

A DEFENCE

OF THE FAITH PROCLAIMED IN ANCIENT
TIMES

BY JESUS AND THE APOSTLES, AND ALL THE PROPHETS WHO PREVIOUSLY
AROSE IN ISRAEL, A FAITH WHICH WAS SUBMERGED AND LOST IN FABLES
SOON AFTER THE DEATH OF THE APOSTLES, BUT IS NOW REVIVED IN

THE CHRISTADELPHIANS

*(Or brethren of Christ), scattered throughout England, Scotland, Wales,
the United States, and the British Colonies; being*

A REJOINER

TO THE PUBLISHED CRITICISMS OF THE REV. J. P. BARNETT, (OF SWANSEA,
LATE OF BIRMINGHAM), ON "TWELVE LECTURES."

BY ROBERT ROBERTS,

(OF BIRMINGHAM.)

PUBLISHED BY THE CHRISTADELPHIANS OF SWANSEA AND MUMBLES.
TO BE HAD OF R. ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW,
BIRMINGHAM.

1874.

A DEFENCE, &c.

THE Rev. J. P. Barnett, of Swansea, has broken the silence which it is usual for the clergy to observe towards the truth in its struggles against the darkness that reigns; and has attempted an assault upon the fortifications erected in prosecution of the war which it is the mission of the truth to wage against all sects and denominations of Christendom. His reason for taking notice of the "new-fangled notions," as he designates the things most surely revealed in the Scriptures of truth, is that "not a few persons (in Swansea) have been to some extent led astray" by them, and that "many who have never given any earnest attention to subjects of this order," are apt to fall into the "rank and repulsive quagmire," which he considers they constitute. Mr. Barnett desires to save such from the fate which impends over them, and has, therefore, been induced, "at the request of several friends, to subject some portions" of the "new-fangled notions" to "a brief examination."

Mr. Barnett's proceeding is, doubtless, praiseworthy, in view of the opinion he has formed of the "new-fangled notions;" and his treatment of the subject is characterised by an equally unexceptionable spirit of candour and fair play. He also brings considerable ability to bear on his task, and has made out a wonderfully good case for orthodoxy, considering how completely rotten the fabric is from top to bottom, and how utterly futile it is to resist the attack which the "new-fangled notions" make (Bible in hand) upon the decayed and dilapidated tenement, with the avowed object of bringing it to ruin. He deserves an answer, and he has it herewith. His "brief examination" (extending over fifty-four closely-printed pages) is thoroughly revised, and all his work frustrated and spoiled. His calculations are altered, his conclusions upset, his sorties are repulsed, his outworks stormed, his defences carried, his arms seized; but it is to be feared he himself escapes capture. He effects a retreat, doubtless through some loophole. Mr. Barnett's failure is not attributable to any fault of his. He fights well, but he is on the losing side. It is impossible to make a stand for orthodoxy on Bible ground; and away from Bible ground, it is vanquished of itself; so that however the defender of orthodoxy may acquit himself, defeat is inevitable. Mr. Barnett seems to feel this by the tone of his remarks in several places throughout his little work. And we make bold to say that no clear and honest mind, investigating the subject to the bottom, can escape the conviction that

orthodox religion is a mere mixture of fable and tradition; and that the truth of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, is something as opposite to it as light to darkness.

Mr. Barnett, in his contest against this conclusion, begins with a mere scarecrow argument. He remarks, "It is singular that the Bible should have been in general circulation for so long a period, without revealing to somebody before now some portion of the truth it contains." This is a piece of intellectual intimidation. It is daring one's judgment to come to any conclusion opposed to the established doctrine. It is an attempt to perpetrate a huge begging of the question at the very outset. Why must we cumber the investigation with a consideration of what other people think or have thought? It is a waste of time. It is an attempt to exercise "undue influence" in the election of truth.

But is it a very singular thing, after all, *under the circumstances described by history*, that the Bible should not have been understood among the millions revering it as the word of God? A calm consideration of the matter will lead to just the opposite conclusion. Mr. Barnett himself will admit that for many centuries, the grossest errors prevailed within the pale of the professed Christian church. The doctrines and the power of the Papacy were in the ascendant in every part of Europe for a long period, and gave colour and shape to religious thought everywhere. Is the present age entirely emancipated from the result of this? It is true the Reformation did much to weaken the Church of Rome and stimulate independent thought on religious subjects; but is it probable (Mr. Barnett argues from probability in the matter) that it entirely threw off the errors of Rome? If the Reformers had been inspired men, one might have accepted such an idea as a matter of course; but considering that the *men who brought about the Reformation* were simply men of natural force of character, who gave battle to Rome on certain points because they saw that Rome was against the Bible, it is unsafe in the highest degree to assume that they elucidated the whole truth in their contest with Papistical darkness. It would have been a wonder had they done so. Nothing short of a miracle could have brought about so complete and instantaneous a transformation from the depths of Romish night to the meridian of gospel day. The only safe rule of action is to measure the Reformers, as well as everybody else, by the Bible; "To the law and to the testimony, *if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*"—(Isaiah viii. 20.) Now, the system of religion extant in our day is a continuation of the system derived from the Reformers. Consequently, if the Reformers were wrong, our system is wrong. But if they are wrong, says Mr. Barnett, surely it would have been found out. So it has,* but because those who have embraced it are

* Mr. Barnett errs in attributing any part of this distinction to the writer. The man who "found it out" is the gentleman whom Mr. Barnett sneeringly describes as our "friend across the water," John Thomas, M.D., and the "finding out" was not the work

in th
being
reaso
The r
the l
it no
train
befor
the o
such
every
in sp
a str
Ther
read
a wc
The
and
prea
becs
Pau
in t
case
ditc
and
rest
infl
wer
M
the
fur
aff
ext
and
oon
] 30,
—
of:
exi
sys
pt
ag
Hi
pr
hi

the truth
is light

a mere
ld have
nobody
piece of
to any
petrate
ber the
ought?
in the

scribed
millions
er will
hat for
fessed
in the
d shape
ed from
urch of
it is it
ntirely
en, one
ng that
natural
ey saw
assume
rkness.
miracle
n from
ly safe
by the
to this
Now,
erived
system
d have
it are

he man
as our
he work

in the minority, he scouts the idea. He laughs at the suggestion of a few being right and a great many in the wrong. Mr. Barnett laughs against reason, experience, and history. The truth in all things begins with the few. The many are too much otherwise occupied to find it out. Is it not so that the laity attend to business, and leave the clergy to attend to religion? and is it not so that the clergy are manufactured to a pattern of antiquated type, trained as boys and drilled as young men to the obedience of what has gone before them, and bound by every interest and every consideration to maintain the old system and preach the old doctrine? Would it be wonderful, under such circumstances, if anything else happened than what is transpiring everywhere, viz., that a large system of theological imposture is maintained, in spite of the fact that the Bible is in general circulation and is recognised as a standard of faith. The Bible is worshipped but not read or understood. There is a veil over it, or rather a blind on the people's eyes, so that when they read, they do not understand. History repeats itself. We have in our own time a wonderful parallel to the state of things that existed in the days of Jesus. The people were very religious, and went to the synagogues every Sabbath-day, and there the Scribes and Pharisees prayed and read the Scriptures and preached to the people. Yet, for all this, Jesus said their worship was in vain, because they preached for doctrine the commandments of men.—(Matt. xv. 9.) Paul says they knew (understood) not the voices of the prophets that were read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day.—(Acts xiii. 27.) Jesus said it was a case of the blind leading the blind, which would end in both falling into the ditch.—(Luke vi. 39.) The only people that were right were a small and illiterate band that espoused the claims of Jesus of Nazareth; all the rest, the teeming crowds of Judean orthodoxy, with a well-favoured and influential clergy at their head, were wrong, notwithstanding that the Scriptures were in "general circulation," though not so general as now.

Mr. Barnett cannot brook the proposition that such is the state of affairs in the religious world of our day. The argument needs, therefore, to be carried further. If the apostles were true prophets, such *must* be the state of affairs in our day. They all predicted, so many of them as have any writings extant, that there should be a departure from the truth which they taught, and that the apostacy thus developed should continue triumphant till the coming of Christ. The evidence of this we commend to general attention.

Paul, in a speech to the elders of the church at Ephesus, said (Acts xx. 29, 30,) "I know that *after my departure*, shall grievous wolves enter in among

of a day, but the result of many years' patient study of the Scriptures, undertaken from experience of the utter futility of looking for the truth at the hands of the religious systems of the day. The results of his study will be found in *Elpis Israel*, a book produced at public request after a wide lecturing tour throughout Britain twenty years ago. The writer met with this book fifteen years ago, and had his eyes opened by it. His activity since that time in the promulgation of the truth thus received, has been prompted by a sense of duty and a desire to impart to others a benefit received by himself. He has nothing to do with the "finding out" of it.

you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things." In a letter to Timothy, speaking still more expressly, he says (2 Tim. iv. 3, 4.) "*The time will come when THEY WILL NOT ENDURE SOUND DOCTRINE, but after their own lusts they shall heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, AND SHALL BE TURNED UNTO FABLES.*" This process of turning away from the truth and giving heed to fables, had commenced in Paul's own day, for he says, (2 Thess. ii. 7-11,) "The mystery of iniquity doth *already* work. . . . They receive not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them *strong delusion*, that they should BELIEVE A LIE." "Evil men and seducers," wrote he to Timothy, (2 Tim. iii. 13,) "*shall wax worse and worse, DECEIVING AND BEING DECEIVED.*" To the Thessalonians he wrote, (2 Thess. ii. 3.) "That day (the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, see v. 1,) shall not come except their come A FALLING AWAY FIRST." Jesus also said, (Luke xviii. 8.) "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith in the earth?" Isaiah, speaking of the same time, when "the Redeemer shall come to Zion," (ch. lix. 20,) says (Is. lx. 2,) "Behold, *the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people;*" and, speaking of what is to be accomplished when Christ has come, he says (Is. xxv. 7,) "He will destroy on this mountain the face of *the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations;*" showing that, in harmony with the apostolic predictions, there was to be a "covering" and a "veil" spread over the nations of the earth, or in other words, a complete triumph of fables which should come to be believed as the truth. Now, the fulfilment of these predictions was exhibited in symbol to the apostle John, in the Isle of Patmos.—(Rev. xvii. 1-6): "Come hither, I will show unto thee the judgment of THE GREAT WHORE that sitteth upon many waters, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns; and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abomination and filthiness of her fornications; and upon her forehead was a name written, **BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.**" The meaning of this is stated as follows:—(Rev. vii. 15,) "The waters which thou sawest where the whore sitteth, are PEOPLES AND MULTITUDES, AND NATIONS AND TONGUES."—(v. 15.) "The ten horns are TEN KINGS."—(v. 12.) "The WOMAN which thou sawest, is THAT GREAT CITY WHICH REIGNETH OVER THE KINGS OF THE EARTH."—(v. 18.) What city reigned over the kings of the earth at the time these words were addressed to John? ROME. Hence the Roman Catholic Church is the great whore; and all nations of the earth are spiritually intoxicated with her false

speaking
 cessly, he
 ENDURE
 emselves
 rom the
 turning
 il's own
 already
 at they
 ion, that
 imothy,
 REIVED,"
 of our
 G AWAY
 h, shall
 n "the
 rkness
 f what
 lestroy
 il that
 ostolic
 er the
 which
 these
 (sle of
 gment
 kings
 earth
 ed me
 arlet-
 orns;
 gold
 ill of
 was a
 AND
 78 :—
 i, are
 ten
 THAT
 18.)
 were
 reat
 also

doctrines. Paul's description of the same thing is a "turning away from the truth," and giving heed to fables, from which it follows that THE RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES OF CHRISTENDOM ARE FABLES. If Mr. Barnett objects to this conclusion, let him answer this; *when and where have the above-quoted predictions been fulfilled?* If, being a Protestant, he says they were fulfilled in the prevalence of Roman Catholic superstition in the dark ages, he clearly establishes this principle, that whatever doctrines Protestantism holds in common with the Romish church, must be fables! A doctrine that is a fable in the church of Rome, cannot be a truth among Protestants. Now, Protestantism holds much that is taught by Romanism. Here are a few points of agreement between them: 1, *the immortality of the soul*; 2, *translation of righteous souls to heaven at death*; 3, *descent of wicked souls to hell at death*; 4, *eternal torments inflicted by a supernatural immortal devil, king of hell*; 5, *regeneration of infants by sprinkling*; 6, *the Trinity*; 7, *salvation by belief in the crucifixion alone*. The Catholics have a few doctrines that the Protestants object to, but those enumerated are held in common, and these really constitute the foundation. They are the first principles and essential doctrines of all the religions of Christendom, from the Old Mother at Rome, to the smallest daughter-sect that has sprung from her doctrines. In view of this, we realize the fact that *all Christendom is under the power of a common faith*. Mr. Barnett says this is the true faith! The New Testament styles it a "strong delusion," "fables," "darkness;" and because an attempt has been made to enforce New Testament teaching on the subject, Mr. Barnett holds up his hand in surprise, and exclaims "how is it that all have so fatally blundered?" We say to Mr. Barnett, this is not the question. The question is, has there been a fatal blundering? Has there been a fulfilment of the apostles' predictions? We maintain there has, and leaving Mr. Barnett to indulge in his wonderment how it can be, we shall follow him in his "brief examination," and show the fallacy of his attempt to maintain the contrary.

Mr. Barnett opens the battle with a great but perfectly harmless boom. He declares the Christadelphian system to be "unmitigated materialism." This is intended for a staggering blow, and with orthodox readers, it will have a good whacking sound with it; but in truth, the detonation is in the cracking arm that delivers the blow, and does not proceed from the object aimed at, which, in truth, is never struck. Why does Mr. Barnett speak of "unmitigated materialism?" Because the Christadelphians believe in a real God, a real spirit of God, and real men, and because they expect a real immortality by a reconstruction of the real body from the grave; a real return of Christ from heaven, a real restoration of the Jews, a real kingdom on earth. If this is "unmitigated materialism," what does Mr. Barnett make of the events that have already transpired in relation to God's purpose in the earth? Are they not, one and all, by Mr. Barnett's rule, "unmitigated materialism?" Was not man formed of substance from the ground? Did not the

condemnation passed upon him for his disobedience, have reference to that substance? ("Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.") Did not the plan of salvation take the form of sending a real Saviour with flesh and blood? Was not Jesus born in Bethlehem a real baby? Did he not grow, as other children grow, to a real manhood? Was he not baptised with real water by John in the Jordan? Did he not, with "unmitigated materialism" eat and drink with publicans and sinners, and ride in fulfilment of the prophecy, on the back of a real ass? Was he not bodily taken by the emissaries of Jewish authority, and ignominiously arrayed in a real purple robe, and subjected to the indignity of a real mock crown of thorns? Was he not impaled on a materialistic cross? Did he not have real nails driven through his blessed hands and feet? Was there not a convulsion of real nature at his decease? a rending of rocks, a darkening of the atmosphere, a dividing of the veil of the temple? Did not Joseph of Arimathea, with a spirit of "unmitigated materialism," beg the body from Pilate, wrap it in clean linen, and lay it in a rock-hewn sepulchre, sealing the door of the sepulchre with a huge stone? Did not angels descend, and with "unmitigated materialism" roll the stone away, bring the captive to life, and strike terror into the Roman guard? Did not Jesus actually reappear to his disciples, and again with "unmitigated materialism," eat fish and honeycomb, and submit to be handled in proof of his reality, and, finally, did he not bodily ascend to heaven after leaving a promise that he would return?

The fact is, all that God has ever done has been what Mr. Barnett derides as "unmitigated materialism;" and, as we shall see, all that He ever will do, will be of the same character: for there is no change with God. It would indeed be strange if it were otherwise. Mr. Barnett asks us to believe that all He has done so far has been "unmitigated materialism," but that all that is to come is to be—what? It would be difficult to find words to describe it—immaterial, shadowy, ghostly, unreal, nothingistic: and, for this, we have merely Mr. Barnett's *ipse dixit*. Of course, Mr. Barnett has plenty of company, but a myriad-belief of a lie will not turn it into the truth. God has promised all the things that Christadelphians are looking for, and for that reason, guided by the light of the past, we expect them, and will never be frightened from our belief of them by shouts of "unmitigated materialism."

For what does this cry mean? It means nothing to the point, nothing that can determine the question, but a mere shout to create prejudice and drive the reader off the scent. "Materialism!" Whence comes the cry, and whence the idea it contains? From the schools. It is an invention of the speculator, a figment of metaphysics, a grimace of learning by which Mr. Barnett seeks to frown down the "foolishness" which it was the glory of Paul to proclaim. Conventionally, it represents the theory that denies the existence of God, disbelieves in anything not palpable to the senses, declares resurrection impossible, and inculcates sensuousness. But Mr. Barnett cannot use it in

ce to that
 l not the
 flesh and
 grow, as
 with real
 rialism"
 t of the
 missaries
 robe, and
 t impaled
 ough his
 re at his
 ng of the
 spirit of
 in linen,
 e with a
 sm" roll
 n guard?
 itigated
 of of his
 promise

erides as
 l do, will
 ideed be
 He has
 to come
 aterial,
 merely
 mpany,
 romised
 guided
 d from

ng that
 rive the
 ace the
 culator,
 t seeks
 oclaim.
 f God,
 rection
 se it in

this sense in applying it to a system which believes in God, puts faith in the Spirit and things unseen, teaches a resurrection, and maintains the connection between present action and future destiny. He, therefore, ought not to use it at all. It is misleading. Materialism is not the synonym of Christadelphianism. Materialism is one of the half-winged systems of the age which imperfect study has given birth to; it recognises a part of truth, but does not take all things into account. Christadelphianism is not pledged to any system. It takes a view as broad as the sweep of inspiration, believing all things that are true whether represented in scientific systems or not. Doing this, it regards man as a creature of the ground and all things as real, but ignores not the subtle and invisible relations of things disclosed by revelation and experience.

Mr. Barnett is evidently puzzled and inconvenienced by the fact that "Mr. Roberts accepts the Bible as a divine revelation, and professes to submit to it as a rule of faith," and still more by the fact that "in vindication of his points, he cites Scripture texts by the dozen." His allegation is that "Mr. Roberts's teaching is unscriptural from beginning to end;" and his difficulty is to reconcile such an allegation with the fact admitted, that the constant appeal is to the Scriptures, from which testimonies are cited "by the dozen" in support of the "points" contended for. He is bound to explain so apparently paradoxical a phenomenon, and so he suggests that "Mr. Roberts has allowed himself to be carried away by the mere surface signification of words." "The Bible," observes Mr. Barnett, "must be interpreted to be understood." What is the meaning of this? If Mr. Barnett had said, "The Bible must be read (or studied) to be understood," he would have been intelligible; but what does he mean by "interpreted?" One can understand "interpretation" as applied to a dream, a symbolical vision, or a dark saying; but what place has it in the consideration of a book which affirms propositions and records facts for belief? What interpretation, for instance, is required in the case of the opening statement of the book: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth;" or in the one occurring soon after: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground;" or in such statements as "God 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 shew thee;" "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire;" "Jacob went on his journey, and came unto the land of the people of the east;" "And Joseph died and all his brethren and all that generation," &c., &c. These are specimens of the kind of statements of which a great part of the Bible is composed. What is the meaning of "interpreting" them? Obviously that is the wrong word to apply; "interpretation" is out of the question. "Belief" is the act of the mind that is called for; for they have only to be read to be understood. If Mr. Barnett contends that there are other statements that are not so easy to understand, we will not say a word against it. There is abundance of metaphor, and a considerable element of symbol in certain parts

of the Bible, and some study is necessary to the comprehension of these, but even then, the result arrived at is by the application of collated truth plainly stated in other parts, and apprehended by reading. The source of enlightenment in every case is the Bible itself, and not the exercise of "interpretation" apart from and independent of it. Why should Mr. Barnett say "The Bible must be interpreted before it can be understood?" One can see the reason. Mr. Barnett admits that "texts" are "cited by the dozen" in *Twelve Lectures*, in proof of the conclusions contended for; and as these "texts" are irresistible if understood according to the ordinary rules of language observed in the historical and fulfilled prophetic parts of the Bible, Mr. Barnett has no escape left but to suggest that these "texts" do not mean what they appear to say, but something which requires clerical "interpretation" to make it visible to the understanding. This is one of the dogmas of the "divinity" school to which Mr. Barnett belongs, and one of the most nullifying of the many traditions by which his class have succeeded in making the word of God of none effect. There can be no return to a scriptural faith without a return, in the first instance, to a rational way of reading the Bible. The Bible was written for our enlightenment, and is couched in language calculated to enlighten, though this fact has been lost sight of through centuries of mystification. If people will but become attentive and constant readers of the Bible, they will come to see this for themselves, and deliver themselves from the trammels by which, for generations, they have been kept from the truth.

BIBLE TEACHING CONCERNING GOD.

Buckling himself to his task, Mr. Barnett makes his first onslaught on Christadelphian ideas of God. This he stigmatises as "materialistic." If he had said "realistic," he would have been more accurate; for the Bible certainly teaches that the Almighty is real, though not "material," in the gross sense of the word. If He were not, how could He be anything? Is Mr. Barnett's God unreal? It would seem so from his objection to the God of the Bible. He cannot tolerate the idea of a real God dwelling in unapproachable light? It may be distasteful to his ideas on the subject, but that it is inconsistent with the teaching of the Bible, he cannot say: for the words of the Scripture are plain enough:

"The blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto.— (1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.)

Our Father *who art IN HEAVEN.*" "Hear thou *IN HEAVEN thy dwelling place.*" "God is in *HEAVEN*, and thou on *earth.*" "Jesus was received up *into heaven* and sat on the right hand of God." (Luke xi. 2; 1 Kings viii. 39; Ecc. vii. 2; Mark xvi. 19.)

Mr. Barnett is equally out of love with the proposition that the Spirit is effluent from the Father, and fills all space, thus giving Him the attribute of

of these, but truth plainly of enlightenment "apart from the Bible must be reason. Mr. Barnett's Lectures, in which he is irresistible served in the Mr. Barnett has no doubt they appear to make it the "divinity" of the word of God without a doubt. The Bible calculated to centuries of readers of themselves from the truth.

slaughter on the Bible in the thing? Is the God of the subject, but why: for the

only unto.—

place," in and i. 19.)

Spirit is a tribute of

omnipresence. Yet how else can he believe the Scriptures?

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit? Whither shall I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up to heaven, Thou art there," &c.—(Psalms cxxxix. 7.)

"The Spirit of God is in my nostrils."—(Job xxvii. 3.)

"Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit; they are created."—(Psalms civ. 30.)

"Do not I fill heaven and earth?"—(Jer. xxiii. 24.)

"The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good."—(Prov. xv. 3.)

"Thou testifiedst against them by Thy Spirit in the prophets."—(Neh. ix. 30.)

"I will take of the Spirit that is upon Thee and put it upon him."—(Num. xi. 17.)

"The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee."—(Luke i. 35.)

"The Spirit of the Lord came upon him."—(Judges iii. 10; vi. 34.)

"Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—(2 Peter i. 21.)

In these testimonies, we have a universal spirit, from which no man can flee, a spirit shared by every living form; and a special or particular spirit which impelled a man to a particular act, or gifted him with a particular faculty. Yet there is only "one spirit."—(Ephes. iv. 4.) Hence these apparently two spirits are but the same spirit in two relations—the first being that in which it forms the basis of established natural conditions, in which supreme intelligence is, in a sense, passively paramount; and the second, that in which the same spirit is concentrated under the action of divine will, and made the vehicle of whatever fiat of wisdom or power may "come forth," to speak scripturally (Dan. ix. 23), from Him "who dwelleth in the light that no man can approach unto." Mr. Barnett says this is "a materialistic idea of God." If it is, it is scriptural. Mr. Barnett admits as much. He says "It is taught there (in the Scriptures) if we have no rational escape from a literal interpretation of much Scripture language on the subject." What "rational" escape is there from the Scriptures cited above, and more copiously set forth in the *Twelve Lectures*? (see Lect. V.) Mr. Barnett's escape seems a highly irrational method of escape. He gets away by saying the language of Scripture on the subject does not mean what it says! This is "escaping" with a vengeance; it is "running away," as those who "escape" generally have to do; and running away from the only revelation we have on the subject. But Mr. Barnett says he is compelled to run by what Christ says; "God is a Spirit," or, more properly, "God is Spirit." Why should this compel him to run? Is the saying of Christ incompatible with the sayings of the holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit? Does the Spirit in Christ contradict the Spirit in the prophets and apostles? The suggestion will not be seriously put forward for a moment. The saying of Christ throws light on the nature of the Deity revealed by the prophets. It defines the essence of His nature to be Spirit. To comprehend this, we must realize the Bible idea of

"Spirit," and not make use, as Mr. Barnett does, of the notion invented by modern metaphysics. Now the Bible exemplification of the meaning of "Spirit" is plain as to one thing, and that is that with the spirit there is power, glory, reality. The wonders of creation were achieved by it.

"The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."—(Gen. i. 2.)

"Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created." "By Thy Spirit Thou hast garnished the heavens."—(Psalms civ. 30; Job xxvi. 13.)

The manifestations of power in God's dealings with Israel were attributable to its operation, through Moses, Sampson, Samuel, David, and others. "The Spirit of the Lord came upon them," and enabled them to do what they did. The angels are Spirit. "He maketh His angels Spirits, and His ministers a flame of fire."—(Psalms civ. 4.) In respect to nature, "Spirit" is the equivalent of incorruptibility, power, strength, durability, as opposed to flesh, which is weak, corruptible, ephemeral. There is just all the difference—and no more and no less—between "spirit" and flesh that there is between "God" and "men." We see this exemplified in Isaiah's rebuke of Israel for having recourse to the Egyptians for succour. "Now the Egyptians are *men*, not God; and their horses *flesh* and not SPIRIT." Contemplating Jesus in his present glorified condition, we are told that he is "the Lord the Spirit," in contrast to Adam, who was simply a living soul, a body formed from the ground; and concerning the immortal state of which Christ's people are to rise, we are informed that "He that raised up Christ shall *quicken your mortal bodies* BY HIS SPIRIT which dwelleth in you."—(Rom. viii. 11.) As the result of which, their bodies will become spiritual bodies, for it is testified that "It is sown a natural body and raised a *spiritual* body;" and Jesus says "That which is born of Spirit is *Spirit*."—(Jno. iii. 6.)

Deriving our conception of the subject, then, from these exemplifications of the significance of "Spirit," we are enabled to comprehend Christ's statement without being compelled, like Mr. Barnett, to "escape" from the great body of Bible teaching on the being and nature of God. Christ gives us to understand that God himself, though dwelling in heaven, is unique with all the manifestations of Himself which He has given—that He Himself is Spirit; that His substance is Spirit, that He is the fountain head of all the Spirit that fills the universe, and is Himself the focalization of Spirit, and therefore resplendent with glory, too dazzling for us to look upon, "above the brightness of the sun."

The remarks which Mr. Barnett quotes on the metaphorical character of many expressions in regard to God, have an element of truth in them, but like almost every other attempt of orthodoxy, they exalt one part of truth at the expense of another, and thus produce a falsehood. All forms of truth co-exist, and he is a workman that needeth to be ashamed who uses one part to destroy another. All metaphor has a literal basis, and if you take away the

tion invented by
the meaning of
the spirit there is
d by it.

i. 2.)

pirit Thou hast

vere attributable
id, and others.
to do what they
pirits, and His
sure, "Spirit" is
7, as opposed to
the difference—
here is between
ebuke of Israel
the Egyptians
urt." Contem-
old that he is
imply a living
mortal state of
e that raised up
velleth in you."
become spiritual
ised a *spiritual*
"—(Jno. iii. 6.)
nplifications of
rist's statement
the great body
sto understand
manifestations
His substance
is the universe,
plendent with
f the sun."
l character of
1 in them, but
art of truth at
orms of truth
uses one part
take away the

literal, the metaphor evaporates to nothing. If we say the sun is "king of day," and rides with pomp across the heavens, we do not destroy the fact that there is a real sun which is not a king and does not ride. The "queen of night," "walking in her brightness," attended by her shining courtiers, as she promenades in stateliness the sable courts of night, is not inconsistent with the fact that after all, the moon is a literal orb, in revolution round the earth, having less importance in relation to the distant stars than we have in relation to the sun. The King of Terrors, stalking through the land, with ghastly mien and instrument of death, does not exclude the ungarnished fact that our bodies are corruptible and daily tending to dissolution, and finally "give up the ghost," and are laid among the worms. How absurd it would be to say that because there is no literal firmament of politics, such as newspaper metaphor loves to image, and no stars of different magnitude shining therein, and no "barometer" to indicate the state of "the atmosphere;" therefore there is no government, no dignitaries of different rank, and no changing moods among our rulers, reflected in the state of the funds. Just as sensible is the attempt on the part of Mr. Barnett to maintain that because the clouds are not the literal dust of God's feet, and because the seas do not rest in the hollow of a literal hand, and because He does not weigh the mountains in literal scales, and because many other metaphorical expressions are not literally true, therefore there is no real God dwelling in light. The reality of God's existence, and the reality of His relation by Spirit to all the wonders of the universe, are the basis of the metaphors in which it is sometimes expressed; and to object to the reality because of the metaphor, is a specimen of the kind of wisdom that pertains, in all its branches, to the system of which Mr. Barnett has come forward as the champion.

He brands another part of the truth, as "a gross material Pantheism." He is filled with horror at the proposition that "in God everything exists; out of Him everything has been evolved." If this is Pantheism, it is the Pantheism of the apostles, and we prefer taking our theology from the apostles, than from the sublimated notions of the schools. Paul, preaching to the Grecians in Athens, said

"IN HIM we live, and move, and have our being."—(Acts xvii. 28.)

"There is but one God the Father, OUT OF (*ex autou*) WHOM ARE ALL THINGS, AND WE IN HIM."—(1 Cor. viii. 6.)

"ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL, WHO IS ABOVE ALL, AND THROUGH AND IN ALL."—(Ephesians iv. 6.)

"DO NOT I FILL HEAVEN AND EARTH?"—(Jeremiah xxiii. 24.)

"Whither can I go from Thy Spirit?"—(Psalms cxxxix. 7.)

"He is not far from every one of us."—(Acts xvii. 27.)

But that which more especially gives Mr. Barnett occasion for cavilling, is the following remark (*Twelve Lectures*, p. 31), which, in quoting, he mutilates, and disconnects from the subject to which it belongs:—

"It is evident that there would be great difficulty in arriving at such a definition of matter as would sustain the argument under consideration. In fact, it is an impossibility. It is only an arbitrary system of thought that has created the distinctions implied in the term metaphysics. *Nature, that is, universal existence, is one.* It is the elaboration of one primitive power. It is not made up of two antagonistic and incompatible elements. God is the source of all. *In Him every thing exists; out of Him everything is evolved. Different elements and substances are but different forms of the same eternal essence or first cause, described in the Bible as "Spirit" and in scientific language as electricity.* The word "matter," therefore, only describes an aspect of creation, as presented to finite sense; it does not touch the essence of the thing, though intended to do so by the shortsighted, because unexperimental and unobservant system which invented it."

The words in italics are those quoted by Mr. Barnett, and over which he holds aloft his hands in aghast surprise. Presuming that "universal existence" must include God, he asks if Mr. Roberts seriously intends to proclaim the blasphemous doctrine that God is a part of nature. Not exactly. Mr. Barnett is a little muddled here. God is not a part of nature, but, in a sense, nature is a part of God. No doubt this will shock Mr. Barnett more and more, but as a matter of calm judgment and Scripture testimony, he cannot get away from it. "Nature" is passive to the divine will; God is the supreme intelligence which controls it. God maintains all, pervades all, constitutes all, by His Spirit, which is everywhere. He has made all; "He commanded, and they came," "by the greatness of His might—by Spirit—for that He is strong in power." He Himself, the fountain of power, dwells in light; and from his habitation, wields the universal sway by His Spirit. He is the first cause, and He is Spirit. Closer than this we cannot get, in words or conception, to Deity; inscrutibility must always pertain to the subject when considered by our finite faculties.

