

ANGELS AND DEVILS,

No 5

WHAT, AND WHERE ARE THEY?

SPIRITUALISM, MATERIALISM,

AND

THE ATONEMENT,

RATIONALLY CONSIDERED.

BY W. COUCHMAN, TYNEMOUTH.

This 2nd and new edition has been carefully revised and rearranged, and I have no doubt will be appreciated and I hope at the same time it may be *useful* in removing many grave errors that have crept in in this age of Scepticism and Materialism.

In adding the all important and misunderstood doctrine of the ATONEMENT my object has been to *divest* it from the Dogmas and Creeds of MEN, and to base it on more Scriptural and rational grounds, and especially to *defend* our all wise, good and Heavenly Father from the *unjust* and illogical imputations cast upon Him, in those *Dogmas and Creeds*. If I have succeeded in placing the great I AM in His true character before my readers, my efforts and life will not have been spent in vain.

Price One Penny. 6s. per 100,

TO BE HAD WHOLESALE:

LONDON: GUEST & Co., PATERNOSTER ROW; H. VICKERS & Co.,
317, STRAND.

MANCHESTER: J. HEYWOOD.

NEWCASTLE: ROSS, SIDE; FRANCE, SIDE; ALLAN DEAN ST.

EVERATT, NEWGATE STREET.

SUNDERLAND: WILLIAMS.

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS AND NEWS AGENTS,

ANGELS AND DEVILS,

WHAT, AND WHERE ARE THEY?

SPIRITUALISM, MATERIALISM

AND

THE ATONEMENT.

RATIONALLY CONSIDERED.

ANGELS.—If I do not wrong the orthodox belief it identifies heaven with the sky, or with some star or stars in it, or else with this earth regenerated. Is the world to come a sublimated form of matter merely? or is the materialistic idea not a huge mistake? We believe it to be so. It is my faith that there are two worlds, distinct from each other, just as the Apostle tells us there are two sorts of bodies, distinct yet intimately united, and in every particular corresponding each to each—the natural (or material) and the spiritual. These are the two sides or phases of the one great whole of being—the two great spheres in which life is manifested. Material properties are not spiritual properties, nor *vice-versa*; the properties of matter are subject to material laws; the properties of spirit to spiritual laws. This of course means two distinct substances—spiritual and material—and if any body would wish to question this statement by asking what *spiritual* substance is, I should beg him first of all to be sure that he knows and can tell me what sort of thing *material substance* is. But I am not now on the defensive; I wish to tell you what I believe; and it is this element of what I conceive to be truth in my belief which makes it imperative that I should do my best to impart what I know to you. If man has a soul, it is tolerably manifest that its substance is not of the same kind as the substance of the body. The soul thinks; the soul feels; the soul determines and acts: the body does none of these, but as to the last is acted *through*, and is the soul's instrument.

The body then is material; the soul is immaterial. The qualities spoken of above cannot exist simply as *abstractions*; they are the qualities of that immaterial substance called soul or spirit, of which the Apostle speaks when he tells us "*There is a spiritual body and there is a natural body*"; and that spiritual substance will endure for ever, though the material body has returned to its dust. Where shall it go to? It will go into a world like itself—a spiritual world. And this spiritual world, where is that? It is just *where the soul is now*. How could a material body live out of a material world? you see it could not. How then could a spiritual body live out of a spiritual world? again we see and say it could not. The spiritual world is where the soul is for the simple reason

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF VICTORIA

that *the soul lives in it*. Death is but the ceasing to be conscious of the material side and the becoming conscious of the spiritual side of the two-fold sphere of life.

Having been always in that spiritual world we need no other introduction to it than the consciousness of it. We do not need to go away to a distance, for it is here. We do not need to be introduced to it by a new body (*so called* spiritual), or to wait till this old one has been dressed up again, seeing, as Paul says "flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." We need but *to be ourselves*, and to be what we are now, for "as death leaves us so judgment finds us." We need but *to be ourselves* and to be what we are now, but this more truly and fully by the *absence* of that element which cannot enter there.

To be in *heaven* we need only to be *in ourselves*, for "*the kingdom of God is within you*." The soul is within the sphere of the spiritual world whether of heaven or of hell, as the body is within the sphere of the natural. The spiritual world is within us and its character is our character: bad if we are bad, and hence called hell; good if we are good, and hence called heaven.

