

Marten J. Aslakson

364 Dickens av

Chicago

A Sister in faith
2-1-61
1/2-1-61

THE

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE;

DESIGNED CHIEFLY TO UNFOLD

“The Things concerning the Kingdom of God,
and the Name of Jesus Christ,”

AS FOUND IN

THE WRITINGS OF PROPHETS AND APOSTLES.

GENEVA, ILL.:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY BENJAMIN WILSON.

1861.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the GOSPEL to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JANUARY 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 1.

New Year's Salutation.

DEAR READER:—It seems proper at the commencement of a New Year and a New Volume, to review the past, examine the present, and endeavor to ascertain what our prospects are for the future.

During the past year there has been a lively interest manifested by many in extending the circulation of the *Banner*, and consequently a corresponding increase in the number of subscribers. To such co-workers we extend our thanks. There are about one hundred names on our list, to whom we send this number, who are in arrears for two years past, which we shall be under the necessity of erasing from our books until they pay their indebtedness. But if any one is too poor in this world's goods, and who is desirous of having the *Banner* continued, by notifying us of the fact, shall receive it as usual. Many testimonials of a pleasing and encouraging character have been sent us during the past year, but as we are always averse to flattery, and blowing our own trumpet, we generally select other matter to fill our columns, which we deem will more profitably entertain our readers. We are aware that articles have sometimes been inserted, which some have objected to, and which even we have not fully approved; but we do not wish to act arbitrarily, and therefore allow brethren to publish their views of scripture truth, while they speak forth the words of truth and soberness. To err is human; we know of no one who is perfect in scriptural knowledge; and for any one to claim that he is the embodiment of the truth, is to arrogate more than seems fitting for the humble disciple of Jesus. Then let truth and error grapple till that which is perfect is come. Let truth be presented with clearness, argument, and earnestness, but at the same time with kindness and love. We have always endeavored to act thus, and hope that all our correspondents will follow the same course.

The past year has been an eventful one. Witness the changes which have disturbed

the political heavens. There have been wars and rumors of war; revolutions; massacres and wholesale murders: and "men's hearts failing them for fear of the things coming on the earth." And not only in the Old world, but also in the New, mutation seems to be the order of the day. Confusion and anarchy are taking the place of law and order. Society is shaken from one end of the land to the other. Atmospheric changes also seem to have been more frequent than usual. Witness the many storms, inundations, hurricanes, intense heat, long continued drought, and famine, which have visited various sections during the past year. Tens of thousands of families will have reason to remember the year of our Lord 1860.

The present volume and year begin under peculiar circumstances. It is well known by many of our readers that there has been a very strong effort to injure our character, and to ruin our temporal interests, and that now we are placed under the ban of a once valued and esteemed contemporary, whose praise is in all the churches. The character which he has given us, is altogether false, and the light in which he has held us up to the Churches is so unjust, dishonorable, and slanderous, that were we to appeal from Christian brethren to justice as administered by unwashed Gentiles, we could in a suit obtain damages for a large amount. But such is not our course; we trust in God. Our heart condemns us not, therefore have we confidence in him. We have endeavored to do our duty, and have left the matter in his hands, being confident that he will cover our enemies with shame and confusion of face. We sincerely hope that brethren who have acted rather precipitately in withdrawing their support, will reconsider the matter. Our readers are referred to the accompanying document for a true statement of facts in vindication of our character.

The year 1861 is ushered in by broils and dissensions in both Church and State. What means all this discord in the Churches of our

faith? Has indeed the time of trial arrived? As it was in the congregation at Corinth, so even now does it seem necessary that there should be contentions or divisions among us, that those who are approved may be made manifest. See 1 Cor. xi. 19. Happy will it be for us, brethren, if the trying of our faith may appear more precious than refined gold that is tested by fire, unto praise and honor and glory at the apocalypse of our Lord Jesus Christ. In all our Church difficulties let us be on the side of truth and justice, while at the same time we make it apparent that we love mercy, and walk humbly with our God. Let pride, ostentation, stubbornness, covetousness, and worldly-mindedness be banished far from our hearts, and the meek and lovely traits which adorned our Savior's character take their place. Then we shall have purity instead of filthiness, peace in place of contention, gentleness instead of uncouth and rude behavior, and all the luscious, ripe fruits of the Spirit in place of the works of the flesh. It is by the Church, as the body of the Christ, that the living characteristics of our Great Head should be manifested. We cannot look for them in the world. That is unrenewed, and at enmity with God.

The present year commences with rather dark prospects for our country. Political excitement and internal discord are rampant in our midst. It behoves those who have taken upon themselves the name of the Anointed One, to keep aloof from the strife, remembering that they are not of this world, even as he was not of this world. "Let the potsherds of the earth strive with the potsherds of the earth," and He who does all things according to his purpose, will so overrule human affairs as to promote his own glory, in the ultimate good especially of his people, and of the whole human family.

And what of the future? Our prospects, individually, so far as the *Banner* is concerned, are dark. We have begun, and shall continue through the year, as before announced, a *Semi-monthly* publication. Had we foreseen what was coming, probably we should not have enlarged. Our brethren and readers, however, can do as they please about re-subscribing. One thing we are confident of, that this disaffection and alienation of some of our readers does not affect our mind in reference to them. We know they are acting in the main from pure motives, and are averse to supporting anything they suppose to be wrong. We admire their conscientiousness. But let every one act impartially, and do as they would like to be done by. Let no one be misled, and unjustly condemn the innocent, without even a hearing. "We know what we say, and wherof we affirm," in this matter; then give us a fair and can-

did investigation. Read the accompanying pamphlet.

The future we leave in the care of the Almighty. Our great concern will be to do our duty, and endeavor thus to glorify him. Whether we fall or rise—whether we be esteemed or despised—whether foes assail, or friends forsake—whether prosperity or adversity be our lot, our determination is made, that nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ. "Far be it from us to boast save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to us, and we to the world." O for more of the self-denying spirit of the apostle Paul! to help one to say in truth even as he said, "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I may finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to fully testify the glad tidings of the favor of God."

In conclusion, dear reader, permit us to exhort you, if a Christian, "to give all diligence to make your calling and election sure;" and "to be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." But if not yet a Christian, "flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before you," in the glad tidings, and then 1861 will indeed be to you a happy New Year. EDITOR.

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

In our endeavor to solve this important question, we in the last *Banner* ascertained that the world was three thousand and fifty-nine years old at the death of Saul. In pursuance of the investigation we present the following:

PERIOD VIII.

Embracing 44 Years.

From the Death of Saul, A. M. 3039, to the 4th of Solomon, 3103.

A. M.	Names and Events.	Ys.	References.
3039			
3049	David reigns,	40	2 Sam. v. 4.
3103	Fourth yr. Solomon's reg'n.	41	1 Kings vi. 1.

The reason we break the chain here is because the fourth of Solomon is the beginning of a long period of four hundred and thirty years. Before proceeding with it, however, the last reference in the above table, 1 Kings vi. 1, claims some notice. It reads as follows: "And it came to pass in the five hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month of Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord." The word *five* in the

above verse, it will be perceived, is in italics. The reason may be seen, by referring to the passage, where instead of five will be found four. We have taken the liberty of altering the verse to this extent, well satisfied that that that is the form in which it came from the Spirit. We beg it particularly to be noticed that the case in question is the first and shall be the last in which the Scriptures shall be altered. It is a habit we deprecate, and would not resort to it in this case were it not that we have the authority of Paul for our proceeding. Paul, it is well known, spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The authorship of the book of Kings must also be referred to the same Spirit. Now the question stands thus: The Spirit in 1 Kings vi. 1, gives four hundred and eighty years from the exodus to the fourth of Solomon. The same Spirit, in Paul, gives five hundred and eighty years for the same period. God cannot be the author of these two statements, for only one of them is true, and God cannot lie. Of course I cannot expect the mind of the reader to go with me unless a *reasonable* explanation of the difficulty be given. We take the longer statement to be the true one, because it harmonizes with the details, as has been shown with which it is utterly impossible to reconcile the shorter, and as before stated, on the authority of Paul. The Spirit was given in Apostolic times to "guide into *all* the truth," which includes chronological truth. There are those who affect to despise this branch of Scripture instruction, but in this they neither resemble the holy Prophets of old, nor yet the inspired men of New Testament times. Leaving them in the enjoyment of their "airs," I proceed to cite Paul's authority for the aforementioned alteration. The Spirit in Paul, in the exercise of its office of guiding into all the truth, was well aware of the fact that a careless copyist had blundered in substituting *daleth*, 4, in the place of *hey*, 5, which are strikingly similar in form, or that in the future such a blunder would be made. It does not require that Paul should know anything about the error. The Spirit was in the habit of using men's brains, and tongues, and hands for the benefit of posterity. We are now in the time when "knowledge is increased"—not scientific knowledge, which is very little made of in the Scriptures, but spiritual, divine knowledge. And is it not increased? A few years ago and who knew or taught the Apostolic,—the Abrahamic gospel? We then in these times are receiving the benefit of the apostle's chronological allusions. Let us not despise them. Paul does not in so many words say that Solomon's fourth year was five hundred and

eighty years from the Exodus, but he says it, nevertheless, very emphatically in the following quotations:

"And about the space of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness," Acts xiii. 18.

"And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan he divided their land to them by lot," Acts xiii. 19. Here the time is not given—sanctioning the time as given in the old Scriptures, and which has been shown to be six years.

"And after that he gave unto them judges for about the space of four hundred and fifty years," Acts xiii. 20.

"And afterward they desired a King, and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years," Acts xiii. 21.

"And when he had removed him he raised up unto them David," Acts xiii. 22. Here again he does not give the time, the Spirit knowing, whether Paul did or not, that no corruption of the Scriptures would occur in this connection. We will therefore set down the well-known period of David's reign as forty years.

Then Solomon's four years.

In all, 580

Thus by an array of testimony equal to the demands of the most sceptical, and by different processes, is it demonstrated that wherever an error may be looked for in the scheme of chronology now being submitted, it is utterly hopeless to expect one affecting the length of time that elapsed from the Exodus to the fourth of Solomon. And yet, strange to say, there is no author who agrees with me in this, as I conceive, the most carefully guarded portion of sacred chronology. On this department of the subject I could, did I feel disposed, pungently ridicule the efforts of others to unravel this, as it is claimed to be the "gordian knot" of chronology, but I spare them, and show them that mercy which I have not received at their hands.

In the September number of the *Banner* it was shown, that

The year of Exodus was A. M.	- - -	2523
Add the		580
years of 1 Kings vi. 1,	- - -	3103
making		3103

the same figures as we got by running along the details.

FRANCIS COGNILL.

New York, Dec. 11, 1860.

Bards of the Bible.

The following passages occur in "Giffiland's Bards of the Bible."

The Bible is a mass of beautiful figures; its words and its thoughts are alike poetical; it has gathered around its central truths all natural beauty and interest; it is a temple with one altar and one God, illuminated by a thousand varied lights, and studded with a thousand ornaments. It has substantially

but one declaration to make, but it utters it in the voices of the creation.

Shining forth from the excellent glory, its light has been reflected on a myriad of intervening objects, till it has become at length attenuated for our earthly vision. It now beams upon us at once from the heart of man and the countenance of nature.

It has arrayed itself in the charms of fiction. It has gathered new beauties from the works of creation, and new warmth and new power from the very passions of clay. It has pressed into its service the animals of the forest, the flowers of the field, the stars of heaven,—all the elements of nature. The lion spurring the sands of the desert, the wild roe leaping over the mountains, the lamb led in silence to the slaughter, the goat speeding to the wilderness, the rose blossoming in Sharon, the lily drooping in the valley, the apple-tree bowing under its fruit, the great rock shadowing a weary land, the river gladdening a dry place, the moon and the morning star, Carmel by the sea, and Tabor in the mountains, the dew from the womb of the morning, the rain upon the mown grass, the rainbow encompassing a dark place, the light God's shadow, the thunder his voice, the wind and the earthquake his footsteps,—all such varied objects are made as if naturally designed from their creation, to represent him to whom the book and all its emblems point. Thus the spirit of the book has ransacked creation to lay its treasures on Jehorah's altar, united the innumerable rays of a far streaming glory on the little hill of Calvary, and woven a garland for the bleeding brow of Immanuel, the flowers of which have been culled from the garden of a universe. The power of the Bible over man has been long and obstinately resisted; but resisted in vain. For ages has this artless, loosely piled little book been exposed to the fire of the keenest investigations, a fire meanwhile which has consumed contemptuously the mythology of the Iliad, the husbandry of the Georgics, the historical truth of Livy, the fables of the Shaster the Talmud and the Koran, the artistic merit of many a popular poem, the authority of many a work of philosophy and science. And yet there the Bible lies unhurt, untouched with not one of its pages singed, with not even the smell of fire having passed upon it. Many an attempt has been made to scare away this fiery pillar of our wanderings, to prove it a mere natural product of the wilderness; but still night after night rises, like one of the sure and ever shining stars in the vanguard of the great march of man, the old column gliding slow, but guiding certainly to future lands of promise, both in the life that is, and that which cometh hereafter.

While other books are planets shining with

reflected radiance, this book like the sun, shines with ancient and unborrowed rays.

Other books, after shining their seasons, may perish in flames fiercer than those which destroyed the Alexandrian library; this must in essence remain fine as gold, but inconsumable as abestos in the general conflagration.

For the Gospel Banner.

Report of the Eighth Semi-Annual Conference,

Held at Geneva, Illinois, Dec. 23rd to 26th, 1860.

According to announcement in December No. of the *Banner*, a Conference of immersed believers in the Kingdom of God and name of Jesus Christ, was held at the Disciples' Meeting house in this place, commencing on Lord's day, Dec. 23rd, and closing on Wednesday evening, Dec. 26th. And here I might observe, that some have the idea that the Meeting house referred to belongs to the Campbellite society, which is erroneous. It was built some years ago by the congregation of believers here, and has ever since been occupied by them.

The attendance at the present Conference was good, being fully equal to any ever held at this season of the year, there being over fifty brethren and sisters present. Indeed, we think it better than usual, seeing that the brethren in St. Charles, ten in number, who have usually attended, absented themselves. And we might add, that the interest manifested was greater than usual, seeing that heretofore, when we have held a two day's session, even some deemed it necessary to return home before its close, while on this occasion we held a four days' session, and *all* were present at our last meeting. I will now give as brief a report of the proceedings as possible, considering the length of the session.

On Lord's day morning, at half-past 10 o'clock the Assembly was called to order by Bro. Joseph Wilson of this place, who officiated on the occasion. After a few appropriate remarks, the emblems of the body and blood of our Savior were partaken of by all present. All then united, as with the voice of one man, in singing praises to our God, and in fervent prayer and thanksgivings. At the close of these exercises a short exhortation was given by our aged brother Geo. Sneath, when the Meeting was adjourned to 2 o'clock P. M.

2 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment. After singing a hymn and reading a portion of Scripture, we were highly edified by remarks from Brethren A. W. Button, L. H. Chase and R. Appleyard, after which Bro. B. Boyes of South Northfield presented before the Conference for their con-

sideration, a plan whereby the financial difficulties existing between Miss Mary Hayes and Bro. P. Innes might be adjusted, so as to put an end, if possible, to the great injuries which the cause of Truth is and has been suffering for sometime past. The subject was entertained for a short time, and left over for further consideration this evening, when the Conference will be properly organized for business, and ready to take action. Adjourned to half-past six P. M.

Half-past 6 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment. After singing a hymn, a motion was made that Bro. A. W. Button of West Northfield, be Chairman during the present session. Carried.

The business left over in the afternoon now coming up for consideration, it was decided, that before anything could be done with effect, we must ascertain whether or not the charges are true made by Miss Hayes in her pamphlet of Nov., 1860, and by Brother Thomas in the *Herald* for Nov. and Dec., 1860, involving the moral and Christian standing of Brethren P. Innes and B. Wilson, in relation to the transaction. Accordingly, on motion of Bro. A. W. Button, a committee of disinterested brethren was chosen for the purpose of thoroughly investigating these charges, and reporting to the Conference previous to its final adjournment. The committee are as follows, viz:—Bro. E. W. Vining, of Dundee, Ill.; A. W. Button, of West Northfield, Cook Co., Ill.; L. H. Chase, of Adrian, Mich.; H. Fish and A. D. Barnes, of Manchester, Boone Co., Ill.; Wm. Keeling, of Rockford, Ill.; J. Whaley, of Melugin's Grove, Ill.; and R. Appleyard, of South Northfield, Cook Co., Ill.

This being disposed of, the subject left over for further examination at the present Conference, was now taken up, viz:—"What kind of Church order are we scripturally bound to adhere to?"

In Acts ii. 42 we read, that "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." At our last session we considered all but the "prayers." It was therefore decided to take up this branch for consideration this evening.

The subject was entered into with spirit, as some of the brethren differed upon it. All desired however, to arrive at Scriptural ideas concerning it. After numerous brethren had expressed their views, and considerable Scripture testimony had been adduced, we think we may safely say that this conclusion was arrived at, viz:—That it is not Scriptural for a brother leading in prayer to include in that prayer all the subjects possible for him to think of, thus making it lengthy, and almost impossible for those expected to join with

him to follow him in all his windings so as to consistently say Amen. And not only so, but compelling every other brother to remain quiet, or else travel over some of the same ground. Such brethren will do well to meditate on the following: "Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God, for God is in heaven and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few. For a dream cometh through the multitude of business, and a fool's voice is known by multitude of words."—Ecc. v. 2-3. A more scriptural plan is to have a definite object before the mind, and pray for that alone. This gives an opportunity for all to take part, and all can respond. Some people pray as though they thought they must fill up a certain amount of time, and consequently ask for things from their heavenly Father which they do not need, and in fact, never expect to get. We ought ever to remember that we are not addressing a fellow-mortal, but the Great Being of the Universe. Our words ought therefore to be few.

This subject having been examined at some length, the meeting adjourned to 10 o'clock A. M.

Dec. 24th, 10 o'clock A. M. Met pursuant to adjournment, and opened with singing and prayer.

The minutes of the last Conference were then read and approved.

On motion of Bro. B. Boyes, Thos. Wilson was chosen as Secretary of Conference for the ensuing six months.

The Corresponding and Financial Committee then made their report, which was approved.

Moved by Bro. R. Appleyard that the same Committee act for the ensuing six months, viz. James Wilson, H. B. Peirce and Thos. Wilson. Carried.

Bro. B. Wilson then gave us a brief account of his visit to Iowa, which was interesting. He was unfortunately obliged to return sooner than was desirable, owing to inconvenient stage accommodations. We have the assurance however that the trip was not lost, as good results are anticipated.

The following brethren then reported to the Conference, the past, present and future prospects of the cause in their respective localities, viz. L. Z. Baker, Aurora, Ill.; B. Wilson, Geneva, Ill.; E. W. Vining, Dundee, Ill.; R. Appleyard, South Northfield, Ill.; A. W. Button, West Northfield, Ill.; John Keeling, Rockford, Ill.; H. Fish, Manchester, Ill.; J. M. Craton, Monroe, Wis.; and J. Whaley, Melugin's Grove, Ill. The reports were very interesting, and from them we may say that the prospects for increase and the spread of the truth are good, and that some

additions have been made since our last Conference. Adjournment to 2 o'clock P. M.

2 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment. Opened with singing. Bro. L. H. Chase of Adrian, Mich., then gave us a brief account of his labors for five years past, during which time it appears he has immersed over 600 persons.

Remarks were then made by various brethren respecting the adoption of some means whereby the bond of union between the Churches might be strengthened. The subject was postponed however, until our next Conference.

Bro. Joseph Wilson moved the following:—"Whereas the brethren have heretofore delivered their reports of the Churches orally, it is requested that hereafter they give them in writing, and if possible send them by delegates, and if not, by mail to the Secretary." Carried.

The question of holding the next Conference at South Northfield, Cook Co., Ill., was then discussed, seeing there are a goodly number of brethren in that locality, but it was concluded best to meet as heretofore, in Geneva. Adjourned to 6½ o'clock P. M.

6½ o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment, and opened with singing. It was decided to examine this evening, the subject of the organization of Churches as a continuation of the subject of "Church order." After examination, the brethren were pretty well agreed upon the following:—That God is a God of order, and has not left the Church in a loose condition, but has given certain laws for its Government. That when a Church is properly organized, it has Elders and Deacons possessing the qualifications given in 1 Tim. iii. 1-10 and Titus i. 7-9. That these Elders are to have the welfare of the Church and of each member at heart, and that the guidance or rule is placed in their hands, to be exercised in accordance with the laws given. That the deacons have the temporal affairs of the Church in their hands, and in fact are the executors or servants of the Church. That it is the duty of brethren to be under government, as the Scriptures indicate, and all thus working harmoniously will constitute a Church in the order pointed out. Adjourned to 10 o'clock A. M.

Dec. 25th, 10 o'clock A. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment and sung a hymn. The Chairman being absent, Bro. Joseph Wilson was chosen as Chairman *pro tem*. There being no particular subject or business before the meeting, the brethren indulged in desultory remarks on prayer, as respects scriptural subjects for prayer—the attitude, etc. A few words were also said as to the dress of those professing godliness. Adjourned to 2 o'clock

2 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment and commenced with singing.

A New Year's Salutation from the Church at Halifax, England, having just been received, was read, and on motion of Bro. J. Whaley, accepted.

Bro. G. Sneath moved that Brethren G. D. Wilson, John Wilson and H. B. Peirce, be a committee to respond, on behalf of the Conference, to the communication just read. Carried.

The question now came up for consideration respecting the plan suggested by Bro. Boyes for settling the financial difficulties between Miss Hayes and Bro. Innes. The Chairman of the Committee appointed on Sunday last being present, said that the Committee would report on the morrow, but that we might now consistently entertain the subject in hand.

The brethren freely expressed their views in relation to it—all being very desirous for the accomplishment of the end in view, and deeply lamenting the injuries which the cause of truth has suffered. The question having been considered, the following plan was adopted.

The brethren considering Bro. D. Innes perfectly responsible pecuniarily no fears as to his honesty, or his notes of hand for the wh and give their own notes so to Miss Hayes, payable in from January 1st, 1861, or cent per annum, she to tr them, thus securing in two years, v losing one cen Innes, except which she incu. and appealing to the

for the settlement of her case, which expenses the brethren could not conscientiously pay, seeing it was her own act and deed, and done contrary to the advice of brethren. Five brethren voluntarily became responsible to her for the \$1500, viz. L. Z. Baker, S. L. Jackson, B. Boyes, R. Appleyard and B. Wilson, who gave their notes for that amount.

The time being somewhat advanced, and preparations having been made for a supper in the meeting house, an adjournment was moved and carried.

At about 6 o'clock P. M. the brethren sat down to a repast, and all seemed to enjoy themselves for a short time in supplying the wants of the outward man. At about 8 o'clock the supper arrangements being ended, the meeting was called to order by the Chairman, and opened with singing. The brethren then followed each other in quick succession, with exhortations, singing, etc. There was a lively interest manifested, and although the meeting

continued till after 11 o'clock, yet some seemed reluctant to close the exercises. There were, doubtless, lasting impressions made on this occasion, as the exhortations were pointed, the hymns applicable, and a general good feeling pervaded the whole. Adjourned to 10 o'clock A. M.

Dec. 26th. Owing to certain matters relating to the Investigating Committee's business, it was found impossible to meet pursuant to adjournment. By agreement, therefore, the Meeting was postponed to 6 o'clock P. M.

6 o'clock P. M. Met agreeable to postponement, and opened with singing.

The Committee of investigation now read to the Conference their Report, and on motion of Bro. J. M. Craton, it was adopted.

Bro. Vining moved, that the Report be handed to the Secretary of the Conference, and that he cause it to be published, and circulated with the *Banner*, and also be forwarded to the Editor of the *Herald*, asking him to give it as wide a circulation as he did that of Miss Hayes, as soon as we can ascertain from him the number of copies required. Carried.

It was then moved that the funds in the hands of the Treasurer, (\$11,00,) be paid to Bro. B. Wilson, towards defraying his expenses to Iowa, and also towards paying for the publication of the Report. Carried.

Bro. L. H. Chase then made a few remarks appropriate to the close of the present session, exhorting all to a continuance in well-doing, and to make sure the high calling to which we are called. There were many present who were touched to tears, especially when alluded in such an affecting manner to our younger brethren and sisters. We feel confident that every one felt well pleased and highly edified with the proceedings of the present Conference, and no doubt all will endeavor to be present at our next one in July.

Bro. Vining moved that we adjourn to the Lord's day next previous to the fourth of July 1861. Carried.

THOMAS WILSON.
Secretary.

For the Gospel Banner.
Salutation.

To the Brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ, scattered throughout Great Britain, Ireland, and America.

BELOVED BRETHREN:—Accept the cordial greetings of the Church at Halifax, who once more seek to turn this kindly season to profitable account.

Since last we sent our salutations, twelve months have been added to our lives, and it is important to pause and consider whether that twelve months has been a period of christian

activity and holiness, or a time of worldliness and indifference. Let us never forget that Jesus our Lord and Master has sent his message to the Churches. "I will give to every one of you according to your works," and has issued the inexorable decree, "*the unprofitable servant shall be cast out.*"

Are we fully alive to this? Are we adding yearly to our stock of good works, of profitable service? Of course we cannot do all we could wish;—we cannot get all that blissful perfection which in our hearts we may desire to attain; but do we give ourselves as much ordinary concern to be profitable servants of Christ as we do to be prosperous and respected in worldly matters? Are we as equally good Christians as we are good tradesmen and men of business? Are we as much interested in the future as we are in the present? Do we love Christ and his precious promises as much as we do this world and its concerns? It is to be feared that if these questions were fully answered, most of us would be found lamentably shortcoming.

Most of us can understand, argue, and perhaps preach about the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Most of us can give a reason for the blessed hope of life that is within us, but it is to be feared in too many instances we carry our faith more in our heads than in our hearts,—have our understanding enlightened, but our affections little softened by that gracious love of Christ which the mouth freely speaks. It is perhaps but too true of most of us that while we may know sound doctrine, we fail in the practical part of christianity,—are but superficially acquainted with its precepts as affecting our every day behavior, and still more backward in obeying them, when we know. In a word, the good seed may have been sown in our hearts, and yet the fruit may be tardy in making its appearance on account of the abundance and vigor of those other plants which find but too ready a vegetation. It is to be feared that we allow ourselves to be influenced by the secular spirit of the age, and our christianity to be diluted with prevailing worldliness. Let us fear! for neither the worldly-minded nor the lukewarm shall inherit the kingdom of God. Let us guard against faint-heartedness. Let us rather strive to make our christianity, honest, straight-forward, and bold. We are apt to be overridden by the external circumstances of the time. Let it be otherwise. Let our characters be known in our circles: let our light shine in the surrounding darkness, and so may we glorify our Father in heaven, and secure his approval at last.

With regard to the affairs of this life, hear the words of our beloved master—"Take no thought, saying what shall we eat! or what

shall we drink! or wherewithal shall we be clothed! (for after all those things do the Gentiles seek,) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things; but seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and these things shall be added unto you." How very few of us act in this spirit! are we not apt to worry ourselves about this life? instead of throwing our heart and souls into the christian life, making our love for Christ, our love for the brethren, and our desire for the spread of the truth, the passion of our souls, are we not apt to lose sight of this blessed assurance of our Master, and to make the secular business, which ought to be altogether subordinate, the chief concern of existence? Brethren, let us take heed, "lest the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful." Let us not weary in well-doing. Many have run well for a time, and at last made shipwreck. Several lamentable instances of this kind have occurred during the past year. Let us take warning. Let us give diligent attention to the precious word of God which is able to build us up in our most holy faith. This is a most important exhortation; for if a man neglect the reading of the scriptures; or if he only attends to it as an occasional manner, his spiritual life will fade, and his mind will be gradually but certainly leavened with the deceptive principles around him.

With regard to our personal condition we know whether we are warm in our hearts toward Christ, his person, his truth, his commandments, and his brethren,—“where the treasure is *there* will the heart be also,” and “out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh.” There cannot be any mistake. Are we doubtful? have we qualms of conscience? “God is greater than our hearts,” and will disapprove of what it condemns. Are we pleased with ourselves, and looking forward with confidence to the coming of our Lord and master? only one thing can justify that confidence,—the consciousness of a holy christian life,—the answer of a good conscience toward God. “Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven,” but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven.” “He that *keepeth* my commandments, he it is that loveth me,”—“ye are my friends if ye *do whatsoever* I command you.” There can therefore be no mistake about the conditions of friendship and ultimate acceptance. “If a man love me, he will keep my words.” Let us measure ourselves by this standard. We have believed the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, and have been baptized into the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That is the first act of obedience,—the first act of conse-

cration; but what a work remains to be accomplished. “*All whatsoever* I have commanded” that is the measure of our duty,—of our goodness. Have we filled it? Brethren, let us diligently study the commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his apostles, and be careful to obey them *all* in our lives, for upon *that* depends our salvation. If we do so we shall be patterns of excellence,—beautiful characters,—noble men, bringing glory to his name; for, says Jesus, “*Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit.*”

A few words in conclusion with regard to the spreading of the truth. We have come to *know* God's blessed word; and hereby has been given to us a most precious talent. Are we alive to its true value? and to the obligation there rests upon us to increase it? It is to be feared not. Some neglect the duty and privilege of helping to disseminate the glorious Gospel among their perishing fellow-mortals, and it is to be regretted that some go further and discourage efforts in that direction. Is not this a misfortune? Does not our common benevolence prompt us to proclaim salvation to our fellow-men, and to place within their reach the same opportunities of obtaining it, that we ourselves have enjoyed? Does not imperative duty call upon us to do so? Let him that heareth say “*come.*” What higher commission do we require? Have we not heard? and shall we not then say “*come*” to our poor fellow-men? It is not enough to say they have the Bible, (although upon them is certainly cast a fearful responsibility by this circumstance.) They have the Bible it is true; but is it not “*a sealed book*” among the people, and more,—is it not a neglected book? Have we not then a noble opportunity to turn it to account; and shall we forego it? Shall we shrink from the task of upholding its blessed truths to the perishing? Shall we refrain from giving a testimony for God in this hard-hearted, unbelieving generation? The common instinct of the brethren will supply the right answer, and though in the estimation of some, it may be a wrong one. let us put it to them whether such an occupation for brethren would be displeasing to Christ, or altogether unprofitable to themselves; or whether the giving account of their lives is likely to be any the less pleasurable for its record of “*good communications*” of the Gospel?

Then let us work while it is called to-day. Let us labor and love and patiently abide, and at the coming of our Lord, may the measure of our service be full, and may we all obtain an abundant entrance into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The Brethren at Halifax most cordially salute you. In behalf of the church,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

For the Gospel Banner.

Reply to Salutation.

To the Children of God and Brethren of the Lord Jesus, assembling in Halifax, England, Greeting:

We, the holders of the "like precious faith" with you, and children of the same God, received with fellowship of feeling your welcome epistle whilst meeting in a Conference capacity at Geneva, Ill., from the 23rd to 26th of Dec., and return our fraternal salutations.