But Mr. Barnett is stumbled by the idea of God having "elaborated all things out of Himself. He says "it follows that previously to the process of elaboration, all things were in God," and, if there, who put them? The answer to this is, that the "things" were not "things" till elaborated. The word "elaborated" has reference to the antecedent relation of the power of God to the "things." All things are made out of God, and not out of nothing, and the word "elaboration" has been employed to designate the process of *making*. Mr. Barnett seizes the word, and plays with it like a hair-splitter. The foolishness of his remarks will be quickly apparent if applied to anything else. "This bread came out of the corn field," observes some one who is fully alive to the fact that it only became bread by the processes of the miller and the baker, and who only means to express the idea that the substance of which it was composed was grown in the field. A smart shallow-brain standing by, says "Indeed, why if it came out of the field, it

fol-
the
"Y
bre
not
of
of
Go
thi
ex
wa
M
su
th
"
u
co
th
G
w
a
r
j
t

or cavilling, is
he mutilates,

it such a
tion. In
t that has
e, that is,
ver. It is
he source
Different
is or first
lectricity.
resented
ended to
t system

over which
"universal
intends to
Not exactly.
e, but, in a
rnett more
timony, he
ill; God is
rvades all,
all; "He
Spirit—for
dwells in
pirit. He
words or
ject when

orated all
rocess of
m? The
ed. The
power of
not out
yed to
ays with
pparent
observes
the pro-
dea that
A smart
field, it

follows that previously to the process of 'coming out,' it must have been in the field; and if so, how came it there?" His companion might well exclaim "You simpleton! have you so little brains as to suppose that I mean that the bread, as bread, was in the cornfield? That which was in the cornfield was not the bread, but the corn which yielded the flour that made the bread; but of course, in speaking of the history of the bread, I am obliged to speak of the bread as if it were bread all the while." So in saying that God has elaborated all things out of Himself, the idea expressed is that previous to elaboration, the things elaborated had no individual existence, but the power by which they consist, did, and that power was God, who by His irradiant Spirit, is universal. "But I thought," exclaims Mr. Barnett, "that God was unchangeable." What has this to do with the subject? With the application Mr. Barnett gives it, it would as much exclude the "creation of all things out of nothing," taught by his class, as the "elaboration" against which he makes such an assault; for if God is unchangeable in the sense that no new evolution of power can take place, how could "creation" have occurred? and it would tell with tenfold force against that part of his creed which teaches that a triune element of the unchangeable God came to earth and entered a human baby-body, and suffered shame and weakness, and death. God is unchangeable in the sense of being for ever the same in character and in the principles and powers upon which He acts. He is not changeable; He is not fickle. He is always love, wisdom, power, goodness, justice, and truth; but to the greatness and possibility of His acts of power there is no limit.

Mr. Barnett prefers the sublime declaration of Moses, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth," as if Mr. Roberts rejected it! The words of Moses are a true statement of the case, but the question is, what do they mean? Mr. Barnett, as a teacher of orthodoxy, says they mean that God made the heavens and the earth out of nothing. Paul declares He made them out of Himself; and it is for the reader to choose between Mr. Barnett's professional verdict and Paul's authoritative declaration, which is in harmony with all that God has been pleased to disclose on the subject.

Mr. Barnett makes one desperate plunge in the quagmire of orthodoxy and sinks deeper. He says the proposition "In God everything exists; and out of Him everything is evolved," *leaves no room or opportunity for sin!* This is incomprehensible, taken on its merits. We require to realize the orthodox meaning of sin in order to see any sense in it. It *would* be difficult to define this meaning in express terms, but it is not misrepresenting the theory to say that from the orthodox point of view, sin is the essence of evil, which comes from the devil, and has contaminated the immortal souls of the human race, and defiled, as by a spiritual soot, the arrangements of the world. Sin, in this view, is a murky vapour of the pit, a sort of chemic-spiritual element or principle that has exhaled from the chimney of hell, and marred the purity of

creation, and to which God has a deadly enmity, and which He desires to sweep out of the earth; but the tenacious adherence of which, spoils the work and compels the destruction of the globe by conflagration! In this view of the matter, Mr. Barnett is quite right; the truth concerning God's relation to the universe "leaves no room or opportunity" for it, for God is supreme in all creation. There is no supernatural devil to fight against him or spoil his work by sending his soot flying about. Whence comes evil? Mr. Barnett might ask. The answer is, from God. What! God the author of evil! Yes. He says of Himself, "*I create evil.*"—(Is. xlv. 7.) "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?"—(Amos iii. 6.) What is evil? Not an essence—not a principle—but an unpropitious state of circumstances brought about by God as the punishment of sin, *e.g.*, the cursing of the ground when Adam fell, and the establishment of the law of decay in his own person. The next question might be, Where does sin come from? Let us see clearly what sin is, and we shall have no difficulty in seeing where it comes from. John defines it as follows: "*Sin is the transgression of the law.*"—(1 John iii. 4.) This definition simplified still further, would yield the following proposition: "Sin is the disobedience of God." That this is the simple state of the case, is evident from the 5th chapter of Romans. Paul says (verse 12) "By one man *sn* entered into the world," and, lower down in the chapter, he varies his language to this form. "By one man's DISOBEDIENCE, many were made sinners." When we consult the recorded transaction to which this has reference we find that Paul's statement is in exact accordance with the facts. Adam was told not to eat of the tree in the midst of the garden, and he did eat—he *disobeyed*, and this was *sn*. Hence, "sin" is but the scriptural definition of *disobedience*. This being the case, the difficulty raised by Mr. Barnett only exists in his own brain, and its existence is owing to the action of a false theology. His objection construed in harmony with the facts would stand thus: "In Him, we exist; out of Him we have been evolved; therefore we cannot disobey Him!" The logic of this is very like something else one has heard in the same line: "A ship floats, trees grow; therefore Oliver Cromwell was a traitor!" It is the very fact that we have been evolved from God and endowed with independent powers of reason and choice, that we are capable of either obedience or disobedience. Had we not been evolved, sin would have been impossible, for we should not have been alive to sin. Disobedience could not have taken place if there had been no independent moral agent to disobey; and there could not have been no independent moral agent until God evolved or made them by, or out of, His power. Being so evolved, we have disobeyed, and hence sin, evil, and death. It was the very formation of man that created the "room or opportunity for sin." That "in Him we exist," Mr. Barnett surely will not deny in the face of Paul's statement, "In Him we live, and move, and have our being."—(Acts xvii. 28.)

Mr. Barnett next takes refuge in a quibble about "embodied," as occurring

in
H
ar
in
is
in
cc
er
w
re
b

d
s
C
a
t

t

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

e desires to sweep
 is the work and
 this view of the
 l's relation to the
 supreme in all
 him or spoil his
 l? Mr. Barnett
 author of evil
 ll there be evil in
 t is evil? Not an
 stances brought
 e ground when
 erson. The next
 learly what sin
 u. John defines
 in iii. 4.) This
 position: "Sin
 of the case, is
) "By one man
 he varies his
 ay were made
 is has reference
 facts. Adam
 he did eat—
 ral definition
 r. Barnett only
 ion of a false
 would stand
 therefore we
 else one has
 iver Cromwell
 ron God and
 are capable of
 would have
 edience could
 ral agent to
 ant until God
 ved, we have
 ation of man
 n we exist,"
 "In Him we
 as occurring

in the following sentence: "Spirit irradiating from Him has under the fiat of His will, been *embodied* in the vast material creation which we behold." He argues that this is impossible, since the act of "embodying" the Spirit would imply the previous existence of material creation in which to embody it. This is too absurd to answer. Did Mr. Barnett never hear of embodying a sentiment in a resolution, or a series of resolutions in a bill for parliamentary consideration? Did the resolution or the bill exist before the act of embodiment? He evidently feels that in this argument he is straining at words, for he finds it necessary to say, "Let not Mr. Roberts stigmatise this reasoning as a battle about words." This is exactly what it is, or rather a battle arising out of a misapprehension of words on the part of Mr. Barnett.

Mr. Barnett is petrified at the suggestion that the Spirit of God should be discoverable in scientific research, and stunned at the "blasphemy" of the supposition that electricity should be that Spirit in its free and universal form. One would almost imagine that Mr. Barnett disbelieved that God had anything to do with the universe. He waxes loftily indignant at the ascription of its powers to God. He denounces as blasphemy the simple and believing application of God's testimony concerning himself. Does he deny the statement of Scripture that the Spirit of God is everywhere? Concerning which we read "If God gather unto Himself *His Spirit* and His breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust."—(Job xxxiv. 14.) If it is everywhere, is it not everywhere? and being everywhere, is it not a reality? How can it be anything if it is nothing; and if it is not nothing, but something, ought it not to be discoverable? Men have observed, considered, tested, compared, and investigated, and have discovered a *universal spirit*. This they have called ELECTRICITY. Mr. Barnett denies this is the Spirit of God. If not God's, whose is it? Mr. Barnett says it is not universal. Does he set himself above Faraday, the great electrical discoverer of the day? and the correctness of whose deductions has been demonstrated in a legion of practical appliances such as "the explosion of mines, the weaving of silk, the extension of printing, the electro-telegraph, the illumination of lighthouses," &c. Mr. Faraday calls it "the *UNIVERSAL spirit of matter*;" and hear another electrician's testimony as to the function it performs, or the relation it holds to the general economy of nature:

"Electricity actuates the whole frame of nature and produces all the phenomena that transpire throughout the realms of unbounded space. It is the most powerful and subtle agent employed by the Creator in the government of the universe, and in carrying on the multifarious operations of nature. Making a slight variation in the language of the poet, I may with propriety say—

'It warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
 Glows in the stars and blossoms in the trees;
 Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
 Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
 Breathes in our souls, informs our mortal part
 As full, as perfect, in a hair as heart;

As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns
 As the rapt seraph that adores and burns.
 It claims all high and low, all great and small,
 It fills, it bounds, connects, and equals all."

"It is immaterial to what department of this globe and its surrounding elements we turn our attention, electricity is there. Wherever we witness convulsions in nature, the workings of this mighty unseen power are there. It writes its path in lightning on the sullen brow of the dark cloud, and breathes out rolling thunder. Though cold and invisible in its equalised and slumbering state, yet it is the cause of light and heat, which it creates by the inconceivable rapidity of its motion and friction on other particles of matter. It is the cause of evaporation from basined oceans and silvery lakes, from majestic rivers and rolling streams, and from the common humidity of the earth. It forms aerial conductors in the heavens, through which this moisture in vapoury oceans is borne to the highest portions of our globe, and stored up in magazines of snow and rain. It is electricity that by its coldness condenses the storm, and opens these various magazines in mild beauty or awful terror on the world. It is electricity that by the production of heat, rarefies the air, gives wings to the wind, and directs their course. It is this unseen agent that causes the gentle zephyrs of heaven to fan the human brow with a touch of delight—that moves the stormy gale—that arms the sweeping hurricane with power—that gives to the roaring tornado all its dreadful eloquence of vengeance and terror, and clothes the mid-day sun in light. It gives us the soft pleasing touches of the evening twilight and the crimson blushes of the rising morn. It is electricity that, by its effects of light and heat, produces the blossoms of spring, the fruits of summer, the laden bounties of autumn, and moves on the vast mass of vegetation in all the varieties and blendid beauties of creation. It bids winter close the varied scene. It is electricity that, by its most awful impressions, causes the earthquake to awake from its tartarian den, to speak its rumbling thunder, convulse the globe, and mark out its path of ruin."—*Electrical Psychology*, (Dod's) pp. 51-53.

If Mr. Barnett can imagine a loftier mission, a greater power, a more universal omniscience (pardon the phrase) than electricians have found to attach to the inscrutable element they term electricity, he is certainly gifted beyond the ordinary run of mortals. The declarations of the Scriptures concerning the Spirit of God are so identical with the portraiture of electricity by modern science, that there can be no doubt as to the synonymy of the two things. There is just one element in the case that science has not reached and never can reach, and which made revelation a necessity. It never could find out the Supreme Intelligence that originates and controls universal power, or divine the future manifestations of that power in the destiny of man. It could not discover the relation in which created man stands to the Inscrutable Creator. It can discover no means of laying hold of this universal element, as God does, when it pleases Him, so as to use it as an instrument of power. They cannot make it "Holy Spirit." It only becomes this when wielded by the will of the Almighty. All it has done is to discover that what the Scriptures revealed before it could be known experimentally, is true, viz., that there is a Universal Spirit by which everything is upheld and controlled. This is all! It but discloses omnipotence around us. It but leaves us helpless in its presence as before. Here revelation gloriously joins hands with nature and unfolds the counsels of the Eternal Mind, which is at the other end, as it were, of this universal telegraphy. The man who can discover blasphemy in such a splendid conjunction of truth, must have a mind strangely warped indeed.

THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE CONCERNING THE DEVIL.

Mr. Barnett, with the clergy of all sections of the Roman Harlot's spiritual dominion, believes in a personal devil, of supernatural origin and power, whose function it is to tempt men to sin, and then take them to hell, if they leave the body before they repent; though why they should be precluded from the opportunity of repentance after leaving the body, does not appear. Mr. Barnett does not enter upon a scriptural demonstration of the existence of the arch-fiend. He begs the question. He takes the popular idea for granted, and contents himself with believing that the words "devil" and "Satan" express this belief. His main exertion is to upset the argument by which, in the *Twelve Lectures*, the popular idea is shown to be unscriptural, and the Bible-devil demonstrated to be a personification of sin in its various manifestations, individual and corporate, in the world. His effort is very feeble and utterly futile. Attempting to deal with Paul's statement that Christ took upon himself flesh and blood, "that *through death* he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, *the devil*," he coolly changes "destroy" to "defeat!" and then declares that in atoning for sin, Christ defeated the devil. This is certainly a very adroit way of escaping a great difficulty; but it is not escaping the difficulty at all. It is doing violence to the subject; it is wresting the Scriptures. Paul says the object of Christ's death was to destroy the devil; *ergo*, if the devil were a personal supernatural being, he was destroyed. But what Christ's death accomplished is otherwise expressed in these words: "He took away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" "He condemned sin in the flesh;" *ergo*, sin in the flesh is the devil. Paul says "the devil hath the power of death;" if the devil is a supernatural personal enemy of God and man, death, the wages of sin, is one of the devil's providences, and not God's act, notwithstanding the fact that it was God that made man mortal on account of sin, and notwithstanding that God says, "I kill and I make alive;" "I have the keys of hell and of death." To escape this, Mr. Barnett *simply affirms* (and yet he finds fault with Mr. Roberts for dogmatism) that the devil has the power of death *in the sense of possessing ability to tempt man!* The explanation is so absurd that it is perhaps best left unanswered. The source of human temptation is defined by James: "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of *his own lust* and enticed. When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." The great inflicter of death is sin; for "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." "The wages of sin is death." The devil having the power of death that Christ destroyed by dying, was sin—not a personal being, but the principle or fact of sin personified. The reason of the personification is gone into at length in *Twelve Lectures*.

Mr. Barnett contends the serpent in the garden of Eden was infernally inspired to tempt Eve. He ignores the explanation furnished in the record:

g elements
convulsions
writes its
athes out
dumbering
conceivable
the cause
rivers and
rms aerial
oceans is
azines of
is storm,
the world.
ngs to the
he gentle
at moves
; gives to
ror, and
is of the
electricity
ring, the
ast mass
as winter
is, causes
thunder,
psychology,

er, a more
e found to
nly gifted
Scriptures
electricity
ity of the
ot reached
ver could
universal
ay of man.
nscrutable
l element,
of power.
ded by the
Scriptures
there is a
his is all
ess in its
ature and
end, as it
phemy in
y warped

"The serpent was MORE SUBTLE than any *beast of the field* that the Lord God had made." Did this greater subtlety not account for the part performed by the serpent? Jesus says, "Be wise as *serpents*;" and Paul recognizes the natural acuteness of the animal in these words: "I fear lest by any means, as *the serpent beguiled Eve THROUGH HIS SUBTLETY*," &c. Mr. Barnett cannot believe the serpent was capable of doing what the Mosaic record says it did. He says the idea is too silly to be entertained. This is his only reason for insisting it was a supernatural devil that was at the bottom of it. He makes his disbelief in the testimony an argument in proof of his fancy! This is logic extraordinary! The divine address to the serpent after the fall is couched in these terms: "Because *THOU hast done this* ('silly nonsense!' shouts Mr. Barnett, 'the serpent didn't do it'), cursed art *THOU* above all cattle and above every *beast of the field*." This was a mistake on Mr. Barnett's principle. The serpent was an innocent tool. The devil was the offender, and yet of the devil there is no mention; the devil gets free and the poor serpent comes in for the consequences! It is a poor theory that involves such logical gymnastics.

Mr. Barnett winces under the fact that "Satan" and "devil" are promiscuously employed in the Scriptures, and in default of ability to explain this in conformity with his theory, he resorts to dogmatism. The fact in question, says he, has nothing whatever to do with the doctrine of the personality of Satan. Begging his pardon, it has much to do with it, though he has failed to see the connection. The favourite mode of proving the popular doctrine of the devil, is to cite passages where the words "devil" and "Satan" occur. Now if it be proved, as has been proved in the *Twelve Lectures*, and admitted by Mr. Barnett, that these terms are of general application in the Scriptures, it follows that their mere occurrence is no proof of the popular doctrine. The popular doctrine must be antecedently established. The defender of the orthodox faith is compelled to show that by "devil," the Bible means *such a devil as he believes in*. The word "devil" and the word "Satan" do nothing for him, since in themselves they represent nothing specific, but are common nouns of general use—a fact which instead of having "nothing whatever to do with the doctrine of the personality of Satan," as Mr. Barnett says, strongly tends to upset it altogether. But, rejoins Mr. Barnett, "other persons are in Scripture called 'gods'; this does not disprove the personality of the Supreme Spirit of good." No; because the latter is expressly taught. If we were not informed that there was a Most High God, Creator of heaven and earth, and "one God and Father out of whom are all things, and who is over all things," &c., we should have no basis for our faith in the personality of the Supreme. Is Mr. Barnett prepared to show a similar state of things with regard to his devil, and can he produce affirmative testimony in proof of the existence and personality of "the chief spirit of evil," as he polytheistically, and in relation to the Almighty, blasphemously styles the

the Lord God
performed by
recognizes the
ly means, as
nett cannot
says it did.
reason for
He makes
y! This is
l is couched
e!" shouts
l cattle and
a principle.
and yet of
pent comes
oh logical

devil" are
to explain
the fact in
ne of the
o with it,
of proving
ls "devil"
he *Twelve*
of general
s no proof
stablished.
devil," the
l the word
g specific,
"nothing
r. Barnett
tt, "other
ersonality
ught. If
aven and
ho is over
mality of
of things
in proof
" as he
yles the

evil deity of his theology? He cannot. He begs the question; he assumes the existence of his Infernal Majesty, and insists that "satan" and "devil" are intended to represent him. More than this neither he nor anybody else can do in defence of the clerical devil, for there is no such thing. He only exists in the bemuddled brains of those who are under the power of the Harlot of the Earth, the great Romish Mother, who has intoxicated all the world with religious fables, and this among the rest.

The city of Pergamos was, by Jesus, styled "Satan's seat" (Rev. ii. 13), because the power of the persecutor was triumphant in that locality. This fact is cited in *Twelve Lectures* as a proof that the Satan present to his mind was not a personal devil, who is supposed to have his quarters in hell, but the human adversary who antagonised his name. Mr. Barnett resents the suggestion, but offers nothing more weighty than an assertion, that the phrase "Satan's seat," as applied to Pergamos, "is a figurative intimation that in that locality Satan wielded a more than usually triumphant power." Understanding Satan in its scriptural sense, we have no objection to the assertion; but, of course, Mr. Barnett means the supernatural devil of orthodox faith. To this we demur; but as it is nothing more than an assertion, we will not stay to fight it.

As to the words addressed by Jesus to Peter, when Peter proposed to prevent his death ("Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men"), Mr. Barnett does no more than again dogmatise. "They were addressed," says he, "as a rebuke to Satan for the temptation, and to Peter for yielding to it." One can only say in answer to this, that one assertion is as good as another, and the counter assertion must be that the words were addressed to Peter as an adversary (through ignorance) to God's designs of love, through the death of Christ. The reader must judge which assertion is more in harmony with the record.

Mr. Barnett admits that the "delivering over unto Satan" of apostolic practice, was excommunication. He proposes, however, to retain the Satanic flavour of the transaction. He thinks excommunication "was more terrible in the light of the doctrine of the personality of Satan." As he concedes the point contended for, the obscure and contradictory expression of opinion with which he accompanies it, may be allowed to pass unmolested.

"Satan hindered us."—(1 Thess. ii. 18.) Mr. Barnett admits, as he was bound to do, that this refers to the "opponents by whom the apostle was troubled," but he tries to preserve the passage as an orthodox proof by suggesting that "a personal Satan may have instigated" these opponents. To this we reply "Prove your Satan first, Mr. Barnett, and then begin to talk of what he may or may not do." A "may have" does not weigh much in argument.

Of a like character is Mr. Barnett's answer to the case of Satan entering

into Judas. In spite of the record that "Judas was a thief," and that his betrayal of Jesus was through covetousness which "entered into him," he attributes his crime to the direct influence of a supernatural tempter; and to get rid of the anomaly of Judas being punished for the guilt of the devil, he affirms that Judas was not punished for the devil's sin, but for yielding to the devil's temptation. Mr. Barnett speaks as one having authority: his clerical training must be his excuse. Apparently considering his dictum a settlement of the point, he reads Mr. Roberts a lecture on "deliberately leading unthinking readers astray," of which he thinks he finds "another instance in his treatment of the case of Ananias and Sapphira." Peter said to Ananias "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?" The lie consisted in saying that a part of his property, which he offered to the service of God, was the whole of it. Mr. Barnett denies that this lie proceeded from the desire of the flesh to save something while enjoying the credit of giving up the whole. He believes that the personal Satan put it into his heart. If so, how strange that Peter should ask Ananias why a devil, over whom he had no control, had done something he could not prevent! Sapphira, Ananias's wife, came in some hours afterwards with the same story. Peter varies his address to her. He says "Why have ye agreed together to lie," &c., so that the Satan filling the heart of Ananias, was the spirit of avarice leading him to make an agreement with his wife to conceal the truth, and palm off a lie. When Mr. Barnett's attention is called to the scriptural definition of temptation in its literal process: "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed," he has no better reply than the suggestion that "a man may be tempted by the spirit of the flesh, and by a personal Satan also." This needs no answer.

Mr. Barnett tacitly admits his inability to reconcile the supernatural devil-theory with the fact that "men are prone to evil according to the relative strength of the animal nature." He first denies this to be a fact. He evidently has not been a thinker, or if a thinker, no observer, which, so far as truthful results are concerned, is as good as being no thinker at all. Doubtless, he has contemplated the world through the logic of "divinity," which is not specially calculated to assist a man's intellectual optics. He has not yet learnt the greatest of all modern lessons—to discard fable and begin with facts. He has begun with the "divinity of other days," worked into his brains by the grinding and cramming process, doubtless of a collegiate training, and he ruthlessly coerces facts into harmony with his theology. No fact is more notorious than the one which Mr. Barnett denies, viz., that there are different degrees in the strength of men's tendency to evil. Some men are naturally more erratic than others, and this difference is invariably associated with a difference of organization. In some men the animal impulses are relatively (to their higher instincts) stronger than in others. To deny this is to evince ignorance or obstinacy. Mr. Barnett does not hesitate to do so, because he

ief," and that his
 "ed into him," he
 l tempter; and so
 lt of the devil, he
 or yielding to the
 rity: his clerical
 tum a settlement
 berately leading
 other instance in
 said to Annanias
 irit?" The lie
 ed to the service
 proceeded from
 dit of giving up
 s heart. If so,
 whom he had
 ira, Annanias's
 Peter varies his
 o lie," &c., so
 upidity leading
 and palm off a
 l definition of
 he is drawn
 ly than the
 ash, and by a
 natural devil-
 o the relative
 evidently has
 uthful results
 less, he has
 not specially
 et learnt the
 ts. He has
 uns by the
 ng, and he
 ct is more
 re different
 e naturally
 ed with a
 relatively
 to evince
 because he

naturally sees a strong element of danger to the devil-theory in such a fact; for if tendency to evil is only exhibited in the ratio of natural bias, the supposed influence of the clerical devil is excluded, or at least reduced to a practical nullity. But Mr. Barnett not unnaturally seems afraid of the position he takes, for he immediately seeks to provide against the consequences of disaster to that position. "If it were" (a fact) says he, "it might still be true that men's proneness to evil is indefinitely aggravated by the tempting influences of an evil spirit." This does not save him at all. Satan's influence, that depends for its strength upon the natural weakness of the tempted, must be a different affair from the power of the fiend who is said to have all the world under his thumb. Mr. Barnett complains that the Christadelphian view of the case makes the world to be more wicked than it is. He virtually exclaims "The world is bad enough, on the supposition that the devil is at the bottom of all its cantraps, but if there is no devil, what a horrid condition of things!" In this observation Mr. Barnett unwittingly pays a tribute to the truth of the view he is assailing. The Bible represents "the world" as a wicked institution. It alleges of it that it "lieth in wickedness"—(1 John v, 19); that it is "an evil world" (Gal. i. 4); that it is "the enemy of God," to be a friend of which (1 Jno. iv. 5, 6), is to be God's enemy, (James iv. 4.); that it heareth not God (Jno. xv. 18, 19); that all that is in it, is "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" (1 Jno. ii. 16); that the carnal or fleshly mind which thus fills it, is enmity against God, is not subject to His law, neither indeed can be.—(Rom. viii. 7.) With all these representations, the Christadelphian view of matters is accordant; it attributes the sin and mischief that exists to the untutored mind of man, which, left to itself, as in barbarism, knows nothing aright, but follows the bent of mere instinct. But if these representations are in harmony with the Christadelphian view, they just sustain the opposite relation to Mr. Barnett's. Mr. Barnett says the world is not so much to blame as the Christadelphians make out. Like a certain popular lecturer, he thinks the world a tolerably virtuous, well-managed and comfortable concern, if it were not for (and this the popular lecturer in question would not add) this tricky, plaguey, meddling devil, who is always putting things wrong. "Poor world," Mr. Barnett may be imagined soliloquizing; "a great many hard things are said of you; you are called wicked, and carnal, and godless, and cold; and no doubt it is so to some extent; but you would not be so bad if you were left to yourself. It is this abominable black creature from the pit that does all the mischief! He was turned out of heaven a long time ago for his conduct, and he came down here to have his pique out, by putting you up to all manner of evil, that he might get hold of you all at last! You have never seen him I know, and you would not know he was among you, if we, your priests and parsons, did not tell you, but here he is I assure you; not in heaven, as some say, not in hell, as others say, but actually in the earth, flitting

about from place to place, attended by millions of bad angels, who fill the air and do his bidding. It is our business to see after him, and to keep him off the ground. Pay the pew rents and tithes, and we'll see after the troublesome wretch and his myrmidons!" So Mr. Barnett whitewashes the world, pats it on the back, and puts all the blame of its misdeeds on the Bogey in the dark! And the world likes this kind of teaching. It feels comforted by the idea that all its sins lie at the Devil's door, and that heaven must speak before it can be righteous—that its vile imaginations are Devil's whispers, and its good thoughts God's inspirations. It likes the idea of being the prize in a fight between God and the Devil. It feels relieved of all responsibility as to the issue. It dislikes all teachers that disturb its mawkish, theologically-begotten complacency, by telling it that it is wicked of itself and by itself. It generally makes short work of them, and gets them out of the way. Christ stands at the head of this class, and his testimony is, "The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth, because I testify of it that *the works thereof are evil.*"—(John vii. 7.) All who follow in his footsteps have the same testimony to present, and in the presentation of it, they must perforce be found in opposition to all devil-mongers like Mr. Barnett, who console the world by laying its sin on a third person.

As to the temptation of Jesus, Mr. Barnett does no more than scout the solution suggested from a Christadelphian point of view. More than this he cannot do. The designation of the tempter as "the devil," determines nothing. If Mr. Barnett's devil is the scriptural one, he must first establish his existence before claiming to recognise him in the word "devil;" for as he well knows, that word is applied generally with the sense of accuser, liar, enemy. He must prove the clerical devil before advancing the mere word "devil," in defence of him. This he cannot do. He has not attempted to do it. He has contented himself with endeavouring to reply to the Christadelphian arguments against him, and the basis of all his argument on the subject is the *assumption* that the popular devil exists. There is nothing but the words "the devil" in the narrative of Christ's temptation, to countenance the popular theory. Mr. Barnett thinks there is more. He thinks the mere fact of Christ being the tempted, necessitates the belief that the tempter was superhuman, a mere man being, in Mr. Barnett's belief, incapable of offering him a temptation. This suggestion assumes that Christ was not human, and that he could not be tempted like other men. The fallacy of the first point will be dealt with in the next section. The second point is disposed of by Paul, who says of Christ "*He was tempted in all points LIKE AS WE ARE.*"—(Heb. iv. 15.) Do his brethren require superhuman temptation? Are they not susceptible to the influence of the human tempter? So was Christ, for he was tempted in all points like unto them. The power of a temptation lies, not in the person presenting it, but in the desirability and feasibility of the suggestion made. Hence the fallacy of supposing

Christ
enough
what i
a trial
the eff
the w
attem
say th
it. T
decidi
consid
that i
the su
One c
than
temp
from
he r
subs
Jesu
view
Chri
"wi
may
lose
tast
H
que
Ror
it v
prie
Bet
sta
"u
Jer
pre
Jes
int
is
de
vit
tes
an

gels, who fill the
and to keep him
the troublesome
he world, puts it
grey in the dark
led by the idea
speak before it
ars, and its good
prize in a fight
ility as to the
rically-begotten
f. It generally
hrist stands at
; hate you, but
of are evil."—
e testimony to
be found in
the world by

han scout the
re than this he
," determines
first establish
devil;" for as
accuser, liar,
he mere word
empted to do
the Christa-
ument on the
s nothing but
countenance
nks the mere
tempter was
ble of offering
human, and
he first point
posed of by
as we
temptation?
ar? So was
power of a
rability and
supposing

Christ's temper was necessarily superhuman. Anyone with adroitness enough to present inducements in an enticing form, and power to perform what might be promised, would be adequate to the occasion. He who provided a trial for Eve in the serpent, found a personage qualified to put Christ to the effectual proof. He had authority enough to offer him the dominion of the world, and was skilled enough in the Hebrew faith to make use of it in attempting to seduce Christ from the path of submission. Mr. Barnett may say this was the popular devil, but he can only say it. There is no proof of it. The Christadelphian, on the other hand, is equally helpless as regards deciding who in particular the tempter was, but in view of the various considerations advanced in *Twelve Lectures*, he is able to be very positive that it was no such personage as the devil of orthodoxy. Mr. Barnett derides the suggestion that it was any official connected with the government of Rome. One can only say that such a suggestion is more in harmony with the narrative than the one he represents. In addition to the fact that the devil who tempted him could offer him political power, it is said, "The devil departed from him for a season," which implies that he returned again. When did he return according to the popular theory? There is no incident in his subsequent life that would answer to it; but when we reflect that Rome put Jesus to death, we see a palpable sense in which the devil of Christadelphian views returned at the expiry of the "season." Rome could not seduce Christ, and departed, but returned and destroyed him on the plea that "whosoever maketh himself a king, speaketh against Caesar." Mr. Barnett may sneer, but more he cannot do. He thinks the temptation of Christ loses its dignity by such a construction! This being merely a matter of taste, may be let pass.

His next objection is that the Messiahship of Jesus had not become a public question at the time of the temptation, and that therefore it was not possible Roman authority could have interposed at such a point. Does he forget that it was a public question in Jerusalem thirty years before, when a Roman prince (at a time when all Jerusalem was moved) slew all the babies in Bethlehem in the hope of getting rid of him? If Rome was so vigilant at a stage so early, is it likely that she would be ignorant that the boy whose "understanding and answers" at twelve years of age had created marvel in Jerusalem, had reached manhood, and would likely soon be active? The probability is that she would be on the alert, and was thus ready the moment Jesus was proclaimed the Messiah by John the Baptist, to put her jealous intrigue into force. Mr. Barnett contends that the phrase "the devil" is incompatible with the Christadelphian view, which he admits "a devil" might not have been. The answer is that the Christadelphian view requires the definite article, inasmuch as the name bestowed on the tempter, whoever he was, shows that he was put forward as the personification and representation of sin for the time being. "A devil" would not have

described his relation to the transaction. The individuality of the person was of the smallest consequence. It did not matter who acted instrumentally for sin on the occasion. It was not a question of an individual antagonism; it was a question of principles. Would Jesus obey under trial? This was the question; and the individual inciting him to disobedience was, for the moment, the representation of the great principles of sin in the flesh, and therefore emphatically ~~the~~ devil. Mr. Barnett argues in favour of the popular devil, from the fact that at the close of the temptation, "angels came and ministered unto him." He asks "if relief came from a superhuman source, why are we to suppose that the temptation was not superhuman also?" How would he answer such a question in the tragedy of Gethsæmane? Angels comforted him during the mental conflict he underwent in view of his approaching shame and death. Would Mr. Barnett say his maltreatment by the Roman soldiery and his death on the cross were superhuman events? Were they not perfectly human and perfectly natural? Angelic consolations had reference to the effect produced on the mind of Christ, and not to the source of that effect. Temptation and suffering violently exercised a mind so lofty and pure. Both were endured for the salvation of the world, and therefore angels were sent to encourage him in the task.