Who then are angels but good men? even as evil men are devils. Where have they come from but from all the good of this earth? Where are they now, but enjoying in that blessed state called heaven, the development of that character for goodness here established within them? Is there then no place called heaven? That place is the spiritual world the counterpart and correspondent of this natural, and everywhere encircling it; but that which gives character to the place and *makes* it heaven is the angel nature developed within us, just as hell is the devil nature we freely choose to assume. But is Heaven not a place in which the angels were created such, and where they dwelt in happiness from long ages ago before man began to be? There were no angels created such—

"Angels are men in lighter habit clad?"

And men are angels loaded for an hour."

The idea of separate angels is as baseless as that of their fall from Heaven to Hell. Let me prove from Scripture that angels are men. We assert that when angels are spoken of in Scripture as appearing *they are always called men*.

Three angels appeared to Abraham, and it is written "and lo, three *men* stood by him." Two of them went to Sodom, and the people said to Lot, "where are the *men* that came unto thee last night?" Lot said unto them, "only to these *men* do nothing," and the inspired historian himself gives them the same title. Of the angel who wrestled with Jacob, it is said, "there wrestled a *man* with him." At Jericho Joshua "lifted up his eyes, and behold there stood a *man* over against him with a drawn sword in his hand," who said that he was "the captain of the host of the Lord." Manoah's wife said "a *man* of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God;" and again she says, "Behold the *man* hath appeared unto me that came unto me the other day. And Manoah arose, and went after his wife, and came to the *man* and said unto him, 'art thou the *man* that spakest to the woman?' And he said 'I am.'" The angel who showed Ezekiel the measurement of the temple was "a *man* whose appearance was like the appearance of brass." The angel Gabriel himself is called "the *man*

Gabriel." Zachariah saw "a man riding upon a red horse, who is called the angel of the Lord." The women at the sepulchre saw "a young man sitting;" we read also in Luke "two men stood by them in shining garments;" and John calls them "two angels in white." In Revelations we have a summary statement of the truth in an *identification* of man and angels, for we read that the angel who measured the wall of the New Jerusalem found it "a hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man that is an angel."

Here is a line of light on this subject running from one end of Scripture to the other.

It would be superfluous to add one word of comment on these passages; they speak for themselves, because they declare the truth in simple unaffected language.

But surely there are passages which distinctly teach us that angels are a higher race than men? There are no such passages, strange as it may seem. This fiction like many other of man's invention, is without foundation in Scripture.

If any one thinks that the statement, that the devil was a "murderer from the beginning" proves it, will he tell us whether he thinks the devil was a murderer in heaven; seeing that *that* was his true beginning, according to this theory? And this is positively *the proof* that there were angels before men! Well may such ideas and teachings produce sceptics, materialists, and unbelievers!

DEVILS.—The common notion is that devils were once angels in Heaven, who, on account of their transgressions, were cast down to hell—hell being a place where those evil angels now are, and to which evil men from this world have to be sent; the whole ruled by a supreme devil called Satan. This is vulgarly supposed to be the Scripture account of the matter.

The passages relied on to prove this position are these:—Jude viii.—"And the angels which kept not their *first estate* (principlity), but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." 2 Peter ii. 2.—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains and darkness to be reserved unto judgment," &c. In both cases the Apostles do not make explicit statements of fact for the sake of teaching these facts, but incidentally refer to something well known to their readers in order to draw a conclusion of warning from them.

Where then did the Apostles and their readers get this information about the angels that sinned? The answer is direct and simple—from a book known to exist in the early church, called the Book of Enoch—a book quoted by Jude a little farther on. This Book of Enoch was discovered in part about 300 years ago, and more recently in full by Bruce, the Abyssinian traveller, has been translated into English by Dr. Lawrence, and contains a pretended account of the angels that sinned, mentioning the exact circumstances repeated by Jude and Peter. What is this book? an apocryphal fabrication. And this is the origin of the orthodox belief in the fall of angels. Account on what theory we like for Jude and Peter

quoting this writer, there the fact stands that they *did* quote him, and further, his book was well known to the early christian church. After this nothing need be said; nor are there any other passages of sufficient importance to claim our attention as to the general idea of angels falling from Heaven. But about the other part of the matter—the notion of a supreme devil or Satan.

