

CHRISTADELPHIAN PUBLICATIONS.

To be had of R. ROBERTS, Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Row, Birmingham.

WORKS OF DR. THOMAS.

- ELPIS ISRAEL. 478 pp., 7s 6d. post free; in America, 2 dollars 50 cents.
EURKHA, in Hebrew, an Exposition of the Apocalypse, 2114 pp., 31s 2d. post free; in America, 3 dollars 75 cents.
ANASTASIS, or Resurrection and Judgment, 3d. post free; in America, 38 cents.
PIANETTES, or Moral and Nazarene Teaching concerning God, 73 pp.; 8d. post free; in America, 38 cents.
WHAT IS THE TRUTH? or a new question Answered in an Exposition of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, 20d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
CATECHISMUS, or a new Instruction in Mortality, Immortality, and Judgment, in the form of a new and simple Catechism, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
DUSTIN, or a new and simple Catechism, a compilation from Dr. Thomas's works; 12 pp.; 1d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
THE PROPHECIES, or a new and simple Exposition of the prophetic periods of Daniel and John, in the form of a new and simple Catechism, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
THE REVEALED MYSTERY, explained in a Summary of Christianity, a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, and a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of the Apostles; 24 pp.; 1d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
HERALD OF THE KINGDOM, several books, 1d. each; in America, 2 dols.

OTHER WORKS.

- TWO LECTURES, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
CHRISTIANITY, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
THE KINGDOM OF GOD, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
EVERY MAN HIS OWN KING, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
JESUS CHRIST AND HIS KINGDOM, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
THE ONLY WAY TO THE TRUTH, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
DISCOURSE ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, by William R. Roberts, 1d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
THE CHRISTADELPHIAN HYMN BOOK, containing Hymns and Anthems, with Music in each number; 350 pp.; 1d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
CHRISTADELPHIAN TRACTS, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
CHRISTIANITY, or a new and simple Exposition of the Kingdom of God, by the Faithful and Fearless, 2d. post free; in America, 11 cents.
MEANING OF CHRISTADELPHIAN MOVEMENT: a Report of Four Days Gathering in Birmingham; post-free 3d.; in America, 49 cents.
MISCELLANEOUS PAMPHLETS.—The Kingdom of God, 2d., or 19 cents. Rev. of the Birmingham Eclectic, 1d., or 20 cents.—The Kingdom of God, 2d., or 10 cents.—The Way of Truth, 1d., or 7 cents.—The Kingdom of God, 2d., or 10 cents—all post free.

A VINDICATION

OF

THE TRUTH (CURRENTLY KNOWN AS
"CHRISTADELPHIANISM,")

FROM

THE MISREPRESENTATIONS CONTAINED IN A PAMPHLET PUBLISHED
BY THE "REV." C. CLEMENCE, OF NOTTINGHAM, ENTITLED

"Christadelphianism Exposed."

BY ROBERT ROBERTS,

OF BIRMINGHAM.

*Editor of the "Christadelphian," and Author of "Twelve Lectures," which are attacked
by Mr. Clemence in the said pamphlet.*

Mr. Clemence's pamphlet, to which this is a reply, can be had (price 3d.) of
Mr. J. Derry, Albert Street, Nottingham.

LONDON:

CHRISTADELPHIAN BOOK DEPOT, 69, UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON,
NOTTINGHAM: J. DERRY, ALBERT STREET.
BIRMINGHAM: R. ROBERTS, ATHENAEUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

1875.

A VINDICATION

OF

THE TRUTH (CURRENTLY KNOWN AS
CHRISTADELPHIANISM)

FROM

THE MISREPRESENTATIONS CONTAINED IN A PAMPHLET PUBLISHED
BY THE REV. C. CLEMANCI, OF NOTTINGHAM ENGLAND.

“Christadelphianism Exposed,”

BY ROBERT ROBERTS,

OF BIRMINGHAM

*Editor of the Christadelphian, and Author of ‘Twelve Lectures,’ which are attacked
by Mr. Clemanci in the said pamphlet*

LONDON

CHRISTADELPHIAN BOOK DEPOT, 69, LITTLE BRIDGE STREET, LONDON
NOTTINGHAM J. DEERY, ALBERT STREET
BIRMINGHAM R. ROBERTS, AUSTIN TOWN HOUSE, TEMPLE ROW

PRICE THREEPENCE

1875.

A Vindication of the Truth.

MR. CLEMANCE, Independent minister, of Nottingham, has written a pamphlet entitled *Christadelphianism Exposed*.

In no sense is the title appropriate. A thing can be exposed in only two senses, it can be exhibited to view, as when you talk of a thing being "exposed for sale." This is the innocent sense. Or it may be exposed in the sense of tearing off a guise under which it is attempted to be palmed off in another than its own character. In neither of these senses is Mr. Clemance's pamphlet entitled to its name. He has not truly exhibited the system of truth currently known as "Christadelphianism:" which was not to be expected. And as for "exposing" it in the sense of unmasking a sham, this he cannot do, for there is no sham to unmask.

The system in question affects no other than its own character. As another and more formidable adversary than Mr. Clemance, has said: "it bears *upon its forefront* UNDISGUISELY its (so-called) deadly character." To speak of "exposing" a thing which openly declares its character is, to say the least, a little unhappy. Doubtless, Mr. Clemance aimed at a vigorous title, but he has sacrificed propriety to style, and not only propriety, but truth; for no man is able, on a full canvass of the whole question, to overthrow the scriptural demonstration that "Christadelphianism" is the truth of God. A thorough and candid examination of the matter will convince the examiner as it has done many already, that "Christadelphianism" embodies the teaching of God's word in its entirety, and achieves the long-sought reconciliation between nature and revelation, enabling us to recognise the facts patent to scientific observation, and at the same time to lay hold with the firm grasp of faith on Christ as the redeemer of human life from vanity. Several able men have made the attempt which Mr. Clemance now makes, to show the

matter otherwise; but the result has been in every case to strengthen the thing assailed.

Mr. Clemance's attempt is by no means the most formidable. It is praiseworthy on his part as a consistent endeavour to exercise his professional functions of pastor of the people and defender of the faith. It is smart in a certain way; but it lacks the force of some attempts that have preceded his.

In a brief manner, we shall "expose" the fallacies that vitiate every effort he makes in this pamphlet to overthrow the truth.

First, there is an attempt to scare the reader with party cries. "Socinianism," "Ana-baptism," "Millennarianism," "Materialism," are put forward, in capital letters, in catch lines, as the leading components of "Christadelphianism." Supposing this were true, it is an unskilful way of going to work on the part of a man who aims at accurate truth in an age when everything is called in question; for does it not raise the question, What are these dreadful things which he enumerates? and are they true or false? Of course, if their falsity is taken for granted, the argument may be satisfactory enough; but seeing that many people (altogether apart from Christadelphians) hold these things to be not false but true, their falsity, in controversial times like these, cannot be taken for granted. But Mr. Clemance takes them for granted. He thus starts his argument against "Christadelphians," by several immense assumptions. That is, he begs the question. That is, he asks his readers at the start to adopt his views on several debateable questions on which keen intellects have differed in all ages, and on each side of which multitudes of partizans have always been found. Thus, he fails at the start to lay his foundation; consequently, his whole structure is in the air, balloon-like, and liable, on the first shot that pierces its canvass, to go crashing to the earth.

But Christadelphianism is not Socinianism, Ana-baptism, Millennarianism, or Materialism. This could be demonstrated in detail; but as it would still leave untouched the great question, "Is it apostolical Christianity?" we will not on this occasion enter upon the demonstration, but hurry to the issue direct, as between Mr. Clemance's assertions and their true character in relation to the Scriptures.

