

# The Christian Lamp

*“Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” Ps. cxix. 105.*

Vol. 2.

OCTOBER, 1875.

No. 12.

---

## CONTENTS

Page 2.	The End of Volume II	Editor
Page 2.	On The Nature of Christ - from The Ambassador	Dr Thomas' Daughter
Page 3.	Comment on Above	Editor
Page 4.	The Bible v. Human Opinion	Chillingworth's Works
Page 5.	On The Nature, Obligations and Ends of Fasting Eclectic	
Page 6	The Third Heaven	Editor
Page 7.	The House of Israel	Jewish Chronicle
Page 8.	Moses, from a Jewish Point of View	Jewish Chronicle
Page 8.	The Influence of the Prophets on the National Life of Israel	Gleaner
Page 9.	Cosmopolitism and Longevity of the Jewish Race	Jewish Chronicle
Page 10.	False Faith	Jewish Chronicle
Page 10.	Talitha Cumi Poem	Robert Morris
Page 11.	A Greater Than John The Baptist	A. H.
Page 12.	The Father And Son	W. Ellis
Page 15.	The World	Gleaner
Page 16.	Where Are The Dead?	Antipas
Page 19.	Discussion on Above Lecture	
Page 20.	The Rev. W. T. Hobson and The Lecture by Antipas, F.D.	Manx Times
Page 21.	Selection from "Gothold's Emblems"	Christian Scriver
Page 21.	Doing Nothing	Children's Messenger
Page 211.	Now and Afterward Poem	Francis Ridley Havergal
Page 22.	Children's Columns	
Page 24.	The Coming Struggle	
Page 26.	A Story	Nehemiah the Tirshatha
Page 27.	Answers to Correspondents	Dr Hayes
Page 29.	Letters to the Editor	
Page 32.	Two Against One and One Against Himself	John Glover
Page 32.	Lord Shaftsbury and The Second Advent	
Page 42.	The Fast of Ab	Selected
Page 34.	France - Liberty of Teaching	Jewish Chronicle
Page 35.	Intelligence	
Page 39.	Bro. Swindel and The Editor of "The Christadelphian"	

-----  
*When He shall appear, we shall be like Him;  
for we shall see Him as He is. And every man  
that hath this hope in him purifieth himself  
even as He is pure."*

*1 John 3:2,3*

## THE END OF VOLUME II.

DEAR FRIENDS, - How time flies! It seems but as yesterday that we were sitting in an upper room on the French coast balancing in our mind whether to embark in the doubtful enterprise of publishing the Lamp; after considerable hesitation our resolve turned the scale in favour of a trial. Since then our eyes have been opened to many things of which we had previously no experience, and the months have come and gone with a startling rapidity. Matter has pressed in upon us; some we have had to reject, some to publish though we could not approve it; but we believe in liberty of speech. Two years have passed away: we are preparing for the issue of Vol. III., and shall soon know how far it will be welcomed. Many communications have spoken of the improvement of the Lamp; the list of names in our book is more numerous every month, and we see no cause why further advances should not be made in both respects. Our object is the same - the pursuit of truth for its own sake; to confirm that which has been acquired, and to dig out new ideas, test them by Scripture and reason - "prove all things; hold fast that which is good. Those who are disposed to co-operate in this work, "to endure as seeing Him who is invisible; having respect unto the recompense of the reward," will inform us without delay, so that we may be able to proceed with our arrangements with as little loss as possible. To those who have stood by us we express our gratification and thankfulness, hoping they may be endowed with perseverance to continue to the end, being assured that they shall reap if they faint not.

EDITOR.

---

### ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST. BY DR. THOMAS'S DAUGHTER.

There are, at this time, some interesting points of doctrine in process of discussion among some in different places, and we do earnestly hope that all parties engaged therein, will be enlightened in the end, and that no cause of strife may arise therefrom. I wish in this letter, to mention and enlarge a little upon one of these points. It is about the nature and constitution of Jesus Christ. Some parties affirm that He did not possess the Divine nature in any respect; that He was constitutionally a sinner like any other son of Adam; that when a child He was no more than any other child, and when arrived at years of maturity the Deity saw that His character was good and suitable for His purpose, therefore He made use of Him, and filled Him with the Holy Spirit at His baptism.

Others affirm that He was constitutionally righteous and incapable of sinning, and devoid of the propensities inherent in our nature. Now, evidently the truth of the matter is not wholly on either position according to the Scriptures. That Jesus was constitutionally good and righteous there can be no doubt, but, that He was incapable of sinning we do not believe. If this were so, there would have been no virtue or merit in withstanding temptation; consequently, the temptation, as recorded in the New Testament, would have been a useless performance. We learn from the testimony that Jesus was created by the Father out of the substance of His mother Mary, at the time appointed by Jehovah - according as it is written - "When the fulness of time was come, He was made of a woman," and the angel Gabriel appeared unto the Virgin Mary and told her the manner of its fulfilment - that the "Holy Spirit should come upon her, and the power of the Highest should overshadow her," and, "That Holy Thing that should be born of her should be called the Son of God." Now we know that, as a general thing, all children partake of the nature, constitution, and character of BOTH their parents. No child is ever wholly, and entirely, and in all respects like one parent only, and we are not warranted in making an exception to this law in the case of the Son of God. From His mother, He derived all the faculties, propensities, and instincts which belong to the nature of the first Adam - as it is written - "He took upon Himself the nature of the seed of Abraham," that sin might be condemned in the nature which had sinned; and also, that He might be able to sympathise with our infirmities, and to "succour those who are tempted," "forasmuch, as he also was compassed with infirmity." This was the "body prepared" for a habitation of the Spirit in all fulness - as it is written - "A body hast Thou prepared for me," "Lo! I come to do Thy will, O God." Now we understand what was the nature of the medium of manifestation, but what was that which was manifested? Was it merely the natural manifestations of a natural man? By no means. It is written, "He shall be called Immanuel," that is, being interpreted, "God with us." This was God manifested in the flesh, although the Spirit of God has operated through other media, both in word and sign. He is called the "only begotten of the Father, full of

grace and truth.” Some might ask, how was the Deity manifested? We answer, in the character of the Son and His mental attributes. The Apostle John says, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,” and, “the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth.” The Word of God is the wisdom of God; the thoughts or intelligence of Deity. This word of wisdom is personified in the Proverbs of Solomon, thus, - I, wisdom, dwell with prudence and find out knowledge of witty inventions,” with many other similar passages. Jesus Christ was the wisdom of God embodied in the flesh - “the express image of His person” or character, because it was ordained that in Him should dwell the fulness of the Godhead bodily, so that it became essential that he should not only receive the Spirit, without measure at His baptism, for the purpose of preaching the Gospel and working miracles, but, that he should also have power within Himself to become perfect in all virtue that He might be found without transgression and without fault from His infancy and childhood; that He might be the lamb without spot or blemish. So, from the Deity, His Father, he inherited wisdom, thought, intelligence, elevation, and purity of character. Being aware of His divine origin and mission at twelve years of age, and perhaps before, He was able to discuss matters pertaining to the law with men of years and education - professed doctors of divinity. Thus we see that He displayed, even in the years of childhood, wisdom and knowledge inherited from His heavenly Father. “Being the Son of God He thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” as all children are, in a certain sense, equal with their parents. The natural illustrates the spiritual. In studying human character we find that the inward thoughts, judgment, or intelligence is something different and distinct from the desires, affections, and propensities; all these are right and good in their proper sphere, when directed and circumscribed within certain limits prescribed by the law of God. If the judgment is clear and well regulated and controlled by the word of God, it will entirely subjugate the desires and affections, and only allow them a certain limited scope. This, however, is a state of mind never completely attained to by us who are born after the flesh by the will of man. Jesus being the word, thought, or intelligence of His Father, consequently the will of the flesh was far more subjugated and subdued, and He was not liable to be led away by excited impulses and perverted desires. The desires of His nature were in a natural state, such as those with which the first Adam was endowed at his creation. Some of the first Adam’s descendants, however, have so nourished and cultivated those propensities (which in their simplicity are good enough), that they have become perverted and altogether unnatural. In the consideration of this or any other subject of Bible doctrine, we should seek to harmonize all the passages bearing upon any particular point; and not accept some and reject others, which (to our limited comprehension) seems to convey opposition of meaning; when in reality there is no contradiction, but a beautiful harmony when rightly put together.

E.J.L. - Ambassador, April, 1867.

#### COMMENT.

We reprint the foregoing for several reasons, all of which it is not necessary to state. It is clear that Dr. Thomas’s daughter wrote this article with her father’s consent or approval, and those who are familiar with her father’s writing will recognise in it both his ideas and his language. It is also equally clear that the editor of the Christadelphian approved of this article from what precedes it, as well as from the prominence it holds in that paper, being the leading article for the month. It was in the month of April, 1867, that this article was published. We are now in the month of August, 1875, making some comment upon it. During the last two years of this interval the Christadelphian and its editor have in many ways denounced us and anathematized us in language of unmeasured bitterness because we are not now able to believe that flesh is full of sin, and that Jesus was a constitutional sinner. We do not now intend to make more than an allusion to our answers to these charges. We wish at this time to call special notice to this article from the pen of Dr. Thomas’s daughter, which affords the strongest possible proof of one of two things, either that the editor of the Christadelphian did not understand its teaching, or that he believed it true. What then does it teach? Let us set the matter in order.

1. Some parties affirm that Jesus was a constitutional sinner, like any other son of Adam.
2. That the truth of the matter is that Jesus was constitutionally good and righteous.
3. That the desires, affections, and propensities are right and good in their proper sphere, when directed and circumscribed within certain limits prescribed by the law of God.
4. That the desires of Jesus’ nature were in a natural state, such as those with which the first Adam was endowed at his creation.

According to the first item Dr. Thomas, and his daughter, and perhaps the editor of the Christadelphian, believed it, in 1867, unscriptural to teach that Jesus was a constitutional sinner.

From the second item it is undeniable that Dr. Thomas and his daughter, and perhaps the editor of the Christadelphian, believed that Jesus was constitutionally good and righteous. In the third item, they (the Dr. and his daughter) affirm that the propensities are good when properly guided; in the fourth that

Jesus was in the same state as Adam at his creation.

Now every reader of the controversy between ourselves and the editor of the Christadelphian must be aware that we endorse the four items above set forth, and that the editor of the Christadelphian denies each and all of them. He has iterated and reiterated (1.) that Jesus was a constitutional sinner. (2.) That the desires of the flesh are sinful and corrupt. (3.) That because Jesus was born of Mary He was involved in the same state as all Adam's children. And these things he obstinately avers without a shred of proof, giving it out all the while that he stands and will stand or fall on Dr. Thomas's platform!!! Is it possible for a sane person in face of the foregoing testimony, to say nothing of much more already adduced in the Lamp and the Lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ; is it possible we say for a sane person not to see that the editor of the Christadelphian has long since committed logical suicide. We cannot be persuaded that had any other man fallen into such flagrant contradiction that the editor of the Christadelphian would have been slow to perceive it, and we are the more confirmed from this fresh evidence of his error, that it is not argument but something else that gives him so much resemblance to the proverbial obstinacy of a very useful animal. But in the very nature of things this is but a preparation for eating the dish of "humble pie." This dish is before him, and the longer he refuses to eat it up the more unsavoury it will become. We shall continue to remind him as opportunity offers that the "pie" is not consumed.

- EDITOR.

-----

## THE BIBLE v. HUMAN OPINION.

Know then, Sir, that when I say the religion of the Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours - as, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the Doctrini Bellarmini or Baronius, or any other private man amongst you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbonne, or of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the Council of Trent; so accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of the Protestants I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melanthon, nor the confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, nor the catechism of Heidelberg, nor the articles of the Church of England - no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that wherein they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action, that is, THE BIBLE. The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they behove besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but, as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they, with coherence to their own grounds, believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes, and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but that of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess: according to this I will live; and for this if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. "Propose me anything out of this Book, and require whether I believe or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this; God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian; I will love no man the less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore men ought not, to require any more of any man than this, - "To believe the Scripture to be God's word; to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it." - Chillingworth's Works, folio edition, 1742.

# ON THE NATURE, OBLIGATIONS, AND ENDS OF FASTING.

By fasting is intended either a total or partial abstinence, for a limited time, from our usual bodily refreshments: to be regulated by a regard, on the one hand, to health, and, on the other, to the several moral uses which may be answered by the practice. An occasional abstinence from one or two meals in a day, which is the most rigorous kind of fasting here in view, is unquestionably conducive to health in most persons; and there are few, if any, cases in which some restraint as to the usual quantity and quality of food would be either prejudicial or inconvenient . . . The true end of Christian temperance and self-denial is to preserve as much as possible a sound mind in a sound body. In considering, secondly, the obligations of fasting, it must be acknowledged that no express command is to be found in the Scriptures, either of the Old or New Testament, which enjoins fasting as a constant or a universal duty, indispensably necessary to all persons, and at all times, in the same manner as prayer and other Christian duties. Nor do the sacred writings inform us what degree of rigour should be observed in our fasts, how long they should continue, or how frequently they should recur. But, though neither the practice itself be absolutely commanded, nor any specific rules given us for regulating its measure, duration or frequency, yet there is, nevertheless, good ground for believing that it is a duty incumbent upon Christians in general, and plainly taught in God's holy word. This opinion is supported first, by many examples recorded in Scripture. David fasted while under Divine rebuke, in the matter of Uriah, through the illness of the child. Ahab fasted when the judgements of God were denounced against him by Elijah. The Ninevites fasted upon the preaching of Jonah. Jehosaphat proclaimed a fast throughout Judah, when the confederated forces of Ammon and Moab came up against the land. And Jesus Christ, by the solemn fast with which he consecrated Himself to His public ministry, hath sanctioned the practice, and proposed it to our imitation as a suitable preparation for any extraordinary service, in which special help and direction are to be sought from above. In all these instances, the fact is recorded with incontestable marks of divine approbation. David was forgiven his complicated guilt, though God saw fit for his correction to take the child; Nineveh was spared; Jehosaphat obtained the victory over his enemies; and even wicked Ahab himself, whose repentance was but short-lived, procured a delay of the sentence which had been denounced against him.

2. By plain and undeniable inference, our Lord's manner of speaking (e.g. Mat. vi. 16) is decisive to shew that He not only allowed, but approved the practice, though he condemned the hypocritical and ostentatious manner in which the Pharisees had been accustomed to observe it.

3. But there are not wanting instances of a divine command being given for solemn and public fasts on special occasions, though there are none which prescribe fasting as a constant duty. Of this sort is the well-known instance in the prophecy of Joel, where, in a time of national calamity, the prophet, in the name of God, commands to "blow the trumpet in Sion, to sanctify a fast, and call a solemn assembly;" and it is probable that Isaiah refers to a similar mandate, xxii. 12.

4. The obligation to this practice may also be argued from its utility, and with reasonable persons no other consideration will be required to promote its observance. But this view of the subject belongs properly to another head, under which we are to enquire.

Thirdly, into the ends and uses of fasting; and

1. Fasting is a natural expression of grief and sorrow. . .

2. Fasting is not only becoming as the companion of penitential exercises, but it is also a great help to prayer and devotional exercises in general. . .

3. This practice may also be recommended as useful for keeping under the body, and bringing it into subjection to the mind; as counteracting sensuality, and promoting habits of self-government and superiority to animal indulgences, and all those "fleshly lusts which war against the soul." ...

4. I shall mention one more excellent use that may be made of fasting, and that is, its being rendered subservient to charity. . . Such charity shews strength of principle, and greatness of soul, beyond the ordinary standard, and a self-denial so applied adds magnanimity to benevolence. To join, at all times, this with the other uses of abstinence would be to render our fasts more pleasing to God, and more honourable to the cause of religion.

The results of the whole, then, is this: that fasting, like alms-giving, is a duty left, for very wise and obvious reasons, in a great degree to our own discretion, and respecting the circumstances of which little or nothing is positively determined. Neither of these cases admit of absolute rules, consistently with the genius of the Christian religion; for such rules would unavoidably be too relaxed with respect to many, and too rigorous with respect to others. No outward action is truly estimable in the sight of heaven, but as

it proceeds from a right frame and state of the heart; and where that right disposition exists, there will be little occasion for more precise rules. ..

“When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites.” - N. G. The Christian Observer, Feb., 1803-pp. 74-77.

ECLECTIC.

-----

SCEPTICS. – The elevated moral character of the best of sceptics and their noblest aspirations after the true and the pure are to be ascribed chiefly to an unconscious reflection of the light of Christianity.

-----

## THE THIRD HEAVEN.

In 2 Corinthians, chapter xii., the apostle Paul mentions certain “visions and revelations of the Lord,” which he had “about fourteen years “ before the time of writing that Epistle, or, according to the date given in the margin, A.D. 46. The apostle only alludes to those visions and revelations; he does not describe what he saw and heard; indeed he tells us that the words he heard in the third heaven were” unspeakable;” “not lawful for a man to utter.” The elevation of the apostle to this height of observation and knowledge impressed him with a deep sense of glory; though he would not glory of himself as a man. This scene of power, located in the third heaven, doubtless acted on the mind of this chosen witness as helm and compass act on the movement of a ship, directing it with certainty over the dark and often perilous waters to a haven of rest and pleasure. And it should seem that some such beacon and impulse were needful to the achievement of a career arduous as his. The scene on the Damascus road would have a similar influence; like the night of Israel’s departure from Egypt, it was a thing much to be remembered; never to be forgotten.

We cannot peruse these few lines in the twelfth of Corinthians without a strong desire to learn more of the Apostle’s experience. We would enter with him into that sealed paradise and hear those words unspeakable. It is impossible to repress this curiosity. And although we are excluded, we linger at the gate, greatly wondering; the more so as the privileged visitant returned filled with awe and delight, his lips closed save for the announcement of his own admission and blissful astonishment; he is not conscious whether it were in mind only, or in body that he was conveyed into the third heaven. So scanty is the information as to be almost worse than none to our eager feelings.