Mr. Barnett has nothing more to say in defence of the devil, except a remark which he makes, as a parting shot, to the effect that Christ's conformity to popular language in regard to Satan, proved the popular idea to be well founded. This remark assumes that the popular Jewish idea in the day of Jesus was identical with the popular idea of the 19th century, which is contrary to the fact. But even if it were otherwise, Christ's use of popular language would not prove the truth of popular ideas. If it did, it proves the existence of Beelzebub, the ruling deity of the Philistines, for Christ conformed to popular language on the point in rebutting the assertion that he (Christ) worked under Beelzebub's inspiration; and it would prove the Pagan theory of demoniacal possession, for to this he appears to give countenance in his allusions to the epileptics of his day. We must educe the truth of all these matters from the express teaching of the Word, and not from mere forms of speech, which would, in conventional use, often have a very different sense from that which they bear on their surface. Referring the reader for greater elaboration on the subject, to the work which Mr. Barnett has attacked, we will pass on to consider his criticisms on

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

On this subject, Mr. Barnett kicks against the pricks, and retires with bleeding feet. Trinitarianism is the unclean spirit that blinds his reason and excites his gymnasticulations. He cannot understand the Christadelphian idea of Christ. It

ty of the person
d instrumentally
ual antagonism
trial? This was
ice was, for the
the flesh, and
in favour of
tation, "angels
a superhuman
of superhuman
re tragedy of
fflict he under-
fr. Barnett say
the cross were
fectly natural?
a the mind of
and suffering
dured for the
ourage him in

cept a remark
conformity to
ea to be well
in the day of
ry, which is
se of popular
it proves the
, for Christ
rtion that he
ve the Pagan
aintenance in
truth of all
mere forms
fferent sense
for greater
ttacked, we

th bleeding
excites his
f Christ. It

is neither a Trinitarian nor a Unitarian idea; quite right. It is a scriptural idea. As he cannot make out what this is, it will be worth while defining it for him, before dealing with his attempt to overthrow it.

First, then, Jesus was the Son of God. If it be asked in what sense, the answer is, he was a man born of the Virgin Mary by the power of God through the Spirit. The proof of this is found in the angel's statement to Mary: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee. THEREFORE also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the SON of God."—(Luke i. 35.) This sonship was perfected in two subsequent stages. At Christ's baptism in Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended upon him in visible form, and filled him with power.—(Acts x. 38.) In the fulness of the Spirit, the Father, who is the fountain and source of Spirit and all power, dwelt in him, and through him spoke words and did works which none other man did.—(Acts ii. 22; Hebrews i. 1; John x. 38; 2 Cor. v. 19.) In this way he was a manifestation of God in the flesh.—(1 Tim. iii. 16.) The final stage of his development was when he was "perfected the third day."—(Luke xiii. 32.) This was at his resurrection, when he was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead."—(Rom. i. 2.) He then became "the Lord, the Spirit," a human being raised by gradations to equality with the Father, having been begotten by the Spirit, filled with it during his life, raised by it from death, and changed from flesh to spirit-nature, and "filled with all the fulness of the godhead bodily."

Mr. Barnett cannot understand this idea. He will have it that Christ was one of "the inscrutable three," (co-equal and co-eternal—"Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,") who came down from heaven as a person and entered Mary's womb to endure wrath at the hands of "God the Father and God the Holy Ghost," for the liberation of immortal souls from hell. It does not strike him as an incongruous thing, that Christ "suffered in the flesh" instead of in the disembodied immortal soul state; that he died a bodily death to avert a "spiritual" one; that he came to the earth to undergo this "vicarious suffering," instead of going to hell where the suffering he came to do away with, was in reality to be endured. It does not strike him that in this view, Jesus was a manifestation of the Son instead of a manifestation of the Father—that he was "the Son manifest in the flesh," instead of "God manifest in flesh;" that instead of God being in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, the Son was in a body performing the work towards an angry God. If it is testified that "God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit." It does not occur to Mr. Barnett, as a strange proposition, that God the Father should anoint God the Son with God the Holy Ghost, to enable God the Son to do things which he testified he had no power to do of himself, but which, according to Trinitarianism, he had power to do "co-equal" with the Father and the "Holy Ghost."

Mr. Barnett is undistressed by these trifling discrepancies. He says "nothing is gained (against orthodoxy) by quoting and commenting on passages which prove that Jesus was a man—that being human, he grew in wisdom as well as in stature—that he received a special anointing for a special work, and that in his human and official capacity, he is to be distinguished from the Father." "These positions," he says, "are held by orthodox believers as cordially and consistently as by Mr. Roberts." This is playing with the subject—a mere darkening of counsel by words without knowledge. How can Mr. Barnett reconcile the foregoing string of admissions with his Trinitarian notions of Christ. If Christ was "very God," he could not grow in wisdom, for to grow in wisdom is to advance from ignorance and folly to knowledge and discretion, and could "very God" be ignorant and foolish? If he was "very God," he would not have required "a special anointing for a special work," for to "require" it, is to be helpless without it; "very God" could never be helpless; and Christ expressly says, *Of mine own self I CAN DO NOTHING* . . . the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works."—(Jno. v. 60; xiv. 10.) This Jesus could never have said if he, as the Son, had been "co-equal and co-eternal" with the Father; because "of his own self" he could have done everything, and the Father would only have been a tripartite accessory to the power he exerted. If he had been "very God," he would have been omniscient as the Father, and could never have said, "Of that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, nor THE SON, but the Father."—(Mark xiii. 32.) If he had been "very God," it could never have been said of him that "he learnt obedience by the things that he suffered." Does "very God" require to be taught?"—(Isaiah xl. 13, 14.) Has "very God" to obey? Can "very God" suffer? It is testified of Christ that "in the days of his flesh he offered up prayer and supplications with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to *save him from death, and was heard* in that he feared."—(Heb. v. 7.) This could never have been recorded of Christ if he had been "very God." Does "very God" pray? Is there any power that can save "very God?" Can "very God" be in danger of death? If Christ had been "very God," he never could have said, "Not my will, but Thine be done;" for as "very God," his will would have been law and could never have been in conflict with the Father's. What are we to make of Paul's testimony, that at the end, "when all things shall be subdued, *then shall the Son also himself be subject* unto him that put all things under him?"—(1 Cor. xv. 28.) If the Son is "very God, co-equal and co-eternal," how can he become "subject?"

Thus does Trinitarianism involve the testimony concerning Christ in endless confusion, by substituting for the intelligible and God-manifesting doctrine of the New Testament, the brain-racking and paradoxical speculations of Athanasius and other "divines" of the dark ages.

But
appare
compr
beginn
God;"
have r
not gi
about
Englis
for th
the tr
helps
entity

Lit
the t
"log
as a I
we h
in th
facts,
on th
It
emin
LAMB
"Thi
unde
used
know
of G
harv
"so
burn
that
by s
as I
illu
this
mu
high
con
Cal
Tri

is. He says "nothing
 on passages which
 in wisdom as well
 special work, and that
 d from the Father."
 vers as cordially and
 the subject—a mere
 ow can Mr. Barnett
 rinitarian notions of
 r in wisdom, for to
 ly to knowledge and
 olish? If he was
 ointing for a special
 "very God" could
 own self I CAN DO
 me, He doeth the
 have said if he, as
 ie Father; because
 Father would only
 d. If he had been
 er, and could never
 gels in heaven, nor
 been "very God,"
 t obedience by the
 to be taught?"
 Can "very God"
 is flesh he offered
 rs, unto him that
 red."—(Heb. v. 7.)
 been "very God."
 save "very God?"
 been "very God,"
 ne;" for as "very
 ve been in conflict
 y, that at the end,
 also himself be
 r. xv. 28.) If the
 can he become

erning Christ in
 God-manifesting
 adoxical specula-

But Mr. Barnett rests with confidence on "the first verse of John's gospel," apparently supposing that the verse has escaped Christadelphian notice and comprehension. He quotes it for their benefit in the following form: "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God;" and observes, "If the Logos be not a divine person, these words have no meaning." Why does Mr. Barnett talk about "the Logos?" Why not give us the translated word—*word* or *discourse*. He might as well talk about *Theos* and *arche*. Indeed, he might as well talk in Greek and drop English altogether. It is easy to see the reason of Mr. Barnett's preference for the "Logos," instead of "the word." By using the original instead of the translated word, he conceals the fact that it is a metaphorical word, and helps to create the impression that the "Logos" is a literal and mysterious entity in the Trinitarian godhead. Let us deal fairly with the matter.

Literally, a "word," or "discourse," is an utterance of the lips, revealing the thoughts of the mind. Hence, Mr. Barnett is bound to admit that "logos" is used in a metaphorical sense. It is true it is employed almost as a proper name, but still it is a name with a metaphorical origin, and what we have to do is to find that origin in the literal facts of the case as testified in the Scriptures, and harmonise the statement in which it occurs with those facts, instead of construing a metaphor literally, as is the practice of orthodoxy on this subject, and doing violence to the literal to make it agree.

It has to be observed with regard to the gospel of John, that it is pre-eminently characterized by metaphor in its statements of truth. "The LAMB of God" is the character in which Christ is introduced.—(Jno. i. 29.) "This temple" is his designation of his body.—(ii. 19, 21.) The Jews understood him literally and derided him; "light" and "darkness" are used to express openness and secrecy.—(iii. 19, 20.) "Meat to eat that ye know not of" is Christ's way of expressing his mental relation to the work of God, uncomprehended by his disciples.—(iv. 32, 34.) "Fields white to harvest" is his way of describing the readiness of men to receive him (35); "sowing and reaping," labour in the truth and reaping results (36); "a burning and a shining light," an eminent witness of the truth (35); "bread that came down from heaven," Jesus as God's means of salvation developed by spirit from heaven (vi. 33); "eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood," as the belief of the truth concerning him (53, 63); and so on. The illustrations are numerous; they abound in every chapter. The whole of this gospel narrative, as well as John's letters, and the apocalypse communicated through him, have the same metaphorical stamp, which makes it highly necessary to bring the literal truth to bear with discrimination in construing any of his statements. For want of this discrimination, the Catholics have established transubstantiation, and the Protestants, Trinitarianism, and its corollary, the personal pre-existence of Christ.

Mr. Barnett thinks if "Logos" does not mean a divine person, the first verse of John's gospel has no meaning. It is without meaning, doubtless, from his point of view; but we shall see it to have a profound and highly significant meaning, when all the elements in the case are taken into account. The object of John's gospel, as distinguished from the other three (which were written much earlier), is evidently to put prominently forward the truth concerning the origin and nature of Christ. There was a necessity for this, which strongly manifested itself in the declining years of the apostle John. There were two classes of errorists, standing at two opposite extremes. One asserted the pure humanity of Christ, imputing his paternity to Joseph—the other denied altogether he had "come in the flesh," asserting him to have been a spectral phenomenon in the guise of a man. With regard to both these classes, John speaks with great plainness in his epistles. Of the one he says "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father."—(1 John ii. 23; iv. 15); and of the other: "Whosoever confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, the same is not of God."—(1 John iv. 3; 2 John 7.) Considering that his gospel was written in full view of these discordant heresies, we can account for the peculiarity of its style, and its difference from the other gospels, in that it omits consecutive biography, employing so much only of the narrative of Christ's life as is necessary to afford a framework for the discussions and discourses he desired to introduce, on the subject of Christ's origin and nature. Now the first fact he puts forward, is contained in the verse in question: this is John's prologue to the life of him who "spake as never man spake:" "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." To comprehend the relation of this to the narrative, we must ask what does John mean by the word? As a metaphor, what is its significance? By the law of metaphor it must be held to mean something analogous, in its own connection, to a literal word or discourse. As already said, a literal word or discourse is the vehicle of the mind—the means by which we convey our thoughts to others. "The Word" must therefore be something sustaining the same relation to God as speech does to us. Now what is that by which God reveals His mind? To this the answer is derivable from testimony: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by THE HOLY SPIRIT."—(2 Peter i. 21; Heb. i. 1.) "Thou testifiest against them by THE SPIRIT in Thy prophets."—(Nehemiah ix. 30.) The Spirit is the means by which God reveals Himself. This came upon the prophets. The oft-recurring record is that the "Spirit of the Lord" came upon them.—(Judges iii. 10; vi. 34; xi. 29; xiii. 25; xiv. 6.) This is varied by the very expression to which Mr. Barnett would impart a mysterious entity, by using the untranslated *logos*. "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, &c."—(Ezek. xxviii. 1; xxx. 1; Jer. ii. 1.) Jeremiah, speaking of the irresistible presence of the Spirit within him, when tempted to keep silence because of the reproach his testimony brought upon him, says the

person, the first
 ing, doubtless,
 and and highly
 into account
 ee (which were
 ard the truth
 ernessity for this,
 apostle John.
 extremes. One
 to Joseph—the
 m to have been
 to both these
 e one he says
 r.”—(1 John
 sth not that
 (1 John iv. 3;
 view of these
 style, and its
 e biography,
 necessary to
 to introduce,
 fact he puts
 dlogue to the
 ing was the
 comprehend
 mean by the
 of metaphor
 ection, to a
 ource is the
 ts to others,
 e relation to
 s His mind?
 od spake as
 l.) “Thou
 niah ix. 30.)
 e upon the
 Lord” came
 is is varied
 e mysterious
 l came unto
 aking of the
 eep silence
 says the

word was in his “heart as a burning fire shut up in his bones.”—(Jeremiah xx. 9.) Paul’s words almost offer a comment on this in saying, “The word of the Lord is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword,” &c. The “WORD,” therefore, literally expressed, is the Spirit of God in operation under the Father’s will. Now this “word,” though often audible in the ears of men through the prophets, was never “made flesh,” until that occurred which the angel told Mary would happen: when the Holy Spirit came upon her and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, the “word” took the form of a man separated entirely to itself. It operated physically to the generation of a Man who by this origin was a prepared instrument, attempered in all respects to the agency whose instrument he was to be, and whose work he was to perform. He was the “body prepared” mentioned by Paul, and when fully matured, was taken possession of by the Spirit at his baptism. It was the same “Spirit” or “word” that spoke through the prophets, but the mode of manifestation was different. Paul defines the distinction in these words: “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by a Son.”—(Heb. i. 1.) It was God who spoke in both cases, but in the one case it was through men chosen from Adam’s race as mere mouth-pieces, while in the other it was by a Son, who, by his begetting through the Spirit, was more than a tool—a Man whose meat and drink it was to do the will of Him who sent him.

Now concerning this “word,” or Spirit in official activity, of which Jesus was the incarnation, John says it was “in the beginning.” It was antecedent to every form of created existence. It was the energy by which, and out of which, as we have already seen, all things are formed. It was “with God.” Irradiant from Himself, it presents the idea of having been something in companionship with Him, separate from Him, but in reality it cannot be divided from His person, being but the expansion of Himself. Therefore, says John, it “was God.” The divine nature is a UNITY, having a focal centre in unapproachable light, and illimitable, invisible, irradiation in space, but the whole is SPIRIT: for God is Spirit (John iv. 24); only there are different manifestations of the same Spirit.—(1 Cor. xii. 4-11.) The manifestation at the Father Centre is very different from that attending the universal diffusion of Spirit spoken of by David.—(Psalm cxxxix. 4-11.)

Now in presenting these facts in preface to his gospel, John at once struck a high and correct key for the life of Jesus. In a few words he expressed the fact stated by Paul, that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto him;” and thus He felled the Josephite school, who taught Jesus was a mere man. On the other hand, by stating that the word was made flesh, he excluded the reasonings of the Gnostics, who taught he was a mere spiritual apparition.

But Mr. Barnett would destroy the force and the beauty of John’s

statements. He insists that the "Word" was "a divine person," as distinct from the Father; that is, "the second person in the Godhead," to use the phraseology of Trinitarians. The "word" in his theory is interchangeable with "the Son;" though why the Son should be called "the word," his theory offers no explanation, since it was "the Holy Ghost" that spoke through the prophets, and not "the Son;" and why this "Logos," as Mr. Barnett delights to have it, would be called THE Son, seeing he was co-equal and co-eternal" with the so-called Father, Mr. Barnett is equally unable to say. Pity for him that the 1st verse of John did not read: "In the beginning was the Son, and the Son was with God, and the Son was God." This would have suited his theory, but it would have stultified all the facts of the case.

"The word was made flesh." How? The Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary and quickened her womb without human aid. The result was, generation in the ordinary course, in nine months, as any other child; but his heavenly origin gave him a higher type than his brethren of purely Adamic stock. So that though a man, "made in all respects like his brethren," he was "from above," and stood far above them in understanding and spiritual affinity. He was THE SON OF GOD, because born by the power of God of Mary. Yet all his excellence was latent and had to be developed by growth, experience, and discipline. "He grew in wisdom;" "he learnt obedience."—(Luke ii. 52; Heb. v. 8.) When the process of his development was complete, the "word," in living power, entered into him, descending visibly and abiding upon him, and spoke by him; which accounts for many expressions that would be unintelligible on the supposition that they were his own utterances. From that day forward, the "Logos" enswathing his being with measureless bounty, he did works "which none other man did," of which he said "the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."—(John xv. 24: xiv. 10.) "Of mine own self I can do nothing."

Now, in all this there was a mystery which no man can comprehend. Paul declares this in the words "Great is the mystery of Godliness; God was manifested in the flesh, justified in Spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, received up into glory."—(1 Tim. vi. 16; Col. ii. 9.) The indwelling presence of the Father by the Spirit, must have resulted in a state of mind of which we have no conception. The Father and Jesus were "one" in a high sense; yet never was the relation of Jesus, the man, to God the Father, lost sight of. Jesus was continually conscious of this relation, as indicated in expressions already quoted. The Father spoke by him, which is the explanation of such remarks as, "How often would I have gathered thee as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, but ye would not," &c.

But though mystery must be admitted in the relation of such a man's being, there is no room for Trinitarianism. The mystery consisted

not in the second deta the One Et myth. Th by the Hol this reason,

He think Thou me w (John xvii existence of wrong. W quality aff testimony i the Holy S made Lord absurd to s with whic manifested God, who l as a purpos of the worl words conc gavest me, 1 other stater and before enter till ad intense lan; title to the come, spok

The Spir. I speak, I s I should sa; speech that his birth. emphasis: tion of this one aspect otherwise Twelve Lec excited by and was g contempora stated by

ivine person," as
the Godhead," to
s theory is inter-
alled "the word"
host" that spoke
"Logos," as Mr.
he was co-equal
equally unable
read: "In the
Son was God."
e stultified all

t overshadowed
The result was
other child; but
threaten of purely
aspects like his
understanding
born by the
and had to be
w in wisdom;
rocess of his de-
tered into him,
which accounts
sition that they
s" enswathing
one other man
he doeth the
self I can do

n comprehend
odliness; God
ieved on in the
The indwelling
a state of mind
re "one" in a
od the Father,
as indicated
which is the
thered thee as
sc.
of such a
tery consisted

not in the representation of three agglomerated gods in one entity, or the second detached from the others and incarnated, but in the manifestation of the One Eternal God, in a man who was His son. The "triune God" is a myth. The mystery of godliness is the manifestation of the Father in a son, by the Holy Spirit. This is neither Trinitarianism nor Unitarianism. For this reason, Mr. Barnett cannot understand it.

He thinks it is destroyed by the words of Jesus, in his prayer: "Glorify Thou me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."—(John xvii. 5.) Upon the surface, these words appear to teach the pre-existence of Christ; but any view that sets Scripture against itself, must be wrong. What is the meaning of "Christ" Anointed? Of whom is this quality affirmed? Of the living man, styled Jesus of Nazareth; for the testimony is "God ANOINTED (Christed, made Christ) Jesus of Nazareth, with the Holy Spirit and power."—(Acts x. 38.) "That same Jesus He hath made Lord and Christ."—(Acts ii. 36.) This being so, it is self-evidently absurd to speak of his having pre-existed in a personal sense. The Spirit with which he was anointed, and through which the Eternal Father manifested Himself in him, was pre-existent, but not the man anointed of God, who learnt obedience by the things which he suffered. He existed only as a purpose, and his glory was a foregone conclusion before the foundation of the world. That it was not a fact at the time he spoke is evident from his words concerning his disciples in the same prayer: "*The glory which Thou gavest me, I HAVE GIVEN THEM.*" Understood as Mr. Barnett interprets the other statement, this would teach that the disciples, while yet in the flesh, and before Christ's death, were invested with the glory which he did not enter till after his suffering (Luke xxiv. 26), whereas it but teaches, in the intense language of a spiritual mind, that Jesus extended to his disciples a title to the glory he himself was to receive. A striking example of things to come, spoken of in the perfect tense, is found in Rom. viii. 29, 30.

The Spirit spoke through him while on earth. He said, "The words that I speak, I speak not of myself, but the Father gave me commandment what I should say and what I should speak." This accounts for many forms of speech that appear inconsistent with the idea that his existence dated from his birth. One of these is the expression on which Mr. Barnett lays emphasis: "Before Abraham was, I am." Mr. Barnett ignores the explanation of this which he attacks; or rather, he confines his attention to only one aspect of that explanation, and so makes easier work of his task than he otherwise would. That explanation is couched in the following words—*Twelve Lectures*, page 135: "This was Christ's answer to the incredulity excited by his statement: 'Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad.' The Jews thought he meant to insinuate that he was contemporary with Abraham; whereas he only meant to express the fact stated by Paul in the following words: 'These all (including Abraham,

see verse 8), died in faith, not *having received* the promises, *but having seen them afar off*.—(Heb. xi. 13.) It was this seeing of the promises of Christ afar off that made Abraham glad. It was the day presented in the promises that he saw, but as they almost always did, the Jews mistook Jesus, and as he was prone to do, he deepened their bewilderment by using another form of speech which still more obscured his meaning on the principle indicated in Matt. xiii. 11-15, a form of speech which, in one phrase, expressed two aspects of the truth concerning himself, viz., that he was purposed before Abraham, and that the Father, of whom he was the manifestation, existed before all." Mr. Barnett may ridicule, but it is impossible he can get rid of this explanation. It is impossible, for instance, to deny that the "day," that Abraham "saw," and was glad about, was a *future day*, for it is only "the day of Christ" (Phil. i. 6, 10; ii. 16; 2 Cor. i. 14), in its future glory that could inspire gladness. The "days of his flesh," which were burdened with "strong crying and tears" to the Messiah himself, could afford no joy to Abraham. It is impossible to deny that the Jews understood him literally, as Mr. Barnett in this instance would do, for they said, "Hast thou seen Abraham?" and it is impossible to deny two things—that Christ spoke to them in parable (Matthew xiii. 10-15) and that the Jews misunderstood his sayings.—(Jno. viii. 43; x. 19-21; xii. 34, 40.) In view of these facts, we are bound to seek a covered meaning in the statement in which he responded to them, and a meaning consistent with the plain teaching of the Word on the subject. Instead of this, Mr. Barnett reads it literally and disregards the patent facts of the case. The meaning of his statement is found in the double fact that "God was in Christ" by the Holy Spirit, and that Christ was "fore-ordained before the foundation of the world."—(1 Peter i. 19, 20; Heb. i. 4.) These two facts are expressed in the words, "Before Abraham was, I am." By this, he uttered the high mystery of godliness of which he was the exemplification, but in a way that only baffled and blinded his persecutors, without, at the same time, in any degree impairing the primary truth that he was the Son of God by Mary.

Mr. Barnett attempts to get rid of this by insisting that the language ("Before Abraham was, I am") ought to be useable by any believer, because "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world." This suggestion ignores the great difference between Christ and his brethren. Christ was the manifestation of God; they are not. Christ was the great pivot of God's operations in the salvation of the world. There could be no salvation without him. The hope of our race was bound up in him. Christ was the only one of our race without sin. He was the only one fit to approach God as a mediator between God and man. He was the only one in whom God was in association as his fellow, (Zechariah xiii. 7;) he was "the only begotten of the Father"—the only name given under heaven whereby men may be saved, the head of the church, the first-born among

many
such
were
was
by th
is not
be hi

Most
view
the f
repre
who r
to the
Mr. J
only
the Sc
his pu
is dea
be th
death,
goes
us th
unto
defini
is the
entere
"deat
again
Adam
dissol
it in
also t
bodily
that d
is the
came
"The
view,
releas

but having seen the promises of presented in the the Jews mistook ferment by using meaning on the oh, in one phrase, viz., that he was whom he was the idicule, but it is ble, for instance, glad about, was ; ii. 16; 2 Cor. i. ays of his flesh," Messiah himself, that the Jews would do, for ble to deny two xiii. 10-15) and 9-21; xii. 34, 40.) meaning in the sistent with the is, Mr. Barnett The meaning of Christ" by the undation of the expressed in the e high mystery way that only a, in any degree ary. t the language y any believer, world." This id his brethren. st was the great here could be no in him. Christ only one fit to as the only one xiii. 7;) he was nder heaven st-born among

many brethren, exalted above the rank of angels. The language which such an one could use would be meaningless in the mouths of those who were but the creature beneficiaries of the great scheme centring in Him. He was formed by the Spirit, filled with the Spirit, moved by the Spirit, used by the Spirit, foreshadowed by the Spirit in all the revelations of old, which is not true of his people. Therefore language expressing these facts would be highly inappropriate in their mouths.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

Most persons, in Mr. Barnett's estimation, will think the Christadelphian view of the death of Christ a ridiculously lame one, because it recognises the fact that the sinlessness of Christ enabled him, after suffering representatively, to rise from the dead, and become the giver of life to all who receive him by faith. No doubt this will appear "ridiculously lame" to those who are only acquainted with pulpit representation of the matter. Mr. Barnett tries to make it appear so in the eyes of such, and he will only succeed with them, and only with those of them who are ignorant of the Scriptures, or beyond the power of reason. How does he try to effect his purpose? By denying the Scripture testimony that "the wages of sin is death."—(Rom. vi. 23.) He argues that the death of the body cannot be the death Christ came to save men from, because all men die that death, whether they believe or not. The first answer to this is that it goes against scriptural definition on the subject. Genesis iii. 19, gives us the wages of sin in the following words:—"Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Let Mr. Barnett find any other Bible definition of the death that has passed upon all men if he can. This is the death alluded to by Paul in Rom. v. "By one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin."—(Rom. v. 12.) There is no other "death by sin" through one man, than the one recorded in Genesis. He again identifies it with death in the words "by man came *death*;" "In Adam all die." And a conclusive proof that Paul recognises death as the dissolution of the body, is found in the antithesis with which he associates it in one of the verses quoted, "Since by man came death, by man came also *the resurrection of the dead*." Surely he will not deny that this is a bodily resurrection that is meant. Its antithetic association with death shows that death is a departing of life from the body or person, just as resurrection is the returning of it. Yet Mr. Barnett denies that this is the death Jesus came to save us from, notwithstanding, too, that Jesus proclaims himself as "THE RESURRECTION." Consistency would compel him to adopt Swedenborg's view, and deny the resurrection altogether, except as expressing the soul's release from the body at death.

The second answer is, that Mr. Barnett ignores the fact that the salvation in question does not take effect till Christ returns from heaven. Christ's people die now, it is true; but the fact is not incompatible with the language of Jesus, which had reference to eternal results, and not the momentary aspect of things at the time he spoke. This could not be more clearly expressed than in his own words, "He that findeth his life shall lose it; he that *loseth his life* for my sake, the same shall find it."—(Matthew x. 39.) "Blessed are ye that *weep now*, for ye *shall be comforted*." Paul says of the existing order of things, "The things *which are seen* are *temporal* (or short lived), the things which are not seen (as yet) are eternal."—(2 Cor. iv. 18.) Hence he says, "We walk *by faith* and not by sight," (2 Cor. v. 7;) and if we ask him what faith is, we are met by the words "Faith is the substance of *things hoped for*, the evidence (or conviction) of *things not seen*."—(Heb. i. 1.) "We are saved," he elsewhere says, "by hope," (Rom. viii. 24;) and reasoning upon the subject he adds, "Now hope that *is seen* is not hope, for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for it? but when we hope for that we *see not*, then do we with patience *wait for it*."—(verse 25). Now the thing waited for and hoped for, is to be revealed or manifested, or brought into the possession of those hoping for it, at the return of Jesus from heaven. Peter says (1 Peter i. 13,) "Hope to the end for the grace that is to be *brought unto you* AT THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST." "Salvation" by the same apostle is described as a thing "READY TO BE REVEALED AT THE LAST TIME."—(1 Peter i. 5). "WHEN the chief shepherd shall appear," he says to the elders, "ye shall receive a crown of glory."—(1 Peter v. 4.)

From all which, it follows that we are to measure the result of Christ's work when upon earth, by what will be developed at *his coming*; when, as the prophet says "He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." Salvation from death will then be a fact. The dead will come forth, "those who have done good unto the resurrection of life, and those that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation."—(John v. 29.) This answers Mr. Barnett's question. "In what respect do the saved differ from the unsaved," since they both die. "Death will be swallowed up in victory" on that occasion, in the case of the righteous, and not as the clergy teach, when supposed righteous souls soar to heaven, as they falsely allege they do. Paul settles the point beyond contradiction. His words are, "When this corruptible (body) shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality, *THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written*, death is swallowed in victory;" a saying written in Isaiah xxv. having reference, as the context will show, to events to transpire in or about "the land of Judah." But the glorious events then to come to pass will spring from what Christ did when on earth. If he had not died, and especially if he had not risen, salvation would have been a nullity.—(1 Cor. xv. 17.) There is, therefore, the direct connection of cause and effect between the two, and for this reason, the

effec
expi
life'
(Joh
The
illus
orth
ough
M
the
on t
His
none
may
Chri
exis
on v
exti
resu
resu
on t
hast
prof
We
all
the
that
exis
will
will
Is
viti
this
unin
the
the
Mr.
bodi
him
to
hav
soul
does

t the salvation in
 Christ's people
 the language of
 centenary aspect of
 expressed than
 at *loseth his life*
 "Blessed are ye
 existing order
 short lived), the
 v. 18.) Hence
 . 7;); and if we
 the substance of
 t seen."—(Heb.
 n. viii. 24;); and
 is not hope, for
 ope for that we
 15). Now the
 ed, or brought
 us from heaven.
 us from heaven.
 "Salvation"
 REALED AT THE
 shall appear,"
 Peter v. 4.)
 sult of Christ's
 ning; when, as
 be satisfied."
 forth, "those
 hat have done
 r. 29.) This
 ed differ from
 up in victory"
 clergy teach,
 llege they do.
 "When this
 shall put on
 written, death
 reference, as
 id of Judah."
 hat Christ did
 d not risen,
 therefore, the
 is reason, the

effect is elliptically associated with the cause in phrases employed by Jesus to express the whole matter comprehensively, such as "I give my sheep eternal life" (John x. 28); "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life" (John iii. 36); "I am the resurrection and the life."—(John xi. 25.) These, Mr. Barnett, with the unwisdom of orthodoxy, construes literally, illustrating the fact already stated, that in its treatment of the Scriptures, orthodoxy is literal where it ought to be figurative, and figurative where it ought to be literal—the admitted literal facts in each case being the judges.

Mr. Barnett's next objection to salvation by resurrection, is astounding on the part of a writer professing a belief in God. He says it must be a fiction, on the ground that God cannot reproduce a man who has gone out of existence. His argument is couched in the following words:—"The resurrection of a nonentity is an absurdity. That cannot be raised which does not exist. It may be replied that the saints have a life reserved for them—hid with Christ in God. But reserved for whom? For saints who once existed but exist no longer? Such a reserved life is unavailable, for there will be no one on whom to bestow it. The saints for whom it is reserved are doomed to extinction before they receive it, and *when once extinct, they cannot be resuscitated* because (as far as they are concerned,) there will be nothing to resuscitate!!!" This is certainly a very extraordinary argument, and recoils on the "rev." gentlemen in a way he cannot have anticipated. In his eager haste to get rid of the Christadelphian argument, he actually foregoes his own profession of faith. Does not Mr. Barnett believe in resurrection of the body? We presume there is only one answer to this, if he is thoroughly orthodox, for all orthodox believers believe in it, but if his argument quoted above has the smallest element of logic in it, it is an impossibility. His proposition is—*that cannot be raised which does not exist!!!* Does the body of Abraham exist? No! Therefore it is impossible to resuscitate it, and therefore there will be no resurrection of Abraham, though God has pledged His word there will! This is the upshot of Mr. Barnett's reasoning.