We are, of course, perfectly aware that the Devil is referred to in the Scripture under the personal pronoun *he*; but we are by no means inclined to be saddled with difficulties which the interpretation implying his personality brings with it. Is he omnipresent? The common belief implies something which certainly is not to be distinguished from it. What definite place are we to assign to him? It is answered, "you are to accept what is told about him in Scripture." Very well; it is presumed we are to accept what is told about Judas too, for we read that the Lord called him *a devil*. It would appear, therefore, that there are more devils than one, and that these devils are men!—unless the Lord was guilty only of a metaphor. And if the account of them falling from Heaven is not true (as we have shown that it is not), it is difficult to see what more likely place they can come from than the earth. In fact, the whole matter becomes at once clear, when we recognise that the quality of *evil* makes a devil in whatever nature it lodges—that men are devils or angels as they have or have not this quality within them—that Heaven and Hell are peopled, as they from the beginning have been peopled, from this earth—and that every devil in Hell now is not only such according to the amount of evil in him, but was once a man on the earth, with an evil nature, and living an evil life, even as some of us do to-day. In this view of the matter we have not far to look for Hell, then; no further than to look for the kingdom of heaven,—“within you.”

Why then is the devil spoken of *apparently* as a person in Scripture? Because in *no* other way could the force and certainty of the *principle of evil* in its destructive action be popularly shown; nor the aggregate power of hellish influence of the multitude of individual devils as active on earth be more emphatically taught and demonstrated.

From the above line of thought a conclusion comes clearly, *viz.*, that Hell like Heaven (as we have seen), is a state as well as a place—a place *because* a state—a state *first*, a place afterwards. In a word, *a state of evil among men, whether on earth or in the spiritual world, is Hell*, the one being but a continuation of the other.

There are devils, then, wherever there are men. Many a man has spoken the truth without knowing it, when in wrath he has called his fellow a devil, or when in sober statement he so characterized his badness. There are devils on earth, or there could not be devils in Hell, and therefore no Hell for them to be in. The Hell is in themselves: they change their place but do not change their nature.

What then is the distinguishing feature of this devilry? How do we recognize it? By its denial of God and its love of self. Wherever this love of self is the central love of the soul, there is the devil nature. It was the choice of this *self*, as man's chief good, which constituted his fall. This was that *true* forbidden fruit, “whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe.” Surely a much more likely and *rational*

cause than any paltry apple or its eating, however tempting or tasteful. Let us grasp and see the inner and *spiritual*, and true meaning of this divine allegory. Either the whole garden of Eden, with its tree of the *knowledge of good and evil* (whoever saw such a *tree*?) and its tree of life—either we say, all this is symbolic of some spiritual truth, and therefore worthy of our acceptance, or it is a false statement of man's history and fall, and not possible of any condition that man was ever in. No! Man's belief of himself as God to himself is that *evil knowledge* of which he began to partake when he fell into the pit of self-love. Man fell *here*—here on earth, and here he continues to exist, a fallen angel; and this love of self is now the life of that fallen being, the central feature of that angel which has become a devil; and a reflection of this truth it is which lies at the root of all theories about the fall of good spirits from Heaven.

On earth we must look for the original home and the seat of the devils' kingdom—on earth, in men's hearts. And surely we have not far to look. It is not necessary to pile fact upon fact as they appear from day to day in the columns of our journals to prove this. Do we not know only too well how much the world at this day is open to every form of devilry? We need not detail the black catalogue of actual and possible evils of which it ever is, or at any moment may be, the dreadful scene. Patent to the eyes of every man they are,—even to those of the men or devils who perpetrate them.

But are there no specific exciting causes of these abounding evils, which specially demand our attention? Surely, if we know and see the effects, the causes are not far from our reach. No doubt it is the human "heart" itself that is "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." The root of the evil without question lies there. But is there no other *exciting cause or occasion*. Many a man that has turned out a devil might have remained as nature made him, if it was not for that stimulant to evil—*strong drink*. England spent in one year *two millions only* for all useful and *philanthropic objects*, and she spent *one hundred and thirty millions upon intoxicating drink*; and this in what is called a *christian country*. God have mercy on a worse one!

