manifested in the flesh," the source of so much perplexity of thought, as also to all other cardinal doctrines of Scripture, we shall find the Doctor in harmony with himself and with the Word; at least in the estimation of those who have profited by the simplicity and clearness of his mode of exposition. By referring to the *Herald of the Kingdom*, vol. V, we shall find there some thoughts from the Dr.'s pen, relative to the "pre-existence of Christ," written by him for the purpose of showing in what sense only a pre-existence could be affirmed of him, and how certain passages of the New Testament can only be understood. We shall only quote from the article to represent the idea intended to be conveyed by the writer. His first quotations are the expressions of the Spirit through Solomon, speaking in the first person as a personality, "I, Wisdom, dwell with prudence, &c. Jehovah possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old . . . Then I was by Him as one brought up by Him; I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."—(Prov. viii.) "Here is an existence," says the Dr., "previous to the existence of the earth and all that it contains. 'By me,' says Wisdom, 'Jehovah formed the earth.' In the words of David, 'By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them, by the Spirit of His mouth. For He spoke and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast.' From these premisses it is evident that 'wisdom,' the 'word,' and 'the spirit,' are but different terms expressive of the same thing. The apostle John, in speaking of this saith: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made which exists. In Him was life, and the life was

the light of men.' The 'word,' 'wisdom,' 'spirit,' 'God,' are all one and the same; for He being the fountain and origin, is as the emanation from Himself. Now, this spirit-word, or spirit of wisdom, Peter styles 'the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets,' or in the words of Nehemiah who saith to Jehovah concerning Israel, 'Thou gavest also Thy good Spirit to instruct them. Many years didst Thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them, by Thy prophets.' But why was the good Spirit of Jehovah in the prophets styled by Peter the Spirit of Christ? Because it was the same Spirit that dwelt in Moses and the prophets that afterwards dwelt in Jesus without measure, and so constituted him pre-eminently the Anointed One, or Christ. Now, of this anointing, it is said in the prophets concerning the man whose name is THE BRANCH—the 'Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and of might; the spirit of knowledge, and of the fear of Jehovah.' This was one spirit, not many, and styled in the New Testament 'the Eternal Spirit' through whom Jesus offered himself without fault to God.

'The Spirit of Jehovah,' says David, 'spake by me, and His word was in my tongue.' Let us hear, then, what the Spirit saith by David in the fortieth Psalm: 'Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; burnt offering and sin offering Thou hast not required. Then I said 'Lo, I come; it is written of me in the volume of the book, Thy will, O my God, I delight to do; yea Thy law is within my heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation. Lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Jehovah, Thou knowest.' Thus spake the Eternal Spirit of Wisdom, who was brought forth before the earth had being, who was from the beginning by Jehovah as one brought up with him. Did not Jehovah then sustain the relation of a father to the Spirit?'—*Herald of the Kingdom*, vol. V., page 110.

The main features of the extract just quoted will be seen to be, first identity of the *Logos*, or Spirit of Wisdom, with Deity; second, its harmonious subjection to the will of the Father, in all the works of creation and in all the divine arrangements concerning the salvation of His people; and the indwelling of the same in Jesus Anointed. This is in exact agreement with what is written on page 95 of *Eureka*, vol. I. concerning the same point. "Of all the *Elohim* one only is the original, independent power of the universe. Speaking of Himself, in His address to the ends of the earth, He says 'Look unto me, for I am AIL, and none else'—(Isaiah xlvi. 22). And to Israel he saith 'Ye are my witnesses, and my servant whom I have chosen, that ye may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He; before Me AIL, or power, *has not been formed*, nor after He shall be'—(Isaiah xliii. 10): a testimony that identifies AIL with the *Logos* and *Theos* of John, which as ONE POWER, he saith, made all things, and without Him was not anything made that was made." Again, on page 166, the same doctrine is taught when speaking of the vision which Daniel saw concerning the Son of Man, who is brought before the Ancient of Days: "the Ancient of Days is the Lord the Spirit, the Quickening Spirit, the *Logos* in David's flesh, who is the head of this Son of Man." Again, vol. I. 95: "In view of these testimonies, we can understand the Annunciation in the

Apocalypse concerning Him who is coming, saying, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."

Some who profess to believe, while agreeing with the Dr. thus far, call in question his teaching concerning the body of Christ, the nature of the flesh in which he came, or the precise time when the Spirit or *Logos* became flesh. We would remark that the Dr. who is careful to preserve distinctions between times and seasons, is also careful not to indulge in speculation, or to assume a positive position upon matters which are not the subject of revelation. Referring again to the *Herald of the Kingdom*, we read: "The testimonies show that in a time appointed, the Eternal Spirit of Wisdom would connect itself with a body. Jehovah styles this body He promised to prepare for the Spirit of Wisdom, 'a precious stone,' and said, 'I WILL ENGRAVE THE GRAVING THEREOF.'—(Zech. iii. 9.) He had told Abraham and David that the body should be taken from their race and nature; but that when the days for its being fashioned should arrive, He would engrave it Himself, so that it should be to Him a Son; son of David according to its nature, son of Jehovah as having formed it by His Spirit." This is in harmony with the Scripture saying: He was "made of a woman, made under the law."—(Gal. iv. 4.)

The Dr. further says: "Now, if these things be duly apprehended, the prophetic testimony concerning the body to be prepared for the Spirit in the days appointed, will not be difficult of comprehension. The testimony has relation, first, to the body before its diversification in the grave; and, second, after the operation has been perfected. THESE DIVISIONS MUST NOT BE CONFOUNDED; for the things they treat of are as diverse as corruption and incorruptibility." This is in harmony with an idea he presented in vol. VI. page 269, concerning these two periods or stages of development. "Christ made sin, though sinless, is the doctrine of God. Such was Jesus in the days of his flesh; when through weakness he was crucified for sin; but now no longer weak, he lives by the power of God. In power he rose from among the dead, and ascended into glory. The revival of his body was its begetting as Jehovah's first-born from the dead. Of his resurrection it is written: 'Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee.' This was the second begetting by the Spirit. *At the first, he was begotten of Mary after her nature; at the second, of the grave, with a nature incorruptible, glorious and powerful; a spiritual body—or life-imparting spirit.*"

These passages clearly present to us the Dr.'s idea concerning the nature of Christ, and will be found perfectly harmonious with other portions of his writings. He further says on the same page: "As a last resort, the doctors of the apostacy fall back upon the saying of Gabriel in Luke i. 35, that the child to be born of Mary was a "holy thing," and consequently of an immaculate nature. But they forget that all the firstborns of Israel were 'holy things.' Jesus was Jehovah's firstborn by Mary, therefore, one of the firstborns of the nation; so that the law of the firstborn applied to him equally with the rest. Hence the holiness of Mary's babe was *not of nature*, but of constitution by the

law. Gabriel declared his legitimacy in styling it a 'holy thing:' a declaration ratified by Jehovah himself before the multitude, when He acknowledged Jesus as His Son, in whom He delighted."—(Matt. iii. 17.)

In *Eureka*, vol. I. page 408, the Dr. says:—"Now, this new creation, wonderful in its development and consummation, began with the formation of a babe in the womb of the handmaid of *Yahweh*, and ends with the cessation of every curse." "When created *and anointed* this new creation was Eternal Power manifest in flesh; and when resurrected and glorified, that flesh was transformed into spirit or Deity; a substantial corporeal entity called by Paul a 'quickening spirit,' and 'the Lord the Spirit.' And He is the head of the body, that among all He might become pre-eminent. The creation of the material world is attributed to Spirit of *Elohim*; the same Spirit afterwards incarnated Jesus, so that he, *when anointed*, was not only the created but the antecedent and creator of all things defined." The same idea is expressed on page 312 of the same volume: "Jesus ANOINTED was the glory of *Yahweh*. This is proved by John's testimony that the *Logos* became flesh and dwelt among us—(Israelites)—and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. This glory of the Father, was seen in the evening of the Mosaic aion; he was seen in the wilderness as Isaiah had predicted; saying, 'the voice of him that proclaimeth in the wilderness,' 'Prepare ye the way of *Yahweh*; make straight in the desert a highway for our *Elohim*, . . . and the glory of *Yahweh* shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see together.'—(Isa. xl. 3, 5.) This was only partially fulfilled in the evening of the Mosaic aion, as related in regard to John the baptizer. He was that voice; the spirit descending in the form of a dove was *Yahweh* or the *Logos*; and Jesus, the *Eloah* of Israel, who when anointed, became as the voice of John proclaimed, 'our *Elohim*.' These two *Elohim*, dwelt among the Jews as the only begotten of the Father, Son of Power and Son of Man, who hath declared the invisible Deity to men."

The Dr. has not omitted to give all due weight to those passages relating to the birth of Jesus, although he did not consider it essential to pry into such a matter any further than it was given the angel to reveal. The testimonies which satisfied the natural inquiry of the mother of Jesus, were also sufficient for his faith to rest upon. A careful perusal of his remarks on page 101, *Eureka*, vol. I., bearing in mind what has already been quoted from other pages will be easily understood.

After referring to certain testimonies, he remarks:—"In these testimonies it was revealed that he should be both the Son of Man and the Son of Deity. How this could be otherwise than is related in the New Testament, would be impossible to devise. 'Is there an *Eloah* without me?' saith the Spirit, 'Yea, there is no rock; I know of none.'—(Isa. xlv. 8.) The manifestation therefore, must be by the Spirit of Deity, or not at all; . . . and 'when the fulness of the time was come, the Deity sent forth His Son made of woman,' begotten not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, but of Deity; by Holy Spirit coming upon her, and power of the Highest overshadowing her;" therefore, also, that holy

thing she bore was called the Son of God.—(Luke i. 35, 31.) Here we see the Dr. recognises in full the heavenly origin of Jesus, though his reasoning is not of such a character as to overthrow the balance of these testimonies which pertain to his perfect humanity, such as we recorded in Paul's letter to the Hebrews: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise partook of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; . . . of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold, &c." "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 himself tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."—(Heb. ii. 14-18.) While giving to these testimonies their due weight and importance, recognizing the entire humanity of Jesus, as to his nature, the Dr. did not place him on a level with mankind; because notwithstanding all the power which the adversary brought to bear upon him, in order to cause him to fall, he proved invincible at every point. This showed a marked superiority over any other individual of the human race that ever lived. But this superiority was of *mental* and *moral attributes*; not a superior kind of flesh to that which the children were possessed of. (And this moral superiority was due to his paternity.—ED.)

In contemplating this vast subject, which the apostle Paul styles "a great mystery, Deity manifested in the flesh"—the Dr. was careful not to crowd all the testimonies relating to it into one period or space of time; seeing that manifestation was a process of development, having certain stages or degrees of progression. He contemplated the Son of God from the earliest stage of existence "begotten by the Holy Spirit," "made of a woman," "born of the Virgin Mary" with a nature like her own. Increasing in wisdom and stature as he advanced in years; of quick understanding in the fear and the knowledge of Jehovah; as exhibited by him at the age of twelve years when reasoning with the doctors in the temple. Subsequently, when the *Logos* abode upon him in unmeasured fulness at the waters of baptism, he was the "Word made flesh." His body was then the temple of the indwelling presence of the glory of *Yahweh*, which as the veil, concealed it from view, even as typified by Moses, when he covered his face with a veil, because the people could not look upon the glory which shone upon his countenance. The period of labour and suffering having passed, "the veil, that is to say his flesh," was rent upon the cross, which divided the period of suffering from the period of glory, or a period of glorified bodily existence. The lamb, the burnt offering, the sin offering, the peace offering, had passed through the fire with acceptance to the Deity, and the Father again begat him to a new life with a spiritual body, consubstantial with Himself.

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN
ECCLÉSIA, No. 78.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

IN our readings this morning, we have had brought before us two speakers—Ezekiel and Jesus. In the days of our ignorance, we should all have had the idea, derived from the unscriptural system of things around us, that there was nothing in common between two such speakers. We should have looked upon Ezekiel and the prophets in general as belonging to an effete age, in which they served their purpose and with which they had passed away, leaving nothing for us to do but to admire their abstract beauty as historic monuments of faithfulness and stern devotion to duty, invigorating, after a fashion, to contemplate, but not involving anything of especial consequence for us to know or consider. Christ, we should at the same time have looked at as representing a new age—an entirely new and different style of things—a totally dissimilar system of thought, feeling and idea. This view of things, in which there is only the smallest element of truth, is common in the professing Christian world. It is fostered by elegant writings which are not according to knowledge, but the mere outgrowth of scholastic theology, which is flimsy, insipid and unreal; being based upon the thoughts and theories of men, and not upon a reverent acceptance of revealed truth.

A knowledge of the truth has emancipated us from this mistaken idea, and enabled us to realise the fact presented to us by Paul when he says, in Heb. i. 1, "God, who at sundry times and divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." We have God speaking in both cases, and to the same

nation and for the same purpose. In the words of the parable illustrative of this very point, "He sent His servants to the husbandmen (of the vineyard) that they might receive the fruits of it: and last of all, He sent unto them His Son."—(Matt. xxi. 33-41.) The mission of the prophets was to bring Israel to obedience of the things commanded them, as we read in Jer. vii: "Since the days that your fathers came out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have even sent unto you all My servants the prophets . . . this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey My voice and I will be your God and ye shall be My people, and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well unto you:" and what was the mission of Christ so far as his personal ministrations were concerned? Was it not the same? He said, "I am sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and his command to them in all his preaching, was "Repent," and his teaching was that "except their righteousness exceeded the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they should in no case enter the kingdom of heaven."

There was doubtless a higher aspect to the work of Christ. "To him" as the climax of God's work with man, "gave all the prophets witness." In him was to be accomplished the mystery hid from ages, how God was to be just and yet the justifier of transgressors of Adam's race unto life eternal, and the way thus opened in one man for the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile. In him was to be accomplished the solution of the problem how condemned men were to be saved by obedience and yet the glory of it should be alone to Jehovah. In him was to

be historically illustrated the name Emmanuel—God with Israel reconciling them to Himself and not imputing their trespasses unto them—giving us in one man the glory of the Father and the headship, and brotherhood, and obedience of the first-born among many brethren. Nevertheless, it was the same God speaking by him that spoke through the prophets, and the object of the speaking was the same in both cases: to induce men to turn from their evil ways and be reconciled to God. The form merely was different; the essence of the forms was identical. Israel were summoned by the prophets to turn to God with all their hearts and to obey the commandments given by the hand of Moses: they were summoned by Jesus to turn to God with all their hearts and obey the commandments delivered by him. In both cases, the object of the summons, so far as Israel was concerned, was the same: "that it might be well with them," with this difference in the case of the summons by Christ, that he made the form and nature of the well-ness, so to speak, more definite and obvious. The resurrection and the kingdom of God were presented by him as the nature and the occasion of the great goodness in store for those who should fear, love and obey him; while in the case of the prophets, they were permitted to speak only of the then present blessings which God should bestow upon Israel in case of obedience.

We Gentiles have been brought into the channel of this blessing through Israel's rejection of it at first. Christ, and afterwards Paul, confined his attention to his kinsmen according to the flesh: but Israel treating the offered goodness with scorn, the same salvation was offered to the Gentiles. Through this circumstance we are assembled here this morning, worshipping God through Christ, in hope of the promises made of God unto the fathers. We, who were once Gentiles in the flesh, without hope, have become

fellow-citizens with all the saints of all past times. We have been adopted into the family. We have been lopped from the wild olive tree, and grafted, contrary to nature, on the good olive tree, and with the obedient natural branches, partaking of the fatness of the good Abrahamic olive tree. This is a position which, fairly realised, is calculated to inspire gladness. We are exhorted to rejoice in it. Frequent is this exhortation throughout the Scriptures: "rejoice in the Lord, ye righteous: shout for gladness of heart." It is well to give reins to our joy. It is true that joy is not an act of the will; we cannot force ourselves to be glad; still, we can review again and again the reasons we have for gladness, and by this our gladness will take new life, though our sorrow will not take final flight till the Lord come. We shall at least realise in ourselves the words of Peter, who, speaking concerning the promises, says, "Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptation that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Christ."—(1 Peter i. 6)

"Sorrowful yet always rejoicing," is Paul's description of his own case; and it is a description that will be found applicable to the experience of every true saint of God. There is much on the surface, and, so far as this world is concerned, deep down as well, to cause continual sorrow of heart: but underneath all there is a constant current of joy in God, a satisfaction at the bottom that comes from leaning on Him, and trusting in Him, and hoping in Him as well as regards the life that now is as that which is to come. Therefore, while avoiding the unseemly ecstasies of unenlightened sectaries, who mistake the electric combustion of the brain for a scriptural joy in God, it is

good to remember the reasons we have for being glad, and indulge, in the midst of our many sorrows, in the joy which springs from a present confidence in God and the hope of that morning of brightness which He has promised, and only waits the right season to reveal.

For another class, this exhortation has to be turned the other way round. There are those who presume upon their standing in the truth, and who forget that they have been called to obedience in many things required of them; and that their continuance in that gospel is essential to their continuance in the position of favor to which they have been called by the gospel. This class have none of the sorrows of the truth, and rejoice after the flesh in their connection with it. They look at others with disdain, and glory in their own enlightenment. They say like Israel, "The people of the Lord, the people of the Lord, the people of the Lord are we," but who like them to sustain the character and position becoming the people of the Lord. Israel spoke the truth in a certain way when they said they were the people of the Lord; but they were cut off for all that, because while with their mouth they drew near to God, with their heart they were far from Him. So men may speak the truth in a technical sense in claiming to be the brethren of Christ, because they believe and have obeyed the gospel, and at the same time they may be walking in utter unworthiness of the position, and may be in as great danger of being cut off like the natural branches of the good olive tree. Such have need to remember Paul's exhortation: "Be not high-minded, but fear. If God spared not the natural branches, take heed that He spare not thee"—(Rom. xi. 21). To such, the exhortation has to be changed into a call to weeping: "Be afflicted and mourn and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning and your joy to heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord."

For what purpose are men grafted into Christ as branches into the living tree? It is that they may grow and bring forth fruit unto God—fruit that God will have pleasure in. So Christ has plainly told us. "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he (my Father) taketh away .

. . . Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit." And what is the fruit that is looked for? We have the answer in that expressed wish of Paul's that the Corinthians might be "fruitful in every good work." And what are good works? Those only that God has required in His Word. There are none good but one—that is God; and there is no righteousness but that which has been constituted such by His word. Hence, to be fruitful branches in the Christ-tree, men must do those things that Christ has commanded for his servants; otherwise, they are unfruitful branches. Of what advantage is it for a man to know the truth and to profess the name of Christ, if at the same time he think and speak and act in accordance with the grovelling instincts of the natural man, which are opposed to what Christ has required? How can a man hope to please Christ who is conformed in all things to the present evil world, to which Christ did not belong, instead of being transformed in the renewing of his mind after the image of the new man, Christ? To such a man the truth is of no advantage whatever, but contrariwise, a positive calamity, as he will find in the day—near at the door—when Christ will say to all such "I know you not, ye workers of iniquity." It is better not to know the way of truth at all than knowing it to continue in the ways, works and maxims of the flesh. The saintship that is disfigured by a conformity to this God-forgetting, man-fearing, self-seeking, money-making, poor-neglecting, unmercy - showing, proud, unjust, merciless, impure, drunken, tobacco-stupefied age—is a saintship that will not be recognised by Christ, for Christ

will recognise only the saintship of his own pattern, which is abundantly exhibited beforehand in the word of truth. That saintship is a saintship of zeal for God, independence of man, faithfulness to truth, purity (both of body and mind), righteousness, mercy, faith in God, love, meekness, gentleness, unselfishness, submission to evil, and kindness to the unfortunate, even if they are erring, fruitfulness in every good work, always abounding therein with thanksgiving, in the inextinguishable hope of the heavenly calling. This is the portrait drawn by the hand of the Spirit: the "image" exhibited for us to try and become conformed to. We become conformed to it in "the renewing of our minds," which is effected by the word abiding in us, and the word abides by being continually implanted in the reading and study of it. The mind is made of plastic material and is being modified every day, for good or evil, according to the influences that play upon it. It is more easily affected for evil than good, because its natural bent is in the direction of evil. Hence the battle is a hard one, and must be maintained to the last. Let us never surrender. Let us hold on to all the helps God has given us; let us avoid all the hindrances and the weights which so easily impede the journey and sink the steps in the mire of the devil's morass, that spreads far and wide on all sides around us. The day of victory will repay all exertion, for thus saith the Spirit: "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."

Of one principle, running through the whole of the divine economy, we must never lose sight. It is expressed by Peter thus: "that God in all things may be glorified." We may not meet with many who rise to this lesson of wisdom. It is a lesson that has become weakened and dimmed and marred by the hypocrisies and shallownesses with which it has be-

come associated in the apostacy of Christendom. The words have come millions of times from heartless lips, on which they almost die for want of sincerity as they are uttered; or they have been shot like sparks of fire from the throats of the tempestuous votaries of superstition, wrought into mesmeric excitement at "revival meetings;" or they have come with a glib hollow sound from mouths that have never truly glorified God. They have come to be hackneyed and cant; but they represent a great reality nevertheless—a reality which is the very heart and glory of the whole system of divine truth. That God may be exalted; that He may be had in highest reverence; that His unsearchable greatness may be recognised; that His great power and goodness and His underived and absolute prerogative may be apparent to the sons of men in their deepest affections and profoundest adorations; that His great name may be magnified and extolled, is the great object of all His recorded dealings, including that widest and greatest of them all, His permission of sin to reign unto death. Apart from this, His ways are not to be understood. It is no wonder that men do not understand the Bible; I mean the intellectual talented men of literature. They ignore or do not appreciate its first principle—the honour of God. They look at it through the medium of the conceptions they have formed from the study of nature, which can give them no information of the *ultima ratio* of things. They interpret it in the light of mere philanthropy. They tacitly assume that creation exists for man alone, and that all things are to be judged good or bad according as it affects him. This philosophy stands between them and the Bible as a veil; for the Bible exhibits a system of truth at variance with this philosophy in many points. The Bible shows us all things for God, and for man only in so far as man fulfils his part towards God. The

chapter read from Ezekiel is an illustration of this kind of teaching. How frequent is the expression in it, in recounting and explaining His dealings with Israel, "I wrought for My name's sake, that it should not be polluted among the heathen."—(xx. 14.) His very choice and manipulation of the house of Israel is, through another prophet, declared to have had for their object (Jer. xiii. 11) that they might be to him "*for a name and for a praise and for a glory*;" and by Isaiah, He says, "This people have I formed for Myself; they shall show forth all My praise." The same object is associated with the work of the gospel. "God has visited the Gentiles, to take out a people *for His name*;" and this people, when taken out, are taken out "that they should *show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into His marvellous light*."—(1 Pet. ii. 9.) This is a very different idea from the idea that is current among "the churches" of Christendom. The idea current in Christendom is that the great purpose connected with the gospel, is the salvation of men in the humanitarian sense. They are taught that a single soul is of priceless worth and that its rescue from a condition of suffering is the *sumum bonum* of the divine operations. Bible teaching (which is the teaching of eternal truth—and no other teaching is true), is the reverse of all this. It is that all flesh is as grass; that all nations have gone out of the way and are become unprofitable and vain; that they are of no value in the sight of God; that, nevertheless, God, in His wisdom and kindness, will save such of them from death as will turn to Him with all their heart, abase themselves before Him, exalt His name, and do His commandments in reverence and fear. The gospel is an invitation to men to come into this attitude that they may live; and such in His sight are precious, in that they "offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that

is, the fruit of their lips, giving thanks to His name."—(Heb. xiii. 15.) This is the scriptural standard of saintship, and none other will avail. Men deceive themselves if they imagine they will be saved, merely because they have come to know that man is mortal and that the kingdom of David will be re-established under Christ at his coming. It is well for them to know the truth; but the truth will only be to their condemnation if they fail to bring forth the fruit which God looks for from the communication of it.

Israel, to whom Ezekiel was sent, were acquainted with the truth so far as revealed; and "certain of the elders," we are told, in the first verse of the chapter read (xx), even "came to enquire of the Lord, and sat before Ezekiel." What was the answer of the Lord to them? "As I live, saith the Lord, I will not be enquired of by you."—(verse 3) There are circumstances in which God will not receive men's advances, and in which he will even lay stumbling blocks before them to turn them out of the way.—(Ez. iii. 20) Both Israel and the Gentiles are illustrations. After long patience, God poured the spirit of slumber upon the mental faculties of the Jews, because they took no delight in His appointments, and honoured not His name; and on the Gentiles also, to whom he sent His messengers in the first century, armed with the gifts of the Spirit, he finally "sent a strong delusion, because they received not the truth in the love of it." These illustrations are of individual service to us. They show us that our knowledge will be no advantage to us unless we carry that knowledge to its legitimate results. If our hearts are not set on things above instead of on things on earth; if the fear of God is not before our eyes all day long; and praise of His name on our lips, and thanksgiving and supplication in our hearts; if our deeds are not framed in accordance with His law, in holy and trembling regard for His

word, and in true and contrite humility before Him, we fail to present the features that will characterise the family that will be gathered together in glorious unity in

the day of Christ, to ascribe "Blessing and glory, and honour, and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever." EDITOR.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 152, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 13.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

MR. GEORGE SMITH, THE ASSYRIAN DISCOVERER.

Mr. George Smith, the discoverer of the Chaldean accounts of the fall, the deluge, &c., has just died, while on his return, after an unsuccessful attempt to cope with Turkish opposition to the renewal of his investigations. His discoveries have added to the list of historical confirmations of the Bible record. *The Rock* says: "A quarter of a century ago an intense curiosity was awakened by the discoveries of Botta and Layard, who found the splendid palaces of Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, under huge sand-crowned mounds on the banks of the Tigris. But after gazing for awhile at the great man-headed lions and bulls

which were presently transported to our national museum, the public interest in Assyrian sculpture began to flag, only, however, to be rekindled by the triumphs of our Rawlinsons, Hinckses, Birches, Smiths, &c., in another department of the same fascinating field. At first little heed was taken—except, of course, by the genuine archæologist—of the multitude of mysterious inscriptions, in arrow-headed characters, incised on marble slabs and earthen tablets, which were found scattered through the various mounds, but as the work of decipherment proceeded, many of these proved to be rich beyond expectation in Chaldean lore, so as both to elucidate and confirm the accounts of many of the most important events recorded in the pages of

Holy Writ. Our readers will not have forgotten the account of the deluge with which Mr. Smith not long since startled the world, and which was published in the first volume of his *Assyrian Discoveries*. A second volume has now been published, under the title of *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*, which contains some remarkable corroborations of the Mosaic record of the creation and the fall. It comprehends also the text of all that remains of the precious tablet, scarcely larger than a lump of sugar. Mr. Smith believes that the era of Uruck, King of Ur, may be fixed with great probability about B.C. 2000; but even anterior to that date, it is quite certain there were buildings and inscriptions, the centre of activity being the region lying between 32 and 33 deg. north latitude. It is pleasant to hear a man so careful and clearheaded expressing himself thus: "Taking the period of literary development in Babylonia as extending from Abraham B.C. 2000 to 1550, we may say it roughly synchronises with the period from Abraham to Moses according to the ordinary chronology of our Bibles; and during this period it appears that traditions of the creation of the universe and human history, down to the time of Nimrod, existed parallel to, and in some points identical with, those given in the Book of Genesis."

THE BIBLE AND "PRE-HISTORIC MAN."

"J. M." circulated some time ago a lithographed tract, entitled *Why I Left the Christadelphians*. On reading the tract, the reader discovers that the title, though coinciding with a fact, is not an appropriate description of its contents; for the reasons given are reasons (and bad reasons as we shall show) for re-rejecting the Bible itself, and not for leaving the Christadelphians in particular, though, in the sense that Christadelphians accept the Bible in the

understanding of it, which other believers in it do not, there is just the least element of appropriateness in calling reasons for rejecting the Bible reasons for leaving the Christadelphians.

The reasons are ten in number. We shall review them from month to month, at the rate of one per month, not at great length, for the publication of the Bradlaugh discussion and review will have, in great measure, superseded the necessity for it. The whole ten reasons are, with one or two exceptions, the stock arguments of unbelief—stale and long ago exploded.

The first objection is that the writer "having for a number of years taken an interest in geology," has "come to the conclusion that our race was (not) introduced into the world about 6,000 years ago;" and that as this is a teaching of the Bible, the Bible must be wrong. He cites Huxley, Carpenter, Page and the *Popular Educator* in support of the opinion. The fallacy of this argument lies in the assumption (1) that the scientific opinion is without the possibility of being mistaken, and (2) that even if not mistaken, it is inconsistent with the Bible account. There is no ground for either of these assumptions. The grounds upon which the opinion rests are too slender to give absolute certainty. Further investigation has dissipated some of the evidence: such, for instance, as the argument founded on the discovery of manufactured brick at a great depth in the neighbourhood of the Nile. It was at first supposed that the earth had accumulated over the bricks at the slow rate of natural deposit, and therefore, it was argued that the bricks must have been made 20,000 or 30,000 years ago. But, afterwards, it was found that there had been an artificial diversion of the river at that very spot during the time of the Roman domination, and that the brick found corresponded exactly with the burnt brick used by the

Romans in Egypt at that time. The specimens had fallen or been thrown into the river at that time, and, of course, when a new channel was made for the water and the old one filled up, the bricks were buried at a great depth. The evidence in general is loose and indeterminate. A few, of course, hold it to be conclusive, and construct theories out of it; but there are others in the scientific world who are equally confident in another construction of it. Only at the last meeting of the British Association (Glasgow) one of the leading authorities condemned the bold generalizations that had been made from very insufficient data, the speaker mentioning Huxley in particular. Mr. Wallace expressed convictions in opposition to Huxley. At a previous meeting (Bristol) another geological authority did the same. It is, therefore, absurd to assume as proved a theory about which scientific men (whose theories, in fact, change like the fashions) are not agreed. A man must either have a very small acquaintance with the bearings of the subject and the state of scientific opinion, or he must have a strong natural bias in favour of unbelief, who would make the scientific opinion of man's antiquity a reason for setting aside a book proved to us in so many and powerful ways.—(See *Bradlaugh Discussion*.)

But even supposing the state of the evidence were such as to induce a unanimous scientific verdict in favour of the pre-historic antiquity of a race of men, it would not follow that the Bible is untrustworthy, because there is nothing to connect the present race with any pre-historic race that might be proved to have existed. The Bible account begins about 6,000 years ago. It tells us (Gen. i. 2) that at that time the earth was in a chaotic state, covered with water, and that darkness was upon the face of the deep. Now, supposing it could be shown that ages before then, the earth had been

habitable, and was, in fact, inhabited by a race of whom nothing but their existence was known, would it disprove that at a period of 6,000 years ago, the said race had perished and the earth been engulfed in a physical catastrophe, in which it had lain for an unspecified time before the work of re-organization described in Genesis? By no means. It would only prove one true thing without disproving another true thing. The Bible is proved in too many ways to admit of its being disproved by any crude theory we may form on subjects so vast. It is indeed on this very subject proved to be true by the present population of the globe. Say it is fourteen hundred millions, and say the population (allowing for war, accident, &c.) doubles itself every two hundred years, and reckon this backwards, and you cannot carry the race further back than the Bible puts it. If man had existed from the untold antiquity of the scientific theorists, the world would, ages ago, have been overstocked with population. So much for No. 1 of J. M.'s reasons.

MIRACLE A NECESSITY TO HUMAN
SALVATION.

Mullan's pamphlet *Miracles and Prophecy*, contains remarks on this subject, which we abridge and amend in harmony with the truth, as follows: "The human race has involved itself in the evils of sin beyond all powers of self-extrication. Will God interfere or not to provide for man that he may escape from ruin, which the laws of his own being and the laws of surrounding nature alike refuse to provide? To answer that question in the affirmative is to assert the necessity of the miracle. For any such interference must be, by the very nature of the case, miraculous. It must include superhuman appeals to the human understanding, and superhuman appliances to human nature. For salvation, according to the only

religious system that declares the necessity and unfolds the method of a redemptive interference—I mean that expounded in the Bible—involves two principal results, a change of state and a change of nature—a change of state, consisting in the forgiveness of sin and reconciliation with God; and a change of nature, consisting in the transformation of the body, and its assimilation to the immortal state. God, therefore, must manifest himself in some supernatural way to make known a plan of forgiveness and reconciliation. Jesus Christ is this supernatural manifestation of God. Mark what takes place. A man miraculously born appears upon the scene. In him is divine everlasting life, derived from the divine everlasting fountain head. He invites all who will to join and follow him, and promises them deliverance. Those who accept his invitation are by their faith made mystically one with Him. As it fares with him, so shall it fare with them. The appearance of the Son of God is, therefore, the grand miracle of all time. As to the chain of minor miracles which signalled the life of Christ and His apostles, no one was witness of the resurrection. Only a few hundreds were permitted to behold the form of the risen Lord. But it was necessary that a whole world should sooner or later become convinced that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Herein we find an ample justification of the chain of minor miracles recorded in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. The evidential force of a consecutive series of supernatural works, countless in number, infinitely varied in character, situation, and surrounding circumstance, performed not only by the Master in his own person, but also in His name by those to whom he had entrusted the splendid prerogative, was irresistible in the minds of the first followers of the cross, and sufficient to inspire them with an enthusiasm of per-

sonal conviction and missionary zeal, such as would render the subsequent employment of the miracle largely, if not entirely, unnecessary. To those who complain that the miracle is not continued still for the fixing and strengthening of human faith, it is enough to answer that we have all that made the miracle valuable and efficacious. We have the Bible, the miraculous heirloom of the old inspiration. We have the public observance of the first day of the week—the standing record of the miracle of the resurrection. We have baptism and the Lord's supper, sacred projections along the centuries of the Christian era of two grand epochs in the miraculous life of Christ. But, above all, we have Jesus Christ himself. Christ, in his person and character, is indeed the great world-miracle, about which all the minor miracles play like scintillations round a central fire, associated with which their reasonableness is morally demonstrated, divorced from which they melt into unmeaningness. With Jesus Christ born and risen, they stand or fall, even as with him stand and fall also all human faith and hope."

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 450.)

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

In passing on to the remaining books, I begin with the Acts of the Apostles. This book was, in the second century, known and received as the work of Luke, as much as his gospel. I need only refer to Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, as witnesses against whose testimony no exception can be made. The canon in Muratori is also a valuable document as to this book. I need not enlarge on this, for the testimony is sufficient to carry us to the time of those who belonged to the apostolic age.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

In speaking of the epistles, to which Paul's name is prefixed, that to the Hebrews was, of course, excluded. The difficulty as to this epistle is not on the points of antiquity and authority, but entirely as to authorship. In the early centuries it was but little known in the West, and thus in the canon in Muratori, it is not mentioned. In the East, however, it was well known and received, and there it was ascribed to the apostle Paul. Clement of Alexandria is a sufficient witness on this point. The North African Church likewise knew of this epistle at an early period, for Tertullian quotes it, ascribing it, however, to Barnabas. All the early accounts would show that it was considered to come from what might be called *the school of Paul*, whether written by himself or not. Though the West had comparatively little knowledge of this epistle in the second century, yet it must have been known there in the first century, as an approved document; for Clement of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians, *interweaves* large portions of the epistle before us. It has been said that "allusions prove nothing;" however, in such a case as this, they prove a great deal. This epistle claims *authority* on the part of the writer; he, therefore, who could approvingly introduce extracts from it into another work, so far sanctions that authority, and this Clement of Rome has done.* We are able, therefore, to say that in the apostolic age it was received as an authoritative document. In the former part of the second century, Justin Martyr (Apol. i.) says that Christ is called an *apostle*, a term which indicates his acquaintance with this epistle,

* It would fill several pages to give the reiterated passages in which Clement interweaves the words and order of thoughts of the epistle to the Hebrews.

and his acknowledgment of its authority. The difficulty connected with its authorship being directly ascribed to Paul, is principally found in the omission of his name at the beginning, and the difference of style throughout. Thus, some of those who ascribe it, in a general sense, to Paul, thought that the ideas were his, but that the language was that of another; in fact, that it bore the same relation to Paul as Luke's Gospel does to him, and Mark's to Peter. Thus Origen, who quotes this epistle as Paul's, says that of the actual *writer*, "God only knoweth."* Ancient testimony is abundantly strong as to the authority of this book; it generally ascribes it to Paul; and this is quite sufficient for us to receive it with all confidence, and to consider it as Pauline in the same general sense.

GENERAL EPISTLES.—FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

The general epistles were not formed into a collected volume at an early period; they were only known and used individually. Hence, we cannot be surprised that some of them were much better known than others. Two only of these writings stand in Eusebius's catalogue of books universally acknowledged.

The first epistle of Peter need not detain us long; Polycarp uses it as freely and fully as a modern preacher might do.† Papias, in the same age, cited testimonies from it, as we learn from Eusebius (l. iii. 39). Clement of Alexandria, and Irenæus quote it *by name*, in the second century, as also does Tertullian; he only, however, cites it in one

* Cited in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. l. vi. 25.

† The following is the first passage of Polycarp in which he interweaves the words of Peter, and this may serve as a specimen of the rest. "In whom though ye see Him not, ye believe; and believing ye rejoice with joy unutterable and full of glory."—(Cap. i.)

passage, instead of making the continual use of it that he does of the gospels and Paul's epistles. This is natural enough, as this writing was only a separate volume, and not part of the collections already formed.

FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

The first epistle of John was also used by Polycarp and Papias, and by the writers of the second century, Irenæus, Clement and Tertullian by name, as is also the case in the canon in Muratori.

BOOKS OPPOSED BY SOME—EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The epistle of James is the first book that we have to consider, of those described by Eusebius as *opposed by some*.

We are not (as I have said already) to feel surprise that epistles not addressed to a particular church should be for a time comparatively unknown; this would especially be what we might expect as to an epistle to those from amongst the Israelitish nation who had believed in Christ.

The first who makes *express* mention of this epistle by name is Origen, in the former part of the third century: he quotes it as the epistle attributed to James. Hence it is *probable* that Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria, knew of this epistle; this supposition is confirmed by a statement of Cassiodorus, a writer of the sixth century, that Clement gave a summary of this epistle (together with others) in a work of his which is now lost; it has, however, been doubted whether the name of *James* in the passage of Cassiodorus, is not put in by mistake for *Jude*. Irenæus says of Abraham, that "*he was the friend of God*."—(l. iii. c. 16, 2.) This looks like an acquaintance with this epistle. A strong testimony to this writing is given by the old Syriac version of the New Testament, in which, although the other books "*opposed by some*" are absent,

this epistle is contained. In the fourth century we see, from Jerome, that the authenticity of this epistle was very plainly asserted, and the epistle was then, as now, ascribed to the apostle James, the son of Alphaeus. This is just what we might expect: a writing, little known at first obtains a more general circulation, and the knowledge of the writing and its reception go almost together. The contents entirely befit the antiquity which the writing claims: no *evidence* could be given for rejecting it; it differs in its whole nature from the foolish and spurious writings put forth in the name of this James, and thus its gradual reception is to be accounted for from its having, from early times, been shown by some to be genuine (as shown by the Syriac Version), and this knowledge having afterwards spread more widely.

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

The Second Epistle of Peter was but little known in early times: it professes (ch. iii. 1) to be addressed to the same persons as the first had been. *Cappadocia* is one of the countries mentioned in the salutation of the former; this, then, must be supposed to have been best known in that and the surrounding regions. Accordingly, from Cappadocia we get the earliest decisive testimony. In the middle of the third century, Firmilianus, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, writes to Cyprian, accusing the Bishop of Rome of "abusing the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, who, in their *epistles*, have execrated heretics and admonished us to avoid them." The mention of Peter can only carry our minds to *this* epistle. We learn from Origen that it was known at this time as a writing about which there were doubts; he knew of no evidence against it, and the doubts then entertained are well balanced by Firmilianus's testimony,

springing from that very region to which we might especially look for evidence. This epistle is not mentioned by Tertullian—a fact at which we need not wonder, since he only quotes the first epistle of Peter, although universally owned, *once*. Eusebius tells us that Clement of Alexandria commented on the general epistles, both those which were universally owned and those which are opposed by some; hence it has been reasonably concluded that he *knew* this epistle. This writing, certainly, is utterly unlike the forged documents, in the name of Peter, which were put forth in the second century: it belongs, at least, to an age anterior to that of Firmilianus and Origen, and thus we approach the apostolic period. Now, Clement of Rome has a passage which seems to allude to part of this epistle: he says, "On account of hospitality and godliness, Lot was delivered from Sodom, when all the neighbouring country was condemned with fire and brimstone. The Lord made it manifest that He doth not forsake those who trust in Him; but those who turn to other ways He appoints to punishment and suffering."—(cap. xi.) The connection of *words* and *thoughts* appears to show that 2 Peter ii. 6-9, was in the writer's mind. In the time after Eusebius but little doubt was expressed as to this epistle, although the points of difference in the *style* were perceived. As to this, let it be observed that the subject continually *forms the style*; no one would write a hortatory or didactic address in the same style as a stern rebuke. I may add that this epistle is much more like Peter, as preaching in the Acts, than is the first. It must be observed that the express testimony of Firmilianus, coming, as it does, from Cappadocia itself, has the utmost importance in connection with this writing. If we have no proof of its having been as widely diffused as other books of the New Testament, all we have

to ask is, whether we have *sufficient* testimony as to its existence and authorship. Internally it claims to be written by Peter, and this claim is confirmed by the Christians of that very region in whose custody it *ought* to have been found.

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

The second epistle of John has as much evidence as so short a writing would be likely to possess; it is expressly mentioned and cited by Irenæus (l. iii. c. 16, 8), whose links of connection with that apostle have been already stated; it is also mentioned and quoted by Clement of Alexandria. *The third* epistle of John is mentioned by Origen, together with the second, as writings about which judgments might perhaps be divided. Dionysius of Alexandria, however, in part his contemporary, speaks undoubtedly of both.—(In Eusebius, H. E. l. vii. 25.)

The canon in Muratori owns, at least, *one* of these epistles; in my opinion, *both*. From the mode in which Jerome speaks of these epistles, we may conclude that the doubt was not as to their being really sacred writings, but as to whether *John* was the author—John the apostle or John the Presbyter, a doubt which is fully met by Irenæus and the writer of the fragmentary canon.

EPISTLE OF JUDE.

We find 'quite sufficient early testimony to the epistle of Jude, for it is mentioned in Muratori's canon, by Clement of Alexandria (Pæd. p. 239), and by Tertullian (*De Cultu*, Fœm. i. 3.) We are able, therefore, at once to repudiate the doubts expressed by some in the beginning of the fourth century, because of earlier evidence, which ascribes this epistle to Jude, the brother of James.

(To be continued.)

IS THE BIBLE DIVINE?

NOW READY, price Two Shillings, (postage 2½d.,) a large-sized pamphlet of about 180 pages, containing a verbatim report of the

SIX NIGHTS' DISCUSSION

(partly conducted on the Socratic method) between Mr. Bradlaugh, the editor of the *National Reformer*, and Mr. Roberts, the editor of the *Christadelphian*, on the question "Are the Scriptures the authentic and reliable records of Divine revelation?" together with

A REVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION,

By the editor of the *Christadelphian*, extending to over 40 pages.

EXTRACT FROM THE REVIEW.

MR. ROBERTS has asked and obtained Mr. Bradlaugh's consent to the publication of this review of the discussion at the end of the published report. He has also offered to print along with it any rejoinder Mr. Bradlaugh may choose to write, but Mr. Bradlaugh has not chosen to write a rejoinder. The addition of a review of the discussion by one of the disputants will seem uncalled for and out of place to such as hold with Mr. Bradlaugh that the discussion should stand or fall on its own merits. If Mr. Roberts could limit his view to the discussion as a performance or trial of polemical skill between two men, he would be of the same mind. But this aspect of the case is to him of the least consequence. He cannot shut his eyes to the wider bearings of the affair, as affecting, in however small a degree, the convictions of those who may seek in the reading of this discussion, some acquaintance with the merits of the question debated. This to him is the only important phase of the reported discussion, and has led him to desire and to ask permission to supplement the discussion with a few things necessary to complete the consideration of the subject.

Six nights seems a long time and long enough to exhaust the subject, or at all events to allow of a very adequate treatment of it. But in the practical working, the case was otherwise. Each disputant had only one hour and a quarter per night, and part of that devoted to interrogation. Even with a full and undisturbed occupation of that time, anyone having any acquaintance with the subject will know how small an extent of ground could be covered in an hour. But when it is remembered that a half of that hour was broken into two separate speeches in reply to speeches from the other side, it will at once be seen that half-an-hour was practically all that was at the disposal of the affirmative side for the elaboration of lines of thought involving really extensive treatment, if at all thoroughly done. The consequence was that the affirmative argument was imperfectly developed, while on the other hand, it was absolutely impossible to deal with a great portion of the hostile details marshalled so rapidly, and on the whole so skilfully (for a bad cause) on the other side.

To make good the deficiency arising from these causes, Mr. Roberts proposed to Mr. Bradlaugh a second discussion, in which Mr. Bradlaugh should affirm the mythical character of the Scriptures which would have given Mr. Roberts the opportunity of following all his objections, but this Mr. Bradlaugh declined. Consequently, Mr. Roberts's only other course is to add this review, which he thanks Mr. Bradlaugh for consenting to. For convenience sake, the review is divided into six parts, corresponding with the six nights of the debate; and each part in two sections.—1, the affirmative, and 2, the negative.

EXTRACT FROM THE PREFACE.

The discussion was largely attended throughout. The report is from the notes of shorthand writers who were engaged for the discussion—revised by the speakers.

Readers will be in a better position to judge of the debate than hearers. Mr. Bradlaugh's loud voice and animated delivery, made an impression which it may be found his arguments fail to sustain. On the other hand, the arguments on behalf of the Bible may be found to have more weight than they seemed to have in the heat of controversy.

The issue debated is the most important of the questions that engage public attention. The discussion is published, not as an exhaustive, or even a moderately thorough canvass of the subject, but merely as a passing contribution to its consideration, which may help to draw to the subject some of the attention which it ought to receive at the hands of rational men.

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13. 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

PROGRESS OF THE PALESTINIAN EXPLO-
RATION.—Mr. Selah Merrill, who lately
explored the East Jordanic territory, gave
in the *Athenæum* of the 15th ult., an
account of the result of his researches.
Of Gadara, where there are hot springs, he
writes: "Four miles east of Gadara, on the

road leading to Cap.tolias (now Beit er Ras)
was a temple, and the foundations and
some portions of the columns which re-
main, show that it was a structure of more
than ordinary size and magnificence. Be-
tween this temple and the city itself, the
way was lined with tombs. In prosperous

times this city of the dead, with its elegant and costly sepulchres, must have been one of the attractions of the place, as well as its temples and theatres and wonderful prospects, and its hot baths at the foot of the mountain below it. Here at Gadara, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews had a flourishing school, and the Rabbis used to visit the springs, and walk for recreation along the shaded banks of the river. The far-famed springs at Tiberias are insignificant in size in comparison with those at el Hamma, and it seems a pity that the delightful waters of the latter should flow on for ever without being enjoyed by those who would appreciate and be benefited by them." The hot springs of Tiberias are repeatedly mentioned in the Talmud, and those of Callirrhoe by Josephus, to which Herod took refuge in his last illness.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE JEWISH COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE.

An article appears in the *Gentleman's Magazine* on "The recovery of Palestine." It is by Hepworth Dixon.

The *Daily News* states that Colonel Gawler (Tower of London, E.C.) has received a letter, dated June 27th, from the heads of the Jewish community in the Haifa district in the Holy Land, telling him that they are sending a deputy to England "to stir up the princes and nobles of the land that they may hasten to help us in the establishment of a system for the cultivation of the soil, as was projected by Colonel Gawler some two years ago, and asking his good offices. The *Jewish Chronicle* heartily wishes the deputy in question may succeed in his mission, but points out that any scheme for the regeneration of Palestine should be disconnected from all idea of converting the Jews to "Christian" doctrines. It remarks: "If those Gentile favourers of Zion and its lawful inheritors could only divest themselves of all conversionist ideas, whether primary or secondary, and proffer their aid simply on the broad ground of philanthropy, of the memory and achievements of the past, of the services rendered to mankind as the teachers of the noblest notions of Deity, and custodians of the purest morality, and come forward in aid of those who are descended from those to whom these obligations are due, help would be accepted with the profoundest gratitude, and Israel's sympathy, the weight depressing it being removed, would swell, expand and gush forth in a copious stream. Jew and Gentile could then go hand-in-hand and something noteworthy might be accomplished."

THE PROJECTED RESTORATION OF JEWISH NATIONALITY.

An influential Jewish gentleman, holding relations with official circles, both in London and Constantinople, writes as follows to the *Jewish Chronicle* :—

SIR,—In a recent number of your journal, you observed that the very fact of the Porte having taken into consideration the proposal of receiving in payment her bonds at a certain price for land that might be purchased in Syria, had a peculiar significance. The suggestion was made in your columns in the name of Jews living in the Holy Land. It was, moreover, made at a time when the creation of the Sir Moses Montefiore Testimonial Fund had conspicuously directed the attention of the Jewish body to the land of its ancestors. There seems to be something providential by way of eminence in all these coincidences. Devout minds will not fail to perceive in this the finger of God. And there can be no doubt that, should the Porte agree to the proposal, large tracts of land would be purchased by Jews in the Holy Land. An impulse might be given to Jewish immigration, not by those who desire to end their days in the land of the patriarchs and prophets, and to mingle their dust with that of these holy personages, but of such as might wish to live in it, and to establish there their homesteads. We will not pry into the designs of Providence. In due time, the veil will be lifted, and we shall see the fresh developments in store for us.

Your observations caused prominent attention to be given to the subject both out and in the community and religious minds of all denominations, indulged in divergent views. Constantinople journals of the 2nd of May even stated that Mr. Hammond, M.P. and myself had offered, on behalf of the Jews of England, France and Austria the sum of eight millions sterling for Syria, which I need not say is untrue. But still, when some such kind of project was mentioned as a rumour to one of our friends, now holding a high office in the present Turkish Ministry, he stated that even if adopted, it would require the sanction of the five powers.

The matter is not as visionary as many

seem to imagine. Public attention has been much directed to it lately, and as the talented authoress of *Daniel Deronda*, in Book VI., published in July, has eloquently sketched out a new Judæa, poised between East and West, a covenant of reconciliation, the subject is now sure to be well ventilated, and with this view, I suggest to you to extract the whole of the discussion from that celebrated work, supposed to take place at a club called "The Philosophers," wherein poor men, given to thought, meet from time to time. The characters introduced are Miller, an exceptional second-hand bookseller, who knows the insides of books; Buchan the saddler, a Scotchman; Pash, watchmaker, and Gideon, optical instrument maker, Jews of different types; Croop, shoemaker. Three Englishmen are also included—the wood inlayer, Goodwin; the florid laboratory assistant, Marrables; and Lilly, the copying clerk. Mordecai, the Jew, whose brilliant ideas are given in several passages of the work, terminates the debate with a magnificent peroration, every word of which should be treasured by our community as precious jewels beyond all value. It is impossible not to catch some of Mordecai's enthusiasm, fervent trust, and energetic certitude.

A momentous crisis is near at hand in Turkey. A diversity of races and interests exist in various parts of her dominions in Europe, and there we can never expect union or prosperity whether under Turkish rule or not. . . . I have raised this question that a plan may be elaborated by the heads of the Jews of various countries at a congress of their body. I have taken measures to circulate extensively these views, and when at Constantinople, next month, will agitate still further, in the right quarters.—Yours, &c., N. GUEDELLA."