Is there the smallest streak of truth in his reasoning? By no means. He vitiate his whole attempt by a false construction of the word "raise." If this is to be understood in the sense of "lift," doubtless his conclusion is unimpeachable. That cannot be lifted which is not in existence. But is this the sense in which "raise" is affirmed of God's purpose towards the dead? That he will lift their bodies out of the ground? Mr. Barnett himself will be ashamed of such a suggestion. Their bodies are not in the ground. They are returned to dust. Mr. Barnett himself will be compelled to admit that to raise the dead, is to re-fashion them, to re-animate them, to re-produce them; to make alive again those who have died. His argument would lead one to suppose that it is the immortal soul that is the subject of resurrection, for he says that cannot be raised which does not exist, and as, in his opinion, all that exists of a person in death is the

soul, the soul only can be raised from the grave, and not the body. In what strange anomalies would even this view involve him. How can the immortal soul be raised from the grave when it never goes into the grave, but shoots straight to heaven or hell on quitting "this mortal coil?" How can the immortal soul be raised from the dead when it never dies? And if it be suggested that "dead" means moral depravity, how can the righteous be raised from the dead when they are not morally depraved? Again, what is the use of "raising" an immortal being who, leaving the body, departs to a state of perfect bliss or consummate woe? and on what principle can the bringing of an immortal soul from "beyond the realms of time and space," to revisit "the glimpses of the moon," be called "raising" it! Is it not bringing it down, depressing it, degrading it?

Leaving Mr. Barnett to crack these nuts at his leisure, we confront him with the blasphemy he has uttered against God. He denies the power of the Almighty to reproduce an extinct man. He says God might make a man like one who has lived and perished; but "*beyond that even Omnipotence cannot go!*" He can make us, but if we are destroyed, He cannot re-make us! He can bring us into existence, but if we die, He cannot bring us back again, unless there is a something left to enable Him to do it; which, after all, would not be doing it, because in that case, we should not have gone out of existence. He can hold us in being—He can preserve us; but if for one instant He allows us to go out of being, it is out of His power to restore us!!! Of the righteous Mr. Barnett observes: "Resurrection to them is not a grim impossibility, for *there is no blank—no break—in their real life.*" That is, God can raise them, because it is not difficult to do so! If it were difficult to do, He could not do it! These are the extraordinary and blasphemous propositions Mr. Barnett finds it necessary to make, in bolstering up the lies of Paganism. Against them, Christadelphians place the dead wall of faith in the power of promises of God, who can and will perform His promised wonder to the dead, by restoring them to life and identity through Christ, who is the "Resurrection and the Life." We know that no man can raise the dead; but "with God nothing is impossible," and in Him we put reliance.

After marshalling such arguments of straw against the Christadelphian view of the death of Christ, Mr. Barnett proceeds to parade the orthodox view with equally singular results. He says "Christ died in vicarious sacrifice:" that is, a substitutionary sacrifice. He underwent the punishment due to sin, *in the room of sinners.* He stood in their shoes, and suffered what they would have had to suffer if he had not suffered it. Otherwise it was not "a vicarious (substitutionary or representative) sacrifice." Now what does Mr. Barnett say is the punishment due to sin? We have only to ask orthodox teaching in general to ascertain, for Mr. Barnett comes forward as the representative of orthodoxy. The orthodox answer is, that the punishment due to sin is the eternal torture of the immortal soul in hell. Now is Mr. Barnett

prepared to the sul days? M and sinne body of C 4; Peter Heb. ii. { constitut disproof truly Chu a banish possess a

Mr. B: (death) (to remin He must of the co principle all fruits the Chri it is sour (even on end befo is narrow with suc

Mr. B "repreat

1.—" that sinn

2.—" "the wa

and liab

3.—V that the the "sy

blood of

4.—" materia

blood sh

be suffe (Lev. x can see

(who c

body. In what
can the immortal
grave, but shoots
How can the
? And if it be
the righteous be
Again, what is
ody, departs to a
principle can the
time and space,
" it! Is it not

confront him with
e power of the
make a man like
ven Omnipotence
nnot re-make us!
; us back again.
i, after all, would
out of existence.
stant He allows
Of the righteous
impossibility, for
d can raise them,
le could not do
ms Mr. Barnett
anism. Against
wer of promises
o the dead, by
Resurrection and
ith God nothing

Christadelphian
e orthodox view
ous sacrifice:
nent due to sin,
hat they would
not "a vicar-
what does Mr.
ask orthodox
d as the repre-
ishment due to
s Mr. Barnett

prepared to affirm that Christ underwent this? Did his immortal soul descend to the sulphurous domain of devils, and endure eternal damnation in three days? Must it not have been so, if he died a *vicarious* sacrifice for sinners, and sinners are liable to such a doom? But is it not a fact that it was **THE BODY** of Christ that was offered in sacrifice (Heb. x. 10; Col. i. 22; Rom. vii. 4; Peter ii. 24), and that the sacrifice consisted in **HIS DEATH**?—(Rom. v. 10; Heb. ii. 9, 14; Heb. ix. 15). Is it not the transaction of **THE CROSS** that constituted the sacrifice for sin? Yea, it is even so; and herein lies both the disproof of orthodoxy and the evidence of the Christadelphian faith. For truly Christ "died for us," and died the death to which we are liable—not a banishment to a state of immortal woe, but a deprivation of the life we possess as created beings.

Mr. Barnett turns round and says, If this is so, it is strange that the result (death) continues. We have already answered this, but we refer to it again, to remind him that the same objection applies to his own view of the matter. He must admit that "the death of the body," as he would express it, is one of the consequences of sin, for it is specified as such in Genesis. Upon what principle does he explain its continuance? Sorrow, suffering, tears, &c., are all fruits of sin. Do they not continue? If Mr. Barnett's contention against the Christadelphian view, on the ground that death is yet occurrent, is sound, it is sound against himself; for he is bound to admit the consequences of sin (even on his theory) to be still operating. But the fact is, we must see the end before we see the work of Christ in its results. Mr. Barnett's argument is narrow and childish in ignoring this. It is no wonder if even a wise man, with such a bad cause to defend, is forced into such a line of argument.

Mr. Barnett, anticipating a demand for scriptural evidence in support of his "representation of the nature and method of salvation," quotes texts:

1.—"*The soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" This is to prove that "the soul that sinneth, it shall enter upon deeper sorrows!"

2.—"*All have sinned and come short of the glory of God,*" and though "the wages of sin is death," he quotes this to prove that all are immortal, and liable to go to hell for ever.

3.—"*Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission;*" this is to prove that the body had nothing to do with sin! The sin of the "essential being:" the "spiritual," immaterial, immortal soul—required the shedding of the blood of the material body!

4.—"*The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.*" How could the material blood of Jesus cleanse an immaterial soul from guilt? How could *blood shedding* be a "vicarious" suffering, if *hell burning* was the thing to be suffered? On the principle that "the life of all flesh is in the blood," (Lev. xvii. 11; Gen. ix. 4,) and forfeiture of life is the consequence of sin, one can see how the spilling of the life blood of a spotless representative sufferer (who could be raised after suffering), is efficacious for the salvation of those

whom he represents; but in Mr. Barnett's theory there is no connection, but confusion and mystery deep as night.

5.—“*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.*” This is good for both sides, and requires no answer.

6.—“*If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.*” If Mr. Barnett quotes this to prove the literal immortality of the righteous, he must abandon immortal-soulism; for the statement implies that those who do not keep Christ's saying, shall SEE DEATH, which is the converse of the lot of the righteous. This conclusion excludes the notion that all men are immortal. Mr. Barnett may say, Well, what does the passage mean? The answer is, it means that those who are Christ's will never sink into final death—that is, death from which there will be no escape by resurrection. Mr. Barnett will naturally demur to receive this on a mere *ipse dixit*, and therefore we give him the evidence of its truth in the words of Christ. Jesus did not mean to say that his people would never taste of death, but that they should never see it in the sense of being given over to it. “He that believeth on me,” he says, “*though he were dead, yet shall he live.*”—(Jno. xi. 25.) “This is the Father's will that of all that He hath given, I should *lose nothing*, but should raise it up at the last day.” Here Jesus puts the losing of his sheep in contrast with their resurrection; if they are not raised they are lost. This is in harmony with Paul. “If Christ be not raised . . . then they that are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED.”—(Cor. xv. 18.) But Mr. Barnett will have it that they are immortal now. Consequently, their safety could not be affected by resurrection one way or other, and Paul and Christ were wrong in putting forward their resurrection as the *sine qua non* of their salvation. But Mr. Barnett is wrong, and Jesus and Paul are right. When men are dead, they are dead, and if not raised from the dead, they are lost. Then it may be enquired, why should Jesus have employed such language as “never see death?” The answer is, first, Jesus spoke of things as related to ultimate results; second, it is in harmony with his general manner of speech. Both points are illustrated by such a statement as “Let the dead bury their dead.” Those that are under the power of death, and destined to disappear in it, he speaks of as “dead;” but those that are destined to live, even though for the moment dead, he does not describe by that term. Of this we have an instance in the case of Lazarus. Jesus heard that Lazarus was sick (John xi. 3), and instead of hastening to his relief, he stayed where he was that Lazarus might die, and his power afterwards be exemplified in the resurrection of Lazarus. In reference to this, he said to his disciples, “This sickness is not unto death, but that the Son of God might be glorified.” The sickness was not unto death, though Lazarus died, because Lazarus was to be raised again. On the very same principle, the sickness of Christ's people is not unto death. They do not see death in the scriptural sense. Though really dead for the time being, they only sleep, because they are to

rise ag
In thi
discipl
Jesus t
to be
the Sp
AS THO
in whi
7.—
Why s
salvati
who et
both t
“wher
immor
himsel
metho
by Ch
8.—
which
John :
Paul i
fight,
is laid
shall
from t
9.—
Paul :
“the
return
sente
this ir
of thi
10.—
the fe
any m
Barne
and n
doctri
hopes.
preac
resurr
when

re is no connection, but
 alt be saved." This is
 ath." If Mr. Barnett
 teous, he must abandon
 who do not keep Christ's
 t of the righteous. This
 rtal. Mr. Barnett may
 is, it means that those
 t is, death from which
 Barnett will naturally
 refore we give him the
 d not mean to say that
 ould never see it in the
 is," he says, "though he
 This is the Father's
 thing, but should raise
 his sheep in contrast
 it. This is in harmony
 n they that are fallen
 Mr. Barnett will have
 safety could not be
 Christ were wrong in
 their salvation. But
 When men are dead,
 re lost. Then it may
 language as "never
 things as related
 s general manner of
 ent as "Let the dead
 eath, and destined to
 are destined to live,
 that term. Of this
 i that Lazarus was
 he stayed where he
 e exemplified in the
 his disciples, "This
 ight be glorified."
 ecause Lazarus was
 ickness of Christ's
 e scriptural sense.
 ecause they are to

rise again. The length of the interval makes no difference to their position. In this sense Jesus used the word "sleep" with reference to Lazarus. The disciples "thought that he spoke of taking of rest in sleep." Then said Jesus unto them *plainly*, "Lazarus is dead."—(John xi. 14.) Where there is to be a resurrection to life, the interval of death, in the native language of the Spirit, is not recognised. God calleth those that be not (but are to be) AS THOUGH THEY WERE. Hence, "never see death" means never see that state in which all is death for ever.

7.—*O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?* Why should Mr. Barnett quote this to prove "the nature and method of (his) salvation?" It is clean against him. It involves the fact that the righteous who employ the language at the resurrection, have been, till then, in bondage both to death and the grave, which Mr. Barnett does not allow. It is only "when this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality," that these words are applicable, as Mr. Barnett may satisfy himself by consulting the context. They entirely disprove "the nature and method of salvation" that Mr. Barnett preaches, and establish the views held by Christadelphians.

8.—*Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord.* Why? Because of that which awaits them. "He that loseth his life shall find it."—(Matt. x. 39; John xii. 25.) "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Paul is a good example of what it means. He says, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. HENCEFORTH there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me AT THAT DAY" (the day of his appearing and kingdom, as appears from the 1st verse of the chapter).—(2 Tim. iv. 8.)

9.—*Having a desire to depart and be with Christ which is far better.* Paul ignored the interval of death, which to him would be no interval, for "the dead know not anything." The end of his life would be equivalent to the returning and being with Christ. Therefore he classed them together in one sentence, when giving incidental expression to his individual hope. More of this in dealing with Mr. Barnett's remarks on the Christadelphian exposition of this verse.

10.—*That I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death, if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.* Why Mr. Barnett should quote this, it is impossible to divine. It destroys his "nature and method" of salvation completely, and substitutes the Christadelphian doctrine of resurrection as the great subject matter of Paul's doctrines and hopes. The resurrection was characteristically the doctrine that Paul preached. Mr. Barnett sneers at it as "this little doctrine of a little resurrection," thereby identifying himself with the Athenian mockers, who, when they heard Paul speak of the resurrection, said, "What doth this

babbler say?"—(Acts xvii. 18.) Paul attached crowning importance to this "little doctrine of a little resurrection." When a man denied the resurrection, he considered his faith overthrown.—(2 Tim. ii. 18.) Paul, as appears by the verse at the head of this paragraph, looked to the resurrection as his hope. "What advantageth it me," says he, "if the dead rise not?" If Paul had entertained Mr. Barnett's view of immortalization and heaven-translation, he would doubtless have shared Mr. Barnett's contempt for "the little doctrine of a little resurrection," but being unspoiled by the philosophy and vain deceit which has corrupted Mr. Barnett and all his class, he clung with desire to "the little doctrine," and strove if by any means he might attain unto "the little resurrection."

These are the ten passages that Mr. Barnett quotes, in proof of "the nature and method of salvation" from an orthodox point of view. We leave the reader to determine how far they serve his purpose.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Mr. Barnett certainly disposes of this subject in a very cool and summary manner. In twelve lines, he dismisses 109 pages of argument and testimony, which he "pooch-poochs" as "vagaries in relation to unfulfilled prophecy." His plea is that he has "no space" for the refutation of the "vagaries." No space! Was Mr. Barnett tied to 54 pages? Would the printer under no consideration go beyond that limit? If he is like other printers, we should imagine he would gladly have lengthened the cords to any length of Mr. Barnett's liking; but we suspect Mr. Barnett did not want more space. He did not like to attempt the difficult task of upsetting the sure testimony of God's Word, in Old and New Testaments, as to God's purpose in due time, to establish a kingdom in the earth, which will destroy and supersede all others. His efforts against the mortality of man he found difficult enough; but this would fairly have baffled his ingenuity; so he avails himself of that discretion which is said to be the better part of valour, and declines the conflict.

For the evidence which Mr. Barnett shirks, we must refer the reader to the aforesaid 109 pages in *Twelve Lectures*. At the same time we cannot allow Mr. Barnett's remark to pass altogether unchallenged in this place. He styles the doctrine of the kingdom a vagary. Is he prepared to say that the things predicted by God's prophets are vagaries? This is what his remark amounts to; for they all predict the kingdom believed in by Christadelphians.

We shall only attempt the merest sample of evidence in this place—having gone into the matter in detail in the book already referred to. First, as to the general form of the "vagary" ridiculed by Mr. Barnett. There is one prediction which no one professing a belief in the Bible can gainsay: "In the

days of those
never be destr
shall break in
ever."—(Dan.

2.—That v
under divine
kingdoms of
ever."—(Rev.

that day ther
3.—That in
of the kingdo

the nations w
time they sha
shall be gath
they walk ar
Is. ii. 2-4.)

from Jerusak
strong nation
and their spe
nation, neith

4.—That
reconstituted
of Israel from
on every side
one nation in
king of them
divided into

5.—That
occupy the tl
give unto
government

and his king
from hencefo
RIGHTREOUS R
judgment in

dwell safely.
nations shal
kingdom, gl

serve and ot
A host o
dismissed by
because "th

importance to this
 the resurrection,
 as appears by the
 action as his hope
 ?" If Paul had
 en-translation, he
 the little doctrine
 sophy and vain
 clung with desire
 might attain unto

of of "the nature
 . We leave this

l and summary
 t and testimony,
 lled prophecy."
 he "vagaries."
 rinter under no
 ters, we should
 r length of Mr.
 ore space. He
 re testimony of
 in due time, to
 vede all others.
 ough; but this
 mself of that
 d declines the

e reader to the
 cannot allow
 oe. He styles
 at the things
 ark amounts
 ans.
 place—having
 first, as to the
 There is one
 say: "In the

days of those things, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume *all these kingdoms*, and it shall stand for ever."—(Dan. ii. 44.)

2.—That when this kingdom is established, all the world will be under divine jurisdiction: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever."—(Rev. xi. 15.) "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name One."—(Zech. xiv. 9.)

3.—That in that era of human history, Jerusalem will be the metropolis of the kingdom of God, from which universal law will irradiate, and to which the nations will periodically repair for worship and enlightenment. "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord to Jerusalem, neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil hearts."—(Jer. iii. 17; Is. ii. 2-4.) "The law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people, and shall rebuke strong nations afar off. 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."—(Micah iv. 2-3.)

4.—That at that time, the Jews will be gathered from dispersion and reconstituted a great nation in the land of Israel: "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 of them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."—(Ezek. xxxvii. 21-22.)

5.—That in the age referred to in the foregoing testimonies, Jesus will occupy the throne of David, and rule the whole world: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David."—(Luke i. 23.) "The government shall be upon his shoulder. . . . Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, but upon the throne of David and his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with justice and judgment from henceforth even for ever."—(Isaiah ix. 6.) "I will raise unto David a **RIGHTEOUS BRANCH**, and a king shall reign and prosper, and execute justice and judgment in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely."—(Jer. xxiii. 3-6.) "All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him."—(Psalm lxxii. 11.) "There was given unto him a kingdom, glory, and dominion, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve and obey him."—(Dan. vii. 14.)

A host of evidence, of which the foregoing are the merest samples, is dismissed by Mr. Barnett, on a second plea that refutation is unnecessary, because "the foundation" is wrong. What does he mean by the foundation?

He means the proposition *in support of which the testimony is quoted*, viz., that the kingdom is a political institution of God. What a remarkable piece of logic! He considers the doctrine wrong, therefore, he won't look at the evidence! He has made up his mind, therefore it is utterly needless to go into the argument! One would almost imagine Mr. Barnett considered himself on an equal footing with the pretender at Rome. No intelligent reader will follow Mr. Barnett in such a course.

The "foundation"—that is, the doctrine itself—Mr. Barnett pronounces "utterly worthless," in the face of two statements which he considers justify him in discarding 109 pages of evidence. 1st, "My kingdom is NOT OF THIS WORLD." This is amusing. If the proposition had been "The kingdom of God will be set up by worldly men, and founded on worldly principles," Mr. Barnett might with justice have considered the statement quoted a decision of the controversy; but the proposition is "The kingdom of God will be established on the earth." How does Christ's statement destroy this? Was not Christ upon earth? was he "of this world?" Did Christ not say to his disciples, "Ye are *not of this world?*" Does Mr. Barnett mean to say they were not real men, walking the earth, eating and drinking like other people? Will a kingdom of God upon earth be *of this world*. Not at all. It will be *of heaven*, for the God of heaven will set it up, but it will be on earth for all that.

The second statement which Mr. Barnett considers sufficient to upset hundreds of passages in the prophets, is as follows: "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death *till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*"—(Matt. xvi. 28.) Mr. Barnett does not say what he understands by this. It would be curious to know; but as he quotes it in opposition to the prophetic doctrine of the kingdom of God, it is quite certain he regards it as an inculcation of orthodoxy in some way. How it can be construed in this way it is impossible to imagine, and as it is not very important to know, Mr. Barnett may be left to expound it for orthodox purposes, while we point to the scriptural meaning. That meaning is apparent in all the three places where the statement is recorded. *It is in each case followed by the narrative of the transfiguration.* It, therefore, follows that Christ's statement had reference to that event. That event was a visional representation of his coming in his kingdom. This we ascertain beyond a doubt. First, it is styled "a vision." "Tell no man *the vision* till the Son of Man be risen from the dead." Second, Christ "appeared in glory."—(Luke ix. 31.) The fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and glistening. This was not reality, for when the vision was past, Christ was found as before. A vision is not a reality.—(Acts xii. 9.) It was a representation, in advance of the actual event, of the coming of the Son of man in his kingdom. Peter, who was one of the witnesses of it, refers to it afterwards in this sense. He says "We have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made

known unto you
EYE WITNESSES o
and glory, wher
This is my belo
came from heav
Peter i. 16-18.)

This is all pla
It is only a wro
is Mr. Barnett's
he sets one par
a weapon wher
majority of ot
want of unde
The system, pe
must be let of
that the man, a
as an active aic
God of none eff

This is the ma
About two-th
anticipated th
consequently,
to say than it

Mr. Barnett
"savage exul
he applies to
of human n
submission.

One's attitude
his attitude to
contend earne
down" of "in
the knowledg
Barnett mista
sincere attac
mistake.

While chid
glories in the
possibility of

ny is quoted, viz.,
remarkable piece
won't look at the
ly needless to go
arnett considered
No intelligent

arnett pronounces
considers justify
n is not of this
The kingdom of
principles," Mr.
ted a decision of
of God will be
stroy this? Was
it not say to his
ean to say they
te other people?
all. It will be
on earth for all

cient to upset
ne standing here
n coming in his
he understands
osition to the
ie regards it as
ued in this way
ow, Mr. Barnett
e point to the
e places where
he narrative of
t had reference
his coming in
; is styled "a
om the dead."
ie fashion of
nd glistening.
und as before.
esentation, in
his kingdom.
in this sense.
hen we made

known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were EYE WITNESSES of his majesty, for he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in the holy mount."—(2 Peter i. 16-18.)

This is all plain enough. Scripture is in thorough harmony with itself. It is only a wrong theory applied to any part of it that makes it clash. This is Mr. Barnett's plight. Instead of "rightly dividing the word of truth," he sets one part at war with another part. He makes use of one passage as a weapon wherewith to overthrow and destroy the teaching of an overwhelming majority of other passages, and that without reason; but through a sheer want of understanding in relation to the passages he makes use of. The system, perhaps, is more to blame than the man, and therefore the man must be let off with gentle dealing. Nevertheless, it is none the less true that the man, as a part of the system, shares the responsibility of the system as an active aider and abettor of the universal process of making the word of God of none effect, and wresting the Scriptures to the destruction of thousands.

THE NATURE OF MAN.

This is the main question to which Mr. Barnett has turned his attention. About two-thirds of his book is taken up with it. We have, in part anticipated the subject in answering his criticisms on other topics, and shall consequently, have the less to say in this section. Nevertheless, there is more to say than it is to be feared can be said in the limits of a pamphlet.

Mr. Barnett finds fault with Christadelphians for what he calls their "savage exultation" over the mortality of human nature. This phrase he applies to their denunciation of immortal soulism. He thinks the fact of human mortality ought instead to be met with devout and silent submission. In this observation Mr. Barnett scarcely shows himself wise. One's attitude in the presence of abstract truth is a very different thing from his attitude towards a pretentious negation of the truth. It is a duty to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, to the "casting down" of "imagination and every high thought that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God."—(2 Cor. x. 4. 5.) This we have done, and Mr. Barnett mistakes earnestness for "savage exultation." We must accept his sincere attachment to the heathen errors exposed, as the explanation of his mistake.

While chiding Christadelphians on one hand, Mr. Barnett, on the other, glories in the popular doctrine of natural immortality. He "shrinks from the possibility of extinction as the dreariest of all possibilities." He does not see

that in this very expression, he gives *prima facie* evidence that in this sinful state, the possibility referred to is a dead certainty. Death is the wages of sin; and it is only natural that the "wages of sin" should, in the divine arrangements, be the "dreariest of all possibilities." But Mr. Barnett prefers the fiction of the immortality of the soul. He says it "gives scope for the indulgence of gorgeous visions of progress in wisdom, in purity, and in blessedness." Perhaps it does; but so does the true doctrine of immortality—a conditional immortality by resurrection; and there is this difference in favor of the truth: that while the immortality of divine promise holds before the mind a vista of supernal blessedness, above all we can imagine, it does not bring with it the vista of another kind, which belongs to Mr. Barnett's theory. Mr. Barnett has to think, not only of "gorgeous visions," but of horrible nightmare visions. He has to realise, not only measureless progress in wisdom, purity, and blessedness, but inconceivable depths of infamy and anguish—unutterable scenes of fiendishness, suffering and woe. While gazing at the celestial glory pictured to his imagination by the popular dogma, and listening to the sound of harps, he cannot close his ears to the yells of the damned and the hiss of eternal fires. He has to think of hell as well as heaven. About hell, he says very little, and only by polite allusion. Is he ashamed of it? Or is he loth to linger on the dreadful theme? If he feels so now, with the blunt and corrupt sensibilities of our common nature, how does he expect to spend a happy eternity with the knowledge that millions of fellow creatures writhe in suffering to which there can be no end or alleviation?

Mr. Barnett ought to put both sides of the immortal soul theory forward, in asking a judgment on its beauties. He fails to do this, evidently foreseeing a very different verdict from that which he tries to force at the very outset of the discussion. He also anticipates the answer to be made to his glowing representations, viz., that all the moral advantages he alleges in favour of the popular doctrine, are derivable from the Bible doctrine of conditional immortality. He denies this on the ground that an interval of death precedes it. The logic of this is so very obscure that we cannot detect it. If immortality, after resurrection, is so entirely marred by a short prevalence of death, how is it that the period of non-existence, which Mr. Barnett must admit transpired before we were born, has not interfered with the glories of the immortality he alleges we are now possessed of? "Oh, but," says Mr. Barnett, "extinction of being is a catastrophe which no resurrection can remedy, and which, as I have already shown (!) renders the very idea irrational." Logic extraordinary! "The demolition of a house, is a catastrophe which no re-building can remedy, and which renders the very idea of re-building utterly irrational!!!" One would imagine the logic lay just the other way. "The demolition of a house is a catastrophe which re-building will entirely remedy, and which makes the idea of re-building highly feasible." Mr. Barnett would doubtless say, "But a man is not a house." No, but will he deny this, that

there is just of man, as He cannot strange position in the God! He can make that He can in death is the very ooc

But Mr. resurrection is to be pres "little resu uses no ar; therefore si however, re Mr. Barnett There is no to a certain are chosen, "Straight i that find i not be able. we find Je is put in pl be saved."— in well doin life."—(Ro understand 16.) Testin properly co he profess his own the than saved devil than attempted in the Bible right, has s Noah and i two daugh whole gene few believe millions al

that in this sinful
 with is the wages of
 could, in the divine
 Mr. Barnett prefers
 gives scope for the
 ivity, and in blessed
 of immortality—a
 difference in favor
 e holds before the
 ne, it does not bring
 nett's theory. Mr.
 of horrible night-
 vgress in wisdom,
 ny and anguish—
 ile gazing at the
 gma, and listening
 f the damned and
 heaven. About
 shamed of it? Or
 ow, with the blunt
 expect to spend a
 creatures writhe in

rtal soul theory
 ails to do this,
 he tries to force
 answer to be made
 ages he alleges in
 Bible doctrine of
 t an interval of
 cannot detect it.
 short prevalence
 r. Barnett must
 the glories of the
 says Mr. Barnett,
 can remedy, and
 tional." Logic
 ophe which no
 building utterly
 er way. "The
 ntirely remedy,
 Barnett would
 deny this, that

there is just the same relation between the power of God and the formation of man, as there is between the power of man and the building of a house? He cannot deny it as a reasonable and devout man. If he deny it, what a strange position for a professed minister of God to take. He has so little faith in the God that he preaches, that though he admits He can destroy, he denies He can make alive again. He admits He can give a man being, but denies that He can restore that being if it is once taken away! Extinction of being in death is just the catastrophe that constitutes resurrection a remedy, and the very occurrence which gives rise to the idea of resurrection.

But Mr. Barnett's principal objection to the Christadelphian doctrine of resurrection is, that it is limited to a particular section of mankind. This, it is to be presumed, is the meaning of his otherwise meaningless joke about a "little resurrection." He quotes no Scripture in support of his objection: he uses no argument. He only demurs. The evidence in Lecture iv. (a) therefore stands unimpeached, and it is unnecessary to repeat it. We will, however, remind readers of the general sentiment of Scripture as opposed to Mr. Barnett's theory and in favour of that which he demurs to and condemns. There is nothing more conspicuous than the fact that the Bible limits salvation to a certain class—a "little flock."—(Luke xv. 32.) "Many are called, but few are chosen," is the expression which this doctrine receives.—(Matt. xx. 16.) "Straight is the gate and narrow is the way," says Jesus, "*and few there be that find it.*"—(Matt. vii. 14.) "Many shall strive to enter in and shall not be able." Descending from these express intimations to general principles, we find Jesus limiting eternal life to "his sheep."—(John x. 28.) This is put in plainer language, thus: "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*"—(Mark xvi. 16.) Again, "*to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour and immortality (God will reward) eternal life.*"—(Rom. ii. 7.) Again, "*He that wandereth out of the way of understanding, shall remain in the congregation of the dead.*"—(Prov. xxi. 16.) Testimonies of this description are endless, so that Mr. Barnett's objection, properly construed, is an objection to the teaching of the Word of God, which he professed to expound. Not only so, but his objection is inconsistent with his own theory! Does not Mr. Barnett believe that more will be damned than saved? that more go to hell than heaven? that more belong to the devil than to God? Is his own view, then, not equally open to the attempted sneer about "littleness?" He is unwise, as a professed believer in the Bible, to talk about "littleness," for littleness, as to the number in the right, has always characterised God's moral triumphs in the earth. Witness Noah and his family out of the world's population at the flood; Lot and his two daughters out of the plains of Sodom; Caleb and Joshua out of the whole generation of Israelites that came out of Egypt; the prophets and a few believers out of whole generations of Jews; Jesus and his disciples out of millions alive in the day of Tiberius Cæsar. God's interest among men

has always been a "little" affair, and will be until the world in its vain generations has passed entirely away, and God's jewels of all ages have been made up, by resurrection, into a multitude that no man can number.

But perhaps Mr. Barnett's objection principally relates to the limitation of responsibility. He would have all men raised—Caribs, Kaffirs, Hottentots, Hindoos, idiots, lunatics, babies, louts, ignoramuses—every human being of every description that has ever lived since man was placed upon the earth. In this he but follows the dictation of orthodoxy, and, as a matter of course, breaks his head against both reason and the Scriptures. Taking the Scriptures first: nothing is more clear than that the ignorant and incapable are irresponsible, and destined to pass away with the other ephemera of the universe. This teaching arises upon two kinds of testimony: first, that which declares the non-resurrection of these classes; and second, such as enunciates principles that, logically applied, make their resurrection impossible. As an example of the first, we append the following:—

They are dead, *they shall not live*. They are deceased, *they shall not rise*. Therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them and made all their memory to perish.—(Is. xxvi. 13, 14.)

They shall sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake, saith the King whose name is the Lord of Hosts.—(Jer. li. 5, 7.)

They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches, none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him, for the redemption of their soul (*nephesh*—life) is precious, and it *ceaseth for ever*. . . . Like sheep they are laid in the grave; DEATH SHALL FEED ON THEM. . . . He shall go to the generation of his father; *they shall never see light*. *Man that is in honour and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish.*"—(Psalm xlix. 6, 7, 14, 19, 20.)

The second kind of testimony is abundantly indicated in the New Testament. We have it in the words of Jesus: "*This is the (ground of) condemnation that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil.*"—(John iii. 19.) Again, "*If ye were blind, YE SHOULD HAVE NO SIN.*"—(John ix. 41.) "If I had not come among them and done works which none other man did, *they had not had sin.*" Paul expresses it, perhaps, in plainer language, "*Sin is not imputed where there is no law.*"—(Rom. v. 13.) "Where there is no law, *there is no transgression.*"—(Rom. iv. 15.) "As many as have sinned without law, *shall perish without law.*"—(Rom. ii. 12.) "The time of this ignorance, *God winked at.*"—(Acts xvii. 31.) "The Gentiles are alienated from the life of God, *through the ignorance that is in them.*"—(Eph. iv. 18.) These and similar declarations enunciate the principle that where there is a state of ignorance, there is no responsibility, and that existence consequently terminates in the grave without judicial prospects. Mr. Barnett fights against

this pr
basis c
that m
myth c
but the
disapp
than th
law d
Popul

Mr.
mome
it. W
are ig
so, wh
that d
from e
unmix
said t
1 Cor.
gospel
LIGHT
God h
way o
mome

If t
shall
unutt
govern
barba
to per
driver
salvat
deride
categ
standi
death
script
to a
happi
Bal
the c
Babie
capab

ld in its vain
ages have been
iber.

e limitation of
ce, Hottentots
man being of
pon the earth.
tter of course.

Taking the
and incapable
hemera of the
r: first, that
ond, such as
on impossible.

shall not rise,
air memory to

King whose

multitude of
, nor give to
hesh—life) in
re laid in the
! go to the
is in honour
lm xlix. 6, 7,

r Testament.
condemnation
r than light
were blind,
ome among
ot had sin."
ruled where
there is no
at law, shall
rance, God
the life of
These and
a state of
onsequently
ghts against

this principle. On what ground? He does not advance one. Doubtless, the basis of his hostility is the assumption that all men have immortal souls that must exist to all eternity in some state or other. Believing the Pagan myth of natural immortality, a man is, doubtless, forced into this position; but that out of sight, and dealing only with reason and Scripture, opposition disappears, so far as true logic is concerned. Nothing can be more reasonable than that irresponsible beings should not be judicially dealt with. Human law does not deal with them, but leaves them entirely out of account. Popular theology makes God less just than man.