And do these things not concern us as a nation? Does this great exciting cause of *devilhood* not call loudly to us to regard it among the *chief agents*, if not the very chief agent, of the devil in the world? Some there are who cannot but in fairness acknowledge these things, but who ask in turn—"What is to be done?" It is not for me here to propound a remedy for the greatest question of the time, other than to draw respectful attention to what some *are doing* and think should be done, and are working to see affected; but it is here my duty to remind my readers that while this world is an incipient and actual hell, peopled with its *real devils*, in human forms, not the least among the producing causes of this kingdom of darkness is the *perversion* of the good and wholesome and life-giving fruits and food of the earth into a fiery drink, which changes the "human form divine" into a demon likeness. If the language is strong the *truth* is stronger.

SPIRITUALISM.—It may be as well here before passing on to the consideration of materialism, to notice in brief the relation of the spiritual

world to the material, with an especial reference to the spiritualism of the present day. When man's distinct spiritual substance or soul quits the body it finds itself in a world which is to all intents and purposes the counterpart of this, with the difference that that world's substance is not material but spiritual, like the soul which has come to inhabit it. That soul has nothing to do with matter any more, for it carries all its powers with it. It is now, and will continue, a full man, having all the powers of a man—a *spiritual body* with *senses* and all bodily parts, just as a man in the world has them. The spirit is in fact a *man* in the fullest sense. This means of course that he is the same *social* being as when on earth. Companionship is still necessary to him; this therefore he has in those who have "gone over to the majority" before him. But are there any others of whom he knows anything? Why not? Are not we here on earth all spirits too? Are we therefore not visible to him? Certainly! Not as Dick, Tom, and Harry—not seen in our *bodies*, for he has no eyes wherewith to see these. Material bodies are only cognisable by material senses; and *these* he has not, for he left them behind in the death chamber. What he sees, then, is that which is cognisable by such senses as he has, viz., spiritual. He sees all that is spiritual, either in the other life or in this. But again, can he communicate with us? Why not, if he finds us open and disposed to communicate with him? The want of reciprocal *capacity* can be the only barrier—from whatever cause that want may arise. So far then we hold spiritualism to be easy of solution.

The question now to be answered is this. Granting, which we do, that spiritual communications can be made, subject to the conditions already stated, what *CLASS* of spirits would be willing to communicate with men? Is there any reason to believe that good spirits would not do it, and that the agents of such communications are evil spirits who *personate* the spirit visitant when they desire to commune with man? That such personation is very simple may appear to us when we recall the fact of the power of spirits near us in the other life to see our spiritual state, which in plain language means, to know our thoughts. Why should not *good* spirits communicate with men to-day? Because the laws of life are not retrogressive! And the progress is from here to yonder, and not backwards—*except*, and the exception explains the whole,—*except* the Lord has a special message to deliver for some end; and then, the Sender of that message is the Lord, and no one else.

If, then, the Word of God be in fact what it professes in name to be, it is surely more rational, and of more importance to us for our consolation and comfort, to accept it as the only true, because truth-giving *medium* between God and His creatures, than the antics of some fantastic spirits, who knock on tables, play tambourines, &c., who, in a word, perform *no real use*, and in their communications, such as they are, make known to us only that which is already present in our minds.

Perhaps, before passing on, I ought to say that there appears to me to be one redeeming quality in Spiritualism. I am told it is the means of turning sceptics to the acknowledgment of a future state. If so I am bound to accept so much good done. Thus setting ourselves right with this phenomenon we pass on to

MATERIALISM.—Is creation one vast confusion, or is it the creation of *order*? To this there can be but one answer, for “order is Heaven’s first law.” That order, as all order I take it, implies degrees and stages of arrangement. Again have we not implied a first and last—a beginning and an ultimate? This too is a necessity of order. We conclude that in creation there is a beginning and an end, a first and a last, a vast and perfect series of degrees and stages.

Who, and what are the first, and who, and what are the last in that perfect order we call creation? The first in creation must be that nature or degree of life, which is nearest to the creator Himself—the spiritual; the last must be the most remote, in the nature of its life, from Him—the natural or material. Just then, as in nature there is a vast series of degrees of different forms of life, so we should expect likewise in regard to the spiritual world; and of this we may be assured when we glance at the nature of man. The different forms or degrees of the spiritual is the *first* in created order; the different forms or degrees of the natural the *last* in created order; and together they form the whole series we call creation.