It gives us lively pleasure to hear of your welfare. "As sweet waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country,"—especially when that comes from those who are believers of the "glad tidings of the Kingdom of God,"—the best news that ever reached the ear or operated on the heart. Both you and we have heard it, and rejoice in the "common salvation." We reach forth the hand—(in spirit only, it is true,) and give you the grasp of brotherly affection. Neither time nor space can ever destroy the sympathies of the brethren of Jesus. Though mighty seas roll between, yet we still are one. Though we do not now enjoy the pleasures of social intercourse and friendly acquaintance with you, yet we rejoice in the blessed hope of one day coming with you "to Mt. Zion, to the general assembly and church of the First-born, whose names are enrolled in heaven."

Dear brethren, whilst we thus exchange our sympathies we thank you for the excellent admonitions and self-examinations your epistle contains. It is right at times to pause and hold strict heart-searchings to see how we stand in the sight of God, to "prove ourselves." We have to confess with you that too often, alas! the solemn realities we profess to be looking for do not receive that serious consideration which ought to obtain. They are treated with too much indifference or inconsiderateness—are made more a question of the head than the heart, the intellect assenting to its reasonableness whilst the feelings and emotions remain but little moved. The result of this is seen in barrenness of spiritual growth. This should not be. The blessed hope and sublime doctrines of the Faith ought to enlist the affections, call forth the feelings, and pervade our entire being with "peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." They should imbue us with rapture, enthusiasm and devotedness. If this were so, the result would be a whole-souled, entire consecration of ourselves and all we have to the service of God, with a single eye to his glory. This combined with a *consistent* and conscientious life would give us an unconquering heart; confidence before God; "full assurance of faith." Oh dear brethren, let us aspire to those higher states of excellence which it is both our duty and privilege to obtain. There are heights and depths of Christian

experience, there are glorious attainments in the divine life which we have not yet reached. Oh let us aim higher—get on higher ground, nearer to God. Let us have more humility and obedience, a disposition to be anything in carrying out the will of God. Let us give ourselves up entirely to him; and banish all selfishness from our hearts. Let us continue in Prayer, and watch thereunto for an answer. Let us seek to develop Faith and spirituality of mind. Let us cherish and increase fervency of spirit, and be animated by such a burning zeal that it may become our meat and drink to do His will. Let us seek also to obtain sound and scriptural views on these things and on our position, and its duties generally, by methodical study of the Word of God, that we may learn what the will of the Lord is. We are all much too remiss in these things, and have often to mourn the waywardness of some who sin from want of laying these things to heart. Our religion must be reduced to *practice*, and carried out in every-day life. It must not be a negative, listless thing, but a *positive demonstration* by good works, of the power of that faith which dwells within us, and impels to noble words and deeds. We must seek out ways and means of increasing our usefulness. We must not fold our arms in supineness but be up and doing. For want of these things the love of some has waxed cold, and they have fallen, being too much in love with this present evil world. Let us take warning therefore lest we should also fall from our steadfastness; making shipwreck of our faith.

Beloved brethren, since you wrote us on the last occasion we have passed through another year of life's chequered scenes. Many of us have been called to pass through trials more or less severe; the heaviest of which have been caused by those from whom we expected better things. When those with whom we have walked to the house of God in company, and have taken sweet counsel together, lift up the heel against us, the blow is more acutely felt. The treachery of "false brethren" is more allictive than opposition from a known enemy, because that is to be expected. But these trials will come, apparently in order "that the approved may be made manifest." "Some of them of *understanding* shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the end." "Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked will do wickedly," etc., Dan. xi. 35; xii. 10. It seems to us that this great *purifying* process, this great *sifting* time is setting in among us, to make ready the Bride; for she does not seem to be prepared just now. Let us then have grace to bear trials patiently, that the pure gold may appear after the refining, and if we have

been chastened for our faults, learn a salutary lesson and improve thereby, or if we suffer innocently, bear it with patience and resignation as a sign of our sonship. Let us breathe no thought of revenge against those who have spoken evil of and injured us, but pray that they may come to repentance.

Dear Brethren:—we are convinced that many difficulties have arisen from want of the true Christian spirit of patience and forbearance; and have gained strength from a lack of Church order and discipline. We cannot too strongly urge the necessity of a thoroughly Scriptural organization, that there may be holy men placed over the flock who shall watch and feed it in accordance with the instructions given by our Master and his apostles;—that the unruly may be warned and corrected, the weak made strong, the Body edified, and all “built up in our most holy faith.” The Church of Jesus is not a democracy in which each can do as they please. There must be *Order* and Government, and a due subjection to a mild, but firm authority of those who are the oldest in the faith, and have the most ability to rule, possessing the qualifications given in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, none of which are supernatural, but capable of being realized now. Therefore let us all be well organized and constituted on the Apostolic basis. Much good is also lost to the body doubtless, by the backwardness of our sisters to take that part in the worship and service of the church which it is their duty to discharge. This may arise partly from want of instruction, and partly from repressive influences caused by misconceptions of certain apostolic injunctions. We recommend that these be better investigated, and that they be encouraged to come forward and take that proper position which the Scriptures assign to them.

Brethren, the “Time of the End” is upon us, and astounding more and more with its marvellous scenes and events. The “signs of the times” are ominous in the extreme. One storm has scarce been lulled, before we hear the premonitory gusts of an approaching tornado. The nations are in perplexity; the “unclean spirits” are at work; discord everywhere prevails both in Church and State; and a momentous crisis is come upon “the Model Republic.” We believe that it is God’s purpose to stain the pride of all human glory, and show the vanity of trusting in an arm of flesh instead of the living God. The last great hour of trial on all the world is at hand, when God shall arise “to judgment, to save the meek of the earth.” Oh let us then “Be ready.” It is probable that every one of our little bands will be subjected to some peculiar trial or series of trials. But let us rely on our God, and stand firm in the truth,

without wavering, that the trial of our faith, “being so much were precious than gold that perisheth may be found unto praise and glory and honor at the appearing of Jesus Christ.”

May health and every needful blessing surround your pathway; may you be given the victory, and granted an abundant entrance into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Signed in behalf of the Conference.

G. D. WILSON,

H. B. PRICE,

JOHN WILSON,

Committee.

Geneva, Jan. 1st, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

An Orthodox Mystery.

Is man so great a mystery as theologians teach,
Possessing other entities the eye can never reach;
The outer man of dust was made, in this they all agree,

And in this house there dwells, a soul and spirit,
making three.

By this arrangement don't you see, a triune man appears,
Mysterious as the three-one God, whose center's every where;

For in the outer man there dwells the mystic man,
the soul,
Also a third, or spirit man, which makes the compact whole.

Soon body-man returns to dust, and spirit-man to God,

The soul-man down to hell is cast, to writhe in fire and flood,

So Cain for six thousand years in these conditions dwell,

One Cain in dust, one Cain with God, the other Cain in hell.

And when the trumpet of God shall sound, these will again unite,

Hell's pent-up lava bursts its bounds, and souls speed out in flight,

Millions of souls go hissing down, deep in the cold blue sea,

To find their bodies there intombed; poor souls, wunt luxury!

Man shuffles off his mortal coil, as chickens do there shell,

And then away to Heaven they fly, or shrieking sink to Hell;

In raptures of extatic bliss, to golden harps they sing,

But mark! they're immaterial Harps, for immaterial things.

An immaterial Heaven have these, an immaterial throne,

An immaterial tree of life, an immaterial crown,
An immaterial harp of gold, an immaterial song,

An immaterial God, and Christ, and spirit, three-in one.

These soulists have a phantom God, whose center's every-where,

No substance, shape, or form, hath he—to see him you must stare;

Well might the Savior say to these, as once he said before,

Ye worship that ye know not what, a phantom—nothing more.

Woodstock, Ill.

T. F. M.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi, 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JANUARY 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 2.]

For the Gospel Banner. Church Organization and Government.

We think our brethren are generally agreed as to not only the importance, but the duty incumbent upon them, wherever practicable, of organizing in a Church capacity, and assembling together every first day of the week to attend to the duties enjoined upon them by the Lord and his apostles. That the primitive Christians did so, there can be no doubt, inasmuch as we not only have the testimony of God's word to this effect, but the corroborative proof of Ecclesiastical history. We do not purpose therefore, to dwell upon this point, but will leave it with the simple suggestion that if it was important that the Hebrew Christians should "not forsake the assembling of themselves together" (Heb. x. 25;) in view of the approaching dissolution of the Jewish state, it can be no less important for us, especially in view of the speedy advent of the Judge of the whole earth. We shall therefore proceed to consider briefly some of the

OBJECTS OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

The first and principal object is, that an opportunity may be afforded for the disciples of Christ to perform *all* the duties enjoined upon them, which it is impossible to do, as perfectly at least, without it. Amongst these we might mention the ordinance of the Lord's supper, the prayers, exhortations, etc.

The Church of Christ is a School of training, where we are to fit ourselves for the high stations of the future. This training is to result in the transformation of our characters into the moral image of Christ our head. True, this may be accomplished outside of an organized body of believers, but how many there are thus situated who can testify to the fact that it is a far more difficult task, inasmuch as they have not the kind exhortations, encouragement, reproof, or mutual teaching, which those have who are privileged with organization. When properly conducted it is a great means of preserving the faith in its purity, a source of encourage-

ment to all connected with it, and a means of building them up in their most holy faith.

The Church of the living God is styled by the apostle Paul as "the pillar and ground of the truth." Seeing this is so, all must concede that an organized effort is better calculated to give this support to the truth than could possibly be given by isolated individuals. In short, the Church when properly organized is complete in itself, rendering it entirely unnecessary for any of its members to unite themselves with any worldly association.

In all organized bodies however, it is necessary that some one should be placed at the head of affairs, in order that the objects of the organization may be properly carried out. So it is in the Christian organization.

THE OFFICERS OF CHRIST'S CHURCH

consists of a presbytery or Eldership, 1 Tim. iv. 14. This appears to be composed of two branches, viz. bishops and deacons, Phil. i. 1. For the purpose of bringing the subject more clearly to view, we will consider the officers separately, and will examine first,

THE OFFICE OF A BISHOP.

The name *επισκοπος*, *episkopos*, bishop, signifies an inspector, overseer; a watcher, guardian; and the name *πρεσβυτερος*, *presbyteros*, elder, signifies a senior, an elder or member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, an elder or presbyter of the Christian Church. In Acts xx. 17, 28; and in Titus i. 5, 7; we find these names used interchangeably showing that they are synonymous, when applied to the officers in question. It might be proper to state however, that the word *episkopous* in Acts xx. 28; is translated *overseers* in King James' translation, instead of bishops. From 1 Tim. v. 17; it would appear that the business of these bishops or elders was to rule, and to labor in the word and doctrine. They were placed at the head of Christ's church to guide its members and direct its affairs, 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; Heb. xiii. 7, 17. From the passage already referred to in Acts

xx. 28; we learn that they are the overseers of Christ's flock, and as such are to watch (verse 31) and see that no grievous wolves enter in and devour it. And from 1 Peter v. 1-3; we learn that they are not only to take the oversight, but are to feed the flock, and be living examples for them to pattern after. We see then that the office is one of great importance, and from the quotations made we may sum up as follows—

THE DUTIES OF BISHOPS.

1. They are to *oversee the flock* of which they have been chosen the heads, and have an eye on the general welfare of the Church. As such overseers they must rule, guide and direct in all matters which are calculated to advance the best interests of the whole body.

2. They are to *feed the flock*. As one of their qualifications is to be apt to teach, it is here shown to be very necessary, in order that they impart proper food and in the most appropriate manner. Although all did not labor in the word and doctrine, yet those who did were entitled to double reward.

3. They are to *watch the flock*, as Shepherds, or some grievous wolf may stray into the fold and devour the sheep. Some unprincipled individual may come into their midst and preach doctrines which aim directly at undermining the faith upon which we are built, and thus seek to destroy our foundation. They must remember that they have the lives of those who chose them to that high station, in their care, and they are to watch each individual member as faithfully as though they would be held accountable for his life at the great day of accounts. If they feel such a responsibility as this, they cannot but be vigilant.

4. They are to be *examples to the flock*. Occupying the highest position in the Church, it is incumbent upon them to so conduct themselves as to be patterns for others to imitate. It is also necessary in order that their words of reproof, etc., may have due weight.

5. They are to take the oversight *willingly*, not by constraint. That is, when one is chosen to fill this high station, he is to assume the duties as one who is *willing* and anxious to do all in his power for the furtherance of God's plans, even to performing the arduous duties of the Elder's office. But above all things we are to guard against placing those in authority whose *willingness* arises from a desire to *lord* it over God's heritage, or who have an eye on the *filthy lucre* which may be offered as a means of support. Such men will bring ruin upon the flock, and instead of feeding it, will, like the Shepherds of Israel, "feed themselves, and will eat the fat, and clothe themselves with the wool, and will

rule the flock with force and with cruelty." The churches in our day are so much smaller, and circumstances so different, that we see no necessity for an elder or bishop to devote his whole time to the duties of his office, so as to require support for himself and family, as in the Apostles' days. He need not be tempted therefore, by filthy lucre; but there is danger of placing over us men who, instead of being examples, and ruling in the fear of God, with meekness and love, will show their weakness by *lording* it over the flock. Beware then, brethren, or serious consequences will result from your choice.

Having seen what the duties of Bishops are, we will now see what are

THEIR QUALIFICATIONS.

These are given by Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 2-7, and Titus i. 6-9. Before proceeding, however, we will make an observation as to the word *blameless*, which occurs in the outset. In primitive times it was customary for one desiring "the office of a bishop" to submit to an examination by the Church as to his qualifications, and if he was found to possess them, as given by Paul, he was said to be "blameless," or *unaccused*, as Macknight translated it. That is, not that he was blameless in the absolute sense of the word, not having committed any act worthy of blame, being in fact *perfect*, but, on examination, he stood before the congregation blameless or unaccused *as to the qualifications*. We see therefore, that the word is here limited in its meaning, and a difficulty which has presented itself to many minds is thus removed, viz. where are we to find blameless brethren? This view is further strengthened by referring to 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9, where the apostle gives the qualifications of Deacons, and then says, "and let these *also* (as well as the bishops) first be proved (or examined by the Church as to their qualifications) then let them use (or fill) the office of a deacon, being found blameless," (or being unaccused.) The qualifications in 1 Tim. iii. 2-7 cover the ground. We will therefore enumerate them.

1. *The husband of one wife*.—That is, if he is a married man, he must not be a *polygamist*, as was common in the apostles' days, but be the husband of only *one* wife.
 2. *Vigilant*.—Watchful, diligent and attentive, or some duty will go unperformed.
 3. *Sober*.—Serious, not light-minded or given to frivolity; grave. Or, perhaps as some translators have it, "*Prudent*"—discreet, cautious, provident, careful.
 4. *Of good behavior*.—His past behavior as a disciple of Christ must be considered, and if not good, he cannot fill this qualification.
- Given to hospitality*.—This was especially necessary in primitive times, when it was

customary for the bishops to entertain their traveling brethren, such as evangelists, etc., and had an allowance made them by the Church for that purpose. It is a necessary qualification however, now, as it evinces in the man possessing it a whole soul, and a liberal disposition.

6. *Apt to teach.*—He must be well versed in God's word, and whose delight is in the law of the Lord, so that he may be able to teach or feed the flock, and by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince (or convict) the gainsayers. Titus i. 9. In order to do this, he should be one who can communicate his thoughts readily and intelligible, so that he may be styled an *apt* teacher.

7. *Not given to wine.*—If he is a slave to his appetite in this respect, he is robbed of his Christian character and manhood, and is neither fit to rule, nor for an example to the flock.

8. *No striker.*—He must be cool in temper, or, if a passionate man, he may be provoked to strike, and thus disgrace his office.

9. *Not greedy of filthy lucre.*—If he possess the other qualifications and is deficient in this, we think he ought to be rejected, inasmuch as it is said, that "the love of money is the root of all evil," and although he may not take the office for its profits, yet he can not serve God and mammon at the same time.

10. *Patient.*—It is extremely necessary that he possess this lovely trait of his Master's character, seeing that he may have to deal with brethren who are irritable, and if he loses control of himself, and becomes impatient, he is no longer in a position to judge impartially, or advise correctly, as his judgment becomes warped.

11. *Not a braver.*—Or, as Macknight says, "not a noisy, abusive, quarrelsome talker." On the contrary he must be kind, calm and temperate in speech, so that his words may be weighty.

12. *Not covetous.*—This practice is especially guarded against in the Scriptures, as being a disgrace to the Christian name, and of course bishops must be entirely free from it.

13. *One that ruleth well his own household, etc.*—This, like the first qualification, we think, must be subject to circumstances. If one possessing the other qualifications can be found, having children of such an age as to prove that they are under government, he should be preferred to a young man. It is not a *qualification*, however, that he be at the head of a household, but it is that he be a *good ruler*.

14. *Not a novice.*—That is, he must not be young in the faith, but one well versed in its doctrines, else he will not be able to feed the flock with proper food.

15. *A good report of them which are without.*—He must sustain a good character for morality and integrity in the community where he resides, or he will subject himself to reproach.

If a man is found possessing the foregoing qualifications he is blameless, and fit to fill the bishop's office.

It has been argued by some that we cannot now have scripturally qualified bishops, because they cannot be possessed of the gifts of the Spirit, like those in the Apostles' days. In reply we would say, that we nowhere find the gifts of the Spirit mentioned as a necessary qualification for a bishop. The mere fact that bishops did possess them is of no force as an argument, inasmuch as members of Christ's church who were not in any office possessed them, yet no one will argue that it is therefore a necessary qualification for members *now*. In the list of Spiritual men placed in the Church of Christ we find no mention of bishops and deacons. Why? Because these offices were to continue in the Church till Christ's second advent, whilst the Spiritual men were temporarily given, for a special purpose. Of course, then, all that was performed by these bishops or elders through the direct aid of the Spirit, cannot be performed now; yet it does not follow that men cannot now be found just as scripturally qualified to fill the office as were those of old. Macknight has well observed that "all the duties of their office might be performed with the help of natural talents and acquired endowments." Bear in mind, then, that the *gifts of the Spirit never were a qualification*, and were not necessary for the proper discharge of the bishop's duties. We will now leave this branch of the subject, and consider that relating to

THE OFFICE OF A DEACON.

The name *διακονος*, *diakonos*, servant or minister, seems to point at once to the duties of this office. The word *deacon* in 1 Tim. iii. 8-13 is translated *servant* in Matt. xxiii. 11, and *minister* in Mark x. 43.

In all governments there is an *executive*. So there is in Christ's church. The deacons are the servants or executors of the various branches which grow out of the organization as a church.

The qualifications are similar to those of the bishop, though not so numerous. They are to be grave, not frivolous; always speaking the same thing, and not double-tongued. They, like the bishops, are not to be given to much wine, nor be greedy of filthy lucre. They are to hold the mystery or secret of the faith in a pure conscience. They too must avoid polygamy, and be able to rule their households well, if they have one, "for

xx. 28; we learn that they are the overseers of Christ's flock, and as such are to watch (verse 31) and see that no grievous wolves enter in and devour it. And from 1 Peter v. 1-3; we learn that they are not only to take the oversight, but are to feed the flock, and be living examples for them to pattern after. We see then that the office is one of great importance, and from the quotations made we may sum up as follows—

THE DUTIES OF BISHOPS.

1. They are to *oversee the flock* of which they have been chosen the heads, and have an eye on the general welfare of the Church. As such overseers they must rule, guide and direct in all matters which are calculated to advance the best interests of the whole body.

2. They are to *feed the flock*. As one of their qualifications is to be apt to teach, it is here shown to be very necessary, in order that they impart proper food and in the most appropriate manner. Although all did not labor in the word and doctrine, yet those who did were entitled to double reward.

3. They are to *watch the flock*, as Shepherds, or some grievous wolf may stray into the fold and devour the sheep. Some unprincipled individual may come into their midst and preach doctrines which aim directly at undermining the faith upon which we are built, and thus seek to destroy our foundation. They must remember that they have the lives of those who chose them to that high station, in their care, and they are to watch each individual member as faithfully as though they would be held accountable for his life at the great day of accounts. If they feel such a responsibility as this, they cannot but be vigilant.

4. They are to be *examples to the flock*. Occupying the highest position in the Church, it is incumbent upon them to so conduct themselves as to be patterns for others to imitate. It is also necessary in order that their words of reproof, etc., may have due weight.

5. They are to take the oversight *willingly*, not by constraint. That is, when one is chosen to fill this high station, he is to assume the duties as one who is *willing* and anxious to do all in his power for the furtherance of God's plans, even to performing the arduous duties of the Elder's office. But above all things we are to guard against placing those in authority whose *willingness* arises from a desire to *lord* it over God's heritage, or who have an eye on the *filthy lucre* which may be offered as a means of support. Such men will bring ruin upon the flock, and instead of feeding it, will, like the Shepherds of Israel, "feed themselves, and will eat the fat, and clothe themselves with the wool, and will

rule the flock with force and with cruelty." The churches in our day are so much smaller, and circumstances so different, that we see no necessity for an elder or bishop to devote his whole time to the duties of his office, so as to require support for himself and family, as in the Apostles' days. He need not be tempted therefore, by filthy lucre; but there is danger of placing over us men who, instead of being examples, and ruling in the fear of God, with meekness and love, will show their weakness by *lording* it over the flock. Beware then, brethren, or serious consequences will result from your choice.

Having seen what the duties of Bishops are, we will now see what are

THEIR QUALIFICATIONS.

These are given by Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 2-7, and Titus i. 6-9. Before proceeding, however, we will make an observation as to the word *blameless*, which occurs in the outset. In primitive times it was customary for one desiring "the office of a bishop" to submit to an examination by the Church as to his qualifications, and if he was found to possess them, as given by Paul, he was said to be "blameless," or *unaccused*, as Macknight translated it. That is, not that he was blameless in the absolute sense of the word, not having committed any act worthy of blame, being in fact *perfect*, but, on examination, he stood before the congregation blameless or unaccused *as to the qualifications*. We see therefore, that the word is here limited in its meaning, and a difficulty which has presented itself to many minds is thus removed, viz. where are we to find blameless brethren? This view is further strengthened by referring to 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9, where the apostle gives the qualifications of Deacons, and then says, "and let these *also* (as well as the bishops) first be proved (or examined by the Church as to their qualifications) then let them use (or fill) the office of a deacon, being found blameless," (or being unaccused.) The qualifications in 1 Tim. iii. 2-7 cover the ground. We will therefore enumerate them.

1. *The husband of one wife*.—That is, if he is a married man, he must not be a *polygamist*, as was common in the apostles' days, but be the husband of only *one* wife.

2. *Vigilant*.—Watchful, diligent and attentive, or some duty will go unperformed.

3. *Sober*.—Serious, not light-minded or given to frivolity; grave. Or, perhaps as some translators have it, "*Prudent*"—discreet, cautious, provident, careful.

4. *Of good behavior*.—His past behavior as a disciple of Christ must be considered, and if not good, he cannot fill this qualification.

Given to hospitality.—This was especially necessary in primitive times, when it was

customary for the bishops to entertain their traveling brethren, such as evangelists, etc., and had an allowance made them by the Church for that purpose. It is a necessary qualification however, now, as it evinces in the man possessing it a whole soul, and a liberal disposition.

6. *Apt to teach.*—He must be well versed in God's word, and whose delight is in the law of the Lord, so that he may be able to teach or feed the flock, and by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince (or convict) the gainsayers. Titus i. 9. In order to do this, he should be one who can communicate his thoughts readily and intelligible, so that he may be styled an *apt* teacher.

7. *Not given to wine.*—If he is a slave to his appetite in this respect, he is robbed of his Christian character and manhood, and is neither fit to rule, nor for an example to the flock.

8. *No striker.*—He must be cool in temper, or, if a passionate man, he may be provoked to strike, and thus disgrace his office.

9. *Not greedy of filthy lucre.*—If he possess the other qualifications and is deficient in this, we think he ought to be rejected, inasmuch as it is said, that "the love of money is the root of all evil," and although he may not take the office for its profits, yet he can not serve God and mammon at the same time.

10. *Patient.*—It is extremely necessary that he possess this lovely trait of his Master's character, seeing that he may have to deal with brethren who are irritable, and if he loses control of himself, and becomes impatient, he is no longer in a position to judge impartially, or advise correctly, as his judgment becomes warped.

11. *Not a brawler.*—Or, as Macknight says, "not a noisy, abusive, quarrelsome talker." On the contrary he must be kind, calm and temperate in speech, so that his words may be weighty.

12. *Not covetous.*—This practice is especially guarded against in the Scriptures, as being a disgrace to the Christian name, and of course bishops must be entirely free from it.

13. *One that ruleth well his own household, etc.*—This, like the first qualification, we think, must be subject to circumstances. If one possessing the other qualifications can be found, having children of such an age as to prove that they are under government, he should be preferred to a young man. It is not a *qualification*, however, that he be at the head of a household, but it is that he be a *good ruler*.

14. *Not a novice.*—That is, he must not be young in the faith, but one well versed in its doctrines, else he will not be able to feed the flock with proper food.

15. *A good report of them which are without.*—He must sustain a good character for morality and integrity in the community where he resides, or he will subject himself to reproach.

If a man is found possessing the foregoing qualifications he is blameless, and fit to fill the bishop's office.

It has been argued by some that we cannot now have scripturally qualified bishops, because they cannot be possessed of the gifts of the Spirit, like those in the Apostles' days. In reply we would say, that we nowhere find the gifts of the Spirit mentioned as a necessary qualification for a bishop. The mere fact that bishops did possess them is of no force as an argument, inasmuch as members of Christ's church who were not in any office possessed them, yet no one will argue that it is therefore a necessary qualification for members *now*. In the list of Spiritual men placed in the Church of Christ we find no mention of bishops and deacons. Why? Because these offices were to continue in the Church till Christ's second advent, whilst the Spiritual men were temporarily given, for a special purpose. Of course, then, all that was performed by these bishops or elders through the direct aid of the Spirit, cannot be performed now; yet it does not follow that men cannot now be found just as scripturally qualified to fill the office as were those of old. Macknight has well observed that "all the duties of their office might be performed with the help of natural talents and acquired endowments." Bear in mind, then, that the *gifts of the Spirit never were a qualification*, and were not necessary for the proper discharge of the bishop's duties. We will now leave this branch of the subject, and consider that relating to

THE OFFICE OF A DEACON.

The name *διακονος*, *diakonos*, servant or minister, seems to point at once to the duties of this office. The word *deacon* in 1 Tim. iii. 8-13 is translated *servant* in Matt. xxiii. 11, and *minister* in Mark x. 43.

In all governments there is an *executive*. So there is in Christ's church. The deacons are the servants or executors of the various branches which grow out of the organization as a church.

The qualifications are similar to those of the bishop, though not so numerous. They are to be grave, not frivolous; always speaking the same thing, and not double-tongued. They, like the bishops, are not to be given to much wine, nor be greedy of filthy lucre. They are to hold the mystery or secret of the faith in a pure conscience. They too must avoid polygamy, and be able to rule their households well, if they have one, "for

they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." This seems to indicate that the deacons "holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience," labored in that direction in the church, and thereby purchased "*great boldness in the faith*," etc. They doubtless "purchased to themselves a good degree," or an honorable rank, when they were chosen to fill the office of a bishop, as was sometimes the case. To sum up then, the deacons are the executive of the church, who attend to the poor, the widows and orphans, the temporal necessities of the church, singly and collectively, and in fact are the carriers-out of every department in the church where a servant or minister is needed. We will now say a few words relative to

THE OFFICE OF A DEACONESS.

In 1 Tim. iii. 11 we read, "even so must their wives be grave," etc. Some may ask, why is it necessary for deacons to have grave wives, when no such requirement is made of the bishops? We reply, that this is an improper translation. Boothroyd and Mack might translate it "the women," instead of "their wives," referring, doubtless to the aged women or deaconesses which served in primitive times. See Rom. xvi. 1, 2. The word translated servant there is deaconess in Boothroyd's translation.

In the Apostles' days the arrangements were different from the present. They had all things common, Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 32-35. There was a society of aged widows formed, who were supported by the church, Acts vi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 16. These were women of good repute, who had "diligently followed every good work." Some of these good works are enumerated in 1 Tim. v. 9, 10. These aged widows were women of experience, and able to assist the men in the discharge of their duties, and honored their profession by laboring in various ways in the cause of Christ. We read that Phebe was a "succorer of many," and in Phil. iv. 3, that women labored in the gospel. No doubt they continued also the good works they had been accustomed to perform, such as "lodging strangers, washing the saints' feet," when fatigued with traveling, "relieving the afflicted," etc. In Titus ii. 3-5 we read that these aged women were to be "in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, *teachers of good things*, that they may *teach the young women* to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."

We see then, that they acted as mothers to the younger sisters, teaching them good things, and went about doing every good work which presented itself. We may gather from these facts, then, that deaconesses are not needed as much now as then,—the arrangements are so very dissimilar. Wherever circumstances call for them, however, we do not see why it would not be proper to employ them.

In order that all may go on harmoniously, it is necessary in all governments that the governed do their duty. We will glance then at

THE DUTIES OF BROTHERS.

In Heb. xiii. 17 we read, "Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit yourselves," and in 1 Thess. v. 13, "esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." If these duties are complied with, there can be no difficulty in carrying out harmoniously the order of the church.

From all that has been presented, we sum up the order as follows:—The bishops or elders constitute the head, which guides, directs, rules, oversees, watches, feeds, and sets an example to the flock. The spiritual welfare of the body and of each individual member is under their care, and if they observe any one derelict in duty, or wandering from the narrow path, it is their duty to warn and exhort that erring one, or see that it is done. They must endeavor to so watch for each person as to be able to give an account of *all* with joy and not with grief, at the judgment day, Heb. xiii. 17. But above all things, they should be careful not to allow the body to be distracted and torn to pieces by introducing tests of fellowship other than the Faith as preached to Abraham and by Christ and his Apostles, upon which we ought to unite, and cling to as the anchor of our Hope.

The deacons are the executive of the church, who, besides laboring in the faith and becoming bold in it, have charge of the temporal affairs of the church. They ought to possess the confidence of their brethren so far as to know their private wants, if there are any, and see that no brother or sister is in need of life's necessities. They should attend to widows and orphans, and thus obviate the necessity of brethren joining secret societies for this purpose. They ought also to carry out any mission appointed by the bishops which is for the health of the body; in short, be servants of the church, as their name indicates.

Together they form a presbytery for the government of the church, and we think it proper, that in cases of difficulty, the presby-

tery should consult together, so as to arrive at the best course of procedure.