Forbidden to know what Paul saw and heard within the sacred precincts of the third heaven; are we prohibited the enquiry as to what the third heaven really was? We think not. Jewish tradition describes seven heavens. It would not profit the reader to transcribe all the Rabbi’s say concerning these imaginary spheres. Let it suffice to state that the third signified, according to them, the clouds or oether, and the seventh the domain where are “the souls of the righteous; the souls and spirits which are reserved for the bodies yet to be formed; and the dew by which God is to vivify the dead.” Were this rabbinical speculation and arrangement of any value it would constitute an argument opposed to orthodox Christianity touching the place visited by Paul, since it is generally supposed that the apostle was favoured with a sight of heaven; whereas he was not exalted enough by four stages, being only in the third or the region of the clouds, instead of in the seventh, or habitation of souls and spirits. But our respect for much of Jewish tradition is no stronger than it is for a great deal of modern theology. Regarding the third heaven as the vicinity of the clouds that float above our heads veiling the fathomless azure beyond, what could the apostle see and hear there? Balloons have ascended much higher. When Gay-Luesac had soared 23,000 feet he found himself still in the midst of the blue expanse of air, and that was nearly all he could say. In relation to the apostle’s experience we gain no knowledge whatever by this literal atmospheric interpretation of the third heaven. The question then arises, are we at a stand; is there no other channel in which our enquiries may venture? There is. The employment of figures in the prophetic writings abundantly includes the heavens, and the application of them with all their bright and terrible garniture to the political and religious constitution of the Kingdom of Israel. These were the Almighty’s heavens and earth, studded with golden stars, illumined by sun and moon, curtained by thick clouds, watered by fountains and great rivers, clothed with grass; decked with flowers, shaded with woods and forests, and encircled by the sea. Scarce an object in all our range of vision but what is employed to picture the divinely created and organized confraternity of Israel’s sons. So numerous are the instances of this use of metaphors, that, for the readers whom we address, it is not requisite to adduce quotations.

Here then is a leading fact; a strong point of departure, that is to say the Kingdom of the Lord is known as a system of heavens and earth. The dissolution of these was often threatened by the ancient seers; the heavens were to become black, to be rolled up like a scroll, to pass away; and after a long interval of darkness and desolation, the sun was again to rise, the stars were to be seen in the firmament, the silver moon was to symbolize settled peace, the desert to be watered and richly clad, the forests to clap their hands, the sea to roar and the fulness thereof - in a word, the prophets behold afar off a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. We shall not trace the chequered track of history leading to Zion's obscuration and overthrow. The Mosaic heaven had, in Paul's day, waxed old and was ready to vanish away. Since then chaos reigns. But the brooding spirit at length moves o'er the long dark silence, and the first faint signs of regeneration indicate that the time approaches for the planting of the new heavens and the new earth. The limit assigned for this second heaven and earth is a thousand years, the best period of the world's mortal life; the sabbatic rest after the hard working week; but still only the herald of the eternal climax, or third heaven, when God shall be all in all. The apostle could not be interdicted from disclosing his visions and revelations if they appertained to the first heaven; for in his own time the kingdom had become matter of history. The state of things in the second heaven could not for a similar reason be hidden, because it is the burden of all the prophets. But of the third, no particulars are vouchsafed further than that Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to His Father; that "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." The conclusion then is that the third heaven into which the apostle, while in trance was snatched away, is that third and final manifestation of God's government among men, when the inhabitants of our world shall enter upon an unending paradise of rest, of wisdom, of fellowship with the Elohim, painless and blissful. EDITOR.

-----

## **THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL. A JEWISH OPINION ON THE DOGMA OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.**

The doctrine of infallibility, or rather political supremacy, for that is what the doctrine amounts to, is built on a very insecure foundation, viz.: a supposed superiority and special mission of the Apostle Peter.

Not only, on the one hand, is the assertion in the New Testament of that superiority and that mission doubtful, but the links binding them to the persons occupying the Papal throne, and indeed to that throne itself, are singularly feeble. To us Jews, accustomed to exercise an almost too elastic right of judgment on matters of conscience, and as impatient of ecclesiastical control at this day as we were in the days of old, it seems marvellous that intelligent and educated men should have accepted, except for personal purposes or motives, a doctrine so monstrous as Papal supremacy.

There is no "title" that is worth considering. Perhaps the only argument is the argument that rests on unbounded Faith - and certainly Faith is, we know, immense and uncontrollable. Who can doubt it in this age and this country, when intelligent and educated persons actually believe in Darwin, Tyndall, and Spirit-rapping? Strange it is that several Popes renounced the claim to infallibility, and in effect disowned the so-called privilege of Peter . . . Roman Catholicism does not affect to believe the infallibility of the head of the Church in other than religious or ecclesiastical matters, and we presume that, except in inveterate Papistical eyes, the Pope is believed to be no more infallible in scientific matters than in physical matters. Even the most rigid Catholic believes a Pope can have a toothache by mischance, or can drop a teacup by accident, or can try to solve a problem by an illogical method, or fail in performing a chemical analysis.

The statement that the figure of the key was a metaphorical expression among the Jews, equivalent to giving ordination or authority of homiletical interpretation, is based on a quotation from Grotius, which is itself inaccurate. No such "mos" existed "apud Hebraeos."

There is no mention of such custom in the Talmud, or any Hebrew writing. The ordination ceremony was an imposition of hands (Sanhedrim c. 1). The possession of keys is used metaphorically in the Talmud, to indicate the vesting of authority. The expression Isaiah xxii. 22 is not a case in point, as here a chamberlain and not a teacher is spoken of. The English spirit did, long before the days of the Reformation, reject the sway sought to be exercised by Rome in an Apostolic name on the minds of free-born Englishmen. The question between Catholicism and Protestantism - or rather between Catholics and

Protestants - is one which generally affects the welfare of the civilized world, and is of special interest to us as Jews, in its political bearings. With the religious question at issue, we have no concern. But the political aspect of the question is highly important in its relation to ourselves. In it is involved a momentous question - that of freedom of conscience, and a still more serious question - that of the maintenance of practical faith in revelation.

— From review, in Jewish Chronicle, of a work by the Rev. Canon Jenkins, entitled “The Privilege of Peter, and the claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the councils, and the testimony of the Popes themselves “

---

## **MOSES, FROM A JEWISH POINT OF VIEW.**

It is not too much to assert that the policy of Moses has, since the hour of its advent, changed and governed, and still continues in no mean degree to direct and control, the destinies of mankind.

The prevailing religious systems now recognised by the most civilized nations of the earth, as leavening our civilization, may be traced back to the perennial springs of the desert-mount of Sinai. If we Jews could for a moment divest our great teacher, Moses, of the nimbus of inspiration that surrounds his utterances: and himself of that glory which beams from his face, a glory that increases in splendour with the daily advance of knowledge, we should even then be justified in demanding for him, as an uninspired moral philosopher, the highest veneration of the world, and for his writings the foremost rank, as contributing most largely to the happiness of humanity.

Moses, uninspired in the sense in which inspiration is generally understood, is incomparably greater as a philosophic politician than any who came before or after him. He it is who bases human happiness, not on the existence of impossible virtues, but on the higher duties of life conceived from a human point of view, and tending to develop the social capacities of our nature. In an age like the present, when the mausoleums of nations are laid open to our mental gaze, and the records of those great teachers of the past who adorned their time have found interpreters in such men as Wilson, Rawlinson, Layard, Muller, Grotfend, Spiegel, Bleek, Oppert, Birch, Smith, and the host of their gifted and brilliant compeers; and when we have before us, in such rich detail, the known and the exhumed records of the doctrinal systems and esoteric philosophies of the ancients; and when we compare farther all the schools of philosophy growing out of these several centres of human thought, and compare all men and all systems side by side with Moses and his teaching - the man and the Book will still be the central figures of all, standing out in colossal contrast to their surroundings, he as a lawgiver, at once best conceiving and legislating for the wants and aspirations of humanity; and the Book as a code of morals grand, possible, and practicable, and calculated to influence the culture and determine the direction of man's better and nobler nature. - Jewish Chronicle.

---

## **THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROPHETS ON THE NATIONAL LIFE of ISRAEL.**

The glory of Israel is their prophets: they are a true reflex of Mosaism. The civilization that obtained under the religions of antiquity and the tyranny and caprice of absolute rulers, either remained stationary or retrograded. A strong example of an opposite character is afforded by a comparatively insignificant people - the Jews. They, too, had an absolute monarchy and a hierarchy, and their organized institutions were obviously of sacerdotal origin. These did for them what was done for other oriental races by their Institutions - subdued them to industry and order, and gave them national life. But neither their king nor their priests ever obtained, as in other countries, the exclusive moulding of their character. Their religion, which enabled persons of genius and a high religious tone to be regarded and to regard themselves as inspired from Heaven (as indeed they were), gave existence to an inestimably precious unorganized institution. The order (if it may be so termed) of prophets was under the protection, generally, though not always effectual, of their sacred character; the prophets were a power to the nation, often more than a match for kings and priests, and kept up in that little corner of the earth, the Holy Land, that antagonism of influences which is the only real security for continued progress. Religion, consequently, was not there

what it has been in so many other places - a consecration of all that was once established, and a barrier against further improvement. The remark of a distinguished Hebrew, M. Salvador, that the prophets were in the church and state, the equivalent of the modern liberty of the press, gives a just but not an adequate conception of the part fulfilled in the national and universal religion by this great element of Jewish life, by means of which the canon of inspiration never being complete, the persons most eminent in genius and moral feeling could not only denounce and reprobate with the direct authority of the Almighty whatever appeared to them deserving of such treatment, but could give forth better and higher interpretations of the national religion, which thenceforth became part of the religion. Where shall we seek for a like panegyric of the priesthood as a class?

SELECTED, Gleaner.

---

## COSMOPOLITISM AND LONGEVITY OF THE JEWISH RACE.

The Jews have long triumphed in the glory of having been the first to teach the Unity of the great Spirit of the universe, and through their Semitic brethren, the Arabs, and their colleagues of other nations, of having extended this great faith over nearly the whole face of the civilized globe. They have also long valued their reputation for intellectual and moral qualities; but, apart from the general advantages shared with the world at large, they seem to have dwelt chiefly upon the laurels of the past and the hopes of the future. We need but glance at the numerous works in the recent fields of statistics and natural history, to compile a heap of evidence tending to prove how great are our present and material advantages; how much we now grasp of that which has been derived from the first impress of vital power upon our race; how much we owe to the jealous care with which its unmixed purity has been guarded; and how much to our temperate and domesticated habits, the probable consequences of the two former. Prichard says, "Of the several nations who are connected by this community of language, some who were formerly celebrated have become merely extinct, while others have spread themselves, either as the - exiled followers of a persecuted faith, or as the conquering apostles of a victorious one, over the world, and seem destined through the energy of their invincible minds to survive to the end of time. The Arabs, who spread Islam by their victories from the Atlantic to the Ganges, and the Jews, who are wanderers over the whole world, are perhaps now more numerous than were ever their forefathers." And, again, in evidence of their physical superiority, Dr. Prichard states, amongst other excellences, "We are also convinced that the bones of the cranium are thinner in the Arab than in other races, and more sense in proportion to their size, which is proved by their greater transparency;" and in a note in another portion of his work, "Neither of the two specimens which Blumenbach gives (as the finest examples from his collection) of the capacious intellectual head with ample expansion of the forehead and brain, is of the Indo-European race, one being Georgian, that is of a really Caucasian, not European tribe; and the other a Jewish cranium." Again, "In other parts of the skeleton the Arabs display, according to Baron Larrey, a proportionate superiority in organic perfection to other races of men." The following observations are important and interesting, as they relate to a race which, all its branches, the Hebrew and Phoenician, being included, must be considered as the first and greatest of the whole human family. "We have observed," says Larry, "first, that the convolutions of the brain, whose mass is in proportion to the cavity of the cranium, are more numerous, and the furrows which separate them are deeper, and the matter which forms the organ is more dense, or firmer, than in other races. Secondly, that the nervous system . . . appears to be composed of nerves more dense in structure than are those of Europeans in general; thirdly, that the heart and arterial system display the most remarkable regularity and a very perfect development; fourthly, that the external senses of the Arabs are exquisitely acute and remarkably perfect. The muscular or locomotive system is strongly marked; the fibres are of a deep red colour, firm and very elastic." Such is the opinion of a very distinguished physiologist on the characters of this race, which is, as he says, confirmed by the results of long personal observations among the people of the four quarters of the globe. Naturalists of high rank assign to this people not only an advanced physical development, but apply that superiority in a most practical manner by claiming for it the exclusive property of cosmopolitanism, and in order to prove the truth of this proposition, have collected facts and opinions advanced by admitted authorities to show that no other race has the same power to dwell at will under any latitude. (Statistics show that neither Europeans nor the Negro race can be acclimatized. Abundant proof of this can be furnished with respect to

Europeans in Algeria, the Antilles, etc., the English in India, Java, and the Philippines; the Negro in Ceylon, the Mauritius, the West Indies.) One race alone seem to have resolved the problem of ubiquity; one race alone shows itself truly cosmopolitan, and that is the Jewish race. Without apparent principle of life, says Lamennais, the Jew is everywhere; nothing can destroy him. The Jew occupies to-day every part of the earth; he is found in Europe, from Gibraltar even to Norway; in Africa, from Algeria to the Cape of Good Hope; in Asia, from Cochin China to the Caucasus and from Jaffa as far as Peking; in America, from Montevideo to Quebec. Fifty years ago he invaded Australia. Not only is he acclimatized under the tropics, but he has also lived during a long series of centuries in the only country of the globe situated 400 metres below the level of the sea – in the valley of the Jordan. . . It is worthy of remark that in many countries where the Jew may be situated and compared with other people amongst whom he lives, a difference more or less pronounced is always discovered in the proportion of births and deaths, in that of the sex of the births, and finally in the degree of predisposition for various maladies, of which some constitute the almost exclusive property of the Jewish race, whilst others seem to spare it entirely. In Prussia, during a period of 19 years from 1822 to 1840, the proportion of deaths was found to be amongst 100,000 inhabitants - in the Prussian population, 2,961; in the Jewish, 2,161. . . Dr. Stockton-Hough, in the New York Medical Record, states: “The statistical returns relating to the Jews of Prussia, which have been collected with great care during the period from 1825 to 1861 (1849 to 1851 excepted), show that their increase of numbers always surpassed that of the general population, and above all by the excess of births over deaths. If there are few adults, there are more aged ones.” M. Mayer, in his treatise relative to the duration of life in the Jewish population, found the following facts connected with the statistics of Furth for a period of ten years. Mean average of Jews, 37 years; Christians, 26 years; excess in favor of Jews, 11 years. . . Amongst Christians one half die before 30 years. In France, Dr. Neufville has reached analogous results. It is in this longevity that Jews increased more than Christians, and not in marriages and births. - Jewish Chronicle.

-----

## **FALSE FAITH.**

To believe in a self-produced, self-reproduced, and self-managed creation; to believe in natural selection without direction; appears to us the acme of faith – but a false, groundless faith, a faith almost bordering upon the ludicrous: a fetish worship! Between the two extreme schools of thought which saliently mark the religious philosophy of the day, we have that remarkable monotheism which takes various forms. . . One school unwittingly adopts, though by devious and obscure ways, that grand principle of the Divine Unity which is the immutable essence of Judaism, and which stands like a beacon, the only firm beacon on the shifting quick-sands of doubt, difficulty, and debate. -Jewish Chronicle.

-----

## **Talitha Cumi.**

**The story of Jesus and the little daughter of Jairus;  
as they told it to me at the Sea of Galilee in 1868.**

**BY ROBERT MORRIS, LL.D.,  
Secretary to the American Holy Land Exploration.**

“He took her by the hand and the  
maid arose.” - Matt. ix. 25.

“He took the damsel by the hand  
and said unto her Talitha Cumi, which  
is being interpreted, Damsel (I say  
unto thee) arise.” - Mark v. 41.

“He took her by the hand and  
called, saying, Maid, arise.’ - Lukeviii. 54.

By the Sea her memory dwelleth,  
Maiden, well-beloved and fair,  
And each loving mother telleth  
How she lay a dying there;  
How she lay, that sweet one, dying  
Only child - there was no more -  
While the Oriental crying  
Swelled the murmurs of the shore:  
So they tell it by the sea  
Of the placid Galilee.

How the weeping father hastened  
Christ, a present help, to meet:  
And with awful sorrow chastened  
Fell imploring at his feet:  
“Master - oh, my little daughter, -  
Only child, - about to die, - “  
While the dashings of the water  
Mocked at his despairing cry ;  
So they tell it by the sea  
Of the storm-tossed Galilee.

How the Lord no tarry making  
Through the thronged and narrow street,  
Hastened to a wondrous waking,  
Such as every saint shall meet;  
Mattered not though servant coming  
Said the little one was dead;  
And the breakers hoarsely booming.  
All the mournful message spread;  
So they tell it by the sea  
Of the dirge-like Galilee.

How He found the stricken dwelling  
How He clasped the clay-cold hand: -  
Needless is the further telling,  
Death obeyed his Lord’s command:  
While those waters roll, the story  
Of the maiden will remain,  
Promise of that greater glory  
When the Christ shall come again.  
So they think along the sea  
Of this much-loved Galilee.

Philadelphia, Pa.