It would seem to follow from this, that the last in order should be the basis of the first—that on which it rests; that the natural world, in a word, is the basis of the spiritual or *supernatural*. We have an illustration and proof of this fact at hand in the twofold nature of man. Here the spiritual or highest, or first, has for its basis the bodily, or lowest, or last; and man we know to be an epitome of nature—the microcosm or little world, the reflection of the macrocosm or great world of creation. The material frame work of nature is thus the grand basis and foundation of the universal spiritual world—that in which the spiritual sphere *ultimates* itself (if the word may be pardoned) even as man’s spirit *ultimates* itself in the body. In either case, the *ultimation* is necessary to its existence, or manifestation. The soul of man, then, in order to be brought into manifestation, assumes, and must assume, a *physical basis* as the means by which its powers assume a fixed existence. The spiritual world terminates in the world of nature; the soul of man terminates in his body. This is its fixed limit, and to that limit or boundary it must pass; in other words, *within* that limit it must begin to be in order to be developed upward from thence. He is born here that he may become capable of living elsewhere, or of living at all. Can you collect water but in a vessel? Neither can you organize life but in the *lowest form first*, that from that lowest it may develop upwards. All things must begin from their lowest, to be at all; and for this reason it is that man assumes first a material body.

It will be at once argued that, in this case, what he assumes he must keep if it be a part of himself. But here is just the mistake; the body that he assumes is not part of himself, it is merely the *instrument* of that self, the means of that self’s development, the sphere in which that self or soul comes into its highest capacities of life. Does the butterfly reassume the slough it has set aside? You must collect water in a vessel, as we have said, if you would collect it at all, but when that water becomes ice you can break the pitcher and remove the water bodily, which, in a suitable atmosphere, will remain as it is. What is the body then but t

necessary condition of the soul's formation into a state of development in which it is capable of remaining, and thence of manifesting itself in a suitable sphere—a sphere akin to its own nature; and thus, while “the body returns to dust as it was,” the soul's progress from this world to the world unseen is the “return of the spirit to God who gave it.”

This *return*, also,—is it not conformable to order? If life begins always and necessarily at its lowest possible point; wherein can progress lie, but in its return by way of development towards the original *source* of its existence? Order, then, means and is, a descent of life from God by influx to the ultimate or lowest possible point or *state*; and *ascent* thence by way of development, in and through the conditions by which it is surrounded, perfecting itself as it progresses, casting off garments that it has out-worn, and re-appearing in higher states, till either its existence is terminated, or, as in the case of man, it receives new faculties within and without for continuous upward growth in life unending.

Creation, it thus becomes clear to us is a grand scene of perfect order and arrangement.

ATONEMENT.—This doctrine as taught by the creeds is a most fearful and fatal mistake. It is a “house built on the sand” and was not known in the apostolic age. Let me prove this by quotations from a few of the christian writers.

Clement, bishop of Rome, in the first century writes: “Let us steadfastly behold the blood of Christ and see how precious it is in the sight of God, which being shed for our salvation hath procured the grace of *repentance* for all the world.” Here we see that the blood of Christ was precious in the sight of God, not because He was a *substitute* suffering the penalty due to the sins of man but because he was a *saviour*, who procured for man the ability to overcome sin. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons (A.D. 202), taught “that the Devil had beguiled man into his power. It was necessary that he should be redeemed from the power of this mighty prince by the death of Christ and thus it was to him—the Devil—to whom the atonement should be made.” Origen taught a modification of the same doctrine. Hence it is certain that the now popular idea that satisfaction was to be made to God must have been unknown in those early times. And in fact the doctrine of Irenæus was but the beginning of those abominations which culminated on the one hand in the absurd and blasphemous dogma of Papal Infallibility, and on the other in the equally unreasonable, and unscriptural heresy of salvation by Faith alone. Arius styled Christ “the most noble thing created but inferior to God.” To put down this heresy the Council of Nice was called by the Emperor Constantine (A. D. 325), whence emanated the Nicene Creed, which is full of contradictions.

About the sixth century the supposed Athanasian Creed was written by no one knows who, which, by ascribing tripersonality to God, afforded a basis for the doctrine of substitution, and about which (especially as to its damnatory clauses) the so called *orthodox* church is contending at the present day.

