

OXEN, Vol. 15th Jan 1887
To the Editor of the Christian Worker

DEAR SIR—As I am a reader of your paper, I find an article in the December number headed "The Throne of David" by the Rev. Mr. G. W. Cox, says "Now, we cannot both be right, I also see a short article from yourself on a Mr. Combs, who says you are amused when you contemplate the gathering up of the fragments of the literal throne of David, the wood is rotted away, the gold and silver all wasted to the four winds. By this statement you admit that David's throne was composed of wood, gold and silver. How is it possible now, why do you persist that at the resurrection of soul and body that the body is raised from the grave where it has been for perhaps thousands of years. Are all bodies embalmed or do they rot and, perhaps, scattered to the four winds? Allow me just here to call your attention to the 15th chap. of the Acts of the Apostles from the 17th to the 18th verses, "famous answered saying men, brethren, hearken unto me; Simon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name and to this agree the words of the prophets as it is written after this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down and I will build again the ruins thereof and I will set it up that the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, shall say, The Lord, who doeth all these things, known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Simon tells us that God is now taking out of the Gentiles a people for his name. Let me here remind you that the last King that sat on David's throne was Zedekiah, and the Prophet Ezekiel says in the 21st chap. 25th to 27th verses, "and thou profane, wicked prince of Israel whose day it comes when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God, remove the diadem and take off the crown, this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it and it shall be no more, and he that comes whose right it is, and I will give it him." Here we see that the diadem was to be removed, the crown taken off and be no more until he came whose right it is, and the Lord God has promised to give it to him. Now, if you turn to the 1st chap. Luke and read from the 30 to 33rd verses there you find that God's messenger told Mary that she should be the mother of Jesus and that He, Jesus, should reign over the House of Jacob; 32nd verse: on the throne of his Father David.

Mr. Combs says that God transferred the throne of David from earth to heaven. Please give me a "this saith the Lord." In the 1st chap. of Acts and 11th verse, "when Jesus ascended into heaven the two Angels said that this same Jesus should come in like manner"—a "Cable, tangible, Jesus." In the 2nd Acts 29 and 30th verses we find that he did it "both dead and buried" and that God had "sworn to raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne, and in the 34th verse Peter affirms that "David is not ascended into the heaven."

We ask again where does Mr. Combs get his authority for saying that God transferred David's throne from earth to heaven? Why profess to believe the Bible and then preach or write contrary to its plain teaching?

No, to show that Christ is not yet sitting on His throne (David's throne), allow me to draw your attention to the 1st chap. Rev. and let you, Jesus Christ (after he had ascended into heaven) saw fit to reveal to his servant John, things that had not taken place, and in the 3rd chap. 21 and 22nd verses Jesus says (not me) that "I am that which was with me, and I will go to it with me in my throne even as I overcame and I am sitting down with my Father, on his throne." Does not Jesus here teach that His own throne is distinct from his Father's throne, which he is now sitting on, "so that both ears to hear let him hear," this is what Jesus wishes, for he said as recorded in the 12th chap. of John 48th verse "the words that I speak the same shall judge you in the last Day," then let us be careful to hold fast the form of sound words—2nd Tim. 1st chap. 13th verse. In the 25th chap. of Math 31st verse we are told that "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy Angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of His glory." Has he ever come in his glory with his Angels? If not how can He be now sitting on the throne of His glory? Do you believe this testimony? Again, in the 14th chap. of Numbers 21st verse, the Lord said "as truly as I live all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Let us ask when I can be before Christ comes with his own glory, with his Father's, and the holy Angels? Should we not pray for God's Kingdom to come, that His will may be done on earth as in heaven? Read the 72nd Psalm.

JONAS TUCKER.

REPLY.

The writer of the above shows a vigor of statement rarely found among those "of like precious faith." We have been overwhelmed with attacks on Bro. Cox, since we published his article from the Worker, and we have developed the fact that there are many who are zealously guarding the throne of David, & keep Christ off it for a while yet. I only indorse Bro. Cox so far as he holds that Christ is our King now. I have not given on the throne question as much attention as I have that of Kingdoms. I believe that Christ has "all authority in heaven and earth," and He is King. I believe this because Christ said no. I am not ready to turn myself by saying that he is not our King. Just here our respondent should tread softly.

I believe that the throne of David belonged to God although it is called "the throne of David." We want our respondents careful attention while we whisper in "a ear a little item that should not be overlooked at this point, i. e. the authorship and ownership of thrones." PART—In speaking of Christ, Col. 1-16, says, "who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him." "That in all things he might have the pre-eminence," 18 verse. Now we think by the time our Scribe has digested this statement of the Apostle, he will conclude that David never had a throne except the one that Christ made and gave him the use of. Our Scribe's "mistake" that Christ is now on his Father's (God's) throne, but would have believed that he is to be raised by descending from his Father's throne to a seat on a man's throne, & we will

here remind our Scribe that King Jesus was humiliated once, but is now "highly exalted, to reign until the last evening to destroy."