-----

## **A GREATER THAN JOHN THE BAPTIST.**

The statement contained in Matth. xi. 11, seems to be but badly understood by many, otherwise well acquainted with the teachings of the Spirit. I do not attach the same importance to a proper solution of this passage as I would do to having a correct appreciation of the Nature and Mission of the Christ, or to being well instructed in the doctrine of the Resurrection, or the like. Nevertheless, as “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is useful” in some particular way, I believe it is impossible for the scripture student to derive the proper benefit from a passage he does not comprehend the meaning of, and thus, I shall briefly state what I believe to be the proper solution to the passage referred to. Jesus says, “Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist:

notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he. The most popular idea seems to be that the least in the Kingdom will be immortals, and as John was then but mortal, this would account for the difference. But this does not seem good reasoning. The passage seems to refer to parties then living, and the prophets of by-gone years, "He that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." Or, if it must refer to the future, it would read, "He that will be least in the Kingdom, will be greater than he." In either case, if mortality or immortality was meant at that time or now, everyone is alike mortal; and in the Kingdom every approved one will be alike immortal. Jesus was accrediting all honour to John, but, in so doing, He spoke of a greater and if among those born of women, there has not risen a greater than John, with that one exception, the exception is easily found. John had sent his disciples to inquire of Jesus if He really was the Christ then, as on many other occasions, the answer of Jesus was not direct. He gave them certain things to judge from and decide for themselves. Then He addressed Himself to the multitudes to whom He had been preaching the Gospel, some of whom had likely received it. Not, certainly, that they were in actual possession of the Kingdom preached; but their acceptance constituted them heirs. But, in general, the people would not give the attention to the message of the great Salvation, and Jesus shows them how they had slighted both Himself and John, and showed their culpability in refusing the greatest that ever appeared in human form. In chapter xii. 41-42, Jesus says, "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. They despised John the Baptist, and also a greater than John the Baptist, the Only Begotten Son of God." But it might be asked, why could He be called the least in the Kingdom of God? I answer, the Kingdom was only preached, and accepted or rejected (not certainly set up); but among the few whom He had specially chosen as some of its aristocracy, He says, Luke xxii. 25-27, "The Kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them: and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whither is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as He that serveth." We have the idea -well brought out in Philip ii. 7-11, where it is said, "He made himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven and on earth, and under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father." John and all the Prophets were born of women, and through Adam as their father, were heirs of sin and death. Jesus was also born of a woman, but having God as His Father, was "without sin," and, although "making Himself of no reputation," and "becoming obedient unto death," yet it was through His death that John, or the greatest of the Prophets, could attain to life everlasting. "He was rejected and despised of men," yet, although He was the stone rejected by the builders, was, nevertheless, the foundation and chief corner stone of the House of God. Much more might be added, but I think this will be sufficient to show my meaning. If anyone thinks he has sufficient reasons for dissent from my theory, these remarks may lead him to give others the benefit of his discovery; in the meantime, and until the contrary is proved, I will believe that the meaning of the passage in plain language would be, "Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; and, behold, a greater than John the Baptist is here," as in the case of verses 41 and 42 of chapter xii. Already referred to.

- A. H.

-----

## **THE FATHER AND SON.**

### **Response to Brother Jardine's article**

Dear Bro. Turney, - With your permission I make the following remarks upon Bro. Jardine's reply to my former remarks.

I understand the terms Father and Son to stand related to each other as cause and effect. Jesus did not stand related to two Fathers as the cause of his existence, but to one only. The ground was not the cause of the first man's existence; but simply the material upon which Almighty power exerted itself. The mother of Jesus was no more the cause of His existence than the ground in the case of the first Adam. That Jesus was a son of man or of Adam as to the substance of His body has never been denied by me, but

that He was a son of Adam in the sense of being the effect of which Adam was the cause is what I deny as being contrary to evidence. Jesus was not therefore a son of Adam, because the Spirit of God caused a daughter of Adam to bring Him forth.

It is incorrect to say the first Adam was destined to return to the dust. He was sentenced to return to the dust for His crime, but none except fatalists hold that man was destined either to sin or be put to death for sin. Death is the wages of sin, not the result of destiny.

The conception of Jesus did not preclude the possibility of Jesus being both son of Adam and son of God, says Bro. J. To me it appears the very opposite. If the conception or purpose to bring Jesus into the world originated in Adam or in Adam's daughter, Mary, then it would be true that He was a son of Adam; but inasmuch as the conception originated in the bosom of the Almighty and nowhere else, Jesus was the son of God and of no one else, excepting in the secondary sense of being born of a woman as the medium through whom the first came, gave effect to His conception. Again he says, "Though He is called the second Adam, this secondary feature as a representative head of a family did not begin until after He rose from the dead."

This is a mistake, as is manifest from the fact that between the Lord from heaven and the first man there is no parallel. The parallel between the two men ceases at the point where the first one failed. The Lord who is now in heaven is not coming to be put under trial; but is in the heavens because He overcame where the first Adam failed.

Besides the word Adam defines his relation to the earthly nature, and it would be as reasonable to say He was not a man, as to say He was not the second man. The word man defines His nature or the substance of which He was formed, and the word second defines the order of His coming. To be a son of God as to cause; and son of man as to flesh, defines the time when Jesus became the second Adam. The phrases first man and second man shew or imply that there are only these two men who stand equally related, not to each other, but to the same Father as the direct cause of their existence. To contend that Jesus Christ was not the second Adam until He was raised from the tomb is to ignore the direct operation of God by His Spirit in causing His existence. Jesus was the subject of two divine operations. The first brought Him into existence from a woman. The second brought Him into existence from the grave. The first man was also the subject of two divine operations. The first brought him forth from the dust of the ground, terminating in his being a living man, and here he and the second man were equal. The second divine operation was the sentence of a return to the dust for his crime, terminating in his expulsion from access to the tree of life.

It must be manifest that the first operations upon these men placed them in similar circumstances; both were the possessors of life; and both were in circumstances in which nothing but the individual actions of either could deprive him of that life. They both die. The first because of his own act of disobedience. The second by an act of voluntary obedience not defined in the law under which He was born, but in perfect harmony with its spirit.'

To maintain that Jesus was not the second man until He arose from the dead is indirectly to assert that He was the first man up until He lay in the tomb, and that He lay in the tomb the first man, for certainly He was a man for thirty-three years, and as a man He died.

This is simply another form of saying that a son of the first man died because He was in some way or other criminally related to the first man and to establish a criminal necessity for the death of Jesus on account of His connection with the crime of disobedience, is simply to say that Jesus voluntarily obeyed His Father's will because He disobeyed it. And His father was so highly pleased with this criminal for voluntarily submitting to die for his crime, that He has given Him the honour of being the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. That Jesus was made of or out of the seed of David is not equal to saying He was the seed of David; to contend that they are is to deny the facts relating to the begetting of Jesus. But here is a most extraordinary statement, illustrative of the terrible straits a false position imposes upon its holder. "He is called the One Seed of Abraham." (Gal. iii. 16.) This surely proves Him to have been a son of Adam; and so, also (directly or indirectly), do the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. The fact that Jesus did not naturally descend from Adam does not, cannot, set aside the fact that Adam the first was one of Jesus Christ's parents. The argument based upon Jesus being the One Seed of Abraham ignores the facts as to the cause of Jesus Christ's existence, and assumes a position contrary to them.

The genealogies of Matthew and Luke agree in tracing the direct connection of Joseph, the husband of Mary, with Adam by descent through begetting; but the argument to prove that Jesus was the direct son of Adam by begetting is without foundation and contrary to these genealogies.

Adam was one of the parents of Jesus!!! What next? If Adam was the one who was the other? This would make Jesus the son of two father's but without a mother!!! It is perfectly true that Jesus was born in the house of Joseph, and therefore in the house of David, house of Abraham, and house of Adam, but

He was not there as the direct fruit of Joseph's loins, and therefore not as the direct fruit of either David, Abraham, or Adam. He was, however, born in lawful wedlock, though not the son of a wedded pair; but a son begotten by the kinsman - Redeemer of Joseph and Mary as neither the one nor the other had the power of redemption within them.

"The fact that David called the Christ his Lord, did not ignore the other fact, that this same Lord, while He was in the flesh, "was of the fruit of the body of David," "and so in as true a sense was Jesus the fruit of the body of Adam."

The fruit of a tree is that which grows upon it or comes from it spontaneously. If this be Bro. J's meaning, then I deny that Jesus fulfilled these conditions.

If, however, he means that Jesus was a "righteous branch raised up to David from one of his descendants, and therefore one raised up from the fruit of David's loins," then I agree, and discussion on this matter should cease.

In that part marked 2nd, page 413, in the argument and in support of the idea "that under the law God required man's obedience, and because man could not obey, the law required man's life," Bro. J. says, "Had he driven his thoughts a little further in the same channel, he would have doubtless have arrived at the conclusion that the Almighty must have been foolish in requiring of men to "be holy as He is holy," or that Jesus must have been insane when He exhorted His disciples to be perfect even as their Heavenly Father is perfect." "For, who can be holy as God is holy? Who can reach the perfection of the Almighty?"

These two last questions seem to be put forth to shew that not only the precepts of the law but also those of Jesus Christ Himself are impracticable; but that it would be folly and insanity to have expected they could be kept.

Now, in addition to believing that the law of God could be kept I am satisfied that all that Jesus taught can be obeyed, and also that a pupil may become as wise as his master. There is one who says "through thy precepts I have become wiser than my teachers."

That men have not kept the law is no proof that they could not keep it.

Probably the next point may be that Adam could not keep the law which had only one negative clause in it. He did not keep it. And upon the principle that as Israel did not keep the law of God given to them, it is assumed they could not keep it, so it is but fair at once to conclude he could not have done otherwise than disobey. This is probably the reason why some people say that Jesus could not disobey, and thereby render the terms obedience and disobedience unmeaning terms as applied to either the first or second Adam.

On page 444 Bro. J. says, "But the fact is, puny man imagines he can measure God's justice by his own sense, or want of sense of what justice is." Now that I or any other puny man cannot measure what Bro. J. supposes to be the justice of God is perfectly possible, and if he includes himself in the term puny man, it is manifest that neither teacher nor taught can measure it, for the best of all reasons, it is contrary to fact. The Almighty's ways are equal. "A God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He." And His law is as perfect as Himself. "His law is perfect, converting the soul" that lies in sin; "His precepts are true and righteous altogether." Puny man may not believe what God says, yet he abides faithful. The law of God did not only teach the knowledge of sin, but it also pointed out the only way it could be forgiven, and every sinner not forgiven received a just recompense of reward under it; but while perfect for the purpose it was given for, it was not given for the purpose of giving eternal life to any already under condemnation to die.

(3). "Sin in the flesh." These words are introduced between quotation points, but whence they are quoted we are not told. The scope of this whole piece is to prove that human nature is another phrase for sin in the flesh. This we say is not true. Human nature lived in the world before sin, and therefore sin is not a thing inseparable from it. Jesus Christ was human nature; at least so the advocates of sin in the flesh profess to believe, yet "in Him was no sin." These two facts, viz., that human nature was created and lived for some time at least without sin before it was in the world. And that human nature lived in the world and did not know sin after it had reigned in the world 4,000 years, ought to cause some hesitation to men who wish their judgment respected, before they enter the lists as champions of what is not taught in the Scriptures.

With much that is written in this part I perfectly agree, as being the truth, but it simply proves that human nature has committed sin. It does not seem to dawn upon Bro. J.'s mind that human nature is a divine creation, just as much as the holy and good law that was adapted to it first in its best estate, and now even in its worst estate. The power to acquire ideas, to weigh, separate, and reject the bad and approve the good surely are not inherently bad qualities, because men do not act according to what they know is right. The apostle teaches that no temptation happened to his brethren but such as is common to man, and that with the temptation God will make a way of escape, that they may be able to bear it. This

principle shews that however strong the temptation is, it is never stronger than the tempted is able to bear. If therefore any one is overcome, he makes a mistake if he pleads as an excuse that he had sin in the flesh, and could not help being overcome, or that the temptation was too strong for him, for God cannot be overcome of evil, neither does He cause anyone to be overcome by it. This is certainly a very different doctrine from that enunciated in the saying that God gave a law that man could not keep, and because he did not do the impossible He punished him for incapacity. If such be the judgment of the saints in the coming age, I will pray may that age never come. I have already expressed my mind on Heb. ii. 14 and 16, and simply repeat that I see no reason for construing the verbs took part, might destroy, and might deliver in any other way than active verbs, and as such the common subject must be the Father and not Jesus. The facts recorded by Matthew and Luke confirm this view, viz., that it was the Almighty visited and redeemed His people by raising up an horn of salvation in the house of His servant David, and performed the oath He swore to Abraham and to his seed for ever. Jesus, and to Him we give the honour of having vanquished sin, which had the power of death, in this He stood at the end of His career, a conqueror, and then humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, that he might obtain the power to deliver from death those held in its grasp, and from its fear those who all their life time were exposed to temptations and in danger of being overcome.

Hoping these remarks will be found suitable for the pages of the Lamp, I am, your Bro. in Christ, W. ELLIS.

[We have no more space to devote to this subject at present. ED.]

---

## THE WORLD.

A slight glance at our Lord's teaching reveals the vigilant caution with which He ever admonished His disciples to guard themselves from the seductive evils of the world. Obviously it is not the geographical world described in Gen. i. to which these warnings relate, for "God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good", but the moral world, degenerated by sin, as mentioned in Gen. iii. and portrayed more fully in Gen. vi., and in various parts of the Old and New Testaments.

It is very significant that in the Lord's great intercessory prayer, (John xvii.) he keeps "the world" steadfastly before him, with empathic solemnity, from the beginning to the end. In one verse "the world" occurs three times over; and it formed the chief burden throughout His great intercession that His disciples in every age might be kept from the contagion of its evil. He felt just what a dying father feels on leaving his children - solicitous above all things that they might be protected against the perilous snares which in every form He knew must put their fidelity to the severest test. Still He had no desire "that they might be taken out of the world," but "kept from the evil." And they are kept. There is a section of society that scrupulously shrinks from the contaminating associations of the world. They are not separate merely by the sound confession of a Scripture faith, or their firm adherence to spiritual worship - thus keeping themselves aloof from both the sceptical and superstitious tendencies of the age - but are kept distinct from surrounding evil by the presence of an inward and spiritual life, of which their outward separation is a visible token. "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world," is the Lord's own explanation of their position and conduct. Between them that are "in Christ" and them that are "in the world" there can be no intimate fellowship or cordial sympathy. They meet in the ordinary courtesies and duties of life, they buy and sell together in the same market; as fellow-travellers they meet in the same carriages and converse on passing scenery and topics of common interest, and co-operate in acts of social kindness or public good; but there can be no fellowship of heart with heart, and will with will. One loves Christ his Lord with supreme affections, the other never knew Him, nor desires to know; the one makes it his chief purpose to please God in everything, and finds his favour better than life; as to the other, God is not in all his thoughts. The disciples of Christ have no deep sympathies in common with the people of the world. The personal habits of the Christian, living as Christ lived, cannot adjust themselves to the habits of the world. There is, and ever must be, a felt disparity, a divergence of aim and purpose, an imperfect and interrupted sympathy between the "peculiar people" - "called and chosen, and faithful," whose "life is hid with Christ in God," and others who are content in their lifetime to have their good things, and leave the favour of God and the thought of the future to the confusion of a last sickness and the hurry of a dying hour. The relationship between the Christian and the world, how they act and re-act upon each other, the counsels derivable from the example of our Lord, and the especial services which the world equally needs and demands from those who are exalted to the high privilege of being sons and daughters of the Lord

God Almighty, are matters of momentous interest. Let the disciples of Christ remember everywhere to be witnesses for Him; seeking opportunities for winning back some wanderers to His forgiveness and welcome, and to “keep themselves unspotted from the world.” - The Quiver, - Passion. GLEANER.

---

## WHERE ARE THE DEAD?

“Lecture and discussion at St. James’s Hall. On Sunday evening last a large and intelligent audience assembled at St. James’s Hall, to hear a lecture on the above subject, by “Antipas,” F.D., a gentleman who hails from Birmingham, and who is the author of several books on religious subjects, and editor of a monthly journal entitled *The Old Sun Dial*. At half-past six the lecturer mounted the platform, and opened the Bible at the 14th chapter of Job, which he read in an emphatic manner, making suitable comments thereon as he proceeded. When he came to the 10th verse, which begins “But man dieth,” the lecturer asked his audience how many of them believed the statement that “man dieth?” To believe so was to come into collision with modern thought on the subject, which is that man is immortal, and therefore cannot die. The theory of Christendom is, said the speaker, “once in existence, always in existence;” and therefore by them Job’s statement, “man dieth,” must be and is disregarded. Something more was said about man being of a “few days” and “continuing not,” when the chapter was concluded. The 49th Psalm was also read, after which the lecturer spoke as follows: - There is a well-known Anglicised Latin proverb, which says, ‘Of the dead say nothing but that which is good.’ Believing, as I do, in this sentiment, I shall endeavour to practise it in the observations I may have to make tonight on this, a most serious and solemn subject. It is my intention to say nothing of the dead but that which is Scriptural, and therefore nothing but that which is true; consequently nothing but that which is good; and the first thing I will say of the dead is that they are in the majority – there are far more people dead than alive. This is so much the case that, when persons depart this life, it is often said of them, he or she ‘has gone over to the majority.’” Now (said the speaker) as many of those who once lived and moved among us were, while here, illustrious, and great, and good, and as we must all, sooner or later, “go over to the majority,” it is but natural for us to inquire into their present whereabouts; and in solving this, what is to many a great difficulty, we shall settle the equally difficult question, “whither are we going?” Now, it is an easy matter to fancy, in a large audience like this, that someone may be anxious to tender advice in something like the following language - “You are quite right in saying that. It is quite natural to enquire into these profound subjects; but is it not simply to gratify the inquisitive and the curious; in short, is it not bordering on the impious, and treading upon forbidden ground, when you attempt to answer the question “Where are the dead?” I should meet such objectionable expressions by asking our friend, To which of the “sects” do you belong? Are you a Catholic or a Protestant? Do you know your catechism? If so, are you not aware that every body of religionists have settled this question long ago? Surely you are familiar with the expression found in the Westminster confession of faith - viz., “The souls of believers do immediately pass into glory.” This being admitted, by inference we may conclude that the souls of unbelievers do immediately pass into misery; and what is this but settling the question we have met to talk over to-night? Therefore, your objection is strangely inconsistent.