NEARLY all the daily journals of Wednesday referred to the restricted business transacted on the Stock Exchange on Tuesday, owing to the absence of the Jewish members. Several foreign telegrams also referred to a similar effect being felt on Continental Bourses. The circumstance illustrates a statement of the *Spectator*, that the Jews have become the most powerful clan of modern times.

THE DEADNESS OF ISRAEL.—In an article contributed to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, by a Jew, the writer states that a few poor men are paid a weekly sum to be early at the

synagogue, as prayers cannot be commenced till ten men are present. "The synagogue is open every day of the week; but the week-day services are attended by the paid worshippers only, and occasionally by a few ultra-orthodox persons desirous of reciting the prayer for a deceased parent. When a Jew enters the synagogue he proceeds to shake hands with the friends who have preceded him; queries as to 'how is business' are propounded and answered, and he wends his way to his seat, nodding and smiling as he goes. He envelops himself in his silken talith, produces his gorgeously bound prayer book, and proceeds with his devotions. Should he desire to do so seriously, however, he finds himself frequently interrupted by fresh arrivals who wish to become acquainted with the state of his health, his business, and the latest news."

ASCENT OF MOUNT ARARAT.—We, by letters, hear from Tiflis that Mount Ararat has been successfully ascended by an Englishman—Mr. Bryce, of Lincoln's Inn, London. This is believed to be either the third or fourth ascent, the first having been made by Parrot in 1834, and the second by Abich in 1850. The mountain is 17,212 feet in height, and the last 4000 feet had to be climbed alone, the Cossack escort refusing to go farther. The Armenians of the neighbourhood believe the mountain to be inaccessible, and insist that Noah's ark still exists on the summit.—*Times*.

DISCOVERY OF ANCIENT JEWISH COINS.—A few of the coins which were lately found near Jerusalem, have been secured by Mr. John Lornie, F.S.S., Kirkcaldy. The find was a small one, and consisted of shekels and half shekels of Judæa, which are considered the most interesting of all ancient coins. They are silver of the great high priest Simon Maccabæus, and have the cup of manna on one side, and on the other the budding rod, with the legends in Hebrew. The date is also in Hebrew—viz., year one, being the first year of the pontificate of Prince Simon, or 144 years B.C. Notwithstanding their great age, the coins are in fine preservation, both sides being perfectly legible.—*Fife Free Press*.

HOW THE JEWS ARE FARING IN BOSNIA.—A French paper reports: The Jews of Bosnia having been compelled to contribute considerable sums towards the equipment of volunteers, were informed that they must form a protective guard to check the hordes of robbers. The hundred Bosnian and Bulgarian Jews having complied with the order and provided themselves at their own expense with rifles and other arms, were then coolly informed by the authorities that they had been enrolled as volunteers to the army, and without much ado, despite their protests, were marched off by the soldiery to the scene of war. It is said that there is a considerable

movement among the Jewish population to emigrate into neighbouring Austria.

JEW, CHRISTIAN AND TURK.—The party which is opposed to the granting of equal rights to the Christians in Turkey, have addressed a memorial to Midhat Pasha, in which the following passage occurs: "Look at Servia, supported in this war by all Christian Europe. Has Servia granted to the Jews the same rights as to Christians? Are they not considered as strangers and not even permitted to reside where they like? And are there not besides Servia other countries in Europe, large and small, boasting of their civilization and philanthropy, in which Jews and other non-Christians are excluded from all government offices? Is this Turkish party in its retaliation upon Christians right or wrong? Let Russia, foremost in her denunciation of Turkey, answer.—*Jewish Chronicle*.

THE OLD STIFFNECKEDNESS.—The *Jewish Chronicle* quotes the following:—"While not a few Jews are wandering to Jerusalem, at a recent convocation of Jews in the United States the following was agreed to: 'Modern Judaism does neither dream nor wish to return to Palestine; here is our home, here our Fatherland. Hence we strike from our prayer books any line that reminds us of the temple and sacrifices.'—*Christian Life*. [It is not improbable that some such resolution was passed. It is like the Jews to go contrary to God's requirements. They did so at the beginning, wishing to slay Moses and return to Egypt. But they did not succeed then and they will not succeed now; for God's purpose is to bring them from all lands, and 'ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel.' 'This that cometh unto your mind, saying, we shall be as the heathen, shall not be at all.' So your God hath declared, and His word always stands fast.—Ed. *Christadelphian*.] (Where did this convention take place? We know nothing of it.—Ed. *J. C.*")

THE JEWS AND EARL BEACONSFIELD'S EASTERN POLICY.—The *Spectator* says: "What does it all mean? What Lord Stratford de Redcliffe thinks clearly attainable, what Lord Granville and Lord Russell and Gladstone all treat as practicable, cannot be impossible for any reason but this, that neither Lord Beaconsfield nor Lord Derby will hear of it. Lord Beaconsfield's difficulties are in his own heart. He loves the Turk, and hates the Christian States of Turkey because they have persecuted the Jews; and that is probably the real explanation of the front of triple brass which Lord Beaconsfield opposes to a policy as pacific as any other now, pregnant (which his own is not) with peace for the future, and

sustained (which, again, his own is not) by the enthusiastic support of the nation which he rules." It is a confirmation of the *Spectator's* view, that the Jews are at the present moment the object of peculiar aversion throughout the Sclavic countries. The Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* writes:—

"The unfortunate Jews in Servia are in some respects a great deal worse off than their co-religionists in Roumania. I know it for a positive fact that the Servian Jews are, even now, panic-stricken in expectation of being massacred by their Christian oppressors, who are irritated to fury against them by the accounts that have recently reached Belgrade of sums subscribed by the Jews in Bosnia (under pressure of the Turkish authorities) for the equipment and pay of Bashi Bazouks. The Jews have been uniformly and persistently persecuted in Servia for centuries past; but lately their treatment has been beyond all measure arbitrary and unjust; and now they are trembling in their skins lest they be all butchered, as if they were Turkish prisoners. Cannot Servia's enlightened patrons veto this vileness—or, at least, make their protection conditional upon the exercise of a little humanity and justice towards the Children of Israel?"

It is a further confirmation of the *Spectator's* view that the Jews are well treated in Turkey, thus:

A correspondent writes to the *Ibree*: "In Turkey every one of us may loudly and publicly declare I am a Hebrew, and not conceal his extraction as in several other European countries. The Turks receive the Jew with benevolence and treat him as a fellow citizen. There are even places, for instance the arsenals, admission to which is not allowed to Christians, but are open to the Israelites, who inspire the Turks with more confidence and from whom they do not fear treason. The Jews are called in even in the time of war in order to aid in the arrangements. Many Israelites occupy in the army distinguished positions as surgeons and apothecaries, and discharge high administrative functions. The highest personages of the empire prefer Jewish physicians whose talent, honesty and conscientiousness they know. Religious liberty prevails in Turkey to a degree not found in many European countries. There is not a country in the world where the Israelites can practise their religion with greater liberty and pursue any occupation they like than in Turkey. Whoever has studied and understands the Turkish language, finds easily honourable employment even in the service of the state."

PROSPECTS FOR THE HOLY LAND.

The Quarterly Statement just issued by the Palestine Exploration Society contains a paper on "The fertilising of Ancient Palestine." In the course of his remarks, he says: "The richness of the soil makes it certain that very little would make an enormous change in the productiveness of the country. . . . The curse of the country is bad government and oppression. Justice and security of person and property once established, Palestine would become once more a land of corn, vines and olives, rivalling in fertility and in wealth its ancient condition, as deduced from careful study of such notices as remain to us in the Bible and in the latter Jewish writings."

THE JEWS RETURNING.

The *Birmingham Daily Mail* says: "Palestine, slowly but surely, is being repopulated by the Jews, who are returning there—more especially from Russia—in almost unprecedented numbers. Within ten years the Hebrew population in Jerusalem has been doubled, and whilst the Jews were formerly confined to their own quarter there—the poorest and the worst—they now inhabit all parts of the city, and are always ready to rent every house that is to be let. Great accessions are still going on. We wonder if the panjudaistic theories, broached with so much force in *Daniel Deronda*, will stimulate the Eastward movement?"

A PROPOSAL TO SEND THE ROUMANIAN JEWS BACK TO THEIR COUNTRY.

In Roumania the Jews have so entirely got the upper hand in trade that the government of the country has passed

stringent laws, excluding them from various occupations. Vast numbers of Jews have been thrown out of employment and are in a state of great misery. Still the Jew difficulty remains, for more continue in various employments than those who are out. The following proposal is made by M. Jonesen, rector of the University of Jassy: "We have in our midst an unchristian people, the Jews, against whom we fight in vain. To free us from that pestilence, we must send free men into the Chambers, who are independent of the Jewish money purse, and they must, in order to regulate the Jew question in a peaceable way, resolve, in the name of the Roumanian nation, that the government will issue to all the Jews residing in Roumania, passports without pay; yea, present expenses for the journey to the poor, that they may emigrate to Palestine, and the Roumanians may remain the sole masters of the commerce, which the Jews now control."

A NEW IMPETUS TO THE PROPOSED REGENERATION OF PALESTINE.

A new railway has been projected under the special favour and blessing of the Pope. The proposal is to make a port at Jaffa, and to construct a railway thence to Jerusalem, in order to facilitate pilgrims travelling to the latter place, and to aid in planting Catholic colonies and agricultural establishments in Palestine. In fact, all the profits of the railway are to be devoted to this latter aim, so that the only dividends to be drawn by shareholders will be feelings of satisfaction at having aided in the work. His Holiness recommends the scheme to the whole Catholic world.—(*Birmingham Daily Mail*, Sep. 27th.)

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren. . . . (Heb. 11. 11.)

NOVEMBER, 1876.

SUBSCRIBERS will not forget that the list for 1877 is being made up from pre-paid orders that come to the office, and that in

case of no order being given, the *Christadelphian* will cease to be sent after the next number. In view of the state of affairs on the Continent, there may not be time for another volume of the *Christadelphian*; but we must arrange wisely up to the last moment.

Seven-and-a-half pages of "Answers to Correspondents" in type, but held over for want of space.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

FAILURE OF PEACE NEGOTIATIONS—THE
EASTERN CONFLAGRATION SPREADING.

RUSSIA AND HER APPOINTED MOVE ON
TURKEY.

REMARKABLE POLITICAL SITUATION IN
FAVOUR OF RUSSIA.

THE PROSPECT OF CHRIST'S RE-APPEARANCE.

THE probability is, that before this reaches the eye of the reader, Russia will have thrown off the mask, and openly commenced that southward movement on Bible lands which has been so long looked for by those who have desired the execution of the divine programme among the nations of the earth, as revealed to the prophets of Israel. The political situation, which has undergone such mighty changes in five years, is remarkably favourable to Russian schemes. France's hands are tied. Though possessed of a larger army than she ever had at any time in her history, she is held in check by Germany, who watches her military development with jealous anxiety and fear. She dare not take part in Eastern complications. We, consequently, hear it loudly proclaimed that France will be strictly neutral in the pending conflict. Her power as the frog-disturber of Europe is at an end. She has done her work in developing the immense armaments of Europe, and now she is paralysed by Germany. Germany is in the same position. She dare not move for fear of France. She finds it to her interest to be in quiet league with Russia, to whose neutrality she owed some of her success in the Franco-German war; so that Russia has all the advantage of a German defence on her south-west frontiers. Austria also is not only powerless to hinder Russia, but is compelled, for self-preservation, to sanction her designs, from fear of Italy, who is in the Russian interest, and from

hope of advantage in the distribution of the spoil. By one circumstance and another, therefore, in the wonder-working providence of God, Russia leads, and has her way open, with no power on earth to hinder but England, and England is held back by the opposition of the nation to any farther support of Turkey, and has to be content with defensive operations, the full nature of which is not developed, but which is, at this time of writing, said to include the military occupation of Egypt.

Russia really began her movement when Servia declared war against Turkey. Though Servia was the nominal operator, it is now clear to everyone that Russia was the inspirer and mainspring of her movements, or at all events, that she took up the Servian quarrel and made it her own at a very early period. The *Scotsman* of October 16th, speaking of the armistice that was proposed, says:—

"Notoriously, however, Servia has no voice in the matter. She is neither more nor less now than a puppet in the hands of Russia. The Servian army has been taken out of her control by Russian officers, and General Tchernaieff and his Russian assistants dictate what shall be done by the Servian Government. Nobody who reads the accounts coming to hand from Servia will believe for a moment that the Servian people desire the war to go on. Look at the statements of Dr. MacCormack of the number of men who had wounded themselves in the hand in order to get out of the army. Read the accounts of the manner in which the Russian officers had to drive the Servian soldiers into battle when last they fought. Hear what is said of the desire for peace at Belgrade and elsewhere. No one can doubt that the war has been continued for some time at the instance of Russia, by means of Russian men and Russian money, and, of course for Russian purposes."

At the same time, Russian desires and designs in the matter have been providentially favoured and stimulated in so many ways as to make the divine hand visible in the direction of events. Thus we read in the *Daily News* that the Russian movement, in the shape of Russian volunteers joining the Servian army, "has been spontaneous and democratic, and therefore diametrically opposed to the spirit of Russian autocracy." "The Russian government," says the *Daily News*, "viewed this uprising with dismay, but its diplomacy has recognised the situation, and established friendly relations with the

new situation inevitably to be established in Turkey." So also the *Times* correspondent at Belgrade, speaking of the rejection of the armistice, says, "the war was prolonged for no other purpose than that of the Russian Slavonic Societies whose object has ever been to force Russia into battle for the destruction of Turkey." The *Daily News* correspondent at Belgrade puts the matter clearly and forcibly in the following message:

"Late arrivals from Russia state that it is impossible for the Russian government to repress the popular movement in favour of the southern Slaves, and that it must choose between domestic troubles and allowing the excitement vent by the volunteering of the most violent agitators into Servian ranks. It must be evident to the most casual observer that Russia would never choose such a means for accomplishing any object, and that she is merely dragged along by an irrepressible current which she is naturally endeavouring to turn to her own advantage. Everything that we hear from Russian volunteers confirms the above theory, and they openly declare they would fight their own government if they were prevented from coming to fight the Turks. The whole situation suggests one of those tremendous movements which have changed empires, and which are uncontrollable by the governments actually concerned in them. It is a problem whether it can be adjusted for the present by diplomatic action, or must go on to change the face of Eastern Europe."

In confirmation of this view of things stands the fact that when it became possible at one moment that an armistice might be concluded, the *Popolo Romano*, an Italian journal, published at Rome, "received a telegram from St. Petersburg to the effect that numerous Russian volunteers had resolved to go at their own expense and risk to liberate Bulgaria from the government of the Turks immediately an armistice should be concluded between Servia and the Porte."

THE INSURRECTION OF PUBLIC OPINION IN ENGLAND.

In addition to these home forces impelling Russia in the appointed direction, there has been the insurrection of public opinion in England against Turkey mentioned last month, which though unofficially expressed in the form of public meetings, has had a powerful effect both on the English government and in the decisions of governments abroad. This public movement is the

subject of an article in the *Edinburgh Quarterly Review*, in which the writer says it has had three (what he calls) "exceedingly serious and mischievous results." "First, it (the agitation) has encouraged the Servians to prolong the war, and enabled General Tcherniaieff to reject the liberal terms offered them; Second, it has strengthened the war party in Russia, which is endeavouring to force the hands of the emperor. Third, it has considerably weakened and embarrassed the diplomatic action of the Queen's government at a critical moment when peace or war may turn upon the incidents of an hour." Referring to this same subject, Mr. Trevelyan, M.P., addressing his constituents at Hawick, on the Eastern Question, said:

"It has not surely been forgotten that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, read from a piece of paper a reply, which doubtless had been carefully concocted, that the British Government would not give assistance towards carrying on the war, and would insist on it that no other Government should give assistance either. That answer was understood in the House of Commons to be a distinct threat to Russia; and that it was rightly so understood is shown by a dispatch of Lord Derby, dated July 1st, in which he appears to have repeated the substance of that answer in private conversation to the Russian Ambassador. I have no hesitation in saying that, before this strong feeling against Turkish barbarity was excited in Great Britain, it was the intention of the Government to use the influence, and if necessary the sword of Great Britain, to prevent Russia from giving assistance to Servia. That assistance has been given, largely, effectually, and undisguisedly; and I have no moral doubt whatever that, if this extraordinary outburst of feeling had not taken place, we should by this time have been engaged in the preliminaries of a contest with Russia, which, like all contests that for many years past have been fought against justice and freedom, could not have failed in the end to have been disastrous to this nation. From that immense and immeasurable calamity we have been preserved, not by the foresight of the Government, but the noble feeling of the people, who, without distinction of creed and party; have refused with one voice to be any longer made the instruments of keeping on the necks of their fellow creatures a tyranny that, beyond any recorded in European annals, is unmerciful, unrighteous and impure."

Mr. Bright referring to the same subject in a speech delivered at Manchester, said:

"They (the Government) have gone upon this theory—preserve Turkey as she is. If you can, suppress every rising, not by force of arms, but every rising shall be suppressed as quickly as possible by the Turk. Make peace somehow; put an end to these things which threaten to trouble the peace of Europe without much consideration to the condition and the interest of the populations that are most nearly affected. But whilst this was going on, there was another rising—and a very important one—a rising of the people of England. (Cheers.) The infernal cruelties that have been committed, and but a very small portion of which have been reported to us, these cruelties have opened our eyes and touched our hearts. There has been nothing like it, I believe, in this country since the time of the Reform Bill, when the Duke of Wellington was endeavouring to form an anti-reform movement. There has been no such demonstration against the policy of the Government as there has been within the last two months. Even a great many of our friends of the Established Church, who do not generally go with us—Archbishops and Bishops, dignitaries of the Church—have been as loud and as strong in their language as the most hearty Nonconformist Minister. (Hear, hear.) There is not a class that I know anywhere that has not spoken out upon this question. I say that the speeches made on this question have been admirable. Amongst them was the speech of Mr. Baxter at Montrose, and the speech of an hon. relative of mine at Huddersfield. (Hear.) From them one would expect admirable speeches on a question of this kind, and one might fear perhaps that they would be a little tinged with what would be called party views; but I found in the same paper a speech from the Marquis of Bath. I hope everybody here read it. It is an admirable speech. I have marked one or two paragraphs, and if you would allow me I would like to read them, because, coming from a peer of his high rank, not connected with our party, connected with the Government party, anxious, no doubt, to say little that could be offensive to his leader—I say that speech was remarkable, and the passages strike me as doing honour to his head and his heart. He says, 'The voice of England had declared that so far as she had the power to prevent them it should be impossible for such enormities to occur again. Parties of all shades of opinion and clergy of all denominations had especially distinguished themselves in the movement, and had by resolutions and memorials urged the Government to make a clear and explicit demand that Turkey should surrender all executive power in the disturbed provinces, and that freedom and self-government should be secured to the

Christians.' Well, then he says—'They had also a special duty'—that is England and the English people—from the liabilities they took upon themselves to protect the native Christians when they deprived them of Russian protection in 1856. Besides, it was not interference but non-interference that was required. The English Government had but to withdraw its countenance and its support from the Turks, and Russia would deal with the question and free its kindred races from Turkish despotism.' Then he says, 'As to opening the way to Russian aggression, he had such confidence in the strength of his country that he believed that if Russia were three times more powerful she could do England no harm. Of this he was certain, that if the alternative lay between leaving the provinces of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria at the mercy of the Turk, or letting Russia take them, let Russia have them, and God be with her.'"

EFFECTS ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Stansfield and other public men have spoken in the same way. Their utterances and the corresponding state of the public mind indicate the important effect which the Turkish misdeeds in Bulgaria have had on the political situation. It cannot be doubted that they have opened Russia's path more effectually than it was possible it could otherwise (humanly speaking) have been opened. The Russian people have been affected in the same way, and have hounded on their government to undertake the overthrow of the Turkish Empire which Gortschakoff did not contemplate attempting for some years to come.

THE PAST MONTH'S HISTORY OF EVENTS.

The history of events during the last month has been intensely interesting, and more interesting at the end than at the beginning. In the field of war operations, there has been nothing particularly noteworthy, except that after reaching a certain point, the Turkish invasion of Servia has been arrested and the Turkish army placed in danger through the skilful combinations of the Russian general Tcherniaeff. In Montenegro also the Turkish arms have experienced a series of reverses. The Turkish armies are also suffering from the

approach of winter. The Servians and Montenegrins are hardy races, accustomed to the cold, but the Turkish armies are largely composed of men from warm climates. To the present moment, the struggle has been a "drawn game;" the prospect is that it is about to be changed in its character in the most formidable manner.

It is in the diplomatic field where the principal events of interest have occurred. At the close of the first stage of the war, when the Servians had been driven from their first line of defences, the British representative at the Servian capital obtained the Servian consent to mediate with Turkey on the subject of peace. Britain asked Turkey for an armistice. Turkey replied she could not conclude an armistice with a rebel, but had no objections to a short suspension of hostilities at the request of Britain, for the discussion of terms of peace. A ten days' suspension of hostilities accordingly ensued on both sides. Then the Turkish conditions of peace were made known. Serbia was to give up certain fortresses to Turkish occupation. She was to pay the expenses of the war; and her Prince was to abdicate, and be re-invested at Constantinople, where he should come to do homage to the Sultan. These terms excited derision in Serbia, and the army responded by proclaiming Prince Milan King, and, therefore, independent of the Sultan altogether. Britain asked a prolongation of the suspension of hostilities for the fuller discussion of matters, but Serbia rejected the idea of any further negotiations, and renewed the war with the determination to conquer or be conquered. England then went to work again, and proposed and obtained the consent of the other powers to a scheme of reform for the Christian provinces, which, if Turkey should consent to it, they undertook to force on Serbia. This scheme proposed that the said provinces should govern themselves while remaining subject to the Porte. Coupled with the scheme was a request for a six weeks' armistice to give the scheme a chance of adoption as the basis of peace. It may be said, in passing, that this scheme was far in advance of anything England had ever asked before, and was the result of the storm of indignation roused by the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria. Would Turkey

accept of it, proposed as it was by the combined powers of Europe? This was the question to which all Europe breathlessly awaited the answer. The answer came in due course. Turkey said neither "Yes" nor "No;" she offered to grant reforms for the whole empire, the nature of which she specified, but which did not include self-government for any of the provinces; and as for the armistice, instead of six weeks, she proposed six months. At first, people were delighted with the answer—particularly the friends of the Disraeli Government; peace was now assured they thought, especially as five out of the six governments concerned immediately accepted the Turkish proposal. Ah! but that sixth, what would she say? Doubt on this point made people uneasy. Would Russia accept the Turkish proposal? They saw their comfort dashed to the ground when it was announced that Servia refused to accept a six months' armistice. Afterwards, as this announcement augured, it transpired that Russia rejected the Turkish proposals *in toto* as a mere evasion of the terms prescribed by that Power.

WHAT NEXT ?

This is best answered by the following significant announcement from London :

"War has not yet been formally declared between Russia and Turkey. That is the only sign of peace. To-day everything leads to the belief that the declaration will soon be made—but not by Russia. The responsibility of that awful proclamation she will throw upon Turkey, by simply forcing her to defend the way to Constantinople. The special telegrams which I have received to-day from Vienna, Berlin and Constantinople, besides my own private sources of information, leave hardly the slightest hope that the efforts of the really peaceable Cabinets can avert the long-dreaded conflict. Judging by the information before me, and which, I am sorry cannot be denied by those who know the exact positions in which the Powers stand, Russia has finally resolved upon war, and that in a short time we shall see her moving large bodies of men to accomplish her present purpose—the occupation of Bulgaria, which is but the prelude to the dismemberment, if possible, of the Ottoman Empire. Constantinople is the prize. A few days since it would have been said such a step meant war, not only with Turkey, but with Austria. It is now questioned whether the Emperor Francis Joseph will not consider it is much safer to act with his brother Alexander than against him. To put it plainly, it is

doubted whether the Austrian Emperor has not been "squared;" whether, having exhausted his efforts with other Powers to bring about a settlement, and having failed, he will not stand aside—a consideration being given him for so doing. Turkey, in that case, will have to fight Russia single-handed, unless her old ally consents to help her."

WAR AGAINST TURKEY RESOLVED ON BY RUSSIA.

On this, the *Scotsman* says: "The rumours which reach us from the Continent—and practically they are all the material available for forming an opinion—all point in one direction, and that is, to the resolution of Russia not to have peace made. More than that, one statement, as to the correctness of which there seems to be no doubt, distinctly states that Russia has made her arrangements for an act of war. A Bucharest telegram announces that a convention has been concluded between the Roumanian and Russian railway companies, by which Russian troops are to be carried at the order of the Russian Government across Roumania. Whatever may be the motive for the despatch of troops in that way, or rather, whatever may be the excuse for it, the result is the same—it can only be an act of war against Turkey. Nor is that all. Rightly or wrongly the impression prevails that an understanding has been arrived at between Russia and Austria, and that Russia is to occupy Turkish territory. If thereafter 'events should lead to the overthrow of the Ottoman Government,' says the report, Russia would yield to Austria 'such extension of territory as she might claim on the ground of her general as well as her commercial interests.' That is to say, Russia and Austria would divide the spoil. It is reported that Russia has played over again the game which Prince Bismarck played in 1866, and has concluded a secret treaty with Italy, according to which, if Austria were to go to war with Russia, Italy would attack her in the rear. Austria has suffered once severely from being placed in this way between the hammer and the anvil, and she may well be reluctant to invite further experiences of the kind. Therefore she may have come to an arrangement with Russia as the least of a choice of evils."

The *Edinburgh Evening News* says: "the march of events in the East, after a slight but delusive pause, has now become accelerated in an alarming manner. That circumstance which more than any other might have prevented Russia from declaring war on Turkey—the certain opposition of Austria—has, according to Continental rumours, not without authority, been removed by an alliance between the two Empires. The Powers would appear to breathe at present an atmosphere of secret treaties. One is supposed to exist already between Russia and Germany, which secures the neutrality of the latter State. Italy and Greece, it is thought, have come to a private understanding with Prince Gortschakoff; and now there is the news of this alliance, either impending or concluded, between Russia and Austro-Hungary. As reported from Vienna, Russian diplomacy stipulates for the non-interference of Austria with active measures against the Turkish empire, at least in their initial stage; in return for which she is promised 'extension of territory' should 'events lead to the overthrow of the Ottoman Government.' In other words, Russia is going to play the cut-purse, and bribes a jealous neighbour not to spoil the game. If the intelligence as to this Continental combination be correct, Turkey will have to face odds, which leave her in the long run and unassisted, no hope at all. From various significant facts, it would appear as if her enemies meant to lose no time. The Russian and Roumanian railways are said to have concluded a convention for the transport by the latter of 4,000 men daily, so that 60,000 Russians may be on the Bulgarian frontier before the beginning of November. The Cossacks are now pouring into Servia by thousands. The new Russian ironclad is to leave Cronstadt for the Mediterranean to-day. There are rumours of a forced Russian loan, such as was decreed before the Crimean War. These symptoms among many others, show that 'events' have begun to lead to Turkish overthrow; and 'events' set in motion by a coalition of Russia, Austria, Italy and Greece—all wanting a share, greater or less, in the plunder—would probably not be long in effecting the demolition of the Ottoman Empire."

"PERSIA WITH THEM."—(Ezekiel
xxxviii. 5.)

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* says: "Perhaps the most serious symptom of all is that Persia has been asked to join Russia in the attack upon Turkey. (In obedience to this summons, Persia is sending troops to her Turkish frontier.—*Times* Vienna telegram.) Between these two adjacent states, Persia and Turkey, there has long been a feud, and the former would be very glad of an opportunity of enlarging her borders at her neighbour's expense. That Russia should favour this project shows that she expects the war to cover a wide area. Likely enough Kars will have to stand another siege, but this time without a Fenwick Williams and a Humphrey Sandwith to defend it."

RUSSIA RESOLVES TO FINISH THE
EASTERN QUESTION.

The *St. Petersburg Golos* says: "All Europe is aware that Russia is resolutely and irrevocably determined to finish the Oriental Question, and thus remove a standing danger to peace and good relations between the Cabinets. In pursuing this object, Russia will shrink from nothing. This resolve constitutes her power."

ALARMING PROSPECT FOR EUROPE.

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* says: "I fear that the conflict will be one of extended area, and that several Powers will be involved in it. For some time past there have been increasingly intimate relations between the Courts of Rome and St. Petersburg, and now the Italian papers are declaring that if Austria obtains an increase of territory on the Danube, Italy will require one at the expense of Austria in Tyrol or Dalmatia. Greece, too, will look to get something out of the spoils. Germany will probably hold aloof, at all events at first, for Bismark cannot afford to plunge into a quarrel in the East when he has upon his Western frontier a Power so bitterly hostile as France. But if Italy gets embroiled, we must expect to see the Ultramontanes making a demonstration against Victor Emmanuel, and stirring up strife throughout his dominions. Altogether the prospect may well alarm even the boldest diplomatist."

HOW TURKEY LOOKS AT IT.

A Vienna telegram in the *Daily News* states that the Porte's refusal of the joint proposal of the Powers is due to the Porte's conviction that no concession would satisfy Russia. One Turkish Minister is said to have remarked "If we must lose three provinces, let it be by fighting. At any rate, don't let us be quartered alive."

CONSTANTINOPLE, Sep. 26th.

The anarchy in almost every part of the Empire still continues. It increases rather than diminishes. From all sides comes the same tale of lawlessness on the part of the Moslem resident population, the Bashi-Bazouks and the soldiers on the one side and absolute powerlessness on the part of the Government. Throughout Bulgaria terrorism reigns complete. Mr. Baring's report which, as I telegraphed four days ago, was sent from here a fortnight previously, will, probably, state that when he left that province, the unarmed Christians were at the mercy of the armed Moslem population, and that it would be impossible to restore order until the latter had been disarmed. But this Government, which has long since forgotten what little it ever knew of how to govern, except courage be given to it by positive orders from the Powers, simply dare not attempt to disarm the Moslem population and the rabble hordes which are now preying on the country.—*Daily News* correspondent.

BELGRAD#, Oct. 17th.

The Turks have made a very characteristic proclamation in Bosnia, relieving the inhabitants of that province of the taxes for this year and promising reductions for the next two years. The secret of this apparent benevolence is, that last spring, when the usual period for farming-out the taxes arrived, no one offered to undertake the business in consequence of the disturbed condition of the country. The Turks then seized six of the richest men in Serajevo, imprisoned them and gave them the choice of taking the contract for collecting the taxes of the province or of remaining in confinement. Naturally these men took the former alternative, and, with the assistance of their friends, they advanced the amount of the taxes demanded from Bosnia, expecting to recoup themselves from the collection of the taxes. The Turks having in this way secured the amount due to them, have now magnanimously relieved the inhabitants from paying their taxes, thereby leaving the parties in the lurch who advanced the money last spring.—(*Daily News* correspondent.)

Every day thus furnishes fresh proof of the statement made in the *Pictorial World*

of September 16th, an unusual statement for a secular paper, "The great Eastern oppressor is rotten at the core—the *Euphrates is most assuredly drying up.*"

PROSPECTS FOR ASIATIC TURKEY AND EGYPT.

The *Bombay Gazette* says: "Rumours wild and unfounded find a ready circulation over the dreary tracks of the Arabian desert, and the fiery Bedouins are little prone to consider their actions or act otherwise than on the spur of the moment. Should the Turkish Empire in Europe collapse, we shall probably see the Bedouins and Arabs of Arabia hastening to rid their country of its tyrannical masters, who, at present, are fast driving from its shores the little commerce that it still possesses."

An Indian newspaper, the *Pioneer*, publishes the following opinions, expressed in conversation by an "intelligent and well-informed Mohammedan gentleman," who said: "But, after all, Turkey cannot last very long. They have neither money nor good administration. They deposed Sultan Abdul Aziz and set up Murad, who is a fool; then they depose him, and Sultan Hamid seems hardly any better. And all this is done, not by the will of the Mussulman people, but by the caprice of a knot of viziers. Such an empire cannot stand, though they be victorious for the present. And since it must fall to pieces, England must annex Egypt for India's sake; but, besides this, some trustworthy Power must take charge of Constantinople, which is, by nature, a capital of the world (*dar-i-dunia.*) And there is no power so trustworthy, because so free from covetousness of territory, as our Empress (*hamuri Padishah.*)"

THE PROSPECT OF CHRIST'S RE-APPEARANCE.

The name of Christ and the probability of his coming, begin to be publicly mentioned in connection with these terrible complications. Mention is made of them in two ways, first, as a matter of expectation and desire, and, secondly, as a subject for ridicule. As a specimen of the first, altogether independently of the brethren, who everywhere, throughout the world (a little and very feeble flock it is true) are lifting up their heads in prospect of redemption drawing nigh, may be mentioned the published remarks of "the Rev." J. W. Bardsley, who, at Liverpool, as reported in the *Liverpool Daily Post*, stated at the close of a sermon, on October 8th, (on

the last verse of Obadiah—"the kingdom shall be the Lord's")—"that at the present moment throughout the synagogues of Europe, the Rabbis, in expounding the Scriptures, looked triumphantly to the events now occurring as leading up not only to their early return to Jerusalem, but to the extension of their sway over nearly the whole of Europe. We might be tempted to smile at this anticipation; but our feelings would be very different from one of amusement if we remembered for how long a period the Jews had no acquaintance with Christianity but by persecution, and how natural it was that they should regard Christendom as the modern Edom, and Rome as its chief city. Meanwhile Christians were divided in interpreting Obadiah—some confining the signification to the things spiritual, while others were for a double and some for a literal interpretation. Mr. Bardsley strongly asserted the positive political validity of the prophecy, and insisted that it was a necessity of Christian conviction, as well as a certainty of the world's future, that all unsolved questions should merge in one, and be settled in that actual reign of Christ of which the restoration of the Jews was to be one of the incidents. . . . From the course of present events we were to look for the hastening of the Saviour's coming, which alone would settle those problems which it was most significant to observe seemed to baffle the endeavours of our statesmen and warriors, despite the vastly increased resources at their command"

As a specimen of the other sort of allusion to the subject, we may quote the following extract from a letter by the London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury*: "I may mention that the Irvingites are just now expecting, or professing to expect, the immediate appearance of Christ. They have said pretty much the same thing as long as I can remember; but just now it is, they affirm, to be a matter not of years but of days, and will probably happen before the month is out. Prophecies of this sort are always abundant whenever there is a prospect of war. Directly the Grand Turk gets into trouble, the whole apparatus of horns and vials and trumpets and frogs is brought out, and timid people who have forgotten about the last conflict get their nerves worked upon until they go to bed

each night believing that the day of doom will come with the morrow's dawn. Now is the time for Dr. Cumming and all the rest of the rather shabby latter-day representatives of the schools of the prophets. Should there be another war between the Crescent and the Cross, we shall see a great demand for prophetic pamphlets, and experience has always shown that the demand is equalled by the supply."

This is, of course, the language of scoffing unbelief. "The whole apparatus of horns and vials and trumpets and frogs" in this style of talk, means a paraphernalia of fanaticism and imposture. It does not mean the method by which "The Lord God of the holy prophets" sent "to show unto His servants the things which must shortly be done."—(Rev. xxii. 6.) No man recognising the Apocalypse in its true character would allude to it in this flippant manner; and we would even venture to say that no man with even a moderate original acquaintance with the book and the facts related to it would be guilty of such a style of allusion. It is part of the public scoff to which the divine purposes have at all dispensational crises been subject. It is a scoff based upon ignorance and conceit, allied with cleverness in certain natural directions. It is a scoff which exposes the scoffer to terrible consequences; it is a scoff that will shortly be hushed in the presence of the Son of Man's declared re-appearance in the earth.

"Blessed is he that readeth and they who understand the word of the prophecy" contained in "the whole apparatus of horns, vials, &c." So the Spirit writes in Rev. i. 3. Into this position of understanding many in our day have been brought through the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas, now dead, but shortly to re-appear in the land of the living. What is the import of present events to this class? Will Christ appear with the overthrow of the Turkish Empire? If by his appearing, we understand that palpable manifestation of his presence which by a stroke destroys the power of the Russian Gog on the mountains of Israel (Ezek. xxxviii.), the answer is, Not necessarily, because it is not when Russia comes against Turkey, but when having overthrown Turkey, she attempts the conquest of Syria, in British occupation, that Christ appears on the scene as a man of war, to

inaugurate the war of the great day of God Almighty. Between the one event and the other, there must be an interval and that perhaps a considerable and possibly a peaceful one, in which Britain occupies Egypt and Syria, and the already-commenced Jewish colonization advances to the point of importance and success. Anyone may convince himself of this by a careful reading of Ezek. xxxviii. and Dan. xi. 40 to the end. But does it follow that those who are looking for Christ will have to wait the attempted conquest of Syria by Russia before they are called to meet him in judgment? Not necessarily. When Christ is manifested for the destruction of Gog at the crisis of that attempted conquest of the Holy Land, his brethren are with him, as those are well aware of who have considered the bearings of the following testimonies: Zech. xiv. 1-5; Joel iii. 1-11; Rev. xvii. 14; and others. They must, therefore, have joined him before that time. How long before is not revealed, but from the nature of things, it must be some time. The purpose of the preliminary meeting is for judgment, and the number to be judged is great, comprising the responsible dead as well as the living; and the judgment is to be an individual one, though judgment may by the power of the Spirit, be at once simultaneous and individual as our prayers and their answers are dealt in detail to many individuals simultaneously. Then, after judgment and the separation of the multitude of the rejected, there may be a honeymoon, so to speak, a season of mutual rejoicing and intercourse between Christ and his brethren, before they proceed to the work of demolishing the great image of human power politically incorporated. The conclusion is that we need not wait for the full colonization of Judea before we look for the Lord. The Lord has given us to understand (Rev. xvi. 15.) that he comes when the events of the sixth vial are accomplished, and before the Armageddon gathering. Now those events are nearly accomplished and on the point of becoming wholly so. The political frogs have done their work, and the political Euphrates is at the last point of exhaustion, which is in fact the cause of the present movement. When Turkey is overthrown the signs of the sixth vial are ended, and the thief-like coming of the Lord becomes the

event of any hour. Consequently, the prospect of the immediate overthrow of the Turk by the Russian power is very stimu-

lating to those who have been for many years "watching and keeping their garments."

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The following persons have been obedient to the faith during the month: Sept. 21st, **WILLIAM INNES CAMPBELL** (68), sealstone engraver, formerly Independent; also **ESTHER CAMPBELL** (71), wife of the same. Sept. 23rd.—**GEORGE WAGSTAFF** (31), baker, husband of sister Wagstaff of Evesham. Sept. 28th.—**WILLIAM BURNS** (37), nut and bolt maker, formerly neutral. October 19th.—**ROBERT TRUSSLER** (37), herald chaser, formerly neutral, and his wife **FANNY TRUSSLER** (29), formerly Roman Catholic.

The annual meeting was held Oct. 5th, at which the usual appointments of serving brethren by ballot were declared. Sister **Turney** was elected superintendent of the Sunday School, by 124 to 34. On the same occasion, the following persons were withdrawn from, after long and ineffectual attempts to induce obedience to the commandment to forsake not the assembling of ourselves together:—Brethren **George Robins**, **Joseph Kirkbride** and **Edward Hall**. The elder of the two young brethren **Mawson**, sent in his resignation after having been waited upon as to a prolonged absence from the table. Brother **James Murcourt** also resigned, alleging unworthiness to fellowship the brethren. The resignations were accepted in sorrow.

The subjects and speakers at the Sunday evening meetings have been as follow: Oct. 1st: The heaven that Lucifer fell out of, and the hell he fell into; being the hell and the heaven common to many other parts of Scripture.—(Br. Hodgkinson.) Oct. 8th.—The Soul.—(Brother Hadley.) Oct. 15th.—Coming Changes.—(Brother Shuttleworth.) Oct. 22nd.—Russia and Turkey; prophetic outline of the declension of the Turkish power, and its entire suppression by Russia. Impending European crisis: Bible solution of the Eastern and Western question.—(Bro. Meakin.)

BRIERLEY HILL.—Brother **Dawes** reports: "I have much pleasure in informing you that my youngest daughter **GRACE** (17), was immersed into the all-saving name, on the 20th day of August, which makes six of my children who are now striving to be accepted for an inheritance in the kingdom when the Lord shall come to set it up."

BRISTOL.—Brother **Cort** reports three additions to the Bristol ecclesia by the obedience of the following, on Sept. 17th, **MRS. LOWE**, formerly neutral, (daughter in law to sister **Hawkins** of Frome); on Sept. 24th, **GEORGE BAKER**, formerly Baptist,

one of the earliest enquirers in Bristol; on Oct. 9th, **MRS. BELLAMY**, formerly Church of England (wife of our brother **Bellamy**). "The lectures were not well attended at first, but through the liberality of a sister who was visiting here, we had the city well posted with large posters, which had the effect of bringing an average attendance of about 200. Many appear to be interested, and many shew opposition. In fact the truth is making a great stir now in the city."

DONCASTER.—See Rock Ferry.

EDINBURGH.—Bro. **Grant** reports: "Since my last communication lectures have been: August 13th.—The Times of the Gentiles. August 20th.—The Second Appearing of Christ the Christian's Hope. August 27th.—The Serpent's Lie: who affirms its truth in the present day? September 3rd.—Christ as Son of God and Son of Man. September 10th.—Christ made of God unto Believers Redemption. September 17th.—The Jews: their dispersion and ingathering. September 24th.—Is the Christian's Hope realized at death? October 1st.—Believers as sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty. October 8th.—Turkey a symbol in prophecy: her state showing the end of Gentile times."—All these lectures have been well attended, and especially the last, on which occasion our little hall was crowded. In a much larger hall, viz., the Literary Institute, seated for over 1000 persons, bro. **Roberts**, of Birmingham, has this month delivered a course of four lectures, entitled 'The Things that are Coming.' The first lecture was on the Eastern Question, and on that occasion (Sunday Oct. 15th) the hall was crowded in every part and many unable to gain admission. The object of the lecture was to show the meaning of the Eastern Question from a Bible point of view, and that its final settlement would only be effected by the re-appearing of Christ and the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Israel. The other lectures (2, Prophecy; 3, State Christianity; 4, Christ and the Narrow Way), were fairly attended. We thus do our part by sowing and watering the seed, while we leave the results to Him who alone can give the increase, and to whom will be all the praise and glory."

GLASGOW.—Brother **John O'Neill**, who was lately ensnared by the Renunciationist heresy and separated from the brethren for awhile, writes: "I have made known to the brethren in George Street, my intention to come back, and of my regret and sorrow for what I have done. I have every reason for

hope that they will take me into their fellowship (which they have since done.—Ed.) from the kindness I met with from all at their meeting yesterday. Indeed, bro. Roberts, I have never had that peace and joy in the belief of the truth since I left them as I had before, but how could I when I renounced the truth itself? I was so cajoled and persuaded by Ellis that I did not see the deception with the many fair appearances that are coated over it, and as I said to Turney and Farmer it only requires one to be in it to see it in all its deformity. This, thank God, I have seen and by His aid have been able to cast it behind me as a thing in which there is no profit. Bro. A. Andrew's articles in the August and September *Christadelphian* have been of immense benefit to me, for which I thanked him. I have thrown up all connection with the error, and I have written to E.T., asking him as a favour to make my change of mind known through the same channel as made my Renunciation of the truth so triumphantly known, but I don't anticipate compliance with my desire (We are informed that compliance has been refused. Ed.) I have written to Farmer telling him my opinion of the *Christian Lamp* and his advocacy of Dowieism, and garbage from the writings of the apostasy. I have received a note from him, telling me I am too severe on E.T., regarding (his treatment of) you, but he says, 'I admit there were strong personal feelings on both sides.'

There were no personal feelings on our side whatever. We loved Edward Turney, as we do still from certain points of view. Our refusal of his "complimentary" chairmanship at Kettering, and the subsequent and consequent disclosure of our sentiments regarding his relation to the practical precepts of Christ, were a mere washing of our hands in the sight of Christ of a complicity with wrong practical teaching, the burdensomeness of which on our conscience had been growing for years. Afterwards, we did all we could to heal the breach, even to the point of submitting to the humiliation of a written retraction, and were striving by increased co-operation to remove all soreness or misapprehension of our objects—when it turned out that the truce was broken without our knowing anything about it, and that the means to which we stooped for the sake of peace were being privately made use of to destroy our influence with the brethren, and finally an attempt to subvert the truth itself. But thanks be to God, the machination, successful for a time, has proved a failure; yea, has tended to the furtherance and consolidation of the truth in its highest aspects,

and has left us unhurt in the eyes of those who can discern. It would be a cause of rejoicing if even now at the eleventh hour, these erring brethren retraced their steps. We can assure them (and many of them must be convinced of it in their own hearts) that we have no personal grudge or malice against any, and that if we have stood entirely aloof, and shewn an uncompromising hostility to their proceedings, it is because of what duty to the truth of God in this dark day requires at our hands. God grant them a recovery from the snare into which they have fallen.—EDITOR.

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Bro. Diboll, junior, writes: "Since my last communication addresses have been delivered as follows:—September 17th.—The Restoration of Israel.—(Bro. T. H. Boshier, of London.) Sep. 24th.—The Mortality of Man.—(Brother J. W. Diboll.) October 1st.—The World that now is and the World that is to Come.—(Brother J. W. Diboll, junior.) October 8th.—God's ways and man's ways.—(Bro. D. Spinney.)"

LEEDS.—Brother W. H. Andrew writes: "I have to announce the addition of two to our numbers, viz., bro. Peacock and bro. Pickles, whose immersion was announced in the September number of the *Christadelphian*. Subjects of lectures have been as follow: October 1st.—The Promises and the True Hope. October 8th.—The Devil. October 15th.—The Restitution. October 22nd.—The Manifestation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to destroy the devil and his works."

LEICESTER.—Brother Burton reports: Sister Waite, the death of whose husband was reported in the Birmingham intelligence in the *Christadelphian*, has returned to Leicester. On Thursday October 5th, we held our usual quarterly tea meeting, one of the largest gatherings of that kind we have had in Leicester, nearly all the brethren and sisters, with the addition of a few strangers being present. The general thought that the Master is at the door, seemed to be felt by all the brethren who spoke to us, and the words that fell from their lips were indeed words of faithful exhortation. Brother Phillips, of Birmingham, who was passing through the town, was with us and gave us an interesting address upon the Sign of the Son of Man, which may be clearly seen in the political heaven of Europe. On the next day, Friday, the children of the Sunday school, who number upwards of forty, had their annual tea meeting. A magic lantern consisting chiefly of views of Scripture and natural history, had been provided for their instruction."

LONDON.—Brother Elliot reports: "The particulars of the following immersions,

owing to an oversight, have not previously been forwarded for insertion in the *Christadelphian*, viz: July 19, Mrs LUCAS, wife of bro. Lucas. August 20, HENRY PILE, formerly Baptist. The following are the subjects of the lectures for October, at 69, Upper Street, Islington. Oct. 1st.—Salvation is of the Jews.—John iv. 22.—(Brother A. Andrew.) Oct. 8th.—The Turkish Atrocities; their connection with the Revealed Destinies of England, Russia and Turkey.—(Brother J. J. Andrew.) Oct. 15th.—The Wise Men from the East, (Matt. ii. 2.) and what they said.—(Brother Thomas Bosher.) Oct. 22nd.—(Adam as the Head of a Fallen Race, and the Type of its Redeemer.—(Brother J. J. Andrew.) October 29th.—The Occupation of the Redeemed in the World to Come.—(Brother A. Andrew.)

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland writes October 13th, "I have pleasure in reporting the obedience of JANE KING (of North Street Hill, Hucknall Torkard), sister in the flesh to bro. King, of Codnor Park. She was immersed into the sin-covering name on September 15th, after an intelligent confession of the things to be believed before obedience. She will be numbered with the brethren at Codnor Park; Also SARAH ELIZABETH ASHTON (32), who was assisted to put on Christ by immersion on Oct. 2nd. She is a nurse in the Middlesex Hospital, London, and sister in the flesh to sister Kerry, of Nottingham. She is now on a visit to her friends here, and on returning to the Hospital, will join the brethren in London. We have also during the month received two sisters who were left at the synagogue at the time of division, viz., MARY ANN PEEL, wife of bro. Peel, and LOUIZA ANN PEEL, mother of bro. Peel. They now and for some time past have been satisfied we teach the truth concerning Christ, and were anxious to be in fellowship with us. We have also another addition by immersion: WILLIAM LEVERTON (61), outler, 23 and 25, Red Lion Square, Nottingham. He was baptized into Christ October 5th, formerly neutral. We continue to have good attendance at our Sunday evening lectures: others are interested."

RIPLEY.—Brother King writes of the obedience of his wife, of which there are particulars in the Nottingham intelligence.

ROCK FERRY.—Brother Ashcroft writes, Sep. 17th, "On Friday Evening, we were cheered with the obedience of JOSEPH PEET (52), commercial traveller, formerly Wesleyan; and this (Sunday) Evening, JOSEPH PAINE, mechanic, (about 32); also formerly Wesleyan, put on the sin-covering name in our bath room. The two immersions occurred in the presence of brethren, and were preceded by clear acknowledgment of the truth as apostolically delivered. Brother Peet has gone to reside at Doncaster, and hopes to have fellowship in the truth there. Brother

Paine has displayed great sympathy with the brethren in their beliefs, for some time past, and felt that he could no longer delay the required obedience. We hope that these brethren will adorn their profession, and that they will find acceptance at the judgment-seat of Christ. We need the encouragement which these additions afford, for we are compelled to withdraw from brother Gee for disorderly walk, which has brought much reproach upon our feeble ecclesia. It is indeed, a day of darkness for us now; but we accept our position with joy, and are thankful for the opportunity of suffering for his name. Sister Ashcroft's growing devotion to the truth and all that it involves, occasions me much praise and gratitude. Our daily readings, according to the *Bible Companion*, prove very refreshing to us, and we are sensible of thus being transformed by the renewing of our minds. Your visit was full of inspiration and strength to us—quite a green and shady spot in this dry and thirsty land. When too late, I discovered that I had not restored the *Dr.'s Life* to your possession. I send it now by post, with great gratitude for the loan of so inestimable a treasure. I remember also that I failed to send you the cost of its postage to me. This oversight is remedied herewith. I thank God continually that in His Providence I have been placed in the line of these divine communications. Truly the Dr. might have used Paul's words, 'As poor yet making many rich?'"

SWANSEA.—Brother Randles reports: "We have much pleasure in announcing the obedience of three sisters, who were immersed into the sin-covering name on the 14th instant. The immersion took place in the Swansea Bay. Their names are as follow: ELIZABETH CUMMINGS (46), ANNIE KERSHAW (30), sister in the flesh to bro. Randles and formerly neutral, and MARY JANE LOWE (28), daughter of bro. Lowe, also neutral. The latter is a source of great joy to bro. Lowe, she being the first in his family to yield obedience to the truth. We omitted last month to include brother Rawlings in our number, and to state that brother Johnson, formerly of Birmingham, is again amongst us by removal from Llanelly. We have been much cheered by a visit from bro. Shuttleworth, on Sunday October 1st. In the morning we had a very profitable season and were much refreshed and comforted by the words of exhortation which he spoke, and in the evening he delivered a discourse on the Glorious Gospel, &c., to a large and appreciative audience."—Brother Messenger and brother Goldie wish it stated that they and those with them have no sympathy with Renunciatism, No-willism, or Trine-immersionism, as the intelligence last month would seem to imply.—ED.

STOCKPORT.—Brother G. Waite reports the obedience of MISS ANN WRIGHT (34), formerly of the Church of England, who put on the saving-name in the appointed way on September 10th.