Mr. Barnett has only to face his doctrine of universal resurrection for one moment, to see its absurdities and enormities, and like an honest man, abandon it. What would he do with "heathens" when raised to judgment? They are ignorant, brutish, debased, swinish. Would he send them to heaven? If so, what is the use of the gospel, and where would be the scriptural principle that darkness, ignorance and carnal-mindedness, bring death and alienation from eternal life?—(Prov. xxi. 16; Romans viii. 6. 13; Ephesians iii. 18.) If unmixed barbarism is a sure passport to salvation, in what sense can it be said that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation?"—(Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 21); that Christ hath brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel*—(2 Tim. i. 10), and that Paul was sent to win men from DARKNESS TO LIGHT in order that they may be saved.—(Acts xxvi. 18.) Why is it that God has made any attempt to enlighten and reform mankind at all, if the surest way of saving them was to let them alone? The suggestion will not for one moment bear investigation.

If this is the case with the theory of "heathens" securing salvation, what shall we say of that version of the matter which dooms them all to the unutterable and endless agonies of hell? In what a fearful light is the moral government of God placed, if we are to believe that the poor untutored barbarian or idiotic unfortunate is to be consigned to endless woe for failing to perform an impossibility! It is no wonder that humane minds have been driven to the other, and no less unscriptural extreme, of believing in their salvation. The escape from the dilemma is the doctrine which Mr. Barnett derides without a reason. Every abortive form of rational life is in the category of irrational life and shares the same fate. "Man having no understanding, is like the beasts that perish. Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them." This is reasonable and humane, and, let us add, scriptural, for these are the words of Scripture. Annihilation is no calamity to a blighted, perverted, idiotic, or incapable nature; for misery, and not happiness, is the condition of such a state of being.

Babies may appeal more powerfully to our sympathies, but, considered in the calm light of judgment, their case is in precisely the same situation. Babies are undeveloped human beings. Their minds are not open; their capabilities are latent; they have no knowledge, no character, no consciousness.

In the years of childhood, their infantile minds are taken up with trifles, and dead to the gravities of rational and responsible life. Heaven or hell for undeveloped life like this is a fiction of Paganism. The monstrosity of one and the futility of the other is self-evident. Mr. Barnett may quote Christ's words in opposition to this: "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," but if he deals rationally with the passage, he is bound to see that it helps him nothing as regards the eternal destiny of children. Christ was on earth in a crowd when he uttered the words, and they were confined to the occasion and the circumstance that gave them birth, viz., the eagerness of mothers to get Christ's hands laid on their offspring, and the somewhat narrow-minded officiousness of the disciples in keeping them back. The only spiritual bearing they have is the one given by Christ in the words immediately added, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." The destiny of children is determined by the principle upon which men are saved, viz., the principle of faith—which excludes those like them who are incapable of faith; and it is affirmed in the words of Job: "O that I had given up the ghost and no eye had seen me. *I should have been as though I had not been.* I should have been carried from the womb to the grave."—(Job x. 11-18; see also Job iii. 11-16.)

By a curious freak of logic, Mr. Barnett attempts to find an argument for immortality in human experience of mortality. He says the life of human experience is "all too brief," and he quotes some beautiful words from a friend's letter in illustration of the fact. The fact will not be denied, and every sensible mind will be affected by the sadness which tints the quotation in question; but what a strange act of reasoning it is to say, that because we find life short, therefore it must be long! because we experience mortality, therefore we must be destined for immortality! Mr. Barnett seems to forget that this is a cursed state. He overlooks the fact that we are under the curse of Eden—that this is man's portion under the sun—"vanity and vexation of spirit." He reasons as if this were a normal state in which the aspirations of our nature must necessarily have fulfilment. By ignoring the testimony of revelation as to the present position of the human race, he falls into a mistake.

Then he thinks the "little doctrine of a little resurrection" throws little light into the darkness. This is another mistake attributable to educational bias. From a scriptural and rational point of view, the case stands just the other way. The doctrine of resurrection is just the light the thoughtful mind longs for. We see men die, and wonder if death is a universal finality, and if human existence is to be nothing but an eternal story of vanity. Christ's doctrine of resurrection answers the question. It informs us that God's purpose is to develop through the Son of His love, another and immortal state of existence on earth by resurrection, regulated, however, by certain

principles v
Barnett doe
even styles
that Christ
him with th
received an
"when the
mocked," a
to be a sett
THE RESURRE

Lauding
we realise
becomes a
fewness an
which requ
'vanity' or
remark fro
would have
inexplicabl
he not belie
are "made
believe the
torture of
religionists
exemplifies
immortal-s
C.S.S.R.,"
stamped "
is in the ce
first featur

"Listen
tormented
groanings
the shrieks
roaring lik
dragons.
of the devi
which shak
in hell a so
in the worl
hell. Is it
of the earth
sound of oc

up with trifles, and
 Heaven or hell in
 The monstrousness of
 . Barnett may quote
 ren to come unto me
 ven," but if he deas
 helps him nothing
 earth in a crowd wh
 he occasion and the
 ss of mothers to ge
 what narrow-minded

The only spiritual
 s immediately add
 z little child shall in
 ; determined by the
 iple of faith—which
 ; and it is affirmed
 and no eye had seen
 I should have seen
 e also Job iii. 11-16.)
 nd an argument for
 s the life of human
 utiful words from a
 . not be denied, and
 tints the quotation
 to say, that because
 xperience mortality,
 nett seems to forget
 ; we are under the
 sun—"vanity and
 ual state in which
 nent. By ignoring
 the human race, he

tion" throws little
 able to educational
 use stands just the
 he thoughtful mind
 versal finality, and
 of vanity. Christ's
 ms us that God's
 ther and immortal
 0wever, by certain

principles which limit the number of those who will be the subject of it. Mr. Barnett does not appreciate this light of God, but speaks lightly of it, and even styles it "a ridiculous doctrine." One would almost fancy he denied that Christ taught resurrection at all. His contempt for the doctrine identifies him with the Athenian Platonists who derided Paul, and whose doctrines are received and taught in all seminaries of modern learning. It is recorded that "when they (the Athenians) heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked," and also that others said "What doth this babbler say? He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus AND THE RESURRECTION."

Lauding the orthodox doctrine, Mr. Barnett exclaims "The moment that we realise the fact that he (man) is *made for God* and eternity, his life becomes a transfigured and a glorified thing; and there is nothing in the fewness and fleetness of his years—nothing in the sorrows which crowd them, which requires him, either in chagrin or despondency, to write the word 'vanity' on his brow." It is difficult to comprehend the meaning of this remark from Mr. Barnett's point of view. If he had been a Universalist, it would have had a little force; but to come from a hell-fire christian, it is inexplicable. He must have forgot half his theory when he penned it. Does he not believe that the majority of men, instead of being "made for God," are "made for the devil," as far as the upshot of events goes? Does he not believe the vast mass will go to hell, and writhe for ever in the unspeakable torture of the devil's fires? We will present Mr. Barnett and his co-religionists with a picture of their hell, drawn by one of themselves. It exemplifies the "transfigured and glorified" system of belief to which their immortal-soulism commits them. The painter is "the Rev. J. Furness, C.S.S.R.," and his picture is issued under the warrant of authority, for it is stamped "*permissium superiorum*." Here it is. After surmising that hell is in the centre of the globe, the writer mentions "a terrific noise" as the first feature of the place:

"Listen to the tremendous, the horrible uproar of millions and millions of tormented creatures, mad with the fury of hell. Oh, the screams of fear, the groanings of horror, the yells of rage, the cries of pain, the shouts of agony, the shrieks of despair from millions on millions! There you hear them roaring like lions, hissing like serpents, howling like dogs, and wailing like dragons. There you hear the gnashing of teeth, and the fearful blasphemies of the devils. Above all, you hear the roaring of the thunders of God's anger, which shake hell to its foundations. But there is another sound. There is in hell a sound like that of many waters; it is as if all the rivers and oceans in the world were pouring themselves with a great splash down on the floor of hell. Is it then really the sound of waters? It is. Are the rivers and oceans of the earth pouring themselves into hell? No. What is it, then? It is the sound of oceans of tears running down from countless millions of eyes. They

cry for ever and ever. They cry because the sulphurous smoke torments their eyes. They cry because they are in darkness. They cry because they have lost the beautiful heaven. They cry because the sharp fire burns them. Little child, it is better to cry one tear of repentance now, than to cry millions of tears in hell."

"The third dungeon, the lowest depth of hell," is described as follows:—

"The roof is red-hot; the walls are red; the floor is like a thick sheet of red-hot iron. See, on the middle of that red-hot iron floor stands a girl. She looks about sixteen years old. Her feet are bare; she has neither shoes nor stockings on her feet; her bare-feet stand on the red-hot burning floor. The door of this room has never been opened since she first set her foot on the red-hot floor. Now she sees that the door is opening. She rushes forward. She has gone down on her knees on the red-hot floor. Listen! she speaks. She says, 'I have been standing with my bare feet on this red-hot floor for years. Day and night my only standing-place has been this red-hot floor. Sleep never came on me for a moment, that I might forget this horrible burning floor. Look,' she says, 'at my burnt and bleeding feet. Let me go off this burning floor for one moment, only for one single short moment. Oh, that in this endless eternity of years I might forget the pain only for one single moment!' The devil answers her question: 'Do you ask,' he says, 'for a moment, for one moment, to forget your pain? No, not for one single moment during the never-ending eternity of years shall you ever leave this red-hot floor!' 'Is it so?' the girl says with a sigh that seems to break her heart; 'then, at least, let somebody go to my little brothers and sisters, who are alive, and tell them not to do the bad things which I did, so that they will never have to come and stand on the red-hot floor.' The devil answers her again, 'Your little brothers and sisters have the priests to tell them these things. If they will not listen to the priests, neither would they listen even if somebody should go to them from the dead.'"

What a ghastly sarcasm there is in Mr. Barnett's remark when read in the light of the foregoing picture. Human nature a transfigured and glorified thing! If orthodoxy be true, it is anything but a glorified thing. It is a parched, withered, blighted, demonised, accursed thing, destined to bake and simmer in eternal agony. The "redeemed," basking in the felicities of "heaven," is no counterpoise to the unutterable catastrophe of eternal woe! Mr. Barnett may shrink from the picture, and perhaps repudiate it in the particular form in which it is set forth by Mr. Furness for the instruction (?) of children; but he cannot get away from the sting of the picture,—the doctrine of eternal torments. This doctrine is the lever of popular religion. Nothing could be done without hell and the devil. They are brought to the fore front in all earnest agitation of popular theology. This is only a logical result; for if they are true, they are necessarily *the most important matters that can be pressed upon human attention*. In this respect, the Methodists are the only

consistent a
they hold tl
persuade n
notably so-
sceptical of
like what is
eternal torr
succumbs to
has failed t
so slightly.
"vanity" c
express his
"vanity."
it, human
Christadely
contemplat
Mr. Barr
only to tho
this qualif
combating
suggests "
that "vani
of view, are
view, are tl
eternal tort
The reason
instead of
irons!

But Mr.
places him
to be "va
illustrator

"Every
"Man is
(Ps.

"He the
"Vanity

"All n
than r

"All fle
—(Is.

Then M
is a reality

orments their
use they have
them. Little
y millions of

follows:—
hick sheet of
s a girl. She
er shoes nor
g floor. The
her foot on
shes forward.
she speaks
hot floor for
red-hot floor.
this horrible

Let me go
oment. Oh,
only for one
sk,' he says,
or one single
r leave this
to break her
sisters, who
at they will
answers her
them these
listen even

when read
figured and
a glorified
used thing,
asking in the
astrophe of
repudiate it
struction (?)
e doctrines of
i. Nothing
e fore front
l result; for
hat can be
re the only

consistent and exemplary section of the apostacy. Believing those doctrines, they hold them up with fervid zeal, and exert themselves with extravagance to persuade men of their danger. The other sects—and Mr. Barnett's sect notably so—the Baptists, take the matter very coolly, as if they were really sceptical of what they profess. No wonder. It is impossible for intelligence, like what is generally found in the Baptist ranks, to accept such a dogma as eternal torments. Fairly realized, the mind revolts at it, and, in many cases, succumbs to it, in madness and suicide. We can only suppose that Mr. Barnett has failed to realize it, or does not believe it, that he deals with the matter so slightly. If there is nothing in the orthodox theory to make man write "vanity" on his brow, it is only because that it is too languid a word to express his awful lot. The liability to eternal torture is something worse than "vanity." It is a curse more horrible than words can paint. In the light of it, human existence is not only a failure (which Mr. Barnett, repudiating Christadelphian views, seems to regard as a calamity too great for contemplation) but a malignity, an extravagant enormity unutterable.

Mr. Barnett may seek to escape from this, by saying that his remarks apply only to those who ascend to celestial spheres. The instant he puts forward this qualification, he surrenders his argument; because the theory he is combating provides for the everlasting blessedness of the righteous, and never suggests "vanity" may be written on their brow. It is only as to the lost that "vanity" can be affirmed. Now the lost from the Christadelphian point of view, are those who perish like beasts; the lost from Mr. Barnett's point of view, are the eternally tortured. Mr. Barnett does not consider a destiny of eternal torture sufficient to warrant a man in writing "vanity" on his brow! The reason must be, as already suggested, that his position is so awful, that instead of "vanity" he ought to brand "damnation" on his brow with hot irons!

But Mr. Barnett in refusing to inscribe "vanity" on the human brow, places himself in direct antagonism to Scripture. They declare human existence to be "vanity," and the end of wickedness to be the same. We append illustrations:—

"Every man at his best estate, is altogether VANITY."—(Ps. xxxix. 5.)

"Man is like to vanity: his days are as a shadow that passeth away."—

(Ps. cxliv. 4.)

"He that soweth iniquity shall reap VANITY."—(Prov. xxii. 8.)

"Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, all is VANITY."—(Eccles. i. 1.)

"All nations before Him are as NOTHING; they are counted to Him less than nothing, and VANITY."—(Isaiah xl. 17.)

"All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof as the flower of the field."

—(Is. xl. 6.)

Then Mr. Barnett becomes apparently a little perverse. He says if death is a reality, a man may say to himself, "Why should I strive? My time is

too short. I cannot finish what I begin. I will take what repose I can. I will indulge my inclination; virtue is in the end the same thing as vice. I will go down to the grave by the easiest and pleasantest path I can find." This is absurd. If the Christadelphians put forward the Sadducean view, that death was a finality, Mr. Barnett might indulge in this style of argument; but as it is, it is altogether off the mark. Mr. Barnett himself was conscious of it, for he instantly anticipates the answer. "Mr. Roberts," he says, "will again point us to his pet doctrine of a resurrection." This is precisely what he does. Why not? It is Christ's "pet doctrine," so much so, that it is one of his names, "*The Resurrection and the Life*." It is just the doctrine that bars the way to the conclusion that Mr. Barnett strives to enforce from the doctrine of human mortality.

Mr. Barnett, before leaving the subject, says, "Mr. Roberts must revise his repulsive doctrine of death before he can impart to his ridiculous theory of a resurrection the most infinitesimal measure of worth." This is a singular remark, and a remarkable piece of logic, and calls for the following comments:—It was never claimed for death that it was not repulsive. It can never be anything but repulsive to a righteous being. It was imposed as a curse, and intended to be repulsive. The righteous consider it repulsive when they exclaim, "O death, where is thy sting?" It is only as a repulsive thing that the Spirit in the prophet said of it, "O death, I will be thy plagues" (Hosea xiii. 14); and its repulsiveness is inversely apparent in the glorious statements, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. xv. 26); "There shall be no more death."—(Rev. xxi. 4; Luke xx. 36.) Mr. Barnett obviously does not regard death as repulsive. He takes the view of it which Christendom has inherited from paganism. He looks at it as a golden release from mortal encumbrance; a translation among the gods; a deification; an introduction to "realms of endless day"—not therefore as a curse but a great blessing. This being so, what extraordinary logic is contained in the above quoted criticism. Death must be made non-repulsive in order to make resurrection attractive? One would have thought the necessity stood just the other way. If death be such a very delightful thing, resurrection, which puts an end to it, cannot be very acceptable, but if death be ghastly and repulsive, the more glorious is resurrection. In proportion as you take away from the repulsiveness of death, you detract from the attractiveness of the resurrection. If a man goes to heaven and is well off, what does he care for the resurrection? A captive's deliverance is always joyful in proportion to the painfulness of his bondage. If he is well-treated, as a captive, it takes off the edge of his appreciation of liberty. But Mr. Barnett reasons against these long-established rules of common sense. He in effect says, that before salvation can be made to appear of any value, it must be made out that mankind were not so very badly off. The logic of this we leave without further comment, and proceed to follow

Mr.

These are things in themselves." The human mind can do nothing, but earth produce and lilies? But we will have his loose doctrine at which of Jno. I use he means the brain, effort, we have that of death is the immetaphysical philosophy "matter" distinct on To admit the argument mean by "The more come into imponderable Is light, v Mr. Barnett the beasts immaterial "matter" down from Having use of it wounds. matter," it cannot be is immaterial gander." tasted," th

MR. BARNETT'S ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY.

These are few and futile. They begin with the obscure proposition, "No one thing in nature can be the source of another which bears no resemblance to itself." This is intended to prove in one bold stroke of argument that the human mind must be "immaterial" and immortal; but it fails to prove anything, because it is not true in the form in which it is put. Does not the earth produce lilies, for instance; what "resemblance" is there between earth and lilies? A hen produces eggs; is there any resemblance between them? But we will forbear to torture Mr. Barnett. We will not take advantage of his loose definition for the sake of a little play, but at once go to the point at which he aims. This he confidently strikes in the following parody of Jno. iii. 6: "That which is born of matter is matter!" The use he makes of this instantly follows. "If thought be the production of the brain, it is essentially material." Now, before considering this syllogistic effort, we had need to ask Mr. Barnett to perform a logician's first duty, viz., that of defining his terms. What does he mean by "matter?" "Matter" is the invention of a surface system. It belongs to the school of metaphysics which is rapidly crumbling before the advance of inductive philosophy, or the system of ascertaining what is. To use the term "matter" in this discussion, is to beg the question. It assumes the distinct order of existence which metaphysics teach and designate by it. To admit this distinct order of existence, would be to surrender the argument on the Christadelphian side. What does Mr. Barnett mean by "matter?" Does he mean that which can be seen, felt, and handled? The more palpable objects of nature, which we know as substances, would come into such a category; but where would he draw the line? Are the imponderable fluids, which can neither be seen, felt nor handled, "matter?" Is light, which reveals, but is not visible, "matter?" Is life "matter?" Mr. Barnett might here be tempted to shout "No!" but he must be careful; the beasts have life. They see, hear, feel, hunger, thirst, and pain; have they immaterial, immortal souls? Mr. Barnett will have to withdraw the term "matter" as an exploded term, representative of scholastic tradition, handed down from the days when Baconian philosophy was unknown.

Having assumed his definition of "matter," Mr. Barnett proceeds to make use of it to demolish the truth, but being a wooden sword, it inflicts no wounds. He says "thought possesses none of the known attributes of matter," the meaning of which, he elaborates in the following words: "*it cannot be seen, heard, touched, smelt, or tasted.*" and therefore he concludes it is immaterial. We can only say, "sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." The strength of a horse "cannot be seen, heard, touched, smelt, tasted," therefore on Mr. Barnett's principle, a horse's strength is immaterial

what repose I can. I
thing as vice. I will
h I can find." This
adducean view, that
style of argument;
myself was conscious
Roberts," he says
urrection." This is
doctrine," so much
he Life." It is just
Mr. Barnett strives

Roberts must revise
is ridiculous theory
worth." This is a
s for the following
s not repulsive. It
s being. It was
righteous consider
sting?" It is only
l of it, "O death, I
iveness is inversely
t shall be destroyed
th."—(Rev. xxi. 4;
h as repulsive. He
om paganism. He
translation among
endless day"—not
that extraordinary
must be made non-
ould have thought
a very delightful
y acceptable, but if
ion. In proportion
t from the attract-
d is well off, what
is always joyful in
well-treated, as a
But Mr. Barnett
mse. He in effect
value, it must be
e logic of this we

and immortal. The faculty of hearing or sight "cannot be seen, heard, touched, smelt or tasted." Beasts see and hear; therefore their faculties, by Mr. Barnett's argument, are immaterial and immortal!

"It (thought) does not reveal itself to the senses," says Mr. Barnett. Is this true? Has Mr. Barnett never *felt* the activity of thought on his pillow on occasions when the mind has been too active to allow him to go to sleep? Has he never *felt* the labour of thought at times when his nervous force was exhausted and his head afflicted with aching? If he has not, he is an exception to fellow mortals.

"Everybody knows," he proceeds, "that it (thought) exists, yet nobody can find it." This is intended to suggest that thought must be immaterial and immortal. The answer is, if it proves it for thought, it proves it for a few other things, to which Mr. Barnett would deny its application. Who ever "found" the instinct of the bee? yet everybody knows it exists. Who ever "found" the sagacity of the dog? yet everybody knows it exists. Is canine intelligence immaterial and immortal? nothing of this class is to be "found" in the mechanical sense in which Mr. Barnett uses the word. Things impalpable are seen only in their effects. Are we therefore to say that they are in their nature out of the lists of material forces, and indestructible? This is what Mr. Barnett does with regard to thought, but the fallacy is apparent.

"Electricity," continues he, "can be made visible, but not thought." Does this prove the immortality and indestructibility of thought? If so, what does Mr. Barnett say to this: "Electricity can be made visible, but not instinct, therefore instinct is immortal." This is quite as logical as the other. He proceeds "there are no material tests by which the materiality of thought can be proved—we conclude then that thought is not of the nature of matter, and therefore cannot be the production of matter." This has only to be applied to animal instinct, to prove the fallacy of the reasoning. "There are no material tests by which the materiality of instinct can be proved. We conclude then that instinct is not of the nature of matter, and therefore cannot be the production of matter," ergo, as Mr. Barnett reasons as to thought, instinct is an immortal principle constituting in an animal an immortal soul!

Then Mr. Barnett shies at the true explanation of the matter as it becomes visible in his path, despite his attempt to close his eyes in metaphysical dosing. He says, "Mr. Roberts may repeat the old platitudes about 'living matter thinking by virtue of its organisation,' but they will not serve his purpose." Why not? A mere pooh, pooh! like this will not prevent the truth from serving its own purpose. Who ever heard of living matter thinking that was not organised to think? An ass's ear, for instance, a hen's toe, a dog's paw, are so many forms of living matter, but not being "organised to think," they are not capable of thinking. Applied to man,

the same truth think, because that thinks is his specially organised substance is separate circulatory supply of blood and healthy, it vitiated blood, derangement.

Mr. Barnett, the theorist, asks, "work?" What function. He v other people if work, first, because Were it exposed at rest. In so removed, the brain whenever thought that a common to "keep the brain might just as work?" True;

Mr. Barnett goes "either in the separation combination of matter due to the thought Mr. Barnett evid He asks, with a doubt there were substances argument. One smallest element to end. Mr. Barnett the brain, separated, is true these elements are the fact does not brain. Even the beyond test; and is impossible to tissues, the fact of

een, heard,
aculties, by

arnett. Is
his pillow
to sleep?
vous force
t, he is an

et nobody
immaterial
as it for a
on. Who
it exists.
knows it
othing of
r. Barnett
Are we
f material
regard to

t." Does
so, what
, but not
the other.
riality of
he nature
has only

"There
proved.
therefore
ms as to
imal an

becomes
aphysical
t 'living
serve his
vent the
; matter
, a hen's
ot being
to man,

the same truth is apparent. His finger nails are living matter, but do not think, because they are not "organised to think." The only part of man that thinks is his head, because his head is "organised to think." His brain is specially organised for the purpose, and so important is that purpose, that its substance is more dense than any other part of the body, and it has a separate circulatory system to itself, by which it draws a large and direct supply of blood from the heart. When it is large and perfectly organised and healthy, it thinks well; but if small, or damaged, or supplied with vitiated blood, its function is very feebly performed, or subject to entire derangement. This is matter of every day experience. And yet Mr. Barnett, with the simpleness of a child, or the perversity of a blind theorist, asks, "If it be the brain that thinks, *why cannot we see it at work?*" What would he say to a similar enquiry as to the stomach's function. He would probably laugh, and rightly so, and he must excuse other people if they laugh at his questions. We cannot see the brain at work, first, because it is carefully encased in a strong protection of bone. Were it exposed to view, it might be possible to set Mr. Barnett's incredulity at rest. In some surgical cases, where a portion of the skull has been removed, the brain has been observed "at work," as Mr. Barnett puts it, whenever thought or passion has been excited. Mr. Barnett may be aware that a common recommendation in cases of exhausted nervous energy is to "keep the brain quiet." Mr. Barnett's question is really amusing. He might just as well ask, "If it be the ear that hears, why can't we see it at work?" True; a donkey's ears twitch considerably when excited by sound.

Mr. Barnett gets no better as he proceeds. "There is nothing," he says, "either in the separate elements of which the brain is composed, or in the combination of these elements together, which suggests even the remotest clue to the thought-producing power which the brain is alleged to possess." Mr. Barnett evidently regards this as a deadly thrust at the Christadelphian. He asks, with a flourish, why it has never been answered before, and suggests there were substantial motives of prudence for passing by so great an argument. One can only smile at this. For it is impossible to discover the smallest element of argument in it. It is a mere assertion from beginning to end. Mr. Barnett declares there is nothing in the material elements of the brain, separately or combined, to suggest a clue to thought. That the substances composing the brain furnish no clue to thought when they are separated, is true, as it is true of any other organ, but how is it that when these elements are *together*, thought occurs? The impossibility of explaining the fact does not disprove the fact. It is impossible to analyse the living brain. Even the nervous fluid, which is common to man and beast, is beyond test; and the brain is but a mass of nerve substance. But though it is impossible to ascertain the connection between thought and the brain tissues, the fact of the connection is palpable in a variety of ways. Look at

the difference between a brain well-stored with nervous energy and a brain exhausted by dissipation. Is Mr. Barnett unaware that the mental faculties are affected in the latter case? Even the legitimate expenditure of brain power, if carried beyond the point of prudence, will bring mental debility. Yet Mr. Barnett denies that there is any proof of the connection between the brain and thought-producing power. In this, he speaks against the light both natural and revealed; for even the Scriptures declare that the Almighty "formeth the spirit of man *within him*."—(Zech. xii. 1.)

Mr. Barnett reproduces the argument of personal identity amid atomic change. This is sufficiently answered on page 34 of *Twelve Lectures*. A remark or two, however, is called for here. He bases the argument on a fallacy to begin with. He says that during the change of a man's substance from waste and nutrition, "*his personality undergoes no corresponding change*." This is not true. A man at forty feels himself a very different person from what he was at ten. An entire change in the nature of his consciousness takes place in the interval. It is a matter of universal experience, that as years roll by, the ideas change, the tastes change, the character changes, the voice changes, the personal physique changes—everything changes; and the nature of these changes depends upon circumstances. Why? Because the new material introduced into the system in the process of nutrition, is directed into new shapes and forms, according to the activities by which its absorption is guided and determined. If a man goes to sea, his muscles and vital organs, and the bony framework are in continual occupation, and the nutritive elements are consequently more largely made use of, in building up the mechanical parts of his being, than if he stayed at home. Send him to college, and you will see a different result. Activity of brain is brought into play, to the neglect of the bodily functions; and the consequence is, the brain monopolises the nutritive supply, and is developed to the detriment of the merely physical powers, the result of which is, that the man is more feeble as a whole than his sea-faring brother, and has his mind very differently constituted from what it would have been had he been brought up at the plough. Mr. Barnett's assumption, therefore, that the personality undergoes no change with the progress of material substitution, is wrong. It undergoes many changes, but of course he feels himself the same individual, because the impressions originally constituting his individuality are perpetuated, though modified. But let a "stroke" affect the brain throughout, and obliterate original impressions (of which there have been cases), the person's individuality vanishes. He forgets who he was, and what he knew, and begins the formation of a new individuality by means of new impressions, should his power to receive new impressions not have been destroyed by the calamity. A case of this sort is within the writer's experience, where there was a complete lapse of memory, necessitating the re-formation of

acquaintance with the second education returned. On Mr. Barnett's theory that the brain "explains" the explanation.

Mr. Barnett is compelled to do so, yielding to theoretical recklessness. He says the body "does not do seven." Now, in a person of dark complexion, will the eye and the color of these organic parts by the succeeding generations assume similar qualities to their predecessors? If at the same table of organic quality, that determines how could this be? Mr. Barnett's answer is himself. He says those which the explanation continues to result in the new material *in finitum*. But much as you desire

Mr. Barnett's proposition that identity the sun the product of atomic change. Is it time will weaken "getting out of" of education lies is "subject to" its development

Mr. Barnett's

and a brain
tal faculties
ire of brain
tal debility.
between the
st the light
ie Almighty

mid atomic
s. A remark
a fallacy to
from waste
' This is not
what he was
ces place in
ars roll by,
ice changes,
nature of
se the new
, is directed
s absorption
vital organs,
ie nutritive
ing up the
end him to
is brought
consequence
veloped to
of which
sea-faring
from what
r. Barnett's
range with
goes many
because the
ted, though
i obliterate
ie person's
knew, and
mpressions,
stroyed by
ence, where
ormation of

acquaintance with friends, places, habits and everything. After a while, the second education as quickly disappeared as the first, and the old memories returned. On Mr. Barnett's theory, this was inexplicable. On the theory that the brain "thinks by virtue of its organization," it is susceptible of explanation.

Mr. Barnett denies the transmissibility of qualities. He feels himself compelled to do this, to save his argument on continuous identity; but in yielding to theoretical exigency, he convicts himself of either ignorance or recklessness. The very argument he relies upon disproves his denial. He says the body "changes throughout several times in a man's life, and at seventy *does not contain a single particle of the matter which composed it at seven.*" Now, in view of this, how does Mr. Barnett deal with the fact that a person of dark complexion, *eating the same food as a person of light complexion*, will be dark complexioned till death? Take the colour of the eye and the colour of the hair; how does he account for the permanence of these organic qualities, except that the original quality is taken up by the succeeding atoms of nutrition? Mr. Barnett's answer is "they assume similar qualities of their own." Do they pick up nothing from their predecessors? If they do not, how is it that the same flour and mutton eaten at the same table will turn to four different conditions as regards colour and organic quality, in four different persons? Is it not the existing organism that determines the use and quality of the new material introduced? and how could this be, except on the principle of the transmission of quality? Mr. Barnett's answer to this, finally surrenders the whole case against himself. He says "they enter into the same relation to the laws of life as those which the old have quitted." Precisely, and this applied to the brain, explains continuous identity amid atomic change. Whatever impressions or qualities result from the original organization of the brain, are inherited by the new material, taken up by them, transmitted to successors and so on *ad infinitum*. But destroy the brain altogether, and you destroy the process as much as you destroy the sight of the eye and the hearing of the ear.

Mr. Barnett can "detect nothing but unintelligible nonsense" in the proposition that "mind is the product of the living brain, and personal identity the sum of its impressions." His objection to it is that if mind be the product of the brain, it would be subject like the brain to the law of atomic change. And so it is, as Mr. Barnett will discover, if he reflects but a moment. Is it not a fact, that unless we renew our knowledge, the lapse of time will weaken and in the end destroy it? Is there no such thing as "getting out of use," and forgetting what one has learnt? The very power of education lies in the fact that Mr. Barnett denies, viz., that the mind is "subject to the law of atomic change," and depends for the form of its development upon the forces brought to bear in its guidance.