The brethren, or the governed, of course signify their intention to submit to their rulers by making choice of them. Anyhow, it is their duty to do so, not unwillingly, but with a determination to assist them by good behavior, and a compliance in all things with God's will, so that every part of the body may be in harmony, carrying out the objects in view. If any one is refractory, and is continually opposing the measures introduced for the spiritual good of the body, and cannot be induced to change his course, such an one ought to be brought at once under the condemnation of law, and be cut off, being a hindrance and worthless. God's plan is harmonious, and any one interrupting that harmony by introducing discord, is a disturber, and should be removed, else the whole body will suffer.

Having now presented this subject before you, we trust that those churches who have no Scriptural organization, and are sufficiently large to require it, will at once form one, and do everything in the order God has pointed out.

T.

For the Gospel Banner.

"Paternity of Jesus."

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—In the September number of the *Banner* I read with a mixed feeling of astonishment and pity, an article on the "Paternity of Jesus," the writer of which seems to sneer at the credulity of Dr. Thomas for giving *credit* to the testimony in the record of the Evangelist, Matthew, concerning the birth of Jesus Christ, in preference to his (the writer's) "opinion" upon the same subject. As I happen to be one of an indefinite number that has fallen into the same error, according to the opinion of this writer, and choose to receive scripture testimony in preference to any man's "opinion," I should like some further information on this matter, before taking hold of the "opinion" set up as a standard, and given to the public for their guidance.

First, then, I would like to know who is Mr. Nevius? Is he "an apostle?" "has he seen the Lord?" If not, whence does he derive his authority for repudiating the testimony of one who answers to the above description of "an apostle?" Has he given any good reason for thus annulling the truth of Scripture? He says that himself and his "few other" friends, who have assisted him, "will give their opinion," and then proceeds to bring forward a few passages of Scripture, which have no more bearing upon the matter, as proof, than they have in proving the opposition of the poles, therefore in the absence of sufficient, or indeed, of any proof on the point, Mr. N. must

not blame us for our preference of Matthew's well authenticated testimony over the mere assertion of his unproved "opinion," even with the additional help of the "few" (I hope very few) who have assisted him to form, or manufacture, the "opinion" which he has sent forth, as surpassing God's word, for the enlightening influence which it possesses, as an instructor of the ignorant. Had Mr. N. acted upon the advice tendered to others, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good" upon ordinary investigation, his "opinion" would never have existed, as there are almost innumerable proofs in the "law and the testimony," which he commends to others, to upset and annihilate the crude, unfledged idea contained in the "opinion." It may tend, in their view, to make them a name; the more so, as they have the effrontery to challenge any one to disprove it, and thus give them "credit" for a discovery, which very "few," beside themselves, could make; but in the estimation of any man of sound mind, or "sound doctrine," it will call forth disgust, and show that they have made "shipwreck" of the true faith, if indeed, they ever possessed it. Why did Mr. N. and his few friends run out of the church, if they were conscious of having truth, such as would stand investigation? Why not remain until they were cast out for the truth's sake;—this might cause commiseration or sympathy; or at any rate would bring the matter under investigation, which I think would be profitable to Mr. N. and companions. Why not attempt to prove the truth of their "opinion," if truth it was? But they seemed conscious of having a bad cause. No wonder that they cry out "blasphemy," and run away before their spurious offspring should be exposed, as no doubt it would have been by some of the brethren there. As to the presumption of branding the Apostle's testimony as an "untruth," and setting up their own "opinion" as a superior standard! I pass over in silence, as unworthy of notice.

In speaking of the genealogy of Jesus, Mr. N. takes no notice of the difference between Matthew and Luke. It may be observed that Matthew gives his line of descent, tracing forward from Abraham, to whom the promise of the Seed was given in the covenant, and employs some forty-two names of ancestors of Joseph; while Luke gives his descent backwards, employing some seventy-five names of ancestors of Mary, whose line he traces back to the original promise made to Adam, which was to be the seed of the woman exclusively. With this agrees the sublime language of Paul, Gal. iv. 4. When the proper time arrived, "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman!" Why not of man

and woman, upon the principle of natural generation? It is rather singular how such men as Matthew, Luke, Peter, John, Paul, yes, and the Christ himself, should run into, and lead others into such an error. All these did so emphatically, under the guidance of the Spirit of God. This error is at last discovered by Mr. N. and his "few" friends!! "Made of a woman." Was such an expression ever used in reference to any other child, either by sacred or profane historian? Never. Where is it? I shall now bring forward the testimony, or testimonies, of those above mentioned, and then leave to the public, or at least to the church, to decide whether those testimonies or Mr. N's "opinion" should take the precedence. In so doing I shall abide close to the testimony, and although Mr. N. and his friends may not "credit" it, I shall cherish the hope that many others may.

I shall begin with Matt. xvi. 16. Peter says there, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Not the son of Joseph. In the 17th v. Jesus pronounces a blessing upon Peter for this revelation of His Father, (not Joseph,) but God. Now if Jesus was the natural son of Joseph, can Mr. N., or Mr. anybody else, tell me what need of a revelation from God that it was so? What need of a revelation to tell us that a man was a man, in this instance? No more than that of any other of the thousands of Jewish men and children which were born into, and existed in the world. Mr. N. did not bring this to prove his point. I fear that the passage in Matt. xi. 27 will be fearfully appropriate to Mr. N. and his few friends, "No man knoweth who the Father is, but the Son, nor who the Son is, but the Father," etc., without this revelation. Consequently it is no marvel if we find men, aye, and professors, who know neither Christ nor his Father.

Again, I look at Luke ii. 49, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business." He spoke this to Joseph, his supposed father. If Joseph had sent him about any of his business would he not have known it? And why go three days' journey and return in search of him? Evidently Jesus Christ never acknowledged Joseph as his father. If so, where is it to be found? Not in the whole Book. Look at John i. 1, etc.; and again, 14th v., "And the word was made flesh," etc., through the woman, agreeing exactly with Paul, in Gal. iv. 4, already quoted. Did Joseph make the Word of God flesh? How did he do it? Again, look at the 18th v. If the natural son of Joseph, how was he "in the bosom of the Father?" Did this father mean Joseph? No. Jesus was speaking of God. Look at John iii. 13: "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but

he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man," etc. If the natural son of Joseph, how did he come down from heaven? How did Joseph bring him down? Look again, at the 16th and 18th vs.: "God so loved," etc.; "sent his only begotten Son," etc. Who was Jesus speaking of in those two verses? Of himself? Of course. Mr. N. says that he was the only begotten Son after his resurrection. This language was used previous to that glorious event; but probably Mr. N. does not "credit" those Scriptures.

We look further, at John vi. 38: "For I came down from heaven," etc. If Joseph was his natural father, how could he come down from heaven? Look at the 42nd v. Mr. N. and his friends should have been amongst those cavaliers. Verse 62: "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before." Is not that language fatal to Mr. N's theory? What had Joseph to do with bringing him down from where he was before? Just nothing at all. No more than Mr. N. or myself had! But again, look at the 69th v. Upon the natural principle, and according to the "opinion" of Mr. N. and his "few" friends, the whole of the Disciples, are gone into this error, and what is still more wonderful, Jesus Christ never attempts to set them right!!! Ought not such a confession on the part of the Apostles, and the indifference displayed by the Savior, at such an error, (if error it was,) in not reprimanding it,—a thing which he was not slow to do,—I say ought not this to make Mr. N. and his friends think. One would suppose that I had now brought forward enough to disprove Mr. N's idea; but I have not yet done.

I now proceed to bring forward other testimonies, and in doing so will look at John viii. 19: "They said unto him, Where is thy father? Jesus answered, Ye neither know me nor my Father." And if I mistake not, he would have told Mr. N. and his friends the very same thing. Did not these men, in John vi. 42, ask: "Is not this Joseph's son?" It appears quite plain that all those unbelieving cavaliers knew Joseph very well. Why then ask the question, "Where is thy Father?" If Joseph was his father, why did Jesus tell them that they "neither knew him nor his Father?" Can Mr. N. explain the discrepancy between John vi. 42 and viii. 19, upon his natural principle? My "opinion" is, that if Mr. N., and his few friends, had looked at those Scriptures before forming their "opinion," it would have assumed quite a different form, before coming to the world, in such a palpably absurd shape. Again, at John viii. 42: "I proceeded forth and came from God." Need I ask Mr. N.

how this agrees with his natural generation? If the son of Joseph, how did he come forth from God? and where did he come from? Again, John ix. 35-38. Here the Savior himself falls into the error condemned by Mr. N's "opinion." Where has Jesus Christ ever called himself the son of Joseph? Where has any of his disciples, or any other of his true believing followers up to the present day done so? Nowhere. Why did not Jesus disabuse this man's mind of such an error? If Jesus was the natural son of Joseph, and consequently no more than any other man, why did he allow this man to run into the egregious error of worshipping him? The Angel, in Revelations, would not allow John to do it, although higher than a man. See Rev. xix. 10, and xxii. 9. Mr. N. and his friends must assuredly have read the scriptures of the New Testament with a dark lantern. Remember this was all done before his resurrection to immortality.

I am afraid, Bro. Wilson, that I am trespassing upon your space and patience, but I consider the subject so important that I wish to bring forward a few more Scriptures, lest I might never have another opportunity; I trust, therefore, that you will bear with me. I will look again at John x. 38: "The Father is in me, and I in him." If such a close union, was Joseph the father of them both? No wonder that the cry of blasphemy should be raised against this newly formed "opinion" of Mr. N.; and no marvel that he should not escape from the consequences of an exposure. Why, sir, the devils knew all about Jesus,—better than Mr. N. and his friends; not one of them dare bring forward the blasphemous charge that he was Joseph's son naturally, as any one may see who will take the trouble of turning to the following Scriptures: Matt. viii. 29; Mark v. 7; Luke iv. 34; viii. 28. These are but a few of a great number to the same effect.

Again, how can the language in John xiii. 3 be understood upon the principle of natural generation, "that he was come from God and went to God?" It is true something similar might be said of Isaac, and also of John the Immerser; but it is equally true that the power and influence of Jehovah had to be employed in both these cases, as the parents of both those children had gone beyond the age of child-bearing and natural generation; but not employed in the same way as in the case of Jesus, whose parents (supposed so) were not in the same way, and no necessity existed for reviving their powers of generation, as was the case with the others. It appears quite plain, that as "the woman was in the transgression," and brought sin and death into the world, for "Adam was not deceived," (see 1 Tim. ii.

14,) therefore the original promise of the Seed of the woman would issue in the fact, that by woman also would the means of life and immortality be brought into the world, without the intervention of man;—this was actually done, and is confirmed by the testimony of Matthew, and several other testimonies, which I adduced. Whether Mr. N. "credits" them or not, they are not at all the less true on that account.

Again, John xiv. 10, 11; similar to other passages which have been brought forward. See also John xvi. 27, 28. Plain unmistakable language. Will Mr. N. and his friends please reconcile this with natural generation? Here is the language: "Ye have loved me and believed that I came out from God;" how, if only the natural son of Joseph? "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world, again I leave the world, and go unto the Father." Now the disciples say he speaks plainly,—no proverb,—but plain, unvarnished truth,—no mystery,—no mystification about it. Again I ask Mr. N. to reconcile this with the insolent declaration of his "opinion!!!" At the 30th v. the whole of the disciples go into this fatal error, and Jesus never attempts to rescue them! Now they were sure that he (Christ) came out from God. Can any man be a follower of Jesus Christ and disannul such testimony,—pronounce it an "untruth," and unworthy of "credit?" "O tell it not in Gath," nor in Geneva, "lest the uncircumcised rejoice." John xvii. 5, 8, 24, is also to the point. Why did John go into this matter so fully? For the simple reason, that he had to contend against the same error into which Mr. Nevius and his friends have fallen. This "damnable heresy" having been brought into the church before his record was written, being about thirty years after the record of the other Evangelists.

I have brought forward something from Matthew, Peter, Luke, John, and Christ himself. Now I bring in one or two Scriptures from Paul. Look at 2 Cor. viii. 9: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for our sakes, he became poor," etc. Now if Jesus was no more than the natural son of Joseph, can Mr. N. or his friends tell us when he was rich, from his birth to his death? What high and lucrative position did he fill in the world? What riches did he, as a man, forego to become poor? Where have we any account of any situation, yielding riches or emolument, which he ever held? We have not so much as the first hint of any such thing. Let Mr. N. reconcile this with his natural sonship, if he is able. Phil. ii. 6, 7 is also to the point, and well worthy of consideration. One more, Col. i. 15, 16, 17: "Who is the image of the

invisible God, . . . by him all things were created," etc. Now although this language may be taken in connection with the new creation, and yet future, it will apply equally to the material creation, for Jesus Christ is the creator of all things, as just quoted from the Apostle. Do not understand me to say here, that Jesus had any form previous to his incarnation, or birth; but with the Apostle I say he was the "Word" of God, and by this Word the whole creation was brought into existence. "This Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," agreeing with Heb. x. 5, and following verses: "A body hast thou prepared me;" also Psa. xl. 6, 8; l. 8; from which Paul quotes. The whole of those Scriptures are perfectly intelligible and clear, and quite in harmony one with another. But Mr. N. will not, in all probability, "credit" them. With his repudiation of Matthew's testimony,—branding it as an "untruth," his blasphemous remarks upon the "illegitimacy" of our beloved Lord, and the consequent "justice of his crucifixion!" and also his scurrilous remarks concerning the character of Joseph, "a just man," according to the testimony of Scripture, it is easy to see that Mr. N. and his companions have assumed more than a doubtful position. May God open their eyes, if it seems *good in his sight*. I remain, dear Bro.,

Yours in gospel hope,

THOMAS CHURCHILL.

Toronto, Sept. 15, 1860.

[We sincerely hope that the arguments, Scripture proofs, and pointed rebukes of our worthy correspondent, in the above article, may not be lost upon those who have fallen into the fatal error of setting aside Apostolic testimony. Let them not be offended at the earnest manner in which Bro. Churchill writes, but rather be induced to re-examine the matter.—ED.]

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.—A Preaching Tour.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—I would like to give a small sketch of my last tour, in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. Wife in company with me left home for Saybrook, Ohio, Aug. 8th; arrived there the same day. Met Bro. Wm. Fish and wife, of Dayton, Ohio, at Saybrook. They were on a visit to their son-in-law, Geo. Nellis, of Ashtabula. Was truly glad to see them. They are the choice of the earth. Their whole being is engaged in the cause of the one Faith. I found the congregation at Saybrook in a very bad state. The spirit of jealousy and dissension had found its way among them, by reason of some who wished to rule, and make themselves conspicuous in setting up a standard of

morals of their own, and all that would not bow to their *image* must be "cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth." I labored among them for some six weeks. In that time twelve more were added by immersion. They made a change in some of their officers, and I left them, seemingly, in a fair way to do well.

We then went to Hayfield, Crawford Co., Penn., to the house of our much beloved Bro. T. H. Dunn. Bro. Dunn is a very successful proclaimer of the one Faith, one Hope, and one Baptism. We held some profitable meetings in his neighborhood.

Bro. Dunn accompanied us to Blooming Valley, where there is a society of half-brethren and sisters,—in the faith theoretically, but had not obeyed since they believed. We induced four of them to put on Christ, and many more of them were almost persuaded to become Christians, and we think they will soon. Bro. Dunn continues to speak to them every two weeks.

Bro. Dunn and myself then went to a place called Root's Settlement, where John T. Ongley had a congregation,—partially enlightened in the faith. Bro. Dunn left me to preach to them, while he, in company with a Bro. J. Niles, visited another section, where the said Ongley labors. They immersed six of his church in that place, into the *one Faith*. I immersed seventeen at Root's Settlement. We then returned back to his place where I held several more interesting meetings.

There is a band of very intelligent believers in Bro. Dunn's vicinity, who are earnestly striving for the Kingdom. We enjoyed ourselves very much in their society. We felt that we were kindred spirits, striving together for the faith of the *one Gospel*. We hope to meet them in the Kingdom.

I left, in company with wife, for Knowlesville, Orleans Co., N. Y., where I have a sister. We made her family a visit, and then went to visit my Bro. in the flesh, and in the Lord, at Eagle Harbor, in the same Co.

From thence I went to Rochester, N. Y. Had some good meetings with brethren in that place. Stayed with Bro. McMillan, a faithful and good Bro. There is a faithful and intelligent band of brethren in that city. I preached a number of discourses to them and others who came in to hear. We parted in love and Christian fellowship, hoping to meet in the blessed Kingdom.

Returned to Eagle Harbor. Spoke five times to the people, and baptized one intelligent soul into Christ.

We then left for Saybrook, Ohio. Remained there one week. The brethren there are now doing well. They contributed quite liberally for our expenses, with the promise

that I would soon return again and labor among them. There are good and tried brethren and sisters in that place. We hope and pray they may hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering.

On the morning of the 27th of November we took the cars, at Ashtabula depot, for our home in Michigan, where we safely arrived on the eve of the same day, after an absence of sixteen weeks. Found our family and friends all well. Traveled some 800 miles, spoke 83 discourses, and baptized 34 into Christ.

L. H. CHASE.

Adrian, Mich., Nov. 29th, 1860.

For the Gospel Banner.

Review of Sundry Topics.

Dear Bro. Wilson;—It was with no slight interest that I saw in recent Nos. of the *Banner* the articles headed "Who are Brethren?" It is a sad fact that some who profess the One Faith, and have been immersed into the Name in due order, evidence less goodness than some who have not taken the requisite step to entitle themselves to a participation in the Kingdom and Glory with obedient believers; yet this being so,—furnishes no reasonable excuse for any inconsistency in us. We profess *the faith*, without which, and baptism upon confession thereof, inheritance in the coming kingdom cannot be obtained. If we fellowship those who have not this faith, or claiming to have it, yield not the obedience demanded, the inconsistency of our course is apparent to the discerning eye of all. The Master requires faithfulness. If we be with Him when He rides forth in conquering majesty, this characteristic must be ours, Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 11; &c. We must not practically deny our faith by mingling our petitions with those who say Lord, Lord, and do not what he commands; and we must not commune with such as though they (fable-holding and disobedient) are or can be true partakers of the body and blood of Christ. From such corruptions let us all cleanse ourselves. People then will understand us, and see that we mean what we say. Consistency throughout is demanded, and let no association, how long or dear soever, deter us from the warfare essential to our gaining the approval and honor awaiting the saint.

With your remarks and those of Bro. Boyd concerning marrying unbelievers, I heartily agree. Any attempt to defend or excuse such alliances in the light of God's plain word, must utterly fail. No sincere and understanding disciple will make such attempt. But the subject of *unequal yoking* has more scope than this one of marriage. In face of Paul's questions, 2 Cor. vi. 15, I affirm that it is not for the Disciple to join with children of this

world in electing their rulers. The Christian must *submit* to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; but mingling with the unholy in electing unholy rulers, no matter of what party, is none of his business. It belongs to Gentiles—let it be theirs until their times are fulfilled. And more earnestly do I protest against avowed believers remaining in association with "Free Masons," "Odd Fellows," "Sons of Temperance," and all such like bodies of darkness. Come out from among them! What concord hath Christ with Belial? What part hath he that believeth with an infidel? Touch not the unclean.

The frightful heresy concerning the pater-nity of Christ, I was gratified to see replied to by you. But I thought a strong rebuke was needed also. The heresy is of the most dangerous kind; a damnable one. *Nip it in the bud*, and God bless you in the work. Among the many scriptures making the error manifest, let me refer the inquirer to John iii. 13; Col. i. 13; Heb. ii. 14; &c. And when we look at the express testimony of Matthew and Luke, we hope and pray that the little flock may be kept from the poison of such a plain Bible-denying sentiment. God forbid it should extend—rather may those who have imbibed it be graciously rescued from its ruin.

Perhaps about a year ago there appeared some articles in the *Banner* upon meats. Did Bro. C. mean these when he spoke of "crotchets?" The writer, in proving from Genesis 7th chap. that the distinction between clean and unclean beasts was understood in Noah's time, and before the Deluge, certainly presented a truth worthy consideration, as all truth is. A sensible, argumentative article, if faulty, ever deserves a proper reply. To cry out "crotchets" will not satisfy everybody. Decidedly is your humble correspondent against indulging any whim in this matter. Let no unnecessary yoke be imposed; yet it is *necessary* even for the Christian to abstain from some things; see Acts xv. Does this prohibition include shell-fish?

H. HEVES.

Wallingford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1860.

For the Gospel Banner.

Harvard Conference.

BRO. WILSON:—Being Secretary of the Conference held at this place, I send you a brief account of the same, requesting that you will give it a place in the *Banner*.

Elder H. V. Reel, President, appointed three as a Committee of Business. The following resolutions were adopted by the Conference.

1st. *Resolved*, That a Committee of three be appointed to correspond with the Churches to raise a support for R. Chown, our Evangel-

ist. The following brethren were appointed, C. N. Jeroame, J. Wells, H. Stewart, of Harvard.

2nd. *Resolved*, That the action and doings at the Geneva Conference, from the report of L. H. Chase and others, are approved by this Conference, in favor of the vindication of the characters of B. Wilson and P. Innes, in the case of Miss Hayes.

3rd. *Resolved*, That the Churches of immersed believers in the gospel of the Kingdom send delegates to act in a business capacity in the conferences.

4th. *Resolved*, That our next Conference will be held at Plum River, Jo Davies Co., where Bro. R. Chown may appoint, about the middle of next March. Due notice will be given.

The conference of brethren at this place has been prominent in recommending the establishment of Apostolic order in the Churches. The labors of L. H. Chase are appreciated by many. Bro. Reed has many calls from various fields. Laborers are few. I am going south as far as Iroquois and Warren Co's. Trusting that the Lord's stewards will be faithful in doing their duty, that his laborers may be sustained.

I am, your Bro. in the one Hope,

ROBERT CHOWN.

N. B.—I wish all who have received the *Banner* through my agency, and have not paid up and renewed their subscription, for their own sake to *do so*, that they may be aided in the knowledge of the gospel, and be obedient to the same, that eternal life may be theirs through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Harvard, Ill., Dec. 31, 1860. R. C.

For the Gospel Banner.
Queries.

Will some brother tell us who the "*Ancient of days*" is, spoken of in the 7th. of Daniel, who is to sit immediately after the last throne is demolished, and unto whom "thousand thousands ministered, and before whom ten thousand times ten thousand stood." In the 13th verse, it is said that one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the "*Ancient of days*." Again, in the 21st verse the prophet beheld with prophetic eye, that this small horn power made successful war with the saints, all along down until then. Here is a time fixed. It is not a time fixed for the coming of Christ, no, but if you will look very carefully you will see that it involves other and equally important events. There are four very important events couched in the language of these two verses. First, this horn loses his power, and does no more *prevail* against the saints. Secondly, at, or about the same time this

illustrious personage, the "*Ancient of days*" makes his appearance. Thirdly, judgment is given to the saints of the most High, as also stated in Psalm cxlix. 8; "To bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written: *this honor have all the saints.*" Now, if all his saints are to participate in this very honorable work, then it will necessarily involve one other point which I at first overlooked in my enumeration, and added to the others will make *five interesting points*. This, then involves the resurrection, if all alike participate, and is the *third event* if properly classified, and the executing of the judgment the fourth.

Fifthly and lastly, the saints take possession of the kingdom, the time has come *when* the kingdom shall be possessed by those who are *of the seed, and heirs according to the promise*. See Galatians iii. 29.

Now, I would like to know who this personage is; if any one of the brethren have light on this subject will they be so kind as to let it shine for the benefit of the Seed, or Church in this place. Addressed to the children of faith scattered abroad, by your brother, for the Church at Dayton, Ohio. GEO. NELLIS.

James W. Stone of Zion, Henderson Co., Ky., proposes the following query for the consideration of some of our correspondents;—"Will those who become righteous in the Age to come *die*?" (See Jer. and Ezek.)

Wm. S. Knight of Ind., asks how he is to understand Jer. xxxi. 15-17 compared with Matt. ii. 16-18. Also Mark x. 13-16 with Mark ix. 37.

Hell.

The word hell in the New Testament is translated from three words, all of them having a different meaning. These words are *hades*, *gehenna*, and *tartarus*. "Hades" means the grave, or state of the dead, "gehenna," the place of future punishment, or lake of fire, and "tartarus," the abode or condition of the fallen angels. As these three words, which have *different meanings*, are all translated by the word hell, which now has only one meaning, and so gives the Bible reader a wrong idea, we will give the remarks of some good critics, and every instance in which they occur. And,

1. *Ἅδης, Hades*, never means the place of punishment. Its primary meaning is, "an unseen place, the grave, pit, region of the dead," &c. See *Grove's Gr. & Eng. Dic.* Dr. Clarke says of *hades*, "The word hell, used in the common translation, conveys now an improper meaning of the original word;

because hell is only used to signify the place of the damned. But the word hell comes from the Anglo Saxon, *helan*, to cover." And Dr. Campbell also says, hell "at first denoted only what was *secret* or *concealed*."

We will now give each instance in which *hades* occurs, its translation being in italics. Let the reader bear in mind that in each case it means the grave, pit, or state of the dead.

- Matt. xi. 23. shall be brought down to *hell*;
 xvi. 18. the gates of *hell* shall not prevail
 Luke x. 15. shall be thrust down to *hell*.
 xvi. 13. in *hell* he lifted up his eyes,
 Acts ii. 27. wilt not leave my soul in *hell*,
 31. his soul was not left in *hell*,
 1 Cor. xv. 55. O *Grave*, where is thy victory?
 Rev. i. 18. have the keys of *hell* and of death.
 vi. 9. Was Death and *hell* followed
 xx. 13. death and *hell* delivered up the dead
 14. death and *hell* were cast into

This is a complete list of the use of *hades*, and the reader may decide whether it means a place of "torment," or as the word signifies, the pit, the sepulchre, and state of the dead in general.

The word generally rendered hell in the Old Testament is *sheol*. It occurs 64 times, and is translated *hell* 31 times, *grave* 30, and *pit* 3 times. *Hades* is its inspired translation in the New Testament. We will now give every reference to *sheol*, that the industrious Bible student may if he chooses, examine the subject to its fullest extent.

- Gen. xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xlv. 29, 31;
 Num. xvi. 30, 33; Deut. xxxii. 22; 1 Sam. ii. 6; 2 Sam. xxii. 6; 1 Kings ii. 6, 9; Job vii. 3; xi. 8; xiv. 13; xvii. 13, 16; xxi. 13; xxiv. 19; xxvi. 6; Psa. vi. 5; ix. 17; xvi. 16; xviii. 5; xxx. 3; xxxi. 17; xlix. 14, 15; lv. 15; lxxxvi. 13; lxxxviii. 3; lxxxix. 48; cxvi. 3; cxxxix. 8; cxli. 7; Prov. i. 12; v. 5; vii. 27; ix. 18; xv. 11, 24; xxviii. 14; xxvii. 20; xxx. 16; Eccl. ix. 10; Cant. vii. 6; Isa. v. 14; xiv. 9, 11, 15; xxviii. 15, 18; xxxviii. 10, 18; lvii. 9; Ezek. xxxi. 15-17; xxxii. 21, 27; Hosea xii. 14; Amos ix. 2; Jonah. ii. 2; Hab. ii. 5.

Prof. Stuart of Andover, Mass., gives the following criticism on this word; The meaning of *sheol* which lies upon the face of the sacred record (if I may thus speak,) is indeed that of *grave, sepulchre, under world, or state of the dead*.—*Exegetical Essays*, p. 112.

2. *Γέεννα, Gehenna*. Greenfield in "The Polymicrian Greek Lexicon to the New Testament," defines this as follows: "Properly the Hinnom [2 Kings xxiii. 10] south of Jerusalem, once celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch, and afterwards polluted with every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals, and dead bodies of malefactors; to consume which, in order to avert the pestilence which such a mass of corruption would occasion, constant fires were kept burning."

The Savior has used this word to denote *future* punishment. It is found only in the following texts, and is usually addressed to the Jews.

- Matt. v. 22. shall be in danger of *hell* fire.
 29. whole body should be cast into *hell*.
 30. " " " " " "
 x. 28. destroy both soul and body in *hell*.
 xviii. 9. two eyes to be cast into *hell* fire.
 xxiii. 15. more child of *hell* than yourselves.
 33. can ye escape damnation of *hell*?
 Mark ix. 43. having two hands to go into *hell*.
 45. having two feet to be cast into *hell*.
 47. having two eyes to be cast into *hell*?
 Luke xii. 5. hath power to cast into *hell*;
 James iii. 5. it is set on fire of *hell*.

We will now quote a criticism on this word and give its use in the Old Testament. Mr. Ellis (a Hebrew and Greek scholar) says, "Gehenna is not a Greek word, it does not occur in any classical author; it is merely the Grecian mode of spelling the Hebrew words which are translated, "The Valley of Hinnom." It is found in the following places: Josh. xv. 8; xviii. 16; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3; xxxiii. 6; Jer. vii. 31, 32; xix. 2, 6; xxxii. 35. From history and prophecy we perceive that Gehenna is not a place where the wicked are now being punished, nor will it ever be a place where they will be kept alive in perpetual torments. God surnamed the place (Jer. vii. 32) *The Valley of Slaughter*, and to affirm that the wicked will be kept alive there forever is to charge God with naming it inappropriately!

The valley of Hinnom was a delightful vale planted with trees, watered by fountains, on the south-east of Jerusalem, by the torrent Kedron. Here the idolatrous kings of Judah placed the brazen image of Moloch, which had the face of a calf, but the rest resembled a man with extended arms. The idolatrous Jews were accustomed to sacrifice, not only doves, rams, calves and bulls, but their own children. This valley was likewise called *Tophet*, a detestation, an abomination; from *Toph*, to vomit with loathing. Others derive it from *Toph*, a drum; because the perpetrators of these horrible sacrifices beat drums that the shrieks of the infants who were burned should not be heard. The pious king Josiah caused it to be polluted, and made it a place of desecration, of loathing and horror. There were cast all kinds of filth, together with the carcasses of beasts, and the unburied bodies of criminals who had been executed. Continual fires were necessary, in order to consume these, lest the putrefaction should infect the air; and there worms were always feeding on the remaining relics. Here may be seen the origin of the expression. "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

3. *Tartarow, Tartaro-o.* This word occurs only in 2 Pet. ii. 4. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *hell*, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." *Grove's Gr. and Eng. Dic.* defines *tartarus* to be "the infernal regions, hell of the poets, a dark place, prison, dungeon, jail;" but Dr. Scott says its meaning "must not be sought from the fables of heathen poets, but from the general tenor of the Scriptures." Dr. Bloomfield says it is "an intensive reduplication of the very old word *tar*, which in the earliest dialects seemed to have signified DARK." It may mean a *condition* rather than a *locality*. The parallel text in Jude says, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains, under DARKNESS, unto the judgment of the great day," Verse 6.—*Selected.*

The Splendor of Damascus.