TAUNTON.—Bro. Veysey reports: During the month Mrs. MOGRIDGE, a widow, about 40, formerly a Baptist, has been added to the number of "called-out ones." Others are anxiously attending the meetings.

WHITBY.—Brother Clegg reports that the brethren have withdrawn from sister Fowler.

AUSTRALIA.

WANDILLIGONG.—Brother W. F. Kirk announces the obedience of J. H. NEARN (34), formerly Church of England, a devout man, well read in the Scriptures, who, after reading the *Twelve Lectures* and other books, exclaimed, "I wonder I could not see this before! I am so glad I have found the truth. Truly darkness covers the earth and gross darkness the people." Ten days after his immersion, his wife, SARAH HEARN (24), followed his example. Brother Kirk says: "Two years ago, I was alone, but thanks to our heavenly Father, we now number four. We assemble every first day of the week to break bread in remembrance of our departed Lord, who will shortly come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

CANADA.

COBURG.—Brother McNellie states that brother Wright of this place, after being alone for several years has now the fellowship of brother and sister Mickleboro', lately removed from Toronto.

PETERBORO'.—Brother McNellie, of Port Granby, writes: "In the *Christadelphian* for March, 1876, you will remember a notice through brother C. H. Evans, of certain parties at Peterborough, who had attained to a knowledge of the truth, and were anxious for immersion. On seeing that notice and request, I immediately wrote to the person mentioned, Mr. C. Morrison, and found him anxious, but afraid to take the final step at that time. After some correspondence with brother C. H. Evans, he expressed his desire for baptism, being afraid to delay longer. In consequence brother Wright, of Coburg, and I visited Peterborough, on Saturday, the 16th inst., and to our gratification, found Mr. Morrison earnest and intelligent. He has been a student in the right direction for about three years, and has made very satisfactory progress. On the following day he was immersed into the saving-name to his great joy. He will be alone in Peterborough, but has the sympathy of a few

inquirers, some of whom are considerably advanced in Bible knowledge, others just beginning to look into the 'strange doctrines.' Peterborough, a place of about six thousand inhabitants, is beautifully situated on the Otonah river, with much business for its size, in timber, flour, and several branches of manufacture."

WALKERTON.—Brother W. Gunn writes: "I have much pleasure in informing you that on the 26th day of June last, we again met at the 'bend' in the river Sangeen, in this town, for the purpose of assisting Mrs. JANE KILMER, wife of Mr. Edward Kilmer, of this place, merchant, to put on the sin-covering name, by being on a profession of her faith, buried with Christ in baptism; bro. Ussher assisted in the water. Sister Kilmer formerly belonged to the Church of England, of which she was an active member, although for some time past dissatisfied with the teaching of that Church and orthodoxy in general, in relation to the doctrine of life and immortality and other important doctrines of Scripture. In common with many others, sister Kilmer has had to contend with many difficulties, but the power of the Gospel and an intelligent appreciation of the truth, have carried her through, so far, triumphantly. We also met on the 23rd of September inst., for the purpose of assisting in the induction into the same all-glorious name, MISS ANNIE YOUNG (57), spinster, sister in the flesh to sister McCarter of this place, and aunt to brother James Young of Dundee; and Mrs. CATHERINE MARY USSHER (30), wife of brother Dr. Ussher. Both these sisters formerly belonged to the Presbyterian Church, sister Young being Scotch, after the strictest manner of the sect, sister Ussher a Canadian, after the more moderate manner of American Presbyterian. In both cases the Gospel has proved to be the power of God, to the pulling down of strongholds, the overthrow, so far as they are concerned, of tradition, and the putting-off of this figment of the apostacy, with the body of the sins of the flesh, in the washing of water by the Word. Brother Drake, of Doon, whose business leads him to travel much, just reports a desire on the part of divers enquirers in the northern part of our county, for a visit from some of us, before the snow sets in. So you see that we are encouraged in the path of duty, in the midst of very great and most unreasonable opposition and clamour."

At the last moment, we are obliged to hold over till next month, intelligence from New Zealand: Caversham, Dunedin. United States: Carrol, Lanesville.

The Christadelphian.

He (Jesus) that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (Father): for which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN."—(Heb. ii. 11.)

"For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of THE SONS OF GOD."—(Rom. viii. 19.)

No. 150.

DECEMBER, 1876.

Vol. XIII.

BAPTISM IN RELATION TO JUSTIFICATION.

DR. THOMAS'S TEACHING ASSAILED BY A RELIGIOUS PERIODICAL, AND
DEFENDED BY HIMSELF.

THE *Bible Examiner* of July 1853, contained the following article:

"At a Convention held at Rochester, N.Y., in June, the *Advent Harbinger* reports Dr. John Thomas as having said: 'A man may *believe the truth with all his heart* for twenty years, and yet not be justified—*Baptism is essential to this—this is the law of justification*; we are immersed into the name of Jesus Christ.' We have italicised that part of the remarks which we denominate a *bold assumption*. The Bible teaches, in no equivocal terms, that the 'law of justification' is *faith*. 'That He [God] might be just, and the *justifier* of him which *believeth* in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It was excluded. By what law? Of works? *Nay*: but by *the law of faith*.'—(Rom. iii. 26, 27.) 'Seeing it is one God, which shall *justify* the circumcision *by faith*, and uncircumcision *through faith*' (v. 30), 'Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.'—(Rom. v. 1.) But it is needless to multiply texts of Scripture on this point; nothing is taught more distinctly than that 'the law of justification' is '*faith*.' To affirm that

'baptism is the law of justification,' and that 'a man may believe *the truth with all his heart* for twenty years,' or one year, or one hour, and yet not be justified, we regard as unscriptural and a daring assumption. The question *is not* whether he can *continue* justified unless he is afterwards baptised; that may be true; and it is equally true that he cannot continue justified if he *knowingly* disobeys God in any of His commands: but that 'baptism is *essential*,' (i.e., that without it it is impossible) to 'be justified, is neither scriptural nor rational; and such an assumption we regard as the very *highest* development of *sectarianism*. We express our opinion of the sentiment distinctly, that none need be in doubt as to our position on that question. If men wish to establish a *bitter and persecuting sect*, the sentiment we have animadverted upon is the very best they can start with. We are determined to have no strife with those who hold and promulgate such sentiments; we have borne our testimony against it, and thus discharged what we believed was a duty."—*Bible Examiner* for July, 1853.

DR. THOMAS'S ANSWER.

Friend Storrs is right—"The Bible teaches in no equivocal terms, that 'the law of justification' is faith." I affirm nothing else, and am glad to see that in these words "faith" stands in the sentence for "*the law of faith*;" for the phrase "the law of justification is faith," can have no other import than, "the law of justification is the law of faith." This is evidently Mr. Storrs' sense of his words; for he quotes Paul to show that justification is by "the law of faith," and not by "the law of works."

But *what is law?* While Mr. Storrs defines the law of justification to be the law of faith, he has not favoured us with the sense in which he uses the word "*law*." We are left to guess this. Man's self-glorification, or boasting, in the affair of justification, is not excluded by the law of works, though it is by the law of faith. This idea he reproduces from Paul, as excluding all idea of justification being consequent on baptism; because baptism with him belongs to the category of "works." He has not been immersed himself; yet he regards himself as "justified by faith." We may take his practice therefore as a definition of his sense of the phrase "law of faith" and also of "law," in default of a verbal explanation. Defined by his practice, then, "law," in the New Testament acceptance of the word, is *conviction that what is written is true*. Hence law, belief, and faith, are words expressive of the same thing. The "law of faith" is convertible upon this hypothesis into the phrases "the faith of faith," "the belief of faith," "the law of law" &c.; which may all be very intelligible and significative to Mr. Storrs, but to myself who am unusually dull, and perhaps stupid just now, they are mere tautologies without meaning. The faith of justification is faith; or the law of justification is law! I cannot understand this. A law which interdicts, produces, or requires no definite or specified bodily action, is a curiosity. An involuntary assent of the mind a law! There must be something wrong in Mr. Storrs' theology to admit this; for what is nonsensical cannot be according to truth.

“Law” in Hebrew, Greek, and English, is a *rule or standard of acting*. It was applied to the Mosaic Code, which was the ecclesiastical, civil, and social rule according to which the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and the strangers among them were to regulate their actions as tenant-at-will occupants of the Holy Land. The *obedience* rendered to this law was called “*works*,” of which immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit was never one. The *law of works*, was the Mosaic Law, and is that to which the apostle refers in Romans, and which Mr. Storrs does not perceive, or he would not number baptism among works of law. If a man were justified by keeping the burdensome ritual of Moses (which none but Jesus ever did, and even he was cursed by that law because of hanging on a tree,) he would have something to boast of; but in being baptised, which baptism belongs to the law of faith, there is no scope for self-glorification, or boasting; for a man does not baptise himself; but is passive, being baptised of another, which to the subject is no “work” at all—no more than the burial of a corpse is the work of the deceased. “We are buried with Christ by baptism into death” to sin, “that we should walk in newness of life.”

Law, then, implies regulated action, or obedience. *Law of faith* defines the subjects of the law or rule, that is, *believers*. This law exacts obedience only from believers; none others however willing can obey it; for it is only believers who can render *obedience of faith*. An unbeliever may perform the act prescribed by a law of faith, but he has not therefore yielded obedience in the sense of the law; because his performance has not resulted from faith in the things propounded for his belief.

“*The law of faith*” is a phrase which denotes some particular rule, conformity to which is styled “*obedience of faith*.” “The law of works” exacted obedience from all Israelites, whether they had faith in the things covenanted to Abraham or not; “the law of faith” is “THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM,” which by the commandments of the everlasting God was made known to all nations “*for the obedience of faith*.”—(Rom. xvi. 26.) That is, the gospel of the Kingdom was made known to the nations that it might be obeyed; hence, says Peter, “what shall be the end of them that *obey not the gospel of God*?”—who believing the gospel become not the subjects of the obedience of faith? They shall be punished, cried Paul, with everlasting destruction issuing forth from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.—(Dan. vii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.)

The law of faith, then, and the gospel of the kingdom, are synonymous; and the obedience of faith and the obedience of the gospel, also signifies the same thing. I do not mean to say that “gospel” and “law” signify the same thing; but that the gospel comprehending the law of faith, is by synecdoche put for the law. Gospel is glad tidings; and it is a part of that good news that those who believe the things covenanted to Abraham and David by rendering obedience to a certain law, may become joint-heirs with Jesus of what God had promised to these ancients. If the gospel contained no law, believers could render no obedience; but as there is a law connected with it, obedience is of necessity demanded, and indispensable.

If it be required, “What is the gospel law?”—I reply, read Acts x. 48, where it is written, “And Peter *commanded* them to be baptised in

the name of the Lord." His command expressed to the Gentiles—yea, even to Gentiles not below Mr. Storrs in piety—"what they ought to do"—τι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν—*what it is necessary that thou do.*—(ver. 6.) There is no avoiding this necessity with impunity. If obedience to this command were not imperative, the Angel would not have said to Cornelius "*it is necessary.*" It was made necessary by the Divine will, to which friend Storrs has not yet learned submission as a little child. "Repentance unto life," and remission of sins, are "granted" to believers of the gospel of the kingdom "*through the name*" of Jesus as an Anointed One; to which name there is no access but through obedience to Peter's command. I say *Peter's command*, which in this matter is identical with that of Jesus Christ's and the Father's: for it was not Peter, but the Spirit of the Father in him which spoke.—(Matt. x. 20, 40.) The Keys of the kingdom of the heavens were committed to him, with the assurance that what he should do in relation to it should be ratified in the heavens.—(Matt. xvi. 19.) These testimonies secure for Peter's command the authority of his Lord, and exhibit it as the law of the gospel to be obeyed.

I repeat that "a man may believe the truth with all his heart," not "for twenty years" only, but all his life, "and yet not be justified," if he submit not to Peter's command. It is hardly supposable that a man would believe with all his heart "*the truth*," and not obey it; for where a sincere believer lives in disobedience, it is no "bold assumption" to say that, granting his sincerity, his knowledge of that truth is not enough to save him. An enlightened man whose faith works by love and purifies his heart, needs no exhortation to obey Peter's command. All he desires is to know what that command is, and to do it heartily, readily, and gladly. What I have said that is deemed by friend Storrs so bold an assumption, is this—that *no believer is justified in disobedience*. So long as he refuses to do what Peter commanded the benevolent and devout Cornelius and his house to do, so long he is in disobedience, in a state of rebellion, an unpardoned insurgent against Israel's King. Friend Storrs may think this severe. But what have I to do with that? I have to do with the truth, testimony, and fact, and not with the severity of their pressure on the rebellious. If he would take off the edge of the word with respect to himself, let him do as Cornelius did, and he will be astonished how mild the severity will become; how "bold" indeed, but unassuming is the truth even in the hands of babes.

But if Mr. Storrs is determined to justify himself in disobedience, let him point a single case of such a justification subsequently to the ascension of Jesus. Let him answer this, Was Paul in his sins, or purified from his sins, before he was baptized? I repeat, friend Storrs has not been baptized, yet he says he is a Christian, a justified man, a saint. Judging then from his position with which, I suppose, he is satisfied, he can only answer the question by saying, "my own position indicates my reply"—Paul was not in his sins though unbaptized! This reply then is irrational, which friend Storrs will not admit. According to his position it is most reasonable; to maintain which, is to charge Ananias with speaking nonsense. He said, "Brother Saul arise, and be

baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Had Mr. Storrs been in Saul's place, he would have exclaimed (supposing he had no more light than at this present) "Brother Ananias, what bold assumption! Do I not believe with all my heart, and have I not been praying to Jesus for three days past? How sayest thou then, 'be baptized and wash away thy sins;' am I not already 'justified by faith' and at peace with God? Ananias, my friend, what is thine ambition? Desirest thou to establish a bitter and persecuting sect, that thou comest to me, a believer in Jesus, with an exhortation to wash away my sins in baptism. I am a hearty and firm believer of three days old, and to affirm or insinuate that a man may believe the truth with all his heart one year, or one hour, and yet not be justified, or have sins to wash away, is an unscriptural and daring assumption. I have determined to have no strife with thee, Ananias, but have just borne my testimony against your sentiment, and so discharged what I believe to be my duty."

Poor brother Ananias, how blank he would have looked had "the chief of sinners" replied to his exhortation in the words of our friend Storrs' article and position! But Saul had become like a little child, and meekly arose, and obeyed the truth. He was well skilled in all the questions and customs of the Jews, and when convinced that Jesus was the Christ and that he was alive for evermore, he acknowledged him as the Son of David and of God, covenanted to Israel for their redemption out of the hand of all their enemies. His dogmatism was exploded and his exceeding madness totally subdued, so that at last he was dispossessed and clothed in his right mind. It takes "the unadulterated milk of the word" to develop these results. When friend Storrs shall come to feed upon this congenial, unirritating, and growth-promoting diet, he will no doubt become more like Paul. The Gentiles have very proud hearts, and are puffed up by theologies whose dogmas are nowhere found in Scripture. Methodism is a form of Gentilism but little promotive of a Saul-like or God-like disposition. When friend Storrs purges himself from this by a childlike study of the Word, how sorry he will be for having written such vain words as are now before the reader. He will then see our "bold and daring assumption" in another and more favourable light; at present we must bear with his Gentile manner of discharging his duty and bearing his testimony. I wish him deliverance from bondage, and trust that ere long he may be found in his right mind, like Paul, and zealously preaching the faith which now he would willingly and effectually destroy.

The Editor of the *Harbinger* has truly said that Mr. Storrs has misrepresented my saying in the short extract of his brief report of my discourse at Rochester. I neither said, nor intended to say that "baptism is the law of justification." I never uttered such nonsense. Baptism is not a law, but an action commanded to be submitted to by believers of the gospel of the kingdom, and by none else. It is *the act by which the obedience of faith is rendered*. Baptism is essential to justification by the law of faith; for without baptism a believer cannot obey the gospel, because the immersion of a true believer is the obedience of the gospel. Till that action is intelligently submitted to, a believer is to that same

instant in his sins, or unjustified, which is the same thing. Justification by faith is through the name of Jesus; and immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, is *the act of union* to that name. It is the only formality, rite, or ceremony by which a believer of the gospel of the kingdom can be married to the name of the Lord Jesus. If such a believer refuse to be thus united to his name, in so doing he refuses repentance, remission of sins, and eternal life through that name, for these blessings come to the justified by faith only through his name. A believer is no more united to Christ's name without true baptism than a woman is united to the name of a man without the legal marriage ceremony. This simple rite gives her a share in all that pertains to her husband's name, be they riches, or honor, or both; so after a like manner does baptism into the name of the Lord give the true believer all spiritual blessings communicable through His name, and a title to share with him in his glory.

If it be asked, then, "At what instant is a believer of the gospel of the kingdom justified by faith in the kingdom and name?"—the answer is in the words of Peter, "Having purified your souls *εν τη υπακοη της αληθειας δια πνευματος* in the obeying of the truth through the Spirit," which is synonymous with *in the being baptized*, in the being united to the name, &c. When a believer goes into the water, he becomes passive in the hands of the administrator, who pronounces the formula divinely prescribed, and having ended them, he buries them in the watery grave, from which he raises him to walk in newness of life. In being buried in the water, his renewedness of heart is granted to him for repentance, and his belief of the promise made to the fathers, and in Jesus as Lord and Christ, is counted to him for righteousness or remission of sins; for he is then introduced into the name of Christ, through which name repentance and remission of sins are conveyed to him. An unimmersed believer is not united to the name; he is therefore *not in it*, but exterior to it; and can no more have the things contained in the name, than a man can have access to things in a house when he is in the street without its door.

Baptism, then, is essential to justification. This is both scriptural and rational, friend Storrs to the contrary notwithstanding. "*Baptism saves us*," says Peter, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, as Noah and his family were saved by water by the resurrection of the earth." This testimony sufficiently establishes the scripturality of baptism being essential to salvation from all past sins, which being remitted in Jesus' name, the believer is transferred from under a sentence of death to a sentence of life; for "the wages of sin is death," but sin being forgiven and obeyed no more, the penalty is abolished, and the sins and iniquities remembered no more.

The essentiality of baptism, or the obedience of faith to justification of life, is also rational as well as scriptural. What more reasonable than that as condemnation to death was incurred by *the disobedience of unbelief*, so deliverance from that condemnation or justification of life, should be consequent upon the opposite, which is *the obedience of faith*? The simplicity of the action is no argument against its essentiality. No action can be more simple than the stretching forth of the hand, and plucking fruit from a tree. It is more simple or easily performed than baptism.

It was a little thing in itself to pluck ; but that plucking was expressive of unbelief of God's word ; and behold in the world's history, the awful consequences that have ensued. It is indeed no great thing in itself to be dipped ; but then that dipping is expressive of faith in what God has promised. The wonderful results of this simple act of faith will be fully manifested in the age to come. All God's institutions are simple, but potent and effectual ; and essential to the end proposed. Friend Storrs would probably march up to the cannon's mouth for justification, if ordered of God. This would be a great thing to boast of. But God has laid no such burden upon him, but on the supposition that he believed the truth, he says to him, " Wash and be clean." If the washing of Peter's feet, who had been baptized of John, was essential to his having part with Jesus, how much more scriptural, rational, and necessary, that the unwashed, and therefore unclean, Mr. Storrs, should be bathed from head to heel, that he may have part and lot with the Lord. Let friend Storrs ponder on this. If Jesus would make no exception in Peter's case, Mr. Storrs has no right to presume.

I have heard that Mr. Storrs has expressed his willingness to be immersed to please his friends, but that he considers it unnecessary. This is certainly a very accommodating disposition ! But Mr. Storrs should remember that " what is not of faith is sin." He has no right to trifle with God's institution to maintain his popularity with those who believe in the essentiality of baptism. He ought on no account to presume to be immersed in the name of the Holy Ones, unless he heartily believes in the gospel of the kingdom of God. Believers are " justified by faith " in being baptized, and not by immersion without faith ; for " he that believes not (the gospel of the kingdom) shall be condemned."

Baptism once scripturally received, ought on no account to be repeated. Let Mr. Storrs see well to his faith of what sort it is. The article before us proves that at present he is not fit for immersion either in faith or disposition. I hope it will not be long before he is ; for certainly the Lord is at hand to come quickly ; and if he find him in his madness, Mr. S. well knows what the consequence will be. This is the law of justification which he cannot evade—" Repent and believe the gospel," " be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ into remission of sins," and thenceforth continue patiently in well-doing to the end, and a crown of life shall be yours. I am glad to see that Mr. Storrs is ill at ease in the disobedience of unbelief. In what I said I had no special reference to him. But it seems the cap fits ; he feels his position impugned ; hence his recent sally to bear his testimony against what I honestly and heartily believe to be unvanquishable truth. Well, I am contented calmly to wait the Lord's decision when he comes. If Mr. Storrs be accepted in his sins, I have no right to complain, though I find no such doctrine in the Scriptures of truth. If Mr. S. be Christ's, he has a right to do what he likes with his own ; so there I leave it for the present.

HOW THE CHILDREN OF GOD ARE KNOWN.

Friend Storrs believes in justification by faith, and that he himself is justified, and therefore a child of God. If justified, we would respectfully

inquire, *at what instant* his justification occurred; and *how he ascertained the fact?* Besides this, we should like to be informed *by what faith* he was justified? Was it by the Methodistic faith? Or by the Millerite faith when he denied the restoration of Israel, and preached all or most of the vagaries of that sincere, but mistaken theorist? Or by the faith he embraced when he renounced Millerism? Here are three different faiths—the Methodistic, the Millerite, and his present, all condemnatory of each other! If he were justified by the Methodistic he should have remained a Methodist; If by the Millerite, a Millerite he should have continued; for that system that can impart justification, or make a man a child of God, must be God's own. We should like to be informed *upon divine testimony* concerning these questions relating to Mr. Storrs' justification, that we may be justified upon the true principle. God has but "one faith" for justification, but Mr. Storrs has had at least three incompatible, antagonistic, and mutually destructive faiths. Which of these is the "one faith?" In the absence of light we lightly esteem them all. *Perhaps* we may err in this, though at present we are sure we do not. Will Mr. Storrs enlighten our darkness, or what he considers our darkness? In the meanwhile we will show him a more excellent way of proving divine sonship than that of rummaging over the old Gentile crotchets of the past to discover some happy frame or feeling of the brain upon which he may vaticinate a hope of acceptance in the day of the Lord Jesus.

As Mr. Storrs professes to recognise Paul's authority, we will hear what he has to say on the subject. To the Galatians the apostle observes, "ye are all sons of God IN Christ Jesus, *through THE faith*" Thus far Mr. Storrs might say "amen!" Now suppose Mr. Storrs had stood at Paul's elbow when he wrote these words, he might have inquired, saying, "But Paul, how do they know that they are God's sons through the faith; and at what instant did they become sons?" The apostle having overcome the surprise created by such a question proceeding from one who professes to be a son of God, and a guide of the blind, would reply, "Why, Mr. Storrs, they are the sons of God by faith, *because* as many of them as have been baptised (or immersed) *into* Christ, have *put on* Christ; and though before Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, male and female, yet now having been baptized into Christ, they are one IN Christ Jesus;" and therefore, "sons of God in him." "Have you been baptized into Christ, Mr. Storrs?" Paul had been so baptized by Ananias, but Mr. Storrs by no one. Paul and his brethren of Galatia knew they were sons by faith because they had been baptized into Christ. And this is the only way it can be known; because since the faith came, all God's sons have emerged from or been born of water into Christ. Unborn believers are *in embryo*, and may prove abortive, not having vitality enough to come to the birth. We hope this will not prove to be Mr. Storrs' case; but that he may become Christ's as Paul did, and in the only way possible. If thus he do, "then is he Abraham's seed," being *in THE seed* constitutionally and scripturally; and if a seed of Abraham, then "an heir according to the promise," covenanted with God; and not else. We hope sincerely that Mr. Storrs will soon be able to give like evidence with Paul of his being a son of God by faith; for we should rejoice in being able conscientiously to recognise

him as a Christian and fellow labourer for the kingdom of God. He will then be able to advocate the *Immortality in Christ* on Bible and gospel principles; which at present we regret to be under the necessity of testifying that he is not.—*Herald*, 1853.

THE HOLY LAND AND ITS PROSPECTS.

(Continued from page 492.)

HAVING thus sketched briefly the prominent points in the past history of Syria, and brought the subject to the days in which we ourselves live, I now proceed to a close, though of necessity very brief, consideration of the marvellous events which must mark its future destinies, and involve the fortunes of the whole human race. I still have no desire but to spread before you *strict and sober REALITIES*.

My own conviction that the Jewish nation will be restored as a nation to its ancient land, is as you may have judged from preceding observations, as positive as the conviction of my personal existence, or rather as my conviction of the existence of Him who "rules in the kingdoms of men and gives them to whomsoever He will."—(Dan. iv. 25.) In addition to that solemn conveyance to Abraham, which if it stood alone would be a sufficient guarantee, there are in the Word of Revelation repeated reference to it, such as the following.

"He hath remembered His covenant for ever, the word He commanded to a THOUSAND GENERATIONS, which He made with Abraham and His oath unto Isaac . . . Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance."—(Ps. cv. 8-11.)

"Ye shall inherit it one as well as another: concerning the which I lifted up my hand" (the ancient token of solemn asseveration and oath) "to give it unto your fathers: and this land shall fall unto you as an inheritance" (Ezek. xlvii. 14), in reference to a division which certainly has never yet taken place.

It is accompanied again with such stupendous declarations as the following, which if an upright man were to make to his fellows no one would presume to disbelieve.

"Thus SAITH THE LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar: the Lord of hosts is His name: If those ordinances depart from before Me, SAITH THE LORD, the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever. Thus SAITH THE LORD: If heaven above can be measured." (Have you yet travelled to Lord Rosse's most distant telescopic stars, and planted there his telescope to fathom the abyss beyond them?) "If heaven above can be measured and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath." (Have you yet succeeded in mining down to the centre of gravity?) "I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, SAITH THE LORD." The promise, as in almost every

other instance, binds up the land with the nation, for without any interval there follows, "Behold the days come, SAITH THE LORD, that the city shall be built to the Lord, from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner . . . it shall not be plucked up nor thrown down, any more for ever."—(Jer. xxxi. 35-40.)

Again, (if anyone be permitted to say so), the deepest sympathies of the soul of the Most High are involved in this great consummation, for the *land*, be it always remembered, as well as for the *people*. In the same chapter as the preceding unspeakably and powerful asseveration, are found the following outpourings of divine pity.

"Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee. Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry. Thou shalt yet plant vines upon the mountains of Samaria," at this moment as bare as the south downs of England; "the planters shall plant and shall eat them as common things."

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it *in the Isles afar off*:" ARE THE BRITISH ISLANDS MORE THAN ADAMANT DEAF, THAT THEY CANNOT HEAR EVEN THE VOICE OF THEIR GOD? "*He that SCATTERED Israel WILL GATHER HIM*, and keep him as a shepherd does his flock."

"Is Ephraim, my dear son, a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: *I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord*. Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps. Set thine heart towards the highway, the way thou wentest: turn again, O virgin of Israel, TURN AGAIN TO THESE THY CITIES."

Everyone who has really examined upon this subject the revelation of our invisible Creator, must know that distinct and absolute passages like these, might be brought forward in number sufficient to occupy your attention for the greater part of the night; I will therefore leave this point of certainty of Israel's future restoration to Syria to plead its own cause, as "THE WORD OF OUR GOD" which "SHALL STAND FOR EVER."—(Isa. xl. 8.) Let those who dare neglect or reject such passages, but let us, if we would, dare not to do either. Knowing the Bible to be God's Word, may we take God AT HIS WORD and actively comply with it.

The restoration will embrace not only the Two Tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which were dispersed by Titus and are to be found generally among civilised nations, but also the other Ten Tribes, which were carried away captive to Media about seven centuries before the Christian era.

"Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them *one* nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, *and they shall be no more two nations*, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."—(Ezekiel xxxvii. 21, 22.)

"And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the

outcasts of Israel," the Ten Tribes, "and gather the dispersed of Judah," the Two Tribes, "from the four corners of the earth."—(Isaiah xi. 12.)

If any should ask, where are those Ten Tribes now? It may be replied, that modern travellers have furnished evidence they should first of all be sought for where they were lost, in the district of ancient Media; and that from that point looking to the north, north-east, and east, abundant traces of them will be found from Daghestan on the western side of the Caspian Sea, along the southern shore of that great inland water, into Bokhara, Afghanistan, the north of India and China.* Portions of them may have wandered elsewhere, but in the countries above named they certainly exist in considerable numbers.

2.—The restoration is to be accomplished, in a very great degree, through the assisting instrumentality of other nations, and in an especial manner of some of the "Islands" of the "Daughter of Tyre," "Tarshish," the great maritime nation of the day, of the nation which shall "overshadow with wings," and to which shall be applicable the peculiar title of "*Ketsch ha Aretz*," the end of the earth.

I beg your close attention to the foregoing summary; the welfare of your sovereign, of your country, of yourselves, and of your kin may be inseparably bound up with it. The worst blight that can fall upon nations or families, JEWS OR GENTILES, flows from the sentence above, "Because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; . . . Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, . . . Behold, My servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit."†

"Listen, O ISLES, unto Me, and hearken ye people from afar."—(Isaiah xlix. 1.)

"Keep silence before me, O ISLANDS; and let the people renew their strength."—(Isaiah xli. 1.) There is need enough with Great Britain at this moment for obedience to this last injunction, and it is a happy augury that the passage soon proceeds to declare, "THE ISLES *saw and feared*; the ends of the earth were afraid, drew near and came."

"SURELY, THE ISLES shall wait for me, and the ships of TARSHISH" (Isaiah ix. 9-13), tin-producing Tarshish (Ezek. xxvii. 12), FIRST to bring thy sons from far, their silver and gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God . . . to beautify the place of my sanctuary: and I will make the place of my feet glorious . . . And they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel."

"THE DAUGHTER OF TYRE shall be there with a gift."‡

* "These from the land of Sinim," (Isaiah xlix. 12,) pronounced Seenim or Sheenin. La Chine (French) pronounced la Sheen. In Tartarian, Tcheen.

† Isaiah lxxv. 12—15. The whole passage, referring as it does especially to our own days, is most worthy of close attention.

‡ Psalm xlv. Daughter of Tyre is doubtless applicable to Britain, the *Bath-Tzor* of this Psalm; which prophecies of "*the latter days*," when "*the Mighty God*" girds His sword upon His thigh in glory and majesty to overthrow the people, and to establish His throne. Names of countries and towns are feminine in Hebrew. *Bath-Tzor* is feminine. *Bath*, translated "daughter," signifies also *female descendant*. Britain is the commercial descendant of Tyre, and therefore styled *Bath-Tzor*—descendant, in the sense of the trade and commerce of the east and west once possessed by Tyre, being now in the hands of

“Ho! TO THE LAND OVERSHADOWING WITH WINGS” or “extremities,” (that is, it seems to me in sober application, “overshadowing a large portion of the earth with her dependencies”)* . . . that sendeth ambassadors . . . to a nation scattered and peeled . . . All ye inhabitants of the world and dwellers of the earth, see ye . . . and hear ye.”—(Isaiah xviii. 1.)

And lastly, “Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto ‘*Ketseh ha Aretz*,’ to ‘THE END OF THE EARTH,’ say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh.”—(Isaiah xlii. 11.) This command is usually understood to be addressed to all mankind, *from one end of the earth to the other end of it*. If this were the true meaning it would, of course, include the British Isles, and still make the duty enjoined imperative upon them. As, however, it is expressly asserted as a *general* truth, that at the commencement of the restoration of the Jewish nation, “darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people” (Isaiah lx. 2), is it likely that the nations of the earth, in general, should appreciate such a command, or be the objects of it? Nations in “gross darkness” could not say “to the daughter of Zion, Thy salvation cometh.” This solemn command, therefore, I take not to be *general* but *particular*. Not to mankind *from one end of the earth to the other end of it*, but to that particular nation, which was the western extremity of the great political world (America† does not interfere with general politics), and which was emphatically known of old by the very name used by the prophets, “*Ketseh ha Aretz*,” “the end of the earth”—“the end,” *sing.*, not “the ends,” *plur.* I am more confirmed in this application from the circumstance that “Tarshish,” of which tin-producing England is a part, is declared to be “first” engaged in Jewish restoration—“the ships of Tarshish first;” and the more still, as certainly, of late years, Great Britain has been particularly chosen to be the great sanctuary of the word of divine revelation and the great means of circulating the sacred volume throughout the earth.

Under all these considerations, whether as included in mankind *from one end of the earth to the other end of it*, or as especially included in Great Britain,

Britannia. Tyre’s commerce has descended to Britain, therefore is she Tyre’s daughter of the latter days. No other Gentile power will inherit the world’s commerce after her: for “the abundance (or commerce) of the sea shall be turned unto Zion, and the wealth of the nations shall come unto her.” Jerusalem is the next heir of Tyre’s daughter, and *not the United States*. The trade and commerce of the nations will travel no farther west; but pass from Britain to Syria, whence it originally departed. This is the end scripturally revealed of that “commercial rivalry” now subsisting between Britain and the United States. The people, though not the governments, of these two countries will find increased prosperity in the transfer of the commercial throne from London to Jerusalem, the city of ancient Tyre’s wise, glorious and powerful ally.—*Dr. Thomas*.

* The Colonel’s idea is doubtless correct. It is a “land” upon whose dominions the sun never sets—a “land widely o’ershadowing with wings from beyond to the rivers of Cush,” as rendered and interpreted in my translation of Isaiah xviii.—*Dr. Thomas*.

† America is a “*New World*,” forming no part of the prophetic earth, which belongs exclusively to the “*Old*.” The world known to the ancients is the theatre on which is to be displayed the grand and marvellous events of the latter days, which are to ultimate in bringing Europe, Asia, *America*, &c., into absolute subjection to the king of Israel. The general declaration “that he shall be King over the whole earth,” by implication fortels the conversion of the United States of North America into Regal provinces of his Empire; and the consequent abolition of Republicanism, which is merely a visionary and temporary element of the Gentile economy.—*Dr. Thomas*.

"Ketsch ha Aretz," the end of the earth—I, seeing the extraordinary indications of the days in which we live, bow before the divine command, and with the loudest utterance that I can give, I would say to the daughter of Zion, "BEHOLD, THY SALVATION COMETH! PREPARE YE THE WAY!" And in the same spirit of responsibility, as a man and as an Englishman, I would invite every prudent heart and voice in this united kingdom, to join with practical energy in the appeal.

For its literal accomplishment, it is not necessary that we should endeavour to define to the Jewish people whether that "salvation" is the Saviour they expect, or the Saviour we Christians expect. Both parties look for a mighty Saviour from the God of Israel; and the scriptural and natural signs of our times (as will be presently shown), loudly testify to the nearness of his approach. Let us, therefore, *in union*, in obedience to the divine command, which clearly implies union in effect, "PREPARE THE WAY" for the manifestation of the goodness of our great Creator, whatever it may be. Let it not be recorded against any of us, "When I called, ye did not answer!"

England will not long remain single-handed in assistance to this great work; for it is expressly declared:

"The Gentiles shall come to Thy light, and kings to the brightness of Thy rising."—
(Isaiah lx. 3).

"Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up My hand to the Gentiles, and set My standard to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders; and kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers."—(Isaiah xlix. 22-23).

3.—The restoration, however, will not be effected without great opposition. When, in this world, was ever any great and good work accomplished without strong opposition?

"Now, also, many nations are gathered against thee that say, 'Let her be defiled; and let our eye look upon Zion. *But they know not the thoughts of the Lord*, neither understand they His counsel; for He shall gather them as the sheaves into the floor. Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion: for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many people.'"*

I will not enlarge on this painful particular, although the sacred volume contains extensive evidence in regard to it. The trial will be great, but the triumph greater.

A singular feature in its commencement will be the general dulness of perception of the Jewish people, and the determined opposition of a portion even of them; though divine mercies will supply remedies for the first, and give to the second a signal rebuke and overthrow.

* Micah iv. 11. The daughter of Zion will not "Arise and thresh" until Messiah appear; for it is written "Judah shall be as the mighty, who tread down in the mire of the streets; and they shall fight *because the Lord is with them*." They will, doubtless, contend in battle with Gog, or the Autocrat of Russia, when he invades Syria, but instead of threshing they will be threshed, notwithstanding Britain's aid. The Deliverer, however, will be at hand, to come with great power to cast the enemy out of their land.—*Dr. Thomas*.

"I will give to Jerusalem one that bringeth good tidings. For I beheld, and there was no man, even among them, and there was no counsellor that, when I asked of them, could answer a word."—(Isaiah xli. 27-28).

"Hearken unto me, ye stout-hearted, that are far from righteousness: I bring near my righteousness, it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry; and I will place salvation in Zion, for Israel, my glory."—(Isaiah xlvi. 12-13).

Those who have been brought, as I have been brought, to the full confidence that the words of the Most High are never uttered with lightness, will bend in reverence before the power of language with which the last declaration is enforced.

"I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like Me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. . . . yea (aph), I have spoken it, yea (aph), I will bring it to pass; I have purposed, yea (aph), I will do it."—(Isaiah xlvi. 9, 10, 11.)

4.—All difficulties will be finally overcome and removed by the especial, visible and audible interference of the great God Himself.

"Behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. . . . The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake; but the Lord will be the hope of His people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain; THEN SHALL JERUSALEM BE HOLY, AND THEN SHALL NO STRANGERS PASS THROUGH HER ANY MORE."—(Joel iii. 1, 15-17.)

5.—I now request your most particular attention to the effects of Jewish national restoration upon the whole human race and upon the condition of our globe. They are truly worthy of your consideration, for you will perceive that they are the very effects which statesmen, philosophers, philanthropists, and religious persons have been labouring for centuries to produce in whole or in part, but without success.

All have been sensible that the human race, as a body, is degraded, disorganised, afflicted and unhappy; all have striven to lessen or remove these evils; and yet, after labours indescribable, the success of all and every class has been extremely limited. The mass of human degradation and misery remains unchanged.

This picture represents strict and sober realities. Why are they realities? Is it not because these persons, eager though they have been for great and glorious ends, yet have they not grasped the further reality of the rigid jealousy of the God they have to deal with, for His own appointed means—the placing of the nation He has chosen in the land He has chosen to be the focus and centre of His goodness and glory?

The effects of Jewish restoration *must be*—for the Most High God has said it must be.

1.—Their own extraordinary purification. “Thy people also shall be all righteous.”—(Isaiah lx. 21.)

“For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you . . . and ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people and I will be your God.”*

“And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed forsaken, neither shalt *thy land* anymore be termed desolate, but thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah, and *thy land*, Beulah; for the Lord delighteth in thee, and *thy land* shall be married. . . . As the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee.”—(Isaiah lxii. 2, 5.)

O you who are ice-hearted and infatuated, among Christians and Jews, bend your eyes to read the last paragraph flowing from the mouth of Him that formed you, and Who *even now* searches you out; and say if human language can express more powerfully the glory and happiness of *the land* and of the people, and, through their union, of the whole race of man! What words from God would you have, if the preceding are not sufficient to move you? I know of none that voice can utter or pen can write: fit preludes are they to the marvellous reality that comes next for consideration.

2.—The great invisible Author of the immeasurable wonders amid which we live, breaks from the thick darkness in which He has been pleased to shroud Himself for ages past, “destroys the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is now spread over all nations” (Isaiah xxv. 27), and with wonders in the material world worthy of His approach and presence, again reveals His own visible glory to mankind.

“The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of His people, and healeth the stroke of their wound.”—(Isaiah xxx. 26.)

* Ezekiel xxxvi. 24-28. *Mayim tehorim*, pure waters, or waters of pureness, that is, of heart. The word rendered sprinkle in Isaiah lii. 15, is *nahzah*, and in the future *yazzeh*, not *zahrah*, and in the future, *zahrakti*, as in Ezekiel: *khain yazzeh goyim ravvim ahlav* is rendered by Gesenius, *so shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself*, the verb *nahzah* signifying to leap, to exult, to spring; leaping is the natural action expressive of joyousness; hence, when spoken of nations, *nahzah* signifies to rejoice; but when spoken of liquids, to leap forth, spirt, or spatter. In Isaiah it is used of many nations, not of liquids; it, therefore, in that place, means to *leap for joy*, to exult. The Seventy have translated the Hebrew by *οὐτω θαυματοῦνται εθνη πολλα ἐπ'αυτω*, *so many nations shall be filled with admiration because of Him*. But not so their kings! They will not exult; for it is so written in the next sentence, *yikpetzu melahkham*, the kings shall contract; *i.e.*, as one gathers himself up in death. They shall be dumb, they shall die, they shall not rejoice when the world exults in the king whom Jehovah gives. This is the sense of this passage, which was not, however, perceived by the baby sprinkling translators of the common version.—*Dr. Thomas*.

“When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.”—(Psalm cii. 16.)

“Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty . . . look upon Zion the city of our solemnities : thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation . . . there the glorious Lord shall be unto us a place of broad rivers and streams.”—(Isaiah xxxiii, 17, 20, 21.)

“Then the moon shall be confounded; and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously.”—(Isaiah xxiv. 23.)

“The sun shall be no more thy light by day ; neither for brightness shall the moon give light to thee, but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light and thy God, thy glory.”—(Isaiah lx. 19.)

“My tabernacle also shall be with them ; yea, I will be their God and they shall be my people. And the nations shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.”—(Ezekiel xxxvii. 28.)

3.—These unutterable blessings will not be confined to the Jewish nation. The whole human race which was made “in the image of God,”* and this globe which He “created, not in vain, but to be inhabited” (Isaiah xlv. 18), in peace and in love, will also rejoice in joy in them with joy inconceivable.

“He hath remembered his mercy and truth towards the house of Israel, and all the ends of the earth have been the salvation of our God.”—(Psalm xcvi. 3.)

“For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.”—(Habakkuk ii. 14.)

“Rejoice ye with Jerusalem and be glad with her: ALL YE THAT LOVE HER ; rejoice for joy with her all ye that mourn for her ; that ye may suck and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations ; that ye may milk out and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. For, thus saith the Lord, behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream ; then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees. As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you ; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem.”—(Isaiah lxvi. 10-13.)

“In that day the Lord shall be King *over ALL the earth* : IN THAT DAY SHALL THERE BE ONE LORD, HIS NAME ONE.”—(Zachariah xiv. 9.)

What a most effectual and indispensable element for human happiness is here ! Religious doubts and difficulties which fill men’s hearts with anxieties, and theological enmities, which have blotted the whole volume of the history of our species with frauds, contentions, and blood, will universally cease, and the Most High God be worshipped in His true essence, name and character. To take the lawful preparatory measures for such a great end as this, should not Jews and Gentiles, setting aside in abeyance the differences which make union in effort impossible, heartily and honorably labour *in concert*, as the word of

* “So God created man in His own image, IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM !”

their God commands them? If they labor not *together*, the required preparatory work cannot be done.

"I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness."—(Isaiah lx. 17.)

"O let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for thou shalt judge the people righteously, and govern the nations upon earth."—(Psalm lxxvii. 4.)

Here is a motive for all political reformers. They cannot have spotless supreme government, or completely peaceful and just subordinate management, until Syria and Israel be united. Then, they will soon realize the brightest vision of political perfection.

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it . . . and He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; *and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*"—(Isaiah ii. 2, 4, and Micah iv. 1-3.)

Here is an inducement and a warning for the most ardent promoters of "Peace Societies." So long as the nation of Israel remains dispersed, and the land of Syria depopulated and desolate, Peace Societies are engaged in the labours of "Sysiphus." They may tug and sweat to roll back the mountain avalanche of war as they will; their labour will be in vain; it must return upon them with tenfold impetus, until "Jerusalem be the throne of the Lord," and He shall say to it, "Stand thou still." They cannot make straight what He has made crooked,* but through the means alone which He has appointed to straighten it; and let them remember, that for such means He is most jealous, crossing sometimes in anger every other, even though the end in view be good and desirable.

This portion of our subject may be well and appropriately concluded, with the most energetic invitation and command of the God of Heaven to universal nature to rejoice.

"Sing, O ye heavens; for the Lord hath done it; shout, ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O, forest, and every tree therein: FOR THE LORD HATH REDEEMED JACOB AND GLORIFIED HIMSELF IN ISRAEL."—(Isa. xlv. 23.)

* The Colonel speaks truly. The Peace Society is an empty bubble, the idiotic bantling of maudlin avarice and infidelity. Jesus says, he came to send a sword upon the earth; yet in spite of this, they dream of substituting peace for the benefit of merchant-princes and millionaires! "There is no peace for the wicked, saith God," who would never be able to avenge the blood of His saints shed upon the earth, if the Peace Society's crotchet were to become a fact. War is inevitable, and cannot be staved off by the cupidity of merchants and traders who are heaping up their rusty gold for the spoiler. The day of Christ is at hand, when his poor shall be comforted and filled with good things, and the peace-mongering rich sent empty away.—DR. THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

A CHRISTADELPHIAN'S DREAM.

(Continued from page 494.)

We sat, we stood, we paced
 The room, alternately.—
 The year of His redeemed,
 At last, tho' long the theme
 Of many a brother's song, like death
 Had stalked upon us, silently.
 Our resurrected friend was first
 To break the spell: "Fear Not,"
 (Said he) "the men tho' stern,
 Are gentle, and considerate.
 For standing by my grave
 When I awoke to life, they clad me
 In these garments plain, and neat,
 And free from conspicuity;
 And breathing on my chilly form,
 Heaven's own blast of life,
 Inspiring warmth, my faculties
 Benumbed, returned in vigour:—
 With kindly look and voice,
 Supplying all my wants,
 A scroll they placed within my hand,
 And bade me hasten through the land,
 The living, and awakened dead to meet
 At the appointed rendezvous.

"I stammered forth some words
 Of thanks, of adoration, but
 Upon the midnight air, unheeded
 Save by me alone, they fell.
 How long I sat upon the dewy grass
 And gazed at scores of sepulchres
 Untouched (God knows), lost
 In the reflection of the past—
 Instructed by my scroll,
 I hastened to thine ever open door,
 And knocked with beating heart,
 Lest I should rouse thy fears
 And startle those we love.—
 Brother the past is gone
 And we must forward go,
 Nor rest until the King of kings

Shall give us peace or woe.
I met not one to journey with
In all that mighty throng
Of dead ones who have slept so long
With me in silent company,
But came alone, my office to fulfil :
That thou mayest others notify,
When they shall meet to celebrate
His death, his advent, on the morrow;
Doubtless others move towards this
Appointment, tho' we see them not."

The end hath come,
And ere to-morrow's sun hath set,
Will see commencement for an Exode,
Such as friends will mock
And ridicule : " Ye bigots get you gone,"
" Fanatics all," " Behold the saved,"
" A pilgrimage to Zion's throne."

'Tis well, we said,
Life's even balance tilts no more
Altho' with every blessing blest.
This life is naught compared with rest,
Such rest as Christ alone can give,
To those who living are to live.

To sleep, then, all, for on the morn
The scroll doth point out duties
Many, for us all. No idleness,
For those who to the Master owe
Allegiance ; well ordered houses,
Cancelled debts, adieus to friends :
Last warnings, and farewells—
To children, and to all,
Who answer only, yet, the call
Of Adam and his dismal fall

A chartered ship by steam propelled,
A crowded quay of emigrants,
And greater numbers idly looking on;
Her destiny the Eastern shores
With orders sealed, that none may know
The great, the final rendezvous—
And many days and anxious nights
With haggard faces some, and downcast
In the dark uncertainty that waits

Each one, when he or she
 Shall hear the verdict of the Judge,
 Drag their slow length along—
 Other some, with joy o'erspread with summer's morn-lit eyes,
 Beaming with anticipated rest
 Towards Him their friend, their hope,
 Their life, their all; their love
 Ineffable, untarnished by one
 Single dash of fear, onward
 Straining every nerve to meet
 The Majesty of Heaven, who
 Trod two thousand years ago
 The sacred soil of Palestine.

Gibraltar passed, and Alexandria too,
 Egyptian soil on either side
 With brazen sun above, and scorching
 Heat around, we float
 Upon the bosom of that ancient sea
 Which God did cleave for Israel—
 Unpiloted, we shape our course
 To Akaba, or Elanitic Gulf,
 And distant leagues away
 Upon our left, prodigious piles of rock
 Looming midst centuries of years
 Marked Sinai of old, for judgment.
 And every fault, and act, and thought
 Welled up into our consciences,
 Ten times as big as ere before
 Our lenient eyes had seen.
 But mercy is our stay, our prop
 And hope our anchorage.

A rocky shore, a sweeping bay,
 From Ezion Geber mile² away
 Secluded, hid from every eye,
 We steamed, half speed, 'neath lurid sky,
 To land upon that dreary waste,
 The desert of Mount Sinai.

Our vessel's living freight discharged,
 No longer waited, but to bid adieu.
 No tie now left to western worlds.
 Ten thousand tents burst on our view.
 The shelter for the mighty few,

From Adam's race recalled,
Who waiting for their brethren
From East and West, from North and South,
At last went forth in mighty column,
With stately step and visage solemn,
To meet their fate for weal and woe,
Both king and beggar, high and low.

F. H. 1876.

SUNDAY MORNING AT THE BIRMINGHAM CHRISTADELPHIAN
ECCLÉSIA, No. 79.

"Exhort one another daily."—PAUL.

Our attention has been called this morning to the remarkable exhortation of Paul to the Hebrews, in the 13th chapter of his epistle to them, verse 13: "Let us go forth, therefore, unto him *without the camp*, bearing his reproach." This exhortation had a meaning for those to whom Paul was writing which it cannot have for us. They were Jews who, like himself, had been brought up in subjection to the Mosaic institutions in all particulars, and whose acceptance of Christ brought upon them excommunication from the synagogue, and all the reproach connected with an apparent apostacy from a divine institution, and an acceptance of what was accounted a cunningly devised and magically supported imposture. Their steadfastness was put under a powerful strain in having to accept an apparent dissociation with Moses, by whom all were agreed God had spoken; and in having to associate with one who had the reputation of being a destroyer of the law of Moses, and whose undoubted end as a crucified companion of felons, brought him under the curse of the law of Moses.

It was true comfort that Paul administered to them, when he said to the Romans that his doctrine of Christ, so far

from "making void" the law, "established" it. It was similar consolation for them to be told that Christ had said "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." Writing directly to themselves, Paul had told them that the law, though divine, was but "a figure for the time then present," pointing forward to Christ, in whom all its hidden significances had an end. This was his declaration on the subject as a whole. In the exhortation under consideration, he makes a particular application of it in a matter of detail. He reminds them that "the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, were burned *without the camp*," involving the recollection that anyone availing himself of the ceremonial purification connected with the use of the ashes of the beast, had to go out of the camp to get at them: a typical foreshadowing of the fact that when the real purification from sin was provided, Israelites would have to go outside the national camp to obtain the benefit. In harmony with the figure, Christ "suffered without the gate," in being proscribed by the national authorities, and in being

crucified outside the walls of Jerusalem. From this it was easy and natural to extract the farther figuration, by which the position of Jesus at the time of his crucifixion is made to represent the excommunicated and despised position of those of Israel who afterwards believed on his name. It was a natural climax to say "Let us go forth, therefore, to him without the camp, bearing his reproach."