Probably, no sensible person will mistake Mr. Clemance's caricature of the Christadelphian doctrine of baptism for the doctrine of the Christadelphians themselves. Mr. Clemance says that according to the Christadelphians,

"to be baptised 'in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost,' means to be baptised in the name of the Divine Being, of a man, and of an effluence." One would scarcely have expected so near an approach to clap-trap on the part of a man of the lofty pretensions implied in "Rev." and "B.A." Mr. Clemance must find it hard work to make Christadelphian doctrines appear so ridiculous as he declares them to be, when he has thus to wrest them, rather than let them speak for themselves. True, the Christadelphians say that Jesus was "a man," but is this all they say? Do they not say as Paul says, that he was "God manifested in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii. 16); and with John, "The Word made flesh" (Jno. i. 14); and with Paul, "The brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person?"—(Heb. i. 2.) Why should Mr. Clemance lay hold of the least important aspect of the Christadelphian view of Christ in his derisive representation of the Christadelphian formula of baptism? He might as well found a caricature on the apostolic words which style Jesus "a man."—(Acts ii. 22; 1 Tim. ii. 5.) But Mr. Clemance would be more fair with the apostles, if he would recognise that though they spoke of Jesus as "a man," they also taught he was no mere man, but the manifestation of God on the earth. True fairness is fairness to all alike, and, therefore, if Mr. Clemance were truly fair, he would recognise that the Christadelphians do not speak of Jesus as a man only, but as all that the apostles taught him to be.

So on the subject of the Spirit, Mr. Clemance is funny at the expense of fairness and truth. "An effluence" is *any* effluence, and Christadelphians do not teach that the Spirit of God is "any effluence" but *the effluence of God*—the spirit that proceeds from God, and has its source in Him as the fountain head. To have put the matter in this sober and truthful way would have robbed Mr. Clemance's caricature of its piquancy; but what he would have lost in this way, he would have gained in dignity and in reputation as a fair and penetrating man.

Mr. Clemance alleges that Christadelphianism "denies the distinctive existence of body and spirit," and is able of course, to show how shockingly, on this hypothesis, Christadelphianism is opposed to common sense and the Bible. But here again Mr. Clemance builds without a foundation. The Christadelphians do not deny the distinctive existence of body and spirit. Mr. Clemance puts the matter inaccurately. The Christadelphians believe expressly in the distinctive existence of body and spirit; but the question is,

what is "spirit?" Christians say with the Bible, that it is God's Spirit (Job xxxiv. 14; Psalm cxxxix. 7): that it is in every man's nostril while he is alive (Job xxvii. 3; Gen. vii. 22; Isaiah ii. 22), and that when he is dead, it returns to God with whom it was ages before the man was born.—(Eccles. xii. 7). Mr. Clemance would say it is an entity, ghost, or soul, which has, after its separation from the body, an individual existence, form and function which it did not possess before it entered the body. Therefore at its return, it is not, according to his view, the spirit that God gave in its proceeding forth. In fact, Mr. Clemance would call it "an immortal soul," though he carefully eschews this form of speech throughout his pamphlet. He carefully avoids being explicit on many points, either from inability or unintention. He is like Dr. Angus and one or two others who have preceded him: he is indefinite and non-committal, like the diplomatists, leaving doors open on all sides for ready egress on this side or that, according to the direction of the attack. Truth is not indefinite and non-committal, but explicit and unreserved in the positions it takes.

Mr. Clemance's answer to the question, "What is the truth?" would not be sustainable by the Scriptures or experience. The spirit of man "surviving the stroke of death" is no longer the spirit of man: for no man has power to retain the spirit in the day of death.—(Eccles. viii. 8.) It returns to God who gave it (Eccles. xii. 7), and, therefore, is God's.—(Job. xxxiv. 14.) If Mr. Clemance demurs to this, how is he to dispose of "the spirit of the beast?" There is "a spirit of the beast." Mr. Clemance may not like the fact; but it is a Scripture phrase (Eccles. iii. 21), and the constructive teaching of many parts of Scripture.—(Psalm civ. 30; Gen. vii. 15.) And we will add that it is a fact patent to the senses, for is there not a spirit in a living lion that is gone from a dead lion? Now where is the "spirit of the lion" when the lion is dead? The answer of the Scripture is, "It is gathered unto Himself (God)."—(Job xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29, 30.) It is returned to God who gave it; for did not God give it? Mr. Clemance may deride; but facts are not thus to be disposed of. Therefore, the spirit of the beast "surviving the stroke of death," is on a level with the spirit of man "surviving the stroke of death." In both cases, it ceases to be the spirit of man or beast; it reverts to its primal relation to eternal power, and its "living onward and onward still" is not a living of man or beast "onward and onward still," but the living of eternal power "onward and

onward still." To become the spirit of man again, man must be restored. This he will be, in millions of instances, by resurrection. If there were no resurrection, they would perish.—(1 Cor. xv. 18.) This is the teaching of Paul and of common sense, but if Mr. Clemance were right, it would matter nothing to the dead if there never were a resurrection.

Mr. Clemance declares that "the very principle on which the word of God is based," is "the spirituality of man's nature." It would have been well if Mr. Clemance had defined the meaning he attaches to the word "spirituality" in this connection. He has not done so, but his connecting it with "nature," points, of course, to "being," constitution, &c. Whether this be his sense or no, it requires not a great acquaintance with the word of God to see that it is based on the very opposite principle, viz., the total unspirituality of man's nature, whether understood physically or mentally.

As to the physical phase, we are informed expressly concerning Adam, that "that was not first which is spiritual, but THAT WHICH IS NATURAL;" that "the first man was of the earth, earthly" (1 Cor. xv. 17); that he was made of the dust; that he is dust, as his name—earth—imports, and will return to dust again.—(Gen. iii. 19.) In relation to the experience of saints, now and afterwards, it is written: "It is sown a natural body and raised a *spiritual* body," showing that they are not now spiritual bodies. Therefore, it cannot be of man's body that Mr. Clemance speaks of "the spirituality of man's nature," though, considering that human nature is bodily nature, it seems strange that Mr. Clemance should apply the term "man's nature" to anything else.

If, by "man's nature," he mean the mind of man, he is still more unfortunate in speaking of "the spirituality of man's nature;" for if there is one fact more prominently put forward than another, it is the fact stated by Paul, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."—(1 Cor. ii. 14.) "The carnal mind," he says, "is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."—(Rom. viii. 7.) This doctrine is set forth in a great variety of vigorous forms, for illustration of which, see the following passages.—Rom. vii. 18; viii. 5; Gal. v. 19; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Jno. ii. 16; Matt. xv. 19; Gen. vi. 5; Jer. xvii. 9.

In no sense, therefore, can Mr. Clemance sustain his assertion that "the

Word of God is based on the spirituality of man's nature." The truth lies in the opposite proposition, that the Scriptures originate in the fact that man's nature is not spiritual, but carnal, and requires to be made spiritual—first morally and then physically, or first in state of mind and then in state of body. The Scriptures, therefore, justify Christadelphianism in that for which Mr. Clemance condemns it. That Mr. Clemance should hazard such an assertion so thoroughly unscriptural is evidence that he is a mere theologian in the conventional sense, and not a guide and instructor in the Holy Oracles. Peter says, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."—(1 Pet. iv. 11.) This does not Mr. Clemance in speaking of "the spirituality of man's nature." Let him put his finger on the book, chapter, or text that speaks of "the spirituality of man's nature."

Then we have to look at the allegation of Mr. Clemance, that "Christadelphianism commits three fatal errors in the interpretation of the Word of God." What is the first? "It deals with the Bible as if all the books in it were of equal value and gave us equal light." This is certainly a surprising item. Suppose, all ye believers in the Bible, whom Mr. Clemance would protect from "the proselyting zealots of Christadelphianism," that this were a true statement, is it not an extraordinary charge to be brought against people accused of going against the Bible by one coming forward as the defender of the Bible against them? If Mr. Clemance had said, "The Christadelphians place more value on one part of the Bible than another—some books, in fact, they consider of doubtful authority"—one could understand the appropriateness and gravity of such a charge; but to say "these people attach equal value to all parts," is positively a tribute of commendation where Mr. Clemance intended a damaging blow. Certainly, it must be considered highly complimentary to the Christadelphians in the estimation of all who revere the Scriptures. Complimentary or not, it is worth emphasising: a clerical guide of the people finds fault with the Christadelphians for attaching "equal value" to all parts of the Bible! A supposed defender of the Holy Scriptures opposes a body of people for placing too high a value on them! Significant incident! Illustrative fact! It speaks volumes. Let Christadelphianism be investigated, and the state of the case will fully explain the apparently superficial incident.