But we now give attention to the writers' coming. He cited a little at our comment at the idea of gathering up the literal fragments of the throne of David, but not relishing an effort to make his absurd position look reasonable he shined off by raising a question about the resurrection of the body. Now here is a chance to show his true position. Does he mean to say that the resurrection of the throne of David and the resurrection of the body are similar? Let us see. "But some man will say, how are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain it may chance of wheat, or some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body, see 1 Cor. 15:35 to 38. Now if the throne of David has the germ of life in it, like wheat or the human body that will produce a body just like the one sown, your little dodge will help you out. Has it this germ? Speak out!

His reference to Acts 15 chap. is very unfortunate for his literal position, because it involves the necessity of a resurrection of the tabernacle as well as the throne of David. We fear he is getting bewildered in this resurrection question, and the next thing he will tell us that David's mules must be raised before the reign of Christ will be complete on David's throne. The man that cannot see that Acts 15th refers to the universal reign of David over the Jews in their divided state before the tribes were scattered, and that Christ was to reign over Gentiles as well as the out-tribe of the Jews, is not to be reasoned with. His reference to Ezekiel 21st chap. is just to the point. "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it and it shall be no more until He comes whose right it is." Who comes? Christ, of course. Has he not come? You must make it read "until He comes again and again" his first coming was not yet when the prophet uttered these words. Bro. Cox, I judge, made the statement that his throne was transferred to heaven, based on his definitions of "throne," "kingly authority." No thus saith the Lord can be given for his statement, but good sound reasoning will establish it we think.

His reference to Rev. 3. 21. 22, is tapping a turnip for red blood. Because Christ says "to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne," therefore Christ has never yet sat upon his own throne!!! Speak reasoning! will do for children but men ought to know better. If I should say to a man that if he will persevere and come from Owen Sound to Mesford, I will grant him the privilege of sitting in my chair, this proves that the editor of the Worker never sat in that chair!

Yes you may pray for God's Kingdom to come if you live in a heathen land where it has not penetrated, but thank him for its having come in this land where Christ reigns. "And be ye kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

BRO. EVANS.

Bro. Evans' letter is another part of this issue will be read with some interest in regard to it. It is remembered by all that Bro. E. is a very dear brother in Christ, and withal a man of excellent parts. The spirit of his letter will indicate the true friendship that exists between him and the writer of this. Bro. E. like myself, believes that we may differ in opinion and yet be brethren. We do not want, nor will not have any discussion of a controversial character on this question, but while the subject is up, we want to say some things. I agree in part with Bro. E. that the resurrection is a necessity in order to a knowledge of the future life. Further than this; we are ready to admit that our own resurrection is necessary to the full enjoyment of eternal life in the world to come.

But when it is denied that there is conscious existence between physical death and the resurrection, we demur by saying that such an assertion is easily in need of proof. If it is true, as Jesus said, "this is eternal life, to believe on the name of the only begotten son of God."—We are at a loss to know how this "eternal life" is to become unconscious by physical death. It would look more reasonable to say that "eternal life" began with faith in Christ and that death only opens the gate to a more full enjoyment of "eternal life" and that the resurrection is the crowning act ushering us into the complete enjoyment of this "eternal life" that began by faith in Christ. The use of such terms as "innate immortality" may serve a purpose, but it misleads the reader. You may triumphantly challenge me to show any such thing in the scriptures as "innate immortality." Of course we will fail to show it, as you know very well, but can we not come as near to it as you can in trying to show from the scriptures that we have "innate mortality"? When you find the passage "mortal soul," please read in the verse just below "immortal soul." Neither of these terms being found in the word of God, the question must be settled (if settled at all) by some other way. If we are the "offspring of God," I am inclined to think this would strengthen the idea of "innate immortality" to some extent. Paul quotes the heathen poet approvingly, "for we are his (God's) offspring." Now if evolution be correct, and we declare the truth of evolution as our promise, upon this promise we can easily establish the fact that man is only an animal, no more immortal than his relatives, viz., monkeys and so on down, but that he has so far evolved, as to receive a promise of immortality upon conditions of faith and obedience to the gospel. But this leaves our children and all our fellow-men who have never had the privilege of hearing the gospel on an equality with the brute, because "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of the Lord." Our babies can't believe and many of our fellow-men have not the opportunity. Now here is a difficulty. We make a marked difference between "immortality" and "eternal life." The first means "not subject to death" but he who is the author of immortality can cause it to die. The second refers to "happy condition" as well as eternal existence. Death means "separation." It may refer to separation of life from the body, or separation from God by sin, or eternal separation at the general judgment. Hence we have the terms "Dead No Christ, Dead to King, Dead to the judgments of the

World, dead in Christ." Has not Jesus been dead? Neither of those cases where the term "dead" as used in the scriptures, and indeed several cases out of eight in the scriptures where the term death or dead occurs, is unconsciousness, and not a good sense. This being true we should at least be a little in haste about declaring that in the case where physical death is meant that it is unconsciousness.