We cannot apply this to ourselves in a direct manner this morning. We are not Jews, who in accepting Christ, have had to turn our backs upon what is called Judaism, and to go forth with courage to brave the reproach of those remaining in the camp. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which we are called upon to submit to such an ordeal. We have had to go forth from a certain camp, bearing the reproach of Christ, and dating historically back to the work of the apostles in the first century. We have left that camp, with all the attractions that belong to a popular establishment. We cannot assemble with the respectable crowds that fill the commodious religious edifices that abound in every town. We cannot take part in their opulent arrangements, or join their imposing and comfortable services. We have chosen to step out of the flourishing throng; to desert the attractive festivals of popular faith; to stand aloof from the profitable associations of "the names and denominations of religion." We have accepted the obscurity and the dishonour of hole-and-corner meetings with the poor and illiterate. It has been a hard resolution to take, not only because of the temporal disadvantages of our decision—not only because of the sacrifice of present gratifications of society, and the acceptance of present mortifications to the natural man and the spirital too, but because the system of religion around us accepts Christ by profession. If these systems said "We reject Christ," our course would have been much easier; instead of that, they profess his name, and proclaim

themselves his servants. It has in consequence been a great exercise of mind for us to consider whether we are justified in having a system professedly subject to Christ, and taking a step which by implication passes condemnation on them as an unchristian thing. But we have not faltered when all the facts were fully before us for decision.

We have learnt that the true "house of God, which is the church of the living God; is *the pillar and ground of THE TRUTH*" (1 Tim iii. 15); and that men and systems may say, "Lord, Lord," and may even claim to have done wonderful things in his name, and yet have no claim to his recognition at his coming, by reason of their non-submission to his requirements. Consequently, we have asked—Is the religious system under which we were born "the pillar and ground of the truth?" A pillar supports, holds up: does the religious system support, hold up, the truth? "Ground," gives a resting place, a basis, a foundation: does the religious system act as a foundation, a resting place for "the truth?" We have been able to answer this with an emphatic negative when we have come to know what "the truth" is.

This phrase "the truth" is a very comprehensive phrase. "The truth" we find to be made up of many things which require to be put together before we can have the whole thing so defined. For instance, it is true that God exists; but to believe that God exists is not to believe the comprehensive thing meant by "the truth." The Jews believed in God's existence: and yet Paul had "continual sorrow of heart" because they were not in the way of salvation. The truth is not only the fact that God exists, but that He has said and done certain things and given to us certain commandments. It is part of the truth that Christ was crucified: but to believe this of itself is not to believe the truth. Jews and infidels believe that Christ was crucified,

but reject the truth of which that is an element. It is part of the truth that Christ rose from the dead and appeared to his disciples; but if these facts are disconnected from his ascension and the promise of his return to raise the dead and establish his kingdom, the belief of them does not constitute a belief of "the truth." So with every element of "the truth" by turns: they must all have their place in relation to the rest, or we fail to receive and hold the truth.

Now, when we try the system around us by this test, we find it is the very opposite of being "the pillar and ground of the truth." It lacks, yea rejects, the very first principles of the oracles of God. It teaches a triune instead of a one God; it asserts man to be immortal instead of mortal: it declares torment instead of death the wages of sin: it preaches the death of Christ as a "substitutionary" satisfaction of the divine law, instead of a declaration of the righteousness of God (Rom. iii. 25) in the condemnation of sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3), as a basis on which the forbearance of God offers the forgiveness of all who recognise themselves "crucified with Christ"—(Rom. iii. 25; Gal. ii. 20). It proclaims death instead of resurrection the climax of the believer's hope; it preaches heaven instead of earth as the inheritance of the meek. It affirms our going instead of Christ's coming as the means and occasion of the promised reward. And so forth. The dissimilarities might be enumerated in other points. Instead of being "the pillar and ground of the truth," the religious system around us is the puller-down and scatterer of the truth. How, then, could we hesitate to "come out from among them?" It is part of apostolic doctrine that we are not to be identified with any who bring not the doctrine of Christ, whatever their profession (2 Jno. 10; Rev. xiv. 9; Rom. xvi. 17). Consequently we could not remain in popular fellowship without the

danger of being responsible for their errors. This is the explanation of our position this morning in having gone forth out of the popular camp, unto Christ, bearing the reproach incident in our professedly Christian day to a profession of his truth.

It is well also to recognise the fact that the principle which isolates us from popular communion isolates us also from the fellowship of all who reject any part of the truth. Some accept the truth in part, but are either unable or unwilling to receive it in its entirety. They believe in the kingdom but reject the Bible doctrine of death; or they hold the mortal nature of man but do not receive the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel; or they accept both, but deny the judgment; or believe in the judgment, but deny the kingdom; or accept all three but reject the apostolic doctrine of Christ's nature and death, and so on. Such persons are generally what is called very "charitable;" that is, they are willing to connive at any amount of doctrinal diversity so long as friendliness is maintained. They are lovers of peace. Peace is certainly very desirable when it can be had on a pure foundation: but the charitable people referred to are not particular about the foundation. They will compromise the truth in some one or other of its integral elements for the sake of personal harmony. This is a spurious charity altogether. We are not at liberty to relax the appointments of God. The exercise of "charity" must be confined to our own affairs. We have no jurisdiction in God's matters. What God requires is binding on us all: and the faithful man cannot consent to accept any union that requires a jot or tittle to be set aside or treated as unimportant. Such a man cannot consent to form a part of any community that is not "the pillar and ground of the truth."

There is just another side to this question which cannot be too well remembered, and that is that the possession of

the truth in its entirety does not necessarily ensure acceptance with Christ at his coming. The Scriptures speak of "those who *hold the truth in UNRIGHTEOUSNESS,*" and declares that the end of such will be "indignation, anguish and wrath." Consequently, no one should rest on the knowledge and belief of the truth as securing his salvation without failure. That knowledge is of great value to him. In the obedience of it (in baptism) it brings him into relation with Christ, who is the righteousness of God; invested with whose name he stands a forgiven man, "purged from his old sins." But he has a life to live after that, and Christ shall judge that life at his coming; and it will all depend upon his estimate of that life as to how he will deal with the person. He will give to every man "according to his works." In the case of some, he will "blot their name out of the book of life." He will take away their part out of the holy city. He will refuse recognition and dismiss the refused to the society of the adversary, at that time about to be "devoured." In the case of others, he will confess their names, and invite them to inherit the kingdom of God. There is no sane man who would not desire to be among the latter. There is a principle upon which admission is predicated. The doctrines of the apostasy have obliterated this principle. They teach that men have "only to believe" that Christ has paid their debts, and that they have nothing to do but believe that Christ died for them. Whereas the exhortation of Peter is to be "diligent to *make our calling and election SURE;*" that only "if we do these things (which he had enumerated), we shall never fall." This is the uniform teaching of Christ and his servant Paul. Jesus says it is vain to acknowledge him unless we do what he commands.—(Matt. vii. 21). Paul says every man at the judgment seat of Christ shall receive according to that he hath done (2 Cor. v. 10); and that he who doeth wrong shall receive the

wrong that he hath done.—(Col. iii. 25). Consequently it rests with us to work out our salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. ii. 12), as obedient children, not fashioning ourselves according to our former lusts in our ignorance, but as he that hath called us is holy, so must we be holy in all manner of conversation.

There is a natural tendency to overlook this phase of the work of Christ, unless we are on our guard. The popular habit of depreciating the importance of doctrine, is liable to have the effect of shutting us up entirely to the fact that apart from a knowledge of the truth, we cannot be saved. We are in danger of shutting our eyes to the equally certain truth that a knowledge of the truth will be of no value to us if it fail to effectuate that purification of heart—that moral and intellectual assimilation to the divine character which it is intended to produce in all who are called to the holy calling: we can only avoid this dangerous extreme by a habitual and meditative reading of the holy oracles. In this exercise, day by day, we shall be made acquainted with the full and noble breadth of the divine work, in the practical transformation of men. We shall not fail to perceive that Christ made the state of the heart and the character of our actions the most prominent feature of his teaching. He preached the Kingdom of God it is true, and constantly did so: but this, only, as the framework of his instruction. The character of those who would inherit that kingdom, was constantly the burden of his speech to those around him. And we shall only resemble him and take part truly in his work, in proportion as we do the same. And, what is more solemnly true, we can only hope for an entrance into his kingdom in the day of his glory if we are of the same mind and work as he. It is written "There shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth, neither what-

soever worketh abomination or maketh a lie."—(Rev. xxi. 27). Men—aye, even such as are called brethren, may forget or be indifferent to this meanwhile, but they will discover at last that the word of the Lord standeth sure, and that the gate of eternal glory will be barred against every one who conforms not to the divine standard revealed in the Word. The fact may

appear a stern one, but its effect as regards the house of God will be only good and glorious: it will secure a perfect fellowship, composed of such as know God and delight in His praise, and in the delightful love one to another that glows in every heart that truly seeks His face.

EDITOR.

THE BIBLE TRUE;

OR,

ARGUMENTS, ARTICLES, PAPERS, EXTRACTS AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTER, FROM
VARIOUS SOURCES TO PROVE THAT

THE SCRIPTURES ARE THE AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE RECORDS OF
DIVINE REVELATION,

AND THE ONLY SOURCE AT PRESENT AVAILABLE TO MAN OF TRUE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING
A FUTURE LIFE, AND THE WAY BY WHICH IT IS TO BE SECURED.

"Concerning Thy testimonies, I have known of old that Thou hast founded them for ever. Thy word is true from the beginning."—(Psalm cxix. 162, 160.)

"Come hither, and hear the word of the Lord your God."—(Jos. iii. 9.)

"He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: what is the chaff (dreams) to the wheat?"—(Jer. xxiii. 28.)

"When ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God."—(1 Thess. ii. 18.)

"The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—(Heb. i. 1.)

"The sword of the Spirit is the word of God."—(Eph. vi. 17.)

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."—(2 Tim. iii. 16.)

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed."—(Prov. xiii. 13.)

"Their root shall be as rottenness and their blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."—(Isaiah v. 24.)

THE EXISTENCE OF EVIL AND THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

—
AN unknown friend submits, through a brother, the following proposition: "If God cannot compass good ends, without those means which produce evil, then that 'cannot' deprives Him of His claim to omnipotence. If He can do so, and is consequently omnipotent, then, by preferring to work out good by evil, He cannot be benevolent."

The difficulty is one of terms and not of facts. The "cannot" in the case is

wrongly placed in antagonism to omnipotence. God can do anything so far as the exercise of power is concerned: all power is with Him and there is no power that is not of Him. But this power is exercised subject to what, for want of a better phrase, may be called His moral attributes. He is faithful, for example; He "cannot" lie (Titus i. 2), but the impossibility does not conflict with omnipotence in the sense which omnipotence is affirmed of Him. He cannot deny Himself or be other than what He is: He cannot do a thing and not do it at

the same time; but this impossibility is not inconsistent with His power to do any work of power He may choose to perform. He cannot make a world which shall never have existed after its having been made; but this is not inconsistent with His power to make anything He likes, which is the attribute of omnipotence. He cannot make a straight line that shall at the same time be a curve. There are impossibilities with Him, and yet His omnipotence in the correct sense of the term is none the less a fact. He cannot stultify Himself. He is a God of order: this is revealed; He cannot at the same time be a God of chaos. But He is none the less omnipotent: for omnipotence was never intended to affirm power to stultify Himself, but His ability to accomplish any work of power. His power is equal to anything He may design, but He cannot design and not design at the same time; yet He is none the less omnipotent, for His omnipotence was never intended to include absurdities, and is only made to do so in the hair-splitting of verbal quibblers who are bent on logical trifling rather than on the serious and candid ordering of facts and truth. The application of this to the particular proposition must be evident. "Good ends" is a very ambiguous term for such a precise proposition. Who is to be judge of what are such in the ultimate sense? Pigs would consider the filling of their troughs the highest of "good ends;" and there is a parallel to this in the thoughts of man, a class of whom are scripturally likened to these animals. A wise man, who has any capacity for profound thought, will waive the right and disclaim the ability to be judge of "good ends." God, who gave us what little capacity we have, must be allowed to be the only judge of what "good ends" are, and of the way they are best to be achieved. If those "good ends," as concerning His purpose with this world,

involve the development of character on the basis of free agency, and if this development cannot take place without the subject being placed in evil circumstances, then His provision of those evil circumstances is part of His wisdom and kindness, and no evidence of want of omnipotence, for His omnipotence does not consist of doing a thing and not doing it at the same time. Finally, it is not for us to say He could not have compassed His "good ends" with the human race in some other way than the one adopted. Perhaps He could, it is presumptuous in us to argue the point: it is for us to accept the fact as it stands as evidence that the plan adopted is the best for the end in view.

"J.M.'S" OBJECTIONS TO THE BIBLE.

The second and third paragraphs in the lithographed tract by "J.M.," referred to last month, are in reality one, and one answer will dispose of them both. In the first, he tells us that when he began to see man's antiquity as a race, he set himself to "test whether they (the Scriptures) were really infallible, and it occurred to him that very few of the books themselves claim to be so." We have already shown how entirely the antiquity of the human species (even if proved) fails to afford a reason for doubting the Scriptures, which deal only with what began six thousand years ago, and what must be admitted on mathematical grounds to have commenced only that length of time ago. We have only now to look at the lame results to which "J.M." so easily allowed the alleged antiquity to guide him.

He might have unburdened himself of the fact that "very few of the books" of the Bible claim infallibility. If one of them does, and claims it for all, and that one is itself proved divine, the inspired character of the rest is as firmly established as if every one of them

claimed that character. This is the state of the case. Christ, speaking of the Old Testament compilation as a whole (viz., "Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms."—Luke xxiv. 44), says, "The Scripture *cannot be broken*." Christ rose from the dead, which is evidence that God spoke by him; consequently his endorsement of the "Old Testament" compilation is proof of the divinity of the books comprised in that compilation, even if there were no other proof, which there is in abundance.—(See *Bradlaugh Discussion*.)

Paul says the same thing in another way, and with a like result in logic. He reminds Timothy that from a child he had known the Scriptures—referring again to the Old Testament compilation, and concerning these Scriptures he says two things: 1.—That they are able to make wise *unto salvation*, (which, of itself, shows that in Paul's estimation, they were divine): and 2.—That they are "given by inspiration and profitable," &c., which is a precise formulation of the doctrine of their divinity. Now, Paul saw Christ after his resurrection and was commissioned by him as his apostle and ordained with the Spirit abundantly. Consequently what he wrote has all the authority of "a commandment of the Lord" as he claims.—(1 Cor. xiv. 37.) Therefore, his statement as to the Scriptures is proof of their divinity, notwithstanding that "very few of the books themselves" may claim it. For the demonstration of Paul's case, see *Bradlaugh Discussion*.

It would have been better if "J.M." had frankly avowed the notion that the Bible is a human composition, instead of trying to drag the Bible into an unnatural fellowship with his views.

But pursuing his process of test, "one of the first things that struck him" was that whereas the prophecy of Gen. xv. 13, seems to require that Israel should have been afflicted in Egypt 400 years, they

could not (according to his calculation) have been more than 140 years subject to that experience. The conclusion he evidently gathers from this is, that there was a failure in the fulfilment of the prophecy. Ought not this to strike him as a strange conclusion, even on the hypothesis that Moses was the sole and unassisted author of the books bearing his name? At the time that Moses wrote, the fulfilment of the prophecy was a matter of history. That is to say, Israel had been delivered from the affliction of the Egyptians; and Moses knew as a matter of fact how long that affliction had lasted. Consequently, it was in his power to make the prophecy, if the prophecy was his invention, to tally exactly with the facts. Can "J.M." imagine that the exact and skilful writer of the Pentateuch, (apart now from all question of its divinity,) was as devoid of common discretion as to publish a confutation of its prophetic character by perpetrating a glaring discrepancy in a matter which was at the time a matter of history, known to all?

Even on the infidel hypothesis of the Bible, such a supposition is incredible. Even on that hypothesis, there must be agreement between the prophecy and the fulfilment in such a matter.

And there is. The prophecy is (Gen. xv. 16), "In the *fourth generation* they shall come hither again." And the fact is that Moses was the *fourth* from Levi who represented the first generation after Abraham. (Thus: 1.—Levi. 2.—Kohath. 3.—Amram. 4.—Moses.) In the fourth generation after Abraham, Israel was delivered. Here is a key to the meaning of that part of the same prophecy which says, "they shall afflict them 400 years." The four hundred years are the measure of the time occupied by the four generations after Abraham. Consequently, "J.M." errs in making them begin with the death of Joseph. They begin with the delivery of the prophecy to Abraham.

They are an indication of the length of time that would elapse before the seed of Abraham would begin to exist as a free and independent nation. This time is described as a time during which they were to be "strangers in a land that is not theirs," and relatively in a state of affliction. This reads as if it were applicable to Egypt only: but we must interpret it in harmony with the facts. They were not in Egypt 400 years. Part of the 400 years they were in Canaan, and they were strangers in Canaan as well as in Egypt. They sojourned "in the land of promise as in a strange country."—(Heb. xi. 9.) Abraham himself said he was a stranger and a sojourner with the children of Heth.—(Gen. xxiii. 4.) The judgment of "that nation whom they should serve" is an episode after the 400 years should expire—how long after is not stated, but it proved to be 30 years after. With those facts in view, the statement of Moses, in Ex. xii. 40, is capable of being understood without difficulty, thus: "Now the sojourning (that is, from the time of the promise to the exodus) of the children of Israel who dwelt (260 years) in Egypt was 430 years."

—

AUTHENTICITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Continued from page 510.)

—

THE APOCALYPSE.

"EUSEBIUS speaks of the book of Revelations in a very peculiar manner—perhaps a book universally received, or one altogether spurious. Not so, however, did the second century judge. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, near Laodicea, the contemporary of the apostle John, received and used this book.—(Andreas, in *Apoc.*)

"Justin Martyr, before the middle of the second century, held his contention with Trypho, the Jew, at Ephesus, where

John had been living thirty or thirty-five years before. He says that the Revelation had been given to 'John, one of the twelve apostles of Christ.' Irenæus, so closely connected as he had been with the immediate disciples of John, gives a similar testimony: he even tells us *when* John saw the Revelation, almost, he says, in his own days, about the end of the reign of Domitian.—(l. v. c. 30, §3.) As to the true reading of a passage, he refers to the information which he had received from those who had known John face to face. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the second century, wrote a book on the Revelation of John.—(Euseb. l. iv. 26.) All this evidence is more or less connected with the very region of the seven churches of Asia, to whom the book was addressed.

"In Egypt, we have the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, pp. 207, 667), and, after him, of Origen. In North Africa, we have Tertullian (*L'e Pras.*, c. 33), and, at a little later time, we have (at Rome probably) Hippolytus.—(*Opp.*, p. 18.) There was thus the united testimony of the East and West.

"Caius, a Roman Presbyter of the end of the second century, is said (*Euseb.* l. iii. 28) to have rejected this book; but this could have no weight against such evidence. Dionysius of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, in opposing the doctrine of the millennial reign of Christ (*Euseb.* l. vii. 24), chose to ascribe this book to John the Presbyter and not to the apostle, but still he elsewhere uses it as an authority.—(*Euseb.* l. vii. 10.) The growing opposition to Millenarianism led to an acquiescence in the view which regarded this book as non-apostolic; hence, probably, the peculiar language employed by Eusebius. Of course we shall adhere to the contemporary evidence which ascribes this book to the beloved disciple, instead of following mere arbitrary conjectures.

“Indeed, it may be observed that there is perhaps no book of the New Testament of which we have such clear, ample and numerous testimonies in the second century as we have in favour of the Apocalypse. And the more closely the witnesses were themselves connected with the apostle John (as was the case with Irenæus), the more full and explicit was their testimony. That doubts should prevail in after ages, must have originated either in ignorance of the earlier testimony or else from some supposed intuition as to what an apostle *ought* to have written. The objections raised on the ground of internal *style*, &c., can weigh nothing against the actual evidence. It is in vain to argue *a priori* that John could not have written this book when we have the evidence of several competent witnesses that he *did* write it.

RESULTS OF EVIDENCE.

“I have now discussed all the books of the New Testament, and to this I may add, that if I were to investigate other remains of antiquity, we could rarely find one tenth part of the evidence for works undoubtedly genuine: and even this evidence is often only found after intervals much greater than that from the apostolic age to the end of the second century.

“Historic evidence embraces a much wider range than that of eye witnesses. Thus we do not in the slightest degree doubt the facts which Bede mentions in his history as occurring a century and a half, or two centuries before the time when he wrote. We conclude that he made due enquiries of those who could inform him of what had taken place before his time. A person who takes pains may learn much orally on good authority as to past events. I can well remember the interest with which, when a child, I listened to accounts of the

Scotch rebellion, in 1745, under Prince Charles Edward Stuart: and these things were told me not on report, but by an eye-witness. Things thus learned (as Irenæus says) grow with us; so that the whole of the rebellion would have been a history in my mind, even if I had never read a word on the subject. This is wholly different from hearsay report. And observe that this period of 106 years, is as great as that between the apostolic age, and the time when Origen had arrived at man's estate. A very few lives may continue testimony for a much longer period. In the popedom of Sixtus V. (1585-90) was born Giovanni-Battista Altieri. When very old he became Pope in 1670, under the name of Clement X. He died in 1676. Now, in March, 1846, I visited at Rome, the convent of Santa Francesca Romana. The abbess of this convent was a princess of the Altieri family, then aged almost 100. This abbess had known several in her own family, very aged, of course, when she was young, who had been acquainted with their kinsman, Clement X. In conversing with the old abbess, about these things, it seemed as if I was transported back two centuries and more. Here were links of connection that carried me back into the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Two hundred and fifty years carry us from the time of Paul to that of Eusebius—the extreme interval over which our enquiries have been extended.

“Has not, then, the requirement of the rule of evidence laid down by Augustine, been fully met? We can show that a successive series of writers from the age immediately subsequent to that of the apostles, have mentioned, or used (and in general extensively) the books of the New Testament. And if with regard to some, such as the Epistle of James and the Second Epistle of Peter, the indications are less frequent, we have only to enquire whether they

are not sufficient? As to the books in general, the evidence is so cumulative, that nothing more attested is presented to our notice."

"I have *indicated* the evidence on many points, without stating it at length: this has only been, however, the case when the facts are unquestioned. I have omitted vast masses of evidence as to many of the books, not because it is not both good and valuable, but because a few unquestionable witnesses sufficed to prove the points. I have also passed by many statements which are often brought forward as evidence, because of some difficulty or doubt which may attach itself to these testimonies. An advocate may easily invalidate the force of his case by adding weak or doubtful evidence to that which is beyond exception. Cavils may be raised against that which is weak, which will undermine in the thoughts of others that which is strong. Harm has often been done to Christian evidence by referring to writers for that which their works do not contain, except by doubtful interpretations.

"Here then we have plain historic reasons for accepting the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, as the genuine works of eight persons—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter and Jude. But will this evidence apply to *these* books alone. I asked why do we receive the acts of the Apostles and reject the acts of Paul and Thecla? I have answered the former part of the enquiry. I will now briefly reply to the second. Because the acts of Paul and Thecla, though written by an Asiatic Presbyter, who had known Paul, was never received by contemporary Christians, and those of the age immediately subsequent, as an authentic history, and farther, as we learn from Tertullian and Jerome, the author of the book was excluded by the apostle John from his office as Presbyter for having written it.

"And as to other early writings,

though we may find occasionally one or two who use them and cite them, yet this is the rare exception; it is as much a matter of individual opinion as it is when we now find a Protestant who believes in the Divine authority of some book of the Apocrypha.

"But if this be the evidence in favour of the New Testament books, what is that which can be brought to meet it? Should we not hear *both* sides? THERE IS NO COUNTER EVIDENCE WHATSOEVER. Surmises and hinted doubts are all that can be brought to meet the united testimony of the early Christian Church, scattered in many regions, yet testifying to the transmission of the same books. But might not this common testimony be only a *tradition*? If tradition be used in an indefinite sense, then I say, certainly not. For this testimony goes back so far as to exclude the lapse of time needful to give birth to indefinite tradition. And besides, the tradition of something to be propagated by mere oral report is wholly different from the account which is received relative to a monument inscribed with a record, or a book which claims (as do Paul's epistles) to be written by any well-known individual. The received account then becomes a sort of public consent to the recorded inscription, whatever it be.

"Those who seek to invalidate evidence by means of surmises, represent ordinary minds as incapable of nicely balancing such points. They say that without certain habits of study and mental training, we cannot do this. But is the allegation true? Can it be applied generally? Certainly we so act as if we thought that minds in general are capable of appreciating evidence, when placed before them intelligibly. We do not seek for profound scholars or men of most acute intellect, as if the *facts* in question in judicial enquiries could only be determined by such. And though we sometimes find a brainless jurymen,

incapable of comprehending evidence, yet this does not prevent our considering that men in general are competent to weigh testimony to *facts*. Mental training and experience of a particular kind are certainly necessary to enable anyone so to investigate facts and to arrange the evidence on which they rest as to present them intelligibly before others; but this is done so for the very purpose of putting them in the possession of the evidence which enables them to grasp the *facts* as such.

"It has been said that the investigation of Christian evidence is on the whole unsatisfactory, because the point to which it is intended to lead the enquiry is known beforehand. This objection is very much in accordance with the habit of mind which loves a considerable degree of uncertainty, and which wishes to make the first elements of truth a mere field for speculation.

"But if this objection be good, will it not apply to other subjects also? For instance, in mathematical studies, we know very well as soon as a theorem is enunciated *what the point is* which the teacher intends to prove. We are not instructed how to demonstrate that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, in order that this should afterwards be in our minds a debateable question; but we learn the demonstration that this may henceforth be held as an established and unquestionable fact. Just so is it as to the evidence for the records of our religion. We do not prove the genuineness of the New Testament books on any grounds of mere *opinion*, so that what seems established to-day may be overthrown to-morrow, but we demonstrate it by evidence, which loses no part of its value by lapse of time, any more than time can weaken the force of a mathematical demonstration."

(To be continued.)

THE JEWS AND THEIR AFFAIRS.

"The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure."—(Ps. cxxxv. 4.)

"What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to Himself."—(2 Sam. vii. 23.)

"The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."—(Deut. vii. 6.)

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock."—(Jer. xxxi. 10.)

"A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it from the beginning of the year; even unto the end of the year."—(Deu. xi. 12.)

"The Lord hath chosen Zion: He hath desired it for His habitation. This is My rest for ever. Here will I dwell; for I have desired it."—(Ps. cxxxii. 13. 14.)

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—(Luke xxi. 24.)

THE MONTEFIORE COLONIZATION SCHEME.—A sub-committee of this Fund has been engaged for some week past investigating the claims of the several candidates for the office of Agent in the Holy Land, of whom there were no less than forty-five. At a meeting of the Executive Committee held on the 19th inst., a report of the sub-committee was submitted, and eventually adopted. A

Russian gentleman, appearing to possess every qualification, was unanimously selected as the most fitting candidate, but having regard to the present disturbed state of Turkey, it was deemed advisable not to make any actual appointment until the condition of the country will enable the agent to undertake, with security and comfort, the discharge of the important

duties which will be confided to him.—
Jewish Chronicle.

JEWS RETURNING TO THE HOLY LAND.—The *Lebanon* has learned from Alexandria that an Austrian vessel which left Egypt on Ellul 36, for the Holy Land, was crowded with Polish and Russian Jews. Having been asked why they resorted to the Holy Land in such numbers, replied: "Have you not heard that the Holy Land has become the property of certain wealthy brethren-in-faith of London? We now go there to take possession of the land of our fathers." This is the effect of the advertisement and discussion of the Montefiore scheme, and an effect not contemplated by its promoters. The Jews throughout the world have conceived vague ideas of the project, leading them to expect their return to the Holy Land, which may bring forth further fruits of this sort, and stimulate the development of the scheme.

EASTERN AFFAIRS AND "THE LIGHT OF PROPHECY."

A clergyman ("Rev." W. Curling, of Southwark), writes to the editor of the *Daily News*, thanking him for the exposure of the Turkish atrocities. He says "You have spoken to the nation's heart, and you have had your reward in the response that has made England's name for humanity to be more than ever renowned through civilised Europe. In the light of prophecy, I see the fast-approaching end of Turkey's abused dominion; and what will follow, beyond the predicted restoration of the now scattered people of Israel to their own once 'glorious land,' no human mind can tell." If this clergyman knew the Scriptures, he would be able to speak more definitely on the subject. "What will follow" besides the restoration of Israel, may briefly be summed up in this saying: "The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever."

A JEWISH VIEW OF THE FUTURE OF PALESTINE.

The *Hebrew Observer* has the following on "the Future of Palestine:" "Is there no other destiny for Palestine but to remain a desert, or to become the appendage of an ambitious foreign power? Syria will ere long be the *entrepot* between the East and the West. On the Euphrates and along the coast, old cities will revive and new ones

will be built; the old times will come back on a scale of greater vastness and splendour; and bridging the level districts, the steam car will run in the track of the caravan. Syria, then, will be a place of trade—pre-eminently. And who are pre-eminently the traders of the world? Will there, when the coming change takes place, be any more congenial field for the energies of the Jew? The country wants capital and population. The Jews can give it both. And has not England a special interest in promoting such a restoration? Russia covets Syria, and desires to have a Greek patriarch supreme at Jerusalem. It would be a blow to England if either of her great rivals got hold of Syria. Her empire, reaching from Canada in the West to Calcutta and Australia in the South-east, would be cut in two. England does not covet new territories, but she must see that they do not get into the hands of her rival Powers. She must preserve Syria to herself through the Syrians. Does not policy, then—if that were all—exhort England to foster the nationality of the Jews, and aid them, as opportunity may offer, to return as a leavening power to their old country? Rome has persecuted the Jews. Nowhere has oppression and contempt attended the Jews so much as in Rome, in the despised Ghetto quarter of the Eternal City. Russia, too, in her Greek orthodoxy, condemns the Jew. But in England, he is unfrowned on by the Church, and endowed with the fullest rights of citizen. England, also, is the great trading and maritime power of the world. To England, then, naturally belongs the rôle favouring the settlement of the Jews in Syria. Do not the dictates of policy exhort her to the same course? The nationality of the Jews exists: the spirit is there, and has been for three thousand years; but the external form, the crowning bond of union, is still wanting. A nation must have a country. And is not Syria open to them? They seized it of yore, as a wave of armed and enthusiastic warriors; will they not, ere long, return to it as pioneers of civilization to re-clothe the land with fertility, and as the busy agents of a commerce which will bring together both East and West on the neck of land between the Euphrates and the Levant? The old land and the old people, and commerce flowing again in its old channels. We see strange things now-a-days; may not this also be one of the notable sights of this epoch of resurrection?"

EXTRAORDINARY PROJECT FOR THE OCCUPATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

The *Christian Standard* quotes from the *Journal de St. Petersburg* an extraordinary statement concerning the priest who has

been recommended by the Pope (now 85 years of age) as his successor. It is to the effect that "Father Becker" (the priest in question) "seeing Romish power to be irrevocably doomed in Europe, hopes to gain a footing for it in Asia. His plan is to buy up Palestine as cheaply as he can get it from the Porte, and make Jerusalem the Rome of the future. Negotiations for this object, adds the *Journal*, are being carried on with great vigour between the Vatican and the Porte by means of the Patriarch, Mgr. Hassoun. The Russian paper professes to be able to give even the details of the plans of the Curia. A railway is to be built connecting Jerusalem with Bethlehem, and Jaffa is to be made a first-class harbour. A hope is entertained that many rich families of Europe professing the Romish faith will gather round the new Papal kingdom, and countless profitable pilgrimages are looked forward to. In consideration of the great favour to come, Mgr. Hassoun is reported to have offered the Porte sufficient funds with which to carry on the war against Russia."

There are several reasons for thinking such a scheme inadmissible in the programme of latter-day events; but the existence of such a thought may have an important effect in giving an impetus to the Anglo-supported schemes of the Jews themselves, to whom a Papal occupation of Palestine would be of all other occupations, the most abhorrent.

THE FIRST JEWISH SKETCH OF JESUS.—The *Jewish Chronicle*, of Sep. 18th, 15th and 22nd, presents its readers with a series of extracts from Professor Gratz's newly-published *History of the Jews*. The extracts cover the period of Jewish history during which Christ appeared, and contain what the *Jewish Chronicle* styles "the first sketch that ever emanated from a Jewish pen" of the life and career of "that extraordinary individual who was an instrument in the hand of providence to produce the greatest revolution that ever human agency effected on earth." Professor Gratz attributes the development of Jesus to the teaching of John the Baptist, to whom he devotes some particular attention. His sketch, though professedly historical, is essentially theoretical and idealistic, as was to be expected.

John is introduced as a zealous Essene, who hopes to establish what with Rabbinical vagueness is termed "The Messianic age." Jesus is one of his disciples! John's work is interrupted by Herod through political jealousy. "After the Baptist's capture," say Professor Gratz, "his work was continued by some of his followers, of whom none was so successful as Jesus of Galilee. The young disciple soon excelled his master, and gave the first impulse to a movement which imparted to the history of the world an entirely new aspect, and through a thousand concatenations wrought the most radical changes in thought and customs, in art and science, in individual relations as well as in political combinations. Never yet did one born of woman enjoy such an enthusiastic divine reverence for thousands of years. With this splendour he obscured the conquerors and founders of great empires; nay, conquerors and founders, heroes and geniuses bowed their heads to adore him in humility." It does not seem to occur to Professor Gratz as a strange thing that a mere carpenter, crucified for his fanaticism and unraised from the dead, should achieve this lofty elevation above every name that is named even in the present world. Like the rest of his brethren, he is blind to the palpable truth concerning Jesus. Shortly, we may hope he may have the opportunity of uniting with those he now misleads, in expiating his crime against God, by abject humiliation before the crucified Nazarene returned to reign in power and great glory on the throne of his father David. Meanwhile, he says some things which have a considerable element of truth in them, which the paganised Christianity of the present day is unable to perceive. He says :

"Jesus was far removed from assailing the foundations of the Jewish creed or its observances. It was not at all in his plan to become a reformer, much less to establish a new religion; his only object was the conversion of sinners to the divine law, and their preparation for the Messianic period through godliness and sanctification. As to the unity of God, he was so far from the intention of modifying, to say nothing of subverting this cardinal doctrine of Judaism, that he, on the contrary, urged it with great emphasis. Once, when a scribe asked him what he believed to be the essence of Judaism, he replied, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,

and with all thy soul, and with all thy might—is the first, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself—is the second commandment.' So we read in Mark, and the omission of the declaration of unity in the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke is obviously not without a dogmatical purpose. Another time when addressed with the words, 'Good Master,' he energetically declined the title, adding, 'There is none good but one, that is God.' Those of his followers who remained true to Judaism, transmitted as one of his sayings, 'I am not come to destroy but to fulfil the law; for sooner shall heaven and earth pass, than one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law.' As to the Sabbath, he undoubtedly held it sacred, or else such of his disciples as adhered to Judaism would not have been the strict Sabbath observers they were. It was merely the Shammaitite rigour which forbade to cure on Sabbaths, that he opposed, saying that the law could not possibly be intended to prevent doing good on the sacred day. Against the existing ritual of sacrifices he had no objections whatever; what he demanded with reference thereto, was, in full agreement with the teachings of the Pharisees, that reconciliation with man should precede that with God. Not even to the observance of facts was he opposed, but merely asked that it should be practised without ostentation and hypocrisy. So entirely did he remain within the confines of Judaism that he shared the illiberality of his age in having the utmost contempt for the heathen world, by which term in those days were meant the tyrannical Romans and their still more contemptible accomplices, the Oriental Greeks and Syrians. He refused to have anything to do with heathens, with regard to whom he said, 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you.' A woman of Canaan, *i.e.*, one of the Syro-Greeks of Phœnicia, once asked him to heal her sick daughter, he said abruptly, 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of Israël; it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to the dogs.' When sending his disciples forth, he admonished them, 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of Israel.'

Not in opposing Judaism did Jesus seek his mission, but in planting its religious and moral truths in such hearts as had heretofore been entirely destitute of them. Not even pure immortality in the sense of the continuance of the soul's life in heavenly blessedness after its departure from the body, did he teach, but merely, just as did the rest of the Rabbis of his day, the resurrection of the body at a certain time, when the pious and righteous would be awakened

to establish on this earth a new order of things which was called the world to come (*Olam-ha-Ba*), which resurrection, it is likely that Jesus, in agreement with the Pharisees and Essenes, associated with the Messianic age or the appearance of the heavenly kingdom."

"REVIVE THE ORGANIC CENTRE OF JEWISH NATIONALITY."

The following is an extract from the words of Mordecai (in the new book, *Deronda*), to which Mr. Guedalla makes allusion in his letter last month:

"What wonder that multitudes of our people are ignorant, narrow, superstitious? What wonder? What wonder? The night is unto them, they have no vision; in their darkness they are unable to divine; the sun is gone down over the prophets, and the day is dark above them; their observances are as nameless relics. But which among the chief of the Gentile nations has not an ignorant multitude? They scorn our people's ignorant observance; but the most accursed ignorance is that which has no observance—sunk to the cunning greed of the fox, to which all law is no more than a trap or the cry of a worrying hound. There is a degradation deep down below the memory that has withered into superstition. In the multitudes of the ignorant on three continents who observe our rites and make the confession of the divine unity, the soul of Judaism is not dead. Revive the organic centre: let the unity of Israel which has made the growth and form of its religion be an outward reality. Looking towards a land and a polity, our dispersed people in all the ends of the earth may share the dignity of a national life which has a voice among the peoples of the East and the West—which will plant the wisdom and skill of our race so that it may be, as of old, a medium of transmission and understanding. Let that come to pass, and the living warmth will spread to the weak extremities of Israel, and superstition will vanish, not in the lawlessness of the renegade, but in the illumination of great facts which widen feeling, and make all knowledge alive as the young off-spring of beloved memories.

I say that the effect of our separateness will not be completed and have its highest

transformation unless our race takes on again the character of a nationality. That is the fulfilment of the religious trust that moulded them into a people, whose life has made half the inspiration of the world. What is it to me that the ten tribes are lost untraceably, or that multitudes of the children of Judah have mixed themselves with the Gentile populations as a river with rivers? Behold our people still! Their skirts spread afar; they are torn and soiled and trodden on; but there is a jewelled breast-plate. Let the wealthy men, the monarchs of commerce, the learned in all knowledge, the skilful in all arts, the speakers, the political councillors, who carry in their veins the Hebrew blood which has maintained its vigour in all climates, and the pliancy of the Hebrew genius for which difficulty means new device—let them say, 'we will lift up a standard, we will unite in a labour hard but glorious like that of Moses and Ezra, a labour which shall be a worthy fruit of the long anguish whereby our fathers maintained their separateness, refusing the ease of falsehood.' They have wealth enough to redeem the soil from debauched and paupered conquerors; they have the skill of the statesman to devise, the tongue of the orator to persuade. And is there no prophet or poet among us to make the ears of Christian Europe tingle with shame at the hideous obloquy of Christian strife which the Turk gazes at as at the fighting of beasts to which he has lent an arena? There is store of wisdom among us to found a new Jewish polity, grand, simple, just, like the old—a republic where there is equality of protection, an equality which shone like a star on the forehead of our ancient community, and gave it more than the brightness of Western freedom amid the despotisms of the East. Then our race shall have an organic centre, a heart and brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defence in the court of nations, as the outraged Englishman or American. And the world will gain as Israel gains. For there will be a community in the van of the East which carries the culture and the sympathies of every great nation in its bosom; there will be a land set for a halting-place of enmities, a neutral ground for the East as Belgium

is for the West. Difficulties? I know there are difficulties. But let the spirit of sublime achievement move in the great among our people, and the work will begin. . . .

What is needed is the heaven—what is needed is the seed of fire. The heritage of Israel is beating in the pulses of millions; it lives in their veins as a power without understanding, like the morning exultation of herds; it is the inborn half of memory, moving as in a dream among writings on the walls, which it sees dimly but cannot divide into speech. Let the torch of visible community be lit! Let the reason of Israel disclose itself in a great outward deed, and let there be another great migration, another choosing of Israel to be a nationality, whose members may still stretch to the ends of the earth, even as the sons of England and Germany, whose enterprise carries afar, but who still have a national hearth and a tribal of national opinion. Will any say 'It cannot be?' Baruch Spinoza had not a faithful Jewish heart, though he had sucked the life of his intellect at the breasts of Jewish tradition. He laid bare his father's nakedness and said, 'They who scorn him have the higher wisdom.' Yet Baruch Spinoza confessed not why Israel should not again be a chosen nation. Who says that the history and literature of our race are dead? Are they not as living as the history and literature of Greece and Rome, which have inspired revolutions, enkindled the thought of Europe, and made the unrighteous powers tremble? These were an inheritance dug from the tomb. Ours is an inheritance that has never ceased to quiver in millions of human frames. . . .

What wonder if there is hatred in the breasts of Jews, who are children of the ignorant and oppressed—what wonder, since there is hatred in the breasts of Christians? Our national life was a growing light. Let the central fire be kindled again, and the light will reach afar. The degraded and scorned of our race will learn to think of their sacred land, not as a place for saintly beggary to await death in loathsome idleness, but as a republic where the Jewish spirit manifests itself in a new order founded on the old, purified, enriched by

the experience our greatest sons have gathered from the life of the ages. How long is it?—only two centuries since a vessel carried over the ocean the beginning of the great North American nation. The people grew like meeting waters—they were various in habit and sect—there came a time, a century ago, when they needed a polity, and there were heroes of peace among them. What had they to form a polity with but memories of Europe, corrected by the vision of a better? Let our wise and wealthy show themselves heroes. They have the memories of the East and West, and they have the full vision of a better. A new Persia, with a purified religion magnified itself in art and wisdom. So will a new Judea, poised between East and West—a convent of reconciliation. Will any say, the prophetic vision of your race has been hopelessly mixed with folly and bigotry; the angel of progress has no message for Judaism—it is a half-buried city for the paid workers to lay open—the waters are rushing by it as a forsaken field? I say that the strongest principle

of growth lies in human choice. The sons of Judah have to choose that God may again choose them. The Messianic time is the time when Israel shall will the planting of the national ensign. The Nile overflowed and rushed onward: the Egyptian could not choose the overflow, but he chose to work and make channels for the fructifying waters, and Egypt became the land of corn. Shall man, whose soul is set in the royalty of discernment and resolve, deny his rank and say, I am an onlooker, ask no choice or purpose of me? That is the blasphemy of this time. The divine principle of our race is action, choice, resolved memory. Let us contradict the blasphemy, and help to will our own better future and the future of the world—not renounce our higher gift and say, 'Let us be as if we were not among the populations;' but choose our full heritage, claim the brotherhood of our nation, and carry it into a new brotherhood with the nations of the Gentiles. The vision is there; it will be fulfilled."

The Christadelphian.

He is not ashamed to call them brethren.—(Heb. ii. 11.)

DECEMBER, 1876.

THIS closes the thirteenth volume of the *Christadelphian*; consequently, it contains the ordinary title page and table of contents for binding the volume. This usually forms part of the number: but on this occasion, we supply it over and above the forty-eight pages of which the number consists. Readers will accept it as a present.

The next number will only be sent to those inscribed in time on the new list of subscribers being made up—the condition of inscription therein being, as is known, the pre-payment of the subscription price mentioned on the cover. We shall hope to have done with this cumbersome and weak machinery by and bye. We hope the fourteenth volume may be arrested in the course of publication by the events now transpiring in Eastern Europe. The Lord comes when the political Euphrates is dry,

and the King of the North in possession of the Sick Man's house. It would seem as if this eventuality were near. At the same time, past history shews the divine work to be on a large scale of time. Consequently, while looking for the Lord's re-appearance as a daily contingency, and therefore "with loins girt and lights burning, like men waiting for their Lord," let us guard against impatience, should the closing events of this closing era take a longer time to arrive at maturity than may be agreeable to our ardent wishes for the dawn of Israel's consolation.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE POWERS DISCUSS THE EASTERN QUESTION.

MUTUAL MENACES OF RUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

IMMENSE PREPARATIONS FOR WAR.

RUSSIA is not yet in the field; but all the events of the last month have tended to make

her early appearance there something more than a probability. The first of these was the defeat of the Serbian army at Djunis, and the capture of Alexinatz by the Turks, which virtually placed Serbia at the mercy of the marauding hordes of the Ottoman. On this occurrence, Russia addressed an imperative demand to Turkey for a six-weeks' armistice, to be followed by a conference on the matter in dispute, threatening in case of refusal, within 48 hours to re-call her ambassador, and suspend diplomatic relations—the first step towards a state of war. Turkey consented, and an armistice, to terminate with the end of the year, immediately ensued. England then took steps to assemble a Conference of the Powers on the Eastern Question, which is to be held in Constantinople early in December, and at which Turkey is to be asked to grant self-government to the Christian provinces.

So far, on the face of things, it seemed as if peace might be arranged. Some eagerly believed what they so much desired. Yet no one, in the press or on the platform, spoke hopefully on the subject. It was felt that the question to be debated at the conference was one in which it was impossible that agreement could be arrived at, and that in point of fact, the conference was more likely to extend than end the war. And so far as events have developed themselves, this seems likely to be the result.

ENGLAND AND RUSSIA THREATEN EACH OTHER.

To begin with, the very chance of harmony was destroyed by the strange indiscretion of Earl Beaconsfield (Mr. Disraeli that was, now a peer) who, at the annual civic banquet in the Metropolis, in the beginning of November, indulged in a menace of war. He said that though England was a country of peace; she was three times better prepared for war than any other, and if she had to begin a fight, she would not end the fight till her object was accomplished. The immediate effect of this was visible in the Emperor of Russia himself, on the following day, openly expressing himself, for the first time, on the Eastern Question; and in a manner that left no doubt of his intentions. He said he wanted peace, and hoped the conference would result in securing it. "Should this, however," he added, "not be achieved,

and should I see that we cannot obtain such guarantees as are necessary for carrying out what we have a right to demand of the Porte, I am firmly determined to act independently, and I am convinced that, in this case, the whole of Russia will respond to my summons, should I consider it necessary, and should the honour of Russia require it. I am also convinced that Moscow, as heretofore, will lead the van by its example. May God help us to carry out our sacred mission!"

This speech of the Czar unfavourably affected political prospects, as regards the world's point of view. A telegram from the capital of the German Empire, says, "The speech of the Czar at Moscow is considered here as the reply of Russia to Lord Beaconsfield's inopportune and mischievous manifesto. Two harangues have practically cancelled all the engagements gained during the past fortnight, and public opinion regards the whole Eastern question as thus prematurely opened. The *National Zeitung* says: 'Two Powers—Russia and England—are again brought face to face with the chances in favour of a warlike collision.' The *Vossische Zeitung* says: 'If Russia has determined in advance on only one solution, it is unnecessary to hold a Conference.' The tone of the Press generally is one of discouragement."

The effect of the speech on the Russian people has been electric. A telegram from St. Petersburg says: "The Emperor's speech at Moscow has been followed by a general and enthusiastic echo throughout the Russian Empire. Town Councils, diets, trade guilds, clergy—in fact, all classes of the population—unanimously proclaim their full and joyful readiness to contribute towards giving effect, as far as in their power lies, to all the demands which the Monarch and the Empire may make upon them for the protection of the interests of Russia. Declarations are made that the inhabitants place all their fortune and all their resources at the disposal of the government for defraying the necessary expenses."

MOBILISATION OF THE RUSSIAN ARMY.

Following out the delivery of the speech came the issue of official orders from St. Petersburg, to get a portion of the immense Russian army into a state of

readiness to take the field. A circular was at the same time issued by Prince Gortschakoff, explaining the meaning of the military measures, to the representatives of Russia abroad. The circular says: "that in view of the acts of violence perpetrated in the Turkish Empire, and which continue, notwithstanding all the efforts of the Imperial Russian Cabinet, the Emperor is firmly determined to obtain the accomplishment of the object aimed at, and finds it necessary to mobilise a portion of the army.

The active army will comprise the 7th, 8th, 11th, and 32nd corps, under the supreme command of the Emperor's brother, Grand Duke Nicholas Nicholasievitch, with Adjutant General Nepokoitschitzky as chief of the staff, Prince Massalsky as commander of the artillery, Major General Depp as commander of the engineer corps, Major General Stolzenwald as inspector of the hospital department, Lieutenant General Tomlin as captain of the irregular forces, Prince Barklay de Tolly-Weimarn as commander of the 7th corps, General Radetzky of the 8th, Baron Kruederer of the 9th, Prince Woronzoff of the 10th, Prince Schachoffsko: of the 11th, General Wannowsky of the 12th, Gen. Ahrens as commissary of stores of the army on active service, and Dr. Priselkaw as military medical inspector.

TURKEY ON THE BRINK OF RUIN.

In the midst of these threatening preparations, the English plenipotentiary, the Marquis of Salisbury, has left London to take part in the conference. Meanwhile, Lord Derby has published a full official narrative of the course of negotiations, down to the granting of the present armistice in compliance with the demands of Russia. The most noticeable feature in it, next to the evidence it contains, that all efforts of peace have from the beginning been foiled by untoward and unexpected occurrences (or in other words, that God is fighting against human efforts to stave off the Eastern Question), is, the expression of Lord Derby concerning Turkey, in reference to the failure of England's efforts to bring her to a reasonable attitude: He says "Sir Henry Elliott was accordingly instructed, on the 5th, in the event of the terms of peace which had been proposed by the Powers being refused, to press upon the Porte as an alternative to grant an armistice of not less than a month, and to state that, on the conclusion of an armistice, it was proposed that a Conference should immediately follow.

He was further to intimate that, in case of the refusal of an armistice, he was instructed to leave Constantinople, as it would then be evident that *all further exertions on the part of her Majesty's Government to SAVE THE PORTE FROM RUIN would have become useless.*" Lord Derby, England's Foreign Minister, is a man having access to correct information as to the bearing of events: and if in his judgment, current events involve the exposure of Turkey to "ruin," it is a strong confirmation of the views and expectations of those who, with God's purpose in view, desire nothing more ardently than the complete perdition and disappearance of the Euphratean power. In a similar sense, it is interesting to read the remark of the *Times*, quoted by the *Liverpool Mercury*, that "it is easy to see *the Ottoman empire is PERISHING.* We can trace the progress of decay with scientific accuracy, and show that the disease is as incurable as old age. We are about to witness such another set of revolutions as have led to the present states of Roumania, Servia, Egypt, and Greece. So long as the interests of England and Europe are not menaced, it would be worse than useless to stop a process which is the natural and inevitable transition from the misrule of the Porte."

THE RUSSIAN EMPEROR ON RUSSIA'S INTENTIONS.

Next among the important occurrences of the month is the publication of an official account of a long conversation between the Emperor of Russia and the British Ambassador at the Court of Russia, on the Eastern Question. The publication of this document was desired by the Russian Government and consented to by the British Government, with a view to tranquillize the public mind. It was noticeable, however, that the request and the consent were both several days before Earl Beaconsfield's warlike speech and its consequences. To some extent, therefore, the document has become effete. The *Daily News* remarking on it, says:

"The Emperor Alexander was very anxious to explain to the British Ambassador his relations with England, and more especially to make a statement respecting the designs attributed to Russia upon Constantinople. The Emperor declared that 'he desired no aggrandisement, aimed at no conquest,

and that he had not the slightest wish or intention to be possessed of Constantinople.' All that had been said about a will of Peter the Great and the aims of Catherine the Second were illusions and phantoms—they never existed in reality, and he considered that the acquisition of Constantinople would be a misfortune for Russia.' Further, 'His Majesty pledged his sacred word of honour in the most earnest and solemn manner that he had no intention of acquiring Constantinople, and that if necessity should oblige him to occupy a portion of Bulgaria, it could only be provisionally and until peace and safety for the Christian population were secured.'