But Mr. Clemance is wrong when he says that Christadelphianism holds that all parts of the Bible give equal light. Christadelphianism recognises

and acts upon the self-evident fact that more light is communicated on some subjects in some parts than in others. For example, there is more light on the question of practical duty in the sermon on the mount than in the genealogical lists in the Chronicles.

But what Christadelphianism does hold is this, that all parts of the Scriptures are of equal authority on the matters of which they severally treat. That is, Exodus is as much an authority on the subject of Israel's deliverance and national constitution as John is an authority on the discourses of Christ. Each book is of equal value with respect to the particular matters with which it may deal. Can there be a reasonable demurrer to this on the part of reverent and intelligent believers in the holy oracles? One would think not, but presently Mr. Clemance gives us an example of a man claiming to be such, and doing so.

He talks of "the gloomy sayings of Old Testament saints, as David and Hezekiah," and refuses to receive them as "the veritable teachings of the Spirit of God." By implication—nay, by positive assertion—he sets down the sayings of these "holy men of old," as the unauthorised, despairing, erring utterances of unenlightened human brains! Wherefore should Mr. Clemance find himself compelled thus to go in the face of the New Testament declaration that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit?"—(2 Pet. i. 21.) Wherefore should he go in opposition to David's declaration that "the spirit of Jehovah spake by him, and that His word was on his tongue?" (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), confirmed as this always is by Christ's allusions to the Psalms, speaking of them as sayings of David "in spirit" and the word of prophecy?—(Matt. xxii. 43; xiii. 35; Acts iv. 25; Heb. iv. 7.) There is one very obvious and pertinent answer to this question. These men have said things which are irreconcilable with Mr. Clemance's theology. These men have said:

- 1.—"In death there is no remembrance."—(Psalm vi. 5.)
- 2.—"In the day of death the thoughts perish."—(Psalm cxlvi. 3-4.)
- 3.—"The dead know not anything."—(Ecc. ix. 5.)
- 4.—"The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth."—(Prov. vi. 31.)
- 5.—"All the wicked shall God destroy."—(Psalm cxlv. 20.)
- 6.—"They that go down to the pit (grave) cannot hope."—(Isaiah xxxviii. 18.)
- 7.—"There is no wisdom nor knowledge in the grave."—(Ecc. ix. 10.)

In opposition to these sayings of "holy men of God," who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, Mr. Clemance holds—

- 1.—In death, there is no forgetfulness.
- 2.—In the day of death, the thoughts become brighter.
- 3.—The dead know everything.
- 4.—The righteous shall be recompensed above the clouds.
- 5.—All the wicked shall God preserve in torment.
- 6.—They that go down to the grave, can hope if they are righteous.
- 7.—There is more wisdom in the disembodied state than in life.

Mr. Clemance sees the impossibility of reconciling these views which he holds, with what "holy men of God" have said. Therefore, he is forced to set down the sayings of the "holy men of God" as the gloomy sayings of the men themselves—the uninspired sayings—the worthless sayings of human opinion! Ought not this fact to suggest to all believers of the Bible as the word of inspiration, that there is something wrong in the creed which necessitates such a mode of defence? True, Mr. Clemance presently states further on, that "he believes the whole of *the word of God* to be inspired," but this general and equivocal statement does not remove the fact that he arbitrarily puts his finger upon this verse and that verse that does not suit him, and says "this is the gloomy saying of an Old Testament saint." If it be the "gloomy saying of a saint," of course it is not "the word of God;" and if he remove some verses thus from the word of God, what is to hinder him doing the same with every passage that does not square with his views? His doing it in one case is a reason for believing he may do it in any case, and in every case; and thus Mr. Clemance's congregation are in danger of having the Bible squeezed this way and that to suit Mr. Clemance's creed. Mr. Clemance talks of the Christadelphians subjecting the Bible to "the Procrustean method" of interpretation, but he has proved in this very pamphlet that it is he who is guilty of the heinous offence he charges on the Christadelphians. Well may it be said to him, "Take first the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou wilt see clearly to take the mote out of the eyes of others."

"But," says Mr. Clemance, "we prove the Christian doctrine of immortality and life mainly from the New Testament. 'Life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel.'" A noble saying, and capable of yielding

a right meaning, though that is not the meaning intended by Mr. Clemance. Mr. Clemance is talking about "the immortality of the soul." He calls this "*the Christian doctrine of immortality*," as if to hint that the immortality he is speaking about is not the Pagan doctrine of immortality. But, in fact, what Mr. Clemance means by "*the Christian doctrine of immortality*" is the Pagan doctrine of immortality: for Mr. Clemance means the immortality of the soul, and that is exactly what the Pagans believed and taught.

However, Mr. Clemance chooses to call the immortality of the soul "the Christian doctrine of immortality;" and he says he proves it mainly from the New Testament, where it is "brought to light by the gospel." Of course, if this is true, the proof will be easy and apparent. Where, then, is the statement of Christ that the soul is immortal? Where is the assertion of the apostles that the soul is immortal? Where is the declaration in the gospel that the soul is immortal? Mr. Clemance cannot produce such a statement. It does not exist. On the contrary, Christ says that "He is the Life (immortality), and that if men do not come to him, they have no life (immortality) in them."—(John. xi. 25; vi. 53.) So the apostles say, that the righteous in the present state are "seeking for glory, honour and immortality" (Rom. ii. 7), and that only at the coming of Christ will this mortal life be swallowed up of immortal life.—(1 Cor. xv. 51-54; 2 Cor. v. 4.)

Mr. Clemance says, "What is the use of going for light on these profound themes, to books that were written ages before the gospel was known?" Here Mr. Clemance makes a great mistake. He represents the Christadelphians as going for light on the subject of immortality, to the books of the Old Testament. This they do not do. They are thankful to receive the clear light of the New Testament on this subject. But they accept the light of the Old Testament *on the subject of mortality*. It is here that Mr. Clemance does not discriminate. The Christadelphians believe the revelation of the Old Testament so far as that revelation goes. It sheds a little, but not much, light on the subject of immortality, but is very clear in its instruction on the subject of death, how it came, what it results in, how it affects man, &c., &c. Are we to reject this instruction? Would Mr. Clemance tell his congregation not to believe the Old Testament *on the subjects that it does speak about*? He would not say this in plain words; but this is what the principle he lays down amounts to.

The Old Testament says that man goes to dust (Gen. iii. 19), that the dead rest together there (Job xvii. 16); that there is no wisdom, knowledge or consciousness in that state (Ecc. ix. 10; Psa. cxlvi. 4). Mr. Clemance cannot fit this with his view, and, therefore, he sets aside these teachings as "the gloomy sayings of Old Testament saints." Thus he is obliged to accept the fact that, according to his system of belief, the New and the Old Testaments are in conflict, whereas the beauty of the faith held by the Christadelphians is, that it sees perfect harmony between both departments of the Holy Oracles; that while the New Testament plainly reveals eternal life as the gift of God through Christ by resurrection, it is not in contradiction to the Old Testament, which tells that our native inheritance is death, and our state in the grave that of death and unconsciousness for the time being. In fact, the negative teachings of the Old Testament necessitate the positive teachings of the New; for if death be a reality, then is resurrection a necessity if there is to be salvation. But looked at as Mr. Clemance views the subject, there is no such harmony; for in the first place, the Old Testament, instead of speaking the truth, gives us "the gloomy sayings of Old Testament saints," and in the second place, the New reveals a resurrection for which there was no necessity, since reward and punishment is meted out to the dead independently of any resurrection.