You should leave the subject alone yourselves before you give your advice to others. The lecturer then proceeded to establish what he called the legality of the subject by quoting copiously from the numerous obituary notices found in the Scriptures, making special mention of some statements made by the patriarch Job, who had, in the dispensation of God’s providence, been called upon to look at death straight in the face; for to him above all other men death was a stern reality. He lost all his friends, and no attempt is made by him to stifle his contemplation of their state in death. He did not believe his friends were in “glory” or in, “misery,” for he says, “Man dieth, and wasteth away . . . He lieth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more. They shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep.” It was also mentioned that Job had spoken of the grave as the “land of forgetfulness,” and as “where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest,” and he himself said that “worms would destroy his own body; yet in his flesh he would see God.” This was brought forward by the speaker to show that men in ancient times considered the subject of death, and came to conclusions thereon; and as it was left on record in the Scriptures, and as the Scriptures “were written for our learning,” and having a divine command to search the whole of the Scriptures, and not part of them only, it was a matter of impossibility to comply with this command without entering heartily into the question of the death state. The language of the Apostle Paul was quoted to show that the early Christians were exhorted by him to study the

subject; "I would not have you be ignorant concerning those who are asleep." At this point the speaker submitted evidence from the Scriptures to show that the words "death" and "sleep" were used to describe absolute death. Lazarus is said to have been asleep by the Saviour, when he was really dead; and Paul affirmed that "we shall not all sleep," by which assertion he doubtless meant that Christ's disciples who are alive when He returns will not die, but be changed or made like unto Himself. The lecturer said he had met a great number of persons who had a great aversion to death being a sleep, because they appeared to dislike the idea of going out of existence. Some had said to him that they would sooner live in "eternal misery" than go out of existence altogether. This (said the speaker) is easier said than experienced, and such men ought to object to go to sleep at night, for healthy sleep is a state of unconsciousness as much as death. Drunkenness also was a state of dead unconsciousness. The speaker quoted some interesting medical evidence to show that some men had become unconscious through receiving scalp wounds. The bone of the skull having pressed upon the brain, thought was suspended until the bone was removed, when the patient began to think where he left off. These facts, said the lecturer, are all discarded by ordinary theologians, who call the "thoughts" the "soul," of which they say "it cannot die." A good deal was said about "tombstone theology," and the paradoxical language engraved thereon was held up to ridicule. On the top of the stone may be read, "Died," on such a date; and on the bottom of the same stone, engraved by the same chisel, we may read, "Not dead, but gone before." Such language could not pass current for truth but with the indifferent and thoughtless. The following epitaph was quoted as expressive of the sentiment of the whole of Christendom: -

Our little Sarah did to Heaven go,  
 Baby life so fleet is;  
 She was afflicted when here below  
 With the cerebro-spinal meningitis.  
 'Tis hard to lose our Sarah so,  
 But the reflection sweet is--  
 She is gone above,  
 Where there is no cerebro-spinal meningitis.

This is a fair specimen of popular sentiment; but although this fond father writes of his little girl having gone above," yet, like most others who lose their friends, there are certain misgivings as to the fact, hence there is much weeping about the departure of a good man, while the demise of a known bad character was treated with indifference. If the good "go above" at death, and the bad "go below" at the same time, we ought to rejoice at the departure of the good and weep at the departure of the bad; but it was always vice versa, which showed that our natural instincts were stronger than theological falsehoods. The lecturer thinks that the general misunderstanding of the word "soul," and its consequent misapplication, was the prime cause of the prevailing errors. This had given rise to the delusion known as spiritualism, and hundreds of other "abominations." The xlix. Psalm was quoted to show that the "soul" could and did go into the grave, hence the phrase, "Thou wilt redeem my soul from the power of the grave;" and the Prophet Ezekiel was referred to to show that "the soul" that sinneth it shall die. These "souls" referred to by the Prophet and the Psalmist could not be "the immortal souls" the clergy are always talking about. It is said of the Christ that he "poured out his soul unto death" and Peter says "that His (Christ's) soul should not be left in hell." This proves that the "soul" of Christ died, and that it went to hell (the grave); and that it was not left there because God raised him from the dead. It is of the highest importance that we should understand the constitution of our being, and in so doing we shall understand the constitution of our "souls," for, according to the Bible and the lexicon, the soul is the man or the person - not something inside the person; therefore Longfellow was mistaken when he said:

Dust thou art, to dust returnest;  
 Was not spoken of the soul.

The Scriptural testimony concerning man's nature is, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Abraham, in pleading with God, says, "I am but dust and ashes." It is, moreover said, speaking of God, "He knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are but dust." Although God remembers this, yet most men seem to have forgotten it. If they would but remember it, much confusion would disappear. The Burial Service expresses Scriptural truth, when it says, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, in hope of a joyful resurrection." This could be read with propriety over the grave of every true Christian, for it is by resurrection only that future life can be obtained. The record of the death of Abraham was cited to show how devoid it was of common sentiment - no rhapsodies about Abraham, or part of Abraham going to heaven, but simply "Abraham died an old man, full of years, and was gathered unto his people, or buried with his fathers." It could not be allowed for one moment (said the lecturer) that Abraham's fathers

went to heaven, for they, as the Book of Joshua showed, served other gods, and were consequently idolaters; and Abraham was gathered unto them in the same cave or burying place, referred to by Jacob, when he charges his sons concerning his burial, "bury me with my fathers," says the old man, in the cave that is in the field of Ephron, the Hittite. There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac, and Rebecca his wife; and there I buried Leah. After this arrangement, it is simply said that "he gathered up his feet into the bed and yielded up the ghost," or fell asleep. This idea harmonizes with Paul's commentary upon the death of the Patriarch, in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, where he states that "these all (the Patriarchs and Prophets) died in faith, not having received the promises, God having provided some better thing for us that they, without us, should not be made perfect." This showed that the fathers are dead, and that they will remain so until the time of the fulfilment of the promise, when all God's servants will be "glorified together." Moses was taken to the top of Mount Pisgah, and from its summit he was permitted to see the land of Canaan, but was told that as a punishment for his sin at Kadesh, he should not enter in but die; and he died on the mount and was buried there. It is reasonable to ask in what sense could the death of Moses be a punishment if viewed from the ordinary orthodox standpoint, which makes the land of Canaan, into which Moses was not allowed to enter, simply a type of the heavenly Canaan, into which Moses must immediately have passed. If ordinary theology is worth anything, Moses did not die, but went to heaven; and, therefore, he was not punished for his sin, but blessed. The Bible should come before any mere opinion of men, and its assertion is that Moses died and was buried. There is no land of Canaan beyond the stars, but there is a land of Canaan known to us as Palestine, which will one day "flow with milk and honey," and be the joy of the whole earth, for as sure as it has been said "The will of God will be done on earth as it is done in heaven." The case of Hezekiah was also brought forward as proof that the soul could see corruption, and that the dead were incapable of thought or action. The king's words were quoted :- "For the grave cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee. They that go down into the pit cannot hope for Thy Truth. The living, they shall praise Thee as I do this day." The testimony of this king clashes with the generally received notions which, taking Dr. Watts as an authority, teaches that the dead can and do, praise the Lord, He says: - I will praise my Maker while I have breath, And when my voice is lost in death, Praise shall my nobler powers employ.

You cannot believe both the king and the doctor. I take the king and leave the doctor. You of course will please yourselves. I believe the statement of Isaiah concerning Hezekiah, because it harmonizes with the whole of the Bible, and beautifully coincides with the following statements of Solomon, whose wisdom is proverbial:- "The living know that they shall die: the dead know not anything. Their love and their hatred and envy have all perished. Therefore, whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no device or wisdom or knowledge or work in the grave whither we go." Some of our "divines" have concluded that the word "grave" in the sentence just quoted is equivalent to "the place of departed spirits." Well, it is not true; but suppose for the sake of argument, it be for a moment allowed, and read as written it is just equivalent to the grave, for there is no device or wisdom or knowledge or work in "the place of departed spirits" whither we go. David says in death there is no remembrance of God, and Peter, many centuries after the death of David, says in the 2nd chapter of Acts: "He is both dead and buried, and is not ascended into the heavens." And agreeable to this, Jesus says Himself, "No man hath ascended into heaven." The New Testament entirely agrees with the Old Testament on this great and important subject. Some may think otherwise, but I have learned that the books of the Bible cannot be separated without its uniform teachings being distorted. I should otherwise, if time permitted, be as willing to canvass the one book as the other; and in conclusion I will bring before your notice one or two instances in the New Testament. It is often said by persons who speak on this subject that "no one ever came back to tell us." Now, I only believe part of this sentence (said the speaker), that is the last clause, "to tell us." No one ever told us anything, but many have returned. There was the little child raised up by Elisha, recorded in the Book of Kings. The child was really dead, and was raised up to life again from the Bible standpoint, but from the popular standpoint the child was in Heaven and came back. If this be true, is it not a wonder that it did not say to its mother, "Mamma, I was in such a nice place; why did you not let me remain?" But, no, not a word. The child was only too glad to be restored to its mother; it said nothing, because "the dead know not anything." The case of Lazarus was brought forward to show that he was dead and not alive during the four days of his separation from his sisters. He came back, but he did not tell us anything, because "the dead know not anything." Jairus's daughter came back but she was silent, because "the dead know not anything." The widow's son was raised from the dead in the city of Nain, but had nothing to tell us, because "the dead know not anything."

In conclusion, "Antipas" requested the audience to look well into the subject at their leisure, as it was only when the death state was properly understood that the glorious doctrine of the resurrection became interesting. He also begged them not to go away under the impression that he believed there was no future

life. He believed in a future life for the righteous, because it was said that the gates of the grave should not prevail against Christ's Church. His view could be expressed in the language of a poet:-

Oh, false, ungrateful words,  
To call the grave man's long, last home;  
'Tis but a lodging place held from week to week  
Till Christ shall come.

## THE DISCUSSION.

At the conclusion of the lecture a question was asked by a gentleman, whose name did not transpire, as to what was meant by the statement of Christ to the dying thief? "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." At the suggestion of the lecturer, it was arranged that others should present their queries; and he (the lecturer) would endeavour to answer them altogether. Several questions were then presented:-

The first was, as to "How long had the view held by Antipas been in the world?"

The second was, "How could the scene on the Mount of Olives be reconciled with the theories of the lecturer, seeing that Moses and Elias appeared, and His disciples saw them?"

The third was, "Did not Jesus say that God was the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and that He was not the God of the dead, but of the living? Did not this show that the Patriarchs were now alive?"

The fourth question asked the meaning of "Solomon's" statement, the body returns to the dust from whence it was taken, and the spirit returns to God who gave it.

At this point a gentleman in the body of the hall suggested that if the questions presented were answered before others were put, it would save confusion.

To this the lecturer assented, and stood up and answered them as follows:-

The narrative of the dying thief could not be understood, unless the whole of the context was read. It was clear that the thief did not request Christ to remember him that day, but when He came in His kingdom; and the reply when properly punctuated, would amount to this, "Verily I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in My kingdom." The earth is to become a paradise or garden, when Christ reigns upon it, and at that time the thief will be remembered, and be with Christ in Paradise. Christ did not ascend to heaven that day, but died, and was buried, and was with His disciples 40 days subsequent to His resurrection.

The second query as to the age of the faith of Antipas was dealt with in a very brief manner. The lecturer said "it was as old as Adam."

The third question was answered as follows:- If Moses was really on the Mount, he having died and been buried, he must have been raised from the dead for the purpose of appearing there; and, unless he died again, he, and not Christ, was the first fruits of them that slept. But, if the narrative is carefully read, it will be seen that it was a vision, and therefore not a reality; for did not Christ say to the disciples who had slept on the Mount, when they woke up - "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of Man be raised from the dead."

The fourth interrogator was dealt with in the following manner: - The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the dead, and they encountered Christ, who was teaching what was contrary to their belief; so the question is not are the dead alive but will the dead be raised? And to show that they will, Christ refers them to Moses, and says "Now that the dead are (to be) raised; even Moses showed at the bush, when he called Jehovah the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob," "for," adds the Saviour, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him." That is, there being no past, present, or future with the Deity. He speaks of "those things which be not as though they were." Hence He speaks of the patriarchs as though they were alive, because they died in the faith, and He intends at the last day to raise them from the dead.

The replies seemed to give general satisfaction, and it seemed as though "Antipas" was capable of answering as many questions as might be asked.

He next proceeded to deal with the statement of Solomon "The body returns to the dust, and the Spirit to God who gave it." He said it was a mistake to confound the word "spirit" with the word "soul;" the plain teaching of the verse was that that which God "gave" returns to Him, which is the life or breath which He breathed into man at the first. If the "spirit" here means the "soul," and the "soul" is the man, then man pre-existed, and is like God Himself, "from everlasting to everlasting." This cannot be sustained, and consequently the verse says nothing in favour of common sentiment.

This concluded the first string of questions, and now Mr. Joseph Johnson rose, and at the commencement of his remarks, passed a high eulogium upon the lecturer's reasoning powers, and

expressed himself as pleased with the attention of the audience, and though it was indicative that this Palestine gospel was making progress. He then addressed himself to the subject, and asked the lecturer several pertinent questions, which ended in rather a smart tussle between Mr. Johnson and the lecturer, about a general resurrection. "Antipas" affirms that there are three classes of persons in a world; that there are certain who live without law, and Paul shows the destiny, by saying they shall "perish without law." That is, they will not be raised, but will, to quote Jeremiah sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake," and therefore it would appear that "Antipas" holds that none but those (to use his own words) who have known the Master's will are amenable to resurrection and judgment. The interest kept up to the end, and there were many persons who could not put their questions, in consequence of the late hour. It was now nearly 10 o'clock, and some friend in the meeting struck up the Doxology, and thus the meeting closed. While the people were dispersing, a gentleman walked up to the platform and seemed willing to address the meeting, but the lecturer suppressed his aspirations by saying the meeting was closed. The gentleman then addressed himself to "Antipas," and stated that he had seen a person dressed in the garb of a clergyman destroying the bills which announced the lecture, and that on inquiry he had ascertained that the clergyman's name was Hobson, and that he was so disgusted with this exhibition of bigotry that he had written a letter to The Isle of Man Times. We learn from "Antipas" that he replied to the gentleman as follows:- "Mr. Hobson, no doubt, was enraged at his name appearing on the bills and in the advertisements; but as a public man, and as an heretic withal, he ought to 'be angry and sin not.' It was my original intention to review Mr. Hobson's recent lectures on the subject of 'Eternal Punishment,' but having had four hour's conversation with the gentleman, in the parsonage, I found out his whereabouts on the subject, and I therefore changed my arrangements; and although the people of Douglas think he has 'come out,' I am of opinion that he has gone in further to the dark. He has renounced Protestantism and embraced Catholicism. His own language was to me, 'I believe in an intermediate conscious state for the departed.' His present position can be fittingly described in three words - "Confusion worse confounded."

The Isle of Man Times.

---

## **THE REV. W. T. HOBSON AND THE LECTURE BY "ANTIPAS," F.D.**

Sir, - I was passing along the new road, off Duke-street, on Saturday evening last, about half-past five o'clock, returning to my lodgings, when my attention was drawn to a clergyman tearing a placard off the wall, which announced the following (here you have the contents word by word) :- "Where are the dead? The above important question is intimately connected with the subject recently discussed by the Rev. W. T. Hobson, and will form the basis of a lecture by Antipas, F.D., editor of the Old Sun Dial, in St. James's Hall, Douglas, on Sunday evening, July 18th, 1875, at half-past six o'clock, when it is hoped that the inhabitants of Douglas and visitors generally will attend in great numbers. A collection will be made at the close of the lecture to defray the expenses of the hall and printing. Discussion invited at the close of the lecture. - 'Prove all things.' - Paul."

Wondering what could induce him to do such an act, which tends (I think) to lower his position as a clergyman, I followed him a little up Duke-street, and (as I am only a visitor in Douglas) I enquired of a gentleman who was standing at the door of a draper's shop in the same street if he could oblige me with his name (the rev. gentleman had just passed); and, sir, he informed me that he was the Rev. W. T. Hobson, M.A., rector of St. Barnabas' Church. Of course I soon found out the query, as he was evidently the gentleman alluded to in the above placard. I myself can't find or perceive anything in the above placard (quoted) from which any rational being could take offence. Such an act, in my opinion, and I think in every right minded person's opinion, is that it savours only of the pure outcome of egotism and bigotry. It shows clearly where the clergy of the Church of England are drifting to. "He that hath ears let him hear." Hoping you will insert this in your Saturday's edition, -  
Yours, etc., ANTI-BIGOTRY.

Times, (Manx), July 24th.

# SELECTION FROM "GOTTHOLD'S EMBLEMS"

By Christian Scriver

## WHEAT.

Gothold one day looked on while a farmer's wheat was being thrashed, and observed that the men not only stoutly beat it, but trode upon it with their feet; and finally by various expedients, separated the good grain from the chaff, dust, and other impurities. How comes it, he asked himself, that whatever is of a useful nature, and intended to be profitable to the world, must suffer much, and be subjected to every kind of ill-treatment; but that man who himself does with other things as he lists, is unwilling to suffer, or permit God to deal as He lists with him? Wheat, which is the noblest product of the earth, is here thrashed, trod upon, swept about, tossed into the air, sifted, shaken, and shovelled, and afterwards ground, remitted, and baked, and so arrives at last upon the tables of princes and kings. What, then, do I mean in being displeased with God, because He does not strew my path with rose leaves, or translate me to bliss in an easy-chair? By what other process could the wheat be cleaned? And how could I be sanctified or saved were I to remain a stranger to the cross and to affliction ?

Deal with me, therefore, O my God, as thou wilt, and grant that what is Thy will may also be mine. Thrash, toss, and sift me, that at last I may appear as white and pure bread upon Thy table. I will suffer all the more willingly, knowing as I do the words of Thy servant: "Bread-corn is bruised, and yet not destroyed by thrashing. This also is done by the Lord of Hosts, who is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working." (Isa. xxviii. 28 29 Luther's version.)