"We cannot, however, affect to think that with the publication of these assuring declarations of the Russian Emperor, the gravity of the situation has disappeared. In this same conversation the Emperor stated that 'unless Europe was prepared to act with firmness and energy, he should be obliged to act alone.' A statement like this powerfully discloses the difficulty of the position in which all the governments are placed. Indeed, everybody is remarking that the prospect of a Conference on the condition of Turkey has by no means been accepted by either the Russian or the Ottoman Government, as a reason for abating the activity with which each is preparing for war. Every day brings intelligence of the increasing magnitude of the armies of the two Powers, and of the energy with which each of them is developing its belligerent resources. While the Czar mobilises his army corps by the half dozen, and concentrates them for operation on the Pruth, or for the defence of the Black Sea, the Sultan calls out regulars and irregulars by the hundred thousand, to form armies on the northern slopes of the Balkan and among the mountains of Armenia. Peaceably disposed spectators, observing this vast expenditure on preparations for war, not unnaturally ask themselves whether those who make them are really sincere in accepting the proposal of a Conference, or have not rather resolved upon a course dictated solely by their own passions or interests, regardless of the opinion of Europe."

THE REAL DESIGNS OF RUSSIA.

The *Liverpool Mercury* remarks as follows

on the real nature of Russian tactics and designs:

"We are at length overtaken by a crisis in which it behoves us to fling the sham courtesies of diplomacy to the winds, and to ask ourselves, soberly and seriously, whether Russia, in the recent counsels of the Powers upon the Eastern Question, has or has not been perpetrating a huge fraud upon Europe. The startling news which we publish this morning shews it is not a case in which to mince matters, the issues are too tremendous. . . . On the sole guarantee of what we have believed to be the present Czar's personal character, we have suppressed our instincts and closed our eyes to patent facts to an extent which must almost have made the late Lord Palmerston turn in his grave. . . . Who was it that took advantage of the German-French war to tear up the treaty of 1856, and once more threaten Turkey with a Russian fleet in the Black Sea—the good Czar, or the Russian people? So far as appeared upon the surface of things, the Russian people knew no more about the transaction than we did—were not aware that it was even contemplated, indeed, till the publication of Prince Gortschakoff's insolent manifesto made the Czar's design known to all Europe. Who is it, again, that has been filling the Black Sea with transport ships sufficient to carry an army of 90,000 men, occupying all the railway lines in the conveyance of troops southward from all parts of the empire, massing heavy divisions and 20,000 cavalry in Poland, and raising a secret loan in the Netherlands—the Government of the Czar, or the Russian people? The answer goes without saying. Finally, who incited the Herzegovinians, the Bosnians and the Bulgarians to rebellion, and Servia and Montenegro to a declaration of war? The published records of our own Foreign Office tell us. It was the diplomatic agents of the Government of the good Czar and their emissaries. Were all these things done in the interests of peace, does anyone suppose? Nay, does not every action of the Russian Government, on the contrary, indicate a fixed purpose to foment war? . . . That Russia means to go to Constantinople, if possible, is as clear as that we intend to keep India, if possible. All she wants is a decent pretext for getting on her way thither.

The whole history of Russia is a history of aggression, with a view to the extension of her territory. As is pointed out by a writer in the current *Edinburgh Review*, she has, since 1772, doubled her area. Within eighty years she has pushed her way 350 leagues nearer to Vienna and Paris; she has taken possession of half Sweden and of Poland; she has seized as much as would make another Austrian empire. She has wrested from Persia as much as would make another Great Britain. By successive wars and

treaties she has purloined from Turkey an area as large as Prussia was before; and within the last five years she has spread herself eastward almost to the gates of India. . . . When the secret history of the pending negotiations comes to be written we shall be surprised if we do not find the Powers have been far more anxiously engaged in circumventing the warlike intentions of Russia than they have in providing for the peaceful future of the Christian dependencies and provinces of Turkey."

THE CRISIS AND ITS TENDENCIES.

No doubt the closing remark of the foregoing article hits the truth. Benevolence never yet governed the politics of mankind. The Conference represents a clash of interests in which concern for the Christian provinces of Turkey is merely a pretext for furthering long-cherished political designs. If it were not that the intrigue, on all sides of it, is tending to the development of the situation of the latter-day, in which "the man whom God hath appointed" will step in and assume the invincible direction of affairs himself, it would have no interest for those who desire to see the love of God and man triumphant in the earth. But having this tendency, the intrigue is supremely interesting, particularly as it approaches a climax from which there must be a new departure, and perhaps, the one on which the hopes of the saints are fixed.

It is evident that the pressure of the crisis is giving birth to very revolutionary schemes in high British quarters, as regards the future of Turkey. Mr. Grant Duff, ex-under Secretary of State for India, has written to the *Times*, recommending the deposition of the Sultan, and that he should be replaced by the Queen's son, the Duke of Edinburgh, on the throne of Turkey, as the only means of regenerating Turkey, or at all events, saving her from Russia. In a second letter, he says the idea is not his own, but is independently entertained in many quarters. Such a scheme is of no practical importance: but it is valuable as shewing the situation ripening for that establishment of British power in Asiatic Turkey, which prophecy justifies us in expecting at the present crisis.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.*

F.L.—For an explanation and reconciliation

of the two genealogies of Christ by Matthew and Luke, see the *Jew Discussion*, pp. 7-8; but more particularly, the *Christadelphian* for Dec., 1872, pp. 568-9. The "infidel world" which "makes capital out of these apparent discrepancies" involved in these genealogies is a very shallow world. It is not concerned to arrive at the truth in matters so distasteful to it as the history of Christ. It is not even in the position of the scorner, "seeking wisdom and finding it not."—(Prov. xiv. 6.) It seeks rather to get rid of wisdom; and in its eagerness to do this, it does not scruple to exaggerate every appearance of discrepancy it can find and to close its eyes and ears to every reasonable explanation. Be not troubled at them.

WHO ARE THE CALLED AND WHO ARE THE FEW CHOSEN?

W.L.—There can be no doubt that when Christ says "Many are called but few are chosen," he means many are brought into the gospel by the hearing, belief and obedience of it, but that of that many, only a few will be found fit for a place in the kingdom of God. If he meant that many are invited (called) but few accept the invitation (call), we should then be unable to understand Paul when he says "Ye see your calling, brethren, that *not many wise* men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble *are called*." If invitation and calling are the same, it would follow that all men are called because all are invited, and therefore that many wise men after the flesh are called, which Paul says is not the case. He restricts the phrase "the called" to those who have obeyed the truth, thus: "Among whom (the nations) are ye also (the saints at Rome) *the called* of Jesus Christ"—(Rom. i. 6). Again, "Ye are called in the one hope of your calling" (Eph. iv. 4); "Holy brethren, *partakers* of the heavenly calling"—(Heb. iii. 1.) The connection in which Christ used the words shows that by the "called," he means those who are brought within the operation of the gospel call. The words are twice recorded as having been used by him. In the one case (Matt. xxii. 14), it is a guest who comes to the feast, at the call of the host, but who comes in an unfit state, and concerning whom the Lord says, "Bind him hand and foot and take him away, &c., for many are called but few are

* We have been obliged to hold over a portion of these to make room for the Signs of the Times.—Ed.

chosen." In the other case, it is a grumbling person among the *labourers in the vineyard* to whom the Lord says, "Is thine eye evil because I am good? So the last shall be first and the first last, for many be called but few chosen."—(Matt. xx. 16.) The general teaching of Christ is in harmony with this. "Enter ye in at the straight gate for . . . few there be that find it."—(Matt. vii. 14.) "Many shall seek to enter in and shall not be able." Why is this? The reason is perfectly plain. The Lord gives it himself: "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God."—(v. 20.) "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."—(vii. 21.) "They that *hear the word of God* and do it," is His own definition of the blessed. It is because few of the many who are called obey the commandments steadfastly in their entirety that few of the called will be chosen. They are, therefore, no vain words of exhortation that tell us to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling."

WHY DID CHRIST PRAY?

If Christ was the one Saviour spoken of in the Prophets (of whom the Spirit saith there is "none else") why did Christ pray to the Deity to be saved from death?—J.C.M.

ANSWER—This question is obscurely put, but it probably means that Christ as "the one Saviour" was Jehovah, and that Jehovah praying to Jehovah is an inconceivable idea. If this is the difficulty, it is sufficient to remind the questioner that though Christ was the manifestation of Jehovah, by conception and anointing, he was a new individual, who had to render obedience to the one common Father of all, upon whom he declares he was dependant and to whom he ascribes all the glory of his works. This explains why he prayed. It may be, however, that the questioner's difficulty lies here: if Christ was the predicted Saviour, was not his salvation from death so much a matter of course as to make praying for it superfluous? In this case, we can only say that God's ways are more comprehensive and perfect than man's, and that no part of wisdom is neutralised by another. Though

Christ was the destined Saviour, he was destined to become so by thorough obedience; and prayer was a part of that obedience, not to speak of it as the natural expression of his fervent longings for the salvation of God at a time when he "endured the contradiction of sinners against himself," and sustained himself by the prospect of the joy set before him (Heb. xii. 2).

BROTHER A. ANDREW'S ARTICLE ON "SIN, ITS ORIGIN," &c.

The following was sent by brother Andrew to appear at the close of his recent articles, along with the other answers to questions put by those who object to his position. It was, however, too late to appear in the Oct. number. Its appearance is not unseasonable now.

4.—QUESTION. If the shedding of Christ's blood was necessary to *his* resurrection, on what principle can any be raised from the dead who have not become associated with his sacrifice by immersion into his name? Does not the idea that the shedding of his blood was necessary to his resurrection clash with the belief that some will be raised from the dead who have never been immersed into Christ?

ANSWER.—Without entering into the question of whether any who are not "in Christ" will or will not be raised from the dead, but assuming that some out of Christ will be raised, we may point out that there is no inconsistency in the matter. If there be any such raised, they will not be raised to eternal life, but to be punished for their rejection of God's proffered mercy. They will be raised to manifest God's power, and vindicate His insulted Majesty, and for that their association with the sacrifice of Christ is no more required than in the case of Lazarus and others who were raised from the dead to manifest the power of God and attest the mission of His Son. The shedding of Christ's blood took place not simply with a view to men being brought out of the ground—raised to mortal life, but with a view to their *complete* redemption; therefore association with the sacrifice of Christ by immersion into his name is necessary only in regard to those who are raised to eternal life. If, in Heb. xiii. 20, the shedding of Christ's blood is spoken of in connection with his mere resurrection from the tomb to mortal life, it is, doubtless, because in his

case that resurrection was a guarantee of his exaltation to immortality, (Acts xvii. 31); but in regard to others, this will not be so; their resurrection from the grave affords no such guarantee, because they are raised in order to be judged whether they are worthy of everlasting life.

SMOKING AN UNBECOMING PRACTICE IN BRETHREN.

W.L.Ts.—We had occasion recently to write privately to a brother on the subject; and we cannot better reply to your remarks than by repeating the substance of what was written: "A habit which makes the personal proximity of the practiser of it nauseous to every man of a healthful sensibility cannot be in accordance with the purity which the saints are exhorted to cultivate both in body and in spirit. Habitual smoking is such a habit, and ought not to be named among us as becometh saints. On a recent occasion, a sister was advising a brother to give it up as a filthy habit, and therefore unbecoming in those who are under apostolic command to purify ourselves from all filthiness. The brethren with you were quoted in defence of it. I must say it made me feel sad. I had supposed that you, at all events, might be relied upon to uphold among the brethren 'Whatsoever things are pure, and lovely, and of good report,' and abstinence from even 'the very appearance of evil.'

"Your reasoning is not good. We are free from the law of Moses, but we are not free from the law of Christ, which comprehensively forbids things that are not specified. If there is one thing more distinctly forbidden in a general way than another it is filthiness of body, uncleanness of flesh or spirit (2 Cor. vii. 1), '*fleshly* lusts that war against the soul.'—(1 Peter ii. 11.) Holiness both of body and spirit is more than once enjoined, as you know.—(1 Cor. vii. 34.) And in view of the fact that our *bodies* are the members of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 15) this is intelligible. I could understand a paganised sectarian, who distinguishes between man and his body, making our treatment of the body a matter of indifference; but I cannot reconcile this position with a knowledge of the truth. There are things on which men of sense and holiness do not require prohibition. 'Doth not nature itself teach you?' is a question applicable in many cases; and certainly in the particular matter in question. Who does

not know that narcotism is inconsistent with the pure action of the vital machinery of which God has constituted us? Who does not know that tobacco fumes have a defiling and depraving effect on those who steep their faculties in them? Who does not know that it is the universal practice of wickedness, and associated with every form of debauchery and evil doing in our dark and evil day? Who does not instinctively shrink at the sight of children indulging in it? Who could behold a woman smoking without feeling she was degraded? Who could imagine Christ with an abominable 'cutty' in his mouth?

"On these grounds alone, a man of judgment will say that smoking is a thing to be eschewed by every man who seeks to purify himself from 'all filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' that he may be 'holy both in body and in spirit,' walking as becometh a saint in the midst of an evil world. And in saying it is a thing 'not in accordance with the truth,' such a man would not be setting up a 'righteousness of his own,' but would only be enforcing the righteousness enjoined by the apostles on the saints of whom he prays that they may be 'sanctified *wholly*, in their whole *spirit and soul and body*,' (1 Thess. v. 23,) and to whom he gives a large commission of holiness in saying, '*Whatsoever* things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report, . . . if there be *any* virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things;' (Phil. iv. 8,) and whom he exhorts to 'abound more and more in all knowledge and judgment, that they may *approve of the things that are excellent*;' (Phil. i. 10,) and that 'filthiness,' with 'jesting and foolish talking,' may be excluded from the practices of the saints; (Eph. v. 4,) being 'in behaviour as becometh holiness.'—(Titus ii. 3.)

"A man of judgment would not contend that we are at liberty to do just as we like 'in all things of flesh.' Paul says, 'Brethren, ye have been called to liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh.'—(Gal. v. 13.) We are at liberty to choose our own ways in all things of God's appointment, such as eating, drinking, walking, but even then our liberty is subject to the law prohibiting idleness, theft, &c. But who will say that God appointed smoke for the mouth? If in a sense, all things are lawful, all things are not expedient; and in this sense, it is not true that we are at liberty

to 'use all things.' We are Christ's free men—not to be filthy or anything else that is incompatible with the holy calling. We are the Lord's bondsmen in things of the flesh as well as things of the spirit, for it is written 'Whether ye eat or drink or *whatsoever* ye do, do all to the glory of God.'

'I am sorry to differ from you, but I have no alternative when you lay down the princi-

ple that questions of 'carnal practice' are of indifference in saintship. A discreet application of the apostolic standard of holiness will make it cover *all things*; and in this standard is reflected the mind of Christ. I am against crochets equally with you; but a point of wisdom kept in its own place is not a crochet. In all things we ought to be without reproach.'

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM.—The following persons have been immersed during the past month: THOMAS STEPHENS (42), engraver, formerly neutral, residing at West Bromwich, in the neighbourhood of Birmingham. Nov. 2nd, Mrs. STANLEY (34), formerly Primitive Methodist, now residing at Great Bridge, near to Birmingham; Mrs. WOOLSCROFT (28), wife of brother Woolscroft, of Toll End, formerly Wesleyan; JOHN BIRCH, of Toll End, formerly Wesleyan; ELLEN GARRETT (33), formerly Church of England. Nov. 9th, Mrs. BALDWIN (36), sister in the flesh to sister Hardy, of Birmingham, formerly Wesleyan; CLARA EGGINTON (18), daughter of brother and sister Egginton. Nov. 16th, CHARLES TODD (33), bricklayer, formerly Church of England. Also, on Saturday, Nov. 18th, WILLIAM CASTLE (51), mason, formerly Church of England, and ROBERT TAYLOR (26), policeman, formerly Church of England—both of Eateington; and HARRY PIMM (21), sculptor, of Shipston-on-Stour, formerly Church of England.

On Monday, Nov. 14th, a profitable tea meeting was held, devoted in the usual manner to exhortation, interspersed by singing.

During the month, four special week-night lectures have been delivered by brother Roberts, in the Temperance Hall, on the subject of Prophecy and the Eastern Question. Good and attentive audiences were naturally to be expected and realised in the present disturbed state of Eastern politics.

The Sunday evenings during the month have been occupied as follow:—Oct. 29th, Question night.—(Brother Roberts.) Nov. 5th, Baptism and Forgiveness.—(Brother Hodgkinson.) 12th, The Proverbs of Solomon.—(Brother Shuttleworth.) 19th, The Fall.—(Brother Roberts.) 26th, Question night.—(Brother Roberts.)

BRIGHOUSE.—Brother Spencer reports the delivery of lectures in the Oddfellows' Hall in this place by brother J. S. Dixon, of Manchester, by arrangement of the Elland brethren. There were fair and attentive audiences. The subjects related to the coming of Christ and the Signs of the Times. Brother Bairstow, of Elland, also

communicates information of the lectures, stating that they were delivered on Oct. 15th and Nov. 12th, and consisted of a lecture in the morning and in the evening on each date. Brother Bairstow states that brother Goggins lectured in the same place on Oct. 29th, adding that the Elland brethren have had these lectures at Brighouse, because the people at Elland do not seem disposed to listen to the truth.

BRISTOL.—Brother Coles reports the loss (through removal) of brother F. Cort, who has left Bristol, and gone to reside at Northampton—his native town. The loss is felt by the Bristol brethren, as brother Cort has been mainly instrumental in bringing five of their number to acknowledge the truth. There have been two immersions during the past month, viz., on Sunday, the 5th, R. G. REES (about 25), formerly neutral, who put on Christ in the appointed way, and (following a sea-faring life) afterwards left Bristol for Cardiff; and on Sunday, the 12th, EDWARD GUNTER (18), formerly neutral, who has been a regular attendant and attentive listener at the meetings for the last two months. Others in Bristol are interested, and the truth is evidently progressing in spite of much opposition. The clergy are aroused (some of them), and are warning their hearers to beware of, and keep aloof from the Christadelphians. One of them, a somewhat popular minister amongst the Congregationalists, the "Rev." W. W. Jubb, recently delivered an address, entitled "Christadelphianism Exposed," evidently taking his cue from the "Rev." Clement Clemance's pamphlet. Two lectures were delivered by the brethren in reply, on two consecutive Sunday evenings, to large audiences. Brother Rae, originally of Glasgow, late of Leeds, has removed to Bristol, so that the ecclesia now numbers ten brethren and four sisters. A little more than a year ago there were only two.

CHELTEXHAM.—Arrangements were recently made for the delivery of a course of twelve lectures at 228, High Street, extending from Oct. 15th to Dec 31st. The lecturers are brethren J. Millard, W. R. Otter, J. Horton, A. Medlicott, T. Merrett, W. Osborne and E. Constable. The subjects range pretty much over the entire system of the truth. In addition to the

lectures, an "Open Bible Class" is held, at which questions are allowed. We have not heard how the lectures are attended. One thing is certain: brethren cannot try to serve the truth in this way without reaping great benefit to themselves.

CLEOBURY MORTIMER.—Brother Betts reports:—"On the 26th ult., a lecture was delivered in the Assembly Room, by brother Phillips, of Birmingham, on The Eastern Question from a Bible point of view. The attendance was very good, and the interest in the subject all that could be desired from the audience."

DALKEITH.—We have an intelligence communication from this place, but unaccompanied with any intimation of those professing the truth in this part having taken a right attitude towards the errors introduced by the Renunciacionists.

EDINBURGH.—Brother W. Grant reports. "MARY SMITH (19), eldest daughter of our brother and sister Smith, having expressed a desire to accept God's invitation to 'His kingdom and glory,' was, on Tuesday, 24th October, constituted an 'heir' of that kingdom, by being immersed into the sin-covering name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Sister Mary Andrew has returned from York, whither she had gone some six months ago. She felt her isolation from those of 'like precious faith,' as all will who desire to reap the blessings of the one faith. Our lectures for the month have been as follow: Oct. 29th, The Gospel as preached to Abraham. Nov. 5th, The Gospel as preached by Jesus Christ. 12th, The Gospel as preached by the Apostles."

GLASGOW.—Brother Nisbet (who has been appointed secretary, in conjunction with brother Leask as assistant secretary) reports that since last communication three more have been added to the number "of such as should be saved" through obeying the form of sound words delivered unto us by the apostles, viz: on Sep. 24th, MRS. MAXWELL, wife of brother Maxwell; and JANE JOHNSTONE, sister in the flesh to brother Johnstone; and on Nov. 12th, ARCHIBALD SPEIRS, who has been attending the lectures for a considerable time.

"I have the pleasing duty," says brother Nisbet, "to announce that brother O'Neil is again in fellowship with us. He broke bread with us for the first time on Sunday, Oct. 15th, having entirely withdrawn from the unscriptural theory propounded by E. Turney. This is very strengthening as well as encouraging to us, and we trust that a few more will follow his example ere it be too late. Our Sunday lectures, since last communication, have been as follow: Sep. 17th, The Jew and his Destiny.—(Brother Thos. Nisbet.) 24th, The Christian Hope.—(Brother Owler.) Oct. 1st, The Punishment of the Wicked.—(Brother Jas. Nisbet.) 8th, The Sons of God, and their Future Manifestation.—(Brother Robertson.)

15th, The Great King.—(Brother Mulholland.) 22nd, The Destiny of Man.—(Brother Jno. Ritchie.) 29th The Present Crisis.—(Brother Owler.) Nov. 5th, Baptism.—(Brother Jas. Nisbet.) 12th, The Great King, second lecture.—(Brother Mulholland.) The lectures continue to be well attended, and a few are anxiously searching the Scriptures daily to see whether these 'strange things' are so or not, so that they may believe and obey."

GREAT YARMOUTH.—Brother J. W. Diboll, jun., reports: "I have the pleasure, this month, of reporting an addition to the number of those in this place who are waiting for the return of God's Son from heaven. Our new brother's name is BENJAMIN WOOLNOUGH (27). He was formerly a member of the General Baptists' community in this town, but as the result of several months' attendance at the lectures, now rejoices in the freedom which the truth only gives. Our subjects for the past few weeks have been as follow: Oct. 22nd, The Fall.—(Brother J. Diboll.) 29th, Hell.—(Brother A. Harwood.) Nov. 5th, The Immortality of the Soul.—(Brother J. Diboll, jun.) 12th, Stephen's Dying Prayer.—(Brother D. Spinney.)"

GREAT BRIDGE.—Brother W. Hardy, of the Dudley ecclesia, who resides here, reports that after labouring for some time as opportunity served to make known the truth in this neighbourhood, his efforts, in conjunction with those of other brethren, have brought forth fruit, and there are now several persons besides himself who profess the truth in Great Bridge. As some of these are sisters, who would be unable to walk to Dudley (three miles distant), they are about to establish an ecclesia at Great Bridge. It will number ten brethren and sisters. Of these, five have but recently obeyed the truth, viz: T. PICKEN (48), of Wolverhampton, formerly Independent, husband of sister Picken; and four others immersed at Birmingham, under which heading particulars of their cases will be found.

HALIFAX.—Brother Firth writes: "We are still holding forth the truth in our place of meeting on Sunday evenings, at the Assembly Rooms, and although we do not see much fruit spring from the efforts put forth, yet we rest in hope, knowing that we have done what we could; hence we patiently wait the increase which Paul says is of God."

LEICESTER.—Brother Burton reports the obedience of TOM J. W. WYKES (21), of Coalville, mineral surveyor, of whom he says that he attained to a knowledge of the truth through conversations held with two sisters who, some time ago, removed from Leicester to Coalville; and from reading published works. Also, on Nov. 5th, the obedience of SAMUEL BALDWIN (60), who had first become acquainted with the truth

some three years ago, when he lived elsewhere. He used to attend the lectures in Birmingham, since which he has removed to Mesham, a village a few miles from Coalville. There he became acquainted with another enquirer, James Bradford. They mutually helped one another in their study of the Word, assisted in the matter by brother Wilber, of Leicester, through whom the truth had, in the first instance, been introduced to J. Bradford. On the Sunday following brother Baldwin's immersion, Mr. BRADFORD came over with a like result, having witnessed a good confession, and was then invested with the role of righteousness in Jehovah's own way."

LONDON.—Brother Elliot writes Nov. 14: "One more out of the millions in this great city has put on the saving name of Christ, viz: Mrs ANN HAYNES, formerly Congregationalist, who was baptised on the first of November. I hope to have other cases to announce next month. The Sunday evening lectures here have been very well attended of late. Last Sunday afternoon we commenced a series of meetings for the consideration of scriptural subjects, at which strangers who believe in the inspiration of the Bible, are to be allowed an opportunity of stating their views. We had a very interesting meeting, and were surprised by an address from a total stranger, setting forth the Bible doctrine of man's nature; that knowledge in divine things is increasing. The lectures for November have been as follow:—Nov. 5th, The Devil.—(Brother J. J. Andrew.) 12th, The Mosaic Sabbath: a past institution, but a type of the future sabbatic rest of a thousand years.—(Brother A. Andrew.) 19th, Gog and Magog.—(Brother Thomas Boshier.) 26th, The Eastern Struggle.—(Brother J. C. Phillips.)"

NOTTINGHAM.—Brother Kirkland reports another addition by immersion, in the person of Mr. WILLIAM DENT (69), lace dresser, 27, Union Road, formerly Millennial Baptist. He had been a regular attendant at the meetings for some time past.

SCARBORO.—Brother Kidd announces the resignation of brother and sister Hood, which (though the reasons alleged they considered inadequate), was accepted by the ecclesia as the best solution of difficulties with which they had exercised long patience and forbearance.

SHEFFIELD.—Brother Boler says there has been a great stir in Sheffield in "missions." "The Church of England," he says "are having a mission, and the people are flocking to the churches by thousands. I never saw anything like it. We are lifting up our voices and sending out the gospel to them as well as we can. I went to hear the Archbishop of York on Saturday, Oct. 14th. I heard him make this statement,

'I will not believe that as soon as I die I shall drop into dust.' This is an illustration of his serpentised mind.—(Gen. iii. 2.) On Sunday Oct. 15th, I gave a discourse in our lecture room, viz: 'The Sheffield Church Mission and the Mission of Christ at variance.' The room was filled. Brother Skinner also lectured, October 22nd, on the gospel. There was a good attendance. So you see we have had a mission as well as they."

Writing again a week or two later, bro. Boler says "Our little ecclesia, now numbering 22, has been augmented by the removal of brother and sister Johnson, of Glasgow, to the vicinity of Sheffield. The subjects for the past month, in addition to those mentioned above, have been as follow: Oct. 29th, Penitent form, scaffold and death-bed repentance a delusion.—(Bro. Boler.) Nov. 5th, The coming troubles, or evidence that the end is near.—(Brother Skinner.) 13th, Who made the soul immortal?—(Brother Boler.) The above discourses were required from us by circumstances."

SWANSEA.—We have nothing more to say in answer to letters from the brethren referred to at the end of last month's intelligence from this place, except that we should be glad to hear of unity in the truth being established, and common good feeling prevailing. As regards their particular case, all that "justice" required was done by publishing their disclaimer of sympathy with Renunciationist doctrine. If their arguments do not allow us to go farther, the fault is not ours. When people say "the implantation of a physical law of decay which works out dissolution and death" is one thing, and that "our hereditary mortality is a physical law of decay in our nature" is quite another and "very different" (when by the writer of both definitions, the meaning intended and expressed is the same), there is very little encouragement to hope for agreement by the use of language. It is one of countless causes of regret which we can only strive to endure in patience against the soon-coming day of rectification before the tribunal which will hush all differences in glory or shame.—(Ed.)

AUSTRALIA.

NEW TOWN (Ipswich).—Brother Jno. Faulk, who has settled in this place, wishes to say he should be glad to hear from any of the brethren in Queensland or the other colonies. He is without society in the faith, and feels lonely. He is to be found at "Railway Works, North Ipswich, Queensland." Ipswich, he says, is a quiet place and very religious (principally Catholic), but very intolerant of the truth. He is doing his best by book-lending and con-

versation to exhibit the truth, but with very little result so far as he can see. He advises no one to emigrate from England if they are able to get on at all, as times are very backward in the colonies.

CANADA.

TORONTO.—Brother D. P. Ross reports the obedience of the WIFE of brother Gemmel, also the DAUGHTER of brother Mickleborough, and one named Lockhart of whom no further particulars are supplied. There are also additions by removal of B. and S. Black, with their families, from Scotland. On the other hand, there are losses as follow: sister Gill, by death; brother Mickleborough, with his wife and daughter, by removal to Coburg, Ont.; sister Edwards, to England; and brother and sister Evans, to Winnipeg, Manitoba, leaving the ecclesia at 43.

WALKERTON.—Brother Gunn states that the brethren have removed their meetings from a private house to the Council Chamber in the Town Hall, which has been granted by the authorities. [To brother G.: Thanks for the "Rev." Mr. Wollaston's letter, which, if we could have his permission, we might publish. It indicates the progress of scriptural ideas. Meanwhile, it is forwarded, as you request, to brother Ashcroft, and books to Mr. Wollaston.]

HAMILTON.—Brother Bolingbroke has been doing his best to hold aloft the banner of the truth amid many discouragements. The day of recognition hastens on apace, and no one will then regret the humiliations and mortifications of a trying service.

NEW ZEALAND.

CAVERSHAM, Dunedin.—Bro. W. W. Holmes reports that all difficulties here have been adjusted without any compromise of truth and righteousness, and that the brethren are having very happy meetings. They have rented a new hall, called the Caversham Hall, seated to hold 150 persons, which they occupy all day on Sunday, and one night during the week. The attendance of the public is small, but a few seem interested. Brother Holmes sends a few advertisements clipped from the local papers to show how the brethren advertise; also a cutting to show that at last the brethren have succeeded in getting the Christadelphian publications admitted to the Library of the Dunedin Athenæum.

UNITED STATES.

BURNET, Tex.—Bro. Banta reports: "Since my last writing, I have assisted six in putting on the sin-covering namé in the appointed

way, viz.: MARGARET LAVERT, HARRIS KEELE, T. F. KEELE, J. C. MCKEE, and his wife S. J. MCKEE, and JOSEPH GREEN, all of whom gave ample proof of their sufficient enlightenment in 'the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus anointed,' to yield acceptable obedience to God; they also evinced the true Abrahamic disposition. Five of them were the result of lectures delivered by brother S. H. Oatman, and myself in Bell County, Texas, at which place I left bro. S. H. Oatman to deliver another course of lectures, a few miles from where we first spoke. Some interest seemed to be manifested by the people in that vicinity. We have reason to anticipate a favourable reception of the truth in the above-named county. There seems to be better prospects for the spread of the truth in this part of the country." (In answer to question: We are nowhere commanded to "put away" a penitent transgressor. The "wicked person" of 1 Cor. v. 13 was one living in transgression, the same as in the case of an idolator, a drunkard, &c., with whom he is classed in verse 11. When a man acknowledges and forsakes his sin, we are bound to receive him, remembering that "He shall have judgment without mercy that showeth no mercy." Leave judgment to the Lord.—As to marriage, it is going beyond the word to say that a believer marrying an unbeliever becomes a fornicator. Marriage is a civil contract, on a natural basis, regulated by the law of the land. Rome has made it "a sacrament." Let us not fall into her mistake. A believer takes a false and dangerous step in uniting in wedlock with unbelief or indifference, and will probably be punished in the spiritual injury that results; but to call upon him or her to annul the marriage as a condition of fellowship is to do that for which there is no warrant, either in Scripture or reason.—Ed.)

CARROL (La.)—Brother P. F. Sanders reports the obedience of his brother-in-law, ALEXANDER H. STRONG, who came to brother Sanders' house last summer a stranger, but soon became interested in the truth and finally put on the saving name on the 17th of September. Brother Sanders says that through removals, the company of believers in Carrol is reduced to four. He advises brethren anywhere in want of a settlement, to come to Carrol. Land, he says, in these parts is fertile and to be had at a low price. [The terms of restoration to fellowship in the case of any manner of offence is a confession of wrong-doing and repentance. If there are any doubts, give the offender the benefit of the doubt, and leave the Lord to judge at his coming. The duty of the ecclesia is done when it washes its hands of the offence. Penitent offenders are to be received and helped till the Lord come.—Ed.]

LANESVILLE (King Wm. Co., Va.)—Bro. Lemuel Edwards writes: "In the Intelligence column of the *Christadelphian* for September. Bro. J. S. Neale writes from our place giving an account of the opening of our new house of worship, and some of the circumstances connected therewith, upon which you remark as follows: 'The church, as defined by Paul, is the pillar and ground of the truth—the thing that holds up—the thing that gives foundation to the truth. No community is entitled to this character unless it performs this function to the truth in its entirety. Dr. Edwards has a good character in this connection. It may be that the community described above shares it in fact, if not in reputation. We hope the best, but if the doctrine of the judgment is compromised, there is a flaw in the title deed. What is implied in this criticism calls for a word of explanation. But first allow me to say that I object to our brother Neale's allusion to me as 'our own shepherd, Samuel Edwards' (Lemuel it should be). Brother Neale is young and understands perfectly what he is saying, which may excuse him, but others may not understand him, and as in our day it has a Babylonish savour, it is distasteful to me, as I have no relish for anything that has the slightest taste or odour of Babylon, and for this, and other reasons, I would prefer that brother Neale should use the language of David, Ps. xxiii. 1: 'The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want;' and of Eze. xxxiv. 23: 'I will set up one shepherd over them;' and of Jesus, John x. 16: 'There shall be one fold, and one shepherd.' To be one of the sheep fills up the whole measure of my ambition, and hence I respectfully protest.

"But to your remarks: 1st, The 'community' as a body, which makes up the ecclesia of which I am a member, is Christadelphian in all that is signified by the word. We accept the Christadelphian faith, defining it as the 'one' Abrahamic and apostolic faith set forth in the Old and New Testament, and so copiously elucidated in *Elpis Israel*, *Eureka*, *Twelve Lectures*, and other works by the same authors; and we would have it known from Canada to Texas, from Birmingham to Hong Kong, that this faith in its entirety is the only faith that will stand the test of the judgment, or avail us in the trying hour; and to this faith there are no 'ifs and ands,' pros and cons,' 'yeas and nays;' but 'As God is true, our word to you is not yea and nay, but yea and amen to the glory of God.'—(2 Cor. i. 18-20.)

"Of the sixty or more members which form our ecclesia, I know of none which stand in opposition to the scriptural doctrine of the judgment; yet there may be reasons which make us justly open to the suspicion implied in your remarks. There are some among us who can see no harm in casting their

votes for Cæsar in a quiet way, to promote, as they say, the best interest of government and the peace of the land, seeming to be ignorant of the fact that in so doing they not only identify themselves with the 'sovereign people' who make up the kingdom of Satan, but legally and morally commit themselves to the use of the sword by which that kingdom is upheld, and constitute themselves citizens of that kingdom, in contravention of that profession which requires them to 'resist not evil, and if smitten on one cheek to turn the other,' and which transfers their citizenship to heaven and centres it in the King of Israel, who is to come again to re-establish the commonwealth of Israel (of which they are 'fellow-citizens with the saints') and fulfil to them the covenants of promise which is the foundation of their hope. He is coming to shiver all the kingdoms of Satan which 'Gentiles in the flesh' are labouring so industriously to uphold and perpetuate, and which stand in irreconcilable antagonism to the kingdom of our God and His Christ. Ye are not of the world, brethren, even as your Lord is not of the world, neither is your kingdom of this world as his kingdom is not of this world. Then 'come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and I will receive you.' These are Christadelphian doctrines which it is not safe to ignore, lest in this respect there may be a 'flaw in the title deed.'

"Now there are among us a few brethren, good and true in other respects, who say they cannot see as I see, and calmly and quietly cast their votes for Cæsar as a matter of 'conscientious duty' to elect the best rulers. Now, brother R., please tell me are we compromising the truth in retaining in fellowship these conscientious brethren, in the hope that their growth in grace and in the knowledge of the truth may bring them in the ways of the Lord more perfectly? I am sure that you and I will agree that we cannot see what possible good they can do by this affiliation with Cæsar, and if we warn them faithfully, as we do, that there is danger in the position, can we do more? But—

2.—I apprehend there is another ground on which you base your suspicion of defectiveness on the part of our ecclesia, found in the names of the speakers who co-operate with us in the opening of our synagogue. Brother Anderson was an old and tried friend of brother Thomas, and he has been labouring with us for years. We know his worth in many respects, and are unwilling to give him up. He is now over three score and ten, and has devoted much of his life to the advocacy of the truth. On the question of the judgment in its details, his ideas, I think, are quite indefinite. He rather avoids the discussion of it in private, and never discusses it in his public addresses. He knows our

uncompromising disposition and jealousy for the truth, and as he never preaches anything, at least with us, which the most thorough Christadelphian cannot endorse, I do not think we commit an error in having his co-operation. If, however, he were to distinctly avow himself in opposition to the truth as taught by the Christadelphians, he would of course force us to a change of Christian relationship.

"Brother Weeks, of Baltimore, has been with us frequently on former occasions. He always professed himself a learner, willing to accept the truth, whenever he could see it clearly—a firm believer and an able advocate of the leading elements of the kingdom—has arrived at no definite conclusion as to the details of the judgment, and never discusses it in his public addresses.—He only gave one lecture on the occasion referred to, which was very acceptable to the ecclesia, as well as the outside hearers.

"Brother Wiley Jones, of Norfolk, if I understand him, is a Christadelphian, and an advocate of the truth in its entirety, and gave lectures nearly every night, and sometimes day, during the week, which was very acceptable. Should this meet his eye, and I do not understand him, he will please correct me.

"Brother Luxford, of Richmond, who was also with us, is a true Christadelphian, and needs no remark.

"At the close of the meeting seven persons confessed their faith and put on the sin-covering name in the ordinance of baptism. From that time to the present we have continued the meetings, my son, Dr. J. T. Edwards, and myself lecturing every Friday night, Sunday morning and Sunday night. We made our addresses as plain and forcible as possible, which seems to reach the understandings of the people, and excite considerable interest. Eighteen more, at intervals, asked the privilege of baptism into the glorious and holy name, and we aided them as before. All calmly and quietly done without the least animal excitement, which leads us to hope that the power of truth and that alone was the impelling cause. 'The Lord gives the increase, and we bless His Holy Name.'

"With all the facts before you please tell us whether we are justly chargeable with compromising the judgment.

"Subsequent events may require different action, but one thing is certain, I shall never knowingly compromise the doctrine of the judgment, or any other vital doctrine of the gospel, and this I believe to be the unanimous sentiment of the ecclesia at Lanesville."

[The tone of brother Edwards' letter will

commend itself to every thoroughgoing friend of Christ—and none others can hope to be "chosen" though they may have been "called." The grounds of the misgiving hinted at in the September *Christadelphian* are manifest in the letter itself. They are such, however, as appear to be diminishing with the lapse of time, by growth in the right direction. It is not a question of the "details" of the judgment, but of the fact of judgment itself. "Details" we must wait to see: but the fact that Jesus will dispense life or death to his professing friends assembled in his presence at his coming is an element of the apostolic testimony for Christ in the gospel, and, therefore, not to be compromised in a scriptural basis of fellowship with men. Objection to it, whether passive or active, is a disqualification for union on that basis—and of what value is any other basis? It is not a question of whether the objection is "conscientious." The introduction of this element only serves to embarrass the perception of and submission to the calls of duty. "Conscience" may be a dark affair, as in the case of Paul who thought he was doing God service when he persecuted the Church of God. Catholics and Protestants are many of them "conscientious" enough in their opposition to the truth. A "conscientious" objection is a more respectable sort of objection than a malicious objection, and commands more patience and consideration: but it is none the less an objection incompatible with that unity which constitutes the primary basis of fellowship in the gospel. This applies with equal force to the question of duty after the truth has been accepted. A man believing the truth, but walking contrary to the precepts of Christ in any particular is equally disqualified for fellowship with the man who denies the truth in some vital particular; for Paul commands withdrawal from such. For a man to take part in politics, is to identify himself with the present world to which Christ declared he did not belong, and to which he said his friends do not belong, and which both of them in union, will shortly proceed to destroy, root and branches. For faithful brethren, therefore, to fellowship those who do this, is to partake in their evil deeds. First purity, then peace, is the apostolic rule. Any other kind of peace is unwholesome in its effects, both on offenders and those who countenance their offence. But hasty action is never the part of wise men. Yet the ultimate action of wise men is always in accordance with the claims of truth and duty, even if pain and sacrifice are the result.—ED.]

No. 139.—January 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

The Spirit of God and the Bap- tism Thereof	1	The Bible True—Darwin and Huxley Refuted—The Bible the Proof of its own Divine Origin—The Truth of the Bible	18
Things New and Old from the Treasuries of the Spirit .. .	7	The Jews and their Affairs .. .	27
Forty Stray Shots from a Norman Cross-bow	11	EDITORIAL, Signs of the Times	30
Sunday Morning at the Birming- ham Christadelphian Ecclesia. 12		Answers to Correspondents .. .	38
		Intelligence.. .. .	45

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY OF EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN
to Subscribers in the United States, 3 DOLS.;
in Canada, 9s.6d.; in Australia and New Zealand, 10s.6d.; in
advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

ANATOLIA.—This is not to be had separately. It is bound up with the third vol. of *Eureka*.

G.H.V.—“Interesting letter from Troy” held over till next month.

H.S.—We do not know the value of “Californian money” as distinguished from U.S. currency.

S.B.—It is not the custom to acknowledge letters or remittances privately. Acknowledgement will be found in the letter list on page 8 of cover.

W.H.—Sometimes intelligence is omitted by inadvertence. If so, send again. Sometimes it is condensed because of lacking space: never because the place it comes from is “despised.”

WANTED.—A brother in Birmingham is in want of the *Christadelphian* for April, 1871, and January and February, 1872. Those who have them to sell will oblige by sending them to the office.

S., D., E., AND OTHERS.—We see not our way to accept lecturing invitations where Christ is put to shame in the house of his friends. Harcourous and uncalled for divisions obstruct the way of the truth. Labour in such circumstances seems thrown away. We prefer to work where it is fruitful through the unity and love of the brethren.

R.H.V.—We send two copies of the *Christadelphian* (for 1876) to your address, as you do not give an address for the third copy ordered. Brother Shuttleworth also requests note of this that while three *Christadelphians* at the enhanced price come to £1 11s. 6d.; pamphlets ordered and sent 19s. 10d., postage 8s. 11d., total £3 0s. 3d., the actual amount remitted is only £2 11s., leaving a balance of 9s. 3d. owing.

LECTURE SUBJECTS IN “INTELLIGENCE.”—“Tours” used to be the subject of narrative with an object in view. That object accomplished the narratives have ceased. Also with an object, the subjects of lectures have been copiously reported in the intelligence department. That object is now pretty well realised in the general activity in this line of things, and in future, while not being omitted, they will be stated as briefly as possible. We make a beginning this month.

CASES OF NEED.—Information is communicated of a worthy brother and sister, who are in great need through an ailment of the former which incapacitates him for regular work, and renders the little work he is able to do a matter of pain. Help has been rendered by the London brethren, but as the case calls for more than they can accomplish, they appeal to other ecclesias. Brother Kidd, of Scarborough, mentioning the death of brother Fowler, says sister Fowler is left in very needy circumstances, and adds that all that Christadelphians can do ought to be done for her and her family. Contributions sent to the office will be forwarded.

MANY SUBSCRIBERS.—Your letters, on the occasion of renewal of subscription, are thankfully received. A sense of the duty which an evanescent mortal owes to “the Heir of all Things” is the prompting motive of our work. Still it is some encouragement in the midst of weariness and vexation to know that our labour is not in vain, but leads to the monthly comfort and strengthening of the comparatively large number in all parts of the world to whom the *Christadelphian* pays its visits. We would write a private and separate word of acknowledgement and gratitude to each subscriber so expressing

himself, if time and strength and means allowed it. But as this is impossible, let each one consider that this note is to himself personally.

S.P.—Any person or body denying that Jesus overcame by the voluntary subjection of his own will to the Father who sent him, denies one of the first principles of the New Testament teaching, and are responsible for the consequences that may result from the raising of this unscriptural obstacle. The will of Christ was of the Father’s production; but being produced, it was his own as the Son, and voluntarily subordinate to things required of him by the Father from which he would have preferred to escape, e.g. “Let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not my will, &c.”

J.D.—I am sinned and was sentenced to death. We were in him at the time in the sense that propagation by him had not commenced. The root from which we have sprung was in him, and as this root became physically vitiated by death through sin, it may be said by a figure that we sinned and were condemned in him. This was not denied in the remarks to H.D.R. in November. What was denied was that we sinned literally and in the moral sense. If you look at the context of the sentence again, you will see it was the moral bearings of the matter that were the subject of remark. Men cannot sin in the sense of being guilty, who do not exist. Surely this is a truism. But because we inherit the physical results of Adam’s transgression, we may by a figure (and the figure is only once used—Rom. v. 12) be said to have shared in that transgression. That we are “held guilty” of it is unscriptural and absurd. As well might you say that the unborn millions that would have sprung from the antediluvians, had they been allowed to live instead of being drowned, are “held guilty(?)” They were “in Adam” in the same sense that we were. The root of them was there, and had the flood not occurred, they would duly have sprouted from their germ in the Adamic stock; but their branch was cut down by the flood; and so millions of people who were “in Adam” never appeared. Had they appeared, they would have been mortal because of sin in which they had no moral participation; but if you substitute the idea of “guilt,” you have the idea that people were “guilty” who never lived and never will live. A plain subject has been needlessly mystified.

“THE BIBLE VINDICATED AGAINST MODERN THEOLOGY: truth v. tradition; life and death realities; the question of questions unsolved; orthodoxy against itself; the Bible not responsible for the opinions of the schools and divinities. What am I and whither am I going? A MASS OF TESTIMONY FROM VARIOUS SOURCES, ANCIENT AND MODERN, relating to the subjects of life and death; mortality and immortality; matter and mind; materialism and immaterialism; privilege and responsibility; the literal and spiritual, or allegorical gehenna, hell and the grave; eternal torments and everlasting destruction; human tradition and divine knowledge; resurrection and judgment; the Kingdom of God and the age to come, &c., compared with Scripture. Connected and arranged by a CHRISTADELPHIAN. Such is the title of a book of over 300 pages in paper cover, page size of the *Christadelphian*, issued by the brethren in Canada, with a view to getting the truth into public circulation in that part of the world. It consists largely of acknowledged extracts from the writings of Dr. Thomas; also *Twelve Lectures*, and other productions, connected in continuous discourse. By and bye, we hope to have a supply for the British brethren. We shall be able to give particulars next month. The price will be something like 2s.6d. or 3s.

SUBSCRIBERS CHANGING THEIR ADDRESS.—
These should always send their new address, as
the omission of it has, in several cases, led to
the *Christadelphian* being either lost or returned
VISITORS TO BIRMINGHAM.—Such in quest of

lodgings, while accommodating themselves, will
help the widow and the orphan by availing
themselves of apartments opened by the sister
widow of brother John Roberts (late of Ottawa),
at 81, Belgrave Road.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Nov. 22nd, W. Smith, G. Craigen, J. H. White; 23rd, G. A. Birkenhead, W. J. Jannaway, F. Cort, M. A. Hayes, J. Atkinson, A. Bell, J. Howatson, F. C. Walker, J. Phillips; 24th, F. Gaskin, G. A. Thorne, J. Boler, W. Buckler, J. Hawkins, J. Wareham; 25th, C. Fifth, W. H. Andrew, F. Dealtry, T. Holland; 26th, M. Savage, F. Clegg, E. Trueblood, R. Wilkie, F. Hodgkinson, M. Luckman; 27th, J. Birkenhead, B. Sawden, A. Tait; 29th, J. Richards, W. Ripley, M. A. Harris, A. W. Goldie, A. Dixon, J. Dalglish, W. Atkins; 30th, J. Shuttleworth, H. Leah, G. Baker, F. Masters, J. W. Royce, "Warrington," J. C. Gamble. Dec. 1st, W. Darlow, S. Richards, A. Sykes, T. Leigh, T. Watson, D. Gaskin, F. Chitty, M. Birkenhead, H. Haigh; 2nd, W. Hughes, J. Hood, D. Drake, J. Phelps; 3rd, H. S. Sherwood, J. Hirst, J. C. Gamble, J. Durrie, J. Waller, H. Clarkson, G. Waite, P. Henderson, W. Dugdale, C. Jones, J. Birkenhead; 5th, F. Cort, J. Mulholland, R. Oliver, F. Peel, D. Laverock, A. Tait, G. B. Follows; 6th, T. Nichols & Son, W. Smith, R. Oliver, W. Osborne, W. H. Hutton, M. Sharpe, E. Telford, M. Hamilton, J. Birkenhead, F. Cheetham; 7th, S. G. Hayes, T. E. Legg, A. Sykes, C. Armitage, T. Merritt, W. Watson, R. Harrison, W. Birkenhead, B. Lowe, W. Dunmore, J. Atkinson; 8th, C. Fifth, S. Boardman, G. Drake, W. H. Andrew, G. A. Birkenhead, J. Gale, J. Hawkins, J. Grant, H. Haigh, T. Sykes, J. A. Hobson; 9th, J. Mycroft, S. Davies, C. W. Clark, W. Smith, E. Trueblood, G. B. Follows, J. K. Snelson; 10th, A. Sutton, J. Cooke, J. Hawkins, H. Bannister, T. Poyce, J. Brighton, W. Buckler, J. Young; 11th, M. Dawes, W. Wilber, C. Benton, T. Sixsmith, L. Spencer, H. Andrew; 13th, T. C. Walker, E. Edwards, J. Hawkins, S. A. Jagger, J. Henderson, R. O. Oliver, W. Fisher, A. M. Arcus, J. Dalglish, W. Wilson; 14th, A. Sutton, W. E. Hill, J. Down, H. Leah, J. W. Diboll, J. Alexander, J. W. Moore; 15th, W. H. Andrew, F. Peel, S. Boardman, J. Birkenhead, J. Lack, T. Colderbank, B. Elliott, W. Buckler, G. Baker, A. Andrew, W. Warren, W. J. Maxwell, J. Burnett, J. Elliott, G. H. Smith, H. Bannister, A. Harwood, J. Kirkland, W. Peel; 16th, F. Pigott, "Warrington," W. Armstrong, W. Peel, W. Pate, F. Kerr, J. Kirkwood, D. Wylie, J. Hall; 17th, S. Boardman, W. H. Cheetham, S. Briggs, T. Sleeman, A. Smith; 18th, W. Smith, D. Wadsworth, "Warrington," J. Ross, J. Sydenham, T. Haining; 20th, S. Richards, J. Pettigrew, Jos. Mortimer; 21st, C. Fifth, J. U. Robertson, T. Fisher, "Warrington," B. Sawden, T. Yardley, F. Cort, J. Dalglish, H. Veysey, G. Kidd; 22nd, W. Blount, A. Andrew, J. W. Thirtle, D. Atkins, R. Carruthers, J. Power, J. Atkinson; 23rd, J. Horton, C. Thomson, F. Cort.
FOREIGN.—S. H. Oatman, B. F. Sanders, S. Edwards, J. J. Smith, J. C. Wooster, W. Gunn, S. F. Gratz; 24th, W. C. Taylor; 29th, N. E. Smead, J. Leonard, K. Bradley, W. N. Brown, P. Hall; 30th, W. F. Kirk, B. F. Sandford, W. C. Gilliam, M. E. Delozier, H. Tucker, A. Ladson, C. Mitchell, J. Betts, A. Cooke, J. L. Harp, F. Sander; 6th, F. G. Millar, J. Malcolm, T. A. Corbell, M. Knight, W. Maxwell, J. Merry, H. Shields, T. H. Lowden, A. Hall, T. T. Fowkes, A. North, W. S. Cox; 7th, A. E. Magill, A. Ladson, J. F. Sykes, H. Lister, L. Woods; 8th, E. Jacobs, H. Smith; 11th, G. H. Ennis, J. Moffat, A. D. Strickler; 13th, J. Ward, J. Campbell, W. W. Holmes; 14th, E. Bott; 15th, C. Bolingbroke, E. S. Calkins, J. McMillan, C. H. Morse, A. L. Whiting, L. Anderson, E. Neilson, J. O. Woodruffe, C. Jones; 16th, S. J. Ellis, U. S. Agire, S. Hisien, C. Sweet; 17th, S. B. Oatman; 20th, A. Duelli, J. S. Oothill, J. W. Boggs, G. Inwood, M. V. Bickler, P. Graham, J. P. Brown, R. Harper, M. G. Lee, F. Connell, L. Edwards, A. Fincher; 21st, R. C. Vandegriff, W. T. Pottinger, J. K. Magill, R. Bingham, H. C. Jacobs, L. J. Harp, T. K. Clark, H. L. Todd, E. Jacobs; 22nd, C. H. Evans, J. W. White, M. A. Barnes, J. D. Benedict, L. C. Gunn, J. W. Cuckton, W. Crichton.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Nov. 22nd, J. H. White, G. Craigen; 23rd, G. A. Birkenhead, J. Howatson, J. Atkinson, R. Sinclair (2 parcels), G. Scott (2 parcels), R. Wilkie, J. J. Smith; 24th, H. Sulley, W. Buckler (4 parcels), J. Wareham (2 parcels); 25th, T. Holland; 26th, A. Andrew, F. Peel; 27th, J. Birkenhead, B. Sawden; 29th, K. Bradley (4 parcels), Mr. Durley, J. Dalglish, J. Emery, J. S. Leonard, Miss Ronald; 30th, H. Leah, E. Delozier; 31st, R. H. Tucker (5 parcels), W. F. Kirk (3 parcels), W. C. B. Gilliam, F. Masters, J. W. Royce, S. Sanders, C. Mitchell, J. W. C. Gamble, Dec. 1st, W. H. Andrew, R. Roberts & Co., V. Collyer, J. Rhodes (2 parcels), W. Darlow, W. H. Andrew (3 parcels), C. W. Clark; 2nd, W. F. Kirk (2 parcels), H. Haigh; 3rd, J. Waller (2 parcels); 4th, G. Oliver (2 parcels), J. Mulholland, J. Birkenhead (4 parcels); 6th, R. Oliver, E. Telford, J. Merry, T. T. Fowkes (2 parcels), W. Osborne, C. Smith; 7th, W. Birkenhead, W. Watson, J. Rhodes (2 parcels), J. Atkinson; 8th, C. Fifth, R. Carruthers, J. Grant, B. Lowe, J. Hawkins, A. Barraclough, J. Booth, J. Rhodes, E. Sharp, C. H. Edwards (11 parcels), G. G. Walmsley; 9th, W. Smith, E. Thomas (12 parcels), C. W. Clark, W. Wilson, B. Sawden, A. U. Millar, F. C. Walker, T. Kidd, D. Smith, J. U. Robertson, B. Sawden, W. Wilson, A. U. Millar; 10th, J. Hawkins (3 parcels); 21st, Royce, H. Haigh, J. Richards, J. Hirst, J. Mortimer (3 parcels), F. Cort; 11th, L. Spencer, T. Sixsmith (2 parcels), M. Dawes, H. Andrew, J. Moffat; 13th, J. Dalglish, Mr. Tucker (2 parcels), Mr. Jackson, L. Spencer; 14th, J. W. Diboll, C. Weale, W. E. Hill, E. Bott, J. Waller (2 parcels), S. Empsall; 15th, W. H. Andrew, S. Boardman; 16th, F. Pigott, T. E. Nichols, W. Pate, W. Peel (2 parcels), Mrs. Hooper; 17th, F. Sleeman, S. W. Oatman (2 parcels), J. Burnett, W. H. Cheetham, J. Elliott, A. L. Whiting; 20th, J. S. Oothill (4 parcels), P. Graham (2 parcels), J. Tier, C. Fifth, A. Fincher; 22nd, J. Yule, C. H. Evans, J. W. White, J. W. Thirtle; 23rd, T. Horton (2 parcels), J. Atkinson (3 parcels), J. W. White (6 parcels).