Then Mr. Clemance says the books of the Old Testament were "written ages before the gospel was known." This is another mistake. The mistake is clearly due to his notion of the gospel. He believes the gospel to consist of the death, burial and resurrection of the Son of God, and as these facts were neither known nor preached till their occurrence, the supposition that they are the gospel, naturally leads to the idea expressed by Mr. Clemance, when he speaks of the books of the Old Testament having been written "ages before the gospel was known." But Paul says "the gospel was preached before unto Abraham."—(Gal. iii. 8.) He also says it was preached to Israel in the wilderness.—(Heb. iv. 2.) The death, burial and resurrection of Jesus were not preached to either. Consequently, there must be something else not recognised by Mr. Clemance, answering to the phrase "the gospel." Nor is there any difficulty in discovering from the New Testament what this is. It is many, many times spoken of as "the glad tidings of the kingdom of God."—(Luke viii. 1; Acts viii. 12; xix. 8; xx. 25; xxviii. 30, 31, and other places.) The gospel of the kingdom was preached to Abraham

and to the Israelites, which enables us to comprehend Paul's statements referred to. The doctrine of the cross was super-added to this doctrine of the kingdom: and the two make the complete gospel of the apostolic age. Mr. Clemance excludes the first, and the second it would not be difficult to show his theology prevents him from understanding.

Mr. Clemance says the Christadelphians quote isolated passages. This is a frivolous objection. What ought they to do? Should they quote whole chapters? Is it not reasonable, in illustrating a certain point, to quote only so much as is relevant to the point? By implication, Mr. Clemance considers that *his* practice is the right thing to follow. Well, what is this? Just the same as the practice he complains of in the Christadelphians. Numerous illustrations might be selected from his pamphlet. Let the following suffice:—

"The body without the spirit is dead."—(Jas. ii. 26.)

"I must put off this my tabernacle."—(2 Pet. i. 14.)

The time of my departure is at hand."—(2 Tim. iv. 6.)

What are these but "passages quoted in isolation from the context?" Not a word is to be said against it if the passages teach what Mr. Clemance maintains; but it is just matter for complaint, that Mr. Clemance should make a matter of accusation against the Christadelphians out of a thing which is reasonable in itself, and in which he himself commits the same offence, if it was an offence, at the very moment he makes the accusation.

Similarly unfortunate is Mr. Clemance's assertion that the Christadelphians quote isolated passages with a meaning which the context would not sustain. He gives but one example. He says they quote "I am but dust and ashes," as Abraham's declaration that he had *no soul*. This is a complete mistake, due, probably, to the dimness of perception manifest in other parts of the pamphlet. The Christadelphians believe Abraham had a soul; the question is, had he the immortal soul of pagan belief? If Mr. Clemance had inserted the word "immortal" before soul, his statement would not have been so wide of the mark as it is; but then it would have lost its piquancy.

As has already been intimated, Mr. Clemance accuses the Christadelphians of a "Procrustean" method of treating the Scriptures, which, being literally rendered, means wresting the Scriptures. He founds the charge upon their mode of explaining twelve passages which he quotes *in extenso*, and

concerning which he alleges, they (the passages) teach that *all men live immediately after death*. Let us follow the passages and see if either his accusation or his assertion be founded in truth.

BODY AND SPIRIT.

1.—“*The body without the spirit is dead.*” To this the Christadelphians say, “Yes.” Wherein do they wrest the statement? What they do is to demur to the meaning Mr. Clemance would put on the word “spirit.” *He* would make it mean an immortal immaterial person; whereas *they* accept the Scripture teaching that it is God’s Spirit, which when He gathers it to Himself, all flesh perishes together, and “man returns again to the dust.”—(Job. xxxiv. 11.) And then, how does it teach that everybody lives after death? Seeing that men are *living bodies*, the passage proves that when that Spirit which makes them so is withdrawn, they are dead “immediately after death,” and not alive as Mr. Clemance maintains.

“HAVING A DESIRE TO DEPART.”

2.—“*For me to live is Christ; to die is gain. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.*”—(Phil. i. 21, 23.) The Christadelphians say “Yes” to this also. For Paul to die was gain, not because he would in death get Christ: for Paul associates the possession of Christ with his life in contrast with his death, saying “*For me to live is Christ;*” but because it would have for him two distinctly beneficial personal effects: it would terminate his great tribulation (2 Cor. xi. 23-27), and annihilate for him the interval of time dividing him from the meeting with the Lord at his coming; for “the dead know not anything” (Eccles. ix. 5): the time to them goes with the rapidity with which it passed with us before we were born. Therefore, the death of Paul, and his being with Christ, would be to Paul instantly sequential events, not as a matter of fact but as a matter of feeling, which is matter of fact to those who are the subjects of the feeling. It is customary with Christadelphians to speak in this same manner with respect to this same event and people not knowing their faith would, on such occasions, imagine they shared Mr. Clemance’s expectations, just as Mr. Clemance mistakes Paul’s incoherent allusions to his own hope, for a definition of the orthodox impossible

hope. Paul’s hope was to be with Christ at his coming.—(2 Cor. iv. 14: Titus ii. 13.) But Mr. Clemance takes no pains to reconcile apparent conflict. Paul’s statement, read apart from a knowledge of what Paul’s hope was, seems to countenance Mr. Clemance’s idea of Paul being alive after death; but the seeker for truth is not content with appearances. If Paul had said, “I shall be alive immediately after I am dead,” there would have been the reality in addition to the appearance, but as his words stand, there is merely an appearance, which disappears when all the facts are taken into account.

INHERITING THE PROMISES.

3.—“*That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.*”—(Heb. vi. 12.) Surely this does not teach that men are alive immediately after death. The word “inherit” is in the indefinite tense, referring neither to past, present or future. The emphasis lies on the “faith and patience” and not on the time of results. We have to look into the facts of the case before we can come to a right conclusion as regards the time of inheritance. Mr. Clemance would contend, of course, that the “them” referred to, went straight to the inheritance of the promises, “immediately after they were dead.” But Paul expressly excludes this view of the matter, in the same epistle, speaking of the same characters. He says “*These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off . . . God having provided . . . that they without us SHOULD NOT BE MADE PERFECT.*”—(Heb. xi. 13, 40.)

PUTTING OFF THIS TABERNACLE.

4.—“*I must put off this my tabernacle.*”—(2 Pet. i. 14.) “Tabernacle” is a figure here, as Mr. Clemance would not deny: so therefore must the “putting off” be. The literal truth concerning the act and effects of death is not to be learnt from a figurative description of it.

“MY DECEASE.”

5.—“*I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease.*”—(2 Pet. i. 15.) Surely this will not be pressed as an illustration of a Procrustean treatment of Scripture on the part of the Christadelphians, or as a proof that all men live immediately after they die.

"MY DEPARTURE."

6.—"The time of my DEPARTURE is at hand."—(2 Tim. iv. 6.) The word translated departure is *αναλυσαις*, *analysis*, which is equivalent to dissolution. The meaning is death. Mr. Clemance will say, "No; it is departure to glory, to receive the crown of righteousness." But Mr. Clemance is proved wrong by the "context," which he so blames the Christadelphians for leaving out. Paul's words in the context are "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at THAT DAY (his appearing and his kingdom—see verse 1), and not to me ONLY but to ALL THEM ALSO that love his appearing."

"TO-DAY SHALT THOU BE WITH ME."

7.—And Jesus said unto him, *verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.*—(Luke xxiii. 43.) By this, Mr. Clemance understands that on that day of 24 hours (hoping he wont be hypercritical like some opponents of the Christadelphians, and say a Roman day had only 12 hours), the soul of Christ and the thief were together in heaven in the presence of the Father. But this understanding is shown to be wrong by the statement that during the three succeeding days his "soul" was "in hell" (Acts ii. 27), and that on the morning of the third day he had not ascended to his Father.—(John vi. 17) Therefore the right meaning has to be sought. Mr. Clemance may call it the Procrustean method; but wise men are not to be frightened away from the solution of a difficulty by hard names. The clue is found in the fact that the thief's question, to which Christ's words were an answer, introduced a particular day to attention. "Lord remember me *WHEN thou comest into thy kingdom.*"—(v. 42) The answer seizes hold of this, and calls it "to-day" in the sense of *this day*—the day just spoken of or the day before their minds. For examples of this use of *σημερον*, see the following as given in the Septuagint:—Deut. ix. 1: Moses having told Israel of their approaching entry into the land of promise, says, "Thou art to pass over Jordan *this day* (*σημερον*)."
This was said more than two months before they crossed the Jordan.—(Compare Deut. i. 1, and Josh. iv. 19:)—Ex. xii. 14 "This day," (*τη ημερα ταυτη*—even more emphatic than *σημερον*) spoken at least before the tenth day of Abib, refers to the fourteenth day of that month.—(Compare verses 3, 6, 17, and 28.)