Damascus is the oldest city in the world. Tyre and Sidon have crumbled on the shore; Baalbec is a ruin; Palmyra is buried in the sand of the desert; Nineveh and Babylon have disappeared from the Tigris and Euphrates; Damascus remains what it was before the days of Abraham—a centre of trade and travel, an island of verdure in a desert, "a predestined capital"—with martial and sacred associations extending through more than thirty centuries. It was "near Damascus" that Saul of Tarsus saw the "light from heaven above the brightness of the sun;" the street which is called Straight, in which it is said "he prayeth," still runs through the city. The caravan comes and goes as it did a thousand years ago; there are still the sheik, the ass, and the water-wheel; the merchants of the Euphrates and of the Mediterranean still "occupy" these "with the multitude of their wares." The city which Mahomet surveyed from a neighboring height, and was afraid to enter because it is given to have but one Paradise, and for his part he was resolved not to have it in this world, is to this day, what Julian called the eye of the East, as it was in the time of Isaiah, "the head of Syria." From Damascus came the damson or blue plum, and the delicious apricot of Portugal, called *Damasco*; *damask*, our beautiful fabric of cotton and silk, with vines and flowers raised upon a smooth bright ground; the damask rose, introduced into England in the time of Henry VIII.; the Damascus blade, so famous the world over for its keen edge and wonderful elasticity, the secret of whose manufacture was lost when Tamerlane carried off the arts into Persia;—and the beautiful art of inlaying wood and steel with silver and gold, a

kind of mosaic—engraving and sculpture united—called *Damasking*, with which boxes and bureaus, and swords and guns are ornamented. It is still a city of fountains and bright waters; the streams of Lebanon, the "rivers of Damascus," the "rivers of gold," still murmur and sparkle in the wilderness of "Syrian gardens."

A Sure Remedy for Bigotry.

Take one ounce of Intelligence, two ounces of Common Sense, three ounces of Modesty, four ounces of Charity. Mix well together, then boil slowly over the fire of "self-imperfection," till the whole shall attain the consistency of "impartial justice." When cool, take in considerable doses, every hour, till you shall begin to discover that there are others in the world who know something as well as yourself. This symptom will indicate convalescence, and you may begin to feel that your case is hopeful. Continue taking it, in somewhat smaller doses, till you shall recognize the right of every other person to think and speak, as well as you. It will now be safe for you to leave your place of confinement and go out into society.

P. S.—A cure always warranted when directions are followed.

PRICE.—A little "self-reflection."—*Ex.*

DR. McCULLOH, an author of Baltimore, says: "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either soul or spirit in the technical sense in which we use the terms, as implying something distinct from the body." Vol. ii. p. 466-8. We are also informed by an individual who was employed for over three years in the Dublin University, as a translator of ancient Irish MSS., that there is no word in the Celtic language, which signifies, or answers to the popular idea of *soul, spirit, heaven, or hell*.

A HEATHEN'S CONCLUSION.—In Siam a priest came to our missionary and asked "how long his God tormented bad men in a future state," and when answered, "Forever," he replied, "Our god torments the worst of men *only one thousand years*, so we will not have your American God in Siam!" The doctrine is a barrier to the Gospel to the heathen as well as to us.

ANCIENT TESTIMONY.—Justin Martyr, who was born A. D. 89, and suffered martyrdom for Christ A. D. 163, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, says: "Should you happen upon some who are called Christians, . . . and say there is *no resurrection of the dead*, but *INSTANTLY when they die are received up into heaven*, do not count these among Christians."

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the GOSPEL to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., FEBRUARY 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 3.]

For the Gospel Banner.

A Parable.

A Great King having a revolted province, determined to conquer it again to Himself, but instead of sending against it an invincible armada to destroy the rebels, He resolved upon a course which should win back the willing to their allegiance. To this purpose he choose one, and after disciplining gave him the promise of an estate, constituting him and his land the centre point of His purposed redemption. The mode of this was that all who were disposed should become heirs of the estate and its privileges; which privileges were escape from the condemnation of the rebels (death, John v. 24,) and exaltation to the Monarch's favor, Rom. v.; Psa. xxx. 5. For the more certain effectuation of this He allied with this chosen one's family, and made the Son born thereof the Prince of the province. The plan then stood that all who wished reconciliation and salvation should take upon themselves, by a certain ordained rite, the name of this Prince, and thus becoming adopted into the family of the Elect One, called Abraham, Gal. iii., they should be heirs of the estate and its privileges, and also by their thus being younger brethren of the Prince—the heir of all things—they should become the nobility and heirs of the province.

The plan was thus beautifully and perfectly laid. Its very simplicity, however, caused it to be scorned by most of the provincials, who thought themselves deservng of a more elaborate system. Many however were delighted with it and readily embraced it, and thus there became two camps as the King had intended; the Tzaddikim or Prince's Guards, as they were called, and the Reshaim under the leadership of Satan, who as leader of the rebels had long ago organized standing armies of men called priests.

The rite aforementioned as the introduction into the number of the elect was the renunciation of their past service, by passing through a grave of water, and their uprising

was accounted as an expression of their determination to be loyal subjects and faithful soldiers to Messiah, the Prince. They were also taught that this rite was symbolical of the circumstances through which they should possess the estate and its privileges, which was not given to them immediately, but reserved to the end of the campaign, so that all might at once enter into the possession of it. To accomplish this fully their Captain had the power, which none other ever possessed, of healing all who fell wounded, and quickening again those who were slain or died during the war.

Now Satan, the rebel captain, was extremely angry at this opposition camp, formed of those who had before been his subjects, and containing many deserters from his body guards. He made many a furious onslaught upon them, but though numbers were slain, the body was so admirably generated that the phalanx was never routed. He therefore changed his tactics, and aided by volunteer emissaries, endeavored to corrupt and disorganize the Prince's Guards, proffering an alliance, and otherwise flattering their vanity. They had the better chance at this because the Captain had been called away to his Father's court for investure with the insignia and power of the dominion. He left behind him certain commissioned officers to organize and carry on the war, but the war endured longer than had been thought by any but the Emperor, and those in His secret. So it came to pass that as the commissioned officers were slain or otherwise removed, the non-commissioned neglected their duties, and so gradually the spies introduced dissension and mutiny into the camp. Therefore when Satan offered his alliance and protection the greater portion accepted it, and only a few true-hearted soldiers protested and rejected it. These became the butt of persecution by the allies, but guarded by their absent Captain's Aides, and strong in the power of their principles, remained steadfast. About the time that the Com-

mander had announced he would return to them, and complete the campaign, they were more stirred up to zeal, and increased in number, though still a mere handful in comparison with the legions of Satan.

Now the enemy successful in having broken up the camp of the Tzaddikim suffered what he had by no means expected. The incorporate army became, from the alliance and having no strong enemy to fight, so disorganized as to be utterly useless. They divided into *separate* camps, into regiments, into battalions, each taking the names of their captains or of their standards; and these dividing, again and again, like zoophytes. This state of things, whilst preventing Satan leading forth a united host against the Prince's Guards, had still an evil influence upon these, for they being mainly recruited from Satan's camps brought in with them some of this dissenting spirit.

This brings us down to the special point of our parable. At one part of the province, called Tarshish, was stationed a small *corps d'armee* of the Tzaddikim. These warred "not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, (yelept priests,) against spiritual wickedness in high places." (But many of these little battalions merely stood on the defence.) Now these soldiers were many of them lastly received from the battalion yelept Campbellism, others from the Baptist regiment, and not being heartily enlisted, still clung to portions of their old uniforms; some liking to retain the belt, others the shoes (the old and clouted,) others the shako, the stock, etc. In some of the Ecclesia companies the examinations were very lax, so that some were admitted who refused to take the oath of allegiance by the *grave* (or immersion) rite, as contained in the Army Order book; alleging that they had already observed it in the Baptist regiments, and that its value was in itself, etc., etc., and on this plea were admitted to *rations*. On other companies objecting to this laxity some were pleased to obey, others refused. So it was resolved to call a court-martial for the proper settlement of the question, if such could be made by the examination of the Laws of the camp, which all professed to abide by, but which all did not read alike. The formal question was whether these battalions were according to law in serving out *rations* and arms to any, but those who had taken the oath on entering the army. Examiners and Advocates were appointed respectively, and the court opened its discussion.

The Advocate for the Purists (as those who insisted upon the conservation of the regiments were called) stepped forth and

said: "Brother soldiers, we are met to-day for the consideration of a question. Looking for the speedy coming of our Lord and Captain, Jesus the Christ, according as he hath warned us, I had hoped that we should have appeared in the day of the review as a compact phalanx, ready in arms, one in spirit, having only one battle cry. Alas for the past and dashed hopes, but let us hope better things for the future, realizing them also by our own deeds.

Brothers, I plead *your cause* because I plead that of mighty Truth. You will all grant me this I hope, for I am solicitous that we calmly and deeply *consider* this question, and not make it a controversy. It is always best to make definitions, or otherwise state the proposition as plainly as possible, so as I am chosen to open the investigation I will content myself with this, and then we will to the Law-book.

It has been made known to the camp by the usual regimental reports that several companies serve out rations to *unenlisted* persons, and others have in their ranks individuals who have not properly taken the prescribed oath of allegiance; these having certainly gone through water when they enlisted into some of the various regiments in the Baptist *corps d'armee*, but not again on their entrance into the companies of the elect. The specific point then to be settled, being the one in dispute, is whether the rite is *intrinsically* or *relatively* valuable. This decides the serving of rations and the issuing of arms as a consequence. I therefore will proceed to reading the Law as to the rite.

"He who believeth and is immersed shall be saved." This is the first and principal statement. To this we all give witness,—that the matter to be believed is the Gospel of the Kingdom, otherwise the Abrahamic Promises. Now does it not follow in the nature of grammar and reason that as the belief precedes the action, so the value of the rite pertains to the Gospel of the Kingdom. Therefore does it not follow that all must be immersed *after* they have believed, to ratify that Faith. I do not understand how any one can object to this, even provided they have been under water before. You will excuse a personality and permit me to say, that when I understood the Truth, I never had any thought than to obey it, my previous immersion seeming at once as valueless. The rite it is always confessed is the initiatory to the regiment—alike in each camp. This is obvious from all the testimony of the Book. If initiatory then of course it is what we have agreed to call it the oath of allegiance. Then where is the sense of accounting the allegiance rite in the enemy's camp as valid in the Righteous army. "Know ye not that so

many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." I put it to you, my brethren, whether we knew Christ in our former service? Which of us, believing we were already immortal, were immersed into his death. Did we know anything of burial with him, in going down into the watery grave and rising again to newness of life; how could we when the premises were so opposite? And if not discerning the Lord's death therein, did we not make condemnation to ourselves by our former immersions? (I speak to those who have been done before,) and do we not therefore require to *obey the truth*, and thus make an at-one-ment for our previous error.

"Except a man be born out of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." This is decisive of both counts; for

Firstly, the birth objective to the Kingdom, by becoming Sons of Abraham, Gal. iii. So that all unimmersed persons are *unborn to Life*; and by claiming to be Sons of Abraham without the water-birth must be *illegitimate*—Hagarenes.

Secondly, such characters can have no right to eat ordained rations; indeed to do so is unnatural, seeing that the fœtus cannot either eat or drink. All before immersion is parturition, so that any who are really enquirers after the Truth must be in the womb of the Gospel. How then shall they come to the Lord's table, which is for men,—his brethren. I have quoted Paul's saying, that from the water-grave we rise to walk in newness of life. How then say some of you, that any have a right to eat rations at the Lord's table who have given evidence of newness of life, though unimmersed? *Can* we have any evidence of this newness of life in any moral transition, or in any way but in the legal and obvious one of the resurrection out of the water?

"In whom ye are circumcised," etc., Col. ii. Does not Major Paul teach the parallelism of the rite of immersion to that of circumcision in the old Body-Guard of Israel? And the imperative need for every Son of Abraham to undergo the rite you all know. What is it then but that all who would be Sons of Abraham must enter into the *bonds* of the Covenant with him, according to the ordinance of the New Covenant. And you know it was death to any uncircumcised person to eat of the Passover. How then shall

any uncircumcised person eat the Christian Passover, and be guiltless? Will he not "eat and drink condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body;" for can any eat *worthily* who have not acquired a legal right? John x. 1. I should tremble to do it, being afraid of the "*judgment*."

I will ask you to examine at length Paul's argument concerning the exode of the Israelites. 1 Cor. x. Mark the sequence; that immersion into Moses preceded the eating and drinking, which immersion, we know from the record, was their birth as a free nation. If these were types to us, is not their evidence conclusive?

But I will sit down now, merely remarking, that the council wait the argument of the brother appointed to defend and set forth the other side, after hearing which I shall beg the privilege of reply.

The Advocate for the Expedients has not yet spoken;—at least no report has reached us.

IOTA.

For the Gospel Banner.

"Chronological Speculation" Vindicated.

[New York, Jan. 22nd, 1861.

BRO. WILSON:—The following article was sent for publication in the *Herald of the Kingdom*, but refused a place. I therefore send it to you for an insertion in the *Banner*. It explains itself.

Yours, etc.,

F. COGNILL.]

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again," is a trite and a true saying. It contains the history and fortunes of all truth, and of all its espousers in all ages. So, though the truth which I have presented in my communication of Jan. 3rd, has been "annihilated," (nominally,) it is only that it may have a better resurrection.

In view of what you have said in the first paragraph of your reply, entitled "The Difficulty Annihilated," in the July number of the *Herald*, p. 162, I have just reason to feel doubtful as to the reception this present communication will meet with. I allude to the following language: "We feel great pleasure in stating the truth upon all subjects with which we are acquainted, but a very great disrelish, and" (to be more emphatic) "positive aversion to the labor of giving chase to erroneous phantoms, through all the labyrinths it devises for their protection. The chronological speculation before us is one of these." If digging month after month to find out how many of the six thousand years the present evil world is to last have gone by, and how near is the redemption, be "chasing erroneous phantoms," "chronological speculation," etc., then I plead guilty. Now to the subject:—

It will be necessary to restate the issue.

You claim that Abraham was born when Terah (Abraham's father) was seventy, and your proof is Gen. xi. 26: "And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran." I claim, on the contrary, that he was not born till his father was one hundred and thirty, and for proof I adduce the following incident in his life: "He (Abraham) left Haran after his father died," (Acts vii. 4,) who died aged two hundred and five, (Gen. xi. 32.) and Abraham when he left Haran was seventy-five years old, (Gen. xii. 4;) 205 less 75 leaves 130, Terah's age at Abraham's birth. The proof of your position I claim to be no proof at all, for if it were admitted as proof, then Gen. v. 32 would prove that Shem was born when Noah was five hundred; when we know on the contrary, from Gen. xi. 10, that Noah was five hundred and two at the birth of Shem. To overturn my position, you claim that Acts vii. 4 is not correctly translated, and you furnish a new translation. This new translation is followed up by a remark which I think was uncalled for. The remark I allude to is, "But Bro. Coghill may perhaps call for other authority than ours for the use of the word"—no matter what—it and what follows is all Greek to me. I want no *authority*. I want reason which I can appreciate, and testimony to which I can refer. I will now put the common version and your new translation of Acts vii. 4 in opposite columns, as follows:—

Common Version.

"Then came he (Abraham) out of the land of the Chaldeans and dwelt in Charran, and from thence when his father was dead, he removed him into this land (Canaan) wherein ye now dwell."

New Translation.

"Then departing out of the land of the Chaldeans he dwells in Charran, afterwards after that his father died, he removes himself into this land upon which ye now dwell."

With reference to the left hand column, I will now put and answer the following questions:—

Question.—When Abraham came out of the land of the Chaldeans where did he dwell?

Answer.—He dwelt in Charran.

Q.—From Charran where did he go?

A.—He went into Canaan.

Q.—When did he leave Charran?

A.—When his father died.

Q.—How old was his father when he died?

A.—He was two hundred and five, Gen. xi. 32.

Q.—How old was Abraham when he left Haran?

A.—He was seventy and five, Gen. xii. 4.

Q.—Then what must have been Terah's age when Abraham was born?

A.—He must have been one hundred and thirty.

Next, with reference to the new translation, I put similar questions:—

Question.—Abraham, "departing out of the land of the Chaldeans," where does he dwell?

Answer.—In Charran or Haran.

Q.—"Afterwards," where does he remove to?

A.—"Into this land (Canaan) upon which ye now dwell."

Q.—How long "afterwards"?

A.—"After that his father died."

Q.—How old was his father when he died?

A.—He was two hundred and five, Gen. xi. 32.

Q.—How old was Abraham when he left Haran?

A.—He was seventy-five, Gen. xii. 4.

Q.—Then what was Terah's age when Abraham was born?

A.—He must have been one hundred and thirty.

Thus, you see, that the new translation leads to precisely the same result as the old.

I will next take notice of the following remark. You say, "If it be asked to what particular incoming after Terah's death does this *afterwards* refer? we reply, to that referred to in Gen. xxii. 2." You have forgot the most important part, viz., to prove it. If I am asked the same question, I reply unhesitatingly, to that referred to in Gen. xi. 31 to xii. 1 to 5 inclusive. I thus reply on the authority of Stephen. Acts vii. 3 is a quotation from Gen. xii. 1.

Acts vii. 3.

"Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land that I shall show thee."

Gen. xii. 1.

"Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I shall show thee."

If we ask the question, when had the Lord said unto Abram, "Get thee out of thy country?" etc., Gen. xii. 1; Stephen tells us, Acts vii. 2, "When he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran." Abram in response to this, came out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran, Acts vii. 4. The narrative of this is in Gen. xi. 31, and then in the 32nd v. we are told of the death of Terah at the age of two hundred and five, which happened at Haran. In chap. xii. we have an account of the departure of Abraham out of Haran, aged seventy-five. This answers to the clause in Acts vii. 4, and "afterwards after that his father died, he (Abraham) removed him." Where to? Gen. xii. 5 says, "to Canaan," or as Stephen

says, Acts vii. 4, "into the land wherein ye now dwell." Acts vii. 5 goes on to say, "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, yet he promised (in Gen. xiii. 15) that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, WHEN AS YET HE HAD NO CHILD. This is a clincher, proving conclusively to any one who will be convinced, that the incoming, referred to by Stephen, was one that took place before Isaac, or even Ishmael was born, to that which took place when Abraham was seventy-five, and Terah two hundred and five.

I might go on to show that every event Stephen mentions in his admirable epitome of Jewish history follows in consecutive order, in which case the incoming, you refer to, should not appear earlier than the 8th v. after the circumcision of Isaac. I hesitate not to challenge any one to point out, from the 2nd to the 47th vs., a single incident that is not in its consecutive order.

After what I have said, you will pardon me for not seeing the "allusion," to which you refer, in your concluding paragraph. Seeing anything of the sort would be only an *optical illusion*, for no such thing is there.

I will conclude with a quotation from Hales, who says, "The principal improvement of Usher's system is in the age of Terah, 130 years at the birth of Abraham, in which he happily rectified the vulgar error, that Abraham was born in the 70th year of his father's age." FRANCIS COGILL.

New York, June 14th, 1860.

The Future of England in Prophecy.

Dr. John Cumming, of London, England, delivered a lecture in the Collegiate Institute, on the above subject, on Tuesday evening, Nov. 6, 1860. The *Liverpool Courier* of the 7th ult. says: "The discourse was in connection with the winter course now being given by the Young Men's Christian Association of Liverpool, and the popularity of the theme, together with the recent public notoriety which has attended the elucidation of prophecy by the Rev. Dr. Cumming, attracted a large and highly respectable audience to hear the lecture." After making some few remarks suited to the occasion, Dr. C. introduced his subject, and then remarked, says the *Courier*, that "there were Christian ministers and men of every denomination who did not see unfulfilled prophecy as he saw it; but he said where they could not agree, let them agree to differ, recognizing that there was a substratum of Bible Christianity on which they were all one. On these great truths he spoke without hesitation and without reserve; but when ho

spoke of unfulfilled prophecy, he might be mistaken, he might err, and certainly he could not expect to command the confidence of everybody; but they should listen to the data which is laid down, and look at the logical conclusions which he arrived at from the premises which he laid down." The same paper further remarks:

"The chapter in the Bible on which he formed his conclusions was the 18th of Isaiah, which he read, pointing out more particularly the passages in the beginning and towards the end of the chapter. The chapter alluded, first of all, to a people whose features were trodden under foot, whose land the rulers have spoiled, and who are to be presented to the Lord of Hosts as an offering. Secondly, it is stated that some nation, described in the second verse, was to present this people; and thirdly, that this was to be done, not now, but at the close and wind-up of this present mundane economy. He was charged with being a prophet, and with having prophesied that the world would come to an end in 1867. He never prophesied any such thing—he was not a prophet nor a prophet's son. It was one thing to foretell, another thing to forth-tell, what was already foretold in the Word of God; and what he had said was liable to a great deal of popular misapprehension. He did not believe that this world was ever to be annihilated, but that England was to be one of the loveliest outposts to Heaven. The people as described in the 18th chapter of Isaiah, to be presented, was described as a people scattered. The Hebrew word meant scattered over area and long ages; it comprehended time and place. The people to be presented were also described as a people "peeled," a word to which many definitions had been given. If his audience were asked to glance over Europe, and along the centuries that were lost in the midst of ages past, what people would they lay their hand upon as answering to the description given—a people scattered and peeled? He said the Jews, who were emphatically living alone amidst the nations of the earth. They found that the Jews had been a despised, a persecuted, and a proscribed race. The Jewish elevation would be equal with the depth of their depression. Jerusalem was now most oppressed, and if they looked upon the earth they found that Palestine had been the most crushed, its people most persecuted, and was a land comparatively vacant. But still the Jews kept up their identity over all other nations. And the only inference he could draw was, that it was the Jews who were thus described as the people who should be presented to the Lord of Hosts on Mount Zion, and in the midst of the nations of the earth. The

point arrived at was this—that the people were the Jews, that these people were to be presented to God in their own land as an offering acceptable to him; and the way in which they were to be presented to him was described in the 18th chapter of Isaiah. The literal translation of the Hebrew word rendered “wo” was “ho;” it was the same Hebrew word that occurred in the 55th chap. of Isaiah, 1st v., which began, “Ho, every one that thirsteth.” The land addressed was described as “overshadowing with wings.” In the 53rd chapter of Isaiah: “He was despised, and we esteemed him not,” meant, “He will be.” Prophecy inspired of God was so sure that it was recorded as though it had occurred. Bishop Horsley said the words “shadowing with wings” meant protected with wings. What were the wings? Constantly by poets, and sometimes in Scripture, they were used to denote the sails of ships. Look at England with her possession of India in the East. Might not our Queen, without any exaggeration, be called—at any rate since 1859—the Queen of Sheba? And on the West her possessions stretched out in America; and her realm encircled the whole globe. Take another feature of the 18th chapter, “That sendeth ambassadors by the sea.” This referred to the normal habit of the people. It might be said of many nations, but there was one country, and that was their own, whose ambassadors were at every court in the world, whose representatives were in every capital, and of which it could be said permanently that it sent ambassadors by sea. This land, then “shadowing with wings,” sending ambassadors by sea, a land that was an island, whose prophetic name was Tarshish, was to go and send swift messengers in vessels of bulrushes upon the waters to present to the Lord this people “scattered and peeled.” First of all, what was meant by the expression, “vessels of bulrushes,” in which the messengers were to go? Some of the most learned and eminent commentators upon the Bible had said this word meant a fast-sailing packet vessel; and he believed the word most certainly meant steamships or steamboats, which would not only carry Bibles and missionaries to the furthest, but would be consecrated to the highest object of all—the conveyance of the Jews back to their own land. There was a parallel passage in the last chapter of Isaiah, where it is said, “They shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts,” etc. The words translated “horses,” “chariots,” “litters,” and “mules,” had been translated correctly; but the words rendered “swift

beasts,” literally signify “a machine turning round with great swiftness.” A most accomplished linguist had translated the passage “swift carriages.” It seemed to him that the steamboat was indicated by the one, and the steam carriage or the railroad by the other. Jeremiah said, “Silver spread into plates is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz, the work of the workmen and the hands of the founder; blue and purple is their clothing; they are all the work of cunning men.” Ezekiel says, “Tarshish was thy merchant, by reason of the multitude of all kinds of riches; with silver, iron, tin, and lead, they traded in thy fairs.” What were they to infer? That it was an island in the ocean, having maritime connection with all lands, protecting its allies and its friends with its wings, the people being manufacturers, celebrated for their textile fabrics, their manufactures in silver, iron, tin, and lead, and its traffic with all lands. They were thus to be restored to their own land in ships, and these ships and these means of conveyance, were to be afforded and presented by a nation, powerful, prosperous, of vast maritime position, and sheltering its colonies over all the earth. What nation was that? He maintained that England was retained for this great service—that England was the great, powerful, prosperous nation; in other words, that her sun would not set until it mingled with the rays of the millennial sun. The roll of England’s drum would be heard in every land, and the boom of England’s cannon would be the signal to the oppressed and to the oppressor; and he believed England would be spared and blessed, a prosperous, powerful, mercantile, commercial, maritime land, until the end of this present economy. Look at the difference between Italy and England. In England, no sooner did the Queen express the possibility of such a thing as foreign invasion than 200,000 volunteers had been enrolled, and depend upon it, foreign despots would think twice before they attempted to invade England. One might almost hear the echoes of the approaching conflict. What nation in Europe at this moment was not agitated? What nation was not prepared for war? What king had not his hand upon his sword’s hilt? Was there not in all men’s minds a sort of trembling and fear of things coming upon the earth, as if God were giving a presentiment of the terrible crash in which England might suffer—out of which England should emerge, powerful, prosperous, better and greater than she had ever been before? Therefore, let him say what a sweet American poet had said in another country:—

“Thou, too, sail on, oh! ship of State,—
Sail on, old England, strong and great;

Humanity, with all its fears—
 With all its hopes of future years,
 Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
 We know what master laid thy keel,
 What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
 Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
 What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
 In what a forge, and what a heat
 He shaped the anchor of thy hope.
 Fear not each sound, each sudden shock,—
 It's of the wave, not of the rock;
 It's but the lapping of the sail,
 And not a rent made by the gale.
 In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
 In spite of false lights on the shore
 Sail on, sail on, for ever more—
 Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
 Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
 All, all on thee, is all on thee."

From Kurtz's Church History.

Constitution, Life, Discipline, and Worship of the Church.

From the commencement regularly appointed officials were set apart, in order that the process of contributing to the edification of the church, on the part of all its members, might not degenerate into arbitrariness, presumption, and anarchy, and that, amidst the changes of time, the government and edification of the church might continue uninterrupted. On them the preservation of order, the prevention of abuses, the direction of public worship, the preaching of the word, the dispensation of the sacraments, the cure of souls, the exercise of discipline, and the outward representation of the church, devolved as their peculiar and fixed calling. The need of such an order of men must have been all the more felt, when the extraordinary qualifications of charismata gradually ceased. It became now more than ever necessary, by means of a regular outward call to assign proper limits, and to give a settled character to the inward call. So long as the apostles labored in the churches which they had founded, the duty of teaching and of governing devolved upon them.

1. *The Charismata*.—According to 1 Cor. xii. 8, etc., 28, etc., the *special and extraordinary gifts* of the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic Church were of twofold character, as they manifested themselves either in word or in deed. The former momentary, such as the gifts of speaking in tongues and of prophecy; and again, supplementary to these, the gift of interpreting tongues and trying the spirits. Some charismata were lasting, such as the gift of teaching—i. e., either the speculative gift of wisdom and of knowledge (Gnosis,) or the practical and didactic gift of faith (Pistis.) Among the practical charismata we reckon the supernatural gift of directing and administering the affairs of a church, and the gifts of performing miracles and of healing the sick.

2. *Bishops and Presbyters*.—to aid them in their work, or to supply their places in their absence (Acts xiv. 23;) the apostles ordained rulers in every church, who bore the common name of *Elders* (*Presbuteroi*) from their dignity, and of *Bishops* (*episkopoi*) from the nature of their office.

That originally the *sumpresbuteroi* were the same as the *episkopoi*, we gather with absolute certainty from the statements of the New Testament and of *Clement* of Rome, a disciple of the apostles, (see his First Epistle to the Corinthians, chaps. xlii. xlv. lvii.) 1. The presbyters are expressly called *episkopoi*—(compare Acts xx. 17 with ver. 28, and Tit. i. 5 with ver. 7.) 2. The office of presbyter is described as next to, and highest after that of apostle; (Acts xv. 6, 22.) Similarly, the elders are represented as those to whom alone the rule, the teaching, and the care of the church is entrusted, (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1, etc.,) on account of which the apostles designate themselves as *sumpresbuteroi*; (1 Pet. v. 1, 2, and 3 John i. 3.) The various offices of the church are summed up under the expression *episkopoi kai diakonoi*. (Phil. i. 1; Clem. Rom. c. ch. xliii., comp. 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8.) 4. In the above quoted passages of the N. T. and of *Clement* we read of *many* bishops in one and the same church. In the face of such indubitable evidence, it is difficult to account for the pertinacity with which Romish and Anglican theologians insist that these two offices had from the first been different in name and functions; while the allegation of some, that although, originally, the two designations had been identical, the offices themselves were distinct, seems little better than arbitrary and absurd. Even *Jerome*, *Augustin*, *Urban II.* (a. 1091.) and *Petrus Lombardus* admit that originally the two had been identical. It was reserved for the Council of Trent to convert this truth into a heresy.

3. *Other Church Offices*.—Comp. *R. Rothe*, die Anfänge d. christl. Kirche und hrer Verfass. (Commenc. of the Chr. Ch. and of its Constitut.) Wittemb. 1837. Vol. 1.—*J. W. Bickell*, Gesch. d. Kirchenrechtes (Hist. of Eccl. Law Frankf. 1849. 1. 2. p. 62, etc.)—Conjoined with, but subordinate to, the office of presbyter or bishop, of which the apostles themselves for so considerable time discharged the duties at Jerusalem, was the office of *Deacon*. It was first instituted by the apostles, with consent of the people, for the purpose of caring for the poor and the sick at Jerusalem, (Acts vi.) Thence it spread to most other Christian communities; the number of deacons being always seven, until the original functions of the office were enlarged, and the deacons called to assist in the cure of souls and in preaching the word.

Functions corresponding to those of the deacons—but only so far as the original design of the deaconate was concerned, (according to 1 Cor. xiv. 34; and 1 Tim. ii. 12;—devolved on the *Deaconesses*, (Rom. xvi. 1;) who took charge of Christian females. From 1 Tim. v. 9; we gather that, commonly, only widows above the age of sixty were admitted to this office. The presbyters and deacons were set apart by the laying on of the hands of the apostles, or of their delegates, (Acts vi. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14, etc.) Individual churches were also in the habit of employing special *evangelists*, whose duty it was to travel about in order to preach to the heathen, (Eph. iv. 11; Acts xxi. 8.) When, one after another, the apostles, who, even when absent, were regarded as concentrating in themselves the supreme guidance of the churches, were called to their rest, gradually and almost necessarily one of the elders obtained prominence over the rest, though at first only as the *primus inter pares*, and with it the distinctive title of Bishop, in contradistinction to the other presbyters. The relation of James to the church at Jerusalem, (Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18,) and the full powers which Paul claimed for his assistants (Timothy, Titus, and others) in individual churches, may have served as a commencement and a type of the later Episcopate.