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, JAN., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	The States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	88d.	d2.80	10s2d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	1185d.	d4.0	13s6d.
1086d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	1186d.	d4.0	13s6d.
686d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d2.75	8s6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	88c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	83c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	3d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	3d.
1864d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2	1864d.	62c.	186d.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3	64d.	25c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	64d.	25c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	34d.	16c.	4d.
186d.	The Apocalypse Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	186d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	1 1/2d.
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	29c.	9d.
2d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	35c.	10d.
6d.	The Biblical Newspaper	6d.	29c.	1s.
pr. doz.	No. 14	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
184d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	188d.	97c.	2s4l.
pr. 100	per 100.
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, }	1s.	55c.	186d.
pr. doz.	13, 14, 15 & 16	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	14d.	8c.	2d.
86d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	88d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	1 1/2d.
864d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	8610d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	40c.	1s2d.
8d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	4 1/2d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	4d.
200d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	284d.	d1.0	3s4d.
860d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	384d.	d1.30	4s4d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	8d.	15c.	4 1/2d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
186d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	186d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
66d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6610d.	d2.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
26d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	28d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (Illustrated)	2s2d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph)
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price.
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..

All communications must be addressed to **ROBERT ROBERTS**, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 140.—February 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

The Spirit of God and the Bap- tism Thereof	49	Darwin and Huxley Refuted— The Bible its own Proof of its Divine Origin—The Truth of the Bible	69
Are Christians of the present day baptised with the Spirit?	53	Sunday Morning at the Birming- ham Christadelphian Ecclesia.	81
Adam's Sin and Condemnation as Affecting his Posterity . .	57	EDITORIAL	85
Interesting Letter from Troy ..	64	Signs of the Times	86
The Bible True—The Last Hours of an Ex-Infidet Agitator—		Intelligence	91

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENEUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY OF EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN
to Subscribers in the United States, 8 DOLS.;
in Canada, 9s.6d.; in Australia and New Zealand, 10s.6d.; in
advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

letters. David King then immediately sent a final letter of a libellous character with regard to other persons, which he knew could not be published and which he thought would have the effect of preventing the appearance of the correspondence. The others were in type when the final letter came. Nevertheless, the Editor introduced an acknowledgment of having received it. That David King should try to make this appear in an evil light is only one of many assaults of malice we have to endure in the defence of the faith.

Now ready, price One Shilling,

MAN MORTAL;

A WORK OF 116 PAGES BY THE EDITOR,
Being the answer to Mr. Grant which
appeared in the *Christadelphian*.

POSTAGE EXTRA.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it. Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Dec. 23rd, J. Boler; 24th, C. H. Eastwood, J. Howie, H. Moyer, J. Smither, T. Tibbs, J. Clark, T. Smith, T. Atkinson; 27th, W. Wilson, W. Counts, T. Weston, W. Cuthbertson; 28th, F. Peel, G. Dowie, J. Skinner, J. Owen, L. Goodwin, G. Taylor, F. Cort; 29th, C. Firth, T. Mankin, H. M. Skeats, T. Betts, E. S. Evans; 30th, A. P. Willis, G. Drake, E. G. Holden, W. Dew, T. Andies, J. Colles; 31st, G. Wait, J. Gillies, J. Steel, G. Cree, J. Robertson. Jan. 1st, 1876, V. Collyer, J. McIntosh; 2nd, J. Curwen, J. J. Andrew, J. Yardley, T. Randles, A. Dowie; 4th, J. Hage; "Warrington," A. Sutton, B. Sawden, B. Corbet, J. Birkenhead, J. Glasgow, W. King, G. Taylor, G. Wait, J. W. Dibol, J. Taylor, W. Smith; 5th, T. Parkes, C. Firth, Mrs. Fox, W. Owler, T. Bowen, D. Wadsworth, J. Eyre, J. W. Dibol, G. Taylor, T. Merritt, W. Green, J. Howatson, J. Curwen, M. H.; 6th, J. J. Andrew, J. Mulholland, E. Birkenhead, J. Wootton, A. Williams, H. M. Skeats, J. Herriott, G. A. Birkenhead, W. P. Handy, J. W. Thirle; 7th, J. J. Andrew, J. Shuttleworth, J. Robinson, W. Cameron, A. Dowie, J. Atkinson, S. Daves; 8th, J. Birkenhead, B. Lister, T. Kitchen, W. Owen, W. Jeffries, a sister, W. Sinclair; 10th, D. McCann; 11th, J. S. Nisbet, R. Goldie, J. Sanders, J. Grant, J. Hopcroft, "Warrington," C. Smith, T. Royce, D. Mar; 12th, W. Owler; J. Waller, S. Richards, J. Atkinson, J. H. Fowler, A. Bell, M. B., J. Aac; 13th, "Warrington," E. Ailen, C. Smith, J. Waite, J. Anderson; 14th, J. Boler, S. Wand, G. Drake (2 letters), E. Phelps, J. Atkinson, J. Herriott, J. Mortimer; 15th, T. Swindell, R. H. Phillips, H. Elliott, E. P. Gillon, G. H. Kidd, J. Yule, W. Owler, S. A. Jagger, F. Unwin; 17th, J. Birkenhead, D. Birstow, J. W. Dibol, E. Bellamy, A. U. Miller, E. Birkenhead, Newburgh Ecclesia, "Warrington," J. Boler; 18th, F. Cort, H. Porter, T. Bowen, B. Atkinson, R. Paterson, W. McDonald, G. Baker, W. Peel, J. W. Dibol, J. Birkenhead, C. W. Clark, T. Bosher, W. Blount, W. H. Andrew; 24th, A. McKillop, E. Trueblood, R. Hodgson, T. Bosher.

FOREIGN.—Dec. 27th, J. E. Pyle, J. I. Wallace, C. H. Morse, O. C. Brown, J. D. Tomlin, M. Greenlee, J. Lufford, W. Vassie, E. M. Gray, A. Butts, J. Wallace, H. McFadyan; 28th, W. Brittle, J. Turner, J. B. Paton, J. S. Adams, H. C. Jacobs, A. Packie, A. Hall, C. W. Tomkins, J. Wood; 30th, J. W. Boggs, W. Gunn; Jan. 3rd, *Herald* for brother Andrew; 4th, E. T. and E. J. L., H. L. Drake, J. S. Leonard, C. Collorn, J. Lufford, W. Brittle, J. Shaw, S. Short, E. Seyb, J. G. Sanders; 5th, J. Harroun, H. W. Hudson, H. J. Moore; 7th, A. B. McDaniel, T. F. Keele; 10th, E. P. Hall, M. Tomlins, J. Inwiddie, C. M., L. Edwards, A. Sintzenich, J. Laing, W. H. Reeves, W. F. Green; 11th, T. Hart, E. F. Erringer; 12th, J. L. Hathaway, A. O. Latehaw; 13th, F. E. Utter; 17th, T. Hart, J. M. Riggs, Mrs. Rosecran, N. H. Brown, T. H. Jeffries, M. Dunn; 18th, J. Wallace, C. H. Evans; 20th, S. Boyley; 24th, F. E. Henderson, W. C. B. Gillam, F. H. Coleman.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Dec. 24th, J. C. Gamble (3 parcels), J. Boler, C. H. Eastwood, E. Thomas, H. Moyer, B. Sawden, J. Parkinson, R. Sinclair, G. Scott, W. H. Andrew, J. Barlow, W. Chaudler, A. Hood, F. Masters, G. G. Walmesley, W. H. Andrew, R. Roberts & Co. (2 parcels); 30th, W. Cuthbertson, G. Drake, J. Skinner, B. Sawden, F. S. Evans, D. Stokes, J. Martin, L. Goodwin, J. B. Paton; 31st, D. Stokes, W. Gunn, W. Routley, M. P. Ensey, J. Birkenhead, J. Kitchen (11 parcels), W. Brittle, J. Wood, G. Wait, E. Thomas (3 parcels), W. Brittle, E. Thomas, F. Peel, A. Andrew; 3rd, E. Bott, J. McIntosh, M. H., W. Summers, J. Smith (2 parcels); 4th, J. J. Andrew, R. Roberts & Co., F. Peel, J. Lufford, F. Seyb, H. L. Drake, T. Graham, Mrs. Inwiddie, G. G. Bickley (8 parcels); 5th, Bagster and Sons, C. Colleen (2 parcels), C. Firth (3 parcels), L. Howatson, F. Baker, J. Eyre, J. W. Dibol (3 parcels), T. Parkes (2 parcels), J. Kitchen (6 parcels), J. Lufford (2 parcels), J. Howatson, T. Bowen, (2 parcels); 6th, R. Richards (4 parcels), H. Moore (2 parcels); 7th, J. F. Keele (2 parcels), A. Atkinson, J. P. Campbell, S. Richards, J. Robinson, J. Bowen; 8th, J. W. Dibol (2 parcels), J. Fitch, W. Owler, F. Hodgkinson; 10th, S. Daves, D. McCann, J. Johnson, J. J. White, M. Tomlins (2 parcels), A. W. Fenton, E. Beck, A. Sintzenich, W. F. Green, W. H. Reeves, E. Bellamy; 11th, T. Hart (3 parcels), T. Royce, J. Herriott; 12th, J. Atkinson, E. Erringer, Miss Robertson, J. Elliott; 13th, A. Latham, F. Peel; 14th, J. Anderson, G. Drake, J. Herriott, F. E. Utter, S. Wand, W. Birkenhead; 15th, J. Waller, T. Unwin, R. H. Phillips, J. Yule; 17th, E. Bellamy, A. Haracough, J. M. Riggs, B. Riggs, J. Boler; 18th, W. McDonald, B. Atkinson, G. Butler, H. Porter, J. Atkinson, J. Martin, R. H. Phillips, J. Robinson, F. Cort, W. King, G. Wait, H. L. Drake, J. W. Dibol; 19th, T. Trezize (3 parcels), C. Firth (2 parcels), W. Houtt, Mr. Anderson, J. Grady; 20th, S. Boyley; 21st, F. Cheetham (3 parcels), R. M. Tuttle, J. Lind; 22nd, J. U. Benson, J. Hawkins (4 parcels); 24th, F. E. Henderson, E. Trueblood, F. H. Coleman.

NOTES.

S.—We are yet without a supply of the *The Bible Vindicated against Modern Theology*.

There are still on hand six copies of the Photographs of Fraternal Gathering at Olton, price 2s6d. each.

C.H.M.—Judgment at the appearing of Christ is a first principle of the gospel, and to be insisted upon in any basis of fellowship.

J.R.—So far as we know, John Howie, who has commenced "an occasional magazine for the interpretation, criticism, and upholding of the Scriptures of truth," is a brother of good standing in Edinburgh.

H.M.—There is no law in England exempting Christadelphians from serving as jurymen; but as regards the taking of oaths, they may avail themselves of a law passed some years ago, admitting affirmation instead of swearing where there are conscientious objections.

DELIVERIES FROM THE PRINTER.—There are now in the office from the printer, supplies of *Twelve Lectures, Book Unsealed, Jew Discussion*, and some copies of *Chronikon Hebraikon*, printed in separate form. The price of the last is 1s.

M.G.L.—We are not in a position to obtain practical information on the boom business; and you will not misunderstand us when we say we find it necessary to steer clear of such matters in the conduct of the *Christadelphian* and the general service of the truth.

Sister Hage writes: "Brother J. J. Andrew's *Heralds* are now complete. We thank the brethren in America." The Editor adds: If payment has in any case been overlooked, send charge to the office with name and address.

J.B.P.—The eleven Nos. of the *Christadelphian* were sent month by month to the address you gave. It now appears they are lying at a post office in the States, from which they will be forwarded to you. You omitted to mention the name of the county or state, which is the cause of the hitch.

H.B.—"Hope for our race" received with thanks. It will not mislead those who know God and are grounded and settled in the hope of the gospel. As for others, God allows stumbling blocks to be brought in their way that they may fall. Israel and the Gentiles are examples of a principle that operates individually. We may notice the book by and bye.

TRUTH SEEKER.—Paul did not say Christ "was rich and became poor." His words are *επιτιχευσε πλουσιος ων, being rich, he impoverished himself*. That in which he was rich did not depart from him during his submission to poverty. See remarks on the subject in the *Christadelphian* for April, 1874, page 181.

Brother James Wood, of the United States, purposes visiting England about March or April. He will be located during his visit with his sister, Mrs. Hulme, Castletoncat, Blue Pitts, near Manchester, and would be glad if the brethren in Liverpool, Manchester, Stockport, and Sale would send him, to the care of his sister, the address of their respective meeting-rooms.

Brother Alexander, of Stow, writes contradicting the report appearing in the *Christiau Lamp* concerning Galashiels. He says the account given of a visit to Galashiels is not true, which he illustrates in particulars needless to mention. He says: "I need scarcely say that very little credit need be given to what the *Christian Lamp* says. The brethren in Galashiels want none but those who speak the truth."

C.—We deny the slanderous statements to which currency is eagerly given in the publications of those who hate us. Friends know they are untrue. We do not answer them in detail, simply because we will not be dragged into bootless controversy upon personal matters, which destroy the power of the truth in all who engage in them. They are published with the object of hurting the truth. We think it a sufficient offset to record our emphatic denial, and there leave it, at the same time prepared at any time to submit to any investigation that may be necessary.

THE CASES OF NEED.—The following amounts have come to the office for division, according to instruction, between the two cases mentioned last month:—a brother, 10s.; a brother, 2s.; an ecclesia, 37s.; a brother, 6s.; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 10s6d.; a sister, 20s.; a brother, 10s.; an ecclesia, 20s.; a brother, 6s.; a brother, 20s.; a sister, 30s.; a brother, 20s.; an ecclesia, £5; two brethren, 8s.; a brother, 20s.; an ecclesia, 10s.; a brother, 2s.; a brother, 5s.; a sister, 10s.; an ecclesia, £3; a brother, 1s.; an ecclesia, £6; a sister, 10s.; a brother, 10s.; an ecclesia £2 4s.; a brother, 10s.; an ecclesia, 20s.; an ecclesia, 7s.; a brother, 10s.; a brother, 5s.; a sister, 5s.; an ecclesia, 20s.; anonymous, 5s.; a brother, 7s6d.; a brother, 2s6d.; a brother, 30s.

M.P.E.—Your mother's immersion was overlooked. It is mentioned in this month's intelligence from Baltimore. As for a Christadelphian demonstration in Philadelphia during the coming International Exhibition, the circumstances do not call for or admit of it. The crowd that came together on Pentecost was an assembly of devout men come together to worship; the multitudes that will throng Philadelphia will be there to glorify American Independence—the political incarnation of the natural mind in its rebellion against God. Then it was the Spirit that embraced the opportunity, not the apostles, who, without the Spirit, would have been powerless as we are. The fact that "all parties" are arranging to demonstrate on the occasion is no reason for us, for their objects are totally different from ours. We must wait the day of the "manifestation of the sons of God."

J.C.—The partial suppression of correspondence artfully introduced by David King in his letter (appearing in the *Ecclesiastical Observer*) as a reason for declining to debate with the Editor in Nottingham, relates to an incident about twelve years old. The Editor at that time proposed to meet David King, which David King declined. Several letters passed. The Editor sent him word he would publish the

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, FEB., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
7s6d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse), Vol. I.	8s2d.	d2.80	10s2d.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s6d.	d4.0	18s6d.
10s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	d4.0	18s6d.
6s6d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d3.75	8s6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	1s.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	31c.	11d.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	8d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	8d.
2s6d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s10d.	d1.38c	3s3d.
8d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s3d.
1s54d.	Prophetic Cha. t. No. 2	1s6d.	62c.	1s9d.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3	64d.	28c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	64d.	28c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	34d.	18c.	4d.
1s6d.	The Apostasy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s8d.	90c.	2s.
3d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d.
3d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
3d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	8d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	38c.	10d.
6d.	The Biblical Newspaper	6d.	28c.	1s.
pr. doz.	No. 14	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1s4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, }	per 100.		
10d.	13, 14, 15 & 16	1s.	55c.	1s6d.
pr. doz.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	14d.	8c.	2d.
9s6d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	9s6d.	d1.25	4s.
1d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
9s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	9s10d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	40c.	1s2d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas) ..	24d.	11c.	4d.
2s6d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	d1.0	3s4d.
8s6d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	8s4d.	d1.90	8s4d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	8d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
1s3d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s6d.	The Defence	6s10d.	d3.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
2s6d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s2d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph)
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2 months of 1872, at the published price
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable. Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coumbe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 141.— March 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

The Spirit of God and the Bap- tism Thereof	97	The Obedience of Christ in Relation to the Manifestation of God in him.. .. .	117
Things New and Old	101	The Jews and their Affairs	129
The Bible True—Darwin and Huxley Refuted—Lecture by the Editor	105	EDITORIAL	133
Difficult Passages, No. 8.	110	Signs of the Times	134
Condemnation in Adam and Justification in Christ—A Parallel	114	Answers to Correspondents	138
		Intelligence	140
		Aid to Memory in Learning the Order of the Books of the Bible	144

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY OF EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN
to Subscribers in the United States, 3 DOLS.;
in Canada, 9s.6d.; in Australia and New Zealand, 10s.6d.; in
advance.

No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number

NOTES.

J. P. and OTHERS.—Your queries will receive attention in due time, if the Lord will; health and the pressure of other work interfere with all we could wish to accomplish in this line.

ERRATUM.—The name of the brother immersed at Scarborough, as per intelligence last month, should have been "John H. White," and not "W." He has since obtained employment in Leeds, and will meet with the brethren there.

W.—It was by a printer's oversight that the writer's name was omitted from the intelligence appearing last month, from Victoria, Australia. The letter ought to have been preceded by the following words, "Brother Kitchen writes as follows."

AMERICAN.—The failure of Thurman's confident prediction of the Lord's coming last year, and the ridicule of which it has been the subject in the American press, are trying to the genuine disciples of the Lord who look for his appearing; but it cannot shake or unduly distress the faith of those who can distinguish between incompetent and egotistical fanaticism and the reasonable grounds of the one hope.

W.G.—The note appearing some months ago, entitled "What is Renunciationism?" has been published as a separate leaflet, which supercedes the necessity of publishing it in the body of the *Christadelphian*. As regards important matter sometimes appearing on the cover, and therefore being omitted from the bound volumes of the *Christadelphian*, some get over the difficulty by giving the binder instructions to bind in the covers.

THE CASES OF NEED.—Brother Kidd, of Scarborough, writes Jan. 9th in thankful acknowledgment of the liberal contributions made by the brethren and forwarded to him in the case of the widowed sister mentioned two months ago. He mentions that one or two have remitted to him directly. Verbal acknowledgment to the same effect was made to the Editor in London while present there during the past month, on handing over sums contributed to the case of urgent need in that city.

S.—The proposed discussion with Bradlaugh is in train for arrangement, so far as we are concerned. A letter was despatched to that gentleman a few days ago, proposing a six nights' debate in the Town Hall, Birmingham, in the autumn of the present year—three consecutive nights in each of two consecutive weeks—the Editor undertaking to affirm that the Scriptures are the authentic and reliable records of divine revelation. We shall probably be in a position to give further information next month. (Since writing the foregoing, the Editor has received a letter from Bradlaugh, stating that he has handed the Editor's letter to Mr. Holyoake, of Leicester, with full authority to arrange.)

J.P.J.—Many things may be inexpedient and spiritually dangerous, which are not wrong in the sense of being forbidden. An earnest fellowship with Christ will never be much at a loss to decide the question when it arises. Friendship with the world is enmity with God:

you cannot take part in the secular performance of sacred pieces without more or less cultivating this dangerous friendship. The only safe friendship is friendship on the basis of the truth. Brother Allsopp, who now sleeps in Christ, was a member of the Birmingham Festival Choral Union when the truth came to him, and of his own accord, by the effect of the truth upon his mind, he gave up his membership as a thing likely to prove a barrier to spiritual development. He will not regret this when he opens his eyes at Christ's return.

W.L.—There can be no question that a complete detailed index of *Eureka* would be of great service to the brethren in their studies of scriptural things. The desirability of such a thing has long been felt and expressed; but there has hitherto lacked a competent brother or sister with a sufficient amount of leisure to accomplish so large a task. We are happy to state this lack is now at an end, and that in fact an index of the most elaborate kind has been in course of preparation for more than a year, and is now nearly ready to put into the hands of the printer. It is the work of a sister, who has in this way consecrated leisure and qualification possessed by few, to a work which, judging humanly, must have otherwise remained unperformed. It will be published in pamphlet form, *Eureka* size. As to the time of its appearance, experience of printers' promises leads us to be chary of speaking definitely.

D.K.—Your proposal that we should submit to a committee for inspection, or publish the too late letter referred to in the note to J.C. on the cover of last *Christadelphian*, while declining to meet the editor in debate, is worthy of a politician, but quite unbecoming the dignity of a man professing to have the things of God in charge. If we were all you wish to make us appear, it would not affect the question whether you or we preach the kingdom of God. The question "What is the Truth," is of unspeakable moment: your character, or ours, is not a worthy subject of debate. It is a question ultimately affecting ourselves only, and will be effectually settled at the coming of Christ, whose judgment, we are content to wait. Your particular proposal, as to the omitted letter, it is out of our power to comply with, even if it were right to do so, for the simple reason, that receiving it so long ago as nearly twelve years, we have searched in vain to find it; but if you have a copy of it we have no objection to your publishing it.

O.C.H.—It is a mistake to suppose that the coming of Christ in any degree depends upon the prevalence of harmony among those who profess his name. On the contrary, Christ has given us to understand that when he arrives there is a class in the household who are in the act of beating their fellow-servants. Therefore, regard not the existence of "quarrels" with despair. It is a sign of the times. Be careful only to be on the right side. Your proposed remedy is well meant and ingenious, and pleasing in its style of proposal, but powerless for

the end proposed. The ground traversed by your argument, is ground not untrodden by those who have gone before you in anxious search of the ways of God. The rule that we cannot believe anything the apostasy may hold, is not so easy a mode of settlement as you imagine. It requires to be applied with discrimination. The Apostasy believe that Christ was crucified, and that his death was a sacrifice. Are we to disbelieve this because the apostasy believe it? This is an illustration. So, the fact that the apostasy believe that by Adam's offence sentence came upon all men to condemnation, is no reason for our disbelieving it if it be scripturally true, which it undoubtedly is. The mistake in your argument lies in attempting to square the subject mathematically. You leave out of account the nature of the chief element of the problem, namely, a living, irresponsible creator, jealous of His honour and supremacy.

SUBSCRIBERS CHANGING THEIR ADDRESS.—These should always send their new address, as the omission of it has, in several cases, led to the *Christadelphian* being either lost or returned.

VISITORS TO BIRMINGHAM.—Such in quest of lodgings, while accommodating themselves, will help the widow and the orphan by availing themselves of apartments opened by the sister widow of brother John Roberts (late of Ottawa), at 81, Belgrave Road.

Now ready, price One Shilling,

MAN MORTAL;

A WORK OF 116 PAGES BY THE EDITOR,

Being the answer to Mr. Grant which appeared in the *Christadelphian*.

POSTAGE EXTRA.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Jan. 25th, T. Bowen, R. H. Phillips, J. Atkinson, A. Harwood, C. Weale, R. Paterson, D. Wylie, G. T. Boyd; 25th, C. Sheffield, W. Jagger, W. Smith, W. Sommers, R. Carruthers, C. H. Fa-twood; 27th, A. Andrew, P. Black, G. H. Kidd, E. G. Holden, J. P. Jones, J. C. Gamble, E. Emmerson, E. Birkenhead; 28th "Warrington," W. Jagger, K. Bellamy, J. P. Jones, R. Paterson; 29th, H. S. Swift, A. U. Miller, J. H. Benson, J. Cope, A. Harwood; 31st, a brother, a sister, B. Hodgson, C. W. Clark, W. Smith, J. W. Moore, S. Daives, W. Dasher, R. Carruthers, J. Boyd, Feb. 1st, W. and E. Wheeler, J. Thornton, A. McKillop, "Warrington;" 2nd, C. Firth, C. W. Woodard, E. Trueblood, J. Geddes, W. Muir, J. W. Diboll, G. Thornton, S. Richards, J. W. Thistle; 3rd, J. Clafford, T. Kitchen, C. Killick, T. Bowen, R. Carruthers, R. M. Tuttle, J. Atkinson, J. Scrimgeour, S. Bagster; 4th, "Warrington" S. Boardman, J. W. Davies; 5th, C. Jones, "Warrington," F. Hanson, C. W. Clark; 7th, W. McDonald, R. H. Phillips, J. Dalgleish, C. H. Evans; 8th, G. H. Kidd, J. W. Davis, A. Durrie; 9th, B. Sawden, F. Peel, J. Wishart; 10th, J. Boier, S. Boardman, G. H. Kidd, W. J. Peach, W. Hamilton, E. Trueblood, G. W. Wait, A. McKillop; 11th, G. H. Kidd, C. Firth, G. Atkinson, A. Sutton, J. Mortimer, J. Mortimer, G. T. Boyd, G. Young and others, T. Leigh; 12th, C. Woodard, "Warrington," H. Bannister, S. Baldwin, H. Marriott; 14th, A. Andrew, H. L. Swift; 15th, J. Waller, R. Elliott, G. H. Kidd, G. A. B. P., J. W. Diboll, J. Phillips; 16th, O. C. Holden, A. P. Willis, J. W. Diboll, J. Yule, J. Kirkland, J. Henderson, W. R. Otter, J. W. Moore; 17th, B. Parsons, A. E. Ashforth, M. A. Warren, J. Birkenhead, S. Baldwin, J. Rae, W. Hughes, J. Leask, W. Hollier, T. Newton, J. Wareham; 18th, R. Carruthers, A. P. Willis, R. M. Skeats.

FOREIGN.—Jan. 25th, E. J. Lasius, C. H. Morse, D. Pfeiffer, D. White, M. McNeillie, C. H. Evans; 26th, J. Smith; 31st, J. B. Paton, S. Busby, J. M. Allen, E. B. Wright, Feb. 1st, T. L. Robertshaw, J. D. Tomlin, H. J. Moore; 4th, J. Coombe, J. Spencer; 7th, J. Coombe, A. G. Smith, J. L. Norman, J. W. Boggs; 8th, C. A. Cox, L. McDaniel, S. T. Norman, C. Sweet, W. B. McArthur, J. D. Tomlin; 9th, E. Connel, F. Chester; 10th, W. Brittle, J. W. Griffin, C. A. Cox, A. C. Fenton; 14th, W. Gunn, W. Rooke, T. Hart, C. Bolingbroke; 15th, M. E. DeLozier; 18th, J. W. Crichton.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Jan. 25th, J. Atkinson (2 parcels), R. H. Phillips, T. Bowen, E. Thomas; 26th, W. Jagger (2 parcels), R. Carruthers (3 parcels), C. Weale, M. McNeillie, R. McGimsie; 27th, J. P. Jones, F. Wallis, J. Grant, J. Horton, W. Muir, H. Love; 28th, E. Birkenhead (2 parcels), A. Andrew, F. Peel; 29th, J. Cope, A. U. Miller (3 parcels), J. U. Benson, T. Royce, J. Durrie, J. Merrie (2 parcels), T. T. Foulkes; 31st, W. Smith, L. Menzies, J. C. Gamble (2 parcels), S. Busby, C. W. Clark, T. Randles (3 parcels), S. Daives (2 parcels), J. Stoddart, E. B. Wright (3 parcels). Feb. 1st, J. D. Tomlin, A. McKillop, J. Thornton, J. W. Diboll (2 parcels); 2nd, C. Firth, E. Trueblood; 3rd, R. Carruthers (4 parcels), J. W. Thistle, J. Kitchen (6 parcels), J. Atkinson, C. Killick, E. Worty, J. Scrimgeour; 4th, S. Boardman (4 parcels), J. W. Davies, J. Coombe (6 parcels); 5th, J. Yule; 7th, Mr. McDonald, J. Dalgleish (2 parcels), J. A. Norman (3 parcels), S. Lockton; 8th, Mr. Bendall, W. Dasher (2 parcels), J. Durrie (2 parcels), L. McDaniel, S. T. Norman (2 parcels), A. Cox (2 parcels), C. H. Evans; 9th, F. Peel, E. Trueblood, J. Boier, G. A. Birkenhead (2 parcels); 11th, G. Claxton, W. Scott, G. Wait, C. Firth, G. Atkinson, J. Wishart, J. Waller, J. Hawkins (2 parcels), H. Leah (2 parcels), W. Stephenson, W. H.; 12th, H. Marriott (2 parcels), S. Baldwin, C. Woodard (2 parcels), T. Leigh (3 parcels), H. Bannister (5 parcels); 14th, J. J. Andrew; 15th, J. Waller, H. Leah; 16th, J. Henderson, A. P. Willis, J. W. Moore; 17th, A. E. Ashforth (3 parcels), M. A. Warren, C. H. Morse (1 parcel), J. W. Diboll, J. Mortimer; 18th, T. Newton, J. Wareham, R. Carruthers, R. Roberts & Co.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, MAR., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
7s6d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8-2d.	42.80	10s2d.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s7d.	44.0	13s6d.
10s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	44.0	13s6d.
6s6d.	Ephis Israel	7s2d.	42 75	8s9d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	1s.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	38c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	8d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	8d.
2s6d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s10d.	41.38c	3s6d.
8d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s8d
1s54d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	1s6d.	62c.	1s9d.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	64d.	28c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	64d.	28c.	9d.
8d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3s4d.	18c.	4d.
1s6d.	The Apostasy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s8d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d
4d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
3d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	8d.
4d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	8c.	10d.
1s4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, }	1s.	55c.	1s6d.
pr. doz.	13, 14, 15 & 16	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	14d.	8c.	3d.
3s6d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	2s9d.	41.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
8s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3s10d.	41.25	4s.
8s1.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	40c.	1s2d.
8d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas) ..	24d.	11c.	14d.
2s0d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	41.0	3s4d.
8s0d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	8s4d.	41.30	4s4d.
8d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	8d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
1s8d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s6d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6s10d.	42.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
2s6d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s2d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph) ..			
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except			
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2			
..	months of 1872, at the published price			
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		

all communications must be addressed to **ROBERT ROBERTS**, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for Books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coumbe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 142. — April 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Spiritualism	145	The Jews and their Affairs ..	178
Why Do Men Die?	154	EDITORIAL	177
The Rib's True—Darwin and Huxley Refuted—Authenti- city of the New Testament	156	Signs of the Times	179
Sunday Morning at the Birming- ham Christadelphian Eccle- sia, No. 75	162	Answers to Correspondents ..	184
Things New and Old from the Treasures of the Spirit ..	169	Heads of Lecture delivered by Dr. Thomas more than Twenty Years Ago—Who to Preach the Gospel	188
		Intelligence	190

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

R.S.—Thanks for the Santa Barbara paper with good article ("Is the Bible Inspired?") for *Bible True* department. All such good contributions are thoroughly welcome.

ERRATUM.—In the article last month on "Condemnation in Adam and Justification in Christ," page 115, first column, line 27, instead of "a simple law," read "a natural law."

A supply of the publication (*The Bible Vindicated against Modern Theology*) has now arrived at the office, and can be had, price 8s. per copy, postage extra.

T.A. & S.—It is not a rule in the conduct of periodicals to require an express permission from the writer of a letter before the editor is at liberty to publish it. The fact of the letter being sent carries permission with it unless it is marked "private."

J.W.—We were misled as to the amount of additional foreign postage required for the *Christadelphian* as an unregistered magazine to the States. The excess will be allowed on next year's subscription, as the return of it would be largely consumed in postage.

J.G.—The last we heard of Mr. Nightingale was that he was the pastor of a congregation in the North of England. At the time of the discussion, ten years ago, he described himself as preacher to one of Lady Huntingdon's free churches (Severn Street, Birmingham).

S.S.—Read *Eureka*, read *Eureka*, and re-read *Eureka*. It is the best advice you can have, next to "Read the Scriptures daily." We are indifferent to the scorn of men on the subject, who show either insensibility to or incapacity to perceive the interests of the truth in this cloudy and dark day.

Brother James Wood, of Rock Ford, U.S.A., whose visit to Britain was spoken of a month or two ago, writes to say that he will not arrive in England till the month of June. He also states that there was a mistake in the address given—that "Castleton-cat" ought to have been "Castleton-leat."

The writer of the letter appearing in the *Christadelphian* for Feb., 1874, signed "John Martin," (Plymouth,) now writes to cancel said letter, having changed his mind since the writing of it. We are not obliged to publish his reasons. Justice to him is fully discharged by the intimation now made.

M.H.—The United States dollar at the present time fetches 8s.4d. in Britain. How much a money-changer ought to give for 3s.4d. in America we don't know. The best mode of remittance to America is through a bank. There are two other modes—by P.O.O., or by greenbacks, purchased in England, and enclosed. In the last case, however, there is danger of abstraction.

J.M. (P).—Your letter having been marked "private," we acknowledge having made a mistake in publishing it without asking your permission. We had overlooked the circumstance of its being marked "private." But being entirely on a doctrinal subject, and to the advantage of the truth, it did not occur to us that you could object to your views being known.

Finally, it is rather late to complain of it at the end of two years. However, we beg pardon.

SPARE BOOKS.—Brother Osborne, of Tewkesbury, appeals to brethren and sisters having spare books and pamphlets on the truth on hand, to forward the same to brother "A. Mellicott, 105, High Street, Tewkesbury." Brother Mellicott (from London) is working several localities in Tewkesbury, from house to house, with weekly book loans. His stock of books is now exhausted, and he is unable to procure more.

"A BROTHER."—The sum of four pounds, dropped into the letter box for the two cases of need, was duly received and forwarded. It ought to have appeared last month along with other contributions, as follows: a brother, 10s.; a sister, 5s.; a brother (yourself), 4s.; a brother, 5s.; a brother, 5s.; a sister, two dollars (68s.); an observer, 2s.; an ecclesia, 68s.; a brother, 5s.

"APOCALYPTIC ALBUM."—Brother Warner, of Leicester, having obtained the consent of the proprietors of Elliott's *Horae Apocalypticæ*, has arranged for the publication of a series of photographs of the medals and other objects cited by Mr. Elliott in illustration of the apocalyptic symbolism. The first is ready—"The Roman Horse." The series will, no doubt, be interesting and instructive, and will be particularly appreciated by the readers of *Eureka*. The photographs will be 3d. each.

W.R.O.—Luke does not say that Jesus completed his thirtieth year in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, but that the word of God came to John that year. Jesus had completed his thirtieth year when he came to John, but John had been preaching some time before then. How long is not stated in the chapter; but having the date of John's preaching and the date of Christ's birth, we are able to see that the period would be three years and a half. Consequently the difficulty raised by the notes in the New Testament lent you is fictitious.

D.B.—The correspondence published last month, "The obedience of Christ in relation to the manifestation of God in him," was not written, so far as our part was concerned, with a view to publication. We supposed it possible the interests of the truth might call some day for its publication, and therefore kept copies, but we did not intend publication unless it became necessary, which we hoped not. And it was not in accordance with any previous intention that publication was made last month. The fact is, we were forced into it in a certain way. The printer was clamorous for copy; and we were in an unfit state to produce the quantity required, and therefore laid our hands on the letters, which by suppressing names we made ourselves at liberty to use, but as you say, "good may come out of it."

DAVID KING.—Your bitter letter lacks the sting of truth, and, therefore, hurts not. Neither can its ingenious proposals conceal your fear to encounter the competent advocacy of the gospel of the kingdom. We had hoped better things of you, notwithstanding the past; but your letter is an extinguisher to all hope. We are sorry but not discomposed. We are getting accustomed to the fact that the world is evil. We are not of it; we wait its appointed destruction by the kingdom of the Little Stone. We are strangers and sojourners. Therefore, your evil treatment of us, in which you are one of many adversaries, has not the discouraging effect it would have if our heart were set upon present objects, ecclesiastical or otherwise.

S.—The discussion with Bradlaugh seems likely to fall through, owing to that gentleman's refusal, by his agent, Mr. Holyoake, to hold the

discussion in Birmingham. He insists on Leicester, where his friends are numerous. This interposes a barrier on our part, since one principal object in consenting to challenge Bradlaugh was to make a discussion with him useful in delivering the truth from the imputation of infidelity, in a town where the truth is better known than in any other, as the result of many years' proclamation, but in which, nevertheless, it has that prejudice to encounter. A discussion with Bradlaugh would be a great effort for our peculiar physical liabilities; and we should not feel justified in venturing upon it without some commensurate object such as we have mentioned. In any other town but Birmingham, unless it be London, we should fail to realise sufficient incentive; for we have no hope of benefitting the class of minds who have embraced secularism. Our aim would be to serve the truth. Having to serve it many ways, we cannot afford to incur the physical risk of an encounter with Bradlaugh without a tangible prospect of good service. Hence our proposal for Birmingham, which Holyoake declines. If the proposal fall through, we may publish the correspondence.

SUBSCRIBERS CHANGING THEIR ADDRESS.—These should always send their new address, as the omission of it has, in several cases, led to the *Christadelphian* being either lost or returned.

VISITORS TO BIRMINGHAM.—Such in quest of lodgings, while accommodating themselves, will help the widow and the orphan by availing themselves of apartments opened by the sister widow of brother John Roberts (late of Otisawa), at 81, Belgrave Road.

Now ready, price One Shilling,

MAN MORTAL;

A WORK OF 116 PAGES BY THE EDITOR,
Being the answer to Mr. Grant which
appeared in the *Christadelphian*.

POSTAGE EXTRA.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Feb. 18th, O. C. Holden; 19th, A. Perrin, B. Messenger, T. Randles; 21st, A. Andrew, B. Lowe, F. Piggott, B. Warren, W. Booth; 22nd, W. E. Coles, E. C. Trueblood, W. Peel, W. Smith; 23rd, R. Skeats, J. W. Diboll, J. Grant, B. Sawden, J. Wareham; 24th, G. T. Boyd, A. Sykes, R. Carruthers, W. Dasher, G. Dowkes, C. A. Silverwood, W. King, W. Peel, F. Hodgkinson; 25th, J. Alexander, "Warrington," W. Owlser; 26th, A. Andrew, M. H., B. Warren, B. Messenger, J. Leask, F. Cort, J. Martin (P.); 28th, R. Hardy, D. McCann, R. Tocher; 29th, G. T. Boyd, J. Grant, J. Smith, W. H. Tomlins, J. Boote, W. Dew, F. Cort; March 1st, W. Owlser, M. A. Harris; 2nd, B. Warren, R. Melrose, H. Veysey, J. Martin (P.), J. Boote; 3rd, J. Hawkins, T. Boyd, "Warrington," B. Sawden; 4th, W. Hartley; 6th, T. B. Eames; 7th, W. H. Andrew, J. Ashcroft, J. W. Thirle; 8th, W. Hardy, T. C. Nichol, B. Sawden, S. A. Jagger, J. Grant, J. Geddes; 9th, S. Briggs, "Warrington," T. C. Nichol; 10th, R. Black, J. Birkenhead; 11th, T. Bowen, J. Boyd, A. Sutton; 13th, J. Mycroft, J. Menzies, W. Watson, W. H. Andrew, D. Bairdow; 14th, a brother, J. W. Diboll, J. Birkenhead, J. Dalgiesh, T. Bowen, J. Gordon, E. Briggs; 15th, R. Elliott, E. Trueblood, J. Kirkland, M. Hamilton, J. Bell; 16th, W. Owlser, W. Gill, T. Haining, J. Cunningham, V. Collyer, W. Osborne; 17th, J. Boyd; 18th, W. E. Coles, J. Hawkins, W. R. Otter; 20th, G. Smith, A. Andrew, A. McKillop, A. W. Warner, J. Geddes.

FOREIGN.—Feb. 21st.—T. & R. Trezise; 22nd, J. Luxford; 23rd, T. F. Keele, P. A. Blackwell; 24th, P. F. Sanders, J. Coombe, E. M. Foulk; 25th, J. A. Corbell, C. C. Kelly, J. McMillan, March 1st, C. J. Requa; 4th, S. Elsas, T. & R. Trezise; 6th, D. Skinner; 7th, J. Faulk; 8th, W. McPherson; 9th, J. B. Paton, M. McNeillie, J. D. Tomlin; 13th, L. T. Nichols, H. C. Jacobs, C. H. Morse, C. C. Mann, T. F. Keele, T. Hart; 14th, J. W. White, S. Cook, S. J. Bottorff; 16th, J. Wood, H. J. Moore.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Feb. 18th, M. H.; 19. A. Perrin; 21. F. Piggott, B. Lowe, W. Booth; 22. W. Peel (2 pcls), E. Bott, J. J. Andrew, E. Trueblood; 23. R. Roberts & Co., B. Sawden, J. Grant; 24. W. Peel, H. Williams, G. Dowkes, C. A. Silverwood, W. King; 25. A. Andrew, F. Peel, G. Paterson, J. Alexander; 26. J. P. Brown (2 pcls); 28. R. Tocher, D. McCann, H. Hardman, W. Hardy, E. M. Foulkes, P. F. Sanders; 29. W. Dew, W. H. Tomlinson, J. Smith, R. Jones, G. T. Boyd (2 parcels); March 2nd, J. J. Andrew, M. Harris, J. Grant, W. Gill, J. Boyd, M. Fraser, K. Fraser; 3. J. Hawkins, B. Sawden (2 parcels); 4. T. Trezise (4 parcels), W. Hartley; 5. F. Hodgkinson; 7. W. H. Andrew, J. Ashcroft, T. B. Evans, T. H. Mawson, T. Trezise; 8. T. C. Nichols, J. W. Thirle (2 parcels), B. Sawden, W. Hardy; 9. E. Thomas (6 parcels), S. Briggs (3 parcels), J. B. Paton, J. D. Tomlin, R. Dey, J. Wilson; 10. J. Birkenhead, M. Poo; 11. J. Weir, W. Carvie, W. Latham, W. Watson, J. Mycroft, M. W. Owens (2 parcels), J. C. Jacobs; 14. J. Dalgiesh, A. McKillop, R. D. Robertson; 15. M. Hamilton; 20. A. Dava, M. Hamilton, G. Smith (2 parcels).

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, APRIL, 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Net Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
7s6d.	Fareka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8s2d.	d2.80	10s2d.
10s6d.	Fareka ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s6d.	d4.0	13s6d.
10s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	d4.0	13s6d.
6s6d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d2.75	8s6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	39c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	2d.	11c.	3d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	2d.	11c.	3d.
2s7d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s10d.	d1.38c	3s6d.
3d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s6d.
1s5d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	1s6d.	62c.	1s9d.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	6d.	25c.	9d.
9d.	Destiny of the British Empire	6d.	25c.	9d.
3s6d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3s7d.	15c.	4d.
3s6d.	The Apostacy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s8d.	90c.	2s.
6d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	1d.
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
4d.	The Shain Lamb (Anti-Renunciational Lecture)	2d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationalism) ..	1d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	1d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	33c.	10d.
1s4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d.
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, }	1s.	55c.	1s6d.
pr. doz.	13, 14, 15 & 16	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	1d.	8c.	2d.
3s6d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	3s7d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	1d.
3s6d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3s10d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	9d.	40c.	1s2d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	3d.	15c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	2d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	2d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas) ..	2d.	11c.	4d.
2s9d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	d1.0	3s4d.
3s9d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	3s4d.	d1.30	4s4d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	4d.
2d.	The Declaration	2d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	2d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	2d.	11c.	4d.
1s3d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s6d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6s10d.	d2.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
2s6d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Tubercle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s2d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph).
..	Back Nos. of the <i>Christadelphian</i> , from 1364, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price.
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.
3s.	The Bible Vindicated	3s4d.
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	3d.	16c.	4d.

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s. larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for Books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, never by *Post Office Money Order*, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 143. — May 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A

MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Everlasting Punishment ..	193	and ever increasing Armaments of Europe	225
Restoration of Israel before and after the Advent ..	198	Signs of the Times—The Eastern Question. The Drying Euphrates ..	227
Is Trine Immersion Apostolic Baptism?	202	The Proposed Discussion with Mr. Bradlaugh	231
Winds of Doctrine	220	Intelligence	233
The Jews and their Affairs ..	221		
EDITORIAL — The Enochian			

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

**ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.**

**TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.**

No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must begin with the January number

NOTES.

J.T.B.—The *Christadelphian* is mailed every month to S. A. Brown to address given. We cannot account for its non-delivery.

S.B.—The *Book Unsealed* has been reduced to 3d since the advertisement you refer to. This accounts for the difference.

Any one having a complete set of Dr. Thomas's *Herald* will find a purchaser if they will send the same to the office of the *Christadelphian*.

PLEASE RETURN.—The 1st vol. of Dr. Thomas's *Apostolic Advocate*, lent to some one from the office, is wanted.

MANY BRETHREN IN AMERICA.—We have at last complied with your request, and gone thoroughly into the question of fine-immersion in the present number.

Brother F. Cort, 13, Princess Street, St. Paul's, Bristol, will be glad to take charge of contributions in aid of a case of pecuniary embarrassment in that town.

ERRATUM LAST MONTH.—In the answer, "Will partial obedience be accepted?" page 187, col. 2, line 30, the word "difficult" ought to be "different."

BROTHER PATERSON'S DEATH.—See intelligence from "Leeds" in the present number. One ecclesia has had a collection amounting to £7 17s. We have also a contribution from a sister, £1.

S.B.—The statement on the cover of the *Bible Companion*, that the price of the *Christadelphian* is 5s., is, of course, an error, due to the printer copying a former edition of the *Companion*, printed at a time when that was the price. The *Christadelphian* has, since then, been much enlarged.

S.—The discussion with Bradlaugh is likely to come off after all; but awkwardly cut up into two sections in two different towns—Leicester and Birmingham. For the explanation of this and the present position of the affair, we find it necessary to publish the correspondence appearing in the present number of the *Christadelphian*—page 231. It is proposed to hold the discussion in the third and fourth weeks of June.

VISIT TO YORKSHIRE.—The Editor is due at Stockport, to lecture, Sunday, May 7th, and Leeds on the Sunday following. There will be one or two lectures during the week in both cases. The approach of the Bradlaugh discussion rendering it desirable to avoid a strain, the Editor will not on the present occasion extend the visit to any other part of Yorkshire. Brethren not communicated with (that is, who do not deny the probation of the Lord Jesus and where there are no personal divisions) will please accept this notice in love. We shall visit them on a future occasion if the Lord will.

S.S. (Canada).—The surcharge on the *Christadelphian* in Canada last month is due to a freak of the post office people in Birmingham. Their published list of charges issued at the close of last year, stated that the postage would be 3d. per copy, per month. To verify the same, was applied to the post office, and were informed that there was a mistake in the list—that 3d. ought to be 2d in the case of Canada. One of the officia's actually made the alteration with ink in the printed list now in the office. We went by this alteration, and the *Christadelphian* passed muster three times at 3d. The fourth time, this was treated as "insufficient postage," and it was surcharged accordingly, as you complain. Applied to for an explanation, they say the published list was right, and that it was a mistake to pass it at 2d. This is the simple history of the case, from which you will see that we are sometimes led into mistakes by the authorities themselves.