"ABSENT FROM THE BODY."

8.—"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him."—(2 Cor. v. 6, 8, 9.) The Christadelphians do not put this passage into "clips, screws and stretchers;" they but ask the meaning of it. And for this, they refer to the "context" which ought to be a favourite with Mr. Clemance in view of his former complaint. And what is that context? "In this (body) we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." Here, there are two bodies: the one the present body of weakness and humiliation; the other the glorious and incorruptible body which the saints will receive at the resurrection. The change from the one to the other is when the Lord comes.—(Phil. iii. 21.) So long as we are in (or at home in) this body, we are absent from the Lord, for with him we cannot be in this corruptible, and when he comes, the corruptible will be swallowed up. Therefore every instructed saint is willing and anxious to be absent from this body and to be present with the Lord; and labours, whether present or absent, to be accepted of him in view of the fact stated by Paul in the next verse succeeding to the one quoted by Mr. Clemance, "We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ that everyone may receive the things in body (omitting the italics) according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." (Of course, Mr. Clemance will say "No, no; it means that Paul wanted to be unclothed altogether—to be a dead man—that he might be with Christ." But we show Mr. Clemance to be wrong, by quoting Paul's explicit utterance in the very passage on this very point: "NOT FOR THAT WE WOULD BE UNCLOTHED, but clothed upon, that *MORTALITY might be swallowed up of life.*"—(ver. 4.)

"WHETHER WE LIVE OR DIE."

9.—"For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, *WE ARE the Lord's.*" (Rom. xiv. 9.) True, but Mr. Clemance says we cannot die. Paul's meaning is not obscure, and certainly helps Mr. Clemance not at all. It is written, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of all His saints."—(Psa. cxvi.)

15.) They are none the less His because they are dead. They "sleep in the dust of the earth" (Dan. xii. 2): they "dwell in the dust."—(Is. xxvi. 19). But, they are only laid by for a time. They are to come forth (John v. 29. Zech. ix. 11) in the day referred to in the following: "They shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in THAT DAY when I make up my jewels, and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him."—(Mal. iii. 17). Meanwhile it is a comfort to all who belong to this class, that whether they live or die, they are the Lord's: and that death shall not be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, who is the Resurrection and the Life.—(Rom. viii. 38-39; John xi. 25).

THE DEAD THAT DIE IN THE LORD.

10.—"And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."—(Rev. xvi. 13). The key of this statement is to be found in the phrase "from henceforth." From whenceforth? The answer is, from the point of time in the vision shown to John in the Isle of Patmos, at which the statement occurs. The "context" will show that that point of time is the destruction of the Roman Mistress and her progeny, who now occupy and corrupt the earth, and the manifestation of the Son of Man to punish the inhabitants of the earth and set up his kingdom. This is the time when the blessedness of the dead dying in the Lord will be apparent both to themselves and others; for they will then enter into the rest that still remaineth for the people of God. Mr. Clemance no doubt imagines the statement refers to the supposed translation of righteous immortal souls to the sky at the death of the body; but if this were the meaning, seeing that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and thousands besides, went to the "blessedness" ages before the revelation was given to John, what can be the sense of the words "from henceforth?"

"AWAKE OR ASLEEP, LIVING WITH CHRIST."

11.—"Our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."—(1 Thess. v. 9, 10.) The "context" shows the meaning of this. Paul was speaking of "the day of the Lord"

which should "come as a thief," when the dead should rise and the living be changed and together meet the Lord, and so be ever with Him.—(See chap. iv. 16-18; and chap. v. 2.) In relation to this time, God's appointment for the saints was that whether they should fall asleep or remain unto the coming of the Lord, they should at that time "live together with Him." If this be not the meaning, in what sense, according to Mr. Clemance's theology, do those who are "awake" (or, in his language, "in the body") live with Him "together with" those who are dead?

DEATH AND LIFE.

12.—"And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."—(Rom. viii. 10, 11.) What Mr. Clemance means by quoting this against the Christadelphians and as a proof that all men live immediately after death, it is difficult to imagine. All that need be said is that the Christadelphians heartily believe the statement, and that it is an explicit enunciation of their hope.

We have gone through the twelve passages which Mr. Clemance calls "sore trials to Christadelphianism." The reader will judge whether they are so or not. They are all of them enunciations of Christadelphian principles, but in the uncertain form which at some time or other befalls all truth in its verbal expression. What Mr. Clemance untruly calls the "Procrustean method" is really the reconciliation of apparent discrepancies between different parts of the Bible. There is no "wresting the Scriptures" in such a process. It is a process for which all honest men are thankful. The possibility of accomplishing it is one of the evidences of truth being on its side. It is a false "case" that cannot be fitted with all parts of the evidence. The case has a place for every fact; but of course, in placing some of them, the process of explanation is necessary, which a flippant opposing counsel calls the "Procrustean method." The said counsel would be glad if he could apply it to his own case, but finding this impossible, it only remains for him

to abuse the witnesses. This is Mr. Clemance's position. He cannot reconcile all parts of the Bible with his theory; therefore he stigmatises some utterances of the holy oracles as "the gloomy sayings of old Testament saints."

"DEATH" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

But Mr. Clemance has other charges against the Christadelphians which we must proceed to notice. He says that their affirmation that death means extinction of being, is contrary to the habitual use of the word in the New Testament. Illustrative of "habitual use," he quotes six verses in which the word is used in an exceptional or derived sense. Mr. Clemance has carefully selected these, and discriminated them from the "habitual use." Let anyone take a Concordance, and turn to the terms "dead" and "death," and they will see the truth of this statement. Hundreds of times are these words used as in the following: "Raise *the dead*" (Matt. x. 8); "He was *as one dead*" (Mark ix. 26); "They found her *dead*" (Acts v. 10); "By man came *death*"—(1 Cor. xv. 21). These are illustrations of the habitual and primary use of the word death; and let the candid reader judge whether they are not the Christadelphian use. Mr. Clemance's specimens of "habitual use" are not the habitual use, but the exceptional and secondary use. All terms have secondary uses, but these secondary uses are derived from the primary or first use, and must be interpreted by the first use, instead of being made the foundation of a gratuitous theory that destroys the first use. The matter is capable of very simple illustration. The daughter of a certain ruler died (Matt. ix. 24); Christ went to raise her from death. The people in the house made much ado in mourning. Christ said "The maid is *not dead* but sleepeth." Now, in fact, the maid was at the moment dead; but since Christ intended to make her alive, he told the people she was not dead, which was a secondary use: meaning she was not dead in the sense supposed, that is, dead to be buried and appear no more. So in the case of Lazarus (1 John xi. 4). Lazarus died of a certain sickness. Yet Jesus, intending to bring him from the grave, said "This sickness is *not unto death*." Actually, it was unto death, for he did; but as regards the giving of him over unto death, it was not unto death, because Jesus interposed to prevent this result. We see the inverse application of this principle in the answer of Christ to the young

man who wanted to bury his father before following Christ: "Let *the dead* bury their dead." Jesus refused to acknowledge the maid or Lazarus dead, because though actually dead for the moment, they were destined to live. So here he refuses to consider the unjustified as alive, though actually alive for the moment, because destined to die. In both cases, the secondary use of the word is founded on the first, and has no meaning apart from it.

So in the exceptional cases quoted by Mr. Clemance, it requires but a little explanation to bring them into their right relation to the first and proper meaning of the word death. We will parenthetically insert the explanation in each case and reproduce the passages he quotes.