---

## DOING NOTHING.

"Curse ye Meroz," says the prophet, "By what authority?" "The angel of the Lord."

"What has Meroz done?" "Nothing." "Why then is Meroz to be cursed?"

"Because he did nothing." "What ought Meroz to have done?"

"Come to the help of the Lord."

"Could not the Lord do without Meroz?" "The Lord did without him."

"Did the Lord sustain any loss?" "No; but Meroz did."

"Is Meroz then to be cursed?" "Yes, and that bitterly."

"Is it right that a man should be cursed for doing nothing?" "Yes, when he ought to do something."

"Who says so?" "The angel of the Lord"

"That servant that knew His Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." - Children's Messenger.

---

## NOW AND AFTERWARD.

Now, the sowing and the weeping,  
Working hard and waiting long;  
Afterward the golden reaping,  
Harvest-home and grateful song.

Now, the pruning, sharp, unsparing,  
Scattered blossom, bleeding shoot!  
Afterward the plenteous bearing  
Of the Master's pleasant fruit.

Now, the plunge, the briny burden,  
Blind faint gropings in the sea ;

Afterward the pearly guerdon  
That shall make the diver free.

Now, the long and toilsome duty  
Stone by stone to carve and bring;  
Afterward the perfect beauty  
Of the palace of the King.

Now, the tuning and the tension,  
Wailing minors, discord strong;  
Afterward the grand ascension  
Of the Alleluia song.

Now, the spirit conflict-riven  
Wounded heart, unequal strife;  
Afterward, the triumph given  
And the victor's crown of life.

Now, the training, strange and lowly,  
Unexplained and tedious now;  
Afterward the service holy,  
And the Master's "Enter thou."

**FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL.**

-----  
The law of God is like a diamond, reflecting light from many facets.  
-----

## **CHILDREN'S COLUMNS**

### **AN INCIDENT IN THE "HOLY WAR."**

Dear Children - When you have heard your parents talking about what they have read in the newspapers lately, - of the immense guns that are being made, and the war-ships, and how all nations seem preparing for a mighty war, have you ever thought what a great deal of the Bible is about battles and wars? When I used to learn my History of England, I wished there had been no battles, that I might not have had their dates to learn, but if we had to learn all the dates of the battles fought in the Holy War our task would be much harder.

I am not thinking now about that long war which was begun by that bold brave man, Peter the Hermit, who went all through Europe calling upon Kings and people to take up arms and follow him to the Holy Land, to drive out the infidel Turks. This was called the Holy War, as others have been since, but only those wars are holy which are ordered by God, and led by the Holy One. You will remember it is said "The Lord is a man of war." He allows all the wars we hear of, and often raises up one wicked army against another for the sake of shewing His great power, and destroying both. But there was a time when God chose a poor, weak, nation, and told them to go up and take the land of Canaan for their own, and destroy all the people that were living in the land. They knew they had not power of themselves to do this, for they were the "fewest of any people," and the land of Canaan was thickly peopled with strong and mighty men; there were some wonderful giants lived there. But the Lord promised to go before them and fight their battles. Most likely there was a list kept of all the battles the Israelites fought, for in Num. xxi. 14, mention is made of the "book of the wars of the Lord." This might be written for the sake of encouraging them when they felt weak, or unequal to so many encounters with their strong enemies. If they read of the mighty victories which God wrought for them at Jericho, Ai, Gilgal, Gibeon, and many other places, they would say, "Power belongeth to the Lord, we will trust, and not be afraid." If we read carefully through these wars, we shall find that God made the Israelites victorious, only if they had obeyed Him. If for a time they forgot the true God and followed the wicked ways of the heathen nations around

them, then God sent one of these nations against His own people to punish them. In other cases God was careful to shew the Israelites that it was not their own hands that saved them, but His great power. So in many instances He would not allow them to take as many men to the battle as they thought needful to gain the victory. He wished to shew that He could give great strength to the weak and the few. "Not by might (or army), not by strength, but by my spirit saith the Lord of Hosts." Zech. iv. 6. Their enemies too might have thought if there had been great numbers that it was the power of numbers, not the power of God, that had conquered.

The particular battle I have chosen for this paper is one that was fought after Canaan was divided into the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah. You will find it in II. Chron. xxv. King Amaziah was about going to fight against the Edomites. Now the Edomites were a very strong people. So Amaziah first counted his men, and found he had 300,000 choice men that could handle spear and shield; surely these would be enough; but Amaziah did not think so, he wanted to make sure of success. So he hired 100,000 more mighty men from the kingdom of Israel, and paid them 100 talents of silver. This was a great sum of money, equal to several thousands of pounds of our money. But Israel had been disobedient to God, and He was not pleased that Judah should ask the help of a nation with whom He was angry. It seems strange that Amaziah should have forgotten that wonderful battle gained over a great company that gathered themselves together in the days of King Jehoshaphat. How God had told His people not to be afraid, that they should gain the victory without even fighting; all they should do would be to stand still and see how the Lord would save them. Yes, "all Judah stood before the Lord, with their little ones, their wives and their children." Then they all fell down and worshipped the Lord. The next morning the King once more told them to "believe in the Lord, and this was followed by a glorious hymn of praise to Him who can give the victory to whom He will. And when they sang in faith, they saw that they had not trusted in vain, for God had smitten their enemies, and they were all dead bodies smitten to the earth!"

Yet Amaziah, to make sure of success, had hired these extra soldiers to help him. God's ways, however, are not as man's ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts. He sent a messenger to tell Amaziah not to take these men with him, if he did he should not conquer. Now look what Amaziah said to the messenger. "But what shall we do for the hundred talents of silver which I gave to the army of Israel?" He had paid them. If they did not work for the money would it not be like throwing so much away? The first thought was not "God bids me do this, and I must obey," but it was-- "oh dear! how unfortunate; if I obey I must lose all this money, what a pity I can't get it back, and then it would cost nothing to be obedient." Yet God was patient with him, and instead of smiting him at once for thinking first of his money, the messenger told him that God was able to give him much more than this. Yes, he was to teach Amaziah that all wealth belongs to God as well as all power, but He is a jealous God, and must have obedience. And it is quite right that He should be obeyed, because all He orders us to do is for our own good and happiness. Have you never seen a little child gather a bunch of beautiful bright red berries from the hedge and come running to its mother with such glee. The mother say "My child, you must not eat them, give them to me." The little child does not understand why, and perhaps does not like to part with them, but a good child will give them up at once without asking why, just because it loves and trusts its good kind mother. "She knows best, and I must obey," should be the first thought of every good boy and girl. Then the mother perhaps instead of these poisonous berries that would have killed her child gives it some beautiful bunches of red currants.

Remember, children, that we never give up a wrong thing without being doubly paid for it. If we get nothing just at the time but the knowledge that we have done right, that will be so sweet that when we have once felt it we would not give it up for silver and gold. We should not first think what we are to gain by obeying, it looks as if we meant "Well, I'd much rather disobey, but so long as you pay me well I'll do as you tell me." God loves ready, cheerful, and willing obedience. The first thought should be, "I will do this because it is right; I will do it because it will please God," and if you have to give up some things which you would like, God can more than make it up to you.

Amaziah obeyed and conquered.

-----

## **THE COMING STRUGGLE.**

When the barometer has been slowly and gradually falling for a long period, persons who study the weather tell you that you may expect heavy and continuous rain. The quiet city gentleman who leaves his house in the country after giving an impatient tap at the weather-glass is but a novice if he thinks that the

movement of the mercury will indicate whether it is prudent for him to provide himself with an umbrella and an overcoat. The barometer is a faithful instrument if studied, but its indications are not to be regarded as immediate portents. And the political barometer must be consulted in the same way. It would be worse than useless to assume that any one could say whether a storm will break over a country or over Europe to-day or to-morrow, or within the next week or fortnight. But it would be worse than blameable not to acknowledge that there are everywhere signs of a coming storm, and that men's hearts are disquieted. As in the sky the clouds roll up and the elements are disturbed while the storm is gathering so political discontents grow and gather around us. But it is of course quite possible that the storm may blow over in either case, or that the abundant materials may be dispersed by other means. It is the very nature of prophecy to be uncertain; but prophets are not therefore to be disregarded.

Thus, fifteen or ten years before the French Revolution, men had begun to see that the outcome of the poverty and discontent of the French must be a great commotion, though they had a long time to wait before the storm burst; and the celebrated Lord Chesterfield, as well as Horace Walpole, won for himself a certain celebrity as a prophet by foretelling the French Revolution.

In the present juncture of affairs we are not without prophets of evil of all kinds. The Pope himself, the acknowledged head of millions of religionists who look upon his word as almost divine, has not hesitated to tell us that his Church is in a state of warfare and oppression, and that the faithful must be prepared for very hard times in which they will be eventually victorious. His holiness continually receives gifts from the faithful to add to his treasury and to carry on the struggle. And Cardinal Manning, the chief captain of the Pope in this country, in an address to the English Roman Catholics who flocked round him when he accepted the crowning honour of his life – the Cardinal's hat - declared, with a voice shaken with prophetic fervour, that he was like one appointed to lead a "forlorn hope." And yet the world is, as it were, at peace. Now one does not lead a forlorn hope in peace, and, if the Cardinal meant anything, it was that he scented the battle afar off, and that during his Cardinalship some such feat as scaling the stronghold of another Church might be required of him. How has it come to this? Why should one talk about forlorn hopes in the midst of peace? Why should another priest talk of dipping his frock in blood?

On the other hand, the German, Swiss, and other Protestants, the Italians, French, and Austrian's, with Prince Bismarck and other politicians, have been quite aware of this under-current of thought. Where it has been possible, the machinations of the Ultramontanes have been met by force, and the Romish Church has been made subject to the law - not without apparent hardship, for in a religious quarrel, either side that is obliged to succumb will claim to be martyred. And it is especially difficult in such quarrels to say who began the fray. The very fact of writing upon it may be taken as an overt act of enmity, and Papal power is far-reaching, and is brought to bear in many ways. Thus, even in England, where perhaps we see less of the struggle than in France, Italy, or Germany, the majority of editors are unwilling to write on the subject. In the first place, Romanism has made so many perverts that they might offend some of their readers; in the second, there is a belief that it is better, since we have those in every society who believe with Tyndall, Huxley, Voysey, or with Pusey, Mac-konochie, or Professor Clifford, to ignore all questions of faith and religion; in the third, there is among newspaper men and men of the world the old-fashioned and absurd idea that "Giant Pope" is as dead as he was when John Bunyan wrote of him, and that he will never revive; and, in the fourth, there is a somewhat blind faith in the sound Protestantism of John Bull, and that he needs but to be awakened to shake off Romanism and Ritualism, "like dew-drops from a lion's mane." Lastly, the mass of the people really care for none of these things, and are in the deep slumber of a decided opinion that Democracy cannot be dealt with by a priesthood, however skilful and however learned. The gross effect of all this is that we English "stick our head in a bush," and refuse to believe that anyone can see farther than we do. Possibly this quiescence may keep the ship trim. We shall see.

However, let us look abroad to a little constitutional country, the admirer and the admired of England, formed by a sage king and his ministers upon the model of our own, connected with us by marriage and by race, and whose brave men and women, the Belgians, are industrious, peaceful, and very like ours, so much so that, if they did not speak, and but for some difference of dress, Belgian farmers or well-to-do provincial shopkeepers might well be taken for English. Now Belgium suffered years ago far more bloodily than we from Papal persecution; the siege of Antwerp, and the dealings of Alva in the Low Countries, are matters not unknown to readers of history. Yet the country became under Leopold and the Constitution of 1830 the most liberal of all Continental States. Education, religion, and the press were free. The Church was not to be controlled by the State, and fair play was given to every form of faith. As a natural consequence the best player won the game, or the most compact and best-drilled army the war. God Almighty, said the sceptical Louis XIV. and his mot was repeated by the first Napoleon - is on the

side of the strongest battalions. And it is in the nature of Protestantism that it has no battalions - it is not fond of drill.

The brave Belgians found before twenty years were over that there were difficulties in their churches and schools. Liberalism was in fashion, but mothers somehow did not like to send their children to Protestant schools, and children themselves were discouraged. But in those days peace and industry were the passwords, and in 1848 the socialist revolution gave a very wholesome scare to kings and priests. In 1851 the Great Exhibition of London was on so vast a scale, and was so gigantic a success, that an era of peace was proclaimed. The war drum, as Alfred Tennyson had written, was to throb no longer, and "the battle flag was furled in the parliament of man and the federation of the world."

These were brave words. In the meantime foreign artisans were studying English manufactures, especially of guns and artillery; Louis Napoleon made himself the master of France, the *ouvrier* Republicans were shot down or sent to Cayenne in 1852, the Pope, aided by the holy bayonets of France, rallied, and Nicholas of Russia, lured on by the peaceful words of England, was prepared to hoist "the sick man," the Sultan of Turkey, out of Europe, and to seize his territory, giving England Egypt as a sop in the pan. This last far-sighted scheme resulted in the war of the Crimea, which established Napoleon on his throne, gave him place and tone, enabled him again to help the Pope very materially, and cost our peaceful England two hundred millions, and a loss of diplomatic prestige, besides the important friendship of Russia.

The history of the world since that time has not been one of peace in either Europe - witness the fall of the two Sicilies, the Italian, Austrian, Danish, Franco-German Wars - or America, Asia, or Africa, South America and New Zealand, and the far east of Asia, China, and Japan have had their wars. Of all the industries shown at Prince Albert's glass-palace, that gorgeous toy-shop, which has brought us as much evil as good, those of the gun-maker, the iron-clad builder, and the gunpowder-manufacturer, have been the busiest; and in nations happily not at war in themselves it would be useless to conceal that the priests have been at work. Sacerdotalism, even in the ranks of extreme dissent, has been gaining ground, whether for evil or for good we forbear to say; and Liberalism, so far as it consists in a perfectly free press, free speech, free education, and that constitutionalism which even English Tories concede, has been losing. As the priestly idea has waxed, true liberty has waned. We do not now hear of progress. Nay, the vagaries of trades-unions and the vulgarities of Democracy have disassociated the thinkers from the workers - a very bad sign of the times indeed. The Pope has again and again cursed or condemned Liberalism, Progress, and Constitutionalism. To do him justice, he makes no secret of his opinions. He is remarkably plain-spoken in his allocutions. The Liberal press has reported them, and upon the wings of the wind the reiterated and prodigious assertions that he is the sole guardian of Truth, that he is the only unfailing judge of all that belongs to Faith and Morals - that is, to Law, human or divine - and that every baptized soul belongs to him, have been published as regularly as our reports of Parliament, till they have grown to be believed.

In Germany the Government long ago took warning, and saw in the Pope's Dogma of Infallibility cause to be alarmed. The authority of the bishops was brought face to face with that of the law of the country and that country was directed by a religious Sovereign and a very remarkable Minister. Meanwhile in England and in Belgium - which nations we believe have much to fear and suffer - the Romish party made immense strides. England was re-divided into Dioceses, the hierarchy of Rome became fashionable, and many of the most praised scholars of Oxford passed into her magic circle, there to be greatly feted and honoured, and to win over very many of the nobility and commonality. The ill-advised resistance of Lord Russell became a dead letter, Protestantism came by constant iteration and reiteration to be pronounced vulgar and in "bad form," the Reformers were no longer praised as saints and martyrs, but were depicted as rogues and ruffians, the authority of the Bishops was everywhere denied or scouted by the High Church, and the defence of sound Protestant principles left to hands in which they became ridiculous-those of Messrs Newdegate and Whalley. Under such leadership, and harassed on the other side by rationalistic, deistic, and even atheistic tendencies. Protestantism and religion itself suffered; and, when the Archbishop of Canterbury published a letter which welcomed - or at least did not condemn - lay preaching by popular revivalists, a High Church paper declared that he "had knocked the Church of England into a cocked hat," and advertised pamphlets written by clergymen, called 'Are the Bishops Mad?' and the answer, 'No, not Mad, but Maudlin.' Add to these symptoms the increase of monasteries, nunneries, sisterhoods, and the organized and compact influence of priests on our English elections, and one may see that a struggle sooner or later must come.

In Belgium it has begun. The Liberal party, everywhere defeated, has given place to an Ultramontane Ministry. The King, thought to be too liberal in his ideas, though a wise and indeed a model monarch, has been discounted by the priests and the best society kept from Court. Ultramontane papers have fomented

a quarrel with Germany by taking part with the German recalcitrant bishops; Protestants and Liberals have been threatened by Ultramontane papers with a baptism of blood; and processions, pilgrimages, and miracle - one of which is of a girl who bleeds every Friday from five wounds like those of the Saviour - are encouraged, and Protestants or Liberals who do not countenance these have been insulted and struck. In times of religious (?) fervour or fanatical hatreds, a very slight cause will produce bloodshed. We have seen that in Belfast and other parts of Ireland religious processions have to be controlled; and in Brussels a schoolboy who did not pull off his cap to the host and a passing image, and for that reason was cuffed by an indignant old woman, replied with jeers, and produced a riot. In Antwerp similar causes have produced the same effects. In that town and in peaceable Brussels troops have been under arms and cannon posted to prevent the Ultramontanes from flying at the throats of the Liberals.

In France Roman Catholic fervour seems as high, and unhappily the irony of events has helped the Pope in enlisting patriotism on the side of war. The calm and wise general, of Franco-Irish descent, who is President of the Republic, has his work to do in organizing the army and preventing an immediate attack on Germany; while that power, perfectly conscious that France is adding gun to gun, horse to horse, and store to store, and that the accumulation of war material can have but one end, is with difficulty withheld from choosing her own time and declaring war. There is very little doubt that Bismarck could at once find a *casus belli*, and we doubt whether he could well be blamed. England in such a position would scarcely be withheld as patiently as Germany. When a strong man armed with a blunderbuss parades under his neighbour's windows we do not wonder at the peaceable indweller arming himself in some alarm.