Now here I have written a long article when I only intended a few lines. I know that my brother will take this kindly. Let us remember that this is a matter of opinion and that there are two sides to the question. Let us not divide over questions of opinion. It will be all right with us all in that day if we live in accordance with the will of God as revealed in his Word.

UNFULFILLED PROMISES.

We had the privilege a short time since, of listening to a discourse from a man who is a disciple of Dr. Thomas, on "the unfulfilled promises of God." We have to accord to him the merit of speaking his piece well; but the discourse being public, of course we claim the right to criticize it in a friendly way. The speaker undertook too much for one discourse, and on this account we ought to be sparing with our criticisms. We noted a few of the points that were made, to which we file a bill of exceptions. The effort was to make it appear that Christ is not a King now, but that he is as heir to David's throne, and that he will not take his seat on David's throne until he comes again.

The speaker read Nebuchadnezzar's dream and the interpretation by Daniel, and in short ran over the history of the downfall of nations until he saw the present kingdoms of earth merging forth from the toes of the image. He said that in the days of the present kingdoms "the God of Heaven would set up a kingdom." He made this affirmation and left it (perhaps for want of time). He ridiculed the idea of the reign of Christ beginning at pentecost. As he did not make an effort to prove what he asserted, we will reply by asserting that he is wrong, and that Christ is reigning now. He next referred to the promise which God made to Abraham concerning the land of Canaan for an inheritance for his seed. The speaker declared that this promise has never been fulfilled, and in his efforts to establish his assertion he must plead guilty of handling God's word deceitfully. He quoted just enough of the Bible to make it appear that he had proof for his position, when if he read on, his position would have been spoiled. We do not blame him for stopping where he did, mind you, but we blame him for trying to make the Bible teach what it never intended to teach.—E. G. He referred to Acts 7th chap. and quoted a part of the 5th verse to prove that God's promise to Abraham is yet unfulfilled! He could not afford to even read the whole verse. Now to show how misleading such scrapping of the Bible is, we will quote three verses and criticize the points against him, and he gave him none in return. It is, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child.

And God spoke on this wise, that his seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should bring them out into bondage, and entreat them evil four hundred years. And God shall say to Abraham whom they shall be in bondage, whom they shall be in bondage, and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place. Verses 5, 6 and 7. Did not they (the seed of Abraham) go into bondage 400 years? Did not God bring his

judgments on Egypt? Did not the seed of Abraham come forth from their bondage under the leadership of Moses? and did not Abraham's seed serve him (God) in this place? From the time they came forth from their bondage, did not the seed of Abraham have the land of Canaan as their inheritance until the end of the Jewish age? Now I am ashamed of the man's dishonesty, or shrewd at his ignorance that will even make an effort to prove that this promise of God is not fulfilled. His theory demands this mutilation of God's word, but if it is honest he should abandon the theory.

In another part of his discourse he said that "Christ claimed to be a King and this was good human reason for putting him to death by the Romans." But if Christ had said my kingdom is of heaven there would be no reason for his death. Did not Christ say "my kingdom is not from hence?" "If my kingdom was of this world, then would my servants fight?" How readest thou? Did not Pilate say "I find no fault in him?" would he have said this if Christ claimed to be a earthly King? Hence a traitor to Caesar? How reasonest thou? Is this not a glaring perversion of the sacred word? The theory may demand it, but the truth condemns it.

But a still worse perversion of the word is to follow. In referring to the statement of Christ's disciples in Acts 1-6, "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" "And he said unto them, it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." The speaker said that Christ did not disabuse their minds by telling them that his was not a temporal kingdom, but left them thinking that the kingdom would be restored to Israel. The 8th verse completely upsets his theory: "And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Now it is clear that the Holy Spirit was to enlighten them on this question. If the speaker had given us a bit of testimony from these disciples after they had been "enlightened after power from on high" about "restoring the kingdom to Israel," then his quotation would have served him a good purpose. "They went preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ." And men and women were "troubled" out of the kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of God's dear Son. This could not be if the Son of God had no kingdom. The speaker showed a "dexterity" in scrapping the scriptures that is rarely excelled among sectarians and can only be equalled by those who risk a hobby, and are determined to make the Bible favor that hobby. We must say that the Spirit of the lecturer was good, and we would gladly attribute his false application of the Bible to ignorance but the fact that he claimed to be a Scientist will not allow it. We have written the above slight review by request, and will have no more to say on the matter unless something new comes up.

"Since the days of Chillingworth it has been common with Protestants to quote that saying of his. "The bible and the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." This, however, is not true. What Protestant sect is satisfied with the bible alone? Let the sect that is satisfied with the bible speak out, that we may know what sect it is. How many sects in Christendom have succeeded! How can the sect that has a creed truthfully quote that saying, that the bible alone is their religion?"