- 1.—"For this my son was dead (as I supposed), and is alive again, he was lost, and is found."—(Luke xv. 24.)
- 2.—"And you he hath quickened, who were dead (being under condemnation to die) in trespasses and sins."—(Eph. ii. 1.)
- 3.—"For ye are dead (being in yourselves mortal and destined to die), and your life is hid with Christ in God."—(Col. iii. 3.)
- 4.—"We know that we have passed from (the destination of ultimate) death unto (the destination of) life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in (the destination of) death"—(1 John iii. 14.)
- 5.—"For I was alive (having hope of eternal life) without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died (that is, I saw myself condemned to death)."—(Rom. vii. 9.)
- 6.—"For to be carnally minded is (the condition that leads to) death, but to be spiritually minded is (the condition that leads to) life and peace."—(Rom. viii. 6.)

The parentheses in these cases may take away from the euphony of the passages, but they furnish the literal meaning. Truth is not always nakedly expressed: but we must beware of founding a lie on elliptical or literally inaccurate forms of speech.

These explanations with regard to the secondary use of "death" also furnish the answer to Mr. Clemance's remarks on life, except as regards the saying of Christ, "If a man keep my sayings, he shall never see death."—(John viii. 51.) In this case, the original words are *Θανατον ου μη θεωρησεται τοις αιωνις*. These words, as Mr. Clemance is probably aware, have not the precise significance of the English version. Literally translated, they are *may see death in the age*. But even if they had the meaning of the common version, Mr. Clemance could not claim them as a proof of the

immortality of the soul, since they limit that immortality to the believing class, and by consequence, disprove it for the unbelieving, which would be contrary to the doctrine of Mr. Clemance, who believes the unbelieving have immortal souls equally with the believing. Christ's words amount to an intimation that believers in him will be rescued from the dominion of eternal death, or that to those believing in him, there is a possibility (if they are alive at the arrival of the age) of their never tasting death at all. In no case are the words a support of the popular doctrine.

ARE THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTADELPHIANISM CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD?

Next, we follow Mr. Clemance in his tabulated parallel columns in which he seeks to prove his other allegation that, "the doctrines of Christadelphianism are contrary to the Word of God." The adoption of his own plan will best exhibit the unfounded character of his assertion.

a.—Is spirit distinct from body?*

The Bible says, Yes.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it."—(Ecc. xii 7.)

"Christadelphianism" says the same. "The organised dust-creatures are the individualities, and the 'spirit' within them on departing, returns to its original condition . . . (Twelve Lectures, page 123.)

b.—Did Jesus Christ exist before he came into the world?

The Bible says Yes, as to THE WORD whose manifestation he was, and No, as to the manifestation in flesh called Jesus Christ.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."—(John i. 1.)

"Christadelphianism" says the same. Christ was a divine manifestation, an embodiment of the Deity in flesh.—Emmanuel—God with us.—(Twelve Lectures p. 138)

* This and the following questions (a to k) are Mr. Clemance's questions. We preserve their form for the sake of making the impropriety of Mr. Clemance's answers apparent.

"Of this man's (David's) seed hath God, according to His promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus."—(Acts xiii. 23.)
 "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my word in his mouth."—(Deut. xviii. 18.)

The personage, Jesus, was a manifestation by the Eternal Spirit, operating formatively in his conception and emergingly at his baptism, both acts being an anointing of the seed of David with the Spirit, and constituting the resultant man the anointed or Christ. Since the resultant man was a manifestation of the antecedent Anointing Power, apart from which he would have no interest, value, or even existence, he cannot well be considered apart from that power.—(The Christadelphian, vol. xi., p. 523.)

c.—Is Jesus Christ God as well as man?

The Bible says:

"God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself."—(2 Cor. v. 19.)

"Christadelphianism" says the same. See answer in this column to the last question.

d.—Is the Holy Ghost a person?

The Bible

Uses the pronoun "He" in speaking of the Holy Spirit (John xvi. 3), but does not say it is "a person." It implies the pronoun "it," which excludes the idea of "a person." [The pronoun "his" is applied to the world.—(John xv. 19.) Surely Mr. Clemance would not argue from this that the world is "a person."] The Bible reveals "the Spirit" as the power of the Father in diffusion from His person in heaven. The Spirit and the Father are ONE, as the sun and the light of day are one.—(Psalm cxxxix. 7-12.) The Father, therefore, fills heaven and earth by the Spirit.—(Jer. xxiii. 23.) In the sense in which the Father is "a person," the Spirit is; but the proposition that "the Holy Ghost is a person" is a symbol adopted in the dark ages, having all the unutilizability appertaining to the scholastic speculations of those times.

"Christadelphianism" affirms the teaching of the Bible.

The Spirit in diffusion has to do with the Father, for he styles it "my Spirit."—(Gen. vi. 3.) . . . Yet there is a distinction between the Father and the Spirit as to the form in which they are presented to our apprehension. Of the former, as we have seen, it is testified that He dwells "in heaven," "in unapproachable light," and is, therefore, located; while, of the latter, it is declared that it is everywhere alike. . . . Spirit concentrated under the Almighty is will becomes Holy Spirit, as emanated from Spirit in its free spontaneous form . . . not another in essence, but in relation and aspect. In the one we are in the domain of fixed law; in the other, God is in communion with us, for words of wisdom or works of power, independently of fixed law.—(Twelve Lectures, pp. 124, 125, 127.)

e.—Is there a heaven to which believers go?

The Bible says there is a heaven, but that no man has ascended to it: and that the inheritance of believers is the earth.

"God is in heaven."—(Ecc. v. 2.)

"No man hath ascended up to heaven."—(Jno. iii. 13.) "David is not ascended into the heavens."—(Acts ii. 24.)

"The meek shall inherit the earth."—(Matt. v. 5.) "They shall reign on the earth."—(Rev. v. 10.)

"The scene quoted by Mr. Clemance from Rev. vii., is a scene witnessed on earth, where God's throne is to be established. The things described in Rev. which John saw, are things which *must be hereafter*; not which were."—(Rev. iv. 1.)

"Christadelphianism" teaches the same.

The Father of all dwells somewhere in the vast expanse around us in unapproachable light, styled in Scriptures, "Heaven His dwelling place."—(1 Kings viii. 30.)

The earth, and not "heaven above the skies," is the inheritance of the saints, and the scene of God's purpose with the human race.—(Declaration, pp. 17-37.)

f.—Is there a hell?

The Bible, Yes.

"There is Moshech and Tubal and all her multitudes; her graves are round about him: all of them uncircumcised . . . which are gone down to HELL with their weapons of war, and have laid THEIR SWORDS under their heads."—(Ezek. xxxii. 26, 27.)

"Hell" is the grave: "Gehenna," which is the original word in the passage quoted here by Mr. Clemance, is the scene of judgment and punishment in the land of Israel at the coming of Christ.

"Christadelphianism" says the same.

"Hell" is synonymous with "grave." The original word is *sheol* (Hebrew), which means nothing more than a concealed or covered place, and, therefore, an appropriate designation for the grave in which a man is for ever concealed from view.—(Twelve Lectures, p. 71.) *Gehenna* (another word translated "hell") refers "to a locality in the land of Israel, which was in past times the scene of judicial infliction, and which is again to become so on a large scale."—(Declaration, p. 30.)

g.—Is there a devil?

The Bible says, Yes.

Jesus died, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."

"Jesus put away SIN by the sacrifice of himself."—(Heb. ix. 26.)

"Christadelphianism" says the same.

"The devil, a Bible synonym for sin, abstract and concrete, existing as the spirit of disobedience in the children of men, and embodied and manifested in the persons and institutions of the present order of things."—(Twelve Lectures, p. 365.)

h.—Are the blessed dead alive still?

The Bible says, No.

"The Lord himself shall descend from heaven . . . and the DEAD in Christ shall rise first; then *we who are ALIVE* shall be caught up together with them."—(1 Thess. iv. 18.)

"Thy wrath is come and *the time of the DEAD*, that they should be judged and that Thou shouldst give reward unto Thy servants the prophets, and to them that fear Thy name, both small and great."—(Rev. xi. 18.)