But a climax was reached in the eleventh century when Archbishop Anselm wrote a book entitled “*Our Deus Homo*,” in which he propound-

ed the blasphemous doctrine that because Adam fell all his posterity are guilty and it was necessary for Christ to die as their substitute, which is not only derogatory to man, but is alike opposed to reason, scripture, and the justice and goodness of God. It is nowhere taught in scripture that God will not pardon the sinner until someone else has been punished in his stead. Read the parable of the prodigal son and learn thence the Lord's own teaching on this matter, and consider how in the Lord's Prayer we are taught to expect a *free* forgiveness as we are willing ourselves to forgive *freely*. Man surely is not expected to be more perfect than his God. The true doctrine of the word of God therefore is "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father; neither shall the Father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (EZEK. xviii. 20.)

Thus the doctrine of substitution as commonly taught is founded first on a wrong idea of the Divine Personality; and secondly on a false conception of the Divine Character. If therefore I prove from scripture and reason that God is *One* in *essence* and in *person* then this doctrine falls to the ground.

The old Testament scriptures constantly affirm that God is one and as constantly declare that this one Jehovah would Himself become the *Redeemer* and *Saviour* of his people. Of the many passages that set forth these truths I quote only one or two. "It shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him and he will save us; this is *Jehovah*, we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." (ISA. xxv. 9.) "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is none else." (ISA. xlv. 21. 22.) Moreover we read in Isaiah (ix. 6.) that the Child given, the Son born, should be in very truth the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and hence it is not surprising to find that in the New Testament Jesus is called by one apostle "The only wise God our Saviour," and by another "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

During His abode in the world however it could not be otherwise than that an *appearance* should be presented of a separate personality, nor could Jesus do otherwise than speak according to this *appearance*. When He said to one "Why callest thou Me good? None is good save One, that is God," He spake as one man to another *who did not recognise his Deity*. Again when He said "The Father is greater than I," and "The Son can do nothing of Himself," He spake of His Human nature as distinguished (only during its process of glorification) from His Divine; and when He prayed to His Father it was only in His Human consciousness, and, when under temptation, it *appeared as if* God was a distinct Being from Himself and had actually forsaken Him. And lastly when He said "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go to the Father," He described, not any descent of Himself *through space* into the world and *through space* out of the world, but His conception and birth from the Father, and, as a consequence, His perfect identity and Oneness

with the Father *notwithstanding the contrary appearance*. And so indeed His disciples must have understood Him for they immediately replied "Lo now speakest Thou *plainly* and speakest *no proverb* . . . By this we believe that Thou camest forth from God." JOHN xvi, 28—30.

Had Jesus been a separate person from the Father, co-equal and co-eternal with Him, He could not thus have spoken of Himself, nor could He have said, "The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works," nor, again could He have declared to Philip, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known *me* Philip? He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the Father. Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" What language can be stronger than this to express the perfect identity, as to person of Jesus and Jehovah? He it is indeed, to whom we ought always to address our prayers, and who, without doubt, is ever ready to forgive, for his own mercy's sake the repenting sinner.

Seeing then that this, our God, is at the same time a *just* God, and a *Saviour*, no *vicarious* sacrifice was needed to reconcile His Justice and His mercy. It is the greatest mercy to the non-repenting sinner, that he should suffer the consequences of his transgressions, and the greatest justice to him that repents, that he should experience the Divine forgiveness.

Therefore, dear reader, be not carried away by the continued cry of Divine Wrath. There is no such thing. It appears indeed to the wicked man, as if God were angry with him, and Scripture speaks according to this appearance, for the best of all reasons, namely, that many wicked men can only be withdrawn from sin and led to repentance, in *the first instance* by a fear of the consequences, but true doctrine teaches not only that God is one in essence and in person,—the Lord Jesus Christ—but also that He is infinitely good, and that as He says, "Fury" is not in Him, and because He is Jehovah and changeth not, therefore His people are not consumed.

It now only remains, in conclusion, to show why the Lord did come into the world, in order that we may set the doctrine of Atonement and Redemption in its true and scriptural light. Man by sin separates himself from God, and by sin transmits to his posterity a defiled humanity incapable of conjunction with God, just in proportion to the extent of the actual sin, and the consequent hereditary depravity. This is a fact which no one will deny. And as it is now so it always has been, so it always will be.