M.R.—The *Index of Eureka* is nearly ready to put into the hands of the printer. It contains a feature not at first contemplated when the work of compiling it was commenced. Part it will set forth a complete list of all the passages of Scripture which are the subject of exposition in *Eureka*, with the pages where the exposition is to be found. These passages are arranged, not in the order of the books of the Bible, but in the alphabetic order of the books of the Bible, which will make it easier of reference to the greater number. It is surprising how nearly the whole Bible is covered by the list. Nothing more strikingly justifies the remark that *Eureka*, though primarily explaining "Revelations," is an exposition of the oracles of God in their entirety. The *Index* is an elaborate affair, and will make quite a book of itself. It is the work of sister Hodgkinson, of Norman Cross. We have no authority to make this announcement. The making of it may cause pain to the laborious compiler; but the pain will not be 'everlasting torment,' while the pleasure it will afford (so much more than a set off) is an irresistible temptation to divulge the secret. We may add that brother Hodgkinson is getting the book printed independently of our printer, and will place it in our hands for supply to the brethren. The advantage of this will be a much earlier supply of the work than we could otherwise promise. Two months hence the book will probably be in the office for sale. Particulars as to price, &c., we cannot furnish till the printer's bill is rendered.

SUBSCRIBERS CHANGING THEIR ADDRESS.—These should always send their new address, as the omission of it has, in several cases, led to the *Christadelphian* being either lost or returned.

Now Ready, price One Shilling,

MAN MORTAL;

A WORK OF 116 PAGES, BY THE EDITOR;

Being the answer to Mr. Grant which appeared in the *Christadelphian*.

POSTAGE EXTRA.

READ EUREKA:

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE,

In three vols.

(BY DR. THOMAS.)

IT ELUCIDATES AND HARMONISES ALL PARTS OF THE ORACLES OF GOD.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—March 21st, R. Peacock, F. Hodgkinson, J. H. Snelson, P. Edmonston; 24th, J. J. Andrew, F. Peel, R. M. Skeats, J. Denholm, J. C. Gamble, W. King, J. U. Robertson, M. Savage, T. H. Aston, W. Watson, A. W. Warner, V. Collyer; 25th, J. J. Andrew (two letters), C. W. Woollard, "Warrington," M. Hamilton, F. Stephenson; 27th, J. Gillies, B. Messenger, J. U. Robertson, J. J. Andrew, E. Trueblood, C. W. Clark, H. Clarkson, Mrs. Sinclair; 28th, T. Randles, J. Burton; 30th, B. Sanders, A. Andrew, E. A. Barker; April 1st, S. A. Smith, E. Bellamy; 3rd, A. Warner, A. Thorne; 4th, D. Bairstow, S. Boardman, J. J. Andrew, G. Wait, J. Steel, J. Durrie, R. M. Skeats, E. Trueblood, J. Atkinson; 5th, "Warrington," W. Dasher, H. H. Horsman, J. Birkenhead; 6th, J. W. Brigstock, R. D. Robertson, J. Atkinson, L. P. Clitty, F. Cort, W. Sommers, A. Thorne, H. Suller, W. Buckler, W. H. Andrew; 7th, "Warrington," J. O'Neil, V. Collyer, T. Boshier, M. H.; 8th, S. Dawes, "Warrington," D. Hepburn, Simpson and Co.; 11th, "Warrington," J. J. Andrew, J. A. Deatry, J. Howatson, M. H.; 12th, M. H., E. Birkenhead, G. Baker, J. Boyd; 13th, W. Smith, R. D. Robertson, D. Hepburn, J. W. Thistle, J. Mortimer; 14th, S. Dawes, A. Andrew, G. Anderson, J. Dalgliesh; 15th, A. Sutton, W. H. Hatton, R. Elliott, J. Boler, W. Buckler, W. H. Andrew, W. Owlir, J. W. Diboll; 18th, J. Phillips, "Warrington." E. C. Trueblood, A. McKillop, G. Waite, G. W. Muir; 19th, M. H., F. Peel; 20th, G. W. Carter, F. Cort; 21st, "Warrington"; 22nd, J. Horton, W. Peel, Anonymous; 24th, W. Wilson, D. Macrow, C. Cattell, R. Hodgson; 25th, T. Nisbet, R. M. Skeats, S. Boardman, J. Phillips, W. Buckler, J. Sydenham, J. Wareham, R. Hardy, C. Frith.

FOREIGN.—E. Lasius, N. W. Fitzgerald, J. Moffatt; 24th, J. W. Crichton, S. T. Blessing, J. W. Niles; 28th, E. M. Foulkes; 30th, J. Malcolm; April 3rd, E. Seyb; 4th, J. and R. Trezize, J. P. White, L. A. Anderson, E. Bott (two letters); 5th, S. F. Gratz, T. H. Dunn, J. H. Bond, P. Graham; 7th, J. Tanner, C. H. Evans; 8th, T. Betts; 10th, W. Brittle, C. W. Wentz, W. S. Gray, J. T. Benton, J. K. Hoy; 12th, C. Bolingbroke, C. H. Evans; 15th, C. Creed; 17th, J. Ward, J. Leask, J. Baxter; 18th, W. H. Reeves; 20th, J. Brown; 24th, E. Lasius, H. Fish, S. H. Outman, R. Glenn.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

March 21st, J. H. Snelson, E. Thomas (13 parcels), P. Edmonston (3 parcels), J. Coddington (2 parcels); 22nd, Moffat; 25th, J. Savage, J. Deunau (3 parcels), W. King (2 parcels), J. W. Robertson, T. Stephenson, R. M. Skeats, W. Watson, J. Coddington, M. Joel, C. W. Woollard; 27th, T. Blessing; 28th, S. Dawes, J. Smith, E. C. Trueblood; 29th, M. Warner, Mrs. Sinclair, W. Boyd, Mr. Boyd; 30th, F. Peel; 31st, A. Andrew, B. Sawden (2 parcels), E. A. Barker (2 parcels); April 3rd, E. Seyb, E. C. Trueblood, J. F. Bond (13 parcels), J. Atkinson, W. Dasher; 5th, P. Graham; 6th, R. D. Robertson (2 parcels), P. Graham, G. Taylor; 7th, W. H. Andrew, R. R. Nash, D. Spinney, T. Randles, J. Birkenhead; 8th, T. Betts, J. Bailey, D. Hepburn (3 parcels), J. Turner (2 parcels); 10th, Sampson & Co.; 12th, P. Findlater, Mrs. Scott, R. Roberts & Co., E. Birkenhead (4 parcels); 13th, W. Smith, J. Hardwick; 15th, A. Andrew, Mrs. Johnson, S. Dawes, W. S. Miller, C. Creed; 18th, E. C. Trueblood (2 parcels), J. Phillips, A. McKillop, C. Packham, Mrs. Phillips, G. W. Muir; 19th, J. Pateron; 20th, G. W. Carter; 21st, J. Horton, F. Masters; 24th, W. H. Jones; 25th, R. M. Skeats, W. Buckler (2 parcels), J. Phillips, U. S. Gray, R. M. Skeats.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, MAY, 1876. CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
76s.6d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8s.2d.	d2.50	10s.2d.
10s.6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	1s.6d.	d.4.0	13s.6d.
19s.6d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s.6d.	d.4.0	18s.6d.
6s.6d.	Elpis Israel	7s.2d.	d2.75	8s.6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	38c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	5d.
2s.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	3d.
2s.6d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s.10d.	d1.98c	3s.6d.
8d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s.1d.	50c.	1s.8d.
1s.5d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	1s.6d.	62c.	1s.8d.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	8d.	28c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	64d.	28c.	3d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3d.	18c.	2d.
1s.6d.	The Apostasy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s.8d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d.
6d.	The Nighingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	28c.	9d.
4d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Relucianist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	38c.	10d.
1s.4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s.8d.	97c.	2s.4d.
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, } 13, 14, 15 & 16 }	1s.	55c.	1s.6d.
pr. doz.		per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spir. tualism explained)	14d.	8c.	2d.
8s.6d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	3s.8d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
8s.6d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3s.10d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	9d.	40c.	1s.2d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas) ..	24d.	11c.	4d.
2s.6d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s.4d.	d1.0	3s.4d.
8s.6d.	Ditto ditto " (bound in cloth)	3s.4d.	d1.30	4s.4d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
6d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
1s.2d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s.6d.	80c.	2s.4d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s.6d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6s.10d.	d2.50c	7s.6d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	1s.4d.
2s.6d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	2s.8d.	75c.	3s.2d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s.2d.	11c.	4d.
	Movements among the Jews (Letter to <i>Daily Telegraph</i>) ..			
	Back Nos. of the <i>Christadelphian</i> , from 1864, except			
	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2			
	months of 1872, at the published price			
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		
3s.	The Bible Vindicated	3s.4d.		
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	34d.	16c.	4d.

All communications must be addressed to **ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham**; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft; the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 144. — June 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A

MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

"Wilt Thou at this Time Re- store the Kingdom to Israel?"	241	Sunday Morning at the Birm- ingham . . . Christadelphian	
"Is the Soul Matter or Spirit?"	246	Ecclesia, No. 76	.. 260
The Bible True	.. 249	The Jews and their Affairs	.. 266
Things New and Old from the Treasures of the Spirit	.. 257	The Obedience of Christ	.. 271
Russia and Military Electric Lights	.. 260	EDITORIAL	.. 272
An Austrian Bishop's Opinion of his Clergy	.. 260	Signs of the Times	.. 276
		Answers to Correspondents	.. 283
		Intelligence	.. 285

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

THE BRADLAUGH DISCUSSION AND THE NEXT NUMBER OF THE "CHRISTADELPHIAN.—The next number of the *Christadelphian* may be behind time in making its appearance. We wish to prepare our readers for this, though we shall aim to be punctual. Brother Hodgkinson, who is superintending the forthcoming meeting with Bradlaugh, orders this announcement to be made in view of the time necessary for preparation (physical). We hope, however, it may prove unnecessary.

THE INDEX TO "EUREKA."—This is making progress in the hands of the printer; and we hope next month to say "N.W. Ready," with particulars.

J. W. W.—Your letter, containing the order for the *Christadelphian*, though written six weeks before, arrived only one post before your second letter complaining of not having received it. This will explain the delay.

A sister is very desirous of obtaining Nos. 11 and 12 of the *Investigator*, published by Dr. Thomas in 1844. It is only from America she has any hope of procuring them. Sent to the Editor's address, they will be acknowledged immediately and paid for.

BROTHER PATERSON'S DEATH.—Bro. Smith, of Edinburgh, writes to say that the provision now made for sister Paterson will suffice. Several anonymous contributions have come to hand for this and the other case mentioned last month.

WANTED.—Brother Parkes, of Brierley Hill, says he "badly wants the *Christadelphian* for

Jan., 1872." Anyone having it to sell will oblige by sending it to the office in wrapper, with the words, "for brother Parkes" written outside. Brother Parkes will see by an announcement elsewhere that the *Shields* are republished.

JAS. B.—We are grateful for your good wishes and your kind words concerning the article on Trine Immersion and the coming Bradlaugh discussion; but there are obstacles in the way of our co-operation. We regret the existence of these obstacles exceedingly; but there they are, and it is out of our power to ignore them.

C M.—It seems probable, on a re-inspection of "copy," that Mr. Bradlaugh intended "C" to appear before "Bradlaugh" in the signature of his first letter. The sweep of his pen, brought down from the last word of his letter, seems intended to stand for "C" but the printer had not observed this, and it would easily escape anyone's notice.

THE DISCUSSION WITH BRADLAUGH.—This is finally arranged for Leicester (Temperance Hall), Tuesday and Wednesday, June 18th and 19th; and Birmingham (Temperance Hall the Town Hall being closed for repairs), Thursday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, June 15th, 20th, 21st and 22nd. To commence each evening at seven o'clock. The chairman at Leicester will be Mr. W. Stanyon, of that town; and at Birmingham, Mr. Geo. St. Clair, F.G.S., M.A.I., late lecturer to the Palestine Exploration Fund. The Editor as maintaining the affirmative, will lead off each evening with a half-hour's speech, to be followed by Mr. Bradlaugh in a speech of similar duration. Then the Editor will have the option to question Mr. Bradlaugh for 15 minutes, and Mr. Bradlaugh to question the Editor for another 15 minutes. After this, the time will be occupied by quarter-hour speeches on each side. The prices will probably be 1s. and 6d. The discussion will be reported, and in all probability, published.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SHIELD

BY J. J. ANDREW.

The following papers have just been re-printed and can now be obtained at

69, UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON;

AND AT THE ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW, BIRMINGHAM.

- 1.—The Thief on the Cross.
- 7.—The Rich Man and Lazarus.
- 8.—Stephen's Dying Prayer.
- 9.—Suffer Little Children to Come unto me.
- 10.—Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.
- 11.—The House of many Mansions.
- 12.—Charity.

Price 1d. each, postage extra, or 10d. per doz. post free. Nos. 2 to 6 and 13 to 16 are still in supply.

A limited number of the first series No. 1 to 12 have been stitched in paper wrappers. Price 1s. post free.

Now Ready, price One Shilling,

MAN MORTAL;

A WORK OF 116 PAGES, BY THE EDITOR,

Being the answer to Mr. Grant which appeared in the *Christadelphian*.

POSTAGE EXTRA.

READ EUREKA:

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE,

In three vols.

(BY DR. THOMAS.)

IT ELUCIDATES AND HARMONISES ALL PARTS OF THE ORACLES OF GOD.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—April 26th, C. W. Clark, W. Green, M. A. Fuisey, J. W. Dibol, P. Hardy, C. Roberts, W. Silver; 27th, M. H.; 29th, J. Smither, E. K. Stephens, "Warrington," A. Mackie, R. Carruthers, G. T. Boyd, May 1st, J. Booth, W. Wilson, T. Boshier, F. Cheetham; 2nd, L. P. Chitty, W. H. Andrew, A. Medcott, D. Briggs, "Warrington," R. Carruthers, J. Hopton, J. Howatson, G. Wait; 3rd, J. C. Gamble, A. P. Willis, T. Nisbet; 5th, E. T. Rawlinson, J. Phillips, B. Sawden, D. Stokes, W. H. Andrew; 6th, "Warrington," J. Hobart, D. Holdsworth, T. Randles; 8th, anonymous, W. Osborne; 9th, J. Hawkins, a sister in Christ, W. Caie, D. Stokes, W. H. Andrew; 10th, G. H. Kidd, a friend, T. C. Gamble, J. Wood, A. Sykes, M. Hamilton, W. Gately; 11th, G. Armitage, anonymous, J. Gillies, M. Daives; 12th, W. R. Otter, J. Grant, G. Drake; 13th, W. Smith (2 letters), B. Sawden; 15th, C. Cattell, J. Cooper, H. Bannister, J. Kirkland, E. Phelps, J. Boler, T. Parkes, W. Owler, G. St. Clair; 16th, W. Blount, F. Cort, B. Sawden, M. Daives, F. Peel, D. Gaskin, M. Hamilton, J. Howatson, T. Kidd, F. Hedgkinson, T. Royce, J. W. Dibol, R. Carruthers, G. Wait, J. Beddoes, D. Gaskin; 17th, S. Boardman, F. Cheetham, A. Sykes, R. Melrose, J. W. Thirtle, H. Leah; 18th, R. Ashcroft, J. Grant, C. W. Clark; 19th, J. J. Andrew, J. W. Thirtle, F. Cort, E. S. Evans, P. Sutherland, C. Cattell, W. Green.

FOREIGN.—April 26th, H. J. Moore, C. Bolingbroke; 29th, M. Knight, T. Blessing. May 1st, C. H. Morse, Mrs. W. Murphy, E. Beck, P. Hall; 3rd, D. Wright; 8th, J. A. Norman, C. A. Wentz; 9th, C. Sweet, M. G. Lee; 10th, C. H. Evans, W. M. Hamilton; 11th, T. Hart; 15th, R. H. Tucker, C. Mitchell, L. Swift, S. H. Oatman, B. F. Sandford; 16th, J. W. Wintree (two letters, date respectively March 18th and May 1st); 17th, J. Laird.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

April 26th.—C. W. Clark, J. W. Dibol; 27th, C. Bolingbroke; 28th, C. W. Clark, A. Andrew, F. Peel; 29th, R. Carruthers (5 parcels), G. T. Boyd, A. Meekie, S. T. Blessing (3 parcels), S. Menzies. May 1st, J. Dinwiddie (3 parcels), J. Booth, C. H. Morse, J. Sommers; 2nd, J. Hopton, R. Carruthers (6 parcels), M. Unwin, Miss Miller, A. Mackie; 5th, D. Stokes, J. Phillips, E. T. Rawlinson; 6th, D. Holdsworth, J. Hobart (2 parcels); 9th, J. W. Whittlesey, C. Sweet, J. Harrison (2 parcels); 10th, W. H. Andrew, V. Collyer, W. N. Hamilton (4 parcels), J. Campbell, E. Connell; T. Hart (7 parcels), W. Gately, J. K. Gillies; 12th, M. Daives, J. Paterson; 13th, G. Taylor, H. Holyoak; 15th, S. H. Oatman, R. H. Tucker; 16th, Mr. Phillips, M. Daives, J. Grant, B. Sawden (2 parcels), T. Royce, R. Carruthers, S. H. Oatman, T. Royce; 17th, J. W. Thirtle (3 parcels), F. Cheetham, S. Boardman (2 parcels); 18th, R. Ashcroft; 19th, E. S. Evans, P. Sutherland, J. W. Thirtle.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, JUNE, 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price		To Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8s2d.	d2.50	10s2d.
10s6s.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s6d.	d4.0	12s6d.
10s6s.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	d4.0	12s6d.
6s3d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d2.75	8s6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	8s.	11d.
6s.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	3s.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	3d.	11c.	5d.
2s.	Catechisms (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	2s.	11c.	3d.
2s6d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s10d.	d1.3s.	3s6d.
3d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	1s.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s3d.
1s5d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.		
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	6s4d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	6s4d.	28c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3s4d.	18c.	4d.
1s6d.	The Apostacy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s8d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	1s4d.
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
3d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	2s4d.	11c.	3d.
4d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciacionism) ..	1s4d.	8c.	2d.
7d.	The Bible and the School Boards	1s4d.	8c.	2d.
7d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	33c.	10d.
1s4s.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, }	per 100.		
10d.	13, 14, 15 & 16	1s.	55c.	1s6d.
pr. doz.	Oodology (Spiritualism explained)	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	1s4d.	8c.	2d.
3s7s.	Who are the Christadelphians?	2s8d.	d1.25	4s.
4s.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	1d.	5c.	1s4d.
8s6s.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	3s10d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	9s4d.	40c.	1s2d.
9d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	3s4d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	2s4d.	11c.	4s4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas) ..	2s4d.	11c.	4d.
2s0d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	d1.0	3s4d.
8s0d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	8s4d.	d1.30	4s4d.
3s7.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	5s.	15c.	4s4d.
2d.	The Declaration	2s4d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	2s4d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8s.
6d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	2s4d.	11c.	4d.
1s3d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	per 100.	per 100	per 100.
6s6d.	The Defence	6s10d.	d2.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
2s6d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph) ..	2s4d.	11c.	4d.
	Back Nos. of the <i>Christadelphian</i> , from 1864, except			
	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2			
	months of 1872, at the published price			
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		
3s.	The Bible Vindicated	3s4d.		
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	3s4d.	16c.	4d.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS must be addressed to **ROBERT ROBERTS**, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable. Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O., or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 145. — July 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A

MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

The Kingdom of God and Modern Spiritology Incompatible Things	289	A Congregationalist Minister Becomes Obedient to the Truth, Un-"Revs." Himself, and Gives up a Salary of £400 a Year	318
The True Hope of the Gospel as arising out of the Promises made to Abraham	296	EDITORIAL	329
The Bible True	302	Signs of the Times	350
Things New and Old from the Treasures of the Spirit	310	Answers to Correspondents	350
		Jewish Affairs	332
		Intelligence	333

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

**ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.**

**TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.**

No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must begin with the January number

NOTES.

W.J.G.—See remarks appended to intelligence from Burnett. The question seems answered in 2 Cor. ii. 6-8.

A.A.—The use of orange-coloured paper for the cover was due to the printer being short of the right colour at the last moment. There is no intention to change from green, which all seem to prefer.

E.J.L.—Wilson's *Diaglott New Testament* is reliable so far as the Greek text and the inter-linear word-for-word rendering are concerned. In fact you need wish no better; but his English translation at the side of the page is often objectionable.

J.A.—The Editor's health has not been hurt by the discussion. On the contrary, it seems better now than the discussion is over than it was before. For this we give thanks to God and to the many brethren and sisters who have made it the subject of their petitions.

T.P.—We have none of the old Hymn Book in stock. We regret the high price of the new one; but the advantages connected with it are certainly worth the price of an umbrella, which the poorest person manages to provide himself with. It is a question of appreciation.

W.R.—You will no doubt have received the posted copies of the *Christadelphian* long before you read this. The cause of the delay was the non-receipt of your letter of renewal till Feb. 14th, on which same day, your parcel of twelve was despatched. Be assured deficient subscription had nothing to do with it. We have never acted on the principles insinuated.

J.B.—A promise to marry, if it is unconditional, is of the same obligation as marriage itself, unless the person to whom it is made is willing to grant a release. Consequently, a brother under such a promise to an alien, (made before his enlightenment in the truth) is in the same position as if the truth had found him married to her, and Paul's advice is "Let this not put her away."

J.J.—Mr. Bradlaugh having sold out his

interest in the discussion to be published, its publication is in the hands of the Editor, who contemplates writing a review of it for addition at the end of the report. The object of the review will be to notice such objections of Mr. Bradlaugh as there was no time to notice in the discussion, and also to supply portions of the affirmative evidence which the Editor was obliged, from the same cause, to omit.

H.C.J.—The hymn book was despatched to your address the same day your letter was received. We do not know where it would be detained. We should be glad if we could tell you of a way by which you could be "sure of getting books from England without unnecessary delay and sometimes total loss." We have for years suffered from the annoyance you complain of, and have lost all hope of reform till the whole ricketty machinery is swept away by the King of Israel.

ERRATA.—In the article last month, "Wilt Thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel," p. 244, col. 1, line 28, "unwise" ought to have been *universe*; and in the article, "Is the soul matter or spirit?" p. 248, col. 2, line 14, "chese immortality" ought to have been *chese mortality*; also in "The bible True," p. 258, col. 2, line 28, "Lary" should be *Liey*; and in four places on p. 256, "Herenas" should be *Hermas*. These are printer's misreadings of MS.

M.R.—The Bradlaugh discussion has been reported by competent shorthand-writers, and is now in the hands of the printer, who promises to push it forward with all haste, which there seems every likelihood he will do. It will, probably make a book of 200 pages, *Christadelphian* size. The price we cannot yet state; but it will be as cheap as circumstances will allow. Meanwhile, you may glean some idea of its general character from the opening remarks in the editorial column, page 323, and from Birmingham intelligence. Suffice it to say it is considered a success for the truth.

READ EUREKA:

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE,

In three vols.

(BY DR. THOMAS.)

IT ELUCIDATES AND HARMONISES ALL PARTS OF THE ORACLES OF GOD.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SHIELD.

BY J. J. ANDREW.

The following papers have just been re-printed and can now be obtained at

69, UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON;

AND AT THE ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW, BIRMINGHAM.

- 1.—The Thief on the Cross.
- 7.—The Rich Man and Lazarus.
- 8.—Stephen's Dying Prayer.
- 9.—Suffer Little Children to Come unto me.
- 10.—Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.
- 11.—The House of many Mansions.
- 12.—Charity.

Price 1d. each, postage extra, or 10d. per doz. post free. Nos. 2 and 6 and 14 to 16 are still in supply. Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 13 sold out.

A limited number of the first series No. 1 to 12 have been stitched in paper wrappers. Price 1s. post free.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it. Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—May 20th, S. Boardman; 22nd, J. U. Robertson, R. Ashcroft, Pagen and Gill, R. Carruthers, J. Horton, T. Royce, W. Peel; 24th, A. Andrew, W. H. Andrew, J. Atkinson; 25th, J. Phillips, W. H. Andrew, J. U. Robertson, A. Harewood, W. Peel, J. Wishart; 26th, H. Lones, G. S. Stone, J. Bell, J. Wood, J. Whitehead; 27th, R. Ashcroft, W. Peel, C. J. Tyler; 29th, "Warrington;" 30th, W. Smith, D. H. Smith, W. Sommers, H. H. Horsman, T. Holland, J. U. Robertson, T. Nichols, J. Birkenhead; 31st, R. Harvey, A. McKillop, E. Burley, J. Sutherland, W. McGregor, "Warrington." June 1st, M. A. Hayes, H. Leah; 2nd, "Warrington," S. Strathearn; 3rd, V. Collyer, C. W. Clark, T. Nisbet, J. Whitehead, C. S. Tyler; 5th, C. S. Tyler, D. Gaskin, J. Ritchie; 6th, J. Wareham, R. Ashcroft, C. Simms, T. Rees, W. L. Perrins, B. Evans; 7th, J. Horton, "Warrington," T. Watson, J. Geddes, D. Stokes, J. Wishart; 8th, E. Head; 9th, J. Heywood, anonymous, J. Burnett, G. H. Kidd, A. Graham; 10th C. S. Tyler, M. Hamilton, "Warrington," J. W. Royce, V. Collyer; 12th, A. Andrew, anonymous, R. M. Skeats, W. Peel, E. Dawes; 13th, T. Boshier, A. Andrew, G. Wait, D. Strathearn, "Warrington," W. Smith, C. Firth, W. Dashper, W. Harvey; 15th, G. St. Clair, W. Hardy, T. C. Nichols, J. J. Andrew, G. Hatton, G. Wait, J. Leask, R. Common, W. H. Andrew, R. Elliott, F. Cort, J. W. Dibol, J. Boler, W. Owler, J. Durrie, T. Calderbank, J. Mortimer, J. Ferguson, J. C. Hodgson; 17th, H. Cordukes, J. Hawkins; 19th, W. Unsworth.

FOREIGN.—May 20th, J. J. Smith, M. E. Sharp; 23rd, W. Rook, J. Colder; 29th, S. W. Coffman, W. Brittle, R. L. Holman, E. Bott, F. E. Utter. June 2nd, S. Boyley; 3rd, J. Banta, P. Cox, J. McKoy; S. W. Coffman, a sister in Christ, L. Fenton, H. L. Drake; S. T. Blessing, R. D. Robertson; 13th, A. Hall; 15th, W. J. Greer, T. A. Corbell, J. S. Adams; 19th, T. Hart, E. J. Lasius, J. W. Boggs.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

May 20th, J. W. Thirle, J. J. Smith, T. Sutherland, E. Sharpe, J. Laird; 23rd, J. J. Smith, W. Peel (3 parcels), Pagen and Gill, R. Ashcroft, T. Royce, R. Horton, H. Leah, J. U. Robertson; 24th, F. Colder, E. Thomas (14 parcels); 25th, R. Ashcroft, J. Savage, W. Peel (3 parcels); 26th, F. Peel, A. Andrew, J. Sotbill, J. Wishart, G. S. Stone; 29th, C. Jones; 30th, T. Holland, W. Smith, T. Nichols, J. U. Robertson, J. Smith; 31st, V. Collyer, E. Barley, W. McGregor, D. A. L. Gaskin, C. W. Clark, J. H. Fowler, W. Smith (3 parcels), J. Birkenhead (2 parcels), A. McKillop, R. Ashcroft, E. Thomas (3 parcels), T. Hart; June 1st, D. A. L. Gaskin, Miss Evans; 2nd, R. Ashcroft, S. Boyley; 3rd, V. Collyer, E. S. Tyler, T. Nisbet; 6th, R. Ashcroft, C. Simms (2 parcels); 7th, J. Wishart, D. Stokes, T. Watson, J. Geddes; 8th, Mrs. Boardman, C. Bolingbroke; 9th, J. Heywood (2 parcels), J. Burnett; 10th, G. Wait, M. Hamilton, J. Yule, C. S. Tyler, T. Royce; 12th, R. Roberts and Co., J. Dinwiddie, W. S. Grey, W. Dalgarnie, T. F. Keel, S. T. Blessing, C. Cort, W. Dashper (2 parcels), D. Strathearn, R. D. Robertson (2 parcels), J. Heywood, R. Paterson, J. Hatton, J. Mortimer, J. Durrie, J. A. Corben (3 parcels), J. Heywood, G. Wait, S. T. Blessing (4 parcels); 17th, J. Hawkins, H. Cordukes; 19th, E. Thomas, A. J. Glover, J. W. Boggs (5 parcels).

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, JULY, 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australasia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse), Vol. I.	82d.	d2.80	102d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	1186d.	d4.0	1386d.
1086d.	Ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	1186d.	d4.0	1386d.
65d.	Elpis Israel	782d.	d2.75	886d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	33c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	3d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	3d.
26d.	Twelve Lectures, (cloth)	2s10d.	d1.38s.	386d.
9d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	186d.
1854d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	61d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	61d.	23c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	37d.	18c.	4d.
136d.	The Apostasy Unsealed (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	185d.	90c.	2s.
3d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d.
3d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	23c.	9d.
3d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Reunuciationist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Reunuciationism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
7d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
7d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torments	8d.	33c.	10d.
14d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	188d.	97c.	244d.
P. 100	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, } 13, 14, 15 & 16 }	per 100.	1s.	16d.
pr. doz.		per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	14d.	8c.	2d.
366d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	388d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
366d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	340d.	d1.35	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	40c.	122d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	4d.
267d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	264d.	d1.0	344d.
386d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	384d.	d1.30	484d.
34d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
6d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
184d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	186d.	60c.	244d.
P. 100.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	per 100.	per 100	per 100.
966d.	The Defence	6s10d.	d2.50c.	766d.
9d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	10d.	55c.	184d.
266d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	288d.	75c.	322d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	24d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to <i>Daily Telegraph</i>)
..	Back Nos. of the <i>Christadelphian</i> , from 1864, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.
3d.	The Bible Vindicated	34d.	16c.	4d.
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	34d.	16c.	4d.

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by *Post Office Money Order*, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 146. — Aug. 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

The Gospel and the Eastern Question	337	—Authenticity of the New Testament—The Four Gospels	345
Who will Rise from the Dead?	342	Sin: its Origin, Effects and Destruction	352
The Reason why Popular "Divines" do not Understand the Apocalypse.. .. .	343	Sunday Morning at the Birmingham Christadelphian Ecclesia, No. 77	363
Ecclesiastical Phrases not representative of Apostolic Ideas	344	The Jews and their Affairs	368
The Bible True—God's Existence apparent from, &c. —Miracles not Inconsistent with the Order of Nature		EDITORIAL	369
		Signs of the Times	374
		Answers to Correspondents	378
		Intelligence	381

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must begin with the January number

NOTES.

Several items of intelligence are too late to appear, having been sent after the 15th.

MANCHESTER ECCLESIA.—The address of the secretary is "E. J. Trueblood, 32, Barlow Street, Bradford, Manchester."

H.N.—Your question on the classes that will be the subjects of resurrection is answered in Dr. Thomas's remarks, which appear this month, headed "Who will rise from the dead?"

T.H.—The person you enquire of went with the Renunciacionists at the beginning of their faction. It was a surprise and a grief: but we have to reconcile ourselves to such things.

S.H.O.—"Inform me what books outside the Christadelphian publications (if any) would assist me in building myself up in the truth in all its branches?" We are unable to supply the information desired.

J. W. and C.—Thanks for your contributions in aid of the poor. Cases often arise at a moment's notice where we are able to administer effectually your discretionary bounty. As the proverb has it: "He who gives quickly gives twice."

R.W.T.—The extract in the *Declaration* from Watson's Institutes has been impugned before; and if we remember rightly, brother Andrew referred to the Library of the British Museum and found it, and furnished the reference to the exact edition of Watson's works where the extract is to be found.

H.J.M.—There is no meaning in the non-appearance of answers to your question at any time. It is merely a case of delay—rather long we grant. We have several bundles of letters of the sort, waiting "a more convenient season," which with more physical robustness would come more quickly. Your letter is among the number.

J.M.—We shall comply with your request to have a hundred copies of the Bradlaugh Discussion printed on the cover with the address of the Aberdeen ecclesia. Another ecclesia asks about a thousand copies. We cannot yet speak about the price nor about the probable date of publication. All we can say is that the printer is busy.

W.B.—If either brother or sister is in the unfortunate position of having promised marriage to a stranger before the said brother or sister was enlightened, while the promise is binding, yet release from it ought not to be difficult to obtain where the brother or sister is in earnest. An alien would not care to be clogged with the company of one whose tastes and objects in life are totally different, and would probably be easily persuaded, with the right representation, to forego the claim.

J.N.—Your "discovery" as to the law of Moses and the relation of Jesus thereto is what we have been contending for; only we go further: the law was a prophecy as well as a code of requirements. It predicted Christ in all its appointments. Consequently, it testifies to the shedding of his blood as a necessity in the work of redemption, and he and his brethren are one. It was specifically required of him. It was the cup which the Father had given him to drink; and what the Father requires can never be considered unnecessary.

S.—No doubt it would be unfair to add to the reported speeches in publishing the Bradlaugh or any discussion: but it is not unfair to supplement the report with an avowed appendix,

for the completion of the argument, especially when the other side is offered the privilege of a rejoinder. Dr. Thomas did so in the case of Watts. We did the same in the case of Nightingale, and there is no objection in true reason to our doing it in the case of Bradlaugh. (Since writing the foregoing, we have received Mr. Bradlaugh's permission to publish an Appendix, though he thinks the debate ought to appear without it. He has not accepted the proposal to write a rejoinder.)

THE LONDON BOOK DEPOT.—Brother Bosher wishes to acknowledge receipt of 10s. sent to him anonymously through the post by a sister, who "hears with regret" that during the three years the depot has been open at 69, Upper Street, Islington, it has been a great loss to him, through the failure of the anticipated patronage of the public in the department of fancy articles. It was feared that this fact would lead to the closing of the depot altogether. It has compelled the relinquishment of the front shop to a stranger; but brother Bosher wishes the brethren and sisters to understand that notwithstanding this, the work of the depot goes on in the rear of the premises, to which there will be access by the hall entrance as heretofore. A notice in front states the hours of attendance for the sale of books.

J. C. H.—Thanks for your letter to Bradlaugh; you could not expect him to publish it; and as for the friends of the truth, they do not look for any other tactics on the part of the enemy than those you condemn. Even the Turks invent victories over the Servians where defeats have actually occurred. What can you expect of those who neither fear God nor regard man? In the case in question, it is difficult for the generality of people to perceive on which side the advantage lies, consequently more scope for misrepresentation without the person knowing it. Most people mistake assertion for argument; denunciation for demonstration; loud-voiced personal scurrility for logical incisiveness. The consequence is that the man is not considered a fit disputant who is chary of the use of such weapons; and who strives to rely on the force of evidence as adapted to the minds of reasonable men. But wisdom is justified of her children, notwithstanding.

SUBSCRIBERS IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.—Some disappointment was caused last year by the *Christadelphian* ceasing to visit old subscribers in those parts. The cause was that letters ordering the continuance of the *Christadelphian* did not come to hand in time for the new list. We have before explained that the *Christadelphian* is not sent a second year unless the subscriber expresses a wish to that effect, and remits the amount of annual subscription. Many reasons make it necessary to act on this rule. We hope friends will continue to bear with it, and let us know in time. When this No. gets into the hands of Australian and New Zealand subscribers, it will be time for them to renew for '77 on account of the length of time it takes for letters to come to England from that part. We regret the Post Office should have increased the postage to such an extent. It makes the *Christadelphian* dear out there. We are helpless in the matter.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SHIELD.

BY J. J. ANDREW.

The following papers have just been re-printed and can now be obtained at

69, UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON, LONDON;
AND AT THE ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW, BIRMINGHAM.

- 1.—The Thief on the Cross.
- 7.—The Rich Man and Lazarus.
- 8.—Stephen's Dying Prayer.
- 9.—Suffer Little Children to Come unto me.
- 10.—Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.
- 11.—The House of many Mansions.
- 12.—Charity.

Price 1d. each, postage extra, or 10d. per doz. post free. Nos. 2 and 6 and 14 to 16 are still in supply. Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 13 sold out.

A limited number of the first series No. 1 to 12 have been stitched in paper wrappers. Price 1s. post free.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH—June 19th, M. Black; 20th, G. H. Kidd, C. Firth, T. Royce, W. Owler, J. C. Hodgson, D. Gaskin, W. Watson, W. Hughes, J. Lucas; 21st, J. Gale, F. Peel, J. Ritchie, J. Durrie, G. Waite; 22nd, G. Armitage, J. J. Andrew, J. Leask; 23rd, J. J. Andrew, S. Evison, R. M. Skeats, F. Cort; 26th, Peacock and Young, J. Alexander; 27th, D. Clement, L. Godwin, A. Harwood, H. Bonniester, W. Gateley; 28th, T. Fisher, J. C. Hodgson, W. Sommers, R. W. Thorp, J. Yule, S. Davies, N. Winship, T. Royce; 29th, R. M. Skeats, E. J. Shaw, J. Boler, J. Mycroft, R. W. Thorp; 30th, J. Booth, C. Barber, J. Leask, "Warrington," N. Winship, S. Trigg, E. Michael, C. S. Tyler. July 1st, W. R. Dobson, F. Peel, E. J. Shaw; 3rd, Miss Harris, J. Shuttleworth, T. Leigh, T. Holland; 4th, R. D. Robertson, "Warrington," W. Smith, J. Merritt, M. Briggs, J. Durward, J. Atkinson; 5th, H. Graham, V. Collyer, R. Skeats, M. A. Harris, J. Bell; 6th, A. Andrew, J. Leask, F. Royce, A. Dray, A. M. Arcus, E. Mitchel, J. Monaghan; 7th, W. Dawson, H. Veysey, C. Firth, W. J. Jannaway, G. A. Birkenhead, R. W. Thorp; 8th, W. J. Jannaway, T. Swindell, T. Weston, C. Savory, C. Benton, J. Durward, W. Osborne, A. Jannaway; 10th, "Warrington," Greenwood & Dugdale, W. Grant; 11th, W. H. Hatton, T. Mankin, T. Royce, W. Dashper, B. Sawden, R. W. Thorp, W. Buckler, J. Cooke; 12th, W. Osborne, "Warrington," C. S. Tyler, D. Lanspeary, C. Firth, R. M. Skeats; 13th, C. Firth, C. S. Tyler, G. Waite, R. Tuke, J. Scrimgeour, Mrs. Atkinson, F. Cort, T. Wilson, W. Buckler; 14th, J. Leask, S. Empsall, C. Barber, A. Williams, W. C. Tyler, J. Mortimer, S. Wood, J. Boler; 15th, J. Kirkland, J. Richards, J. Horton, E. Trueblood, J. Ashcroft, R. Elliott, T. Royce, W. Grant, W. Owler, A. Jannaway; 17th, J. Follows, T. Royce; 18th, J. Hirst, W. Peel, W. Grant.

FOREIGN—June 21st, H. C. Jacobs; 23rd, C. W. Crichton; 26th, J. Banta; 27th, R. Sinclair, T. Trezise, H. C. Jacobs; 28th, P. H. Sims. July 3rd, E. B. Wright, C. Bolingbroke; 5th, C. C. M.; 10th, M. P. Ensey, S. H. Oatman, M. Dunn, J. M. Riggs, J. Campbell; 11th, C. Bolingbroke, H. Ussher; 17th, A. Hall, T. Hart, H. J. Moore.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

June 20th, J. Lucas, C. Firth; 21st, J. Durrie, J. Gale; 22nd, J. Leask (2 parcels); 23rd, T. Royce, G. Armitage, R. Roberts & Co.; 27th, L. Godwin, R. Sinclair; 28th, H. Bannister, H. Lones, T. Trezise (7 parcels); 29th, R. Roberts & Co., J. Boler, J. C. Gambler; 30th, J. Leask (3 parcels), N. Winship, T. Fisher, J. Royce, T. Trigg, C. S. Tyler, A. Andrew, F. Peel, J. Mycroft. July 1st, F. Peel (2 parcels), J. Leask, E. J. Shaw; 3rd, C. Bolingbroke, A. Pitt, Miss Harris, E. B. Wright, E. B. Haigh, J. Holland, J. Hawkins; 4th, W. Smith, D. Briggs, J. Durward (2 parcels); 5th, J. Atkinson, M. A. Harris, G. Taylor, R. Roberts & Co.; 6th, Mrs. Mitchel, A. M. Arcus; 7th, H. Veysey, J. Jannaway, J. Monaghan, R. W. Thorp, R. Norris, C. Firth, W. Dawson (2 parcels), M. Bailey, 8th, T. Swindell; 10th, J. Campbell, S. H. Oatman (3 parcels); 11th, T. Mankin, W. Buckler, R. W. Thorp, J. Cooke, Miss Murfin, R. Roberts & Co., S. H. Oatman; 12th, R. Roberts & Co., D. Lanspeary, C. S. Tyler; 13th, R. Tuke, F. Cort, Mrs. Atkinson, C. S. Tyler; 14th, J. McGregor, W. C. Taylor, J. Leask, J. Mortimer, S. Wood; 15th, G. Taylor, R. Ashcroft, A. Jannaway; 18th, R. Hirst, E. Trueblood.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, AUG., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse), Vol. I.	822d.	d2.80	1022d.
786d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	1186d.	d4.0	1386d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " III.	1186d.	d4.0	1386d.
687d.	Elpis Israel	722d.	d2.75	827d.
687d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	33c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	11c.	3d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	24d.	11c.	3d.
3d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Man Mortal	181d.	50c.	183d
1s54d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.		
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	64d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	64d.	23c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	34d.	18c.	4d.
186d.	The Apostacy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas & Watts)	186d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
4d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciatorist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciatorism) ..	14d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
14d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	186d.	97c.	24d
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2 to 16 }	per doz.	55c.	166d.
pr. doz.			per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	14d.	8c.	3d.
386d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	586d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
386d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3810d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	40c.	1s2d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	4d.
286d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	284d.	d1.0	3s4d.
386d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	384d.	d1.30	4s4d.
8d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	8d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	The Declaration	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
4d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
186d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True }	186d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100	per 100.
66d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6610d.	d2.50c.	766d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
286d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	288d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	24d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph)
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price.
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.
3s.	Modern Theology (the Canadian work)	3s4d.
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	34d.	16c.	4d.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS MUST BE ADDRESSED TO ROBERT ROBERTS, CHURCH ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 117.—September 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Sacrifice in the Future Age and Christ's Accomplished Work— Question by a Correspondent and Dr. Thomas's Answer .. 385	Things New and Old from the Treasures of the Spirit .. 401
The Work of the Truth <i>versus</i> the Work of Sectarianism .. 391	Is it Permissible to Believers to Bear Arms? 405
Dr. Thomas and the Jewish Boy 394	Sin: its Origin, Effects and Destruction 410
My Dead Companions 395	EDITORIAL 421
	Signs of the Times 422
	Intelligence 427

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

J.K.—Don't write your letters in shorthand. Shorthand is not understood in the office; and its use only causes delay in the letter being attended to.

Sister Thomas desires all letters addressed to her to be directed to 38. Graham Street, Jersey City, Heights, New Jersey. Book parcels should be addressed "West Hoboken," as heretofore.

T.P.—The Bradlaugh discussion is being got out by the printer who has bought the copy-right. Consequently, the price will, in the first instance, depend on him; but will be so arranged as to allow the usual bookselling profit to any booksellers you may induce to undertake the sale.

J.L.—The Editor cannot arrange to visit Glasgow on his coming visit to Edinburgh. Appointments before and behind the Edinburgh date prevent it. His visit to Edinburgh will be for a week, in October, commencing on Sunday, the 15th of that month. He may visit Glasgow in the spring of next year, if friends please so to arrange.

T.P. AND W.B.—The publication of Christadelphian works in the Spanish language is an impossibility. With money at command, it might be done; but it has pleased God to withhold this advantage. It is only barely possible to keep the truth in circulation in the language of Tarshish. In all other directions, at present, the door is shut.

J.H.—No doubt, it is better to have nothing to do with the vending of intoxicating drinks in any way; but a wine license to sell over the counter is not to be compared for a moment with public-house keeping. Selling wine as an article of domestic consumption is a respectable act of tradesmanship, while keeping a drinking house can hardly be described in that way.

S.S.—The printer is rapidly advancing with the Bradlaugh discussion. He is at the end of the fourth night. We are not yet, however, in a position to mention a date for its appearance, nor a price. It will, probably, extend to 200 pages, *Christadelphian* size, but broader. It is in bourgeois, a large readable type—the type the Dr.'s articles are usually set in.

H.S.—We cannot be interested in receiving intelligence from those who say that Christ had no will of his own. Such, though they do not intend it, deny the Son; and we cannot be compromised in so serious an error. We regret the difficulty has been raised. The responsibility rests with those who have raised it. Friends of the truth can only hold aloof (in sorrow they do it), till the barrier is taken down in an acknowledgment of the part Christ performed in achieving the victory.

S. AND G.—In this age of religious confusion,

there is no practicable line of demarcation (that shall lead to anything profitable in spiritual things) short of insistence on the whole truth as the basis of fellowship. The truth is such a unit that it will be found, in practical experience, that the compromise of any of its elements in detail, soon leads to the rot of the rest, and consequent general demoralisation and failure in Christ. Earnest men will not be satisfied with anything short of the whole and the genuine article.

R.H.—The Editor's health has not suffered at all from the Bradlaugh encounter, notwithstanding much additional work connected with the getting ready the debate and review for publication. Your suggestion to supply a local bookseller and let the brethren get it from there in detail is best. There will be bills, large and small, announcing the publication; and the Editor will take care you are supplied. Your remarks on the signs of the times are excellent. Accept this mode of acknowledgment in lieu of a letter, for which time lags.

J.C.—The *Bible Vindicated* is selling, but not rapidly. Being a collected reprint of matter already in the possession of most of the brethren, it is not called for so extensively as it would be were it otherwise. A notice of it appeared on the cover of the *Christadelphian* at the time of its publication. It is a good and useful work, but will, doubtless, arrest more attention in Canada than England, because of the greater ease with which such things can be introduced to public notice in the former country. In a country like England, there is no chance unless you can enlist the power of the publishers; and to enlist their favour on behalf of anything advocating the truth is impossible. The experiment has been tried several times. Even infidel publications have a far better chance. The reason is not far to seek.

Brother A. Craigmyle, of Aberdeen, suggests that in order to cheapen the Bradlaugh discussion to the general public, a collection should be made in all the ecclesias, to be applied to the extinction of a part of the cost. The object good, but difficulties stand in the way. Ten thousand copies are to be printed, and any reduction taking place would have to take place on all the ten thousand, because there will, probably, be a continuous future demand during such time as the Lord may delay his coming; and it would not do to start with a low price and then raise it. But to reduce 10,000 to any material extent would require a large sum—more than the brethren could raise, and more than we should feel justified in asking them to burden themselves with for such an object in these times.

READ EUREKA,

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE, IN 3 VOLS.,

BY DR. THOMAS.

It elucidates and harmonises all parts of the Oracles of God.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—July 18th, J. Dibol; 19th, A. P. Wallis, F. Cort; 20th, C. Doe, S. A. Smith, B. Messenger, J. Gillies, R. W. Thorp, W. Copeland, J. W. Thirtle, J. Mycroft, J. Burton, H. Sulley; 21st, L. Spencer, A. Sykes, "Warrington," A. Jannaway, F. Dealtry; 22nd, R. D. Robertson, J. Armstrong, W. H. Andrew, "Warrington;" 24th, T. J. Swindell; 25th, G. D. Wilson, J. Boler, A. Andrew, T. Rosher; 26th, J. S. Nisbet, J. Phillips, T. Holland, R. Johnston; 27th, J. Hollington, J. Ashcroft, A. McKillop; 28th, F. Peel, G. Drake, H. Corduke, C. Benton; 29th, J. Ashcroft, C. Barraclough, T. Swindell, T. Calderbank, R. W. Thorp; 31st, G. D. Wilson, L. Fenton, S. Boyley, J. F. "Lions," Aug. 1st, Belfast, J. Ashcroft; 2nd, J. J. Andrew, H. Sulley, "Warrington," W. Osborne, C. Firth, T. Phillips, W. Bailey, J. C. Gamble, R. Goldie, J. Mycroft, M. Mays, W. Smith; 3rd, J. J. Powell, C. Firth, R. Ashcroft, V. Collyer, E. Trueblood, C. Smith, C. Dalgliesh; 5th, J. Birkenhead, "Warrington," R. M. Skeats, J. J. Spencer, M. Briggs, M. Mays; 8th, J. Lovett, J. Handyside, E. Mockford, J. Mortimer; 10th, R. Carruthers, A. McKillop; 11th, L. Godwin, W. Grant, J. Handyside, J. Bland, A. Andrew, G. Drake; 12th, W. Beddoes, I. Lovett, C. M. Taylor, J. W. Moore, J. Grant, A. Dowie, F. Peel, A. Andrew; 14th, J. R. Clark, G. H. Kidd, J. Durrie, R. Carruthers; 15th, E. S. Evans, F. Cort, J. Boler, M. A. Harris, T. Betts, E. Trueblood, A. Craigmyle, W. Wallace, J. Kirkland, A. Andrew; 16th, R. M. Skeats, J. Burton, A. E. Ashforth, J. W. Dibol, L. Oliver, J. Grant; 17th, V. Faulkner, J. Kliff, M. Briggs; 18th, J. O'Neil, G. H. Kidd, L. Godwin; 19th, J. W. Leask, H. Sulley, A. Harwood; 21st, Trubner & Co., A. Dixon, W. McDonald, J. W. Dibol; 22nd, J. Grant; T. Nisbet, J. Kirkland, J. A. Gibbs, G. Wait, V. Collyer; 24th, S. Boardman, T. F. Atkinson, J. W. Dibol, C. Emmerson; 25th, S. Boardman, H. Sulley, J. Rhodes, R. W. Thorp.