Jewish Restoration.

A New York Paper has the following, which we submit to our readers:

"As soon as peace and quietness are again restored to Syria, the question will come up what future disposition shall be made of these lands, fraught with so many precious recollections connected with the past. Our Eastern correspondent has some suggestions upon this subject in a letter just received, which we place before our readers:—

"The Moslem is now on trial before a jury of the civilized nations of the earth. What will be the verdict? Who can tell? The evidence is before the world, but unfortunately for the Christian and fortunately for the Turk, the jury before whom he is tried, is human not divine. The jury may be influenced by motives of policy, and bring in a verdict not wholly disinterested and wholly in accordance with justice.

"In a political point of view it may conduce more for the peace of Europe, and consequently for the good of the greatest number of Christians, for Turkey to remain in the hands of Abdul Medjid, under proper limitations and responsibility to the Christian Powers; but justice demands, and humanity requires that the spirit of the haughty and fanatical Turk be humbled, and that the proper protection and safety be guaranteed

to the Christian subjects of the Porte and the foreign residents in the land.

"Whatever, therefore, be the verdict of the European nations, the civilized world should demand the execution of the very letter of the Hatti Hamayoun, and the abolition of all distinctions of sect and religion through the Turkish Empire, so far at least as the civil rights and liberties of its subjects are concerned. This is the time to have the Mosque of Omar, which was built upon the site of Solomon's temple, thrown open to Christian and Jew, and all the *tabooed* holy places of Jerusalem. As long as the Turk is allowed to close these holy places at Jerusalem and Hebron against the Christian and Jew, his proud, intolerant, and fanatical spirit will be fostered and strengthened, and the Christian residents will be slaughtered periodically, as at Jeddah in 1858, and Damascus in 1860.

"Now the descendants of Abraham and the chosen people of God are allowed only to weep by the wall of the outer inclosure of the temple, and those who have ever visited the Jews' wailing place at Jerusalem, can understand the degradation and humility of their position as they kneel outside the wall and reverently kiss the stones. Alas, for the poor Jew! nowhere so badly treated as in his own land. Even to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre he dare not go, and the too venturesome are nearly beaten to death with clubs by the furious monks and priests of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Who should be more at home in the Holy Land than the poor Jew? It may be well for the European Powers to remember in their endeavors to solve the vexed Eastern question, that at some future day the Jews are to return to the Holy Land. Having been decreed by the Powers of Heaven, the Powers of Europe cannot prevent it. This may be the time for the Lord to favor Zion—and this may be the easiest solution of the difficulty.

"Europe requires the possession of this land by an independent power, in order to preserve its own peace and security. Should the Moslem who now holds it be pronounced unworthy, to whom shall it be given? No European Prince can receive it without exciting the jealousy of other nations—but it might be given to the Jews, who are scattered over all nations, without exciting the jealousy of any. The Jews have wealth enough to sustain an independent state. They have administrative talent enough to conduct its affairs as being fully illustrated by the history of the Cabinets of Europe, which have at various times been ably controlled by Jews. They have legislative talent sufficient to make laws for their own gov-

ernment as may be seen by the Parliamentary records of Great Britain, and their army and navy would not lack the requisite military and naval officers who now serve under the banners of Christian nations. In this land the Jews received the basis of all law from Jehovah, who appeared to them. This is the land of the lawgivers, the judges, the valiant captains and the fighting men of old, whose blood unmingled now courses in the veins of the Jew in America, Great Britain, and every nation in Europe. The Holy Land would be better reserved, and its old monumental hills and its relics and sacred localities would be more carefully guarded by those who guarded the sacred Scriptures for so many ages, and brought them down to posterity unmitigated and perfectly preserved. What better guarantee of everything sacred to the Christian do we want than the Old Testament, which was given to us by the Jews?

"Until the Promised Land be restored to its proper owners, now so widely dispersed over the earth, I fear the Holy Land will continue, what it has for ages past, a *bloody land*, a land of horrors, of massacres, the theatre of strife and conflict, the cause of national ambition, jealousy, and discord, the source of a *oe* interminable."

From the Advent Review.

What does Infidelity propose to do?

Of late I have learned a lesson by conversing with infidels. I once thought infidelity was a system, doctrine, creed or theory, adopted and set forth in due form. But this is not the case. It is not a system, it affirms nothing, it believes nothing, promises nothing—is nothing. A negative can be prefixed to almost any truth and they will believe it. They believe in *no*-theory, *no*-creed, *no*-organization, *no*-principles, *no*-conditions of initiation into their fellowship, *no*-law, *no*-Bible, *no*-Devil, *no*-Savior, *no*-God. It consists of negatives, it neglects all law, all system, all testimony and all promises.

It builds up nothing, it ignores all authority and government, it does not regard consistency, morals, character or anything of the kind. Its object is to deny all truth. Every argument advocated by an opponent is met with, "I don't believe," as though their unbelief would destroy all evidence!

Infidels do not propose to build anything: their object is not to show "a more excellent way," "a highway of holiness," but to turn us out of "the old paths." Their mission is to pull down. They never organize, but always disorganize. They come not to save, but to destroy. Their work is easily done, because it is all tearing down, disorganizing and deranging.

The reason why they are so hard to discomfit is because they have nothing to defend. Their work is simply to stand off and throw fire-brands into the camp of the saints. They object to the Bible, 1. Because it teaches the immortality of the soul, and 2. Because it does not teach the immortality of the soul. Thus they fire in from every quarter. Their work is to spread destruction as wide as possible, and then tantalize the servant of God with, "I can tear down faster than you can build up." This is true. "One sinner destroyeth much good." One incendiary can burn buildings faster than ten men can build them—tear up more Railroad track than one hundred men can put it down. One enemy can sow more tares than twenty farmers can pull up. As stated, their business is not to build up, but to pull down. They attack the Bible, the Church, and consequently morals, peace, happiness, etc.

Their commission says, Go and make war upon the Bible and its truths, religion and its friends. There is no "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will to men," in their mission. Theirs is a message of hatred toward the Bible and all it contains. Their object is to spread desolation among other men's labors, and lay their work in ruins, leaving nothing but wrecks behind them. Their appeal is to the lukewarm, or apostate,—not to rescue him, but to bid him God-speed in his downward course. To destroy his confidence in *his Bible*, and *his God*. To intimidate and discourage him from all good forever.

Infidelity never has enlightened, civilized nor ennobled a nation or people in the world. That is not its business. Here I assert that it is impossible to point to any good that can possibly grow out of infidelity. Have infidels ever organized society, established peace and order, civil institutions, or a system of morals? Never. They deny everything, and prove nothing. They doubt this, dispute that, and don't believe the other, and nine cases out of ten cannot give a reason for their doubts and fears.

It requires no talent or learning to be an infidel; all that it requires is to know how to deny everything. The most illiterate blockhead under the sun can deny as stoutly as the man of education and ability. I have heard persons who never read the Bible through in their lives (and I doubt whether some of them had ever read the Elementary Spelling-book,) talk of inconsistencies, incongruities and absurdities in the Bible as learnedly as if they had committed the whole Bible to memory. Any blockhead can deny the Bible, and take a leap into the dark; but I cannot see what should cause him to do it. He risks all, loses everything, without the possibility of

gaining anything in this world or the world to come. They do not pretend that the world would be any better for embracing their denials of truth than they would be for rejecting them. They say they oppose the Bible because it is a fable. But why do they not pitch into other fables? "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*" is a fictitious work which has an extensive circulation, why do not infidels spend a part of their time fighting it?

"How can ye believe that receive honor one of another," is the true ground of infidel objections. But I cannot tell how they intend to benefit the world by their doctrines.

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.

BRO. WILSON:—Permit one who has long felt a deep interest in your paper, to express his joy, upon reading the evidence of your innocency, as published in your *Extra*.

I had made up my mind to support the *Banner*, and used my influence to have the report of our first quarterly Conference, for this year published in it. The report was sent by our secretary, and why it did not appear I am unable to say.

But when I read the vindication of Mary Hayes, both by her pamphlet, and by her able advocate John Thomas, I must confess that I arose from the investigation (*ex parte* though it was) thoroughly convinced of your complicity in the fraud and slander, which, upon the face of the evidence, had been practiced upon that unfortunate woman.

To my mind, the evidence of your personal guilt, and the complicity of many of the members, if not the whole Church at Geneva, was irrefragable. I could see no alternative for you but an honest confession of your guilt, and restitution as far as you could possibly make it.

I thus expressed my convictions to many of my brethren. I told them all, however, that I would wait with intense anxiety, the publication of your defence. Weeks passed, and no defence appeared. The suspense became painful to me.

Meanwhile, Bro. Reed wrote me to suspend the decision of my mind until I should see your vindication. But with each revolving week my prejudices grew stronger and stronger against you. But at length the vindication came.

I seated myself by Bro. Tompkins' stove, to read it, with a mind running over with prejudice against you, and the Church at Geneva.

I read it carefully. I scrutinized every part of the testimony. I weighed each part separately, and collectively, in the scale of strict justice, to say nothing in regard to the claims of charity and mercy, and I must in

justice to all parties concerned, to myself, and the truth,—say, that I consider the vindication perfect, and the decision just; and now, the great question in my mind, is, what can John Thomas, say?

How can he screen himself from the charge of complicity with Miss Mary Hayes, for the ostensible object of curtailing your influence, of killing the *Banner*, and building up himself and the *Herald* upon the ruins.

I shall await his vindication with as much anxiety as I did yours.

Please enroll my name as an agent for the *Banner*. I will return home, and make amends, for the wrong I have done you in this matter, by getting up as many clubs for the *Banner*, as I can.

Yours for truth, equity and justice.

J. M. STEPHENSON.

Albany, Green Co., Wis. Jan, 24, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

Prerequisites to Baptism.

BRO. B. WILSON:—Much has been said and written, and some excitement prevails among investigators upon the scriptural subjects for immersion. I am not authorized, nor do I desire to dictate any one's faith on this or any other subject, I only claim the privilege to indite my own cogitations.

The only way I can understand the word upon this subject, is to ascertain first, what the Bible says a person must believe; secondly, what he must resolve to do, before he or she is immersed. It must readily be admitted, that no one could, at first, believe specifically, all the facts, commandments, and promises in the Word of God; though each one must believe "that God is, and is a rewarder of all them who diligently seek him," "that all Scripture given by inspiration of God" is for "our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope," Heb. xi. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Rom. xv. 4. They must specifically believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." "Many other things did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book, but these are written that you might believe that *Jesus is the Christ*, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name," John xx. 31. These show the specific items of faith in order to come to God, and to get life in Christ's name.

If it had been required to believe many things first, then would it have taken much time for younger, and much longer for older and sectarianized persons to have learned those many things; and a liability to put off baptism till they were thirty years old, as did many in the eighth century, in the days

of Chrysostom; and many would have died without ever thinking about it. But I would not urge these things, were it not for two reasons: first, the gospel would not be adapted to mortals, had it required a full understanding of the whole of it, before fitness to obey the commandment, in order to get into Christ; and no one could then have grown in favor and in the knowledge of the truth. Secondly, it requires just the specifications of the Word in order to fitness for immersion.

"Go, preach the gospel to every creature: he that believes and is immersed shall be saved," (placed in a condition for life,) Mark xvi. 16. Believe what? The gospel, of course, is the natural and Scriptural answer. None other is an answer. Then, say some, must it not be *all* the gospel? And is it not the gospel, that Christ is the very God? that he died, was buried, and arose again from the dead? and as they think (for that is not faith which has no evidence for its basis) that the man proper was conscious between death and the resurrection? To the first question I answer, it is the simple, *expressed*, and great fact in the gospel, that must be believed. It cannot be that a full understanding of the gospel preached to Abraham, by the "Scriptures," and all that is glad tidings, were required to be comprehended in this. But what saith the Word of the Lord when persons were to be immersed, after the "church of God" was built upon the "Rock, the Christ, the Son of God?" The jailor was a heathen in great ignorance about the gospel, but he and his family heard, believed, and were immersed "the same hour of the night." It could not have been possible for him, in one hour, to have learned the gospel, specifically, in that time;—they were immersed the same hour of the night, therefore it was not required to learn, specifically, all the gospel before immersion. Then all that is necessary to learn specifically, is only required to be believed in order for immersion. In Acts viii. we have the case: "And as they went on their way they came to a certain water, (a stream,) and the eunuch said, See here is water, what hinders me to be immersed; and he said, If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest; and he said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*" The Record says, he did immerse him; therefore this is just how much is required to be believed in order to fitness for immersion. He did not tell the officer, You must believe in the Trinity. He did not ask him to believe that his soul was immortal; he did immerse the officer; therefore it was not required to believe in the immortality of the soul in order to be fit for Christian immersion. He did not require the eunuch to be-

lieve that "the dead know not anything, the memory of them is forgotten, their love, envy, and hatred are now perished," (though these are Bible truths;) he did immerse him; therefore it was not required to know these truths in order to a fitness to be immersed.

So I might write pages of fair syllogisms, from hundreds of both erroneous and truthful angles; and show the simple truth, that it was not required to believe hundreds of specific truths in order to be fit for immersion. It is proper to say that if a person does not intelligibly believe this great and leading truth of the Bible, he or she is not fit for Christian immersion; hence I do not trammel this argument with "re-baptism," as if the subject of an immersion, who is not a believer, was a fit subject of Christian baptism. Also every person must judge for him or herself whether *they are believers* or not, hence I can't judge for you or you for me; therefore, I have no right to proscribe you for not doing as I think you ought. All I have a right to do, is to tell you just what I believe the word requires.

Affectionately,

WM. P. SHOCKEY.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent no doubt means well in the above article, but we think he has fallen into several errors. We can only allude to them at present, for want of opportunity to reply in full.

The writer mentions certain items as *specific*, which *must* be believed in order to be a proper subject for immersion. 1st, A belief in God. 2nd, In the Scriptures. 3rd, That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. 4th, "The simple, expressed, and great fact of the Gospel." Then he mentions some things which he thinks are not *specific*, 1st, To believe all the facts, commandments, and promises in the word of God. 2nd, To have a full understanding of the Gospel preached to Abraham. 3, To believe in the immortality of the soul. 4th, To believe that the dead are unconscious, etc., etc.

The first three items mentioned are undoubtedly correct as far as they go, but the fourth is not *specific* enough for any inquirer to understand. Would it not be better to say, 4th, To believe the Gospel as preached by Christ and his apostles, and as believed by primitive converts prior to immersion. Were individuals in the Apostles' days so privileged that they could divide the Gospel preached to them? or did the first preachers only offer a divided Gospel for belief? Were not their hearers required to believe *all* that they proclaimed? Did not the apostles preach, and the primitive converts believe the "things concerning the kingdom of God," as

a specific item, nay, as an essential element of the good news itself? We would add nothing to or take anything from the record in the case. Jesus preached "the kingdom of God;" See Luke iv. 43. He sent his apostles to preach it, Luke ix. 2; and "they went through the towns, preaching the *gospel*," ver. 6. "This *gospel* of the *kingdom* shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto the nations, and then shall the end come." Matthew xxiv. 14; evidently the end of the Jewish state is here referred to. This began to be fulfilled when Jesus after his resurrection, sent his apostles to preach the *Gospel* to every creature; and was fully accomplished, (before the destruction of Jerusalem,) as we read in Col. i. 23, it "was preached to every creature which is under heaven;" and in Rom. x. 18, "their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Mark. *this was the Gospel of the Kingdom*. Now for the facts. See Acts viii. 12; xix. 8; xx. 25; xxvi. 6, 7, 22; xxviii. 20, 23, 30, 31. To preach *Christ* is to make known the things concerning him and his kingdom; see Acts viii. 5, 12. To announce these things is to preach "the word," ver. 4; to preach "the word of the Lord," or "the gospel," ver. 35; and to obey it is to receive "the word of God," ver. 14.

Our correspondent refers to the case of the Eunuch, and his reply to Philip, as we have it in the common version—"I believe that *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*," which he makes emphatic by putting it in italics, and adding this remark, "this is just *how much* is required to be believed in order to fitness for immersion." This is not correct. We have no evidence that the Eunuch made any such reply; the passage is spurious, and therefore of no authority. The confession is not the same as Peter's in Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20; John vi. 69; or Nathanael's in John i. 49; or Martha's in John xi. 27. These confessions include the important truth that Jesus is the *CHRIST*—or the anointed king of Israel. If the above confession of the Eunuch be admitted as correct, and "just *how much* is required to be believed in order to fitness for immersion," some other portion of the word surely will indorse or strengthen the position. But the reader will at once perceive that according to this spurious passage, and the view of our correspondent, and of Campbellites in general, all is made to hang on the belief of one simple truth, that a person named Jesus Christ is the son of his father—God. How different from the confessions alluded to above. Peter and his fellow-apostles, Nathanael, Martha, and all the Jews were believers in the things spoken of by the prophets concerning the

kingdom of God, and of the Messiah, and needed only to be convinced that Jesus the Nazarene was the one spoken of. Hence when *they* believed this truth, they believed "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus," or the Gospel.

What proof is there in the record that "the jailor was a heathen in great ignorance about the Gospel?" or that he had never heard Paul preach before? Paul had been in Philippi "many days," proclaiming "the way of salvation" to the people. Who knows how long a time those "many days" were, or whether the jailor was a heathen at all, or had no chance to be instructed? He and family were in a different condition from sectarians of the present day. They had not received a "Gospel, which is not another," and therefore had not that to unlearn, before they could receive the truth. If this generation were not so full of the theories and speculations of the apostacy, it would not take long for a properly disposed person to understand the glad tidings—the promises made to the fathers—as preached by Paul; that gospel which is "now made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith," Rom. xvi. 26.

For our part we think the only safe course to pursue, both for preachers and hearers, is to adhere closely to the word as brought to view in the Acts of Apostles, which gives us the only reliable record of *how* and *what* the apostles preached, and *how* individuals became Christians. They did not preach abstract theories, nor one-idealism of any kind; but "Christ crucified" and his kingdom, and that this is he by whom God will judge the world in righteousness, in a certain day, of which fact he has given a proof to all, in having raised him from the dead. On account of this they said God commanded all men everywhere to repent, Acts xvii. 30, 31. They pointed their hearers to the "Times of Restitution," spoken of by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began, Acts iii. 20, 21. They called attention to what God had said in the Old Testament scriptures, "saying none other things than what Moses and the prophets did say should come," Acts xxvi. 23; believing that they were not only able to make a man "wise unto salvation," but also to make "the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished with all good works," 2 Tim. iii. 15, 17. EDITOR.

☞ He is wise, who learns from every one. He is powerful, who governs his passions. He is rich, who is contented.

☞ "The fear of God is wisdom."

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the GOSPEL to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM of GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The Kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., FEBRUARY 15, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 4.

For the Gospel Banner.
Epoch Men---The Lesson of their Lives.

V. DAVID—GOVERNMENT.

Garibaldi! How every mind is stirred at the mention of this name. How interested is every reader to know what he is doing. How many ardent youths are enlisting under his banner. And yet it would be hard to analyze the attractions which the man inspires. Courage, earnestness, energy, patriotism, skill,—all these are common characteristics; too common amongst our Saxon race to cause that admiration which is so general. Certainly the concentration of all these, each in an eminent degree, in one man, is not an every day spectacle. But doubtless it is the cause for which he labors which invests his fame with such striking features. An hatred of tyranny, especially such hyena-like tyranny as that of the Bourbon, finds response in every heart not sunk in debasement; and the aspirations after liberty wake a responsive thrill in every bosom emulous of higher and better things. But would the man have been so honored in defeat and obscurity? Perhaps not; and yet his cause would be equally as just. For what is he but a Protestant in deed against misrule, tyranny, and savagery of absolutism. And so, even though it is well nigh certain that his efforts will entail a greater degree of oppression for the people in the day of his defeat and the reaction, we cannot but say "God speed him."

And yet the world has witnessed nobler warring patriots. Not now;—in this age he has no peer in the patriot ranks, and his name will link in history, as the man of his age, with Washington, Cromwell, Wallace, etc. etc.;—but possibly the meanest brother of Christ who has fought "the flesh with the lusts thereof," and come off victor in "warfare against spiritual wickedness in high places," may be accounted a greater conqueror than Garibaldi. "Greater is he who ruleth his own spirit than he who taketh a city." But even in his own department has the General been outshone. One noble-hearted, single-eyed, di-

vinely-inspired patriot is all whom we can spare time to notice; but he is prince of all; one who has left his impress upon all times, and one who will ever serve both as the model of the patriot-warrior and the righteous successful ruler. The career of DAVID is without a parallel or rival. Dauntless courage, moral intrepidity, personal strength, warlike power, statesmanship, manly beauty, poetic sensibility, musical skill, all combined make an unique character. But to these must be superadded an intense faith and consciousness of Divine presence and personal responsibility. Noble as is the character of Garibaldi, we have but to compare the proclamations issued by him with the Psalms of David, to cast him into the deepest shade; the one without a word of any power but the strong will; the other devoutly acknowledging the hand of God in everything. Could a warrior pen a finer poem than the third Psalm.

But the life of the Poet-King is itself an epic of exceeding grandeur. We however can only extract a few cantos. His first appearance on the historic page is worthy of his destiny. He comes before us as the Lord's Messiah, chosen to evidence what a monarch should be. The king who had been chosen to evidence the worthlessness of a merely human rule, has naturally degenerated into the capitious, arrogant, God-despising, avaricious tyrant; and has therefore been rejected by Jehovah from being over Israel. The venerable Prophet, Samuel, (worthy of all honor for his bold statement of the consequences of the nation having a king like unto the other nations) is come to Bethlehem to appoint a son of Jesse in Saul's stead. The men of might and war are passed over,—for man "looketh on the outward appearance, but Jehovah looketh on the heart." At last the youngest, a Shepherd keeping his flock, is approved by God; (testifying that true mental worth has a physical counterpart, for the youth is comely of stature and countenance,) he is thereupon anointed with holy oil of consecration. Only the God who elected

him can tell the thoughts and feelings which possessed him upon that calling. Whether he would be overwhelmed with surprise, or whether it would be an event he was mentally prepared for by secret thoughts, ardent aspirations and spirit promptings, we know not; but most probably the latter, as thereby he would more properly parallel his antitype,—Jesus, who knew his mission before being christed by the Spirit after immersion. And even as Saul ceased to be king over Israel in the sight of God from this hour, though holding sway for years after; so the kingdom of the world or Jewish *kosmos*, became vested in Jesus of Nazareth when proclaimed to be Jehovah's well-beloved Son, yet Herod, the sectarian oligarchs, and the Roman powers, have held sway till now.

The mere historian might ask, why would not Saul answer God's purpose as well as David? He seems to have been approved by the people, a valiant soldier, and so forth. The answer to this, beside the more moral and the prophetic reasons, must be sought in the preceding pages of the Divine record. We have seen already that man is corrupt and mortal, but God has purposed an individual and national salvation. In looking at the epoch of the Man of Faith, we found that the principle of empire was making rapid progress in the establishment of murderous monarchies. And in the Law-revelation, we noted the grand principles which were appointed to ensure human welfare in opposition to this life-destroying, sin-promoting sway of man over his fellows. Now was to be evidenced the constitution of government beneficial to mankind. The logic of a code of laws implied a king as supreme judge; to be the main-spring of the civil machinery like the high priest was of the ecclesiastic. But God did not therefore at once appoint a king over Israel. To do so would not have answered his purpose. He was training and disciplining his people to be a pattern to other nations, and also to exemplify the operation of various dominant principles. Had he given the nation a king there would have been no difference betwixt them and the Gentiles, but it would have become a military nation waging incessant wars of conquest, or else have sunk into an enslaved luxurious nation like the Assyrian and Egyptian. So Jehovah first appointed a republican form of government, under patriotic leaders, to let all men see the impotence of self-government. "There was no king in Israel in those days, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." What sort of righteousness that would be, is illustrated by the history of every republic; and the one testimony of history, sacred and profane, is, that a democracy degenerates into a dictatorship and empire.

So it was with Israel. Their best judge had vicious sons, and it seems the very completeness of Samuel's judicial administration had been unfavorable to the development of any individual public character to whom the people would naturally look as a successor to their ageing Judge. And the nation could not apprehend an unseen Monarch such as Jehovah was. In this they were only like the rest of mankind; for the human mind cannot realize unseen agency. They had a *visible religion*, they needed a *visible king*. In point of fact this was right, and accordant with the Divine operation; but Israel sinned in the spirit in which they desired a king. "Make us a king *like all the nations*" was the sin; a king to lead their armies, to parade their power, and so forth. And so God gave them one,—a man of the Louis Napoleon sort, only a finer specimen of the man, for with all his faults, which were the results of the position to which he had been raised, he had some noble traits. If passionate and vengeful, he was also capable of appreciating a noble action, and also of inspiring a respect and esteem in the magnanimous heart of his rival.

Saul was rejected from being king over Israel, because he humanized his office, degrading the calling of the Lord's Messiah (anointed) into a tyrant and a robber like the kings of other nations. His offence in enriching himself with the spoil of the accursed nation, in sparing the monster Agag to swell the pageant of his triumph, and in attempting to usurp the sacerdotal functions, and thus establish an iniquitous alliance of Church and State—a papacy in fact,—was equivalent to that of a Called Saint striving after the riches and pomps of this vain age and allying himself with the systems of this apostacy. Brethren, beware, lest Saul's fate be yours! In what then must David differ? In many ways; indeed in every act which is done in fear of, and toward, Jehovah.

David, then, must be a model-king, if the exemplification of Divine requirements is to be carried out. Therefore he must first of all have a training. Saul was chosen and enthroned without being educated for ruling; but David must undergo a long apprenticeship. That he was a shepherd is an appropriate beginning. Jehovah speaks of this afterward, saying, "I took thee from the sheep-fold that thou mightest be the shepherd over my people Israel." This was much better than Saul's herd-ship, because that it educated certain characteristics of vigilance, wariness, and physical power, beside being the finest school, from its essential solitude, for the development of those poetic, and prophetic natural harmonies, which so beautify the productions of the Royal Psalmist.

The communion with God in nature is an intensifier of Faith in Him, as witness David's encounter with the Philistine giant. However, we cannot follow him in all his acts, or we should see how the shepherd-youth became the minstrel-laureate; how his experience of the moods of an oft delirious king would dispossess the life of a courtier of attraction; how he willingly returned to his humble occupation for a while, how his warlike fame eclipsed that of Saul, and so aroused the latter's jealousy and murderous hatred, even to his son-in-law; how the nobility of David's mind is evidenced by the love kindled toward him in the twin-nobility of Jonathan, so that they loved with a "love passing that of woman." All this must be sought out in the narrative in Samuel, a narrative surpassing for interest any creation of the novelist's pen. We must pass on to the time when he raised the standard of revolt.

This was not till the nation was groaning under the natural results of a military tyranny. In the cave of Adullam he gathered his forces; to him came some 400 men of those who were in distress, in debt, or in discontent. No filibustering hordes these, but patriot-hearts who had suffered loss, or who were at enmity with the unconstitutional state of things, or who had escaped the enslavement of indebtedness most probably to the tax-gatherer. These came apparently to the Garibaldi of the country, not to the Victor Emanuel, as it seems likely that he was not known as the Lord's anointed then. That he did not raise the standard of insurrection for his own selfish ends as a rival monarch, is evident from his message to Nabal, [a sort of Peace-Society man,] and his joy that Abigail had saved him from taking a vengeance for personal wrong. No, he was a patriot, testifying by arms against the iniquity of the tyrant and his myrmidons. The murder of the priests by Saul—an event manifesting the hardening influence of military despotism, in that the officers could look on, though to the mitigation of their iniquity be it noted that it was only the hand of the foreign mercenary which could do the deed,—(a lesson learnt by European tyrants, who find it needful to hire foreign demons to murder their subjects,)—this massacre evidences the heaviness of that rule which had driven David to insurrection in the interests of his people. If he knowing that his head had had the anointing oil upon it, could stand calmly by and witness this oppression, or could emigrate and forever leave it, he would be unworthy the Kingdom; as much as would a candidate for the kingdom now who would not lift up his voice against all iniquity, but would try to flee to some other place. Saul sealed his own destruction by

this unpardonable sin; the approach to God was his no more; and when he would enquire of the future, he had to consult the witch of Endor.

We cannot stay to trace the whole course of David in his wanderings. Not daring to stir up civil war, or in other terms to fight the devil with his own unholy weapons, he was but as an unsuccessful adventurer; a hunted brigand, despised by all such men as Nabal, even as the protesting Christian is tormented by the worldling. But the noble Jonathan recognized both the Lord's calling and the inevitable result of David's patriotic efforts, and so covenanted with him for his mercy toward his children. This at first sight seems a stretch of faith, that the man who is being hunted like a partridge on the mountains should ever be king in Israel, but Jonathan's faith was equal to it. And so was David's. His was that true faith which moves to realizing the thing desired. To this end were his marriages of wealthy ladies; his warlike deeds against Israel's enemies; and even his extreme generosity in twice sparing the life of Saul, because he was the Lord's Christ, (1 Sam. xxiv. 6; xxvi. 9;) would be an emphatic teacher of loyalty, as well as, by proving Saul only to be in the wrong, spread his own fame and fan it nearly to worship. Not perhaps that David did so conscious of this result, but when a man does a work on high principles of duty, such as the prophetic-political act of 1 Sam. xxvi., the high rewards naturally ensue. His temporary transference of service to the king of Gath, and the high character which Achish gives him, (1 Sam. xxix.) prove the purity of his deeds toward Israel. And it is noteworthy that not once have we any mention of bloodshed in Israel by him during all the period of his humiliation. He spares his brother-men and future subjects at the expense of his own immediate interests and reputation. His warrior-generalship was such that his 600 would undoubtedly have been a match to Saul's thousands in those fastnesses; but the strife would not have been holy, and so he skulked about, as his enemies would say, instead of routing the pursuing host.

For three years is this discipline of suffering and humiliation continued. How many sorrows and trials this time witnessed are indicated in the Psalms, such as the xi., xii., xiii., with many others, all of which evidence the patriot-head of Israel, experiencing, like his anti type, Jesus of Nazareth, the wrath of the adversary, but having undiminished faith in the reward of Jehovah. And now comes the end. Having just returned from a notable warlike exploit, similar to the one of Abraham, he received the tidings of Saul's and Jonathan's deaths. His elegy upon them

is one of the finest of its kind, and displays the intrusive nobleness of David's mind; the wrongs are all forgotten, the virtues only are remembered.

And now we must change our strain. We have dwelt long upon the preparation of the Christ for his office, because the training of a king is most important. And we have seen that suffering was the school for the Lord's Anointed. So it is ever, even now. "No cross, no crown." It is so essentially necessary that a Christ learn first to be subject, that even Jesus *learned obedience* by the things which he suffered." "It *behoved* the Christ to suffer:" so "the Captain of our salvation was *made perfect* through sufferings." And we, called saints and candidates for the Christship over the nations, must lay like trials to our account: "if we suffer, we shall reign with him." Three and a half years did Messiah-Jesus have a mission of teaching and suffering; three and a half years was Messiah-David a protesting leader and sufferer. But the time of reward came. The tyrant fell at last; a victim to his own misdeeds, for his dependence on the arm of flesh instead of Jehovah, proved his ruin. And now is an opportunity afforded to show the sort of rule which will be from his previous training.