Man is free now to commit sin, and this being the case it would be unreasonable to suppose he was not also free to avoid sin. This precious gift of freedom is his distinguishing characteristic. He would not be a man but a mere machine without it. God will force none to goodness and heaven. He must have free and intelligent worshippers. Thus the tendency of goodness is to preserve freedom, and the tendency of evil to destroy it.

Now the Divine Mercy desires the eternal salvation of every human being born into the world, and consequently Divine Justice (always perfectly at harmony with Divine Mercy) requires that no human being should be born without the *capacity* for salvation. But as Paul says: "In Adam all died," that is all men through accumulated hereditary

evil separated themselves from God; and rendered human salvation impossible *without a new and eternal medium of conjunction between God and man.* This is the reason why it was necessary for God to become incarnate in the humanity of Jesus Christ. It was because at length no human being could be found who could adequately receive and sustain Divine Influences in the world, that the Lord Himself opened out a new and living way, that is to say His flesh (or Humanity) through which the Holy Spirit could for ever operate on human hearts, and for ever preserve inviolate man's power to "cease to do evil," and "learn to do well." This was in short the great result of the Lord's work of Redemption accomplished while He was in the world. Unless the Lord had thus come and redeemed the race, no flesh could have been saved.

But now let us see *how* this great work was accomplished, that is how "In Christ all are made alive." The humanity which the Lord assumed from the Virgini Mary was, according to the law of hereditary transmission, loaded with tendencies to evil from the whole human race; and in that Humanity therefore it was possible for the Lord to be "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." And thus for our Redemption and Salvation the Lord engaged in a deadly conflict with all the powers of darkness, who, through the increase of evil, were on the point of destroying in man the capacity for salvation. In every case He came off victorious; and by every victory He expelled from His Humanity some of its evil tendencies derived from the mother, until at length His whole Human nature was glorified, or made divine, by the last temptations in the Garden of Gethsemane and on the Cross. Thus God was made man and man was made God in one Divine Person, and no language could teach this more emphatically and distinctly *when our Lord from Himself (not another person) breathed upon His disciples and said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."* And the same Divine Influences now descending from that Divine Humanity for ever keep in subjection the powers of evil, and for ever communicate to man the divine and heavenly blessings of goodness and truth and holiness.

That this brief sketch of the work of redemption, is not only reasonable but scriptural, the following passages evince. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here it is plainly declared that God gave His son, because He so *loved* the world. Again Jesus says, "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth." Here the obedience of Christ is not named as a substitute for the obedience of His people, but as a means of securing that obedience. Again the Lord says, "For judgment I am come into the world that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind," plainly teaching that His work in the world was to deliver men from spiritual darkness, and lead them into the reception and enjoyment of spiritual light. Finally, the Lord says, "unless ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," showing, that in order to realise the blessings of Redemption, or the benefits of Christ's death, we must actually appropriate those divine principles of goodness and truth, which proceed from Him, and are spiritually His flesh and blood. By His sufferings, and *death* all men

were *redeemed*, but only by the appropriation of His *life* can any be actually saved.

Let us then cast away from our minds all those unscriptural dogmas with which the church has been for centuries burdened, and while we humbly follow our Lord in the regeneration, remember with deep gratitude and love, that—

“He passed the dismal vale of death:
The human frame resigned its breath
And like a mortal died.
But death was crushed beneath His feet,
He rose both God and Man complete,
His Human glorified.”

Amazing Mercy! Love immense!
Surpassing every human sense
Since time and sense began!
That man might shun the realms of pain,
And know and love his God again,
His God became a Man.

FORMATION OF THE NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE VEGETARIAN SOCIETY.