FOREIGN.—July 18th, J. Ward, E. Beck; 24th, A. Pitt, J. Banta, J. W. Winfree, H. C. Essington, E. J. Lasius; 26th, F. E. Utter; 29th, A. Sintzenich; 31st, L. Fenton, S. Boyley. Aug. 1st, F. Chester, C. H. Evans; 5th, C. Creed; 8th, W. A. Sanderson, E. Thomas, S. A. Toft, W. C. B. Gillam, J. Luxford, A. Pitt, J. Coombe, J. T. Sykes, J. W. Boggs, Thomas & Casius; 14th, E. Thomas, S. H. Oatman, W. G. Mackay, M. H. King, W. Gilmour, J. B. Paton; 17th, S. T. Norman, W. McPherson; 18th, G. Scott, H. McFadyan; 19th, W. A. Sanderson; 21st, E. J. Lasius; 22nd, P. Graham

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

July 19th, Mrs. McConnell; 20th, H. Sulley, R. W. Thorp, J. K. Gillies, J. Wootton; 21st, L. Spencer, 1. Parke; 22nd, R. D. Robertson (2 parcels), J. Armstrong (2 parcels); 24th, H. C. Essington; 25th, E. J. Lasius (2 parcels), A. Barraclough, J. Phillips, F. E. Utter, S. E. Findley; 26th, H. Corduke, F. Peel, A. Andrew; 31st, L. Fenton. Aug. 1st, A. Gemmell, C. H. Evans, J. Biggar, M. Lowden; 2nd, Mr. Stockwell, T. Sutherland, V. Collyer, R. Goldie, J. Mycroft (3 parcels), J. Smith; 4th, J. Dalgliesh, E. Trueblood, T. Gilbert; 5th, M. Briggs (2 parcels), G. Drake, J. J. Spencer, C. Creed, R. Roberts & Co.; 9th, J. H. Fowler (3 parcels), J. W. Boggs (3 parcels), J. Eyre (2 parcels), J. Luxford (3 parcels), J. Wallace, J. Stoddart, J. Handyside, S. A. Taft, C. Bollingbroke, C. H. Evans, S. Henry, E. Mockford, W. C. B. Gillam, T. Meakin; 10th, E. Thomas (9 parcels), T. Cliff, J. H. Fowler, L. Godwin, J. Bland, R. Carruthers; 12th, C. M. Taylor, J. W. Moore; 14th, S. H. Oatman (4 parcels), G. B. Paton (2 parcels), J. K. Clark, G. H. Kidd, W. Gilmour, W. G. Mackay; 15th, M. A. Harris, W. Wallace (3 parcels); 16th, R. Roberts & Co., A. E. Ashforth, R. W. Thorp, S. H. Oatman, S. Boardman, R. Oliver, J. W. Boggs; 17th, M. Briggs, J. Herriott, M. Wing, W. McPherson, (2 parcels), J. Kliff; 18th, J. O'Neil, L. Godwin, W. Dawson; 19th, H. McFadyan (2 parcels); 21st, J. W. Dibol; 22nd, S. A. Garside, P. Grabam; 23rd, J. A. Gibbs; 24th, T. F. Atkinson (2 parcels); 25th, S. Boardman, R. W. Thorp.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, SEP, 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	F. Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	82d.	42.50	402d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto ditto " II.	1186d.	d.4.0	1386d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	1186d.	44.0	1386d.
683d.	Epis Israel	782d.	42.75	863d.
9d.	Anastasia (Resurrection and Judgment)	3d.	38c.	9d.
6d.	Phanerozo (God-manifestation)	8d.	33c.	11s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	2½d.	11c.	3d.
2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	2½d.	11c.	3d.
3d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
3s.	Twelve Lectures (leather)	28½d.	d1.60	4s.
1s.	Man Mortal	18½d.	50c.	18½d.
1854d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.		
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	6½d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	6½d.	23c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3½d.	18c.	4½d.
1861.	The Apostacy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas & Watts)	188d.	90c.	2s.
1d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	1½d.
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
2d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	2½d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Answers (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	1½d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	1½d.	8c.	2d.
134d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	183d.	97c.	283d.
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, Nos. 2 to 16 }	1s.	55c.	186d.
pr. doz.		per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	1½d.	8c.	2d.
86d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	388d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	1½d.
36d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3810d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	9½d.	40c.	182d.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	3½d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	2½d.	11c.	4½d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
200d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	284d.	d1.0	384d.
83d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	384d.	d1.30	484d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	43d.
2d.	The Declaration	2½d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	2½d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
183d.	Bro. Parke's Tract—Strange but True }	186d.	60c.	284d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100	per 100.
660d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6810d.	d2.50c.	7860d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	184d.
266d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	288d.	75c.	382d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
..	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph) ..	2½d.	11c.	..
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2 months of 1872, at the published price			
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		
3s.	Modern Theology (the Canadian work)	34d.		
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	3½d.	16c.	4½d.

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT BOWERS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable. Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for Books that are sold out.

Purchasers of Books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 148. — October 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Sacrifice in the Future Age and
Christ's Accomplished Work—
by Dr. Thomas 433
The Bible True—Historical Ver-
acity of the Old Testament.
Miracles not Inconsistent with
Divine Wisdom and Immuta-
bility. Authenticity of the
New Testament 445

Sin: its Origin, Effects and
Destruction 451
Things New and Old from the
Treasures of the Spirit . . . 461
Index to Eureka 465
EDITORIAL 467
Signs of the Times 470
The Jews and their Affairs . . 475
Intelligence 476

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

NOW READY: THE INDEX TO EUREKA.—This has now come from the printer, and is in the Office. It makes a bulky pamphlet of 72 pages. For particulars see announcement on page 465 in the present number of the *Christadelphian*.

A GOOD EXAMPLE.—"For several years I have devoted a tenth of my earnings to the service of the truth in my feeble way, and I mean to continue to do so as long as I can earn anything."—(J.W.B.)

J.M.P.—Persevere in your efforts on behalf of the truth. It is not a question of succeeding with people; it is a question of doing your duty. Noah had very small success but he was an accepted preacher of righteousness.

A.R.—The reason of the intelligence not appearing last month was its non-arrival in Birmingham before the 15th of the month. The same reason will hold good in one or two items this month.

S.—Bro. T. Nisbet, (63, St. Vincent-st., Glasgow.) can supply you with the means of stamping symbol-signs on the margin of your Bible to indicate the places where passages on certain subjects are to be found. A letter to him will bring you all particulars.

THE BRADLAUGH DISCUSSION.—The printer hoped to be able to authorise the announcement, "now ready," for this number; but he is not yet in that position, though nearly so. The next fortnight will probably see the discussion out. The whole six nights are now in type, and the principal part of the review.

S.B.—The intention of the writer of the MS. was to publish it, so he declared, and got it back from us for this purpose. Our purpose, was to then, give it some notice by way of reply; so we told him. Its being privately sent round instead would seem to show a fear of the results of criticism.

T.R.—We are not in a position to name a day for Swansea. Several other places, particularly in Yorkshire, have a prior claim, by long-standing promise, and we have not yet been able to arrange for them. There are many duties, and only moderate health, which compels a light and careful programme, with intervals of cessation.

J.M.—(Penn.)—The person you speak of does not speak the truth. His statement that the Editor ever had anything to do with the Mormons or Mormonism is a lie pure and simple; so as to Dr. Thomas. We are both, happily, undefiled by any past connection, however remote, with that abomination. Your informant is either the inventor or the retailer of falsehood.

J.R.—The address of sister Thomas, mentioned last month, is not a new one, though it reads like it. She lives in the same house as before. "West Hoboken" is the name of the district, and letters so addressed remain at the Post Office till called for, while those addressed

to the house as requested (88, Graham Street, Jersey City Heights, N.J.) are delivered. Books, on the other hand, the letter carrier will not carry, and, therefore, they must be addressed as before.

A.T.—The difference between Dr. Thomas's chronology and the chronology recognised among the Jews, is due to the fact that Dr. Thomas adhered to the Hebrew Scriptures, while the Jews under Rabbinical guidance, accept the chronology of the Septuagint, which has been altered from the original for a purpose. It is another case of the leaders of Israel having made void the Word of God through their traditions.

D.R.—We have as little sympathy for thoughts and speeches that hide God in Christ as we have for those that conceal the obedient Son. We have striven for years, and are still striving to maintain the scriptural medium in this and in other questions, and if parties prone to extremes, find in what has been said something to favour one extreme or other, it is only what has happened in every age of the world and on every question. We can only regret the failure of some to harmonise all elements of a glorious truth.

A.C.—There is no library in connection with the Birmingham *Christadelphian* ecclesia, but there is a book club, by which books are purchased by the poorest. Once a week, the members contribute 3d. each, and a lot is drawn as to who shall have the disposal of the total amount, the successful drawer not to have another chance till all the rest have drawn, at the rate of one drawing a week.

V.G.—We are not aware of Dr. Thomas having written expressly against the Mormon pretence of the gifts of the Spirit. He held a debate with a Mormon forty years ago, in which he confuted their doctrines; but we are not aware that the debate was ever published. You need have no difficulty in putting Mormonism to the proof. Ask them to show the gifts of the Spirit, and not talk about them; and if they say you have no faith, let them show a miracle on one of their own friends, to whom the objection cannot apply. There are lame and blind and dead among them; there is plenty of opportunity for showing their claim; but, in fact, they cannot; they are quacks and pretenders, who talk loudly but can do nothing more than other men can do.

G. D. AND OTHERS.—The proposed "Relief Fund" is the project of an inexperienced person or persons—well-meant, perhaps, but unwise in the last degree. Birmingham has been applied to by circular in common with other places; but has declined to take part in it. The reasons are six. 1.—It is a direct encouragement to wrong motives, as regards both those without and within. 2.—The amount of money that would be applied for under such an arrangement could never be raised in a poor community like ours. 3.—It would teach the brethren to lean on an arm of flesh and deprive them of the opportunity of that faith in God which Christ prescribes in common things. 4.—It would deprive almsgiving of the sweetness and profitableness of spontaneous individual contribution, by making the receipt of it a matter of right, and the bestowal of it a matter of burden, degrading it to the unholiness of a poor rate. 5.—It would tend to dry up the springs of individual bounty by keeping before the mind the existence of a fund; and 6.—It would take away the scope for individual stewardship to Christ in the disposal of individual substance according to individual opportunity.

READ EUREKA,

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE, IN 3 VOLS.,

BY DR. THOMAS.

It elucidates and harmonises all parts of the Oracles of God.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Aug. 26th, T. Merritt; 28th, C. W. Clark, R. W. Thorp, R. D. Robertson, J. Grant; 29th, J. Marsh, J. Cooke, J. Dalgliesh, T. Royce; 30th, S. Boardman, B. Sawden, J. S. Jowett, A. Dixon, W. Ellice, J. A. Gibbs, G. Lillie, F. Peel; 31st, A. Andrew, J. Mycroft, T. Royce, G. Taylor, J. Marsh, T. Clark. Sep. 1st, E. Trueblood "Warrington;" 2nd, S. Boardman, H. Corduke, J. S. Jowett, B. Sawden; 4th, W. Wallace, T. Wootton; 5th, D. Gaskin, R. Bairstow, T. J. Wykes, J. Horton, T. Royce, C. W. Clark, J. W. Dibol, M. Savage, "Warrington," J. Atkinson; 6th, T. Bosher, W. Grant, G. Drake, H. Leask, W. Grant, T. Merritt, D. Stokes; 7th, "Warrington" G. S. Fry, W. Wallace, E. Trueblood, W. Wilber; 8th, J. W. Moor, W. Summers, G. Baker, E. Trueblood, G. H. Kidd; 11, H. H. Horsman; 12th, "Warrington," A. Craigmyle, G. A. Birkenhead, W. Booth, Mrs. Jones, J. W. Royce, W. H. Andrew, R. Peacock; 13th, J. Benton, E. Michael, E. Lea, G. H. Kidd, F. Peel, L. Godwin, G. S. Fry, W. Breckenridge; 14th, J. W. Robertson, J. Wood, J. King, T. Randles, F. Cort, "Warrington," E. Lear, J. Millman, W. R. Otter, W. Owler, W. Peel, J. W. Dibol, B. Messenger; 16th, G. Birkenhead, G. Wait; 18th, F. Cort, G. H. Kidd, C. W. Clark; 19th, W. Owler, J. Cooke, R. Skeats, G. Dowkes; 20th, H. Pynn, C. Reid, Mrs. Hamilton; 21st, A. Andrew, R. Young; 22nd, E. Constable, H. Pynn, A. Sutton; 23th, W. Smith, S. Evison; 26th, J. H. Snelson, J. O'Neil, B. Atkinson, C. W. Clark.

FOREIGN.—Aug. 28th, J. Thomas, A. Hall, J. A. Corbell, M. Knight, T. Williams, Mrs. G. Wade, J. S. Bourland; 29th, J. T. Sykes, J. Southill, L. Fenton. Sep. 1st, E. Seyb, E. F. Mitchel, C. F. Zimmerman; 4th, J. McKinnon, J. Moffat, R. Ward; 5th, H. Hearn; 6th, J. T. Sykes; 11th, E. J. Lasius (2 letters), J. K. Magill, J. Johnston, R. Bingham; 13th, M. W. Owen, J. Turner; 18th, J. W. Boggs.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Aug. 26th.—T. Merritt; 28th, J. S. Bourland; 29th, J. S. Sykes, (5 parcels) J. Dalgliesh, J. Marsh (2 parcels), J. Cook, T. Royce (2 parcels), 30th, S. Boardman, W. Ellice, J. S. Jowett, A. Gibbs; 31st, T. Royce, J. Marsh, F. Peel. Sep. 1st, J. C. Gamble, E. F. Mitchel, H. Corduke; 4th, W. Wallace, J. McKinnon (3 parcels), J. Moffat, R. Ward (3 parcels); 5th, Miss Peebles, T. J. Wykes, H. Hearn, J. W. Dibol, J. Atkinson; 6th, H. Leah, W. Grant, D. Stokes (3 parcels); 7th, L. Entwistle, G. Spokes, W. Wallace, C. F. Zimmerman; G. T. Holland (2 parcels), A. Nairn; 11th, J. Magill (3 parcels); 12th, G. Swift, W. Booth, J. Birkenhead (2 pcls.), E. Thomas (2 pcls.), W. Owens; 13th, W. H. Andrew, G. S. Fry, L. Godwin, E. Thomas, T. Randles, J. Grant, W. Smith, F. R. Winterburn, C. W. Clark, J. Richards, J. McIntosh, J. Luxford, J. B. Paton, D. Colder, T. Hart, G. M. Mackay, W. H. Andrew (2 parcels), J. C. Gamble, F. Hodgkinson; 14th, G. Wait (2 parcels); 18th, J. Cort, J. W. Boggs (6 parcels), G. Armitage; 19th, G. Dowkes, R. Skeats; 20th, H. Pynn (2 parcels), C. Mitchel, J. Coombe, W. W. Holmes, C. Creed, J. Hale (3 parcels); 22nd, H. Pynn; 23rd, T. Scott; 25th, J. King, C. Smith; 26th, B. Atkinson (2 parcels), C. W. Clark.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, Oct., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
7s6d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8s2d.	d2.80	10s6d.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s6d.	d4.0	14s10/1.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	d4.0	15s10d.
6s6d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d2.75	8s7/1.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	88c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	88c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	2 1/2d.	11c.	3d.
2 1/2d.	Catechesis (Questions on Resurrection and Judgment) ..	2 1/2d.	18c.	6d.
3d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	18c.	6d.
1s.	Chronikon Hebraikon	1s1d.	35c.	1s4d.
3s.	Twelve Lectures (leather)	3s4d.	d1.60	4s.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s3d.
1s1d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	6 1/2d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Destiny of the British Empire	6 1/2d.	23c.	9d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3 1/2d.	18c.	4d.
1s6d.	The Apostasy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	1s8d.	90c.	2s.
1d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	11d.
5d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
4d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	2 1/2d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	1 1/2d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	1 1/2d.	8c.	2d.
1s4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	Christadelphian Shield, all except	per 100.	55c.	1s6d.
10d.	3, 4, 5 and 16	1s.
pr. doz.	Stitched Set of Shields	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1s.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	1s1d.	85c.	1s4d.
1d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	1 1/2d.	8c.	2d.
9s6d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	9s8d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	1d.	5c.	1 1/2d.
3s6d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	3s10d.	d1.25	4s.
8d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	9 1/2d.	40c.	1s2d.
3d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	3d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	2 1/2d.	11c.	4 1/2d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	2 1/2d.	11c.	4d.
2s0d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	d1.0	3s4d.
3s0d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	3s4d.	d1.30	4s4d.
3s1.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	4 1/2d.
2d.	The Declaration	2 1/2d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	Bible Companion	2 1/2d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	2 1/2d.	11c.	4d.
1s3d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	2s1.	2s1.
pr. 100.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s6d.	The Defence	6s10d.	d2.50c.	7s6d.
9d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	10d.	55c.	1s1d.
2s6d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph) ..	2 1/2d.	11c.	4d.
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	..
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.
3s.	Modern Theology (the Canadian work)	3 1/2d.	16c.	4d.
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	3 1/2d.	51c.	1s8d.
1s.	Index to Eureka	1s1d.

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes his notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 149. November 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Dr. Thomas on Soldiering in Relation to Brethren	481	Sunday Morning at the Bir- mingham Christadelphian Ec- clesia, No. 78	499
The 1260 Years: are they Lunar or Solar?	482	The Bible True	504
The New Covenant: its Present and Future Relations	484	Is the Bible Divine?	511
The Holy Land and its Prospects	487	The Jews and their Affairs . .	512
A Christadelphian's Dream . .	492	EDITORIAL	516
Deity Manifest in the Flesh . .	494	Signs of the Times	517
		Intelligence	525

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

*No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must
begin with the January number*

NOTES.

O.L.—The articles on "The Authenticity of the New Testament," are by "The Rev." Tregelles, as was stated at their commencement. This will account for some expressions in them leaning towards the doctrines of the apostasy.

THE BRADLAUGH DISCUSSION.—The advertisement on page 511 will show that we are authorised by the printer to say "Now Ready," although it is well to say that at the moment of writing this notice, the Discussion is not yet out of his hands.

J.P.—It is, doubtless, a duty to submit to the law of vaccination, however much we may be opposed to it. We are commanded to be subject to the ordinances of man. For remarks on the subject at length, see the *Christadelphian* for June, 1872, page 281.

E.A.—The price of the *Bradlaugh Discussion* to America, including postage and duty, (for the latter of which, in view of what is charged when a quantity are sent, we are obliged to make provision) will be one dollar. We do not get the theoretical value of a dollar in exchanging the dollar in England, and, therefore, have to fix the American price higher than would otherwise be the case.

C.V.—Many untrue things are said against us on the American side of the Atlantic, as well as on this. Those who know us best know they are untrue. We have the answer of a good conscience, and are willing to come to the test at any time. We shall, probably, very soon all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, when things will be made manifest in their true light. Those who accuse us of mere-manimism don't know what they are talking about.

WHITBY.—The statement as to "identification with the Church of England," appearing in the intelligence of withdrawal at Whitby last month, does not apply to brother Mankin, as the construction of the sentence will show. Brother Mankin also gives reasons for his absence, which may prevent brethren elsewhere from being bound by the reported withdrawal. He desires to be at liberty to fellowship brethren in other towns he may visit.

A.R.—The paragraph that has gone the round of the papers, as to a "Sudden death in a Christadelphian place of worship at Leicester," does not relate to the brethren there. There is no elderly man among them of the name mentioned, and no sudden death has happened to any of them. Brother Gamble, of Leicester, says it must refer to "The Alexander Rooms," presumably the meeting-place of Renunciacionists, whose organ has discarded the name Christadelphian.

ERRATA IN ARTICLE ON "SIN."—In the September *Christadelphian*, p. 413, 1st column, lines 24 and 25 have been transposed by the printer. It should read thus, "These two things may be illustrated by the two most prominent features in the Mosaic system of types, viz., the sacrifices and the priests; the offering of sacrifices typifying the carrying out of the law on Christ," &c. Also p. 416, 1st column, 13th line from bottom, after "faithful," instead of "in whom" read "on whom."

L.P.C.—We are to "do good unto all men as we have opportunity." This does not exclude "those whom God has appointed to destruction," until the time for their destruction arrives: for Christ says we are to do good to "the unthankful and the evil." Consequently, it would not be improper to contribute to those who suffer by the judgments of God on Turkey. The only doubt is whether we should contribute separately or in concert with the bodies around us. The former course is at least free from objection.

H.H.H.—The delay cannot be much prolonged. The Jewish settlement of the land

must, doubtless, reach a much more advanced stage than at present, but not necessarily before the Lord come to judge his house. This may precede the Gogian catastrophe a considerable time. The dry Euphrates and the frog-embroidered world are our two signs, and nearly complete. Finally, Jewish regeneration will be a very rapid affair when Syria is delivered from the Turkish yoke, which it probably will be very soon.

T.R.—You will be able to understand "what is meant by the 'No-will' theory," if you read the article in the *Christadelphian* for March last, entitled "The obedience of Christ in relation to the manifestation of God in him." It is a theory that denies that "the man Christ Jesus" had any moral participation in the obedience accorded by him to the commandments of the Father, teaching that he had no separate and independent will of his own, but was helplessly subject to the divine impulse which fashioned and guided him. It is an unskilful deduction from the fact that he was "the word made flesh."

M.P.E.—It was a mistake to charge you with the books sent so long ago in the way they were sent. The mistake was due to brother Shuttleworth having forgotten the nature of the transaction. We were not aware you had been applied to. We are much away from Birmingham, and business matters are in brother Shuttleworth's hands, who acts to the best of his judgment, and always in good faith. His applying to you was not exactly personal to your case. It was part of a plan of reminder he has begun to work on lately on account of the number of those who get books, intending to pay, but who forget, to the serious inconvenience of the Office, which makes a special arrangement, is responsible to the printer for all books sold, but not for those which remain in the Office, which are his property. It will surprise you to know that over £100 is due to the Office in this way. This will explain brother Shuttleworth's card of reminder, which in your case, was a mistake. It will also give everyone to understand the necessity we are under of adhering to the payment-with-order system.

E.M.—Your objection is a Renunciacionist objection, however much you may repudiate Renunciacionism by name. You object to the proposition that our hereditary mortality is a physical law of decay in our nature tending to sin. In defence, you refer to what we wrote in 1869. If you read what we then wrote in its entirety, you will find that we recognised then, as we do now and always have done, that our condemnation is a thing "running in the blood." The "change" against which the remark you quote was directed was a complete change than you associate with the term. It was a change of nature such as orthodoxy understands that I supposed the correspondent in question to have before his mind. My words in opposing this view have been laid hold of to destroy the fact which I contend for in the very same article, viz., that though still "a living soul," Adam condemned was a living soul with condemnation in his nature. Considering the diligence with which our words have been wrested, we are not surprised that you should have been beguiled into this mistake. Nevertheless, your sympathy with this mistake shows there is foundation for the action of those who suspect you of Renunciacionism. We have no partialities in such matters. Any man is our friend who is for the truth in the obedience of it, and *vice versa*. The remedy is in your own hands.

READ EUREKA,

AN EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE, IN 3 VOLS.,

BY DR. THOMAS.

It elucidates and harmonises all parts of the Oracles of God.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Sep. 27th, W. H. Houlden, J. Atkinson, "Warrington;" 28th, F. Cort, F. Hodgkinson, T. Sixsmith, S. A. Garside; 29th, A. W. Warner, T. Merritt, J. Boyd, J. J. Andrew; 30th, W. Smith, R. W. Thorp, E. P. Morrall. Oct. 2nd, A. Andrew, S. Empsall, B. Sawden, H. Sulley, E. Baker; 3rd, J. Birkenhead, J. Sanders, A. McKillop, E. Constable, R. Skeats, C. Smith, T. Bosher, B. Parsons; 4th, W. Smith, W. Sommers, T. Gamble, A. Robertson, W. Dashper; 5th, "Warrington," J. Dalglish, W. Wilber; 6th, J. Leask, J. Richards, A. Perrin, J. Thornton, W. Sharpe, J. Boler, S. A. Smith; 7th, T. Parkes, L. P. Chitty, "Warrington;" 9th, "Warrington," W. Dashper, W. H. Houlden, T. Dobbs, W. Wallace; 10th, W. Smith, G. T. Boyd, F. Cort, S. Jenkins, J. Howie, J. W. Dibol, J. Nisbet, W. Grant, S. A. Garside, W. H. Andrew, R. Carruthers; 12th, T. Holland (2 letters), J. Atkinson, W. F. Roche, L. Holland, G. Wait, R. Goldie; 13th, S. Dawes, B. Messenger, F. Cort, R. Carruthers, M. Briggs, C. Silverwood, T. Rees, T. Randles; 14th, S. Howatson "Warrington," W. Grant, R. Elliott, J. Eurlon, R. Johnstone, J. Kirkland, T. Holland, W. Breckenridge; 16th, E. Cole, "Warrington," S. A. Garside, J. King, J. Hobart, J. W. Dibol; 17th, W. Grant, J. C. Gamble, C. Silverwood, H. H. Horsman, J. Mortimer, J. Dinwiddie, F. Garside; 18th, "Warrington," C. Firth, G. Johnstone, J. J. Spencer, J. Foyl, W. Blount; 19th, J. J. Andrew, H. H. Horsman, F. Garside, Miss Hooper, J. Young.

FOREIGN.—Oct. 2nd, W. F. Kirk, J. Moffatt, H. C. Essington, R. L. Holman; 5th, J. Campbell; 7th, P. F. Sander; 9th, R. S. Weir, M. McNeill; 10th, "Berean," W. W. Holmes, E. J. Lasius; 16th, L. Edwards, C. Vredenburgh, C. Chester, M. P. Hensley; 17th, W. Gunn.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Sep. 26th, C. W. Clark; 27th, W. H. Holden, J. Atkinson; 28th, F. Cort, S. A. Garside; 29th, F. Peel, Mrs. Gordon, A. W. Warner; Oct. 2nd, S. Empsall, E. Morrall, E. Baker, M. E. Essington, R. D. Robertson (4 parcels), W. F. Kirk, A. Andrew; 3rd, B. Parsons, E. Constable, A. McKillop, J. Sanders (2 parcels); 4th, W. Dashper (3 parcels), A. Robertson; 5th, J. Dalglish; 6th, V. Collyer; 7th, L. P. Chitty, J. Boler, A. W. Warner, W. Wallace (2 parcels), T. Parkes; 10th, S. Jenkins, J. W. Dibol (3 parcels), G. T. Boyd, W. Grant (4 parcels), W. W. Holmes (11 parcels), S. A. Garside, J. Nisbet, W. C. Brown (5 parcels); 11th, R. Carruthers; 12th, T. Holland, C. Silverwood (3 parcels), J. Herriot; 13th, Dr. J. Ince; 14th, T. Randles, W. Grant; 15th, W. E. Cole; 16th, M. E. Chester, H. H. Horsman; 17th, W. Grant (5 parcels), W. Gunn, W. Routley (3 parcels), F. Garside, C. Silverwood, J. Wood, "Rev." A. Murray, W. H., J. J. Spencer, G. Johnstone, S. A. Smith; 19th, H. H. Horsman, Miss Hooper, J. Young.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, Nov., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
7s6d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	8s2d.	d2.80	10s6d.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	11s6d.	d4.0	14s10d.
10s6d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " III.	11s6d.	d4.0	15s10d.
6s6d.	Elpis Israel	7s2d.	d2.75	8s6d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38c.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	33c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	2½d.	11c.	3d.
5d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Chronikon Hebraikon	1s1d.	35c.	1s 7.
3s.	Twelve Lectures (leather)	5s4d.	d1.60	4s.
1s.	Man Mortal	1s1d.	50c.	1s3d.
1s5½d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	6d.	23c.	9d.
6d.	Ditto " 3, for pocket	3d.	18c.	4d.
3d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	3d.	18c.	4d.
1s6d.	The Apostasy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas & Watis)	1s3d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	1½c
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul) ..	7d.	22c.	9d.
4d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	2½d.	11c.	3d.
4d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism) ..	1s.	8c.	2d.
4d.	The Bible and the School Boards	1½d.	8c.	2d.
1s4d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	1s8d.	97c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	Christadelphian Shield, all except	per 100.		
10d.	3, 4, 5 and 13	1s.	55c.	1s6d.
pr. doz.	Stitched Set of Shields	per doz.	per doz.	per doz.
1s.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	1s1d.	35c.	1s 7.
17d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	1½d.	8c.	2d.
3s6d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	3s8d.	d1.25	4s.
4d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	1d.	5c.	1½d.
3s6d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	3s10d.	d1.25	4s.
3d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	3½d.	40c.	1s2d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	2½d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	2½d.	11c.	4½d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
2s0d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	2s4d.	d1.0	3s4d.
3s0d.	Ditto ditto (bound in cloth)	3s4d.	d1.30	4s4d.
3d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	4½d.
2d.	Bible Companion	2½d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1888 & 1870)	2½d.	11c.	4d.
1s3d.	Bro. Parkes' Tract—Strange but True	1s6d.	60c.	2s4d.
pr. 100	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	per 100.	per 100.	per 100.
6s6d.	Ditto (leather)	6s10d.	d2.50c.	7s6d.
7s3d.	The Defence	7s7d.	d2.75c.	8s3d.
9d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	10d.	55c.	1s4d.
2s6d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	2s8d.	75c.	3s2d.
2d.	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph)..	2½d.	11c.	4d.
..	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except
..	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2
..	months of 1872, at the published price
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		
3s.	Modern Theology (the Canadian work)	3s4d.		
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	3½d.	16c.	4d.
1s.	Index to Eureka	1s1½d.	51c.	1s 7.

All communications must be addressed to **ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham**; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.

Canadian prices are expressed in English money, as applicable to the English Colonies in general, and, on the whole, less liable to mistake.

No. 150 — December 1, 1876.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN

A
MONTHLY PERIODICAL

DEVOTED TO THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE OF THE
FAITH PREACHED BY THE APOSTLES

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AGO,

IN OPPOSITION TO THE DOGMAS OF PAPAL AND PROTESTANT CHRIST-
ENDOM, WITH A VIEW TO MAKING READY

A PEOPLE PREPARED FOR THE LORD.

EDITED BY ROBERT ROBERTS.

CONTENTS:

Baptism in Relation to Justification	529	of God. "J.M.'s Objections to the Bible. Authenticity of the New Testament. Results of Evidence	553
The Holy Land and its Prospects	537	The Jews and their Affairs	559
A Christadelphian's Dream	546	EDITORIAL	564
Sunday Morning at the Birmingham Christadelphian Ecclesia, No. 79	549	Signs of the Times	564
The Bible True—The Existence of Evil and the Goodness		Answers to Correspondents.. . . .	568
		Intelligence	571

BIRMINGHAM: ATHENEUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

Published by the Editor,

ON THE LAST THURSDAY IN EACH MONTH, FOR THE
MONTH FOLLOWING.

TERMS—SEVEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE PER ANNUM IN BRITAIN;
to Subscribers in the United States, THREE DOLLARS; in Canada,
NINE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in Australia and New Zealand,
TEN SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE; in advance.

No Subscription accepted for less than twelve months, and each Subscription must begin with the January number

NOTES.

W.V.H.—There will be a superior edition of the *Bradlaugh Discussion* by and by—printed on better paper and with a larger margin. Wait till then for a presentation copy.

AMERICAN.—Purchasers remitting for *Index to Eureka* may, for convenience sake, deduct one cent from the price published last month (51 cents). The price will be 50 cents, including postage.

O.J.—The postage on the *Bradlaugh Discussion* is only 2d. The amount stated last month (2½d) was a calculation beforehand from the number of pages; but it turned out to be on thinny paper than the postage was calculated for, which explains the discrepancy.

H.W.—We agree with you as to the unsuitability of a mere satire like "The third epistle of Peter" for general circulation as a tract. The brethren who have published it evidently think differently. Our name appears on it without permission.

J.L.H.—Books of elementary instruction in the tonic-sol-fa notation are to be had in Britain and probably in America also. If you have any difficulty in getting one in the States, we could procure and forward you one. It would not cost above 25 cents, postage included.

Brother Horton, 2, High Street, Tewkesbury, writes to ask (on behalf of brother Medlicott, of that place) for a further gratis supply of second-hand books and tracts on the truth from such as may have no further use for them. They are for free distribution, in which brother Medlicott does some active service.

S.—It is true that a report has appeared in the papers setting forth the particulars of a public bodily wrestle between Mr. Bradlaugh and one of his audience at a place called Congleton. We have the newspaper report before us now. The meeting was in an uproar while the fight was going on, and the interruptor finally withdrew.

D.E. (QUINCEY).—We cannot read in German. Consequently, in the absence of the gift of tongues or the interpretation thereof, the tract remains to us a dead letter. But as to "the everlasting gospel" of Rev. xix. 6, 7, it will not come forth till the Lord has returned to the earth and established himself in Zion.

BROTHER McD.—We have no objections to receive and forward any contributions that the brethren with you or anywhere else may choose to make on behalf of the suffering people in Bulgaria and the other desolated provinces of Turkey. It is, doubtless, our duty to "do good unto all men as we have opportunity." The Birmingham brethren would probably join you.

W.B.—The doctrine of human mortality, as a teaching of Scripture, was first propounded by Dr. Thomas in 1834. His exposition was first accepted in England in 1848, on the occasion of his visit to Birmingham—by some even before then; and the first ecclesias were constituted within the two years following. White, Leask,

Minton, &c., all appeared on the scene much later. The "individual," therefore, who makes these gentlemen the forerunners is misinformed.

THE "BRADLAUGH DISCUSSION."—There is now a bountiful supply of this in the office. It is published by the printer at his own risk, but he passes all stock through our hands for supply, to the trade or retail purchasers. We regret the highness of the selling price. It was necessitated by the terms exacted by the London publisher. It brings, however, the advantage of enabling us to allow a discount, amounting to 61. per copy, to any bookseller undertaking its sale. Anyone wishing them to sell again can have a supply on these terms.

S.B.—We have received the No-will pamphlet of letters on "God Manifestation." We cannot notice it favourably. It is an incompetent manipulation of divine truth, with the result not only of blotting out the individuality and the victory of "the man Christ Jesus," but of establishing Calvinistic conclusions with regard to his brethren, and displacing the written word from its position in the work of God, as the means of influencing and constraining our wills to obedience. It is another illustration of how error on one point logically works out the destruction of other parts of the truth. The blame of division rests with those who teach things contrary to apostolic doctrine, however well-meaning they may be: and not with those who, under whatever misunderstanding will resist all speeches, mild or blustering, that would tend to the nullification of the truth. Remarks next month.

J.W.—"Kept back" is scarcely a correct description of the letters omitted from the Halifax correspondence. The fact is, two letters, one by a sister and one by the Editor, both shared together the fate which sometimes befalls documents too carefully put away; they were not found again when wanted, and have not been found to this day. They were diligently searched for by more than one person, that they might appear with the other letters. But they were not material, though they would have been welcome, and therefore the correspondence appeared without them. If it were a case where personal character was involved, and where the publication of some particular letter might be necessary to allow of a just judgment on the matter of accusation, the omission might be reprehensible, especially if it had been deliberate. But on a merely general subject, where it is a matter of editorial prerogative whether any and what part of a document shall be utilised for publication, only prejudiced feeling could attempt to impart an evil colour to the incident. We thank you for your good advice; but we know the battlefield, and the exigencies of the conflict and the men we are dealing with, and we must choose to do and not to do what ever appears to be dutiful and necessary, even at the risk of displeasing such as may sincerely imagine we are on the wrong tack.

IS THE BIBLE DIVINE?

A SIX NIGHTS' DISCUSSION, BETWEEN THE EDITOR AND
MR. C. BRADLAUGH;

With a REVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION, by the former.

By Post, Two Shillings and Twopence.

LETTERS SINCE THE ISSUE OF THE LAST NUMBER.

These acknowledgments are published from month to month that correspondents may know that their letters are received and attended to, without being privately communicated with. Private acknowledgment is a simple impossibility, in such a large number of cases with so much else to do. Recognising this, let no one consider himself or herself slighted in not receiving acknowledgment through the post. It is a necessary rule not to do it.

Letters intended for the Editor's eye only should be marked "private;" some letters are marked "private" when there is nothing private in them. It is desirable this should be avoided, as marking a letter "private" is likely to lead to delay in its being attended to. Intelligence letters should be sent by the 15th of the month. They should be written on note paper size, on one side only.

BRITISH.—Oct. 20th, H. Sulley, "Warrington," W. Grant, T. Mankin, J. Ritchie; 21st, S. G. Hayes, T. Nisbet, W. Dashper, C. Reed, D. Pogson, F. Peel; 23rd, H. Bannister (2 letters), W. Beddoes, F. Hodgkinson, J. J. Andrew, G. W. Otter, S. Harvey, G. Johnston; 24th, S. Boardman, J. J. Andrew, W. E. Coles, G. Wait, F. Cort, C. Firih, G. Boler, E. H. Chandler, T. Wilson, R. D. Robertson; 25th, G. H. Kidd, R. Common, W. Osborne, F. Hanson; 26th, C. W. Clark, J. Hall, W. Norrie, J. Monaghan; 27th, D. Clement; 28th, C. Firih, G. Wotton, R. O. Oliver; 30th, M. Mays, B. W. Thorp, J. J. Spencer, J. Wootton, R. M. Skeats, A. McKillop, W. Wilber; 31st, C. Firih, W. Sommers, T. Voice, G. Drake, G. Wait, W. Peel, D. Drake, R. Carvie, J. W. Thurtle, T. Holland, J. Thomason, "Amen," J. Nisbet, A. Andrew. Nov. 1st, C. W. Clark, G. Dowkes, F. Cheetham, T. Mankin, G. W. Otter, J. Horton, W. Jefferies, J. Glasgow, J. O'Neil, J. Warkham, J. Hawkins, J. Ask, L. P. Clitty, J. K. Gillies, D. Stokes, R. M. Skeats, G. St. Clair, A. T. Rae, R. Sanderson; 2nd, "Warrington," V. Collyer, R. W. Thorp, R. Armstrong, G. A. Birkenhead, J. Steel, R. Carruthers, J. U. Robertson, G. Allan, J. Thomason, J. W. Dibol; 3rd, H. Sulley, W. Blount, V. Collyer, "Warrington," W. Osborne, Anonymous, S. Briggs, D. Drake, J. W. Moore, A. L. King; 4th, J. S. D. Wolf, E. Trueblood, C. Watts; 6th, J. U. Robertson, J. Fowler, J. W. Moore (2 letters), F. Hodgkinson, D. Hepburn, J. Durrie, J. Nisbet, J. Betts, T. Hawkins, J. Royce; 7th, C. Firih, W. Ripley, D. Pogson, S. A. Jagger, Mrs. Dealtry, G. Drake, T. Parkes, J. Rhodes, J. Phillips, C. Smith, C. Watts, T. Sykes, W. Dugdale, W. Wilber, H. Collins; 8th, "Warrington," R. Elliott, W. H. Andrew, B. Warren, F. Hodgkinson, W. R. Otter; 9th, C. Firih, W. H. Andrew, J. Fowler, J. Booth, H. Leah, S. Howson, R. Harrison, W. Stevenson, E. A. Barker, T. Clark, W. Smeclair; 10th, A. Andrew, G. Dowkes, B. Dealtry; 11th, C. Firih, H. Leah, J. Halliday, R. Goldie, A. Tait, R. Weldon, J. Scrimgeour, J. Hopcroft, C. Smith, E. Sampson; 13th, T. Parkes, W. Copland, J. J. Spencer, W. Hatton, F. Peel, H. E. Griffith, J. Howatson, "Warrington"; 14th, "Warrington," J. O'Neil, B. Dealtry, C. Savoury, C. C. Hawkins, W. Grant, S. P. Lee, C. Emmerson, J. Kirkland, W. Cail, J. Smith, W. Wheeler, T. Haining, W. Morgan, J. Boler; 15th, W. Buckler, N. Smith, F. Cheetham, J. Taylor, G. Dowkes, A. P. Willis, A. Dixon, W. E. Coles, T. Leigh, G. Baker, W. Wallace, M. Birkenhead, R. Carruthers, B. Messenger, J. W. Dibol, J. Board, W. Hardy, R. Elliott, C. D. Fish, W. H. Andrew, T. Leigh, J. Burton; 16th, J. J. Andrew, G. J. C., "Warrington," W. H. Farmer, J. S. Nisbet, J. Richards, S. A. Garside, T. Fuller, E. Bellamy, W. Dashper, J. Burton; 17th, T. S. Swindell, J. Yule, J. Sanders, T. Betts, G. Dowkes; 18th, J. Leask, "Warrington," W. Charge, E. Trueblood, F. Goldie, G. Johnston; 20th, W. Hardy, W. Grant; 21st, J. Richards, A. Andrew, W. Cundall, "Warrington," W. McDermott, J. H. White, E. Sawden, J. Jackson, J. Mowatt, W. Booth, W. Smith, G. A. Birkenhead, G. T. Boyd, R. M. Skeats, D. Goskin, T. Sleeman, F. Peel; 22nd, S. Boardman, W. Hargreaves, C. Thomson, W. Green, E. Telford, T. Haining.

FOREIGN.—Oct. 25th, D. P. Ross; 30th, E. Lasius, W. G. Kollymer, J. Moffatt, J. W. Boggs, J. Leask, W. Gunn. Nov. 6th, D. Ehlers, P. A. Blackwell, E. T. Sanders, J. Moffatt; 7th, E. Lasius, C. Bolingbroke, W. Gunn, J. Campbell, J. J. Hawkins, W. W. Holmes; 9th, W. H. Burridge; 13th, T. Lowden, C. M. Taylor, J. W. Boggs, J. Banta; 14th, J. Faulk, Z. D. Bugbee, J. Johnston, W. N. Brown; 15th, T. L. Jones; 16th, M. Knight; 20th, E. J. Lasius, J. Magill, J. J. Smith, W. N. Brown, J. L. Hathaway; 21st, J. Wood, J. Kitchen, J. W. White II, J. Moore, J. T. Sykes.

DESPATCH OF PARCELS DURING THE PAST MONTH.

Oct. 20th, W. Dashper; 23rd, H. Bannister, M. Allen; 24th, F. Cort, S. Boardman; 25th, J. Scorgina (4 parcels), G. H. Kidd (3 parcels), R. D. Robertson, T. Wilson, E. H. Chandler, F. Hanson; 26th, F. Peel, R. Roberts & Co., C. Firih, C. W. Clark (2 parcels); 27th, J. Monaghan, D. Clement, J. Mycroft; 28th, T. Hart, C. Bolingbroke, T. Leigh, T. Royce, G. H. Kidd, A. McKillop, T. Mankin, R. W. Thorp, C. Savoury; 30th, T. C. Nichols, T. Swindell, R. Caddick, J. J. Spencer, T. Holland, J. Gray, C. Creed, D. Pogson, J. Boyd, H. Horsman, T. Randles, F. Hodgkinson, C. W. Clark, J. Scrimgeour, A. W. Warner, J. Leask, J. S. Nisbet, S. Empsall, G. St. Clair; 31st, C. Firih, C. Smith, V. Collyer, W. H. Andrew, A. P. Willis, W. Dashper, W. Gunn (2 parcels), J. Coombe, J. Cooke, W. Peel, E. A. Roberts, J. Nisbet, R. Ashcroft, D. Drake, S. A. Garside, W. Hage, B. Sawden, W. Gunn, Mrs. Atkinson, W. H. Andrew, T. Nisbet. Nov. 1st, F. Peel, J. Wootton, W. Dowsdale, B. Turner, T. Holland, R. Carvie, C. Smith, C. Bradlaugh, F. R. Winterburn, R. Sanderson, F. Cheetham, J. Horton, W. Glasgow, J. Moore, A. Hall, D. Drake, W. Thurtle, J. Thomason, F. Chester, J. W. Moore, W. H. Hatton, W. Jefferies, D. Stokes (3 parcels), J. Mortimer, W. Mackay, W. Routley; 2nd, E. Thomas (8 parcels), J. Leask (7 parcels), J. Cliff, J. U. Robertson (2 parcels), W. Routley (2 parcels), J. K. Gillies, J. O'Neil, J. W. Dibol; 3rd, S. Briggs, A. Medlicott (2 parcels), J. Jellyman (2 parcels); 4th, G. W. Osborne, E. Trueblood, J. B. Faton, H. McFadyen, J. Dinwiddie, L. Fenton, J. K. Magill, L. Thomas, W. McPherson, R. D. Robertson, J. W. Dibol, J. U. Robertson, J. Steel, G. A. Birkenhead, J. K. Gillies, J. Shaw, S. Howatson, G. T. Boyd, T. Clark, W. F. Kirk, S. J. Norman, E. Thomas (4 parcels), C. Bolingbroke (2 parcels), J. Turner, W. Gilmour (3 parcels), Mrs. J. Hamilton, D. Strathearn, R. Strathearn, J. Spencer, T. Williams (2 parcels), P. Graham, R. Roberts & Co., J. Kay, J. Moffatt, P. A. Blackwell, J. Durrie (3 parcels), J. U. Robertson, R. Forbes, D. Hepburn (3 parcels), J. Wing, J. Hawkins; 7th, J. Phillips (3 parcels), F. Dealtry, J. Rhodes, H. Collins, S. A. Jagger, T. Sykes, W. Dugdale (2 parcels), W. Ripley, R. Hardy, N. H. Wollaston (2 parcels), E. Thomas (3 parcels), H. Warner, W. W. Holmes (2 parcels), J. Duncan (2 parcels); 9th, J. Campbell (1 parcel), W. Rooke (9 parcels), W. H. Burridge, S. E. Esso, C. A. Barker, J. Booth (2 parcels), W. Stephenson (2 parcels), E. Thomas (12 parcels); 10th, R. Olive, R. Carruthers, W. H. Andrew, S. A. Jagger, F. Cheetham, C. Firih, W. Smith, F. Peel, W. Dugdale, C. H. Evans, G. Dowkes, B. Dealtry (2 parcels), W. Cooper; 11th, J. Phillips, A. Tait, C. Firih, J. Halliday; 13th, F. Pitman, J. W. Boggs (8 parcels), T. Lowden, T. Parkes (2 parcels), H. E. Griffith; 14th, J. J. Spencer, J. Faulk (3 parcels), J. Smith, Mr. Cail (2 parcels), C. Emmerson; 15th, T. Leigh, W. N. Brown (6 parcels), W. Morgan, W. Wallace, F. Pitman, F. Cheetham, R. Carruthers; 16th, G. J. C., W. Dowsdale, W. Andrew; 17th, J. Yule, J. Sanders, A. Medlicott, J. Jellyman, E. Bellamy (2 parcels), S. Briggs, W. Jefferies, G. Dowkes, C. Firih (2 parcels); 18th, E. Trueblood, G. Dowkes (3 parcels), W. H. Ferrie, W. Charge, C. Firih, S. Eason; 20th, J. L. Epperson, J. J. Smith; 21st, J. Mowatt, C. Sweet, H. J. Moore, G. A. Birkenhead, J. Richards (2 parcels), W. Cooper, J. W. White, T. Sleeman, J. H. White, J. Kitchen (10 parcels); 22nd, Mr. Woolard, R. Ashcroft, W. Hargreaves, C. Thompson, E. Telford.

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS

IN SUPPLY, DEC., 1876.

CARRIAGE INCLUDED.

Nett Price.		In Britain.	To the States.	To Canada, Australia and New Zealand.
786d.	Eureka (Dr. Thomas's Exposition of the Apocalypse,) Vol. I.	882d.	42.80	1086d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " II.	1186d.	44.0	14810d.
1086d.	Eureka ditto ditto ditto " III.	1186d.	44.0	15810d.
662d.	Elpis Israel	782d.	42.75	886d.
9d.	Anastasis (Resurrection and Judgment)	9d.	38s.	11d.
6d.	Phanerosis (God-manifestation)	8d.	33c.	1s.
2d.	The Herald of the Kingdom (old Nos.), also Future Age	24d.	16c.	6d.
5d.	Book Unsealed	4d.	16c.	6d.
1s.	Chronikon Hebraikon	181d.	35c.	184d.
8s.	Twelve Lectures (leather)	384d.	41.60	4s.
1s.	Man Mortal	181d.	50c.	1.3d
8d.	Everlasting Punishment not Eternal Torment	8d.	33c.	10d.
154d.	Prophetic Chart, No. 2, for wall	2s.		
6d.	Ditto ditto " 3, for pocket	64d.	23c.	9d.
8d.	The Good Confession (a Conversation)	34d.	18c.	4d.
186d.	The Apostacy Unveiled (a Discussion, Dr. Thomas v. Watts)	188d.	90c.	2s.
4d.	Catalogue of Christadelphian Works	1d.	5c.	14d
6d.	The Nightingale Discussion (Immortality of the Soul	7d.	22c.	9d.
2d.	The Slain Lamb (Anti-Renunciationist Lecture)	24d.	11c.	3d.
1d.	Questions and Questions (Antidote to Renunciationism)	14d.	8c.	2d.
1d.	The Bible and the School Boards	14d.	8c.	2d.
184d.	Christadelphian Tracts, 2	188d.	97c.	284d
pr. 100		per 100.		
10d.	Christadelphian Shield, all except }		55c.	186d.
pr. doz.	8, 4, 5 and 13 }	per doz.		per doz.
1s.	Stitched Set of Shields	181d.	35c.	184d.
1d.	Odology (Spiritualism explained)	14d.	8c.	24d.
366d.	Pictorial Illustration of God-manifestation	188d.	41.25	4s.
4d.	Who are the Christadelphians?	1d.	5c.	14d.
366d.	Ditto ditto ditto per 100	3810d.	41.25	4s.
6d.	The Meaning of the Christadelphian Movement	94d.	49c.	1.2d.
8d.	The Baptists and the Millennium	34d.	16c.	4d.
2d.	The Revealed Mystery (by Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	44d.
2d.	The Kingdom of God (a Lecture, by R. Roberts)	24d.	11c.	4d.
2d.	What is the Truth? Pilate's Question—(Dr. Thomas)	24d.	11c.	4d.
286d.	The Children's Magazine, first and only volume	284d.	41.0	384d.
366d.	Ditto ditto bound in cloth	384d.	41.30	484d.
9d.	The Vindication (Reply to "Christadelphianism Exposed.")	3d.	15c.	44d.
2d.	Bible Companion	24d.	11c.	4d.
6d.	The Record of the Birmingham Ecclesia	6d.	25c.	8d.
2d.	Old ditto (1868 & 1870)	24d.	11c.	4d.
188d.	Bro. Parke's Tract—Strange but True	186d.	60c.	284d.
pr. 100.		per 100.	per 100	per 100.
662d.	Hymn Book, with Music in both notations	6810d.	42.50c.	786d.
786d.	Ditto (leather)	787d.	42.75c.	886d.
9d.	The Defence	10d.	55c.	184d.
286d.	The Hebrew Titles of the Deity	288d.	75c.	382d.
2d.	Tabernacle in the Wilderness (illustrated)	24d.	11c.	4d.
	Movements among the Jews (Letter to Daily Telegraph).			
	Back Nos. of the Christadelphian, from 1864, except			
	first 6 months of 1870, the whole of 1871, and first 2			
	months of 1872, at the published price			
1s.	The Jew Discussion	1s.	50c.	
pr. 100	The Querist, No. 1 and 2	1s.		
8s.	Modern Theology (the Canadian work)	3-4d.		
3d.	Apocalyptic Photographs	34d.	16c.	4d.
1s.	Index to Eureka	184d.	50c.	186d.
2s.	Bradlaugh Discussion	282d.	41.0	288d.

All communications must be addressed to ROBERT ROBERTS, Athenæum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham; to whom also Post Office orders and cheques or bank drafts, must be made payable.

Remittances may be sent in postage stamps up to the value of 10s.; larger amounts are preferred in the form of P.O. or bank draft, the cost of which may be deducted from the remittance. The letter accompanying the remittance should always specify distinctly what the money is for, and whether the books have already been had, or are to be sent.

Parties sending for books or pamphlets, or back Nos. of any serial publication, would save unnecessary trouble and disappointment if, before sending, they would look at the list of supply set forth above. We often receive orders for books that are sold out.

Purchasers of books must, in every case, pay carriage, except when the price is stated to be inclusive of postage, or the book or pamphlet is post free. The omission of some to observe this rule makes this notice necessary.

Orders will be executed with the utmost practicable promptitude. Purchasers, however, must not consider themselves neglected or forgotten if delay should sometimes take place, as there are many causes which occasionally prevent the immediate despatch of parcels.

AMERICA AND CANADA.—Remittances from the States should always be in paper dollars or bank draft, NEVER by Post Office Money Order, because the Post Office and not the remitter sends the order, and it is never possible to say whom the order is from.

Most of the Works may be obtained of sister Thomas, West Hoboken, New Jersey, U.S.A.; also of bro. John Coombe, Toronto, Canada, but the prohibitive import duty on books in both these realms, interferes with the free supply of these agencies. Consequently, sometimes, it may be necessary to send direct to England.

In the foregoing list, the American and Canadian prices (including carriage) will be found inserted in parallel columns, after the English price. Customs duties and the difference between the value of paper money, on this and the other side of the Atlantic, accounts for the difference in the English and American prices.