The king being dead, David as naturally fills the vacancy. By Jehovah's direction he removes to Hebron, the ancient city of his own tribe, who *elect* him, and enthrone him there as king over Judah. For seven years he had only this tribe under his sway, because that Abner, in the spirit of family aggrandizement, or hereditary monarchy,—as though the nation were the *property* of the former herdsman and his race,—elevated Saul's son to the headship of all Israel. Abner would then be chief of Israel, because Ish-bosheth was merely a puppet. This act bears a very intimate relation to the usual course of human empires; for we generally find the army elevating some creature of their own to the throne. Because this throne had such an insecure foundation as the will of a General and the passions of an army, it fell at the first shock. So when the kingdom of Saul had fallen by its own rottenness, the people of Israel came and acknowledged David as their head. How parallel is David's experience to that of Messiah.

DAVID.

Born in Bethlehem.
By occupation a Shepherd.

Anointed in comparative secrecy, and long before he came to the throne.

Hailed as conqueror by acclamations, which

CHRIST.

Born in Bethlehem.
By occupation a Carpenter.

Christed by the spirit at his immersion, but not enthroned then.

Hailed as Son of David, and soon after cru-

arouse hatred in Saul, and cause his exile.

Followed in his outlawry by a band of devoted adherents.

Hunted to extremity of hunger, homeless, a dweller in caves.
3 1-2 years a wanderer.

30 years old when he was made king in Hebron.

Reigned over Judah only 7 1-4 years.

Israel the while being under the rule of the former family.

On the overthrow of the military rule, they come to David, claiming kinship, and confessing him as their former and rightful leader.

United Israel under his lead subdue the enemy. Jerusalem in the first place is won.

The Ark located, and materials for the Temple building prepared.

David and Hiram, or Israel and Tyre, are allied.

His reign one of great magnificence in both war and peace.

These parallels might be greatly extended but we must content ourselves with the foregoing. They must also suffice for all notice of events of his chequered reign; and we must draw near to a conclusion, by an examination of the characteristics of a righteous kingdom.

In his last charge to his son Solomon,—a verbal testament putting to shame any imperial reversion, such as Napoleon's or Peter of Russia,—he is found testifying Jehovah's requirement at the hand of monarchy: "He who ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Nearly equal to this is Jehoshaphat's charge to his judges; "Take heed what ye do; for ye judge not for man, but for Jehovah, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of Jehovah be upon you; take heed and do; for no iniquity is with Jehovah our God; nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts" "Thus shall ye do in the fear of Jehovah, faithfully, and with a perfect heart. . . . Take courage and do, and Jehovah shall be with the good." A king thus minded, and princes thereto chosen and overseen, leaves well nigh nothing to be desired by a nation. For the instincts of the people are just, when they

cified by the rival power.

Followed in his humiliation by devoted disciples.

Life oft threatened: "the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."
3 1-2 years an outcast teacher.

30 years old when he was anointed by Spirit.

Will reign first over Judah.

Israel being under the rule of their own kings in their dispersion.

On the overthrow of the Gentile armed confederacies, they come to Messiah, confessing former rebellions, and acknowledging his right to reign.

United Israel are the Lord's battle-axe, breaking in pieces the nations, under Messiah's command.

"The Messenger of the Covenant," "he shall build My Temple, saith Jehovah."

Israel and the Gentiles, especially Britain, are allied.

The kingdom of God, magnificent beyond compare. Initiated by an era of conquest it becomes glorious in peace.

ascribe most of national good or evil to the government. A righteous and parental government is a certain cure for all the evils, social, political, and even most physical, to which a nation is liable. David was thus righteous, for Jehovah calls him "a man after His own heart," and he himself is bold in uprightness of act; *Psa. iv. 3; v. vii. xv.* and in almost every personal Psalm. He knew experimentally, that

"The wicked walk on every side,
When the vilest of the sons of men are exalted;"

and so in his uprightness he endeavored to be himself righteous, knowing that the kingly manners model the court, and the people imitate their leaders. The impartial historians certainly reveal faults in him, but they are sins born of the man's strength, and serve to throw into bolder relief by the sincerity of his penitence, his righteousness toward God his Ruler. Still as sin cannot go unpunished, and as there is some secret physical law entailing evil upon descendants, these offences had posterior results, which show the Divine will in government.

The hereditary kingship was promised to David's house, in reward for his good intention of Faith in the building of the Temple.

"Go and say to my servant David, thus saith the Lord, why shouldst thou build me a house to dwell in? Whereas I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcot, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel; and I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men who are in the earth. Moreover I have appointed a place for my people Israel, and have planted them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime, and as since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused them to rest from all their enemies. Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house. And when thy days are fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men. * * * And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever."

There is an exquisite reciprocity in the promise; "Also Jehovah telleth thee that *He will make thee an house.*" House regnant for House sacred. Though the Lord accept not the deed from David because he was necessarily a man of strife, yet He approves the intention in this signal manner. And

why? What was there in the idea of a Temple to be so well pleasing to Jehovah? The Temple was to the kingdom what the Tabernacle was to the journeying people; a centre point for the national regards. We noticed the intention of the Tabernacle in our previous article; it is therefore enough to note that the Temple was the embodiment or permanency of the same. So then David's idea was by building a Temple in place of a tent, to make Jehovah's habitation *correspondent to the nation's established condition*, and as a consequence to *found a metropolis for Israel and the world.* Such a thought was worthy of the mind it came into, and immeasurable above all Napoleonic or Garibaldi schemes. It was sowing the seed of an Empire of the World in a right spirit, and so met with the Divine approbation. Only it lacked one thing of consistency; i. e. an universal Empire should be an immortal one, and not subject to the vicissitudes of dying men. Therefore did Jehovah bless the intention by promising a Son whose Kingdom should be an everlasting kingdom, and who should build him an House. Primarily referring to Solomon it can only have its fulfilment in Him of whom Solomon was type and forerunner. This Covenant, like many other prophecies, is telescopic, having minor and major perspectives. Hence when Israel fill their appointed place, a thing not done as yet, to be no more moved, then shall David's Son, (who is Christ,) possess the Throne of David forever and ever, give peace to the earth as king of kings, or Universal Monarch, and build the Temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem. *Jer. xxxi. 27, 28, 31-34, 38-40; xxxii. 36-44; Psa. lxxxix.; Isa. lv. 3, 4; liv.; lx.; lxxv. 18-25; Hag. ii. 9; Ezek. xl. to xlviii.; Zech. xiv. 16, 17, 20; Micah iv. 1-8; Mal. iii. 1-4.*

The faith-inspired integrity of David's heart was never more finely manifested than in his last prayer, as recorded in *Psa. lxxii.* The king who would manifest such deep solicitude for the best interests of his people, even the humblest, and whose solicitude for his successor was that he might be righteous;—such a king was surely a fitting representative of the majesty of monarchy. The noble old hero, pouring out his desires for his peaceful and magnificent son, is inspired by the Spirit to foretell what shall be the experience of the people under the realization of the desired righteous rule; "the kingdom of Heaven" under Messiah's sway.

Oh God, give Thy judgment to the kings,
Yea, Thy righteousness to the son of a king;
May he decide the cause of Thy people with equity,
Even of Thy poor with judgment,
May the mountains announce prosperity to the people
And the hills, through righteousness;
May he give sentence for the afflicted of the people,
Save the children of the poor,

And crush the oppressor!
 May they fear Thee as long as the sun shall shine;
 Yea, throughout the changes of the moon,—
 From generation to generation!

He shall descend as rain on the pasture,
 As showers, shall he moisten the earth.
 In his days shall righteousness blossom.
 And peace be abundant till the moon shall fail.
 He shall rule from Sea to Sea.
 Yea, from the river to the ends of the earth;
 The rangers of the desert shall kneel before him,
 And his enemies shall lick the dust. [ents]
 The kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring pres-
 The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts.
 Yea, all kings shall pay homage to him,
 All nations shall serve him.

Behold, he will deliver the poor who crieth aloud,
 And the afflicted, who hath no helper!
 He will have pity on the needy and poor man,
 Yea the lives of the poor will he save!
 He will redeem them from wrong and from violence,
 And precious shall be their blood in his sight!

Thus shall he live.— [Sheba]
 And thus shall be offered to him of the gold of
 Prayer shall be made for him constantly;
 Daily shall he be blessed.

Over the earth shall be a store of corn;
 Over the tops of the mountains shall it rustle.
 Like Lebanon shall be its produce.
 The inhabitants of the cities also, shall [spring up,
 as the grass of the earth.

His name shall live forever!
 With the orb of the sun shall his name last!
 And men shall be blessed in him;
 It nations shall pronounce him happy!

Blessed be JEHOVAH-GOD, the God of Israel,
 Who alone worketh marvels;
 Yea, blessed be His glorious name forever;
 And let His glory fill the whole earth!
 AMEN! and AMEN!

This then is the grand consummation of
 government for which Israel was called, Ju-
 dah chosen, Saul made king, David anointed.
 For this was David disciplined, Israel dis-
 persed, Jesus made a sufferer in life and
 death;—that the Divine government might
 be established. By Divine government do
 not let us understand the rule of God which
 says, 'let the thing be' and it is; but that
 perfected condition of man which makes him
 harmonious with all the Divine creation. The
 one is a despotism good and right, but if ap-
 plied to man in the way infidels presume to
 dictate to Jehovah would make him only a
 machine; the other is a Sonship wherein
 God's children are educated to "know Him"
 and His deeds as good and right. So hymn
 the redeemed in the Song of Moses and the
 Lamb—the anthem recitative of Jehovah's
 whole wondrous working out of earth's re-
 demption and assimilation to HIMSELF:—say-
 ing,

"Great and marvellous are thy works Lord God
 Almighty;
 Just and true Thy ways, Thou king of the sancti-
 fied.
 Who shall not fear Thee, oh Lord, and glorify Thy
 name?"

For only holy art Thou;
 For all nations shall come and worship before Thee;
 For Thy Judgments are made manifest."

We have thus far given some little consid-
 eration to the five epochal characters illustra-
 tive of the five important principles of Mor-
 tality, Righteousness, Faith, Obedience, Gov-
 ernment. This is the sum of the lessons we
 have learnt. That man is mortal in conse-
 quence of sin; That God has provided a way
 of redemption of which righteousness is a pre-
 requisite; That he has laid this way in a
 Covenant of Faith; That this Faith, to be
 well-pleasing to Him, must be joined to entire
 obedience to his laws; and That the end which
 Faith takes hold of is—Eternal Life in the
 Kingdom of God.

Our illustrations have all borne witness that
 Jehovah does nothing at random, but every
 work is apposite to its end; and consequently
 His children, called to be inheritors of Eter-
 nal Life, appointed to the administration of
 the Divine Laws, and separated to the glori-
 ous future of kings over the earth, must be
 trained for their positions. Being Mortal,
 they must be shown how by Righteousness,
 Faith, and Obedience, they may attain the
 immeasurable dignity of Kingship; how
 they may be made worthy of being "Kings
 and Priests to God." That such may be
 yours and my future, dear reader, is the
 earnest prayer of the writer. *

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

PERIOD IX.

Regul Age Embraces 430 Years.

From the Building, A. M. 3103, to the Destruction
 of the Temple, A. M. 3533.

A. M.	Names and Events.	Ys.	References.
3103	Solomon from the time he began to build the Temple,	36 2	Ch. ix. 30.
3139	Rehoboam,	17	" xii. 13.
3156	Abijam,	3	" xiii. 2.
3159	Asa,	41	" xvi. 13.
3200	Jehosaphat,	25	" xx. 31.
3225	Joram,	8	" xxi. 5.
3233	Ahaziah,	1	" xxii. 2.
3234	Athaliah,	6	" xxii. 12.
3240	Joash,	40	" xxiv. 1.
3280	Azariah,	29	" xxv. 1.
3309	Uzziah,	52	" xxvi. 3.
3361	Jotham,	16	" xxvii. 8.
3377	Ahaz,	16	" xxviii. 1.
3393	Hezekiah,	29	" xxxi. 1.
3422	Manasseh,	55	" xxxiii. 1.
3477	Amos,	2	" xxxiii. 21.
3479	Josiah,	31	" xxxiv. 1.
3510	Jehoaahaz, 3 months.	0	" xxxvi. 2.
3510	Jehoiakim,	11	" xxxvi. 5.
3521	Jehoiakim, 3 mo's 10 d's	0	" xxxvi. 9.
3522	Zedekiah,	11	" xxxvi. 11.
3533	Temple burned, Total,	429 6	months 10 days.

The foregoing period is so clear and satisfac-
 tory that any verification of it, as in the

case of preceding periods, would seem quite superfluous. Nevertheless, there is a corroboration of its accuracy, nothing short of demonstration. The reader will please peruse the 4th chapter of Ezekiel. He will there see that Ezekiel is commanded to represent in sign the siege of Jerusalem, vers 1 to 3 inclusive. Verses 4 and 5, the Prophet is told to lie upon his left side for 390 days, during which time he bears in sign the iniquity of the house of Israel. In the 6th ver. he is told to lie on his right side 40 days, bearing the iniquity of the house of Judah. During all these 430 days the siege is going on, ver. 8.

These days represent years, vers. 5 and 6, hence it follows that the iniquity of Judah stands related to a well-defined period of 40 years, and the iniquity of Israel to an equally well-defined period of 390 years, making together the amount of our table.

Proper questions for enquiry, then, would be: What is the iniquity of Judah, or, as Micah i. 5 has it, "What is the transgression of Jacob?—is it not Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah?—are they not Jerusalem?" The high places of Judah stand related to the first 40 years of the accompanying period, during which time there was *virtually* but one kingdom. It might be asked, Where is the testimony regarding the iniquity of the 40 years' period? To so reasonable a request I refer to 1 Kings xi. 1-13, where will be found the details of the iniquity that precipitated the disruption of the kingdom. In few words, Solomon, led astray by his wives, became an idolater, and built high places, so that the Lord threatened to rend the kingdom from his (Solomon's) son,—a threat which was fulfilled partially in the first, and completely in the fourth year of his son Rehoboam's reign. So much for the transgression of Judah.

The transgression of Jacob stands related to the succeeding 390 years, beginning when the transgression of Judah ended. The fourth of Rehoboam, or the third from the rebellion of the ten tribes. The narration is as follows: On the death of Solomon Rehoboam succeeded him, and reigned for a time—short of one year—over the whole twelve tribes. Jeroboam, *who was in Egypt*, (1 Kings xii. 2,) heard "that all Israel were come to Shechem to make Rehoboam king." Until he was sent for into Egypt, and his return from there, Rehoboam remained in undisputed possession of the dominion of his father Solomon. It was not long, however, till Jeroboam headed a successful rebellion against Rehoboam, and was made King over Israel; Rehoboam retaining in allegiance to him only the tribe of Judah. Jeroboam, however, strengthened the kingdom of Judah

three years, (2 Chron. xi. 17,) so that the dismemberment was not complete till the fourth year of Rehoboam. Dividing the whole number of years, in the table, at this point we have 40 years and 390 years, answering to the 40 days and 390 days of Ezekiel. The 40 years are made up as follows:

Solomon from his fourth year, - - -	36 yrs.
Jeroboam, in Egypt something short of 1 "	" "
Jeroboam strengtheneth Judah, - - -	3 "
	40 "

The accuracy of the foregoing table, then, may be considered established.

Did the siege actually last 430 days? The *probability* is, that it did; and *certainly* it was divided into two parts. Whether one of these parts was 430 days, and the other 40 days, and whether the long or the short period came first, I cannot say; but, at all events, the siege lasted from the beginning to the end 539 days, 2 Kings xxv. 1-4. This is 109 days too many; but from Jer. xxxvii. 5, we ascertain that there was an interval, during which the Chaldeans departed from Jerusalem. The following corresponds with Ezekiel:

First part of the siege, - - -	390 days.
Interval, - - - - -	109 "
Second part of the siege, - - -	40 "
	539 "

Thus the temple was destroyed at the end of a siege, lasting a day for every year of its existence. FRANCIS COGILL.

From the Harbinger.

The Kingdom of God.

Reader, it is clearly taught in the Word of God that the kingdom of heaven, kingdom of David, kingdom of God, and kingdom of Israel, are one and the same thing, and that it is the only kingdom that Jesus and the saints are heirs to, therefore it is the only kingdom that they will ever possess.

The terms "kingdom of grace," "mediatorial kingdom," "gospel kingdom," "spiritual kingdom," "kingdom of God in the skies," "the kingdom of grace in the heart," "kingdom of God among the stars," "the kingdom of God above the stars," "God's upper kingdom," are terms that never, in a single instance, are found in the Bible. But one would suppose, after hearing what is called an orthodox sermon, that the Bible was full of them.

Nowhere in the Bible is the church of God called a kingdom.

There is not a promise, in all the Bible, that one of the human family, either dead or alive, will ever go to heaven where God and Christ now reside.

The only home ever made for man, and

promised to him in the Bible, is this earth which he now inhabits. For man earth was made, but in consequence of his transgression of the law of his Maker, he lost it. Jesus, the second Adam, has paid the price of its redemption. Therefore, the title is in him, and at the time appointed, he will come and redeem it, and give it to the heirs of promise.

In Dan. 2d chap. we are informed that it is in the days of the divided state of the iron (Roman) kingdom, that the God of heaven sets up a kingdom, and as the western Roman empire was not divided into ten kingdoms, symbolized by the feet and toes of the image, until A. D. 476, therefore Jesus could not come into possession of his kingdom whilst the Roman kingdom was a unit. And as the kingdom of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia and Rome were literal, tangible kingdoms, and located upon this earth; and as their grant was universal, so God's kingdom under the administration of Christ and his queen, (the little flock,) will become universal.

In Luke xix. 12 we are informed, that a certain nobleman (this noble is Christ) has gone to a far country, (this far country is heaven where God resides,) to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return; and when the time shall arrive for him to return to this earth, God has sworn, under a solemn oath, that he will give him the throne and kingdom of his father David. Then the promise which he made to his disciples, on that memorable night in which he instituted the supper, will be fulfilled: "I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." See Luke xxii. 13; Matt. xxvi. 29; Jer. xxxi. 5.

I will now notice the most prominent texts, which our orthodox brethren adduce to prove that the kingdom is set up in the Christian's heart. Luke xvii. 20-24 is the main fort into which the believers in a heart-kingdom rush. Yet, upon an examination of this text, you will find that not so much as an allusion is made to Christians; but the address was made to the Pharisees. "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them (the Pharisees) and said, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation (or outward show—margin.) Neither shall they say, 'lo here, or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you.'" (The royal majesty of the heavens is among you.) It is recorded in Mark xv. 43, that "Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counsellor, waited for the kingdom of God." But modern orthodoxy, by its teachings, would have us believe that these wicked, ungodly Pharisees, whose hands were about to be stained with the blood of the Son of God, had the kingdom of God in

their hearts. Oh, orthodoxy! Well might heaven blush at thine ignorance upon the things concerning the Christ and the kingdom of God.

Luke xii. 32 is adduced as proof that the kingdom is set up in the hearts of all Christians. But all who have a correct idea of the use of language, know that this promise looks forward into the future as the time when it shall be fulfilled. "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." In the previous verse we are informed that it is the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of David, as is clearly proved by other parts of the divine record, [for they are one,] which they are destined to possess. And in Matt. xxv. 31-34, we are taught that this promise is to be fulfilled subsequent to his coming in the glory of his Father, with all the holy angels with him, and taking the throne of his glory, (which is the throne of his father David,) and gathering the living nations of earth before him, and separating them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.

Rom. xiv. 17 is adduced as proof that the kingdom is set up. But upon an examination of the text and the context, you will find that the apostle is endeavoring to show the brethren, that if they were heirs to the kingdom, they would bear its fruits in this age, which did not consist in meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Col. i. 13 is resorted to as proof that the kingdom is set up. But it is positively certain, from the testimony of Dr. Bloomfield, Dr. Robinson, and the living oracles, that the proof is not in the text. I understand, by the best authority, that the passage should read thus—"Who [God] hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath (*mestlesen*) transferred us over unto the (*Basilian*) kingdom of the son of his love."

The parable of the "leaven," Matt. xiii. 33; is referred to as proof that the kingdom of God is set up in the heart. But I think that every Bible student must admit that "leaven" is never used to represent the Christ, or purity of heart. Matt. xvi. 6, 12; Luke xii. 1; "Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy." 1 Cor. v. 6; "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Rev. i. 9; is often referred to as proof that the kingdom is set up. But a correct rendering of this text is all that is wanting to convince the inquirer after truth that the proof is wanting. "I, John, who also am your companion in tribulation, and in [for] the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Heb. xii. 28 is claimed as proof, "Wherefore we, [the brethren] receiving the kingdom." Now it must be obvious to every mind that has no creed to sustain independent of the Bible, that it is only by promise that the saints receive the kingdom. For Jesus has said, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." And Peter, as a motive to induce the brethren to "add to" their "faith," "virtue," "knowledge," "temperance," "patience," "godliness," "brotherly kindness and charity," informs them that "an entrance should be ministered unto them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." And in Matt. xxv. 34 we have the time fixed upon, when the saints, the "little flock," shall enter, or receive the kingdom. Amen. R. V. LYON.

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.

BRO. WILSON:

I write you a brief sketch of my labor as an evangelist, for the *Banner*, as no doubt some of your readers would like to know what I am doing. I left Harvard Jan'y. 1st for Ashkum. At that place I have delivered four discourses, and organized a Church, by appointing bro. Wm. Brayton as Elder, and bro. Cyrus Bigelow as Deacon. Here I would remark, that I do not think any one capable of feeding the flock as Elders, but those who are well instructed in the things of the kingdom of God, from the fact that the preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto them that are saved it is the power of God. How true it is, what God says, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise men," &c. It is conclusive that the world by wisdom know not God. The whole system of theology ignores the preaching of the Cross. They deny the superscription, "*this is the King of the Jews*," and by it the whole economy of God's plan is set at nought, and by their vain traditions, and worship.

I have had to meet with almost all of the modern dogmas of modern ignorance, and inasmuch as the people were bewitched by sorceries in Philip the Evangelist's day, so they are in the day of Robert the Evangelist; and the same preaching of the things of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ only, will meet the demands of the people to deliver them from the power of Satan, or the sorceries of priestcraft. The gospel of Christ is "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth," and it will also be the witness to judge, justify or condemn in the day when the secrets of men's hearts shall be judged by Jesus Christ, according to Paul's gospel. He, the apostle to the Gentiles, declares that he was not ashamed of the gospel

of Christ, and he taught it to both Jew and Gentile, and it is that only which will justify and save us by our obedience to it.

The modern Priest has in these parts been put to flight, by only hearing the blast of the trumpet and breaking the pitcher. They are somewhat divided at this place. The Baptists and Presbyterians closed the school-house, and even nailed the windows. There being a Catholic church here, and some of the Old Lady's daughters having refused the school-house, I was informed that the Old Lady would open her house, if the school-house could not be obtained. I would here remark that it doth seem that the time has come that the strong delusions are on them, to believe a lie, that they all might be condemned, for they have no pleasure in the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness. Dear brother, how thankful we ought to be that our understandings have been enlightened; but are we rendering unto God according to the benefits we have received? When I travel around and find souls covered up in ignorance, for lack of the knowledge of the Gospel, my very bowels yearn after them in their sad condition, perishing for want of some one to open the scriptures to them.

The people where I have been laboring are much interested. Quite a number have confessed their faith in word, who will soon do so in works. I cannot enforce obedience by baptism until I know they understand the gospel of Christ—that Jesus is the Anointed King of Israel, to reign and rule and govern the nations, according to the scriptures; and that there must be a distinction kept up between subjects and king, and also between the knowledge of the glory, and the glory filling the whole earth; the Ages, as well as the Age to come; between God's gospel, Christ's gospel, and Paul's gospel, which all point to the same. In its proper order and place, every man that is a workman must know how to rightly divide the word of life, or he had better stay at home chopping wood. When I look around on the various teachers professing to teach the gospel, who but darken knowledge by their traditions, I conclude them worse than an out and out counterfeit, because they are not so easily detected. One evening while delivering a discourse from Acts i. 6, following a bogus teacher, who taught six kingdoms, I showed that the kingdom was definite, and one assented to it. There being three teachers present, viz. one Methodist and two United Brethren, (the old billy-goat having fled, not being able to meet the sheep's bleat,) these young goats declared that what I read was not in the Bible, and accused me of reading incorrect. I then got them in the stand and made one of them read it. They then had the hardihood to pronounce mine a

bogus Bible, which, when compared, made them so ashamed that the goats all left, and I preached to the congregation some two hours on the things of the Kingdom of God, and since that I have had all kinds of anathemas heaped on me, but as yet they have all been met. Last evening, a goat undertook to butt at me in the Post Office. He denied the testimony of inspiration. I requested a Bible, to show the gent his ignorance. The Postmaster said I had whipped him bad enough without it. I offered to debate any Bible question with him, and give him double time, or take himself or any one else of his clan. They have tried to get some one to debate with me, but they cannot find any one to meet me, from the fact that they have nothing but error to hold up, which will soon have an end.

I am your brother in Christ, valiant for the truth.

ROBERT CHOWN.

GILMAN, Iroquois Co., Ill., Jan. 30, 1860.

From the Harbinger.

"Four,"

The Number of Earthly Empires.

In the broadest sense, the governments of earth are divided into "the kingdom of men" and "the Kingdom of God." "The kingdom of men" accomplished, is but another form of statement to embrace "the time of the Gentiles fulfilled."

"The times of the Gentiles" are divided into "four" parts. The number and the names of these great prevailing forms of "the kingdom of men," are given plainly, frequently and harmoniously. They are confined to "four."

There is, on this point, no varied readings, no collision of manuscripts, nor diverse ancient or authorized interpretations. No, indeed. Where the number is either expressed or implied, it is *four*. By Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, or Zechariah, it is *four*—only *four*! (The changes in each of the four alter not the number.)

"The fourth" is the highest figure amid the scenes of human dominion, imaged forth in Dan. ii. "Four" and "fourth" occur in connection with the symbolized governments, Dan. vii. This distinctive and expressive "four" is repeated as to "the four beasts," and "the four kings," or "kingdoms," about seven times in all. Thus, this number "four" is made an essential in this most complete prophetic outline of earth's whole history, on to the kingdom of God. The first having given place to the second, in Dan. viii., we find there the remnant of the four. It is three, and only three.

This filling out of the series of "four" in all, is sustained by the most minute and extended of the historic prophecies, Dan. x. to

xii. Babylon the first, having fallen by "Cyrus, the Persian," the Persian was the prevailing,—the second form. The third, or Grecian, followed the Persian. Rome succeeded to "Grecia," completing the circle of "four."

Rome Pagan, (the fourth and last,) was changed into Rome Papal 1260 years, according to the words of the prophets; and now we are approaching "the end" of this series,—"the end" of these eventful scenes which introduce "the kingdom of God." Rome remains the recognized "fourth" in all the symbols that are most distinctive in both Testaments. "The fourth" Roman reaches to the judgment, Dan. vii. 8—11. Rome remains Roman, and retains her distinctive, geographical, historical, chronological and prophetic position to "the judgment" on the Gentile world, Dan. xi. 27.

This judgment on "the fourth beast" is geographised and identified in the central scenery of the "seven hills of Rome." That was "the great city" that then reigned over the earth, Dan. vii. 8—27; Rev. xvii. 1—18. No nation ever had or now has the "seven mountains" in her capital, save Rome, "the fourth" and last, in the prophetic series. The chronology and geography are Roman to "the end." "The times of the Gentiles" (Luke xxi. 24) are fulfilled, —filled full, or completed in this *four*-fold series, as we know by Zech. i. 18—27. Here the symbolic horns are "four,"—only four!

These "four horns" are explained to be the Gentiles that have scattered Israel, Judah and Jerusalem. Nay, they continue on with no other as successor, till "the four carpenters" fray them away, and cast out these horns of the Gentiles. These four Gentile powers fill the whole picture. No one can crowd in "another beast" or horn, or Gentile dominion, but by adding to the Word of God. This would be sin, Rev. xxii. 18, 19. "Add not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar," Prov. xxx. 6.

REMARKS.—Could there be "five" earthly empires, the fact would falsify the "four" of prophecy, and confound the whole.

Could there be "five," the judgment could not come on the fourth, that desolated Jerusalem, Dan. ix. 24—27.

Could there be "five," or another earthly prevailing power, then the kingdom of God is crowded off far enough into the future to make room for it.

Could there be "five," then it is egregious folly to preach the Messiah near, as he cannot come "till the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled."

But no! "the fourth," the Roman and last, is accomplished. The Lord's coming, "is nigh, at the doors!" Amen. —

Extracts from Letters.

From a great number of letters, (all good enough to print, if we could find room for them,) we make the following selection, the most part of which are only short extracts, to show our readers in general, how we and the *Banner* stand at present, in the estimation of our brethren at large, after the scathing fire through which we have had to pass. We shall omit names and places of abode, as the letters were not designed for publication. The only exception we make is the letter to the Church here from the brethren at Newark, N. J. The following is a copy:—

“The Church of Jesus, the Christ, at Newark, N. J., to the brethren of like precious faith at Geneva, Illinois, send greeting:

Brethren, your reply to our former letter was received and read to the whole Church, and we may add that we had with us that day, brethren John O. Woodruff and Nicholas Dabb from Elizabeth City, which was gratifying to us as to them. We did agreeably to your request suspend our judgment, until we should have all the testimony and evidence before us. The *Banner Everta* was received, it has been generally read, consultation together has been had, and an impartial judgment has been formed—that is, that you are fully justified in separating Mary Hayes from your fellowship, and that should she come into this locality we could have no fellowship with her, unless she brought evidence from you that you had been satisfied of her repentance, that she had made all the *amends she could to you* for the evil done, and that you had restored her to confidence. We sympathize with you, brethren, in the trials to which you have been subjected in this matter; but as the end has been to only establish the more fully your faith and integrity, we trust that our Heavenly Father will make this and all trials work to the fulfilling in you of all the good pleasure of his goodness and the work of faith with power, that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified by you, and you may be glorified by him, according to the favor of God and the Lord Jesus the Christ.

That grace, mercy, and peace may abound unto you, brethren, and that an abundant entrance may be ministered unto you into the everlasting kingdom of the Lord and Savior, is the fervent prayer of your brethren in the One Faith, and in the Hope of Israel.

In the behalf of the Church,
ENOCH L. DUNN.

Newark, Feb. 5, 1861.”