A meeting of ladies and gentlemen favourable to vegetarianism was held on Wednesday evening, April 28th, 1875, in the Alliance Temperance Hotel, for the purpose of forming an auxiliary to the Vegetarian Society. The proceedings were inaugurated by a tea and fruit banquet of a most tempting nature. After the repast Mr. Edmund Procter occupied the chair. In the course of his remarks, he stated that although he was only a vegetarian of some two months standing, the doctrines of vegetarianism were not entirely new to him. He had studied Mr. Smith's "Fruit and Farinacea" many years ago. He would strongly recommend them all to give it a trial. Vegetarians did not use fruit and vegetables from a hygienic point of view only, but from the greater enjoyment which they felt after becoming accustomed to the system. Mr. Couchman then detailed how he became a vegetarian. It was twenty-two years ago, that he adopted the system, and he had adhered to it ever since. Mr. Edwin Robson and other gentlemen having made some remarks, it was finally resolved to form a North of England Auxiliary of the Vegetarian Society. The following was the result of the election of officers and committee:—President and treasurer, Mr. Couchman, 5, Lovaine-row, Tynemouth; vice president, E. Procter, Esq., Benton-terrace; secretary, Mr. W. H. Dennison, 25, Blenheim-st., Newcastle; committee, Messrs Robson, Troup, Stewart, Dobson, Vicars, & Cameron.

Friends who are desirous of obtaining information, or who are wishful to join the Society, either as Associates who do not bind themselves wholly to abstinence from animal food, or as members who promise to adopt and practice a vegetarian diet, may obtain all requisite information, copies of tracts, &c., on application to either Treasurer or Secretary, as above.

To the charitably disposed, a sight interesting and cheering might have been witnessed in the Free Church, Gallowgate: 100 to 200 poor children, only too faithful representatives of the wide-spread misery and distress prevailing. Mr. Troup offered to bear the cost if a dinner was provided *without* animal food. Mr. Couchman, the well-known vegetarian, was applied to to lend the aid of his long and practical experience. A substantial and nutritious repast was provided consisting of bread, soup entirely of vegetables, and boiled rice with sweet sauce. It may be fairly said that the experiment proved how much good could be done at small cost, the whole *only* costing 16s. 2½d.—*Newcastle Daily Chronicle*.

Mr. Rutherford, of the Alliance Temperance Hotel, having appealed to the public for means to supply more poor children with dinners, as no response was made (on Vegetarian principles), Mr. Couchman, of Tynemouth, came forward and offered to supply the funds to feed 200 more children. The soup consisted of peas, barley, pease-flour, carrots, onions, &c., and rice with currants, raisins, and sweet sauce. Those only who were present can know how thoroughly the children enjoyed themselves, and the hearty cheer they gave to the giver of the feast, the cost not exceeding one penny per head.—*Newcastle Daily Express*.

Third Edition.

Twentieth Thousand.

HOW TO MARRY

AND

LIVE WELL

ON A

SHILLING A DAY;

AND HOW TO PREPARE A

DINNER FOR A PENNY:

By *W. COUCHMAN, Tynemouth.*

“Fix upon that course of life which is best, and habit will make it the most delightful.”—*Pythagoras.*

I would advise my readers, especially the ladies, to buy this production (*Man's Best Diet*). The two most vigorous and healthy old men I know have been Vegetarians over twenty years. It is quite clear we do not make enough use of vegetables and fruit as articles of diet; they could be made up for the household *with profit*. I have seen most of the receipts as dishes made up at a table, and can *speak very highly of them*. The *Penny Vegetarian Cookery*, published by F. Pitman, Paternoster Row, London, I strongly commend to every household for the useful information it contains for making many very economical and nutritious dishes. It may be had at most booksellers, or from Mr. Couchman, 5, Lovaine Row, Newcastle.—“*Elfin*” in the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*.

Mr. Couchman's pamphlet on “*Man's Best Diet*,” has sold so largely in the North, that he has been encouraged to resume his efforts, and has now issued a second edition, which he has entitled “*How to Marry and Live Well on a Shilling a Day*.” This revised edition is well worth reading both by young and old. The economist will find it one of the best and most useful pamphlets he has ever read, and may with confidence, commend it for its truly valuable information. All who know Mr. Couchman say he is one of the finest looking old men they have seen, and in this way his work does him great credit, for he practices as he preaches.—*Dietetic Reformer*.

Price One Penny, 6s. per hundred.

TO BE HAD WHOLESALE:

Newcastle-on-Tyne—Mr. ROSS, Side; Mr. FRANCE, Side; Mr. ALAN, Dean Street;
Mr. EVERETT, Newgate Street.

North Shields—Mr. HALL; Mr. ALLEN.

London—Mr. H. VICKERS, 317, Strand; GUEST & Co., Paternoster Row.

Manchester—Mr. JOHN HEYWOOD, Deansgate. And at 91, Oxford Street.

1875.