In Austria, in Italy itself, in Spain, with an Ultramontane pretender carrying on war with English, French, and American gold; in Switzerland, Belgium, and in Holland, in Protestant England, in Ireland, and in far-off America, there is a spasm of resuscitation in the Church of Rome, which takes the form of ambitious advancement. We do not marvel at it. To those who love that Church and identify it with the pure faith of Him whom she still claims as her Master, there is the noble ideal of universal supremacy and of the kingdoms and kings of this world bowing down before the priests of God. But it would be worse than useless to shut our eyes to the fact that the triumph of Rome means the defeat of progress, liberty, Liberalism, and Protestantism. When the cry comes of "To your tents, O Israel!" it is well to know on which side you mean to fight. The Roman journals do not blink the facts. They have even taken to prophecy. The *Saturday Review* which, takes a much clearer and more serious view of matters - as do the correspondents of the *Times*, who are on the various spots of emeute - than do the Liberal journals, which seem blinded or hoodwinked, quotes from the *Rosier de Marie*, a paper dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which prophesies an immediate war between France and Germany, in which, through the invention by a Frenchman of a new destructive power, the Germans will be terribly slaughtered and driven through Châlons, Thionville, and Cologne to Königsberg before three victorious armies of France, which will march on to and take Berlin, and there discover papers compromising Russia, Italy, and Spain! France then will take her revenge. Prussia will cease to exist. Poland will be restored, and the borders of France extended to Frankfort and take in part of Bavaria. Italy is to be thoroughly defeated and divided into three kingdoms, and the Pope to "regain his rights." Switzerland will be allowed to remain a Republic, but placed under the Pope's protection; and full of peace, glory, and honour, old Pio Nono will die! This may be a wild dream; but it is evident that the wish is father to the thought. We do not believe in the extraordinary programme; we rather incline to the opinion that the Latin and Celtic races will succumb further to the Teutonic. But there are terrible elements of discord abroad. There are a theological bitterness and activity of which our fathers even did not dream. Nay, in 1851, the Exhibition year, our feelings of to-day would have been called impossible. There is enough combustible stuff stored up in armed Europe for a conflagration as terrible as the prophetic battle of Armageddon. Accursed will be the hands that first apply the torch.

-----

**A STORY** is told of an old man who lived long ago. Forcible was the way in which he spoke of the struggles he had to carry on. A friend asked him the cause of his complaints, since in the evening he so often complained of great weariness and pain. "Alas," answered he, "I have every day so much to do. I have two falcons to tame, two hares to keep from running away, two hawks to manage, a serpent to confine, a lion to chain, and a sick man to tend and wait upon." "Why this is only folly," said the friend; "no man has all these things to do at once;" "Yes, indeed," he answered, "it is with me as I have said. The two falcons are my two eyes, which I must diligently guard, lest something should please them which may be hurtful to my salvation; the two hares are my feet, which I must hold back, lest they should run after

evil objects, and walk in the ways of sin; the two hawks are my two hands, which I must train and keep to work, in order that I may be able to provide for myself and for my brethren who are in need; the serpent is my tongue, which I must always keep in with a bridle, lest it should speak anything unseemly; the lion is my heart, with which I have to maintain a continual fight, in order that vanity and pride may not fill it, but that the grace of God may dwell and work there; the sick man is my own body, which is ever needing my watchfulness and care. All this daily wears out my strength.” The friend listened in wonder, and then said: “Dear brother, if all men laboured and struggled after this manner, the times would be better, and more according to the will of God.”

– Nehemiah the Tirshatha.

---

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS. BY DR. HAYES.

A brother writing from Buffalo proposes the following questions for solution in the Lamp: -

1. Was Cyrus' decree to Judah, or to all Israel?
2. Is the resurrection spoken of in Rev. ch. xx. political or literal?
3. How do you reconcile Jno. xi. 44 and Lu. viii. 53 with Ac. xxvi. 23, 1 Co. xv. 20, 23, Col. i. 18, and Rev. i. 5?
4. Explain Jude, verses 6 and 9.
5. Is Mat. ch. xxv. v. 31 to end a national or individual judgment?
6. When Paul says we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, does he mean Jews and Gentiles?

In reply to the first question, we answer the decree of Cyrus had no reference to any particular tribe or tribes, it was general, and not special, as the record of the proclamation in the first chapter of Ezra shows. Thus in verse 3rd it is written, “Who is there among you of all his people?” and in the 4th verse, “whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth.” But notwithstanding it is clear from the 5th verse that “with all them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem,” the tribes of Judah and Benjamin are prominent, and they doubtless of all the Jews would feel the greatest desire to return to their own canton, where the house of the Lord was to be built. The ten tribes had been carried away long before, had probably become settled in their new habitations, and more or less amalgamated with the nations among whom they sojourned, and were, therefore, not likely to manifest an equal anxiety with their brethren of Judah and Benjamin, to return to the land of their fathers.

While, therefore, it is possible that some few of the other tribes might have returned in virtue of the decree of Cyrus, the great bulk of them remained in captivity, and have since been entirely lost.

At the opening of his book, we are informed by Ezra that it was for the purpose of fulfilling the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah that the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus to make the proclamation concerning the building of an house at Jerusalem and the return of the Jews to that city. But an examination of the writings of Jeremiah will prove conclusively that the prophet declares many things concerning the Jews which remain unfulfilled to this day, and moreover, those who returned in the days of the Persian monarch have since then suffered another deportation from their country which continues desolate to the present time. Not a vestige of the good work accomplished through the instrumentality of Cyrus remains to mark the fulfilment of the words of Jeremiah, “That good thing promised unto the house of Israel and to the House of Judah has not yet been performed. There is neither throne nor temple, nor can there be until the Antitypical Cyrus appears to execute judgment and righteousness in the land. Jer. xxxiii, 14, 15. But on this subject, to save repetition, we beg to refer our correspondent to what was published in the June number of the Lamp, under the heading of “Notes on the Psalms,” commencing on page 348. The passage referred to by him, (Jer. 1, 4.) relates to the future return of the children of Israel and the children of Judah. This will appear by what is written in verses 19 and 20 of the same chapter, and also in ch. xxxi, 8, 9, compared with Ho. iii, 4, 5. “For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king and without a prince, and without a sacrifice and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim. Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God and David their King; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days.”

Question 2. The resurrection spoken of in Rev. xx. is undoubtedly literal as the whole tenor of the chapter teaches. At this period, the previously dead saints awake to life, and are judged every man according to their works. Those found worthy live and reign with Christ a thousand years, and the unworthy become the subjects of the second death. It seems unnecessary to enlarge on this topic.

Question 3. We really do not see any particular difficulty in reconciling the passages quoted. It is true that in order of time Jesus was not the first who was raised from the dead, but He was the first who was resurrected to die no more, and in this sense has the pre-eminence. Others, such as Lazarus, though brought to life before Him, were not quickened with life eternal. With regard to the passage in Colossians we refer our brother to the explanation given in the Lamp, for August, on page 451.

Question 4. The verses in Jude's Epistle are not so easily disposed of. The angels who kept not their first estate are supposed by some to have been inhabitants of the earth before the creation of Adam, and to have left it without the Divine sanction, in consequence of which rebellion they were driven back and reserved for judgment. Such in brief was the view taken by the late Dr. Thomas. It is plausible, but we will not venture to affirm its correctness or otherwise. Our correspondent can read the Doctor's arguments for himself, in the second chapter of his "Elpis Israel." On this passage Macknight, in his Apostolical Epistle, observes, everlasting chains is a metaphorical expression which denotes a perpetual confinement, which it is no more in their power to escape from, than a man who is strongly bound with iron chains can break them. The ninth verse is a somewhat difficult passage, which has been variously interpreted by commentators. We find the following note on this verse of Jude's Epistle by the author just mentioned. "In Daniel's prophecy, Michael is spoken of as one of the chief angels who took care of the Israelites as a nation. He may therefore have been the angel of the Lord, before whom Joshua the high priest is said, Zech. iii, 1, to have stood, Satan being at his right hand to resist him, namely in his design of restoring the Jewish Church and State, called by Jude the body of Moses, just as the Christian Church is called by Paul the body of Christ. Zechariah adds, and the Lord, that is the angel of the Lord, as is plain from ver. 1, said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee. Le Clerc gives a different interpretation of this passage. By Satan, in Zechariah's vision, and Διαβολος in Jude's epistle, he understands Tatnai and Shetherboznai, the king of Persia's lieutenants, who opposed the restoration of Jerusalem, and who on that account might be called Satan, or the adversary of the Jews, in the same manner that Peter was called Satan by his Master, for opposing his suffering at Jerusalem. According to this interpretation, Jude's meaning is that the angel in Zechariah's vision brought no reviling accusation against the adversaries of the Jews, but reproveth them with modesty on account of their being magistrates. This Jude mentioned to show the ungodly teachers who reviled the Roman magistrates, that they were culpable in doing what the angels, who, as Peter observeth 2 Ep. ii. 11, are greater in power than they, did not attempt to do."

Others of the reputed learned have imagined that by the expression body of Moses, the dead body of Moses was meant, but this idea seems scarcely worthy of a serious refutation. We copy the following from The Old Sun Dial, of April 1st of the current year:- "From the above passage (Jude 9) by some the Devil has been invested with a personal organization, and an individual disputation is supposed to have taken place between Michael and his Satanic Majesty about the body of Moses. If orthodox notions be correct, then the Devil in this instance was more concerned about the "body" than the "soul" of Moses; but the phraseology itself is suggestive of a better explanation. If Moses as a person had been meant, Jude would have said Moses, not "the body of Moses." By the statement, we understand the "brother of James" to have referred to the house of Moses, over which house he is said to have been "faithful as a servant." Heb. iii, 5.

That is, the people composing the Jewish Nation who were "baptized" into him (Moses.) 1 Cor. x. 2. And therefore as his disciples were "one body" just the same as those who are baptized, or immersed, into Christ, are "one body." Then we believe that the Israelites were the body of Moses, about which the devil and the archangel disputed. This kept in mind will materially aid us in the understanding of the passage. As to the disputants about this "body" we can see no good reason for not regarding Christ as Michael the chief angel or the great Prince, and his opponent, as the chief priests and scribes, for it is a fact that their disputes were many, and that too, about Moses' house, or "body politic." In Christ's disputes he brought no "railing accusation" against any of his numerous enemies; but when they "reviled Him, He reviled not again, but committed Himself to Him who judgeth righteously;" or in the words of "Judas, not Iscariot" (Jude), he said "the Lord rebuke thee." The enemy, or devil, was not one person, but many, and they have been "rebuked" by the same Michael, by his life, death and resurrection, destroyed their ceremonial and sacrificial law of the body of Moses, and thus decided for ever who has the right to that body. The Devil is defeated and Michael is triumphant, and when He returns He will declare His right by restoring (by resurrection) the house of Israel, and sitting for ever Himself as their King on their ancient throne, while all His adversaries will lick the dust, or be cast into an everlasting grave. We take the foregoing views, because,

1st. The Bible does not teach the doctrine of one personal devil.

2nd. There is no account given of a dispute about “the body of Moses” in the Bible, which will accord with the statement of Jude, but the one we have given.

3rd. Jude being one of the Apostles (Luke vi. 16,) of Christ, would be quite familiar with the “dispute” between the Master and the Jews, and also familiar, being a Jew, with the use and significance of Jewish phraseology.”

The above remarks are very suggestive, and we commend them to the consideration of our correspondent without however entering into a critical examination of them at the present time.

Question 5. Our understanding of Mat. xxv. 31, to end, is, that it is not a judgment of nations as such, but a Judgment of all those who at various times have been taken out from among the nations by the Gospel call or invitation, and who at this crisis receive every man according to his works, the one class, the faithful that is, “inherit” the Kingdom prepared for them,” or “enter into life eternal,” while the other class, the unfaithful, whose practice has not been according to their profession, “go away into everlasting punishment.” Compare Mat. xvi, 27, and Luke xiv, 14, with the verses referred to above. “Not everyone (says Jesus) that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter in to the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father, who is in Heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name? and in Thy name have cast out devils? and in Thy name done many wonderful works. And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.” Mat. vii, 21-23.

Question 6. When Paul says (2, Cor. v. 10. “We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.” He alludes to the saints generally, including Himself and the other apostles, a mixed assembly composed of both Jews and Gentiles, every one of whom then receive the things in body (or through the body) according to that he hath done, whether good or bad. And this is in perfect harmony with the passages referred to in the previous question.

---

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

LISTOWEL, 15th July, 1875. DEAR BRO. TURNEY: - I notice a communication in the Lamp, from Bro. J. Whaly, of Geneva, Illinois, respecting Thurman’s view of the termination of the 2,300 days of Daniel, viii. 14, as having expired on the 19th of April last. Will you allow me to make a remark or two on the matter. It is true Thurman was in error as to the particular event which was to mark the termination of the 2,300 days vision, but that the period itself did actually end on the 19th April, I cannot for a moment accept as a fact. Yet I agree with Bro. Whaly, that Thurman’s chronology is the nearest to the truth of any that has ever been published, though by no means perfect, or the events specified in the Book of Daniel must now be in the past and we know to a certainty that none of those events noted in the Book of Daniel, xii, 1, 3, have yet transpired.

But these events must of necessity be included in the period covered by the vision, which reaches to the cleansing of the Sanctuary, (which is yet trodden under foot,) and to the last end of the indignation.

Now in reference to his chronology, or that part of it established by eclipses, I believe it is invulnerable. These eclipses fix to a certainty the dates of certain periods having reference to the events connected with the first advent; such as the 69 weeks beginning with the going forth of Cyrus’ edict, in the first of his sole reign, Ezra, i, 1, in their termination exactly at the birth of Messiah, the Prince, B.C. 5. Thurman’s chronology shows that the first of Cyrus’ was B.C., 488, then as 69 weeks make 483, the appearing of the Messiah must be at B.C. 5., and nearly all admit that was the date of His birth. But I apprehend the error, that of Thurman, consisted in placing the beginning of the 70 weeks, (which is a period entirely distinct from, and unconnected with the 69,) at B.C. 426, or, in the 12th year of Artaxerxes. Now if that had really been the year for the beginning of the 70 weeks, cut off from the 2,300 days vision, then of course the 70 weeks must end in the spring of A.D. 65. But what proof have we that Daniel’s 70 weeks ended then? None at all. The city and temple, or sanctuary, were then intact.

No Roman army standing in the holy place, the sacrifices still going on, and the Sanctuary yet unmolested. But, says our Lord, when ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, “let whoso readeth, understand.” What were they to understand?

Evidently that the desolation to come upon the people and city, at the end of their allotted 70 weeks, was now at hand. Taking this stand point for the termination of the period of 70 weeks, we go back 490 years, and we strike B.C. about 19 or 20. Just about the time if not the exact time, that Nehemiah built the wall “in troublous times,” that is in the 20th of Artaxerxes. Neh. ii. 1. Dan. x. 25. So then from the time

that the wall was finished in the month Elul. Neh. vi. 15. to the time the city fell and the Jewish Commonwealth ended, was just 490 years, or 70 weeks. All this is in perfect accordance with Thurman's chronology which covers the disputed ground of the reigns of the kings of Persia. So then taking it for granted that Daniel's 70 weeks ended with the overthrow of Jerusalem, the 2,300 days cannot end earlier than 1880. But what decisive event may occur before that time none can tell. But we have good reason to believe, that before the Sanctuary is cleansed or vindicated, and the great indignation terminates, God's people will all be hidden in His pavilion, and remain in that place of security till the indignation be overpast; they standing on the sea of glass, having the harps of God, singing the song of victory; awaiting the clearing away of the smoke arising from the out pouring of the seven last plagues upon the seat of the beast and his worshippers; antitypical of those preceding the exodus from Egypt.

I would conclude, then, that Thurman's mistake consisted not so much in a defective chronology, as in a premature application of the prophetic periods, and a misapprehension of the significance of certain events which he supposed marked the beginning and termination of the period of 2,300 days and 70 weeks; as for instance, he took it for granted that the effort made by Haman as recorded in the book of Esther for the destruction of the whole Jewish race, was the counterpart of the vision of the Persian ram pushing, etc., Daniel viii, 1, 4, whereas nothing seems to have been done in that 12th year of Ahasuerus, or Artaxerxes as he is called in the Greek, but casting of the lot before Haman, from day to day, and from month to month, from the 1st to the 12th month. Supposing that decree had been the real counterpart of the vision which Daniel saw, yet there was no decree put in execution either against the Jews or their enemies, for nearly two years, from the 14th of the first month, B.C. 426, that is on the 14th of the twelfth month, B.C. 425. So admitting the correctness of his application of the prophecy, yet it is evident it was premature. But I am much inclined to believe that the application of the vision to the events recorded in the Book of Esther is erroneous, and that the 70 weeks begin with Nehemiah's commission to build the wall in the 20th of Artaxerxes, which according to the most reliable system of chronology extant, synchronized with B.C. 20, ending with the complete demolition of the temple, and everything pertaining to the Jewish polity, at A.D. 70-71; now if this be the correct view of the matter, then the remaining 1810 years of the 2,300 must run to 1880-1, before the Sanctuary yet trodden under foot of the Gentiles shall be cleansed, justified, or vindicated.

Now in view of the Apostolic declaration that all Scripture is given by Divine Inspiration and is profitable for doctrine, etc., I cannot endorse the conclusion of the Doctor that the true Bible chronology is lost, simply because his or any other system has failed. To do so, would seem to me to be an impeachment of the goodness and wisdom of God, in giving to us a series of prophetic definite periods relating to the most important events; if He permitted the loss of the only means by which those inspired dates could be made available, or be at all profitable to us who are so deeply concerned in those events. W. H. HACKING. Listowel, Ontario, 16th Aug. 1875.

-----  
Henderson, Kentucky, July, 2nd, 1875.

Mr. Edward Turney, Nottingham, England.

Dear Sir: - Though personally unacquainted with you, I take the liberty of sending you a few lines, which I hope will not be offensive. I have read with pleasure what you have written on the "Two Sons of God," published in the second volume of the Lamp. As you contemplate publishing a book on the subject, I shall send for one or two copies as soon as the publication is completed, and I ascertain the price, including postage.