Mr. Barnett struggles in vain against the proposition that if the mind

be immaterial, its functions ought to be unaffected by the condition of the body. He suggests that it is associated with the material elements of his being on the common basis of life, which unites and affinitises all parts. Animal and vegetable substances are amalgamated on this basis, and why not a third, argues Mr. Barnett—the immaterial and immortal? The answer is, nothing is impossible; but if this is the principle on which the mind is developed in the body, obviously the inversion of the principle must be fatal to it. If life gives, death must take away. When “the principle of life” is withdrawn, the “animal and vegetable” elements of man’s being are destroyed, and any third element depending upon “the principle of life” for its basis, must perish also. Mr. Barnett’s argument recoils upon himself. To evade the recoil, he dogmatizes on “the principles of life.” He says life is not the *result* of organization, but a principle that operates through organization. Upon this, we have to ask if the life of a dog is not in the same category? Mr. Barnett cannot exclude it. A dog is as much God’s handiwork as a man. It depends upon the same laws of respiration and deglutition as those which govern human existence. The Bible says men and beasts are identical in the mode of life and death.—(Eccles. iii. 19, 20.) What then would Mr. Barnett do with his definition as applied to a dog? “Life is not the result of organization: organization is the medium through which life is manifested.” Has the dog an immortal principle of life which was antecedent to its organization, and which only manifests itself through its doggish body? If so, whose principle of life was it before the dog came? Was it the dog’s? If Mr. Barnett will admit that the primitive life-power in all cases is God’s, we might agree with him; but in admitting this, he must abandon the idea that human lives are separate entities or “souls,” which may be disembodied and live as conscious beings still. All human life, and all beast and all insect life, are but inspirations from the eternal universal fountain of life, of which the God revealed to Israel is the focal centre and controller. But Mr. Barnett’s Platonism, deeply tinctured with the spirit of Greek mythology, teaching the existence of so many separate independent immortal intelligences, prevents him from seeing this. He insists upon three separable compounds as constituting the unity of a human being. If he would define them, the argument might be made more serviceable. “Body, soul, and spirit” are his words, quoting from Paul. We submit to Mr. Barnett that these words describe aspects of human existence *only while a man is alive*. This is shown by the fact that they were addressed to and spoken of living men, and that the three aspects expressed are only presented in life. Is there a “body” when man is dissolved in the grave? Is there a “soul” to that body when all soul is evaporated? Is there a spirit to it when it no longer exists to be animated by a spirit? It would be curious to know what Mr. Barnett understands by “soul” as distinct from “spirit” and *vice*

versa. From a life presents the (1) the body, which or mind. A dead living man with of “body, soul and The body returns The resurrection incorruptibility.

In the next paragraph brain possesses case of a man citizen thirteen months his previous condition an appearance of view of what he he exemplifies by *healthy action of mind*.” Astonish that the brain has power; and now theory, he speaks of the brain” from any action, learn probably a useless gait. What is the mind. How immortal thing may be suspended occurrence to which he reconcile it observation: “of the man, it depends.” R “materialistic,” in favour of the immortal something exist when separated accepts it on the being exploded

* “One fundamental which they all

the condition of
 aterial elements of
 ffinitises all parts.
 s basis, and why
 tal? The answer
 which the mind is
 iple must be fatal
 principle of life"
 man's being are
 rinciple of life"
 ils upon himself.
 life." He says
 operates through
 og is not in the
 s as much God's
 respiration and
 Bible says men
 des. iii. 19, 20.)
 plied to a dog?
 medium through
 principle of life
 only manifests
 e of life was
 nett will admit
 ve might agree
 dea that human
 isembodied and
 it and all insect
 f life, of which
 ut Mr. Barnett's
 ology, teaching
 al intelligences,
 able compounds
 refine them, the
 and spirit" are
 at these words
alive. This is
 of living men,
 ife. Is there a
 "soul" to that
 en it no longer
 to know what
 pirit" and *vice*

versa. From a common-sense point of view the matter is plain. A man in life presents three aspects cognisant to the understanding. There is (1) the body, which is the basis of (2) the life, which develops (3) the spirit, or mind. A dead man is a body simply; an idiot is a body with soul or life; a living man with full possession of mental faculties presents the combination of "body, soul and spirit." When death comes, it destroys this combination. The body returns to the dust, the life returns to God, and the spirit disappears. The resurrection will put all three together again on the glorious basis of incorruptibility.

In the next paragraph, Mr. Barnett supprises us. Having denied that the brain possesses thought-producing power, he attempts to grapple with the case of a man cited in *Twelve Lectures*, whose consciousness was suspended thirteen months through brain injury. In doing so, he involuntarily surrenders his previous contention on the subject of the brain. He admits the case has an appearance of inconsistency with his theory, but says it is explicable in view of what he calls "the law of organic life." What he means by this, he exemplifies by saying "Even imperfect digestion will interfere with the *healthy action of the brain*, and imperfect cerebral action will *tell upon the mind*." Astounding! a few pages earlier, Mr. Barnett strenuously denied that the brain had any participation whatever in the production of mental power; and now to explain a case that cannot be reconciled with the Platonic theory, he speaks of "the healthy action of the brain!" What is "the action of the brain" from Mr. Barnett's point of view? At first he denied it had any action, leaving us to infer that the interior of the cranium was probably a useless cavity, filled with heavy waste, to give steadiness to the gait. What is "imperfect cerebral action?" Mr. Barnett says, it will tell upon the mind. How could it "tell upon the mind" if the mind were an immaterial immortal thing? "No one denies," says he, "that mental consciousness may be suspended." It is useless denying it, for it is of too frequent occurrence to admit of denial. But being compelled to admit it, how does he reconcile it with immortal-soulism? He attempts to do it in this observation: "So long as the mind constitutes *part of the organization of the man*, it must be obedient to the laws upon which his organization depends." Really one would imagine Mr. Barnett was becoming "materialistic," if we did not know that his remark involves a reservation in favour of the entity called the "man." He assumes the existence of the immortal ghost of his belief. He thinks and speaks of "man" as a something existing in his organization, but apart from it, and that it can live when separated from it. This assumption he does not care to prove. He accepts it on the doctrine of an ancient system of thought which is rapidly being exploded by experimental philosophy.* It would be as reasonable

* "One fundamental thought pervades all the statements—there is one root from which they all spring. This is the ancient maxim that 'out of nothing nothing comes'."

to talk of hearing apart from the ear, or smell apart from the nose, as to talk of the human mind existing apart from the human brain. But even allowing him to beg the question, *what does his explanation amount to?* If the mind during life is "obedient to the laws upon which his organization depends," upon what ground shall Mr. Barnett say it is not obedient to those laws when death destroys the organization? If a "mind" with an injured brain is unconscious, what must be the state of a mind without a brain at all? Mr. Barnett says it is conscious. He can only *say* so; he can offer no proof, unless he accept the spiritualists as proof, in which case he must give up the Bible. So much as we do know of the laws determining mental action, he rejects, and, what we do not know, he speculates upon and dogmatizes. He admits unconsciousness is induced by cerebral injury, but contends that consciousness is greatly promoted by cerebral destruction; but offers, however, no argument in support of his contention. He admits that our experience of life is in favour of the Christadelphian view, but asserts that the fact of death, of which he nor anybody else knows anything, upsets it. All this is mere logical trifling. Let Mr. Barnett first prove that the mind of man is an immaterial ghost capable of disembodied conscious existence, and he may then consider himself at liberty to explain the various freaks which the mind may be shown to indulge in; but to offer an explanation on the basis of a theory, which is assumed from beginning to end, and which is in direct contradiction to the facts themselves, is to violate every rule of logical thought and common sense.

We have no experience of mind except as a condition of the brain. To speculate on what becomes of "the mind" after "its severance from the body" is just as wise as it would be to wonder what becomes of "strength" when "severed" from the leg, or sight "severed" from the eye. Mr. Barnett feels the force of the fact that the mind is interfered with when the brain is injured; but determined at all hazards to uphold immortal-soulism, he declares that an effect upon the mind while it is "connected" with the body "supplies no inference respecting the effect upon the mind produced by its complete severance from the body." What is the worth of a declaration of this sort? It amounts to mere dogmatism, which is always undeserving of notice for logical purposes, but as dogmatism goes for a great deal with some people, it is worth while to expose its fallacy.

—that neither in the organic world nor in the inorganic, is power produced without the expenditure of other power; that neither in plant nor in the animal is there a creation of force or motion. Trees grow, and so do men and horses, and here we have new power incessantly produced upon the earth. But its source, as I have already stated, is the sun, for he it is that separates the carbon from the oxygen of the carbonic acid, and thus enables them to recombine. Whether they recombine in the furnace of the steam engine or in the animal body, the origin of the power they produce is the same. In this sense, we are all souls of fire and children of the sun. But, as remarked by Kelmholtz, *we must be content to share our celestial pedigree with the meanest living thing. The frog and the toad, and those terrible things, the monkey and the gorilla, draw their power from the same source as man.*—Professor Tyndall at the Meeting of the British Association, Dundee.

Facts alwa
he cannot see
without his ey
of sight was
dogmatism w
in the present
If the spinal
feels every im
conducting n
below the poi
ness is exper
natural. If t
Do these fact
is no consciou

The brain t
and mis-shap
injured, it sto
when there is
think until w

Mr. Barnet
in the case of
loses what lit
extremities be
of the poor
"supplied")
its faculties-
organization;
"inference"
maintain at a

But Mr. B
the human
unconscious
one more clu
man rememb
an immateria
operation dur
of the past.
say. He in
disappeared o
or anything
which produc
much when
electrical cur

he nose, as to
in. But even
n amount to?
organization
ient to those
th an injured
ut a brain at
he can offer
case he must
ining mental
id dogmatizes.
contends that
fers, however,
erience of life
t the fact of
it. All this
mind of man
stence, and he
freaks which
ation on the
and which is
every rule of

he brain. To
nce from the
f "strength"

Mr. Barnett
n the brain is
d-soulism, he
d" with the
produced by
a declaration
undeserving
at deal with

id without the
ere a creation
we have now
ready stated,
carbonic acid,
urnace of the
e is the same.
remarked by
t living thing.
la, draw their
of the British

Facts always supply inferences. If a man can see with his eye open, and he cannot see when his eye is shut, the facts "supply the inference" that without his eye, he could not see. A theorist with the notion that the faculty of sight was "an essential principle," might deny the inference, but his dogmatism would only be laughed at. This is what Mr. Barnett deserves in the present case. When a man's brain is in good order, he can think. If the spinal marrow is healthy and free from injury, the brain receives and feels every impression made on the senses; the spinal marrow acting as the conducting medium. If it is cut, the brain is unconscious of everything below the point of incision. If it is diseased but not cut, partial unconsciousness is experienced below the locality of the disease: above it the feelings are natural. If the brain itself is injured, a total eclipse of consciousness follows. Do these facts not "supply an inference" that where there is no brain, there is no consciousness?

The brain thinks: when large and well-formed, it thinks well; when small and mis-shapen, it thinks badly or idiotically, or does not think at all. When injured, it stops thinking. Do these facts not "supply an inference" that when there is no brain there is no thought? We all know we never began to think until we had a brain.

Mr. Barnett thinks these facts "supply no inference." What has he to say in the case of the animals? If you knock a cow on the head, it instantly loses what little sense it had. If you sever its spinal marrow, its hinder extremities become paralysed. If you kill it, you never hear anything more of the poor beast. Mr. Barnett in this instance accepts the inference "supplied" by the facts. He admits the cow is a cow, and depends for all its faculties—its sight, its hearing, and its dull thoughts—upon its cow organization; but he denies that the same facts "supply" the same "inference" in the case of man. This is simply because he has a theory to maintain at all hazards.

But Mr. Barnett makes a violent effort to get rid of the facts as affecting the human species. The case of the man who lay thirteen months unconscious from injury of the brain, lies in his way, and he makes one more clutch at its throat to get rid of it. He says the fact that the man remembered himself when his brain was put right, shews the presence of an immaterial soul, because, on the brain theory, the nutritive processes in operation during the thirteen months, ought to have obliterated the memory of the past. Where Mr. Barnett gets this argument it is impossible to say. He invents the proposition that the man's memory ought to have disappeared on the Christadelphian principle. It is entirely contrary to fact or anything admitted on the Christadelphian side. The brain impressions which produce memory, when they have proper play, exist in a man's head as much when it is injured as when it is whole; but the continuity of the electrical current being interrupted, they are not felt, and the result is a

suspension of the consciousness, which, in their normal relation, they produce. When the continuity is restored, the impressions are liberated from bondage, and memory re-appears.

But Mr. Barnett says "the man had not the same brain, atomically, when he recovered consciousness." This is not true. That there would be some slight atomic modification is undoubted, but not such as to interfere with the identity of the brain. Even if the period had been seven years, when a complete atomic revolution might be supposed to have taken place, the impressions latent in the substance of the brain would not have been destroyed, but would have been perpetuated by the hereditary atomic law before considered. "Impressions" are made on the brain organism as such, and not on the atoms composing it. "Atoms" cannot receive impressions. They come and go without greatly interfering with the general state of affairs, the same as coal supplied to a fire. This is the answer to Mr. Barnett's questions on the subject. It effectually meets the suggestions by which he would seek to get rid of a strong case against him. And then, there still remains the point that Mr. Barnett is obliged to admit, that for thirteen months an immortal soul was unconscious! What an awkward admission for a man who contends that a soul must always and necessarily be so conscious, that even death cannot destroy it! However, Mr. Barnett does not seem to feel it, so other people must feel it for him.

MR. BARNETT'S REVIEW OF SCRIPTURE ARGUMENTS ON MORTALITY.

Mr. Barnett next attempts to follow the scriptural argument. He begins by observing that "it is a waste of words to argue against the received doctrine of man's immortality, as if that doctrine implied that man is not mortal." He illustrates his meaning by saying that the dead are dead in some respects and alive in others. If Mr. Barnett would define his terms, it would be easier to follow him. What does he mean by "death?" Has it no inverse reference to "life?" Do we not derive our idea of death from acquaintance with life. Life is a positive phenomenon, and (in relation to us) has a beginning; and the word "death" has become current to express the cessation of that phenomenon, with which, unfortunately, we are familiar. It is true the word is used with reference to a variety of things, but this only arises from the fact that there is a variety of life. Vegetable life gives rise to its use when a plant dies. Metaphorical life, as the prosperity of an institution, occasions its use, when prosperity departs and the institution dies. To whatever thing it applies, it expresses the opposite of the life pertaining to it, or that may be conceived as pertaining to it. On this obvious and universal principle, the death of a human being must have inverse reference to the life of a human being. It cannot be said that a human being is dead, unless his life as a human being has ceased. It is vain, therefore, for

Mr. Barnett at the same time dead. It would be according to real invisible

Mr. Barnett's Unfortunate! them is that life and death perfectly into the subject w even of *life*," "Except ye *life* in you," answer is, the experience is basis is the s but related to first there will styling himse came to reve makes manid forth) to the Father's will, raise it up at changes at t "WHEN this shall put on IS WRITTEN, I and immorta i. 10), there resurrection. because posse established of them. In th moment alive. only acquire quoted by M life, refer to t His next i does not adv: life? It is vanisheth aw

ly produce.
bondage,

ally, when
d be some
nferre with
ven years,
ve taken
not have
ry atomic
ganism as
ve imprea-
neral state
nswer to
eets the
ong case
Barnett
onscious!
st always
However,
him.

xxx.

He begins
received
can is not
are dead
his terms,
?" Has
eath from
elation to
o express
familiar.
), but this
table life
prosperity
stitution
life pers-
s obvious
se refer-
being is
fore, for

Mr. Barnett to get way from the inconsistency of a man being dead and alive at the same time. If a human being continues to live after death, he is not dead. It would not suit the theory to say that the body is dead, because according to the theory the body is never alive, but only inhabited by the real invisible man, on whose withdrawal the body crumbles.

Mr. Barnett contends for the "elasticity" of the terms "life" and "death." Unfortunately, he does not define what he means. The only elasticity about them is that already indicated, viz., their application to different kinds of life and death. On this principle, the Scriptures quoted by Mr. Barnett are perfectly intelligible without involving that violation of first principles on the subject which he wishes to found upon them. He quotes, "We despaired even of *life*," (2 Cor. i. 8); and placing it side by side with Christ's words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no *life* in you," (Jno. vi. 53), he asks if life in both cases can be the same? The answer is, they are the same thing in two aspects. Actual life of present experience is the subject of the one passage, and actual life on the immortal basis is the subject of the second. It is life in both cases in the vital sense, but related to two aspects of being—the mortal and immortal. About the first there will be no dispute. Jesus determined the truth as to the second, in styling himself the *resurrection and the life*.—(John xi. 25.) The life he came to reveal is connected with, and subsequent to, resurrection. This he makes manifest in the saying, "They that have done good (shall come forth) to the *resurrection of life*."—(John v. 29.) And again, "This is the Father's will, that of all He hath given me I should lose nothing, *but should raise it up at the last day*." Death is not swallowed up of life till the body changes at the resurrection. Paul settles this in words already quoted, "WHEN this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and *this mortal shall put on immortality*, THEN SHALL BE BROUGHT TO PASS THE SAYING THAT IS WRITTEN, *Death is swallowed up of victory*."—(1 Cor. xv. 54.) The "*life*" and immortality brought to light by Christ through the gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10), therefore, have reference to a future bodily state inaugurated by resurrection. In that state, life will be inherent and indestructible, because possessed in an incorruptible body. "Life" will be the normal and established condition in relation to all who enter it. Death can never touch them. In the present state, we are in the power of death, though for the moment alive. In the light of eternal results, we have no life in us. We can only acquire a relation to everlasting life, through Christ. Hence the words quoted by Mr. Barnett, which, instead of referring to something else than life, refer to the same thing in its perfect form.

His next illustration of "elasticity" is of precisely the same order, and does not advance his argument one inch. He compares "What is your *life*?" It is even a vapour that appeareth for a very little while and then vanisheth away" (Jas. iv. 14), with "He that hath the Son hath *life*"

(John v. 12), and suggests that "life" in those passages cannot have the same meaning. The same answer applies to this as to the last. Radically, they are the same, but expressive of two different manifestations. Our present *real life* is a vapour. The *real life* of the immortal state is only acquirable through Christ. It is life in the sense of vital intelligent existence in both cases.

Mr. Barnett is equally unsuccessful in his attempt to show that "death" is used in different and incompatible senses. "I persecuted this way unto the death" (Acts xxii. 4), he contrasts with "We have passed from death into life" (1 John iii. 14), and denies that the word "death" can have the same meaning in both cases. His denial proceeds from want of reflection. As in the last case, there will be no dispute about the sense in which Paul persecuted believers "unto the death." The question is, in what sense have believers passed from death? This is answered by recalling to mind the death from which they pass. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men."—(Rom. v. 12.) "By man (Adam) came death."—(1 Cor. xv. 21.) Was not this the death from which Jesus came to deliver men, and from the jurisdiction of which believers "pass," on believing on him? This will not be denied. The only point is, what was the nature of death that came through Adam? And the scriptural answer is, *resolution into original dust*: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—(Gen. iii. 19.) In this fate we are all constitutionally involved. How do we pass from it? By an alteration in our position in relation to the law of life and death. By nature we are under a sentence of death that, in its operation, would destroy us for ever; through Christ, we come under the operation of the law of life which has been established in him.—(Rom. viii. 3.) But this law has its operation in the future. We are not redeemed till "the body" has come under its actual power in the change from flesh-nature to spirit-nature.—(Rom. viii. 23; Jno. iii. 6; 1 Corinthians xv. 42-56.) Yet having a pledge in God's word or promise, the apostles speak of men's relation to the promise in the language of fact, "calling those things that are not as though they were."—(Rom. iv. 17), saying, they have passed from death to life when they have only passed from a state of death-decree to a state of life-decree. The death from which they pass is real, ending in the grave in total dissolution: the life to which they attain, is real, blossoming at the resurrection, to immortal being. So that in both the passages quoted, death has the same radical significance, and does not in its uses justify the conclusion that "a man may be living in one sense, yet dead in another;" except to this extent—that a living mortal man may be described as a dead man with reference to his future prospects; just as a murderer has been known at the moment of apprehension, to exclaim "I am a dead man!" meaning that death was certain.

"She that liveth in pleasure, is dead while she liveth."—(1 Tim. v. 6.)

Has she ce-
it. The en-
the form of
death."—(J
explanatio
Paul make
opposites.

versus actu
death," in

"The bo
this agains
quotation.

be spiritua
is mortal
himself, wh
ship in Chr
with life.

both condit
and unscri
so-called Cl

Mr. Barne
The only d
the prima
other uses

The begin
does not re
interprets C

Testament
the veil of
veil by whi

ancient phi
harmonise
be reversed.

speculation:
must be al
result start

accordant w
itself from l
truth, at on

intelligence.
Mr. Barn
Lectures, in

hardly need

not have the
t. Radically,
tations. Our
state is only
gent existence

at "death" is
way unto the
m death into
can have the
reflection. As
n which Paul
at sense have
to mind the
the world, and
v. 12.) "By
is the death
tion of which
ed. The only
Adam? And
thou art, and
te we are all
teration in our
e are under a
ever; through
as been estab-
i in the future.
ctual power in
23; Jno. iii.
od's word or
the language
were."—(Rom.
they have only
he death from
lution: the life
mmortal being.
al significance,
y be living in
a living mortal
ture prospects;
sion, to exclaim

(1 Tim. v. 6.)

Has she ceased to exist? enquires Mr. Barnett. No; but she is on the way to it. The end or result of her career is taken to express the nature of it, after the form of speech employed by Solomon, "all that hate me (wisdom) *love death*."—(Prov. viii. 36.) Mr. Barnett is compelled to admit this explanation, unless he is prepared to admit a spiritual sense to "liveth." Paul makes an antithesis; and to have an antithesis, there must be two opposites. It must be spiritual life *versus* spiritual death, or else, actual life *versus* actual death. Mr. Barnett interprets it "actual life *versus* spiritual death," in violation of the most ordinary rules of interpretation.

"*The body is dead because of sin*."—(Rom. viii. 10.) Mr. Barnett quotes this against the Christadelphians, but it is difficult to see the intent of the quotation. What does he make of it? "The body is dead;" can *the body* be spiritually dead? What is the fact? The body of a saint in this state is *mortal* (notwithstanding his connection with Christ), because of sin in himself, which will never fairly be uprooted till the resurrection; his relationship in Christ (which at present is confined to the spirit or mind) is fraught with life. This fact is expressed metonymically by the results attached to both conditions—death and life; but is this to justify the invention of a new and unscriptural "death," to fit with the immortal soul of Platonists and so-called Christians? The same remarks apply to all the other passages which Mr. Barnett quotes.—(Eph. v. 14; Col. iii. 3; Eph. ii. 1; Matt. viii. 22.) The only death known to the Bible is the one defined in Gen. iii. 19; this is the primary which governs all other ideas or expressions of it. All other uses of the word are derived from the literal fact of mortality. The beginning must rule and interpret the end. This Mr. Barnett does not recognise, but writes from precisely the opposite direction. He interprets Gen. iii. 19, in the light of ideas *assumed* to be the intent of New Testament expressions. He imitates the blind leaders of old, in first casting the veil of tradition over the Word of God, and then reading it through the veil by which it is made void and of none effect. He takes his lessons from ancient philosophy and vain deceit, and then attempts (no doubt honestly) to harmonise the Scriptures with his nullifying conceits. The process must be reversed. The plain teaching of God's Word must be upheld against the speculations of Pagan philosophy, and the first lessons of the Scriptures must be allowed to unlock the more advanced. By this plan we get at a result startling, no doubt, to people brought up in popular orthodoxy, but accordant with common sense—a result that makes the Bible harmonise with itself from beginning to end, and brings before the mind a system of revealed truth, at once in harmony with experience and the aspirations of unsatisfied intelligence.

Mr. Barnett's attempts to dispose of the passages quoted in the *Twelve Lectures*, in proof of the unconscious state of the dead are so absurd, that it is hardly necessary to do more than simply repeat the passages themselves.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest."—(Eccles. ix. 10.) Mr. Barnett makes this to mean that "the knowledge, the wisdom, the sagacity which we may possess in eternity will not avail for the work of time." That is to say, Mr. Barnett turns the passage completely round, or rather, makes it stand on its head. Solomon says there is no "knowledge, wisdom, or sagacity" in eternity; Mr. Barnett says there is, and that Solomon "meant" to say there was, but that it could not be utilised for present purposes! Mr. Barnett concludes his remark with the obscure observation, "If death were equivalent to extinction, the exhortation in the passage could only be stigmatised as an instance of 'much ado about nothing.'" As it seems to us, the case stands just the other way, viz., that it requires that there shall be non-existence and impossibility of performance in the grave in order to give Solomon's exhortation point; for if a man cannot think or do anything in the grave, that is the best of all reasons why he should do it now; but if a man has "knowledge, wisdom, and device" in the grave, there might be ground for hope that what the spiritualists teach is true, viz., that in the disembodied state there is continual progression; and the effect of such an idea would just be the contrary of Solomon's, viz., "Take it easy now, for, beyond the grave, there is plenty of time and better means of improvement."

"Why died I not from the womb? For now should I have lain still and been quiet. I should have slept. . . . As a hidden untimely birth I had not been, as infants which never saw the light."—(Job iii. 11-19; x. 18, 22.) Mr. Barnett's comments on this passage develop the following remarkable results:—1st, he denies that Job meant annihilation as the result of death in infancy; 2nd, he admits Job might have meant it "in the gloom and bewilderment of that dreadful time;" and 3rd, he doubts, after all, if Job is to be trusted!!!

"Free among the dead like the slain that lie in the grave whom thou rememberest no more, and they are cut off from Thy hand. . . . Wilt Thou show Thy wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise Thee? Shall Thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave, or Thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark, or Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?"—(Ps. lxxxviii. 5, 10-12.) Mr. Barnett thinks this means people punished by a violent death who are no more "graciously" remembered, and that there is not a syllable in these words which implies that David regarded death as a ceasing to be. What does the reader think?

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—(Ps. cxv. 17.) In Mr. Barnett's estimation, these words are intended to teach that God's people will praise Him when they are dead, but that he wants them to praise him now, in the mortal state, as well! It is

certainly a strange embarrassed in I finds relief in the time forth even y of consciousness i too. The "dead but Mr. Barnett dead praise not is answered in I cannot celebrate Thy truth. TH day." The living righteous shall liv

"Spare me tha.—(Ps. xxxix. 13 Christadelphian is till the resurrecti his theory of immu till I go to heavie view, could David for one moment to "The living kn neither have they Also their love as have they any more—(Ecc. ix. 5-6.)

earthly portion. things of which says "the dead : their lives are r consequent destruc state of orthodoxy blank, knowing no purposes, they mi; the Christadelphia and held by "the behind in the bod love of friends an very neutral and mental faculties passionless thing, and between whiel This does not comp

for there
: whither
hat "the
nity will
urns the
Solomon
. Barnett
t that it
ludes his
xtinction,
stance of
just the
nce and
Solomon's
e grave,
if a man
e ground
embodied
ould just
he grave,

still and
ely birth
i. 11-19;
following
a as the
at it "in
e doubts,

om thou
...
id arise
e grave,
n in the
xxxviii.
a violent
e is not
ath as a

silence."
intended
but that
! It is

certainly a strange way of teaching such a lesson. He is evidently embarrassed in his attempt to give this terrible twist to the passage, and finds relief in the verse following it, "But we will bless the Lord *from this time forth even for evermore.*" He thinks this reveals David's expectation of consciousness in death, but he cannot hold to this and the other suggestion too. The "dead" of one verse is in antithesis to "we" in the other; but Mr. Barnett makes them mean the same. This cannot be. "The dead praise not the Lord, . . . but we" &c. Who? The question is answered in Isaiah xxxviii. 18, "*The grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for Thy truth. THE LIVING, THE LIVING, he shall praise Thee as I do this day.*" The living praise God; and it is the intention of God that the righteous shall live for ever.

"Spare me that I may recover strength before I go hence and be no more."
—(Ps. xxxix. 13.) Mr. Barnett is troubled with this. He says if the Christadelphian is at liberty to say it means that David was to "be no more till the resurrection," he is at liberty to paraphrase it into harmony with his theory of immortality. Let him try. How would it read "be no more till I go to heaven?" At which point of time, from the orthodox point of view, could David be said to be "no more," when David is never admitted for one moment to have gone out of existence?

"The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished: neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun."
—(Ecc. ix. 5-6.) Mr. Barnett thinks this means the dead have no more an earthly portion. True, Solomon mentions an earthly portion as one of the things of which the dead are deprived, but he also speaks of faculties. He says "the dead know not anything" and that the loves and hatreds of their lives are PERISHED. Mr. Barnett says all this may be without any consequent destruction of consciousness! What a curious state the living-death state of orthodoxy must be, if those who are in it are in a state of complete blank, knowing nothing, and loving and hating nothing! For all practical purposes, they might as well be *non est* according to the dreadful doctrine of the Christadelphians. Is it so that a man's knowledge taken in by "the soul," and held by "the soul" does not go with the soul? Is the knowledge left behind in the body? Is it so that a righteous man does not take away his love of friends and love of God to heaven? The immortal soul must be a very neutral and worthless sort of thing, if it can go away and leave all mental faculties and affections behind it, mounting to heaven a witless, passionless thing, a sort of cold spectre that has forgotten it ever was on earth, and between which and its former self, there is not the smallest tie of memory. This does not comport very well with the pulpit representations of disembodied

immortal souls recognising friends in heaven or execrating enemies in hell. Yet they are the tremendous admission Mr. Barnett is obliged to make, in attempting to reconcile the Bible with modernised Paganism.

Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help: for his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day his thoughts perish.—(Ps. cxlvi. 3-4.) Mr. Barnett does not like the translation here. He suggests the substitution of "splendid schemes" for "thoughts." This will not help him a bit, for a man's splendid schemes only "perish" by the collapse of the "thoughts" that led to them. A scheme is a plan, an intention, an idea; and if "splendid schemes" perish in the day of death, there is every reason for believing that "thoughts" in the metaphysical sense, perish also, especially as Solomon says "the dead know not anything."

In death there is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave who shall give Thee thanks?—(Ps. vi. 5.) Mr. Barnett has difficulty with this passage, as well he may. He denies it gives any countenance to the idea of death being a state of unconsciousness. He thinks it means that David was "deprecating a premature death as the result of divine judgment, and as therefore involving subsequent consequences (going to hell?) which must be incompatible with the service and praise of God." The "consequence" specified by David as "incompatible with the service and praise of God" was *going into the grave*. Mr. Barnett thinks it was more than going into the grave. In his opinion David was referring to something which David does not mention. He thinks David had hell in full view; and that if he had expressed himself clearly, he would have said, "Oh, save my soul from the devil: deliver me from going down to the damned; for in hell, there is no remembrance of Thee; in everlasting torments, who shall give Thee thanks?" Had David said this, Mr. Barnett's difficulty would have been at an end, but David does not, and Mr. Barnett must be left to writhe in torture on the point of what David does say, in the hope that he may die theologically, and turn to the truth.

The grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for Thy truth.—(Isaiah xxxviii. 18.) Rightly understood, Mr. Barnett thinks these words have no bearing on the question. Strange! Hezekiah speaks of the grave and death, and the state of those who are engulfed by them. Has this no connection with the question? Mr. Barnett is of opinion that the passage expresses a "horrified soul's" terror in contemplation of the horrors of damnation. One would never arrive at such an opinion by the reading of the passage. It would be curious to know if the expression of such an opinion will, in anybody's estimation, reduce, by one degree, the dead weight of Hezekiah's declaration concerning the state of the dead.

Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud,

yea and all that shall burn therein, neither root nor branch, shall be completely consumed.—(Isaiah lvi. 1-4.) It is defined as the "Sun of (iv. 2.) Did C Instead of the house unto J they were mel is mentioned His saints an Lamb having judgment desc statement, th Lord Jesus from the prese and in Rev. when "He sh God."—(Rev. them (the wi It is not wo with his syste Bride in mai day, all the ye die; and the the Scripture eternal life, n of Christ.

following pl
Rom. ii. 6-16

"They sha
the Lord."—
well-being!"
but this does

"As the wi
everlasting fe
upset as a Ch
the wicked, a
life that Go
statement is

yea and all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."—(Mal. iv. 1.) Mr. Barnett thinks this was finally fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem! This is an extraordinary leap in the dark, bringing with it the inevitable consequence of broken bones. The time of which Malachi speaks is not left open to conjecture. It is defined as "the day when I make up my jewels" (Mal. iii. 17), when the "Sun of Righteousness" would "rise with healing in his wings."—(iv. 2.) Did God "make up His jewels" at the destruction of Jerusalem? Instead of that He gathered the "brass and iron and tin and lead" of His house unto Jerusalem as into a pot, and blew upon them in His anger till they were melted.—(Ezek. xxii. 17-22.) The time of making up His jewels is mentioned in 2 Thess. i. 7-10, when he shall come "to be glorified in His saints and admired in all them that believe," "the marriage of the Lamb having come."—(Rev. xix. 7.) The occasion is marked with the judgment described by Malachi; for in 2 Thess. i. it is associated with this statement, that those who know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, "shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power" (2 Thess. i. 9); and in Rev. xix. the marriage of the Lamb is concurrent with a period when "He shall tread the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."—(Rev. xix. 15.) This is "the day that cometh which shall burn them (the wicked) up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." It is not wonderful that Mr. Barnett does not recognise the period, for with his system, there is no day for "making up his jewels," or uniting the Bride in marriage to the Lamb." The jewels fly at a certain ratio per day, all the year round, according to the rapidity with which righteous men die; and they are married piecemeal to the Lamb. This is contrary to the Scriptures, which teach that there is no judgment, no reward, no eternal life, no inheritance of the kingdom of God till the second appearing of Christ. Proof of this may be seen in passages to be found in the following places:—2 Tim. iv. 1; Rev. xi. 18; xxii. 12; Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 6-16; Luke xix. 11-27.