The following letter from a brother we give nearly entire:

“We, poor mortals, have to judge after the hearing of our ears, and seeing of our eyes,

but the great Judge and Lawgiver will be of quick understanding in the fear of *Jehovah*. I saw several months ago a notice of your withdrawal of Christian fellowship from one Mary Hayes. As there are and will be in this age tares growing with the wheat, I took it for granted that the Church had done its duty, and thought no more of it, until a short time since on receiving the Herald, I found accompanying it a Vindication of as I thought at that time a much abused woman, especially when I found the Dr. had taken sides, or committed himself in her favor. And I quickly replied I never will patronize those who do like that. I felt it to be a case in which any christian had an interest. But being so located at a distance from the seat of trouble, I had no other alternative but to wait until things should naturally right themselves; for every true christian has felt a powerful shock at such an outbreak in the connection. There is a great wrong somewhere thought I, but it will not do for me to take sides until I know more than I do now about the case, although I was desired to do so by some. I am now in possession of the Reply of the church and individuals, (aided by an investigating committee,) to the Vindication of Miss H., and must say that I feel a great relief, although much pained at the course Bro. Thomas seems to be pursuing in regard to such a sad affair. Those who know me, know that I am not a Thomasite, though I esteem him very highly for his works' sake, and labor of love in spreading the truth. But why is he not willing to let you also publish the truth. I think as a general thing that those who take the Gospel Banner also take the Herald. I would like to have them both live. Yours deals in the sincere milk of the word, and his in strong meat. Then I would ask Bro. Thomas, do you want Bro. Wilson to stop the publication of the Gospel Banner, and if so, why? I am willing to do my best to sustain them both. Bro. Wilson, I do think that your Reply will do much to bring back your patronage.

Don't faint, Brother, for you will reap in due time. And to the Brethren at large let me say, don't be too hasty—beware, lest we wrong Bro. Wilson.”

We copy the principal part of another letter, because too good to curtail, and on account of the salutary reflections contained in it:

“I would have sent my subscription before this time, for the present year, but as I saw some grave charges against you, and the brethren connected with you, at Geneva, I resolved to wait for your Reply, which I received with the last *Banner*. I have this day read it over, and also the other testimo-

nies in connection with it, and feel quite satisfied with the explanation given, and consider it quite as reliable as anything on the other side. At the same time it is to be deeply deplored that such circumstances should have had existence, as there are always too many, both in the world and in the professed churches, who are ready to take hold of any handle which may be placed in their way, to defame the truth, and those who hold it, and to take to themselves a temporary triumph. But it appears to me that those things ever have been, and ever will be inseparable from the truth as it is in Jesus, and from those who hold it. The "world will love its own," and bear with its faults. But in the case of those who adhere closely to the truths of the Bible, their mole-hill faults are magnified to mountains. Perhaps this is as it should be,—perhaps there is a "need be" for it, in order to make us more careful and guarded in our walk and conversation; at all events, it is certain that it will do so, in the case of all conscientious believers in "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus." Pity! however, that all the opposition does not come from without,—then it could be easily borne,—but when dissensions arise within, and brethren judge harshly of each other, and sometimes without sufficient information as to facts, and also in the absence of the knowledge of motives, then, indeed, the enemy has reason to rejoice, and say, Aha! aha! so would we have it. * * *

I am very happy to see that the matter has been taken up, and placed in a good way of final adjustment. There is much gratitude due to the disinterested Brethren who have thus come forward and acted as they have done, thus binding themselves to place it in a satisfactory form."

A brother writes as follows:—

"It gave me great satisfaction, the reading of the last Banner, as well as the reply to Miss Hayes' Yindication. It is like taking a great load off my mind; for, dear Bro. I had heard that you had been instrumental in causing Miss Hayes to be swindled out of \$1,500, and I had begun to think that Bro. W. was not the man I thought him to be, and Brethren R —, B —, and myself had come to the conclusion not to take the *Banner*, until I had written you on the subject and learned particulars; for we were determined not to have anything to do with you, if the report we heard was true. We deeply sympathize with you, and the Church of God, and pray that this trial may be found to the praise and glory of our heavenly Father. Some of understanding shall fall among us, in order to try and purify others; that those that are approved may be made manifest. I am a stranger to you personally, but we are one in Christ Jesus, possessing one hope, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father; to whom be glory forever. Amen.

Another brother writes;—

"Dear Brother, I am very glad you sent me the circular, as most of the brethren here are subscribers to the *Herald*, and of course thought you and the rest of the brethren were in the fault. There is not one now believes the charges which were in the *Herald*. Bro. Thomas is too sarcastic. It will never do to use such harsh language, as what the Dr. does. If we wish to gain a brother or sister it is by showing the spirit of Christ, and not by thundering down upon them all the abuse that man can think of. Such a spirit as the Dr. has shown in this case, and in the one of 'Anti-Porkism,' does not become a believer, and especially one who professes to be a teacher of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. But, dear brother, we are told that 'whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,' it will all turn out for the best, and I trust that the truth will not suffer by what has been done."

Another brother sends the following:—

"I have looked over the Report of the Committee in your *Reply* to the Miss Hayes' case, and sympathize with you in the persecutions directed at yourself, and some other brethren in your place. I have lived long enough to learn, that people are quite as apt to make innocent parties the mark of their vindictiveness, as they are the guilty; and more so, because they do not take time to search for the truth before they begin to persecute."

The following was received from a section where the brethren were much prejudiced by what appeared in the *Herald*. A brother writes;—

"We have received the first *Banner* with the *Extra*, and I think the *Extra* has made the hearts of many of our brethren glad, and we are in hope that nothing further on that money subject may make them sorry. I think, our brother, the Dr. has been imposed on; but you must not put too much blame on him, as he is very jealous for the truth, and I think he will do you justice in due time. You have no idea how it pained us. We are very few taking all of our number, the good and the bad; the bad we are sure to have, and they are always ready to help to do wrong, if not to commence."

Another brother writes;—

"Your vindication has given general satisfaction, as far as I know. I am heartily glad that this affair is settled. * * * All the trouble that has been made has been entirely uncalled for, and has arisen from want of patience and *Christian* forbearance. Experience teaches us some important lessons."

An old veteran writes as follows;—

"I think it is impossible for any one to charge me with partiality, when I say that from all that I have read on both sides, I am convinced that Miss Hayes acted very imprudently in that case. I have no doubt but that her behavior has been anything but Christian all the way through. In fact, if ever she was a Christian at any time she has failed to give proof of it in Geneva. But, dear brother, what she has done falls into insignificance with me, when I think of the way in which Bro. Thomas has spoken of yourself and others, and that too before he heard what defence you might make. But though Bro. Thomas is not near so fallible as I and many others, yet he is a long way from infallibility. I do hope, trust, and pray God that he will excuse himself, and make all the amends that justice demands."

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the GOSPEL to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., MARCH 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 5.]

For the Gospel Banner.
The Cross of Christ.

A Sermon by H. V. Reed.

"For the preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto us which are saved it is the power of God."—1 Cor. i. 18.

The text which we have taken involves one of the most important and glorious themes of the word of God. We feel our insufficiency in trying to elucidate the elements of the testimony brought to view in this part of the Holy oracles; yet we rely upon the word of God as a means of enlightenment, and trust that we can by its aid derive some important instruction from the text in hand, and in order to get the subject clearly before the reader, we shall reason from the following points:

1. *What is meant by the Cross of Christ?*
2. *What is meant by perishing?*
3. *What is the Salvation?*

Then we are to consider

I. WHAT IS MEANT BY THE CROSS OF CHRIST?

We hear much about the Cross of Christ, about *preaching* the Cross, and of *bearing* the Cross, and *confessing* the Cross, and of *denying* the Cross, &c., &c. Now it is a matter of solemn inquiry as to what constitutes the Cross of Christ. Paul says, "but God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," Gal. vi. 14. Again, he says, "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the Cross ceased," chap. v. 11. Paul, in discoursing to the Ephesians, shows that both Jews and Gentiles are reconciled unto God by the Cross of Christ—"And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby," Eph. ii. 16.

From the citations above, none can fail to see but that the Cross is important in its relation to the plan of God. It is that which Paul preached, and he declares it to be the *power*

of God to them which are saved. And the preaching of the Cross was foolishness to one class, and the means of saving another; hence the Cross must embrace God's plan of saving men. Now a theme comprehending all these elements ought to be well understood by those who claim to be ministers of the Cross. In preaching the Cross do we understand that it means simply to proclaim to the world that one stick of timber was fastened to another crossways, or does it embrace what was *written on the Cross*? We conceive it to be the last named principle. There would be no principle involved in going to the world and telling them that one piece of wood was nailed across another, and much less embracing God's power in saving men. It was the custom of the Romans when they crucified a criminal to state the nature of the offence on the cross, over the head of the one to suffer. If a man was put to death on the cross for theft, they would write the offence upon the cross, over the head of the criminal; and if he suffered for murder they would put an inscription upon the cross, stating the nature of the offence.* On the same principle, if a man is guilty of any crime in our nation, when he is taken by State authority they must specify in the warrant the nature of the offence, in order to its legality. Now what was written upon the Cross of Christ? "And Pilate wrote a title and put it on the Cross, and the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS." John xix. 19. Here we have the offence of Christ to the nation of the Jews expressed. The Chief Priests wished to alter the title a little, and said to Pilate, "Write not, The King of the Jews, but that he said *I am King of the Jews*." Pilate answered, "what I have written I have written," verses 20-22. Thus we are clearly informed upon this subject, that the Cross embraces Christ's official relation to our world; hence to preach the Cross of Christ, you must preach 1st. Jesus. This is only a part of what was writ-

* See Bagster's Commentary.

ten on the Cross. Christ is called Jesus in fulfilment of the Angel's testimony to Mary, "And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i. 31-33. Here we have expressed what JESUS is to do. He is to reign upon the throne of David, and of his kingdom there is to be no end. Hence to preach Jesus is something more than to sound a mere name without meaning. But when men preach Jesus, and say they are preaching the Cross, they only preach a *part* of the Cross. In order to preach the Cross you must also preach Jesus as the "KING OF THE JEWS." But thousands who pretend to be preaching the Cross deny this language in direct terms, and say that he *never will be King of the Jews*. But this was on the Cross, and you cannot preach the Cross without preaching this part of the inscription. Now what says the Word on this point. The wise men who came to worship the Messiah exclaimed, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East, and we are come to worship him," Matt. ii. 2. These men recognize him in the same light, as what Pilate wrote upon the Cross, "JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS." And Pilate propounded the following question to him, "Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world," John xviii. 37. Here we are informed that Christ came for that purpose. The trial shows this to be true, for he was arrayed in kingly robes, and a crown of thorns was upon his head, which shows in what light he was held; and here we have his good confession before Pilate, 1 Tim. vi. 13-16. That Jesus is the appointed King of Israel is also clear from the prophets. "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be RULER IN ISRAEL," Micah v. 2; see Isa. ix. 6, 7; 2 Sam. vii. 8, 16; Psa. ii. 6-10; ex. 1-7; Acts ii. 30, 34. Thus Jesus is the appointed King of the nation of Israel. The Jews put him to death, and will see him no more until they shall look upon him they have pierced, and mourn for him, when they receive him as their King. Then will they return unto the Lord, and become one nation upon the mountains of Israel. Zech. xii.; Ezek. xxxvii. 15-28; Matt. xxiii. 37, 39. Hence to preach Christ to the Jewish nation in this dispensation is a "stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness." 1 Cor. i. 23. But when

they as a nation return to the Lord, then will their sins and veil be taken away. Rom. xi. 23-26; 2 Cor. iii. 7-12; Jer. xxiii. That Paul in preaching the Cross of Christ preached him as King is evident from Acts xvii. He preached at Thessalonica, and made an uproar among the people, and the Jews of the baser sort came and assaulted the house of one Jason, and said, "these that have turned the world upside down are come hither also, whom Jason hath received, and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, SAYING, THERE IS ANOTHER KING, ONE JESUS." Hence Paul preached Jesus as king in preaching the Cross. It would not have alarmed Cæsar if he had preached that Christ was King in heaven forever, but when they showed the people that Christ was going to turn the World *upside down*, or change the administration of the world, why it caused Cæsar to tremble. The world has the wrong side up now. The Kingdom of men is in power, but when Christ comes he will put this now upside world down, and then "the Kingdoms of this world will become the Kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ," Rev. xv. 11. "And the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven will be given to the people of the saints of the Most-High," Dan. vii. 27. These principles as set forth by Paul, clearly show the nature of his mission, that he was to preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Christ*."

Now from what has been said we can easily understand what is meant by *bearing* the Cross. It is not to wear a brazen metal *around the neck*, as the Roman priests vainly teach, neither is it to get up and "speak in meeting" as the clergy tell us, but it is carrying out this good confession that Jesus is King, and that we are joint heirs with him, to the inheritance. It is to follow him in evil as well as good report, claiming him to be Prince-Royal to the throne and kingdom of David, and that he is "king of the Jews." Rom. viii.

To confess the Cross is to acknowledge him as the anointed, and that what the prophets have spoken of him shall surely come to pass. Hence the Cross of Christ is a summary of God's plan, as revealed in the holy oracles. We conclude, therefore, that all who preach Christ, or the Cross of Christ, will preach 1. *That he is Jesus*, 2. *that he is king*, 3. *That he is King of the Jews*. For he told the woman of Samaria that "*salvation is of the Jews*," which can only be true in the sense of their future return to the land of their fathers; and when Christ becomes their king, and all nations are blessed in the reign of his glory upon the throne of David, over Israel his inheritance; and when the nations are at peace with God, and the earth filled with his

glory. Please examine the proofs. Zech. xiv.; Psa. lxxii.; ii. 6-8; Isa. liv.; lx.; lxxvi. 15-24; Micah iv.; Isa. xi.; Psa. lxxxix. 30-34; Rev. xv.; Psa. xxii.; Matt. xxv. 31, 32; Matt. xix. 28; Luke xvii.; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Jer. xxxiii.; Zech. vi.; viii.; Psa. xxxvii. These testimonies will show the reader that Jesus will yet fulfil his position as king, when he returns from heaven, and takes his kingdom, and reigns as king of nations. Dan. ii. 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 27. We dismiss this point, and now pass to,

II. WHAT IS MEANT BY PERISHING?

The text says the preaching of the Cross is to them *that perish, foolishness*. The world has been taught to believe that the word *perish* means a state of *endless misery*. But such a position contradicts every principle of language and unsettles every rudiment of the philology of words. The word rendered *perish* in the text is in the Greek, *απολλυμι*, *apollumi*, and means according to Green, "to destroy utterly, to kill, to bring to nought, render vain," &c.; and by Donnegan, "To destroy totally, to perish, to die." Now apply any of the above definitions, and you see at once that the wicked must experience *death* as a penalty for rejecting the Cross of Christ. We will here introduce a few plain passages, showing the final destiny of all who stumble at the Cross.

David says, "a little while and the wicked SHALL NOT BE, yea thou shalt diligently consider his PLACE, AND IT SHALL NOT BE." This testimony not only shows that the wicked shall cease to be, but also his *place* shall cease, or it shall not be. Psa. xxxvii. 9. Again verse 20, "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs, *they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away.*" "As many as have sinned without law shall also *perish* without law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the Law." Rom. ii. 12; Again "*they shall be as though they had not been.*" Obad. 16. Isaiah in speaking of the wicked says, "they shall be as nothing, and they that strive with thee shall perish," Isa. xli. 11. This testimony is very explicit, and shows the ultimate of the wicked, that they are to be as *nothing*. They are to be blotted out, and cease to be, instead of suffering to all eternity in a modern hell. They will suffer everlasting punishment, but instead of that punishment being *endless misery*, it is EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION, for so Paul teaches in 2 Thess. i. 7-10; compare Matt. xxv. 46. They are to be burnt in an unquenchable fire; but instead of that fire keeping them *alive to all eternity*, it will burn them up; for says John, in the 3rd of Matt. "But the chaff he will *burn up with an unquenchable fire.*" We might enlarge upon

this point, and show that the whole was uniform in proving that the wicked will perish and cease to be in the final overthrow of the ungodly. The reader can examine the following texts. Psa. civ. 35; cl. 8; xcii. 7-9; lxxiii. 17, 27; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20; Mal. iv.; Matt. xiii. 36-43; Rom. vi. 23; Gal. vi. 7-8; Heb. vi. 8; x. 26-29. Enough has been said on this point to show that Paul's declaration is true, that all who reject the Cross will perish. Hence it is an imperative duty to embrace the Cross of Christ, which covers the plan of the Gospel as revealed in the Holy oracles. May we not despise the covenant, but maintain the faith of the Gospel, that we may be saved; and this brings us to another proposition, viz.

III. WHAT IS MEANT BY SALVATION.

There is much importance attached to the Scripture idea of Salvation. It is something more than a mere saving from one's sins. Men tell us that a man is saved when he becomes a Christian, but instead of his being saved then, he is only an *heir* of salvation. For says the apostle "Are they (the angels) not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be the *heirs* of salvation," Heb. i. 14. The salvation is not yet acquired, but we become heirs to it, and if we hold out to the end we *shall be saved*, thereby showing that the saving time does not come until *the end*, or at the harvest time.

Just here we wish to propound a question. Does the salvation spoken of in the scripture apply to a man's character, or to the man himself? We do not wish to ignore *character*, for it alone will enable a man to be saved. But what is saved, is it the *character* or the man? We here lay down the proposition that the bible *uniformly* represents the salvation of the *man*. Paul asks, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation," Heb. ii. 3. And Peter says, "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls," 1 Pet. i. 9. This testimony put together shows, that the *great salvation* is the salvation of their souls. Not immortal souls, for such a thing is not spoken of in the scriptures. The soul is nowhere represented as immortal, but as subject to death. See proofs, Ezek. xviii. 4; Josh. x. 35, 37, 39; xi. 11. "Let him know that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, he shall *SAVE A SOUL FROM DEATH,*" James v. 20. Now this is the salvation of which Peter speaks when he speaks of the salvation of souls. It is saving them *from death*, and not from an endless hell. The soul could not be saved from death according to the clergy, for it cannot die; but the bible shows, that souls can be saved from death by obedience

to the truth. The salvation of the soul is equivalent to the saving of the man. For the soul generally means the whole man. Gen. ii. 7; xii. 5; Lev. xvii. 10-15; Gen. xlvi. 26; Isa. lvii. 16; Acts ii. 41.

Now the time of this salvation to which the saints are heirs is at the appearing of Jesus the Savior. For Paul says, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear a second time without sin unto salvation," Heb. ix 28. Again salvation is a matter of hope. 1 Thess. v. 8. The gospel is the means by which men get a knowledge of salvation. Rom. i. 15-17; Eph. i. 13. Peter in discoursing to the Jews about the stone (Christ) which the builders (the Jews) rejected, says, "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," Acts iv. 8-12. And Jesus says, "Salvation is of the Jews," John iv. Now how can these two propositions be harmonized? Simply upon the principle laid down in the remarks upon the subject of the Cross—That *Jesus is the King of the Jews*, as was written upon the Cross. By believing in Jesus as the King, we embrace the covenant made unto David in relation to his throne. Acts ii. 30; xv. Amos ix. And when the Redeemer comes to Zion, then will salvation flow to the world, as nations of the earth. Isa. xxxv. 10; lix. 20; xlvi. 13. The salvation spoken of in the scriptures is 1st. Individual, and 2nd. National. These points the reader will easily learn by attention to the scriptures. We can pursue this theme no farther at present; therefore leave it for the reader's reflection, and investigation, hoping that truth may prevail. Amen.

For the Gospel Banner.

Prerequisites to Baptism.

"But the Pharisees and the Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him," Luke vii. 30.

Bro. Wilson.—In the Banner for Feb., under the above head, I read an article in which is one point, (and perhaps one of more importance than may appear upon the face of it,) which I would like to notice a little more particularly than has been noticed I think hitherto; for the purpose of benefitting the writer of the same, as well as others, who may be in the same error of belief, that it is not essential or absolutely necessary for a person to be instructed in the things comprehensive of the kingdom of God, and name of Jesus Messiah, before he can become a fit subject for immersion into the One Body. The point in question is the case of the Philippian jailor, Acts xvi. 30, 31, whose earnest inquiry, has furnished not only the text, but the burden of many of the excited appeals of

Modern Pictist preachers, in times of what are called in latter day parlance, revivals or awakenings.

"What shall I do to be saved," inquires the affrighted jailor, in view undoubtedly of the earthquake which opened the prison doors, and loosed the bonds of the prisoner, and exposing him to punishment, perhaps, of death, and believing in all probability the apostles, and their new worship to be the cause of it; for he could certainly have no idea of salvation from such a dreadful place, as that which Dr. Watts describes in the following terrific language:—

"Far in the deep where darkness dwells,
The land of horror and despair,
Justice has built a dismal hell,
And laid his stores of vengeance there.
Eternal plagues and heavy chains,
Tormenting racks and fiery coals;
And darts v' inflict immortal pains,
Dipt in the blood of damned souls."*

The apostles' answer is, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, (or preserved,) and thy house." This was equivalent to saying to him, if you will believe or have confidence in a certain Lord or Ruler, (*τον κυριον*), *ton kurion*, whose name is Jesus, and who is one that is anointed to be a king, you shall be preserved, and not only you but your house likewise. This was to a Gentile, who in all probability was entirely ignorant of the native character, claims, and mission of Yahweh's anointed King, Ruler, and Deliverer, as well as the fact that an individual named Jesus was he. To the assembled Jews on the day of Pentecost the language of Peter was couched in different terms, although amounting to the same thing. "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," (or anointed.) The men of Israel to whom this language was addressed, had been previously taught with regard to the determination to give to Israel a Messiah, or King, to be both a Ruler and Deliverer, yet they refuse to recognize that same Lord or Ruler in the despised Nazarene, Jesus by name; but had crucified him, and yet looked for another. Hence Peter enjoins upon them the recognition of the crucified Jesus, as the expected one. What the salvation or deliverance in prospect was, we will not notice here, as we purpose making that the subject of another article. What we intend to show after all these preliminaries, is that something more than a mere trust in Jesus as a Savior or Deliverer, was necessary for the Philippian jailor before he was immersed into Christ, and that something, was no less than a hearing, and receiving of the gospel

* 144 Hymn, Winchell.—Watts.

of the kingdom of God. And how do you prove this, asks one? We answer by the apostle's own principles, and by the context. One principle of the apostle Paul is this, that it is necessary for persons before they can believe on the Lord to hear about him. See Rom. x. 14. Hence it was necessary for the jailor in order to believe on the Lord, to hear about him. Well, what are they to hear? Ans. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Well, what is the word of God? Ans. The gospel; for proof see Rom. x. 15, 16, likewise, see 1 Pet. i. 23-25. In the 25th ver. Peter says, "But the word of the Lord endureth forever, and this is the word that by the gospel is preached unto you." Well, have you any proof that this word of the Lord was preached to the jailor? we answer, yes; in Acts xvi. 32. "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." This 'word' was the same word that the Lord himself preached while upon earth; commencing at Galilee and going throughout all the cities and villages of Judea, beginning from the baptism which John preached, which word of the Lord he had a commission of God to proclaim, and it was sent first to the Jews, and afterwards to the Gentiles, beginning at the house of Cornelius. This word of the Lord we have plainly proved, in a former article on the "One Faith," to be the gospel of the kingdom, and the "Word of Faith," necessary to be believed in order to salvation, and an immersion into the One Body of Messiah. It was necessary for the sons of Israel to hear it; it was necessary for Cornelius to hear it; it was necessary for the Philippian jailor to hear it previous to immersion, and it is necessary for every Gentile who would be an inheritor of the kingdom of God to hear, believe, and obey it, by a subsequent immersion into the name of the Holy Ones, and continuing in the faith grounded and settled, and manifesting that work of faith, which, is love, and which purifies the heart, and overcomes the world.

With regard to the shortness of time for the jailor to hear the gospel, I would simply remark, that there is time enough in thirty minutes to present more vital gospel teaching, to an honest, intelligent seeker after truth, that would be grasped and heartily received, than would be believed or comprehended by a prejudiced or bigoted pictist of modern times, of any name or sect, in as many months, and I might say years; for such are "ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth." For such, we have done making special pleas, and leave them to their ragged religious garments of sincere piety; to follow their blind leaders if they will into the ditch, but to those who honestly

and truly desire to come to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, to find the true riches, and are willing in order to do this, to throw off the filthy rags of that righteousness that is of the revival and penitent bench, and enrobe themselves instead, in Christ's righteousness, which is by faith in the sure promises, and by humble and submissive obedience to the form of doctrine delivered, we esteem it not only a duty, but a high privilege to render our assistance so far as in us lies for their instruction, and enlightenment in the things most surely believed by all the Holy Ones. Yours uncompromisingly for the truth as it is in Jesus.

MARK ALLEN.

Woburn, Mass., Feb. 10, 1861.

The Body of Moses.

"Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee."—Jude 9.

There has been much wild speculation on this text, owing chiefly to two causes, viz.: the misunderstanding of the word "devil," and the phrase, "the body of Moses." By the former is by orthodoxy understood, a little, black, omnipresent fellow, with two long, sharp horns, and eyes of balls of fire; a tongue of forked lightning, and a long tail with a barbed spear in the end of it. This is the poetical devil of orthodoxy, but we presume it is not the devil that Jude referred to.

The words, Satan, Serpent, Devil and Dragon, are not the same in the original, and ought not to be so considered in English. The word *devil* is often a translation from a word which means no more than that in the text under consideration. In Zech. iii. 2; to which no doubt Jude referred, the same thing is called Satan, and in the margin adversary.

Now Zechariah, Ezra, and Nehemiah wrote on the return of the captivity in Babylon, and the Cutheans, as the Samaritans were called, opposed the rebuilding of the city and temple, for the reasons hereinafter mentioned.

Now Zechariah says, "And he showed me Joshua, the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him." By the margin, "to be his adversary," or, as Jude is made to say, "to be his devil."

It was the Samaritans who resisted Joshua, and who were also the adversaries of the Jews. But undoubtedly the word *devil* more particularly related to Sanballat, a principal man among the Cutheans, and chief adversary of Joshua and Zerubbabel.

Now as to the "body of Moses," this is the same under the Mosaic dispensation, as the "body of Christ," under the Gospel dis-

corrected - 1861 - 77

pensation. The old Jewish church, organized by the Levitical law, constituted "the body of Moses;" and all, both Jews and Gentiles, who have been baptized into Christ, and put on Christ, constitute the "body of Christ."

Now when the Jews returned from captivity, and began to re-build, the Samaritans kindly offered to assist them, and to be one with them, saying, we worship your God, and are of your religion; thus evidently claiming to be a part of the body of Moses. But Joshua, close communion like, rejected them, and denied their being any part of that body. This greatly incensed them, and hence a warm dispute arose between them about who constituted the body of Moses. But Jude says it was Michael who disputed this point with the devil. And Zechariah says he saw Joshua standing before the angel of the Lord, or Michael. So it seems that this Michael directed the acts of Joshua, and through him disputed with Sanballat.

And because Joshua would not yield the point, the Samaritans would not be at peace with the Jews, but turned against them, and sought means to hinder them from re-building.

So Joshua, divinely impressed by the angel of the Lord, whom Jude calls Michael, brought no railing accusation against Sanballat, the Samaritan devil, or adversary of the Jews; but mildly said, "The Lord rebuke thee."

Z. CAMPBELL.

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

"The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah, that was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon." Jer. xxv. 1. "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem and besieged it," Dan i. 1.

From these two testimonies we learn that Nebuchadnezzar's first year began in the third and ended in the fourth year of Jehoiakim.

To resume from Jeremiah xxv. "Behold I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and will utterly destroy them, and will make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations," ver. 9. "And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years," ver. 11.

The above seventy years then begins in the third of Jehoiakim, and first of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel being one of the captives. Nineteen years of these seventy were comprehended in the last table as follows:

	yrs.	mo.	days.
Jehoiakim from his 3rd year, say,	7	8	20
Jehoiakim,		3	10
Zedekiah,	11	"	"
	19	0	0

This is the year of the burning of the temple—the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar. How long did he reign after that?

"And it came to pass in the seven and thirtieth year of the captivity of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, that Evil-Merodach, king of Babylon, in the year that he began to reign, did lift up the head of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, out of prison," 2 Ki. xxv. 27. Now as Jehoiakim was carried to Babylon in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar, and Evil-Merodach succeeded Nebuchadnezzar near the close of the thirty-seventh year of Jehoiakim's captivity, it follows that Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-four complete years. His death and the succession of Evil-Merodach brings us down twenty-five years later than the burning of the temple, for 19 & 25 are 44.

How long Evil-Merodach reigned we do not know from the Scriptures. According to Rollin he reigned two years, and was succeeded by other two kings, neither of whom are mentioned in Scripture; Nerriglisar, who reigned four years, and Laborosaurchod, who reigned only nine months. Add these to Nebuchadnezzar's forty-four years, and we have fifty years and nine months, or thirty-one years and nine months from the burning of the temple. Belshazzar was the next king of Babylon. To complete the seventy years of servitude to the king of Babylon, nineteen years are wanted. This we will consider the period of his reign. We may remark however, that there is no certainty, and there is not even uniformity amongst historians in the reigns of these kings. The most learned cannot penetrate the obscurity that obtains in this department of ancient history. I will therefore not attempt to do so. It suffices to know that Belshazzar was the last of the Babylonian kings, and the servitude beginning at the third of Jehoiakim, must have terminated with his death, enabling us to stride over an obscure portion of history without stumbling. But though the servitude of the king of Babylon for seventy years ended here, the "indignation" and captivity did not fully end until seventy years from the burning of the temple. The mentioning of Belshazzar's name recalls the mind from the uncertainties of pagan lit-

erature to the certainties of the "sure word" to which we shall turn.

"Thy (Belshazzar's) kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians," Dan. v. 28. "In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain, and Darius the Median took the kingdom," Dan. v. 30, 31.

Just at this time Cyrus the Persian, the associate of Darius or Cyaxares the Median, issued a decree for the re-building of the temple. It is recorded in Ezra, and begins as follows:

Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying; Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God,) which is in Jerusalem," Ezra i. 1-3.

The three first chapters of Ezra contain an account of the execution of this decree until an element of opposition appeared, related in chapter iv. from which the following is quoted, verses 4, 5:—

"Then the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius king of Persia."

Between these two kings of Persia mentioned in the last verse, there was an interval of nineteen years, to fill up which we have once more to have recourse to Rollin's ancient history. From this work we learn that Cyrus and Darius reigned together 2 years, that Cyrus reigned alone 7 years, who was succeeded by Cambyses 7 years 5 months, then Smerdis who only reigned 7 months. Darius came next. The whole together up to his second year, makes nineteen years; the same interval as obtained from the first coming against Jerusalem to the burning of the temple. Thus we have two beginnings and two endings to the seventy years.

From the third of Jehoiakim to the first of Cyrus king of Persia, is seventy years. And from the eleventh of Zedekiah, when the temple was burned, to the second of Darius is also seventy years.