I have also read in the Christadelphian a comment on a pamphlet, said to have been written by A. B. McGruder, of Baltimore, U. S. A., and published by the Doweites, of Nottingham, England, "On the Judgment of the Household of Christ at His appearing." The pamphlet I have not seen, but have been invited to investigate the subject in the light of Scripture. The following are my conclusions. The Apostle James says: "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world." Acts. xv. 18. Man is a part of His workmanship. "He knows them that are His for He hath chosen them." John xiii. 18. "He also knows them that are not His." "They who are His, are in a state of justification." "If they continue in that state until death, their condition will not be altered at the judgment seat of Christ." Acts. xiii. 39. 2 Cor. i. 6, 11. Rev. xxii. 11. "They that are not His, are in a state of condemnation, and the wrath of God abideth on them." John iii, 18, 36. If they continue in that state, their condition will not be altered at the judgment seat.

But before they appear before the judgment seat, they must of necessity be raised from the dead. But how are the dead raised, and with what bodies do they come? Paul says, "the dead in Christ shall rise

first,” 1 Thess. iv. 16, and “they shall be raised incorruptible.” For it is written in the 15 chap. 1st Cor. “that the body is sown a natural (animal or mortal) body, and is raised a spiritual body.” It is sown in corruption (but not raised in corruption) but in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour, (but not raised in dishonour) but in glory. It is sown in weakness, (but not raised in weakness) but in power. Furthermore “They shall not all sleep, but shall all be changed, in a moment in the twinkling of an eye, for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible.” “They also shall be glorified together.” Rom. viii. 17. 1. Cor. xv., 4.2 to 52. The next thing in order, is to appear before the judgment seat, to give an account, or to be made accountable through their works, or in other words to be made manifest or known, (not to God, for He knows all that are His,) to those who know them not. I say, through their works. “For God will make manifest the hidden things of darkness, and bring to light the counsels of the hearts.” 1. Cor. iv. 5, xiii. 12. Will this be done without making each individual known? But it is said by some, that there is a process, or modus operandi which is very necessary to be understood, or we will withdraw our fellowship. It is as follows. The righteous must be raised mortal, first, then revive, or have life; then appear before the judgment seat, then give an account. (As though they could remember every idle word, and every act performed through life.) Then put on immortality, or be made immortal. But it is impossible for any mortal man to remember all he ever said, or did, through life; God only can know, and will make it manifest, for “He has written a book of remembrance for them.” Mal. in. 16.

The next thing in order, after manifestation, is to receive in body the things covenanted to Abraham and his seed, which time and space forbid me to mention, but can be seen by reference to the following testimony. Gen. xiii. 15. xvii. 8. Dan. xvii. 18. Luke xii. 32, xxii. 29.

But it is contended that if the righteous are not raised mortal, the judgment is of no consequence, but null and void. That life through an incorruptible body is the reward. Who can tell a corruptible body from an incorruptible one? Could Jacob tell after wrestling all night? Could Abraham tell after dining with the three angels? They appear to forget that life through an incorruptible body is necessary to receive an eternal inheritance. There has been some quibbling on the phrases, putting on, and giving an account. Putting on immortality is simply to make immortal, and God will make them so at His second appearing. Giving an account, is to make accountable, and God will make manifest all they have done. Does the foregoing make void the judgment? Assuredly not. I think it establishes the judgment. God in His wisdom has determined to make manifest the just and unjust, and to reward them accordingly; and He has appointed a day, which He calls the day of judgment. In conclusion, I think the just stand before the judgment seat in incorruptible bodies, and the unjust in corruptible bodies. - I am a non-professor, yet truly yours, in anticipation of a better day. - J. T. NORMENT.

P.S. - I would be pleased to hear from you in regard to this subject, (for what I have written is my honest conviction,) either privately or through the Lamp, as may best suit your convenience. - J. T. N”.

#### **REMARKS.**

As we shall have something to say at a future time upon the great subjects, Resurrection and Judgment, we are not now at liberty to enter upon the matter. We may remark, however, that these are questions not easily understood in detail, and we think it unwise for brethren whose time and circumstances deprive them of the power to make a close investigation of the subject, to be dogmatic and excommunicative towards others, who cannot at present bring their judgment to acquiesce in theirs. If a man were to deny resurrection and judgment, we should regard him as in a worse case than those who said “the resurrection was already past,” and should after due and proper admonition withdraw from his communion. But we know of no such case among the brethren; the discussion turns upon the nature, time, and manner of the resurrection and judgment, to which, as we have said, it is our intention to make a normal contribution by and by. – Editor.

---

## **TWO AGAINST ONE AND ONE AGAINST HIMSELF.**

The following will show that notwithstanding the Editor of the Christadelphian’s slavish adherence to Dr. Thomas, he sometimes makes the grand mistake of contradicting him.

Are saints under condemnation? Hear the Apostle Paul - “There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.” Rom. viii, 1. “A saint is in a different state. A saint is one whose transgressions have been blotted out, and who is therefore no longer under sentence of death; but under sentence of life

eternal; and therefore in a state of obedience and life.” - Dr. Thomas. (See Christadelphian for May, 1874, p. 199.)

“Suffering the Adamic curse is a question of physical constitution, which (though we put on Christ) remains unchanged till the expiry of the whole time allowed for probation.” - Editor of Christadelphian, May, 1874, p.233.

To the all important question, “Are saints under condemnation?” the great Apostle of the Gentiles gives an emphatic, no. Dr. Thomas also says, no. But the Editor of the Christadelphian says, yes, and argues that they even die under it, because the physical constitution remains unchanged until the expiry of the period of probation. We accept the first answer as decisive because the writer was inspired; we accept the second because it agrees with the first, and therefore we reject the third. It is not necessary to refute the Editor’s answer since he has refuted it himself by publishing its negation in the very same number of the Christadelphian. And what is stranger than all, he has quoted negative testimony from the very man to whom he professes to have committed himself. When will they be ashamed of their Leader’s blunderings?  
- JOHN GLOVER.

---

## **LORD SHAFTESBURY AND THE SECOND ADVENT.**

In times of great religious excitement, or mighty political change, the cry of “The Lord is at hand” is almost invariably raised. To go back no further than the Reformation, the wars and tumults by which that glorious event was attended were by the Protestants generally regarded as so many premonitory signs of the Lord’s return. It was the same with the convulsions of the French Revolution, in which many an anxious watcher was persuaded that he heard the chariot-wheels of an approaching Judge. Nor, during the present century have there been wanting occasions when the cry of “The Bridegroom cometh” has been raised with much persistency and force. We need, therefore, feel no surprise if the sense of vague uneasiness which sits heavy on Continental Europe, coupled with the spiritual awakening that is happily extending so rapidly in our own land, should break upon the ears of many among us as the “Last Warning Cry” heralding the Saviour’s return. Pamphlets to this effect are beginning to swarm; in London and the provinces lectures are announced calling upon “all Christian people to prepare for the speedy coming of the Lord;” and now we have Lord Shaftesbury lifting up his influential voice on the same side. Speaking a few days ago at Beckenham - where he had just laid the first stone of a new church - the noble earl thus expressed himself: - “The signs of the times declare that something - a very great something, cannot be far distant: I mean the Second Advent of our Blessed Lord . . . I would to God the great doctrine of the Second Advent were more prominent in the preaching of the day. It has a mighty effect in keeping up the hope of the people. If it were more frequently brought before them I am sure nothing could be more likely to attract from the great apostacy of these times. And we know not how soon that event may take place. It may be to-morrow, or before this church is built. It is of no purpose to declaim against Popery in its political aspect, and merely protest. Protesting such as this would never have effected the great Reformation. It was not by protesting that all the great men of that generation did their noble and glorious work. It was the blessed truth of this Second Advent of Christ, and this alone that enabled them to beat the great and mighty Antichrist.”

[From report in the Record’.]

This is a striking and suggestive passage, and contains so much in which we entirely concur that it is the more necessary to point out wherein we regard the teaching as defective or erroneous. It is undeniable that among the Reformers an impression of the nearness of the Advent acted with extraordinary power - although Luther, in his later years, was disposed to think the world’s course had still 300 years to run. So far he was right in his conjecture, whereas the hopes of his followers were doomed to disappointment; and from that day to this a similar fate has ever attended the forecasts of too sanguine or impatient spirits. But the power of the doctrine, great as it is, is necessarily weakened by successive failures; and therefore, if again proclaimed, additional caution should be employed. To do otherwise is but to copy the untoward example of a popular expositor of prophecy, whose numerous works announcing the imminence of the Day of Judgment but ignoring certain events by which that day must needs be preceded, have not only given much occasion to the enemy to blaspheme, but have damped the hopes which we are quite sure they were honestly intended to quicken. And unless we be careful what we say at the present juncture, the same evils will inevitably recur, and, as we fear, in an aggravated form. But before we proceed we may be allowed a few remarks as to the duty of Christians in connexion with the approach of the “great day,” as

the same is explained by St. Paul in his two Epistles to the Thessalonians. In the first of these he counsels vigilance, because “the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.” But as these words led the Thessalonians to suppose that the Advent might be immediately expected, it induced a frame of mind so excited and so unhealthy that the Apostle deemed it needful to apply a corrective in a second letter. In this he announced certain events which – however we interpret them - must necessarily come to pass before men would be justified in regarding “the Day of Christ as at hand.” Now, paradoxical as it may sound, the conditions of the problem remain unchanged, although eighteen centuries have elapsed since they were promulgated by the great Apostle. The Advent is still future - and although we fully believe that our lot is cast in the last days of the present dispensation, and although this conviction cannot fail to solemnize our spirits and so lead us to sit more loosely to the things of time, - still, while certain events remain unfulfilled, we have no more right than the Thessalonians had to proclaim that the Lord is at the very door, and be consequently “troubled and shaken in mind.” What may be the nature of the events to which we refer we shall now proceed to show premising that they are one and all such as - at the rapid rate changes are now effected - demand no more than a few years for their accomplishment, and may therefore be expected to intervene without exposing those who take that view to the censure pronounced on all who say “The Lord delayeth His coming.”

We naturally turn to Mr. Elliott’s great work on the Apocalypse as the truest type of Protestant exposition and Protestant expectancy. No apology for doing so is due to Lord Shaftesbury, inasmuch as the work in question is dedicated to him, and he is doubtless perfectly familiar with its contents. Now, there are two chief way-marks by which we may hope to ascertain our position, viz., (1) the prophetic chronology, and (2) our present place in the Apocalyptic scheme. As to the first we will only observe that the close of the grand prophetic period of 1,260 years to which the dominion of the “Beast” is restricted, occurred precisely at the time so many among us expected, i.e. about A.D., 1864-1868. Since then we have been assured by Pio Nono, that “there are no Catholic princes left; while we learn on the same infallible authority that he himself has become a “captive.” The “kings of the earth,” therefore, who for so many ages “gave their kingdoms and power to the Beast” or “Whore,” have at length commenced to “hate her.” Rev. xvii. 16-17. But assuming, as we may safely do, that the 1,260 years expired at the time already named, there still remains - as is shown in the twelfth chapter of Daniel - a further period of seventy-five years, which no doubt mark out or comprise “the time of the end,” though we are left in uncertainty as to the precise date when the “end” itself may be. Then, again, as regards our position in the prophecy which, like the “roll” on which it is written, is being gradually unfolded. Here we find ourselves living under the seventh or last vial, Rev. xvi, 17-21, which includes the consummation, although the exact length of time its effusion may continue is not revealed. We do, however, know that we have already experienced the first shocks of the mighty political “earthquake” which it announces. We see also in rapid progress a tri-partition of the old Roman earth - answering to the clause which foretells its “division into three parts” \* see footnote. - and so soon as this remodelling of the map of Europe shall have been completed, the next stupendous event is the overthrow of “Great Babylon,” which thus at last “comes in remembrance before GOD.” But not a word is said of the destruction of the “Beast” in this catastrophe, he being reserved for a still more terrible judgment, when, with the countless Antichristian hosts, he will be “taken and cast alive into the lake of fire “ Rev. xix. 20 at the appearance of Him who is called “Faithful and True,” and who, as St. Paul clearly predicts, shall, after first, “consuming the Man of Sin with the breath of His mouth, destroy him by the brightness of His coming.” 2 Thess. ii. 8. Here, then, we have three events, each of them placed at some short, though uncertain, period, before the Advent, viz., (1) the tri-partition of Christendom; (2) the departure of Antichrist from his “seat” (θρονος) upon the “seven hills”; and (3) the perdition - no doubt by earthquake and fire - of the city so blasphemously styled “eternal.” But of these three events there is not one but may possibly be near at hand. As to the first - putting Russia aside, as having a distinct prophetic programme of her own - an alliance (already talked of) between Austria and Italy; the absorption of Belgium, either by Germany or France; and a league for mutual protection between France and her kinsmen in the Iberian peninsula, would complete a tri-partition such as the conditions of the seventh vial require. (2) As to the departure of the Pope from Rome, the papers tell us that such a step will be insisted on by the European powers unless (which is quite incredible) the next Pontiff consent to abandon the doctrine of infallibility, (3) In this eventuality, Rome, which in a sudden access of prosperity, seems destined to be speedily converted into a flourishing emporium of merchandise and pleasure, compare Rev. xviii. 8-19, must be prepared to meet her own peculiar and appalling doom. When the cry goes forth that this “is done,” those who are then alive will know that the “great judgment “cannot be far off. But there is yet another sign which must needs precede the Advent, and which - because the Apocalypse is a Gentile prophecy - is only incidentally mentioned in that wondrous book - we mean the partial restoration of the Jews (in an unconverted state) to Palestine. This

partial restoration - as give all the holy prophets witness - will excite the European powers to react the part of Pharaoh, and pursue after those whose departure they have previously abetted. Great sufferings in consequence to the poor Jews are clearly foretold, the same being only terminated by the coming "with power and great glory" of the Lord from Heaven for the conversion and deliverance of His ancient people, the destruction of all His enemies, and the giving reward to all His saints, some little time will, of course, be requisite for the Jews' return and settlement in Judea; but we, who have lately seen the completion of two tremendous wars - one in seven days, and the other in about as many months need not doubt that all will be readily effected by the mighty hand of God, who has declared that He "will make a short work" of what remains to be done at the close of the present age. But although there be enough even now to kindle our hopes, and prevent our entertaining the perilous thought that "our Lord delayeth His coming," we must not, on the other hand, be tempted to neglect our duties, or be soon shaken in mind, as if the Advent might be expected "to-morrow." - The Rock.

*\* In the text of the prophecy the word is "great city."*

---

## **THE FAST OF AB.**

Tuesday last, 10th August, 1875, the anniversary of the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, was celebrated by conservative Jews throughout the world as a day of mourning, for on that day the first temple was destroyed; and by a remarkable coincidence, on the 9th of Ab, the second temple was razed and burnt by the sacrilegious hand of Nebuchadnezzar. In subsequent centuries, on the 9th of Ab, Jerusalem, too, was totally destroyed by the savage hands of Titus. Half a century afterwards, on the same 9th of Ab, Bethar, the stronghold and place of refuge of the Jewish people, was stormed, and the blood of thousands failed to satisfy the inhuman vengeance of Hadrian.

The 9th of Ab has indeed been a gloomy period, and must ever form a dark and bloody page in Jewish history. No wonder that the day has been set apart, so that in humility, fasting, and prayer, they may, in the buildings erected to commune with their God, appear before Him, and in the mournful ritual of the day, accompanied by a devout feeling, beseech the Universal Father so to purify their hearts that, in the words of the last of the Prophets, "the offerings of Judah and Jerusalem shall be pleasant as in the days of old and as in former years." - Selected.

---

## **FRANCE - LIBERTY OF TEACHING.**

The cause of progress has lately sustained a defeat in France which the whole civilized world has occasion to deplore. The French legislature has conceded permission to dioceses, departments and communities - the Jewish included - to establish universities of their own, independent of the State, and even to confer degrees. It will appear strange that we should designate this freedom as a blow to the general cause of progress when the concession to all appearances is a victory obtained by liberalism over reaction. Yet under existing circumstances it was one of the most reactionary measures that could have been carried; the more dangerous because hypocritically it presents itself in the cloak of progress. It is the wolf which appears in sheep's clothing. Under a slight veneer of liberalism there is hidden a dark thick coating of poison and rottenness which will exhale pestilence and death. Who will, and who is, at the moment in the position of turning to an account this permission? The only body that has the wish, the means, and organization of availing itself of this boon are the Ultramontanes. They indeed resemble a well-equipped, drilled, and disciplined army amidst a population much more numerous it is true, and possessing in the aggregate much larger means, but without cohesion, without definite objects, without common leader, and scattered over a wide area. Resistance by individuals is useless. They are overpowered one by one. France will soon be covered by Ultramontane colleges as so many garrisons intent upon the general subjection of the population, until the rising generation shall have been broken in and familiarized with the new teaching, and by dint of habit, lost the faculty of perceiving the hideousness of the doctrines inculcated. And do our readers know what these doctrines will be? Let them read the Syllabus, the moral and religious code of Ultramontanism promulgated by Pius IX., superseding the

Gospels, and they will know them. Let them read this code and tremble for mankind's future religion and morals. Let them read this new evangel and shudder at the contemplation of the horrors which it will beget. Here are a few of the doctrines of the religion of the future which will be taught in the new colleges which like mushrooms will spring up overnight in all parts of France, will poison the atmosphere and spread around moral destruction and putrefaction. Anathematised he that says, "Everyone is at liberty to embrace and profess the religion which he deems the best by the aid of the light of his reason; that men may in any religion, find their way to everlasting salvation, and obtain it; that one may praise a Catholic country the law of which provides that strangers sojourning in it may enjoy the liberty of publicly practising their religious worship; that the Church (Catholic of course) has not the right to employ force; that the Church should be separated from the State, and the State from the Church; that in the case of a conflict between the laws emanating from these two authorities the civil law should prevail; that Catholics may approve a system of education outside the Catholic faith and the authority of the Church."