"They shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."—(2 Thess. i. 9.) Mr. Barnett thinks this means "destruction of well-being!" The passage says that the persons themselves shall be destroyed, but this does not suit Mr. Barnett's theory, so he wrests the meaning.

"As the whirlwind passeth so is the wicked no more, but the righteous is an everlasting foundation."—(Prov. x. 25.) Mr. Barnett thinks this passage is upset as a Christadelphian proof, by the fact that the righteous die as well as the wicked, as if the "everlasting foundation" did not relate to the everlasting life that God has promised! Considered in the light of the future, the statement is literally true. The wicked are like a passing gust of wind, but

hell.
ke, in

ere is
; very
re the
;" for
s only
cheme
ie day
n the
know

7 give
ge, as
being
ating
efore
atible
David
to the
In his
ntion.
ressed
eliver
oce of
David
David
int of
turn

they
. 18.)
n the
l the
with
ses a
ation.
sage.
ll, in
kiah's

roud,

the righteous are a permanent order of men. The occurrence of death while the Lord is away does not interfere with the fact; for those who are destined to be raised to everlasting life, are alive to God's mind, though actually, for the time being, in the same state as the wicked. The literal state of the case is expressed in these words: "*Precious in the sight of the Lord is the DEATH of His saints.*"—(Psalm cxvi. 15.) "They shall be mine in the day when I make up my jewels."—Mal iii. 17.) Therefore, in divine language, they are an everlasting foundation; "but the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke they shall consume away."—(Psalm xxxvii. 20.)

"*The wicked shall perish for ever like his own dung. They which have seen him shall say—Where is he? Yea, he shall be chased away as a vision of the night.* Mr. Barnett takes this to express that the wicked shall vanish from the earth after a short career! One can only say that it is strange the words of Scripture should be taken up with the expression of such incomparable trifles as the earthly aspect of things must be, if the reality is in a sphere to which righteousness and wickedness give an everlasting relation.

In a similarly lame and illogical manner does Mr. Barnett attempt to fritter away the following plain statements:—

"The wicked shall perish; the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away."—(Psalm xxxvii. 20.)

"Like sheep they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on them; he shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light."—(Psalm xlix. 14-19.)

"They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore, hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish."—(Isaiah xxvi. 14.)

MR. BARNETT'S SCRIPTURE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF NATURAL IMMORTALITY.

Mr. Barnett then turns to the passages which are held to sanction the popular doctrine. He admits there is no explicit enunciation of the popular doctrine in the Scriptures, but he soon disposes of this fact to his own satisfaction. Explicit statement is not to be found in the Scriptures, because explicit statement was not needed! "The immortality of the soul," he says, "has been the common belief of mankind, and may be fairly reckoned amongst the intuitions of our nature!" "The teachings of the Bible," he continues, "proceed upon the assumption that this intuition is not to be impugned, and does not require to be defended!" Amongst all the cool assumptions and unfounded assertions with which Mr. Barnett's little book abounds, this, perhaps, is the most glaring. One cannot be surprised at it. The defence of the immortality of the soul compels a man to take this extraordinary ground; for what other answer can we have to the extraordinary fact that the doctrine which orthodox preachers find it necessary to continually

and express question of of nature" is one of the no intuitive A new bor knowledge a mission of ir perception. resulting in recognition speech and c

The "intuit of speculati the Bible c Mr. Barnett assumption immortality goes directl Bible says, Jesus says things from Paul says, VAIN DECEIT

Mr. Barn be inconson declaration light throo immortality "has shed l view!" T immortality before; he of the soul disciples of shed a littl showing t before, it Where, the that "the a thing, l the world.' Says he o

h while
lestined
lly, for
he case
is THE
he day
guage,
nd the
; into

ve seen
of the
m the
rds of
trifies
which

fritter

bs:

all
9.)
se;
to

pular
ctrine
tion.
plicit
been
; the
ues,
ned,
tions
nds,
The
tra-
nary
ally

and expressly inculcate, is never once avowed in the Scriptures? As a question of logic, it won't stand a moment's investigation. The "intuition of nature" upon which Mr. Barnett founds his enormous superstructure, is one of the myths of ancient speculation. As a matter of fact, there is no intuitive knowledge. All knowledge comes to us through the senses. A new born babe is a proper illustration of the subject. It has no knowledge and no consciousness; these are formed with the gradual transmission of impressions to the brain through the eye, ear, and other organs of perception. The mental impressions are slowly classified by experience, resulting in the distinguishment of animate from inanimate objects, the recognition of familiar faces, the use of hands and feet, the articulation of speech and other functions of intelligent life. Nothing comes by "intuition." The "intuitions of our nature" is a phrase expressive of one of the delusions of speculative philosophy. It is part of the wisdom of this world which the Bible declares to be "foolishness with God."—(1 Cor. iii. 19.) But Mr. Barnett endorses it. He declares that the Bible proceeds on the assumption that "the wisdom of the world" (with its principal feature, the immortality of the soul,) is "not to be impugned." In this Mr. Barnett goes directly in the teeth of Scripture, as he does in almost every case. The Bible says, "God hath *made foolish* the wisdom of the world."—(1 Cor. i. 29.) Jesus says of the truth, "I thank Thee, O Father, that Thou hast *hid these things from the wise and prudent* and hast revealed them unto babes." Paul says, "Beware lest any man *spoil you* through PHILOSOPHY AND VALEN DEOREIT."

Mr. Barnett instantly stumbles on an apostolic statement which he feels to be inconsonant with his theory, and is bound to attempt to explain. It is the declaration of Paul, that "Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." His comment upon this is that "life and immortality have not been *revealed* by the gospel!!!" "The gospel," he says, "has *shed light* upon them, *i.e.*, has brought them into clearer and completer view!" This is certainly extraordinary. Paul says Jesus has brought immortality to light. "Oh no," says Mr. Barnett, "not at all; it existed before; he has only shed a clearer light upon it." No doubt the immortality of the soul existed before Christ's time, being taught very clearly among the disciples of Plato. If Paul means to say, as Mr. Barnett suggests, that Christ shed a little more light on this doctrine, Mr. Barnett will have no difficulty in showing that Christ taught the immortality of the soul. If it was clear before, it must have been very clear after Christ "shed light" upon it. Where, then, is Christ to be found affirming "the intuitions of our nature," that "the soul is immortal and lives after death?" Instead of affirming such a thing, he says that he himself is "the life," and came to give life unto the world."—(Jno. vi. 33; x. 10.) "Ye have no life in you."—(Jno. vi. 53.) Says he of man naturally, "If ye believe not that I am he, *ye shall DIE in*

your sins."—(Jno. viii. 24; iii. 36.) Only of him that believes does he say that he "shall have everlasting life."—(John iii. 16.) Only of those that "seek for" immortality by "patient continuance in well-doing," does Paul, one of Christ's disciples, say that God will give eternal life.—(Rom. ii. 7.) "Jesus Christ hath brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel.*"—(2 Tim. i. 10.) Instead of "shedding a clearer light" upon the immortality of the soul, Jesus says nothing about the immortality of the soul, nor do his apostles. They incessantly speak of the resurrection and a conditional immortality in the body, thus throwing great darkness on the immortality of the soul, and effectually excluding and destroying it.

Mr. Barnett proceeds to review in detail, the Christadelphian explanations of those passages which are supposed to countenance the popular theory.

1.—The answer of Christ to the thief on the cross, "this day shalt thou be with me in paradise."—(Luke xxiii. 43.) On this, Mr. Barnett says that when Jesus died, he went to Paradise. Paul, on the contrary, says Christ died "and was BURIED, and rose again the third day."—(1 Cor. xv. 4.) Jesus says of himself, he should "suffer many things of the elders . . . and BE KILLED, and be raised again the third day."—(Matt. xvi. 21.) Peter says he was "in hell" in which God did not leave him, but "loosed the pains of death."—(Acts ii. 24.) Mr. Barnett says "he went to Paradise." This, in orthodox language, would be equivalent to ascending to the Father; yet on the day of Christ's resurrection, he said to Mary "Touch me not, for I AM NOT YET ASCENDED TO MY FATHER."—(Jno. xx. 17.) Mr. Barnett feels the inconvenience of this, and attempts to get over it by saying it refers to his ascension, but this does not ease the difficulty, for it amounts to a declaration that he had not ascended to the Father (*i.e.* in orthodox language, "to Paradise") till the event contemplated in his saying to Mary, and therefore disproves Mr. Barnett's statement that "*when he died, he went to Paradise.*" Mr. Barnett thinks it very "audacious" to suggest that Christ's answer meant that the thief should be with him in Paradise in the day of his kingdom. Is it very audacious to suppose that Christ answered the question put to him?—"Lord, remember us *when thou comest in Thy Kingdom?*" It seems much more audacious to assert, as Mr. Barnett does, that Christ passed over the thief's question, and referred to something that was absent from the thief's mind.

2.—*Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.*—(Luke xvi. 19.) Mr. Barnett admits the parabolic character of this narrative, which greatly simplifies the argument. He says it *must mean something*; with this we will not quarrel. It was never uttered without a meaning, but if it is a parable, let us deal fairly with it. Mr. Barnett, endorsing "a learned commentator's" view of the case, contends that it means itself. He thinks it announces the three literal facts appearing on the face of the parable. How can this be? How can a parable mean itself. A parable is intended to express truth by analogy,

but the anal
The lesson o
rich are ca
standard of
constructs a
to whom he
in every par
his discours
representati
hell, and ac
department
taught the
11-15.) If
and private
as Mr. Barn
enemies.

3.—*The*
contends th
that "the
but conscio
their depa
resurrectio
seen by Jo
would of c
book in w
contrary.
prophecy?
which the
him to sh
Yet Mr.
question,
case is sti
show the
easily que
smack of
were not:
fact at th
character:
wonderfu
superficia
The gr
which th
of the 1

as he say
lose that
oes Paul,
m. ii. 7.)
gospel."
ortality
, nor do
additional
tality of

anations
ry.

thou be
ys that
rist died
sus says

and
vi. 21.)

"loosed
radise."

Father;
ne not,
Barnett

it refers
its to a
guage,

y, and
went to

Christ's
day of

ed the
gdom?"
Christ
absent

Barnett
fies the
arrel.

is deal
of the

literal
can a
alogy,

but the analogy is always founded on something other than the thing intended. The lesson of the parable is clear, viz., that the poor will be exalted when the rich are cast down, and that "Moses and the prophets" constitute the standard of truth in relation to mankind. To express these lessons, Jesus constructs a parable out of the death-state theory accredited by the Pharisees to whom he addressed it. This cannot be denied, for the parable is coincident in every particular with the belief of the Pharisees as set out by Josephus in his discourse on *Hades*. If Mr. Barnett insists on the parable as a literal representation of truth, he must abandon the orthodox theory of heaven and hell, and adopt the tradition of the Pharisees, that "Abraham's bosom" is a department of "hades" situate in "an unfinished part of the earth." Christ taught the Pharisees in parable to conceal the truth from them.—(Matt. xiii. 11-15.) If we wish to know the truth, we must seek for Christ's plain and private instructions to his disciples, instead of attempting to recognise it, as Mr. Barnett does in this instance, in the cloaked utterances addressed to his enemies.

3.—*The redeemed seen by John in vision.*—(Rev. vii. 9.) Mr. Barnett contends that John's vision of a redeemed multitude praising God, is proof that "the persons of whom the multitude was composed, were not only alive but conscious—not only conscious but in a state of exalted happiness, after their departure from this world and previously to the period of their resurrection." On no principle can this be logically asserted. If the things seen by John were actual, the existence and consciousness of the people seen would of course follow: but were they actual? We have only to consult the book in which John has described them, to satisfy ourselves entirely to the contrary. He styles his book "a prophecy."—(Rev. i. 3.) What is a prophecy? A prediction of things to come. This is the very definition with which the book opens "the Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his servants THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS." Yet Mr. Barnett insists that what John saw, in the particular instance in question, was *a state of things in existence at the time John beheld it*. The case is still stronger against him in Rev. iv. 1. "Come up hither and I will show thee THINGS WHICH MUST BE HEREAFTER." But Mr. Barnett is not easily quenched. He goes in the face even of this, and pooh poohs, with a smack of virtuous indignation, the suggestion that the multitude John saw were not alive at the time, but constituted a representation of what would be fact at the advent of Christ. In view of the total absence of evidence which characterises the whole argument on his side of the question, it is not wonderful that he clings with tenacity to a passage of Scripture that, superficially read, bears in his favour.

The ground of his contention is that the sixth seal, in connection with which the multitude was seen, is now historic, and that therefore the vision of the multitude cannot be future. This argument cannot be urged

unless it be contended that the scenes of the Apocalypse are sequential. They are as really sequential as a series of historic and doctrinal symbols would allow; but that there is a consecutive chronology, surely Mr. Barnett would not contend. At every stage, the continuity is interrupted for the introduction of ultimate results in special connections. The final *dénouement* is several times exhibited in connection with an early phase of events. Indeed, the first scene of all exhibits in one bold conjunction, the two extremities of the prophetic line reaching from John's day—the beginning and the end—the commencement of divine interposition, through Jesus, and the end of it in the development of the royal priesthood ready to co-operate with him in the rule of the nations.—(Rev. v. 10.) At every succeeding stage, the vision is hurried to the end, as it were, before the next subordinate phase is introduced. Thus the events of the sixth seal find their termination in “the great day of the wrath of the Lamb,” and the concurrent investiture of the redeemed with robes of victory.—(Rev. vi. 13-17; 9-10.) The events of the seventh seal (including the seven trumpets) are made to end in “the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ” (Rev. xi. 17); and then the beholder is again brought back to witness the historic details connected with the development of the Great Mother of Harlots, the Romish Church. Rev. xiv. shows the saints triumphant and the harvest of the earth reaped; Rev. xv. takes us back to the inauguration of the vials; Rev. xvi. brings divine destruction on the power of man at the coming of Christ; Rev. xvii. exhibits the triumph of Papistical tyranny for centuries previous. The same interspersion of scenes in unchronological order, occurs throughout. The sequence of record, therefore, upon which Mr. Barnett relies, is no guide at all. The nature and relation of the events, considered in the light of “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” as revealed in the plain portion of the Bible, must determine the chronology of the several scenes exhibited. Now, the redeemed multitude had palms in their hands. This indicated victory achieved, and their songs spoke of salvation bestowed. We have before shown that these are not actual occurrent events, until the return of Christ and the resurrection and glorification of his people. The literal state of the case is shown under the seventh trumpet, which is at the terminal extremity of the apocalyptic chronology. Under this, we read that “the time of *the dead* (came) that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear Thy name, both small and great.”—(Rev. xi. 18.) This is the time of Christ's appearing; for Paul's testimony is, “he shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*” (2 Tim. iv. 1); and Jesus says, “Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me.”—(Rev. xxii. 12.)

4.—*The dying prayer of Stephen.* Mr. Barnett considers that Stephen need not have prayed “Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit,” if he only meant his

breath or life without a reflection is that would inevitably subject of pain and pass out that his life back.

5.—“*Abse* Mr. Barnett words are an encumbrance at the resurrection “his labour immediately matter, and with assert everything, belongs in:

Anticipated recognised in continuance “imperfect discuss this (Phil. i. 21. die is exp crown of ri at that day consisted in as with a him and its this) shall resurrection forth to a prospect of concerned; an interval anything.’ millions of

Mr. Bar He does n body,” if tion. He

sequential
 nal symbols
 Mr. Barnett
 ted for the
denouement
 of events.
 n, the two
 rinning and
 is, and the
 perate with
 ; stage, the
 te phase is
 ination in
 estiture of
 The events
 ad in "the
 nd of His
 to witness
 Mother of
 nt and the
 uration
 of man at
 al tyranny
 onological
 on which
 he events,
 God and
 the Bible,
 Now, the
 d victory
 re shown
 ; and the
 e case is
 ty of the
the dead
 ward to
 ear Thy
 Christ's
 he dead
 'Behold

Stephen
 ant his

breath or life—that "he might just as well have passed into non-existence without a thought on the subject." It seems to us that the contrary reflection is the more natural one. If Stephen had an immortal soul which would inevitably go to Jesus, there was no need of his making it the subject of prayer, while if he considered he was about to surrender his life and pass out of existence for the time being, it was natural he should pray that his life might be taken care of against the day when he should receive it back.

5.—"*Absent from the body and present with the Lord.*"—(2 Cor. v. 8.) Mr. Barnett admits that in the portion of his writings from which these words are quoted, Paul was expressing desire for "freedom from the encumbrance of an imperfect body, and possession of the incorruptible body at the resurrection;" but he adds, that as that day "might be long postponed," "his labouring thoughts aspired" to "a state of spiritual emancipation immediately consequent on death." This is Mr. Barnett's view of the matter, and if he were a teacher sent from God, he might content himself with assertion; but being a mortal fallible man, he is bound to prove everything, instead of begging everything, as he and the class to which he belongs invariably do in the discussion of this question.

Anticipating the answer that death is a state of blank to the dead, and not recognised in a saint's relation to futurity, he says Paul would have preferred continuance of "service" in the body, with all its disadvantages and "imperfections," to "dropping away into nothingness." There is no need to discuss this point: Paul has settled it. He says, "To die *is gain*."—(Phil. i. 21.) "I am ready to be offered." The reason of his readiness to die is expressed in these words: "Henceforth, there is *laid up for me* a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge, shall give me *at that day*" (of his appearing and kingdom—verse 1st); and the gain of dying consisted in the fact that by submerging him in "nothingness," it destroyed, as with a stroke, the otherwise long and dreary interval which lay between him and its attainment: "He that loseth his life for my sake (and Paul did this) shall find it"—at the resurrection, "for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."—(Luke xiv. 14), "They that have done good shall come forth to resurrection of life."—(John v. 29.) It was "gain" to die in prospect of an immediate introduction (so far as Paul's consciousness was concerned) to such a glorious consummation. The "great gloom" of such an interval exists only in Mr. Barnett's imagination, for "the dead know not anything." Did Mr. Barnett feel the "great gloom" of the countless millions of years that elapsed before he was born?

Mr. Barnett next amuses himself with a little by-play on the pronoun "we." He does not see how Paul could say "we are willing to be absent from the body," if there is no "we" distinct from the body, and surviving its dissolution. He ignores the idiomatic peculiarity of the language, and greedily fixes

upon it as a literal expression, because on the surface, it serves his purpose. This is unfair. How would he requite a similar misdemeanour in his opponent? For instance: "My soul" implies a possessor and a thing possessed. Who is the "ego" that possesses the soul? The body? No; this cannot be; because the same ego says "my body." The spirit? No; for the same individual abstraction says "my spirit." So that the man—the real person—is neither the body, the soul, nor the spirit. Where and what is he? We would seek him in vain if we were to adopt Mr. Barnett's plan of ignoring the idiomatic accidents of speech, and attempting to put them through the rack of a literal construction.

Let Paul define his individuality: "I know that *in me* (that is, *IN MY FLESH*) dwelleth no good thing."—(Rom. vii. 18.) "We had the sentence of death *in ourselves*, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God that raiseth the dead."—(2 Cor. i. 9.) Did the "sentence of death" apply to Paul's "body" or "soul?" Even orthodoxy cannot hesitate here. It was the body; ergo, Paul's body was Paul's "we." This is apparent in his other words: "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall raise up *us* also, and present us with you." Is it Paul's "soul" or body that is to be raised from the grave? As there is only one answer, it follows that Paul's body is Paul; but of course not the body without the life—for a dead body is inanimate clay; yet it is the basis of a living person, and must be reproduced before the "we," resulting from the action of life upon it can be restored. "Your bodies," says Paul, "are the members of Christ."—(1 Cor. vi. 15.) They are, therefore, indispensable to the development of "the bride, the Lamb's wife," at the time when the marriage of the Lamb "comes."

The idiom which Mr. Barnett would violate in his own favour is a necessity; we are obliged in certain cases, for the sake of expressing our ideas distinctly, to speak as if we assumed the existence of a thing apart from itself. Thus, "my poor dog died ten years ago;" at the time of speaking, there is no dog, but rigidly construed, the sentence would involve its existence. "The ship was begun two weeks ago." There is no ship at the time of speaking, but the form of speech would involve it as much as in the other case. So with regard to ourselves: in speaking of our relation to past and future conditions to our own lives, we are compelled to speak as if we actually existed concurrently with them. Our individuality is the total result of our organization as living beings, fearfully and wonderfully made. It does not attach to body, soul or spirit separately, though we are obliged to speak sometimes as if it did.

"I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better."—(Phil. i. 21). Mr. Barnett is intensely pungent in his ridicule of the Christadelphian explanation of this. It no doubt gives him scope for a fling, and he takes the full advantage, but his lively gymnastics are indulged in at the expense of life and limb. They

bring the he
with putting
accuse of "
"bungling"
John Milton
text is Phi.
desire for di
uncertain as
rather than
to obtain in
as everyone
may be, wh
follows the
immediate
Christ—the
was then a
desires to s
his wishes
passage.
Aristotle i
the temple
which they
fell asleep
departed, t
at the sam

7.—The
from the
was a visi
been rais
other. H
fruits of
the dead
of Zareph
fact of Je
Jesus was
the new
present li
world of
necessary
for ortho
argumen
As to
was spok

is purpose.
our in his
d a thing
dy? No;
irit? No;
man—the
ad what is
e plan of
m through

is, IN MY
e sentence
God that
apply to
e. It was
his other
also, and
be raised
(s body is
d body is
eproduced
restored.
: vi. 15.)
bride, the

necessity;
distinctly,
lf. Thus,
s no dog,
"The ship
g; but the
ase. So
nd future
actually
lt of our
does not
to speak

be with
intensely
It no
but his
They

bring the house about his ears. We will content ourselves on this occasion with putting up Milton to answer him, whom at least he will not dare to accuse of "out-landish versions" or "school-boy Greek criticism," or of "bungling to perfection." This is what Milton says:—(*The Prose Works of John Milton*, vol. iv., Bohn's Standard Library, p. 279-80)—"The fourth text is Phi. i. 23, 'having a desire to depart' (*cupiens dissolvi*, having a desire for dissolution), 'and to be with Christ.' But to say nothing of the uncertain and disputed sense of the word *anahusai*, which signifies anything rather than dissolution, it may be answered, that although Paul desired to obtain immediate possession of heavenly perfection and glory, in like manner as everyone is desirous of attaining, as soon as possible, to that whatever it may be, which he regards as the ultimate object of his being, it by no means follows that when the soul of each individual leaves the body, it is received immediately, either into heaven or hell. For he had a desire to be with Christ—that is at his appearing, which all the believers hoped and expected was then at hand. In the same manner, one who is going on a voyage, desires to set sail and to arrive at the destined port (such is the order in which his wishes arrange themselves), omitting all notice of the intermediate passage. If, however, it be true that there is no time without motion—which Aristotle illustrates by the example of those who were fabled to have slept in the temple of the heroes, and who, on awaking, imagined that the moment in which they awoke, had succeeded, without an interval, to that in which they fell asleep, how much more must intervening time be annihilated to the departed, so that to them to die and to be with Christ, will seem to take place at the same moment."

7.—*The Transfiguration*. This is quoted to prove disembodied existence from the fact of Moses being present. The answer is, if the transfiguration was a vision, Moses was a mere appearance; if it was real, Moses must have been raised from the dead. Mr. Barnett will accept neither the one nor the other. He says if Moses was raised from the dead, Jesus was not "the first fruits of them that slept." This does not follow. Lazarus was raised from the dead before Christ; so was the widow of Nain, and the son of the widow of Zarephath, and others, but did these cases of resurrection interfere with the fact of Jesus being the first fruits of them that slept? by no means, because Jesus was the first to rise out of the death-stricken state common to man, into the new and immortal existence which is the true harvest in relation to the present life. Mr. Barnett's view of the case is that Moses "came from the world of spirits, and supernaturally assumed a bodily form!" If it is necessary to make this guess, in order to make the transfiguration available for orthodox purposes, the reader will perceive how much it is worth as an argument in proof of immortal-soulism.

As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of

*Isaac and the God of Jacob?" God is not the God of the dead but the God of the living.—Jesus affirmed this to prove the resurrection, and the Sadducees were confounded by it; but Mr. Barnett reads it to prove that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "though bodily dead, are still alive as regards their essential personality." In this, he at once gives proof of standing on a different mental platform from that occupied by Jesus when he uttered the words. If Christ's statement proves that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive, it contains no proof of God's intention to raise. The very basis of the argument is the fact of their being dead. Jesus calls attention to the fact that God called himself the God of three men who were dead; and declared what the Sadducees did not question, that God is not the God of those dead who are dead for good—dead as the animals die, without any relation to future destiny. The conclusion was inevitable that God must have entertained the purpose of raising them—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—before He would continue to call Himself their God, after their death. The Sadducees could not resist the argument: it was irresistible. Mr. Barnett calls this "intolerable trifling," and says a few extraordinary things which we have noticed in an earlier part of this pamphlet. His construction of Christ's argument is this: "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as regards their essentiality, are still alive, though bodily dead; therefore it is possible to raise them!" To what a poor, puny, stricken thing does this reduce Christ's argument! and what simpletons it makes out the Sadducees to be, that they should be shut up by an argument which is no argument at all! Worse than all, to what a degraded position it brings the Almighty! It makes Jesus admit that if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were really dead, *he could not raise them*. Further, it represents Jesus as content to prove the *possibility* of resurrection. To prove a thing to be possible, is one thing: to prove it is going to occur, is another. It was not the possibility of resurrection that Christ essayed to prove. The question of possibility never could be in dispute among the nation of the Jews, who had so many exemplifications of the power of God. No one, admitting the existence of God, could logically deny the power of God to do anything. Mr. Barnett is the first believer in God we have heard limit his power. The question was, what did God intend to do with regard to the dead? The Sadducees denied He intended to raise them. Jesus proved it was His intention to do it. On Mr. Barnett's principle he did not prove intention at all, but only possibility; but by the construction of his arguments, which Mr. Barnett rejects, he proved intention triumphantly, thus:—*

God is not the God of men whom He does not intend to raise; God calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; therefore, He intends to raise them.

9.—*Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.—*

(Matt. : parts o
Mr. Bar
He obje
are Chr
sneer, "
quote
in God
He can
words.
entirely
the oth
physic
though
burnt;
may he
Christ's
those w
future.
destroy
"Christ
BUT AI
ETERNAL
to para
which h
not the
(Luke x
and rem
find it."

His
that th
The lar
Mary's
exalted
of Jesu
Thou g
of the
resurrec
seek for

(Rom. i
we also
soweth,

the God
adduces
Abraham,
as their
arg on a
tered the
acob are
basis of
ntion to
re dead;
not the
als die,
evitable
Abraham,
eir God,
: it was
s a few
amphlet.
i Jacob,
fore it is
loes this
ucees to
it at all!
It makes
ould not
bility of
is going
t Christ
e among
power of
y deny
God we
tend to
to raise
inciple
struction
phantly,
tod calls
to raise
he soul;
hell.—

(Matt. x. 28.) This exhortation of Christ's, intimating the destruction of all parts of a man's nature, as the result of divine anger, is insisted upon by Mr. Barnett as a proof that the soul is immortal, and will not be destroyed! He objects to the explanation that it refers to "a life in relation to those who are Christ's, which cannot be touched by mortal man." He asks, with a sneer, "What is the relation of this life to them?" In answer to this, we quote Paul's definition of the point, "Your life is hid with Christ in God."—(Coloss. iii. 3.) Mr. Barnett denounces this as "sophistry." He cannot, however, get rid of it as the solution of Christ's words. "Life" or "soul" in relation to our future existence, is entirely in the hands of God. Man cannot affect it one way or the other. He cannot destroy it by murder, and he cannot preserve it by physic or precaution. The righteous will receive it at the resurrection, though they may be minced to small pieces, and given to the beasts or burnt; the wicked will have it taken from them and destroyed, though they may hedge themselves with every comfort and every remedy. Therefore Christ's words are a natural expression of the matter. We are not to fear those who can only kill the body, but cannot touch life in relation to the future. We are to fear Him that can and will (in the case of the wicked) destroy both. Mr. Barnett tries to turn this position by specious parody. "Christ meant to say then," he exclaims, "Fear not them that kill the body, BUT ARE NOT ABLE TO PREVENT THE BODY FROM RISING AGAIN TO ETERNAL LIFE." We must object to Mr. Barnett as an incompetent person to paraphrase Christ's words in harmony with the Christadelphian idea, which he does not understand. We will give him the right paraphrase: "Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do, (Luke xii. 4,) being unable to destroy the life which passes into God's hands, and remains in His keeping against the day when he that loseth his life shall find it."—(Matt. x. 39.)

His contention on 1 John v. 12 ("He that hath the Son HATH life"), that the life promised is a *present possession*, has already been disposed of. The language he relies on but expresses future certainty, after the style of Mary's words, "He HATH pulled down the mighty from their seats and exalted them of low degree," (Luke i. 52); and the language of Jesus in his prayer, with reference to his disciples, "The glory which Thou gavest me I HAVE GIVEN THEM."—(John xvii. 22.) The literal fact of the case is, that the life thus guaranteed is not possessed till the resurrection. Proof: "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality, (God will reward) ETERNAL LIFE, . . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men."—(Rom. ii. 7, 13.) "When Christ who is our life shall appear, THEN shall we also appear with him in glory."—(Col. iii. 2.) "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also REAP. He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit

REAP life everlasting."—(Gal. vi. 8.) "WHEN THIS CORRUPTIBLE hath put on incorruptibility, and THIS MORTAL hath put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up of victory.*"—(1 Cor. xv. 54.)

It will not avail Mr. Barnett to suggest a distinction between the Greek terms *zoe* and *psuche*, as affording any countenance to the idea that *zoe* may mean immortal soul; for, contrary to his dictum, it is a fact that they are used interchangeably, though largely appropriated to separate uses—*zoe* to the life to come and *psuche* to the present life. For instance, James says, using the word most frequently employed in connection with the life to come, "What is your *zoe* (life)? it is even a VAPOUR that appeareth for a very little while, and then vanisheth away."—(James iv. 14.) Again Paul, using the same word, distinctly applied it to this present life: "If in *this* life (*zoe*) ONLY we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable."—(1 Cor. xv. 19.) Again, "He giveth unto ALL life and (*zoe*) breath, and all things."—(Acts xvii. 25.) These are sufficient to show that *zoe* is sometimes used with precisely the same significance as *psuche*, which, without question, is most commonly applied to mortal life. And even *psuche*, in some instances, is constructively employed to express the significance commonly represented by *zoe*. Thus: "The Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives (*psuchas*) but to save them."—(Luke ix. 56.) Again: "He that findeth his life (*psuchen*) shall lose it, and he that loseth his life (*psuchen*) for my sake shall FIND IT."—(Matt. x. 39.) The attempt, then, to found an argument on the distinction between *zoe* and *psuche*, is like all Mr. Barnett's attempts in his published review—gratuitous and futile. Both occasionally stand for the same thing, for the evident reason that the life that now is, and the life to come, though different, are so far analogous that they both give conscious existence—the one on the basis of corruptible organisation, and the other on the basis of incorruptible

10.—"What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—(Mark viii. 37.) The word here translated "soul" is *psuche*. This answers the argument Mr. Barnett would raise upon it. His suggestion would be that "soul" means immortal soul; whereas it is the same soul (or *psuche*) that is spoken of in the previous verse. "Whosoever will save his soul shall lose it." If it is "immortal soul" in the second verse, it must be so in the other; for both are part and parcel of the same discourse on the same subject. How would Mr. Barnett like to explain the second verse in conformity with this suggestion: "He that saveth his immortal soul shall lose it?" His version of it is as follows: "He that loveth his immortal life, i.e. his welfare in this world (!) shall lose it: that is, shall lose it in death if not before. But he that hateth his life in this world (or is ready to sacrifice his worldly welfare), shall keep it (his worldly welfare!) unto eternal life!" Mr. Barnett hurls accusation

at the Christadelphians very verse. Mr. Barnett's houses. A more bare theory we never witness this paragraph is plain. his life for the whole world?" Mr. Barnett Scriptures." In truth Mr. Barnett, though a putting Mark in harmo is man advantaged if he away?"—(Luke ix. 25

M

Mr. Barnett then by repelling the attacks with the incessant and diversion in the shape lighten his labour, as however, avails him no

He quotes "the p Abraham, Isaac, and J what sense they were; the question, but leave to mean that Abraham heaven." How does b tors were idolators?— If Mr. Barnett is incli they do, what does he the lake that burneth get over this. He were among those w ignorance that was in way of understanding xxi. 16), and whose destroys everything p suggestion as to the for the scriptural mea fathers in peace, TH to go to his fathers w He did not require to the bones of his ances earth was the univers

at the Christadelphians of twisting the Scriptures in their explanation of this very verse. Mr. Barnett would do well to remember the proverb about glass houses. A more bare-faced torturing of Scripture to suit a preconceived theory we never witnessed. The real meaning of the verse at the head of this paragraph is plain. "Of what advantage would it be for a man to barter his life for the whole world, when, without his life, he could not possess the world?" Mr. Barnett calls this an instance of "audacity" in "twisting the Scriptures." In truth it is letting the Scriptures explain the Scriptures, which Mr. Barnett, though a professional Scripture expounder, cannot do. It is putting Mark in harmony with Luke. Luke's version of the verse is, "What is man advantaged if he gain the whole world and *LOSE HIMSELF, or be cast away?*"—(Luke ix. 25.)