"These all (Abraham, &c.) DIED in faith, not having received the promises." (Heb. xi. 13). The living know that they shall die, but *THE DEAD know not anything.*"—(Ecc. ix. 5.)

"Now that *THE DEAD are (to be) raised, even* Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, for God is not a God of the dead, but of the living."—(Luke xx. 37.)

Mr. Clemance uses this passage to prove that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive in death. But Christ quoted it, to prove that they are to be raised. Christ's construction of the matter is to be preferred to Mr. Clemance's. It is more logical. If they are alive, they need no resurrection. If they are dead, they do; and God, who speaks of things that are to be as though they were (Rom. iv. 17), calling himself the God of men for the time dead, was proof of His intention to raise them. The Sadducees saw this and were silenced.

"Christadelphianism" says the same as the Bible.

In the death state, a man, instead of having "gone to another world," is simply a body deprived of life, and as utterly unconscious as if he had never existed. Hence the necessity for resurrection.

. . . The immortality of the Bible, unlike the inherent immortality of popular belief which blooms in death, is to be manifested in connection with and as the result of the resurrection or change of the body. At the return of Jesus Christ from heaven . . .

the dead he will cause to come forth from the dust, and assemble them with the living to his presence. Faithful and unfaithful will be mustered together before his judgment seat, for the purpose of having it declared, after account rendered, who is worthy of being invested with immortality and promoted to the kingdom, and who is deserving of refection, and reassignment to corruption after punishment.—(Declaration, pp. 28, 35, 44.)

i.—Does the spirit of man exist after death?

The Bible says Yes.

'The Spirit shall return to God who gave it.'—(Eccles. xii. 8.)

But the Spirit is God's:

'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.)

j.—Is there a true and proper kingdom of God already in being?

The Bible says, "His kingdom ruleth over all."—(Psalm ciii. 19.)

But the Bible also speaks of a kingdom which has not yet come, but has been promised to the righteous, and which they are to enter at the coming of Christ. "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God. . . . Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."—(Luke vi. 20; xii. 32.)

"I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God SHALL COME."—(Luke xxii. 18.)

"That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which also ye suffer."—(2 Thess. i. 5.) We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God."—(Acts xiv. 22.)

'If ye do these things, ye shall never fall, for so an entrance shall be ministered to you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'—(2 Peter i. 10-11.)

'Jesus Christ shall judge the living and the dead at HIS APPEARING and his Kingdom.'—2 Tim. iv. 1.)

"Christadelphianism" says the same.

It refuses, however, to believe the Pagan dogma that the spirit of man when it has departed from man is man. It believes that the spirit is the life-power of God who gave it at the first, and "takes but what he gave."

"Christadelphianism," which in all things follows the Bible, says the same.

Yet "Christadelphianism," which in all things aims to follow the Bible, rightly dividing the Word of truth, speaks of the coming kingdom as "The kingdom of God not yet in existence, but to be established visibly on the earth at a future day." It is the kingdom of David (Isaiah ix. 7; Luke i. 32, 33), which is fallen down (Ezek. xxi. 27), but is to be raised up as it was in the days of old.—(Amos ix. 11.)

Mr. Clemence contends, on Dan. ii. 41, that if the kingdom of God was not set up before the close of the Roman empire, the prophecy of Daniel is so far a failure. If he would change the word "was" into is, the remark would be a proper one, because although the days of the Roman emperors are past, the days of the fourth-beast dominion are not past. Mr. Clemence surely does not shut his eyes to the fact that there were ten horns and a little horn, with eyes in the head of the fourth beast, and a clay-mixed-foot and ten-toed continuation to the solid iron of the

image. These must have their historical completeness before the Stone-power (or the kingdom of God) appears, and before the Ancient of Days gives the body of the fourth beast to the burning flame. Ergo, his argument recoils on himself, and proves the kingdom of God future and not past.

k.—Is Jesus Christ already enthroned as a king?

The Bible says, No.

'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory.'—(Matt. xxv. 31.)

Mr. Clemence says Christ is king now.

Mr. Clemence rejoins: "As well deny the sovereignty of Queen Victoria because we have Fenians and Republicans amongst us."

"Christadelphianism" says the same.

Christ is personally exalted to power, as the high priest and mediator of his house; but he is not enthroned as "king over all the earth" (Zech. xiv. 9) which is at his appearing.

"Christadelphianism" replies, If he were his authority would be enforced and obedience not left to choice.

"Christadelphianism" responds: "But suppose Fenians and Republicans disobeyed the laws, and Queen Victoria did not interfere, what then about her "sovereignty?"

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

Here we add a word on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which Mr. Clemence has quoted but not insisted on in the course of his arguments. He quotes it, of course in defence of orthodox views of natural immortality and *post mortem* rewards and punishments. He does not give the reader to understand whether it is a parable or a narrative of facts; but if he is like his class in general, he will admit it is a parable.

The idea that it is a literal narrative would bring with it the awkwardness of having to admit that the wicked in hell can see the righteous in heaven, and that immortal souls cannot traverse space, but have to be "carried," and cannot cross "a great gulph," and that souls can be relieved by a drop of water.

On the other hand, the admission of its parabolic character destroys its

force as an evidence in favour of popular views; for it is the essential character of a parable that it teaches something else than its own literal structure. Particularly is this the case with Christ's parables. The parables employed by Christ were not intended as Mr. Clemance's class contends, to simplify truth previously obscure. The New Testament informs us why he employed parables. We are told that "without a parable spake he not unto them (the people); and when *they* (he and his disciples) *were alone*, he expounded all these things unto his disciples."—(Mark iv. 34). The disciples asked him, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?"—(Matt. xiii. 10.) He answered them, "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to others in parables, that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand."—(Luke viii. 10.) Thus the object of parable, instead of being to "simplify" was to *mystify* the things spoken of as a retribution on Israel, who had been perverse for a thousand years.

Treating the case of the rich man and Lazarus as a parable, the candid writer will not, in view of those principles, approach it with the expectation that he is to find the import of it on the surface. The key to it is to be found in the fact, which is recorded by way of preface to it, viz., that "the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things, and derided him" (Luke xvi. 14); and Jesus, addressing them, said "Ye are they who justify yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts." A further element in the case is the declaration of Jesus that the law and the prophets, which the Pharisees made void, and which had become more lightly esteemed since the popular excitement created by the preaching of the kingdom of God, by John and Jesus, were so firmly established as the standard of men's actions, that it was easier for heaven or earth, than for one jot or tittle of these, to pass away.

The case of the rich man and Lazarus parabolically illustrates these facts: that the Pharisees, though enjoying a good reputation, were held in abomination of God; and would, in due time, be manifest in their right character, and receive a just retribution, while the poor and outcast (himself and his disciples) would be exalted; and that the law and the prophets, which were lightly esteemed, were the guides of action unto eternal life, and not the signs, and sensations, and prodigies which the Scribes and Pharisees sought after. The rich man stands for the Pharisee class, and Lazarus for Christ and his brethren.

It does not come within the scope of the parable to illustrate the death state. This was not the matter in question. The situation before the mind of Christ was the moral relation of things present and future. No doubt dead men are made to speak, but this was a parabolic necessity; for, otherwise, Christ could not have made the lesson available for the living. But it does not follow that in the literal counterpart, dead men could speak. It is a liberty of

parable to represent impossibilities as occurring, if the impression aimed at requires it. Of this the following are examples: Isaiah xiv. 8-11—trees and corpses speak, Judges ix. 8-15—trees, vines, and brambles speak; 2 Chron. xxv. 18, and 2 Kings xiv. 9—trees speak. If we knew nothing of trees and corpses but what we learn from these cases, we should imagine that trees had brains and mouths, and conversed together, and that corpses in the grave-yard passed comments on public occurrences. Knowing, in many ways, that trees are destitute of consciousness and speech, and that corpses are as incapable of conversation as the coffins that contain them, we know how to read the parables and get the benefit of them without stultifying our general knowledge.