Woe, woe to mankind, and especially - woe to us Jews when the new Gospel shall have entered the bone and marrow of the people. Mediaeval night will again set in upon us. And France after all, unfortunately, is the heart of European intelligence. Germany may be more erudite, England may possess more intellect and more solidity, Italy more artistic taste, yet France after all is spiritually the most moveable of all European nations. It is their heart. Every one of its beats are felt throughout all their mental pulsations. Since the great French revolution there has not been a movement in France but its sound has re-echoed throughout the whole civilized world. Its whole mental circulation will go wrong when the heart beats irregularly. Meanwhile Paris, Orleans and Angiers are preparing to establish universities according to the heart of Pope Pius IX., who has congratulated Bishop Dupanloup on the success achieved by him. Cardinal Cullen, too, has issued a pastoral to the Catholics of the diocese of Dublin on the O'Connell Centenary in which he says: "Perseverance in asking for our rights will at length be crowned with success. Recent events in France should encourage us to persevere in looking for equality in educational matters. Our French brethren have lately gained a victory over a monopoly established nearly a century ago in favour of Freethinkers and Infidels, and have now a full right in higher Catholic schools and Catholic Universities," i.e., Ultramontane institutions.

- Jewish Chronicle, 13th August, 1875.

---

## INTELLIGENCE.

**ABERDEEN**, 14, Spring Bank Terrace, - Sept. 14th, 1875. - Dear Brother Turney, - I see by this month's Lamp, that Bro. Ellis had wrote to Aberdeen wishing to come through and deliver some lectures, but was pointedly denied the opportunity. It was a pity that we in George Street Hall did not know, else we would have endeavoured to embrace the privilege of a visit from a well tried Brother, although we are the small minority who were spoken of in this month's Christadelphian, in which it was stated that we went out upon the extreme views (of the New Birth); we emphatically deny the charge of going out upon any view of the subject whatever. I took exception to part of a lecture delivered by one of the Brethren, and he stopped away from the Meeting on that account. In consequence an evening was set apart to examine our difference, and the result was, that he and a few more stopped away. The chairman called on me to close that meeting with prayer, but he and another Bro, rose and went out. I was the only one that took exception to that part of his lecture, and I said I would stop away till we should settle our difference. So the result of my stopping away was their coming back to the meeting again. Then I asked if nothing could be done so that we could agree, and the small "minority" get back too, but a deputation of those who were the youngest in the Church was appointed to meet us; so we met, and they protested against having any more fellowship with us till we should change our mind. After laying that meeting before the Church the same was appointed to write a bill of excommunication to us; they did so, and sent it to us, and that is why we are separated. It was "The New Birth" that we differed upon. Marr stated that we are begotten, but not born, that we are in embryo, that we would not be born till the resurrection. I said if we are in embryo we are not responsible, but we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, "Born of water and Spirit." I cannot persuade myself that these are two births, but two agents in one birth, for Jesus says "The Spirit breathes where it willeth, and thou nearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit." "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness." Water will not make any one meet for the Kingdom of God; if we are not children of the Spirit, we are not children of

God at all. Where there is division and strife, there is confusion and every evil work. I do not think any good will result from publishing our difference; if I thought so I would write at length. We would not be afraid to hear any of you should you see your way to pay us a visit. – Yours affectionately, JOHN MITCHELL.

**ABERGAVERY.** - Tytan Villa, 12th September, 1875. - Dear Brother: The public mind here is at the present time considerably agitated through the circulation of our “Heretical Words” and “Orthodoxy,” (so called) in a flutter, because (as their leaders say) of the arrival of a New Sect in the town, who are trying to lead people astray. We should very much like a lecture in the Corn Exchange, which will hold about three hundred people, if you feel equal to it, but not otherwise. The Town Hall is very large, but if I could see any probability of a large audience I would willingly secure it for the occasion. - Believe me to remain, yours in the Faith, WM. BEDDOES

**BIRMINGHAM,** Sept. 13th, 1875. -- Dear Bro. Turney, - I have to report that we are still working away in order to accomplish the liberation of some of our fellow creatures from their death-stricken condition, to a hope of life through Jesus the Christ; but at present we have no case of obedience to the faith to report. The lectures given the last month were the following: -August 22, “The Atonement,” Bro. F. N. Turney; August 29, “The Kingdom of God” (Daniel vii. 14), Bro Ellis; Sept. 5, “The Resurrection of the Dead.” Bro. Ellis; Sept. 12, “The Second coming of Christ – the Christian Hope,” Henry Turner. The lectures have not been so well attended lately, but are now showing signs of improvement. P.S. - We wish it to be understood that we do not fellowship Mr. James Beddoes, of Sparchford, Salop. - Yours fraternally, CHARLES JENNINGS.

**COATBRIDGE.** - Brother E. Russell informs us that through the study of the lecture on the “Sacrifice of Christ,” several persons have been led to embrace the ideas therein taught and to join themselves to the Church in Coatbridge, and it is expected that several others will soon follow their example. The names mentioned by Brother Russell, are James and Mrs. Peticrue, Goare Allin, and Mrs. Allin. Mrs. Peticrue is spoken of as an earnest worker. Brother Russell also mentions that in the interviews the Brethren have had, with certain others, their tone and manner have exemplified the old Pharasaic spirit, - “stand back for I am holier than thou.” Brethren from a distance sometimes come to the Coatbridge meetings, which is described as having a good understanding and a proper disposition. We hope all this will increase and abound.

**EDINBURGH.** - Dear Brothers, There is not much to report from this place. Zeal for the truth is a thing much wanted everywhere, but especially is it wanted here. There is, moreover, so much disorganization in the camp that I am unable to find any quarters where the true term brethren may be applied to persons having on “the whole armour of God.” I have had some conversation with a few whom we used to know as brethren, but nothing of a very interesting nature has transpired. Our mutual friend, Mr. Mewhort, who so vigorously defended the Unitarians last year in a letter addressed to myself, to which I replied, and which you published in the Lamp, has abandoned the “Unitarian” position, and is now fighting in a small way with Bradlaugh; he has already published a “recantation” of Christadelphianism, together with some facts, which some weak-minded persons might think damaging against the authenticity of the Bible. I interrogated him on several points, such as “do you now think you have an immortal soul?” to which he replied he “did not know:” “do you think you will go to heaven when you die?” I am not sure about it,” was his answer: “do you think a future life possible for man?” said he, “it may be, but no one can possibly tell anything about it.” There is one thing in his favour: viz., he is not a stand-still sort of man, and he may yet come to know and believe what has been so graciously revealed. I believe he is honest, and, should the truth lay hold of him, he would have moral courage to confess it.

I hope before your next issue, to have visited brethren in other places, and furnish you with the facts relating thereto. - J. M.

**MUMBLES,** Sept. 13th, 1875 – Dear Bro. Turney, - I am happy to say that the good work of the Deity is widening and deepening amongst us gradually. Our congregation are improving a little, we have some few interested in the good things promised by the Deity. Since I last wrote to you we have spent a few days, including one Sunday, at Llanmadock and the neighbourhood; we found Sister Jennings making a fearless confession of her faith in the promises of God. There are a few in this dark corner of the earth deeply interested in the things of the kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ. We hope to have the pleasure of recording next month the obedience of one from this neighbourhood. Upon the whole I am very much pleased with the meeting in America, and, in my judgment, it is another blow to that blasphemous doctrine that continues to proceed from the Satan. We must labour unitedly with tongue and pen for the downfall and destruction of all error, and God will own and bless our labours. - I remain, yours in hope of the speedy appearing of the Christ, the King of Israel, - WM. CLEMENT.

**NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.** - Dear Brother: We touched at this place on our way north. We met the "few" brethren, who are the "lightstands" of Newcastle in the Scriptural sense. I am happy to inform you that as far as possible, they let their "light shine," and do their best in propagating the one everlasting Gospel. We have only a short stay, but we have partially arranged for the delivery of a course of lectures on our return journey. It is thought that the Jarrow and the Newcastle brethren will join, as they did last year, and arrange for lectures in each town. You shall hear in due course. Great interest was awakened last year in both towns, and although they have had a good season for slumbering, we hope to "revive" it again, but we are very conscious that the "revival" of truth is far harder than the "revival" of error. - J. M.

**NOTTINGHAM.** - The annual meeting of the Ecclesia was held on Monday, September 6th. Tea was provided as usual, and 76 sat down to well provided tables laid out in the school-room. After the tea was disposed of, the Brethren and Sisters adjourned to the upper room, where the business part of the meeting was conducted, about 90 being present. The financial statement for the year was read by the Secretary, and the accounts passed. Some of the presiding Brethren retiring by rotation were re-elected, and it was agreed that another census should be taken, the last dating as far back as May 1873. There have been many changes during the interval. The increase of members for the past year has been 33, the Ecclesia at the present time numbering 169, the additions being almost exclusively by immersion, and not by removal from other places. Some few have been lost by change of residence, and three have died. Sickness has prevailed among the Brethren and Sisters to a considerable extent, but just now there is a decided change for the better in this respect, only one very serious case remaining. Time failing for the full discussion of all the propositions laid before the meeting by the Chairman, some two or three matters were adjourned for a week. The Sunday evening lectures have been continued as usual; August. 22nd, Bro. Turney gave his second lecture on "Religious teaching in Sunday schools;" and on the 29th he delivered an "Exposition of Christadelphian Doctrines," which was very numerously attended, and excited a good deal of interest. On Sunday September 5th, Bro. Richmond took for his subject "The City of the Great King," and on the 12th, Bro. Hayes gave an address on the "Resurrection of the Jews." The open air meetings on the Forest, and the Mansfield Road have been steadily persevered in with the result of drawing together considerable numbers, and exciting a good deal of discussion. The last Essay read at the Wednesday night Bible Class was by Bro. Severn, on John xiv. 2, "In My Father's house are many Mansions." For some weeks previously the Brethren had been engaged in the critical examination of Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

**TRANENT, N. B.** - Dear Brother: We had occasion to visit this place last week; we called to see Bro. Cornwall, and found him in the midst of business, and, therefore, our opportunities for talking over matters pertaining to the Truth" were not as we could have wished. It is well known to your readers that in Tranent there are a goodly number of brethren, and, it is thought by persons well up in Christadelphian history, that the Tranent brethren have always held that Christ was free from sin and sinners, and in consequence, were treated somewhat suspiciously by those who say sin was an element of His nature." Having been told by a brother in Edinburgh that the Tranent brethren had not been "excommunicated" but were still under the wings of the "Protector," I was curious to ask Bro. Cornwall whether the brethren were united in their view of the sinlessness of Christ. His ready answer, was, "O yes"; that is, said I, you all take Bro. Turney's view of the matter, "O, I think so," was his reply, "but we strive to avoid party feeling." My reply was, it is not partisans we want, or that Christ wants, but men and women who know and love the Truth concerning Himself. - J. M.

## FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

**BUFFALO, N. Y.** - I have the pleasure to announce to you that on Sunday last we had another addition to our Ecclesia in the person of Mrs. Beattie, wife of Bro. Beattie, (formerly neutral); she has been attending our meetings for some time, and was fully convinced that we had "The Truth," and that without immersion in water it was impossible to get into the family of Christ. It gives us great pleasure to see our numbers increasing; we have now fifteen in all, and expect another addition shortly. -- Yours in behalf of the Brethren in the one hope, - Jos. W. OAKLEY. - [The above is encouraging. Steady perseverance will not go unrewarded. We have a lengthy letter on the signs of the times from Brother James Elliot, and some questions. The answers to these will be found in another part of our impression. ED.]

**QUEENSVILLE, CANADA.** - I am pleased that you continue in so excellent a manner the publication of the Lamp. I hope that you will be able by the power of reason and testimony, and the Spirit you send forth, to unite the honest hearted believers of the Gospel of the kingdom in brotherly love, who have been set at variance through the unwise course of the Christadelphian. This paper professing by name to be a Brother of Christ, (?) is of arrogant, if not, blasphemous character, in assuming that the Christ, and his

brethren taught the separation of those of kindred faith, by the precepts and example of its own misrepresentation. A feeling of indignation, sooner or later, is the result of such proceedings. All who love righteousness, may find in the precepts of the Word a deliverance from such fleshly works. -

P. DE GEER.

[Our object is to unite all of like precious faith, whose sole desire is to adorn the doctrine of the Saviour in all things. But we are much discouraged in this respect when we see leaders professing to be so highly spiritual, while their every speech to those from whom they differ on some matter of doctrine, prove that "the poison of asps is under their lips." ED.]

**MILWAUKEE.** - Letters from this place show that the truth of the Gospel is highly appreciated, and that the Brethren are cultivating, under the wise counsel of Bro. Harper, a spirit of investigation and charity. They are not unmindful that while knowledge sometimes "puffs up," charity always "builds up." Bro. Harper remarks that while he would by no means cease to search the Word, digging out all the fresh ideas possible, and proving them from the general scope of the Scriptures, he would not impose on others for faith all and every result arrived at. There is a manifest desire for more harmony; for peace in the knowledge of the real principles of the Word, instead of cavil and debate over matters of detail. This is a good and healthy sign.

**HAMILTON,** - Assisted by the untiring zeal of Bro. Powell, the brethren are doing their best in their new place of meeting, mentioned in a previous number of the Lamp, to inform their neighbours and fellow citizens what is the apostolic Gospel. No greater contrast in religion could hardly have occurred than that between the noisy traditionary harangues of the former occupants of the building, and the quiet but spirited reasoning out of Moses, the prophets and apostles, of its present tenants. We sincerely trust that the present labour may not be in vain, but that many will be added who will not only increase the numerical force of the body, but be to it a source of real strength for the further prosecution of the good work. Times are hard with our Canadian brethren; many are out of employ. Their diligence exhibited in adversity will doubtless not grow slack when the clouds roll away and the sun shines out afresh.

**ELIZABETH, NEW JERSEY.** - [The following message is indicative of the feeling of the Church towards us and our work. ED.] - Dear Brethren. - "Grace be with you and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ." I sympathize with you in your labour and zeal for the truth, "in due season you will reap, if you faint not," - "therefore be not weary in well doing." The Christian Lamp comes to hand regularly, am much pleased with the spirit of it, also its change of name, as its present title is more appropriate and better understood. The variety of choice matter is read with interest and profit. You show liberality without compromise. Truth has nothing to fear in comparison with error. Every Brother has his own peculiar way of expressing the truth, but let all express the same as near as possible in Bible language and then we shall all speak the same thing. Persons may speculate on what might or what might not be, if certain things had not taken place, but certain things have happened, and we have to do with the situation as we find it. What difference does it make to us whether Adam was mortal or immortal, previous to his sinning; it is none of our business what might have been the result if he had not sinned. It does not belong to us to create difficulties out of our own fleshly thinkings; we know that sin has entered our world and brought forth death with all its attendant evils, and now the question arises what is to be done in such a case; infinite wisdom immediately devises a plan for the taking away the sin of the world and the curing of all its evils. For the development of this plan, the mission of Christ (the second Adam) is brought into view, and of which you have so fully elaborated in your paper. In order to condemn sin in the flesh by becoming obedient unto death, it was necessary for him to be sent in the likeness of sin's flesh; all must agree on this point. If death had a legitimate claim upon Him there could have been no obedience in the matter. We ought not to speculate as to what might have been the result had Jesus done otherwise than He did in laying down His life according to the prophetic Scriptures. His heavenly origin, taken in connection with His being made of a woman, is a sufficient reason to prevent all such foolish speculations: hence arises the difficulty, the disagreement, the misunderstanding among the Brethren on this subject. It is this contemplating the relation that death might have sustained to the Christ; apart from His Mission which, has created a breach in the body, when it ought not to have existed. When taking a proper view of this subject, there is not that difference among us that at first sight would appear. Having read thoroughly both sides of the question, I find the writers (oftener than otherwise) speak the same thing; a little more love and forbearance will cause both sides to converge more and more until they come together and meet on common ground. I cannot do better here than refer you to the letter of Bro. Charles Reid, on page 280 of the April No. of The Lamp. This letter in my estimation contains the pith of the whole matter, it enters into the merits of the case, and is so in harmony with my own mind that I cannot forbear mentioning the same and recommending its re-perusal. God's purposes must always be considered in connection with His revealed plan - he needs none of our suggestions. Those parts of the great programme that have already

transpired were all pre-arranged - no haphazard work about it, and He knows what remains to be done and how He is going to do it - we may not fully understand the “whys,” and “wherefores,” but we know the end will be accomplished according to the counsel of His own will, and then the result - O how glorious, the will of God done upon earth as it is done in heaven. The shout of the heavenly host will be repeated, if possible with greater emphasis - “Glory to God in the highest heavens on earth peace and good will to men.” The realization of these gracious promises will cause the “heavens to rejoice and the earth to be glad;” yes, rulers and ruled will unite their voices together in shouting, “Allelujah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” If Paul could not fully understand all the mysteries in bringing about this grand crowning consummation, surely we who are uninspired cannot expect to be much wiser, but we can admire and exclaim in his language, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His counsellor. Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed to Him again? For of Him and through Him, and for Him are all things, to Him be the glory for the ages.” Amen. Yours in hope of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. JOHN A. WOODRUFF.

-----

## **BRO. SWINDEL AND THE EDITOR OF THE “CHRISTADELPHIAN.”**

To the Editor of the Christian Lamp: Dear Brother, - My attention has been drawn to a note on the cover of this month’s Christadelphian, addressed to S. C. I should not have thought it worthwhile to notice this statement, but for the word inserted in brackets. Those who know me, know that it would be impossible for me to intentionally misrepresent anybody, or to “misrepresent facts to the (intended) detriment of those concerned.” The man who could do this could only be properly described by two of the ugliest words in the English language, and that the Editor of the Christadelphian can thus brand one who differs from him only shows how unscrupulous he is in carrying out his own ends. Faithfully yours, THOS. S. SWINDEL. Sept. 14th, 1875.