MR. BARNETT BECOMES AGGRESSIVE.

Mr. Barnett then leaves the defensive, not because he has succeeded in repelling the attacks of his Christadelphian foe, but because he is wearied with the incessant and fruitless work it throws upon him, and thinks a diversion in the shape of a counter advance from another part of the field will lighten his labour, and perchance ensure success. His change of tactics, however, avails him nothing. Defeat and disaster attend every exertion.

He quotes "the phrase used respecting each of the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: 'He was gathered to his people,'" and he asks in what sense they were gathered to their people? He does not himself answer the question, but leaves us to infer that he understands the phrase in question to mean that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were "taken home to their ancestors in heaven." How does Mr. Barnett reconcile this with the fact that their ancestors were idolators?—(Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, 15.) Do idolators go to heaven? If Mr. Barnett is inclined, for the sake of getting out of the difficulty, to say they do, what does he make of the statement, "*IDOLATORS have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.*"—(Rev. xxi. 8.) He cannot get over this. He will be compelled to admit that Abraham's ancestors were among those who were alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that was in them (Eph. iv. 18), who having wandered out of the way of understanding, will remain in the congregation of the dead (Prov. xxi. 16), and whose fate is symbolically represented by a fiery lake which destroys everything put into it. Admitting this, he will have to abandon his suggestion as to the meaning of "gathered unto their fathers." Seeking for the scriptural meaning, he will find it in Gen. xv. 15: "*Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace, THOU SHALT BE BURIED IN A GOOD OLD AGE.*" For Abraham to go to his fathers was to be buried, for his fathers were all dead and buried. He did not require to be laid in the identical burying ground which contained the bones of his ancestors. There were no cemeteries in those days, Mother earth was the universal grave, and to die and be buried was to be gathered

ath
EN
, of

eek
nay
are
the
ing
me,
ittle
the
zoe)
19.)
"—
ised
1, is
ces,
ted
ives
his
sake
; on
his
the
e to
ious
on

and
"—
vers
that
that
lose
her;
fow
this
n of
d (!)
teth
reep
tion

to one's fathers. That this is the scriptural interpretation of the matter is evident from Judges ii. 10, 41: "And also all that generation were *gathered to their fathers.*" Did all that generation go to heaven, and did all their fathers go there? Does it not simply mean that all died and were gathered into their grave? The matter is incontestably settled by the following: "I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and *thou shalt be gathered to THY GRAVE* in peace."—(2 Kings xxii. 20; also 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8.) To be gathered unto one's fathers, that is, *to be buried*, was a privilege. The refusal of burial was an indignity. Hence, of the wicked it is said, "*They shall not be GATHERED NOR BURIED.*"—(Jer. viii. 2, 25, 33.)

Mr. Barnett next cites the appearance of Sammel to the witch of Endor, as a proof of immortal-soulism. He does not dwell on it, or lay much stress on it. He throws it away quickly, like a coal too hot for him to hold, as it assuredly is. Mr. Barnett quotes it to prove that righteous souls go to heaven and wicked souls go to hell. Now, Samuel was a righteous man, and what does "the narrative, as it stands," make him say with reference to his condition in death?—"Why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" On Mr. Barnett's theory, he required to be brought down; but Samuel represents himself as a man lying in the grave in a state of somnolence, from which he was raised and brought up on the occasion in question. Again, what does Samuel say to Saul? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be *WITH ME.*" Did Saul—a wicked man—go next day to heaven? No; Saul and his sons joined Samuel in *the state of death.* Mr. Barnett may ask, How did Samuel appear there to give such information, if Samuel was dead? Mr. Barnett must take "the narrative as it stands," which he insists on the Christadelphian doing. It represents something occurring in connection with a "witch"—a woman of "familiar spirit," a clairvoyant. This class of people were prohibited by the law of Moses, and were to be burnt, because they successfully pretended to divine authority, on the strength of natural powers of mind, which they mistook for supernatural gift, and the people regarded in the same light, and which, therefore, constituted a cause of their departure from the law delivered to them. These "familiar spirit" people were like the "spiritualists" of modern times, who, by a huge begging of the question, confound the play of their own magnetic spirits on tables with "spirits" which they presume to exist and imagine to be the moving power. Witches and familiar spirits were a delusion and a mockery—a complete imposition—but a successful imposition, because the powers they displayed were not understood and appeared miraculous. The nation was warned against "seeking to wizards that peep and mutter," and that it was like seeking for the living among the dead.—(Isaiah viii. 19.) Saul, in his better moments, had banished the impostors from the land, but at the time of the incident in question, God having ceased to answer him by prophets, he yielded to the temptation in his extremity of resorting to one of them. The result is the narrative

which Mr. Barnett next takes up. He next takes up the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, as a proof of immortal-soulism. He does not dwell on it, or lay much stress on it. He throws it away quickly, like a coal too hot for him to hold, as it assuredly is. Mr. Barnett quotes it to prove that righteous souls go to heaven and wicked souls go to hell. Now, Samuel was a righteous man, and what does "the narrative, as it stands," make him say with reference to his condition in death?—"Why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" On Mr. Barnett's theory, he required to be brought down; but Samuel represents himself as a man lying in the grave in a state of somnolence, from which he was raised and brought up on the occasion in question. Again, what does Samuel say to Saul? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be *WITH ME.*" Did Saul—a wicked man—go next day to heaven? No; Saul and his sons joined Samuel in *the state of death.* Mr. Barnett may ask, How did Samuel appear there to give such information, if Samuel was dead? Mr. Barnett must take "the narrative as it stands," which he insists on the Christadelphian doing. It represents something occurring in connection with a "witch"—a woman of "familiar spirit," a clairvoyant. This class of people were prohibited by the law of Moses, and were to be burnt, because they successfully pretended to divine authority, on the strength of natural powers of mind, which they mistook for supernatural gift, and the people regarded in the same light, and which, therefore, constituted a cause of their departure from the law delivered to them. These "familiar spirit" people were like the "spiritualists" of modern times, who, by a huge begging of the question, confound the play of their own magnetic spirits on tables with "spirits" which they presume to exist and imagine to be the moving power. Witches and familiar spirits were a delusion and a mockery—a complete imposition—but a successful imposition, because the powers they displayed were not understood and appeared miraculous. The nation was warned against "seeking to wizards that peep and mutter," and that it was like seeking for the living among the dead.—(Isaiah viii. 19.) Saul, in his better moments, had banished the impostors from the land, but at the time of the incident in question, God having ceased to answer him by prophets, he yielded to the temptation in his extremity of resorting to one of them. The result is the narrative

which Mr. Barnett next takes up. He next takes up the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, as a proof of immortal-soulism. He does not dwell on it, or lay much stress on it. He throws it away quickly, like a coal too hot for him to hold, as it assuredly is. Mr. Barnett quotes it to prove that righteous souls go to heaven and wicked souls go to hell. Now, Samuel was a righteous man, and what does "the narrative, as it stands," make him say with reference to his condition in death?—"Why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" On Mr. Barnett's theory, he required to be brought down; but Samuel represents himself as a man lying in the grave in a state of somnolence, from which he was raised and brought up on the occasion in question. Again, what does Samuel say to Saul? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be *WITH ME.*" Did Saul—a wicked man—go next day to heaven? No; Saul and his sons joined Samuel in *the state of death.* Mr. Barnett may ask, How did Samuel appear there to give such information, if Samuel was dead? Mr. Barnett must take "the narrative as it stands," which he insists on the Christadelphian doing. It represents something occurring in connection with a "witch"—a woman of "familiar spirit," a clairvoyant. This class of people were prohibited by the law of Moses, and were to be burnt, because they successfully pretended to divine authority, on the strength of natural powers of mind, which they mistook for supernatural gift, and the people regarded in the same light, and which, therefore, constituted a cause of their departure from the law delivered to them. These "familiar spirit" people were like the "spiritualists" of modern times, who, by a huge begging of the question, confound the play of their own magnetic spirits on tables with "spirits" which they presume to exist and imagine to be the moving power. Witches and familiar spirits were a delusion and a mockery—a complete imposition—but a successful imposition, because the powers they displayed were not understood and appeared miraculous. The nation was warned against "seeking to wizards that peep and mutter," and that it was like seeking for the living among the dead.—(Isaiah viii. 19.) Saul, in his better moments, had banished the impostors from the land, but at the time of the incident in question, God having ceased to answer him by prophets, he yielded to the temptation in his extremity of resorting to one of them. The result is the narrative

which Mr. Barnett next takes up. He next takes up the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, as a proof of immortal-soulism. He does not dwell on it, or lay much stress on it. He throws it away quickly, like a coal too hot for him to hold, as it assuredly is. Mr. Barnett quotes it to prove that righteous souls go to heaven and wicked souls go to hell. Now, Samuel was a righteous man, and what does "the narrative, as it stands," make him say with reference to his condition in death?—"Why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" On Mr. Barnett's theory, he required to be brought down; but Samuel represents himself as a man lying in the grave in a state of somnolence, from which he was raised and brought up on the occasion in question. Again, what does Samuel say to Saul? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be *WITH ME.*" Did Saul—a wicked man—go next day to heaven? No; Saul and his sons joined Samuel in *the state of death.* Mr. Barnett may ask, How did Samuel appear there to give such information, if Samuel was dead? Mr. Barnett must take "the narrative as it stands," which he insists on the Christadelphian doing. It represents something occurring in connection with a "witch"—a woman of "familiar spirit," a clairvoyant. This class of people were prohibited by the law of Moses, and were to be burnt, because they successfully pretended to divine authority, on the strength of natural powers of mind, which they mistook for supernatural gift, and the people regarded in the same light, and which, therefore, constituted a cause of their departure from the law delivered to them. These "familiar spirit" people were like the "spiritualists" of modern times, who, by a huge begging of the question, confound the play of their own magnetic spirits on tables with "spirits" which they presume to exist and imagine to be the moving power. Witches and familiar spirits were a delusion and a mockery—a complete imposition—but a successful imposition, because the powers they displayed were not understood and appeared miraculous. The nation was warned against "seeking to wizards that peep and mutter," and that it was like seeking for the living among the dead.—(Isaiah viii. 19.) Saul, in his better moments, had banished the impostors from the land, but at the time of the incident in question, God having ceased to answer him by prophets, he yielded to the temptation in his extremity of resorting to one of them. The result is the narrative

which Mr. Barnett next takes up. He next takes up the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, as a proof of immortal-soulism. He does not dwell on it, or lay much stress on it. He throws it away quickly, like a coal too hot for him to hold, as it assuredly is. Mr. Barnett quotes it to prove that righteous souls go to heaven and wicked souls go to hell. Now, Samuel was a righteous man, and what does "the narrative, as it stands," make him say with reference to his condition in death?—"Why hast thou disquieted me to *bring me up?*" On Mr. Barnett's theory, he required to be brought down; but Samuel represents himself as a man lying in the grave in a state of somnolence, from which he was raised and brought up on the occasion in question. Again, what does Samuel say to Saul? "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be *WITH ME.*" Did Saul—a wicked man—go next day to heaven? No; Saul and his sons joined Samuel in *the state of death.* Mr. Barnett may ask, How did Samuel appear there to give such information, if Samuel was dead? Mr. Barnett must take "the narrative as it stands," which he insists on the Christadelphian doing. It represents something occurring in connection with a "witch"—a woman of "familiar spirit," a clairvoyant. This class of people were prohibited by the law of Moses, and were to be burnt, because they successfully pretended to divine authority, on the strength of natural powers of mind, which they mistook for supernatural gift, and the people regarded in the same light, and which, therefore, constituted a cause of their departure from the law delivered to them. These "familiar spirit" people were like the "spiritualists" of modern times, who, by a huge begging of the question, confound the play of their own magnetic spirits on tables with "spirits" which they presume to exist and imagine to be the moving power. Witches and familiar spirits were a delusion and a mockery—a complete imposition—but a successful imposition, because the powers they displayed were not understood and appeared miraculous. The nation was warned against "seeking to wizards that peep and mutter," and that it was like seeking for the living among the dead.—(Isaiah viii. 19.) Saul, in his better moments, had banished the impostors from the land, but at the time of the incident in question, God having ceased to answer him by prophets, he yielded to the temptation in his extremity of resorting to one of them. The result is the narrative

matter is
 athered to
 air fathers
 hered into
 : "I will
 GRAVE in
 erial unto
 was
 GATHERED

Endor, as
 stress on
 old, as it
 uls go to
 man, and
 ooe to his
 p?" On
 represents
 which he
 what does
 ME." Did
 ns joined
 el appear
 aett must
 adelphian
 witch"—
 ople were
 y success-
 s of mind,
 ed in the
 ture from
) like the
 question,
 "spirits"
 tches and
 n—but a
 nderstood
 eking to
 he living
 banished
 question,
 mptation
 narrative

which Mr. Barnett thinks proves that the dead "are still living in other regions and other conditions of existence." What transpired was, doubtless, this, that God, who had ceased to speak to Saul in friendship and in the ordinary channels, chose Saul's device to speak to him in anger, supplementing the woman's necromancy by the operation of His own spirit for it is not otherwise to be explained how a true prophecy was uttered. To contend that it was all the woman's doings, is to contend that familiar spiritism was a reality and not a delusion, and that a mistake was made in ordering the extirpation of those who practised it. But if Mr. Barnett insists that it was purely a feat of necromancy, and that the woman brought Saul back from the dead, his main purpose is not in any degree served, for "the narrative as it stands" represents Samuel, not as coming out of heaven, but as ascending from the grave, and the destiny of the wicked, not as the torturous hell of Mr. Barnett's belief, but descent into the silent shades of the tomb.

Mr. Barnett next quotes Jacob's lamentation about Joseph: "I will go down unto *sheol* (the grave) to my son, mourning," and asks, Did Jacob believe that his son Joseph was dead in the sense of being extinct, when he uttered these words? One can only express surprise at the quotation. The words distinctly indicate Jacob's belief that Joseph was in the grave, and that he himself would be brought there also by grief at the fact that he was there.

He next takes refuge in David's saying with regard to a dead child: I shall go to him, but he shall not come to me." He explains this to mean that David expected "he and his child would be consciously and lovingly re-united after his death." Where? In heaven, of course, would be Mr. Barnett's answer; but this cannot be, for Peter says "*David is not ascended into heaven.*"—(Acts ii. 34.) Where is he? Paul answers: "David fell on sleep and *was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption.*" This is where David went to the dead infant. "Poor comfort!" exclaims Mr. Barnett. The answer is, David did not utter the words in question as a matter of comfort, but as a matter of philosophic and devout resignation to bereavement. His own words are the best proof of this. "While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept, for I said, who can tell whether God will be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now HE IS DEAD, *wherefore should I fast?* Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return unto me."—(2 Sam. xii. 22-23.)

Mr. Barnett next quotes Paul's words in the Hebrews, "Ye are come . . . to the spirits of just men made perfect," but, as if in fear that the purposelessness of the quotation for orthodox purposes might be apparent, he suppresses the several items with which Paul classes "the spirits of just men made perfect." Paul's words are, "Ye are come into Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect."—(Heb. xii. 22.) As applied to "the spirits of just men

made perfect," Mr. Barnett contends that the phrase "ye are come" implies "a privilege in present possession." If so, it will imply the same in all the other items. Does it? In the case of "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," for instance, which Mr. Barnett would read as the equivalent of Bunyan's "celestial city," and the orthodox "heaven." Were the Hebrew believers "come" to this in the sense of "*a privilege in present possession*?" It is impossible it could be so, even from Mr. Barnett's point of view. The Hebrews were not "in present possession" of the heavenly Jerusalem of even Mr. Barnett's expectations. In what sense were they "come," then, to the things enumerated? Paul supplies the clue a few verses before. He says "ye are NOT COME *unto the mount that might be touched and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness and darkness and tempest and the sound of a trumpet and the voice of words,*" &c. Now in what sense had the Hebrews "not come" to *these literal things*? They had not been put into relation to the system which had its origin at *the literal mount that might be touched, &c.* They were not under the law which was GIVEN AT SINAI under the terrible circumstances referred to. But they were come to the system which had relation to another set of circumstances no less real than the Mosaic incidents, but of a different order. They were come to a faith which had reference to "Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem (that is, the Jerusalem of the future under a heavenly constitution of things) to an innumerable company of angels and to the spirits of just men made perfect." One of the incidents of the glorious system of things to which men are called by gospel, is, perfection in themselves. At present, "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves," (1 John i. 8.) but when this corruptible has put on incorruptibility, we shall be elevated above the frailty which now leads to much imperfection of spirit. "The spirits of just men made perfect" describes this glorious condition which could not be developed by the law, but which is attainable in connection with the things to which men "come" by faith and spiritual relation, in the gospel. This effectually disposes of Mr. Barnett's untenable theory of "present possession."

"And when he had opened the sixth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held, and they cried with a loud voice, saying, &c."—(Rev. vi. 9-11.) With Mr. Barnett, this is a crowning proof of "the conscious existence of the martyrs." A little examination will put quite a different complexion upon it. Mr. Barnett will, of course, admit that it is part of a symbolic scene. The "souls" and the "altar" are conclusive on the point, letting alone the fact that it is part of the Apocalypse which is a symbolical drama from beginning to end. If he is not reasonable enough to admit this, we will ask him whether there is a literal altar under which the disembodied spirits of the righteous are cabined and confined? In this case "the souls" cry "avenge our blood!" Have immortal souls blood? Can immortal souls put on "white robes?"

The symbolism is signified by it, an altar" representatively the facts of the (Lev. xvii. 2.) Th Now, the blood-spil operation of butcher have escaped de choose to forfeit the being shed, was spil that is upon Christ. vengeance on Cain blood was a consci James v. 4—proves blood of saints shed pleading for venge that are represented lives of his slain peo (Col. iii. 3), and thr for retribution on th incapable of petitio witness in the prese Great High Priest, to be remembered. their life was taken Almighty, though vengeance, and com in the symbol, " commanded to re of ultimate victory says Jesus, "the says again, "and I in the symbol had had been faithful therefore Christ's p assured to them, covered souls, with salvation, did not i was commanded to be completed, "th (Heb. xi. 40.)

"Hell from ben stirreth up the de

implies
all the
od, the
as the
Were
present
point
avenly
re they
verses
touched
est and
use had
en put
it that
VEN AT
ome to
ss real
ie to a
od, the
eavenly
spirits
stem of
es. At
n i. 8.)
d above
pirits of
uld not
things
This
ssion."
souls of
ch they
With
e of the
upon it.
e. The
the fact
ginning
whether
ighteous
blood!"
p"

The symbolism of the scene is without doubt, and the question is what is signified by it, and of what condition of the righteous is "souls under the altar" representative? The answer arises upon a very brief consideration of the facts of the case. "The life (soul) of all flesh is in the blood."—(Lev. xvii. 2.) Therefore, when the blood is spilt, the soul of life is spilt. Now, the blood-spilling of the early witnesses of the truth was not a mere operation of butchery. It was the result of their faith in Christ. They might have escaped death by denying Christ, but the faithful did not choose to forfeit the pearl of great price in this way, and hence their blood, in being shed, was spilt upon the altar of their faith (Heb. xiii. 10; Phil. ii. 17) that is upon Christ. Now, as the blood of Abel is spoken of as crying for vengeance on Cain (which no more involves the supposition that Abel's blood was a conscious agent, than the crying of the hire of the reapers—James v. 4—proves that wages unjustly withholden becomes animate) so is the blood of saints shed for Christ dramatically personified in the Apocalypse, as pleading for vengeance. It is the moral relation of the things symbolized that are represented—not the inherent qualities. Christ, as the altar, covers the lives of his slain people. He holds them in his hand. In him they are hid (Col. iii. 3), and through him, as their representative, they cry to the Almighty for retribution on their enemies. As dead persons, they are in a literal sense, incapable of petition, but the memory of their wrongs stands as a constant witness in the presence of God, who, through the active intervention of their Great High Priest, continually cries aloud for retribution. Another thing has to be remembered. These slain saints cried aloud to the Almighty before their life was taken from them, and that cry lives always in the ears of the Almighty, though the saints slumber; and He will hear the cry, and rouse to vengeance, and command the pit to give up its prisoners. All this is signified in the symbol, "White robes were given unto them, and they were commanded to rest for a little season." That is to say the possession of ultimate victory was secured to them. "He that loseth his life for my sake, says Jesus, "the same shall find it." "Be thou faithful unto death," he says again, "and I will give thee a crown of life." The persons represented in the symbol had sustained the part indicated in these testimonies. They had been faithful unto death, and had lost their lives for his sake, and therefore Christ's promise came into full force at their death. Victory was assured to them, and this is signified by their investment as dead, altar-covered souls, with white robes. But this making certain of their future salvation, did not interrupt their "rest" (in the grave—Dan. xii. 13.) This was commanded to continue till the number of the faithful witnesses should be completed, "that they without them should not be made perfect."—(Heb. xi. 40.)

"*Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth: it hath*

raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us?'—(Isaiah xiv. 9-10.) Mr. Barnett admits this is the language of poetry, yet he cites it to prove a literal hell. If it prove a literal hell, it is a very different hell from that of Mr. Barnett's preaching; for it is a hell in which there are dead peoples and kings on thrones, and in which there are graves and soldiers, with their swords laid under their heads, as appears from the next passage from which Mr. Barnett quotes only a part, viz., (Ezekiel xxxii. 21. 27:) "The strong among the mighty shall speak to him (the King of Egypt) out of the midst of hell with them that help him; they are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, slain by the sword. Asshur is there, and all her company; his graves are about him; all of them slain fallen by the sword . . . They shall not lie with the mighty that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which are GONE DOWN TO HELL WITH THEIR WEAPONS OF WAR," The "hell" of these delineations is the grave. The word (*sheol*) translated "hell," is the word also translated grave, which Mr. Barnett cannot deny. The grave draped in the language of poetry, Mr. Barnett cites in proof of a literal hell, where there is life, sulphur and torture. What would he think of a Christadelphian were he to quote "trees clapping their hands," "mountains skipping," in proof that in the age to come, inanimate nature would become locomotive? This would be as fair and conclusive as Mr. Barnett's citations under this head.

CONCLUSION.

Mr. Barnett then summarises the alleged results of his attack on Christadelphian principles. He thinks them so complete as to relieve him from the necessity of noticing Lecture iv. (*Twelve Lectures*), beyond stating it is "altogether beside the mark." He does just condescend for one moment.—Gen. iii. 22, 23: ("And now lest he put forth his hand and eat of the tree of life and live for ever,") he considers useless against the natural immortality of the soul, since, in his estimation, it applies only to "a bodily immortality." Are there two immortalities, then? The Bible speaks of a bodily immortality ("this mortal [body] shall put on immortality,"—Cor. xv. 53.) It does not speak of any "immortality of the soul." Mr. Barnett might well say that the Edenic precaution against Adam becoming immortal does not touch "this question," for there was no such thing known, and no such thing is mentioned from one end of the Bible to the other.

Mr. Barnett repeats his joke on the "littleness" of the resurrection from a Christadelphian point of view; this we have answered already. We only mention it now for the sake of another feature which Mr. Barnett introduces into his argument. "This doctrine," he says, which limits the resurrection to the responsible, and immortality to the righteous, "proclaims

humanity to
If Mr. Barnes
view of the oi
given over to
were a Univei
argument in
indicate that
his opponents.
does the gre
"failure" in
the side of t
moment, desti
ness, leaving
teaches their
The dispassio
mental warp
his verdict in
examined. Th
he quotes. O
insists upon t
passage, thi
includes "the
refers, viz., th
but the other
are in their g
done good to
resurrection o
upon the wor
invariably de
"those that
responsible cla
for "the dark
(Ps. lxxiv. 20.
evil, any more
and without l
men are blind,
they are not s
upon them "
belong neith
in the "all"
absoluteness
so with res
the limitatio

humanity to be a gigantic failure, utterly discreditable to its author!"

If Mr. Barnett did not believe in hell, we could understand this; but in view of the orthodox doctrine that the greatest part of mankind is to be given over to eternal misery, it is simply incomprehensible. If Mr. Barnett were a Universalist, he might, with some show of countenance, urge the argument in question; but as a hell-fire christain, his use of it would indicate that shameless "audacity" which he so frequently charges upon his opponents. On which side, we ask, in the name of eternal goodness, does the greatest failure of beneficence lie?—(if we may speak of "failure" in relation to any of the schemes of the Almighty); on the side of that view which represents the wicked as a vapour of the moment, destined to disappear before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, leaving the universe tranquil, holy, and blessed; or that which teaches their destiny to be an endless existence of agony and infamy? The dispassionate judgment will not for a moment falter. It is only the mental warp of a life's education that leads a man like Mr. Barnett to give his verdict in favour of the latter view. His arguments are empty when examined. There is the merest semblance of proof in the various Scriptures he quotes. One more he introduces at this place must be noticed. He insists upon the universality of the resurrection on the strength of a single passage, though he quotes two. The second passage he quotes undoubtedly includes "the entire congregation of the dead" of the period to which it refers, viz., the close of the thousand years' reign of Christ (Rev. xx. 7-15), but the other passage is limited in its scope on the very face of it, "ALL that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, *they that have done good* to the resurrection of life, and *they that have done evil* to the resurrection of condemnation."—(John v. 28. 29.) Mr. Barnett's reliance is upon the word "all," but this is not in itself a definite term. Its scope invariably depends upon the subject. In this case, it is comprehensive of "those that have done good and those that have done evil," that is, the responsible classes of mankind. The ignorant barbarian has not "done good," for "the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty."—(Ps. lxxiv. 20.) Yet in the moral sense, they cannot be said to have done evil, any more than the blood-thirsty brutes of the field. They are ignorant and without law, and "sin is not imputed where there is no law." When men are blind, they have no sin.—(Jno. ix. 41.) When the light is not seen, they are not subject to condemnation (Jno. iii. 19), except such as has passed upon them "already" in Adam.—(Rom. v. 12.) The irresponsible, therefore, belong neither to one nor the other of the classes comprehended in the "all" of Christ's statement. Mr. Barnett may insist on the absoluteness of "all" in the passage in question, but he cannot do so with reason, for in passages he will be obliged to recognise the limitation claimed in this instance. For instance, when Christ

hall
how
the
eral
is a
ere
ads,
otes
ghty
with
lain
out
t lie
own
nea-
also
the
e is
e he
that
ould

k on
from
it is
Gen.
, and
soul,
there
' this
ak of
denic
ion,"
one

from
We
rnett
s the
lains

says, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw ALL unto me," does Mr. Barnett believe he means to teach the salvation of *every human being*? Will he not here limit the "all" to those who are to be "drawn," that is, saved? The idea is, not one will be lost that is acceptable before him, as expressed in his other words, "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of ALL WHOM HE HATH GIVEN ME I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day."—(John vi. 39.) So the "all that are in their graves" that "shall come forth," are "all" who are responsible. Not one well-doer will be forgotten; not one evil-doer allowed to escape.

Mr. Barnett considers that the Christadelphian representation of these great subjects, brings with it the conclusion that "God's government of this world has been thus far, and shall be at the end, a failure of the most ignominious character." He sets forth the truth in the following words, which are intended for crushing sarcasm: "He (God) brings into existence innumerable millions of beings with natural powers, capable of splendid development and of noble utility. But the stream happens to be poisoned at the fountain head, and all its ramifications are filled with corruption and end in 'death.' A divine purifier is despatched to the mournful scene, and a little amelioration ensues. But the great bulk of the race has no chance of salvation, because they never hear of the Saviour. After a few years of shameful error, outrageous idolatry, enervating poverty, filthiness of life, barbaric injustice and cruelty, all combining to involve them in the most deplorable physical, intellectual, and moral degradation, these countless millions sink at last into a nonentity, out of which they are never to emerge!" Mr. Barnett thinks this is shocking. What can he think of his own view of the matter, when fairly placed before him: "God has brought into existence countless millions of beings without the smallest opportunity of their being other than sinful, degraded, and miserable; and in this helpless state of theirs, for which they are not responsible, their destiny is, to be consigned, after death, to a state of anguish and suffering far exceeding mortal conception, and a state to which there is no alleviation and no prospect of end, but which shall last, without interruption, throughout the endless ages of eternity." Is this not shocking beyond the power of the mind to endure? If "failure" is to be the description of annihilation, what word is terrible enough to describe an upshot worse than ten thousand failures? If the merits of the two systems are to be tried on grounds like these, Mr. Barnett cannot survive the process for a single moment. Every instinct in our nature would rise in fierce rebellion against it and destroy it.

The other view, which Mr. Barnett condemns with such asperity, shines with a brilliant light; for what is it? Will the human race in the light of it be a failure? Far from it; from among the corrupt masses of sinful population that now crowd the globe, God is slowly developing a family who

shall be purified relatively to that on Christ's return. The power of an enlightened government, a close of the tribulation evermore. The millions of impenitent but a glory for obtain joy and

Mr. Barnett passed away? are not given a woe which and black. They are like the return of mortal arrangement more curse.

Yet Mr. Barnett the light of in exacting a helpless race to be brought blinded his eyes. Almighty to of existence? before Him as should suffer ever? No represents a phrases borrowed genuine faith this startling taken from the hearts, leads to

REJOIND

shall be purified and made grateful by the experience of evil, and who, though relatively to their several generations, a "little flock" will, at their muster on Christ's return, be "a multitude that no man can number," rejoicing in the power of an endless life; the ranks of these will be recruited, in vast numbers, in the age to come, when mankind will be under the guidance of a divine government, and led into the ways of righteousness and peace, to find, at the close of the thousand years, the sweet fruits of obedience in life and joy for evermore. The culmination held up to view by revelation shows teeming millions of immortals on earth, whose existence will not be as ours is, a failure, but a glory for ever. "Everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Mr. Barnett may interpose, But what of the untold millions that have passed away? The answer is, they are not immured in a malignant hell; they are not given over to eternal torments; they are not consigned to the unutterable woe which Methodist Revivalists delight to picture in tints of blue, red, and black. They are destroyed; they *are not*; they have vanished as a dream; they are like the storm that is past; the nightmare that has flown before the return of morning light; the chaos that has given way before the work of arrangement and upbuilding. There is no more pain, no more death, no more curse. Old things have passed away: all things are become new!

Yet Mr. Barnett sees not a single attribute in God worthy of respect in the light of these doctrines. He sees no power in making us, no wisdom in exacting obedience as the law of being, no love in extricating our helpless race from the consequences of disobedience, no glory in "the grace to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ." Orthodox theology has blinded his eyes. What if it be that the operation of wisdom require the Almighty to permit 999 out of every thousand human beings to go out of existence? Are we not clay in the hands of the potter? All nations before Him are as nothing. Is it so much reflection on His wisdom that He should suffer sinners to perish as the dogma that He should torture them for ever? No well-balanced mind will falter in its verdict. Mr. Barnett represents a system of apostasy in which Paganism, dressed up in words and phrases borrowed from the New Testament, is palmed upon the world as the genuine faith of the gospel. Numbers are awakening to the recognition of this startling fact, and the hope that greater numbers still may have the scales taken from their eyes, and the glorious truth implanted in their minds and hearts, leads to the publication of this

REJOINDER TO MR. BARNETT'S PUBLISHED CRITICISMS

ON "TWELVE LECTURES."

tt
ll
s,
n,
th
ut
ill
re
to

se
of
st
ls,
ce
id
ed
on
re,
no
sw
ess
he
ess
to
his
ht
ity
ess
be
ng
no
he
he
on,
nd
ike
ry

res
of
ful
ho

C O N T E N T S .

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	3
BIBLE TEACHING CONCERNING GOD	10
THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE CONCERNING THE DEVIL	19
THE NATURE OF CHRIST	26
THE DEATH OF CHRIST	35
THE KINGDOM OF GOD	42
THE NATURE OF MAN	45
MR. BARNETT'S ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF HUMAN IMMORTALITY	55
MR. BARNETT'S REVIEW OF SCRIPTURE ARGUMENTS ON MORTALITY	64
MR. BARNETT'S SCRIPTURE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF NATURAL IMMORTALITY	72
MR. BARNETT BECOMES AGGRESSIVE	
CONCLUSION.	88