So it is to be granted that if we knew nothing of the death-state but what appears in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, we should conclude that dead men continued alive; but we have much other information, and it is by this other information that the parable is to be settled. The Pharisees, to whom Christ was addressing himself, believed in that view of the death-state which the story of the rich man reflects (as anyone may see from Josephus's discourse on *Hades*.) This was, doubtless, the reason why Jesus parabolically employed it, but we are not thereby to conclude it is literally true, since such a view is in express opposition to all Scripture. If the general teaching of God's Word affirms the immortality of the soul and the consciousness of the dead, the parable may be used in confirmation; but if that general teaching go distinctly in the opposite direction, and shew us the absolute mortality and ephemerality of human existence, and the reality of death as the punishment of sin and the extinction of being, the parable will fall into its natural place as a parabolic embodiment of the lessons Jesus desired to enforce, in the particular circumstance in which it was uttered. The parable stands or falls by the *general question*.

We have followed Mr. Clemance through his tabular analysis and contrast; and we confidently appeal to every discerning reader whether it has not been with the result of showing that the answers which he mostly puts into the mouth of "Christadelphianism" are misrepresentations of the true position of "Christadelphianism" on the various subjects treated, and whether we have not shown that so far from "Christadelphianism" being "opposed to all the Scripture passages under these several heads," the acceptance of Christadelphianism is necessary to the understanding and reconciliation of all these several passages.

There remains but little more in his pamphlet to notice in the way of argument. His "finding no mention" in Christadelphian writings "of the cardinal doctrine of regeneration by the power of the Holy Ghost" is

evidence, first, of his misconception of the Scripture nature and method of 'regeneration,' and of his limited acquaintance with Christadelphian writings. The first eleven verses of the third chapter of John, so far from 'cutting up by the roots the Christadelphian theory of human nature' are a portion of Scripture most frequently employed as a basis for the demonstration of that theory: for that "that which is born of the flesh *is flesh*," is the great fact on which "Christadelphians" insist, as showing the need for the enlightenment of the Spirit, teaching us through His apostles and prophets now, and the transformation of flesh into spirit afterwards, at the "glorious appearing of Christ to change our vile bodies, and fashion them like to his own glorious body."—(Phil. iii. 21.) If Mr. Clemance understood this, he would not experience his professed difficulty in understanding "how sin (*i.e.* disobedience and its results) is possible with man, if he be (what he is) organised dust made alive by the breath of life."

Nor, if he understood the truth, would he try to raise a laugh about the Christadelphians (truly a "little flock" as their brethren always have in all ages been) regarding themselves as the kingdom of God; for they are better instructed in the Scriptures than to fall into the mistake of supposing that the "joint heirs with Christ," who are (if in the mercy of God accepted) "to reign with Christ" (being heirs of the kingdom," Jas. ii. 5), are the kingdom itself. Nor would he be guilty of the folly perpetrated by Mr. Barnett before him, of denying the possibility of resurrection, unless in death there is some life left for God to act upon. He says when a thing is extinct, it cannot be raised, for "there is nothing to raise." Mr. Clemance, do you believe in the resurrection of the body? Of course you do. Is not the body "extinct" when dissolved in dust? Certainly. Yet you believe it will be raised. What, then, comes of your declaration that "to raise the extinct is as impossible as to make two mountains without a valley between them?"

The passages quoted by Mr. Clemance on pp. 22-23 are dealt with in our reply to his tabulated analysis *a* to *k*, and therefore need no further notice.

His statement on p. 23, that "the glorious kingdom will be ushered in at the second coming of the Son of God," and that "this is indeed the blessed hope" must be surprising to those who endorse his statements in the earlier part of the pamphlet. Such are in the habit of thinking (and would certainly suppose from the first part of Mr. Clemance's pamphlet that he thought) that the glorious kingdom needs not to be "ushered in" but already exists in glory above the clouds, and that "the blessed hope" is the hope of mounting to it on the wings of angels when "this mortal coil" is quitted in the article of death. And what must be their still greater surprise when they read in the

next sentence that this "blessed hope" is "a point of Christian doctrine that was *at our time* SOMEWHAT IN THE SHADE!" To what time does Mr. Clemance refer? And what does he mean by calling "the blessed hope" (and there is but "one hope"—Eph. iv. 4) "a point of doctrine" as if it were an insignificant affair? Is not this an unconscious tribute to the scripturalness of the system of truth which, under the name of "Christadelphianism," he has helped to "expose" in a sense he did not intend? It looks like it. But whether or no, it is valuable, as it shows the people that the Christadelphians are not the only people who think there is something rotten in popular "Christianity." If Mr. Clemance and such as he, begin to say "the blessed hope" has been kept "somewhat in the shade," people will be less surprised and offended at the positive assertions of the Christadelphians to the same effect.

Mr. Clemance must have a very limited acquaintance with society and "the pulpit" if he is unaware of the prevalence of the sentiment that "it is of no consequence what a man believe if he be sincere in his course of life before God, and believe that Christ died for sin." That he personally repudiates such a sentiment is satisfactory as regards himself, and a help to the effort being made to call men's attention to the fact that their salvation depends upon their belief of the gospel.

Mr. Clemance is a little inconsistent towards the close. Painting as black a portrait of "Christadelphianism" as he can possibly put on canvass, he says "It would rob us of the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Deity of Christ, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, and yet gives us no substitute for them, and while taking from us all this, it yet expects to be called Christianity!" If this is a true indictment, would it not follow that Christadelphians are not Christians? Why, then, does he say, on page 29, "I do not say that Christadelphians are not Christians?" Does a false charity deter him from blowing the trumpet? It cannot be this, for in a sentence or two he speaks of a certain doctrine of theirs being but "a blind to conceal the vast negations of this new system." As this imputes deliberately criminal motive, we cannot imagine any charitable feeling deters him from saying Christadelphians are not Christians. Is it not rather that there is a lingering doubt that with all his denunciation, Christadelphianism is a scriptural thing? It looks like it. We have seen what he says about "the blessed hope," which proves Christadelphians to have, among others, done what he calls "good service" in calling attention to it. What now does he say about the doctrine of no immortality out of Christ? He says "It (Christadelphianism) professes indeed to inscribe on its banner that eternal life is the gift of God! But there is no need of forming a new sect to proclaim that doctrine, for it is heralded from all evangelical

pulpits." Now if this is a sentence written by a candid hand, does it not mean that the doctrine of the Christadelphians is preached by all ministers like himself? If it does not mean this (and we know it does not mean this, for they all preach the immortality of the soul), is it not an evasion and misrepresentation? It touches, however, upon one fact which is not without its weight in the controversy, and that is, that many preachers have discarded the doctrine of man's natural immortality, *e. g.* — in Nottingham, there is Mr. Stevenson; in Birmingham, Mr. Dale; in London, Mr. White and Mr. Minton and many others. Mr. White's letter at the close of Mr. Clemance's pamphlet, does not dispose of or deny this fact. On the contrary, he remarks incidentally that "Christadelphianism maintains what (in his opinion) is truth on the subject of immortality." He denounces "the spirit" in which, and the arguments by which the doctrine is maintained, but this does not affect the truthfulness of the doctrine itself. Therefore it remains that after all there is a considerable ingredient of truth in Mr. Clemance's statement that the doctrine of no immortality out of Christ is heralded from "evangelical" pulpits. And, of course, if it is true heralded from there, it cannot be untrue when heralded by unclerical, unprofessional, unofficial and detested "Christadelphianism."

Mr. Clemance tries to snipe "Christadelphianism" very hard in saying of it that "of all the odd jumble of the fag ends of old heresies, of all the travesties of the Christian faith, of all the perverse prostitutions of the word of God, to suit the exigencies of a particular theory, we know of none to surpass or even to equal Christadelphianism." But it is argument that destroys doctrines, not hard words. Mr. Clemance speaks hard words, for which we can forgive him, believing he honestly thinks he is doing God service, like Paul of old, in his attempted destruction of the faith of Christ. His arguments are harmless; and will help instead of hinder the dissemination of the truth.