We have now arrived at the second ending, and it remains to show what happened at this time. This we will do by another quotation.

"Upon the four and twentieth day of the eleventh month, which is the month Sebat, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah," ch. i. 7. "Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Ju-

dah, against which thou hast had indignation these three score and ten years," verse 12.

From these passages we see that the seventy years "indignation" expired in the third year of Darius. Precisely as we learn by a comparison of Haggai with the 5th and 6th chapters of Ezra. The work which had been suspended since the days of Cyrus was resumed under a decree, too lengthy to quote here, but which may be found in the 6th chapter of Ezra. We now submit the following table based upon the foregoing outline of the history of this period.

PERIOD X.

The Captivity Embraces 70 Years.

From the Burning of the Temple, A. M. 3533, to the 2nd Year of Darius, A. M. 3603.

A. M.	Names and Events.	Yrs.	References.
3533	Nebuchadnezzar,		26 Com. 2 K. xxiv 12, & xxv. 27.
3559	Evil-Merodach,		2 Rollin & "
3561	Neriglisar,		4 Rollin.
3565	Laborosoarchod,	9 mo.	1 Rollin.
3566	Belshazzar,	3 mo.	18 Da. v. 28, 30, 31.
3564	Cyrus and Darius,		2 Same, & Rollin.
3586	Cyrus alone, (first decree.)		7 Ezra i. 1, & Rol.
3592	Cambyses,	5 mo.	7 Rollin.
3600	Smerdis,	7 mo.	1 Rollin.
3601	Darius' 2nd year,		2 Haggai i. 1, & Rollin.
3603	Second decree,	70	

Whatever inaccuracies may be in the foregoing table, made up in part as it is from other sources than the Scriptures—they are of a nature that cannot affect the result. In order to enforce this conviction we will at the risk of being tedious make the following statements in review of the table, discriminating between the certainties and uncertainties.

1st. It is certain that Nebuchadnezzar died and that Evil-Merodach began to reign at the time stated.

2nd. Whether he reigned two years and was succeeded as represented in the table down to Belshazzar, and whether the latter's reign was as set down, this next thing is certain, that Belshazzar's last year was seventy years from Jehoiakim's third.

3rd. Whether the years of Cyrus and Darius be correct or not, it is certain that the kingdom of the Medes and Persians began at the time stated.

4th. Whether the respective years of Cambyses and Smerdis be correct or not, the succession is corroborated by the following testimony:—"Also I, in the first year of Darius the Mede, (uncle of Cyrus,) even I stood to confirm and strengthen him. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold there shall yet stand up three kings in Persia, (Cambyses, Smerdis and Darius,) and the fourth (Xerxes) shall be far richer than they all, and by his strength through his riches, shall he stir up all against the realm of Grecia," Dan. xi. 1, 2.

In verse 3, a mighty king (Alexander the Great) succeeds the fourth king. In verse 4, the mighty king's kingdom is "divided toward the four winds," or amongst his four generals. When profane history substantiates prophecy it is worthy of all respect, and this is a case in point.

5th. The second year of Darius is the end of a period of seventy years, Zech. i. 7. 12. This period cannot be the same as that which ended with Cyrus, for an *interval* is clearly implied in Ezra iv. 5. The years of the interval, (19) we obtain from outside testimony, and being the *exact complement* of seventy years, is worthy of our acceptance.

PERIOD XI.

Embraces 66 Years.

From the end of the Captivity, A. M. 3603, to the decree in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, A. M. 3669.

A. M.	Names and Events.	Yrs.	References.
3603	Darius reigns after decrees	31	Rollin's Ancient
3637	Nerxes,	12	History, and
3649	Artaxerxes to his decree,	20	Nehemiah ii. 1.
3669	Decree,		
	Total	66	

There is corroboration of the foregoing which will be produced at the proper time.

FRANCIS COGNILL.

The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

A LECTURE BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, LONDON, CANADA WEST.

Being a reply to the Westminster Review, No. 135, Article 5.

Delivered before the Young Men's Christian Instruction Society of London, March, 1860.

It requires very little ability to perceive that the fabric of Christianity—I do not mean the Christianity of this sect or that one, but the Christianity of the gospels—stands on the resurrection of the Lord Jesus:—sweep away that event, and the superstructure crumbles into fragments never to be reunited while the universe lasts. He frequently predicted his own revivification, as in the words, "He must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day;" and if he rose not, his own veracity must be pronounced untrustable; his intercession is a delusion—for how can he interpose if still under the dominion of death?—the hope of resurrection to his followers is a dream—"if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Destroy his resurrection, and the future is wrapped in impenetrable darkness; the voice that seemed fitted to cheer the lone pilgrim toward the unknown is

hushed in eternal silence; and the arm that seemed so valorous to help, has been incurably paralyzed.

For reasons which we need not pause to discuss, there have been many attacks made on Christianity, and on the great fact on which it is reared; and we may as well admit that the assaults have been conducted with a talent equal to the hostility that directed the blows. In our day it was not to be supposed that inimical spirits would resign the conflict, which has been handed down from generation to generation. It is a questioning age, though far from being a profound one; an age in which a daring penman has more ground to hope for a temporary triumph, because there is little time devoted to rigorous inquiry, and assertions easily pass current with many for resistless demonstration. The world is fascinated with Ledgers, and Punches, and Yellow Tales; a volume of substantial thought is nearly as distasteful as aloe and alarming as the plague. Something light is the rage; something very light to answer the necessities of very light minds; arguments bearing on transcendent themes must fall gently as a mosquito's foot, and when you encircle an opponent with a chain of reasoning you are expected to make as much music with the links as possible. But the fact is, that a dilettante reasoner is about as dangerous as a dilettante physician; the one kills his patient, the other his cause. If we are to be strong in our attachments to truth we must have our reflection enlightened, and submit to have our patience taxed; and I do trust that on this occasion you will bear with me, if I invoke attention to some paragraphs, which if they do not regale the fancy, may perhaps establish your faith—a more valuable result.

The battle of Infidelity, Swedenborgianism, a vulgar Spiritualism, is to be fought at the tomb of Jesus Christ. Unbelief denies his restoration to animal life. Swedenborgianism and Spiritualism ignore it entirely. Swedenborgianism and Spiritualism acknowledge no literal revival in the flesh; the tomb of Joseph, according to these systems, was never opened—never to be vacated by the Redeemer in his material form. They admit what they call a spiritual humanity—an invisible man, who resides during life within the visible,—escaped phantom-like from the fleshly structure; and contend that that was all the resurrection he ever had, or ever could enjoy. In doing so they play into the hands of the absolute skeptic; they leave Christians no means of demonstrating their Savior's reanimation. While men of common sense expected, according to the natural import of his teaching, a literal revival, it turns out that there was no proper resurrection; instead of

a conqueror over death and the grave, we are presented with a spectre which none can clasp; and told in mockery "the Lord is risen indeed," while we look upon the bones of Jesus and his dust.

In the CXXV No. of the *Westminster Review*, there is an article designated "THE RELIGIOUS WEAKNESS OF PROTESTANTISM," in which the resurrection of Jesus is attacked in a manner so bold and so insidious, that it deserves a reiterated exposure. Ever since its appearance, my astonishment has been excited at the daring, I might add, effrontery, of the author. The argument he employs descends below the ordinary talent of the *Review*; its strength, however, lies more in the ignorance of readers, than in its own muscles and vitality. In an age like this, many will be imposed on by its glaring fallacies. It embodies not a manly exhibition of the whole resurrection story; but a garbled version of the facts—a caricature of the Record, instead of a daguerreotype of the Biblical testimony itself. For one, I enter my protest against all garbling, misrepresentation, all sophistry, in a grave discussion: if the evidence for the death and resurrection of Jesus is imperfect, by all means, would be my counsel to Westminster Reviewers, and adverse scribblers the world over,—by all means, step forth, and with the hammer of criticism smash in pieces whatever is cracked and feeble;—better leave us shelterless and in despair than the imbecile dependants on an antiquarian fiction; but if you cannot overturn that building which has, like the pyramids of Egypt, confronted the storms of ages, and received many a weary traveler within its walls, do not mercilessly urge the footsteps of the wanderer in quest of another refuge, while Christianity still welcomes him to a peaceful home.

In the Article referred to, the design of the writer is to show that there was no resurrection, because there is no valid proof that Jesus, when crucified, was actually deprived of animal life. This is a mortal stroke; annihilate the evidence of his death, and with the same blow his resurrection is necessarily undone. "Now," says the author, "the very peculiar phenomenon in the Biblical narrative of the Resurrection is, that of the two propositions, (viz; Jesus died, Jesus rose,) both of which are equally essential, it is hard to say which of the two is less satisfactorily sustained." Here then are two subjects inviting our critical study:

- I. THE PROOF THAT JESUS DIED.
- II. THE PROOF THAT JESUS ROSE.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

☞ A soft answer turneth away wrath: But provoking words stir up anger.

A Letter to a young Lady.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 12th, 1861.

BRO. WILSON,—Dear Sir:—

About two years ago I had a conversation with a young lady of Virginia on the subject of religion. Her neighbors are Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, etc. She says what I told her appeared to be true; and yet her neighbors say what they teach is the truth. She writes to me that her ideas are confused, and hopes that I will write to her something plain on the subject of religion. I wrote to her, and after reading it, I thought I would send you a copy for publication, as it might meet the eye of some who are in the same situation as this young lady. I have never written anything for publication before, and will therefore leave it for your approbation whether to publish it or not. The following is a copy.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—

According to your request I take this opportunity of writing to you on a religious subject, as you write to me that you hardly know what to think on the same. I have no doubt but your religious neighbors are sincere and honest in what they believe, and in what they have been taught; for I was brought up to believe the same things; namely, in having an immortal soul, and in going to heaven or hell at death, and other foolish fables; such as the burning up of the earth; (read Jer. xvii. 25; Eccl. i. 4; Psa. lxxviii. 69; which show that the earth is to stand forever;) but for the last few years I have been convinced to the contrary, by reading and studying God's most holy word. Now to convince you, and your neighbors also, for I hope you will let them read and examine this, I will now give you some scripture testimony showing what God's will towards the children of men is. In Gen. xii. 1-3, God chose Abraham and told him he would make him a father of many nations, and that in him and his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. Paul says in Gal. iii. 16 that Christ is this seed. Again in Exod. xix. 5, 6, Jehovah tells the descendants of Abraham that they should be a peculiar people unto him, for he would make them a kingdom of priests for him. Now Abraham was the father of Isaac, and Isaac was the father of Jacob or Israel, and Jacob or Israel was the father of twelve sons, who are called the twelve patriarchs, but neither they nor their descendants have ever reigned as kings over the nations. It is true David, Solomon, Rehoboam, and Zedekiah reigned over their own nation, and subdued some nations, but never have they reigned over all nations; for the last king was Zedekiah, who was a wicked king, as you will see in Ezek. xxi. 25-27, when Jehovah took the kingdom from

Israel as a people, for they were also wicked, and told them it should be no more, until he come; whose right it is, and he would give it to him. Now from that time Israel as a people has been subject to other nations; and even at the birth of Jesus they were subject to the Romans. In 2 Sam. vii. 12-16, Jehovah told David he should have a son, who should rule his kingdom forever. Some say that this son was Solomon; now we know that it was not; for although he was so wise a man, yet after a time he was led away by his wives and concubines into idolatry, and Jehovah took the kingdom and gave it to Rehoboam his son. This son was to reign forever; it could not therefore be Solomon, for David says in 2 Sam. xiii. 5, "thou, Lord, hast spoken of my house, (family or descendants,) for a great while to come," now look at what the angel said to Mary, Luke i. 31-33. He told Mary that she should have a son, and should call his name Jesus; that he should be a Savior to his people, and that the Lord God should give unto him the throne of his father David, and he should reign over the house of Jacob or Israel forever, and of his kingdom there should be no end. Now we know that Jesus did not reign over them; although he told them he was their king. They said, "away with him, crucify him," we will not have this man to reign over us; but in Matt. xxi. 1-9 we read that there were some who wished to make him king for they carried branches of palm trees and cried, "Hosanna to the son of David; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Did Jesus give the people any encouragement to expect that he ever would reign? In Matt. xxiii. 37-39, he says, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and you would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate; for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." We read in Acts i. 10, 11, when Jesus ascended to heaven, two angels or messengers said, "ye men of Galilee why stand you gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner," etc.

It is necessary for us to know what Jesus preached. Turn to Matt. iv. 35; Jesus went about all the cities and villages preaching the gospel of the kingdom. He taught them, and us also, when we pray to say, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven." When his kingdom is come, then all the present Kingdoms, Empires, and Republics of this earth will become

Christ's, and be under his subjection, as we read in Rev. xi. 15. In Matt. xix. 27, the apostles said to Jesus, "Lord, we have left all and followed thee, what shall we have?" Jesus answered, that in the restitution, or regeneration, when he comes the second time with power and great glory, that they, his twelve apostles should sit on twelve thrones, ruling or judging the twelve tribes of Israel. It will be necessary that they should be raised from the dead, and made immortal. Jesus says, I am the resurrection and the life; also they that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and come forth. Again the apostle Peter in Acts iii. 19, speaks of this restitution, saying, "Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." In Acts xv. 14 James says, "that Simcon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." To understand this taking out a people to the name of the Lord, I have shown you where God promised the children of Israel, that if they obeyed him in all his commands he would make them a kingdom of priests, who would be the Rulers of all other nations, and to teach them the will of Jehovah; for Jehovah hath sworn that unto him every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess; he hath also sworn that all shall know him from the least to the greatest, and that righteousness and peace should cover the earth as the waters cover the great deep. Therefore as the Israelites failed in not obeying Jehovah's commands, and even were so wicked as to crucify Jesus, their Head, Jehovah has therefore cast them off from the privilege of becoming a kingdom of Priests, and has determined to take out from among all nations a people, who will believe in his word, love, honor, serve, and obey him, and make them kings and priests, whom he will put as the rulers over the nations. John tells us in Revelation, that Jesus made him to see what should be hereafter, of the state of the church during his absence, of its abominations, and of his second coming, and in Rev. v. 9, 10, we find, that those who have been raised from the dead, and those who have been changed from mortality to immortality will sing a new song; "saying thou art worthy to open the seals, etc. for thou hast redeemed us out of every kindred, tongue, tribe, and nation, and made us unto our God, kings and priests, and we shall reign on the Earth," (not in heaven.) You

will therefore see, that the prophets, the apostles, and Jesus himself taught us, that he would come again to rule this world in righteousness. This will be when he comes in power and great glory, and takes unto him his great Power; he shall then reign King of kings, and Lord of lords, to the honor of God his Father and our Father. Then, as in Acts xv. 14, will "he build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down, and set up the ruins thereof." What for, you would ask? Ans. "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord." So you see that what people now preach for gospel, that when the Lord comes he is going to take the righteous to heaven, and send the wicked to a place of torment, and burn up the earth, is not true; for we read in Psa. xxxvii. 29, "The righteous shall inherit the earth, and dwell therein forever." Jesus says in Matt. v. 5, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; as for the wicked Jehovah says in Isa. xli. 11, 12, and Obad. 16, they shall be as though they had not been. In 2 Thess. i. 9 it says, the wicked shall be punished with everlasting destruction. Again, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should not PERISH but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. Now if the wicked are suffering in hell-fire, as theology teaches, they do not perish, but have everlasting life as well as the righteous. The wicked who are in their graves will be resurrected to their punishment of a second death—annihilation.

You see that an opportunity will be given for men to turn to the Lord, after Jesus comes. "for the Law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," the place where he was crucified. The saints who will then be immortal kings and priests will be appointed by their Lord as the rulers over the whole earth. Then will be gathered all the tribes of Israel from out of all nations to their own land, the land of Palestine, never to be scattered any more forever. Then will be fulfilled that promise which Jesus made to the Apostles that they should sit on twelve thrones. Then will be fulfilled the promised time, when the nations shall "beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; for nation shall not lift up sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more;" for every man shall then sit under his own fig tree and vine none daring to molest or make him afraid." Then will be fulfilled that promise made to Abraham, that in him and his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

"Thy Kingdom come, O day of joy!
When praise shall every tongue employ;
When hate and strife and war shall cease,
And man with man shall live in peace."

My Dear Friend, these are the teachings of the prophets, Christ, and the Apostles, and yet how few there are who believe them. Verily "darkness has covered the earth, and gross darkness the people." Jesus says, "when the Son of man comes shall he find faith on the earth;" and that it shall be as it was in the days of Noah; and then we read there were only eight persons found worthy.

W. J. GIFFERS.

The Waldenses and the Bible.

The Waldenses were more remarkable than any other people on the face of the earth for the large portions of Scripture which they committed to memory. Scripture was their *all*: and as the Jews treasured the manuscripts of the Old Testament, and carried them everywhere in their wanderings, often, as in the persecutions of Spain, winding them around their bodies to part with them only with their lives; so these Waldenses laid up rich portions alike from the Old and New Testaments in their hearts, so that they *could not* be taken from them. The preparation of their pastors for the ministry consisted in learning by heart the Gospels of Matt. and John, all the epistles, and most of the writings of David, Solomon and the prophets.

It is reckoned, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, that a fair copy of the Bible, from a convent, would have cost more than sixty pounds (£300) of our money, for the writing only; and that a skillful scribe could not complete one in less than ten months. Very precious, therefore, was every single portion; and as their enemies seized upon and burnt every copy of which they could hear, societies of young persons were formed in the Vaudois valleys, every member of which was trusted to preserve in his memory a certain number of chapters; and when they assembled for worship, which they did with all possible precaution, from great distances, in some hidden mountain gorge, these new Levites, standing before the face of the minister, would recite, one after another, the chapters of the priceless book, for which they often paid the price of blood. Upon this church of the Book came down, for century after century, the heaviest vengeance of the church of Rome.

A striking instance of their devotion to the Bible is recorded of the inhabitants of two valleys, who, on the 21st of January, 1561, having been ordered to go to mass, or be subject to fire, to sword, to cord, the Pope's three arguments, met to consider what should be done. In the midst of the kneeling people, the ministers pronounced these words: "We here promise, our hands on the Bible, and in the solemn presence of God, to main-

tain the Bible whole and alone, though it be at the peril of our lives, in order that we may transmit it to our children pure as we received it from our fathers." One hundred and thirty years afterwards, when they returned to the valleys from which they had been exiled, they met again on this very spot, the hill of Sibani, and renewed the same oath to God and to each other.—*American Messenger*.

Preparation for Christ's appearing.

Christ has promised to be with his church until he comes again, even to such as observe the "all things." But there is no good promise for those that leave the church, be the church many or few. John says, "they went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us, but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not of us." Says Jude, "These be they who separate themselves, having not the Spirit." "If then I be a Father, where is mine honor, and if I be a Master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts, unto you that despise my commands." But they that fear the Lord, speak often one to another, and the Lord sees, and hears, and has it all written in a book; with the glorious promise that they shall be his in the day when he makes up his jewels. It is one of the precious commands of the coming King, to his little flock,—not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhort, (comfort, edify, building up one another in the one faith and hope) "and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." They long for the first day of the week to come, to have the blessed privilege of commemorating the death of the once crucified, but now glorified and coming Redeemer, knowing as the Apostle says, if they sin wilfully, after that they had received the knowledge of the truth, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Says Paul, "It is treading under foot the Son of God, and doing despite unto the Spirit of grace." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams." "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." Though there was faith, that could remove mountains, and we have not that love that causeth obedience, it becomes as a sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. "And wilt thou know, oh vain man, that faith without works is dead?" "And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" "Be not deceived, God is

not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." "Woe unto you (foolish virgins) that desire the day of the Lord, to what end is it, for you the day of the Lord is darkness, and not light." Amos v. 18.

One great cause of such declension and lukewarmness is, there is more head religion than heart; more theory than a holy, living practice; more conversation about the world than about the coming of Jesus; more conforming to the world, than being transformed into the image of Christ. Says Jesus, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." "But if ye love me, keep my commandments, that ye may have boldness in the day of judgment." "Perfect love casteth out fear." "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." "Who-soever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely, I come quickly. Amen, even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Bro. Wilson;—Please to insert the following query in the *Banner* that it may have your or the brethren's attention for a reply, viz. 1st. How are we to reconcile, the following passages of Scripture;—Exod. xii. 40, 41 and Gal. iii. 17; Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6. If the readings of the passages are at all correct, there appears to be a discrepancy in the chronology. Moses speaks positively, that the children of Israel were actually 430 years in Egypt, whereas Paul reckons only the same length of time, 430 years, from the confirmation of the covenant with Abraham to the giving of the Law, which was after the Exodus. And "God said to Abraham that his seed should be afflicted in a strange land 400 years;" and Stephen corroborates the same in Acts vii.

2nd. If they were actually 400 years in bondage in Egypt, how does this agree with Gen. xv. 16; where it speaks of their coming out in the fourth generation? Were the generations 100 years each? As far as I can find out, they averaged not quite 50 years to a generation, from the time of Abraham to the 42nd generation, when Christ was born.

JAMES WOOD.

[Will Bro. Coghill please give a little attention to the above queries, and answer through the *Banner* for the benefit of the inquirer and others.—En.]

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., MARCH 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 6.]

The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

A LECTURE BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, LONDON,
CANADA WEST.

Being a reply to the Westminster Review, No. 135, Article 5.
Delivered before the Young Men's Christian Instruction Society of London, March, 1860.

CONTINUED.

1. PROOF THAT JESUS' DEATH WAS REAL.

The theory of the *Westminster Review* is, that Pilate was friendly to Jesus, and gave secret orders that he should not be put to death: that out of his revival by cordials when in the tomb of Joseph, sprang the myth of his resurrection, which has long like a will o' the wisp, caused the world to stray. With the Reviewer, we concede, that a mere crucifixion is not in itself demonstration of death; a man may be crucified, and after having been removed from the engine of torture in a swoon, may be restored to health and activity. There are certain infictions which leave no doubt concerning the destruction of life, as, for example, when a man is decapitated, or divided into twain by a sword, or cast into a blazing furnace. Had the brigands that were executed along with Jesus been taken from the cross, even when their limbs were broken, and carefully ministered to by medical science, it is not inconceivable that they might have been recovered so perfectly as even to resume their lawless profession. The mere fact that Jesus hung on the cross from two hours to three, is confessedly in itself no assurance that he expired; but we have such a full narration of all the circumstances attending his death, that legitimate doubts as to his murder are deprived of a foothold. We rest our case, not so much on the fact of his crucifixion as upon his crucifixion in the given circumstances:—the treatment he was subjected to when on the cross—the resolution of his enemies to accomplish his destruction, and the immense absurdity of the theory as to Pi-

late's merciful interference. But to be more specific.

Prior to his crucifixion, we remark, Jesus was physically exhausted. There is no evidence that he tasted of food for many hours anterior to his elevation between the robbers; he had been scourged by the order of Pilate, his disinterested friend, according to the Reviewer; there was an agonizing crown of thorns placed upon his head, and, though in the meridian of life, he had borne much encraving toil and mental anxiety during the course of his public ministry. The brigands, we may reasonably suppose, were fresh and vigorous, and belonged to the coarser types of organic build; the Son of Mary would be extremely delicate in bodily texture, and susceptible, as a result, of more exquisite physical pain. Morbid action would, from the delicacy of his organization, be more rapid at the lacerated portions of his form; and the nervous system, previously debilitated, would sink the more quickly beneath the sympathetic burden laid upon it. Pilate marveled if he were already dead, when Joseph of Arimathea came and begged the body; and the soldiers who fractured the limbs of the brigands were astonished when they came to Jesus and found him lifeless. Death then supervened much earlier in his case; and the physical causes detailed are, in my judgment, quite capable of explaining its premature advent.

Again, the enemies of Jesus, we may be sure, would be careful that his death was real. All the preliminaries—the spitting, the crowning, the scourging, the nailing, had been terribly real; and were they such fools as to be cheated out of his blood? All ranks that afternoon hastened to Calvary: even the Chief Priests were "in at the death." They were lynx-eyed, moreover, and amid the gloom watched the tragely with intense satisfaction. His enemies long plotted for this hour; and it seems to me the mockery of reason to suppose that they would return

to their homes without being assured that their victim's last breath was drawn.

We admit what the Reviewer says, that Caesar's Deputy "unwillingly consented to his execution, and was driven to it only by fear;"—the fear was, that he should be deemed unfriendly to his master by allowing the prisoner to escape. "If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend." The author then assumes that after having condemned Jesus, the Roman Governor "made a compromise with his conscience;" these are his words, "by giving secret orders to the executioner not to kill him, but to put him on the cross for a short time, and give up his body, as if dead, to his friends, as soon as he appeared to faint."

When a man takes the liberty of appending his conjectures to a plain, historical narrative, (and for the occasion I am quite willing to accept the New Testament, as on a level with ordinary veracious human testimony,) he can soon manufacture a theory at once plausible and ingenious; by exercising the same liberty we could easily pitch the Duke of Wellington out of the battle of Waterloo, and make the hosts of Xerxes the conquerors at Marathon. Here we have an adventurer against Christianity making capital out of "secret orders," emanating from his own brain; and by an imaginary "faint" strengthening his cause. Trusting to this writer, one would suppose the crucifixion was more of a farce than a solemn tragedy; that Pilate, and the friends of Jesus, and the soldiers, and the executioners, performed their nicely arranged parts with a design to trick the sacred hierarchy in Jerusalem.

The Reviewer gives Pilate credit for much more interest in Jesus than we have any reason to believe the Governor felt. Pilate was a heathen, and could only look upon the Nazarene as a mild, and yet a benighted enthusiast. True he condemned him reluctantly; but once delivered to the executioners, what would the Roman Deputy care for the unpopular fanatic? When Jesus was suspended on Cavalry, I can imagine the Governor eating his dinner and drinking his wine as comfortably as if there was no agony within a thousand miles.

The soldiers who attended at the execution testify to the death of Jesus. History delivers their convictions, and though the evidence does not look benignantly towards the Reviewer, that is a small matter to one who has a sovereign contempt for facts. The last day of the Jewish week was near, and it was necessary for ceremonial reasons—(the elders and priests could murder a man on Friday, but to let him hang on the cross during Sabbath was a crime they were not wicked enough to commit;) it was necessary, we

were remarking, for ceremonial reasons, that his death, and that of his companions in woe, should be hastened, and the soldiers received orders to that effect. They brake the legs of the two robbers, and when they approached him who hung between them, they found he was dead already. "They brake not his legs; but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." So says John, who was close by, and had every motive to take exact observations of what was done to his Master and Friend. This spearing, according to a natural estimate of the whole transaction, was intended to make sure work, in the same manner as Kirkpatrick acted when he transfixed the mortally wounded Comyn, in the chapel of Dumfries. According to the Reviewer, the spearing was only a branch of the preconcerted scheme: we are to believe that the skin was only punctured, or perhaps that a Roman soldier did not know where to give a mortal thrust. One may legitimately wonder what was the use of the spearing at all: it was a gratuitous idea of cruelty in Pilate's programme, for if he had only commanded the Centurion to pronounce him defunct, when Jesus had gilded into the anticipated faint, that official's word would have readily been accepted by the onlookers. He was not dead, says the author, because when the instrument entered his side, there came out blood and water: if life had been extinct, this writer maintains, the blood would have coagulated, and of necessity, could not flow. Now in the *first* place, Jesus was only recently dead, and the blood had no time to coagulate in the interior of the body. So far from death rapidly congealing all the blood in the thorax, I may state that on one occasion I attended a *post mortem* examination of a young man who had been summoned from life rather unexpectedly, and witnessed the blood in large quantities lifted as yet fluid out of the chest, when the heart and lungs were undergoing inspection. Had that corpse been nailed to a cross, and then transfixed as the Savior was, blood would have ran copiously from the wound twenty-seven hours after dissolution. Again, *second*; In healthy patients the only section of the thoracic cavity where water, in any quantity, is found, is within the pericardium—the sack which encloses the heart; and one can hardly doubt it was this fluid that escaped, along with blood, from the opening made by the spear. Such a wound would have terminated existence, had the least spark of life been lingering in his form. The Reviewer observes, "It is of course *possible*, that though crucifixion had not caused death, this spear-wound proved fatal; but the alternative is equally *possible* that, as he was still alive, neither did this new

wound kill him :” and we may add, since it is a rivalry in supposition, that it is equally possible there was no spearing in the case, or that the onlookers were deceived by a thrust which they imagined drew mortal blood, while it was only a red fluid prepared by Pilate’s apothecary for the occasion.

It was, moreover, no small wound that the spear produced. One who saw him after he had left the tomb listened to these words: “*Reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side;*” language that could never have been employed if a merely superficial incision had been made by the soldier’s weapon. The spear of the Roman soldier was a lance which tapered very gently to a point, and must have entered at least four or five inches so as to produce a scar, as the Savior’s address to Thomas clearly described.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

The Will of Peter the Great. *

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS. †

In the name of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity, we, Peter the First, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias, &c., to all our descendants and successors to the throne and government of the Russian nation:

God, from whom we derive our existence, and to whom we owe our crown, having constantly enlightened us by His Spirit, and sustained us by His divine help, allows me to look on the Russian people as called upon hereafter to *hold sway over Europe!* My reason for thus thinking is, that the European nations have mostly reached a state of old age bordering on imbecility, or they are rapidly approaching it: naturally, then, they will be *easily* and *indubitably* conquered by a people strong in youth and vigor, especially when this latter shall have attained its full strength and power. I look on the future invasion of the eastern and western countries by the north, as a periodical movement, ordained by Providence, who in like manner *regenerated* the Roman nation by barbarian invasion. These emigrations of men from the north are as the reflux of the Nile, which, at certain periods, comes to fertilize the impoverished lands of Egypt by its deposit. I

* Deposited in the archives of the palace of Peterhof, near St. Petersburg.

† This authentic document (the supreme foundation and law of Russian politics since the time of Peter I.) was confidentially deposited in the hands of the Abbe de Bernis, Minister of Foreign Affairs, in 1767; and also in those of Louis XV. See the *Memoirs of the Chevalier d’Eon*, t. 1. page 170.—A copy is also to be found in the diplomatic archives of the French Empire, and a transcript of this appears in the volume, *Politique de la Russie en Orient*—par Victor Morpugo, from which our translation is taken.

found Russia as a *rivulet*, I leave it a *river*: my successors will make of it a *large sea*, destined to fertilize the impoverished lands of Europe; and its waters will overflow, in spite of opposing dams, erected by weak hands, if our descendants, only know how to direct its course. This is the reason I leave the following instructions. I give these countries to their watchfulness and care, as Moses gave the Tables of the Law to the Jewish people.

I. Keep the Russian nation in a state of continual war, so as to have the soldier always under arms, and ready for action, excepting when the finances of the State will not allow of it. Keep up the forces; choose the best moment for attack. By these means you will be ready for war even in the time of peace. This is for the interest of the future aggrandizement of Russia.

II. Endeavor, by every possible means, to bring in, from the neighboring civilized countries of Europe, officers in time of war, and learned men in time of peace, thus giving the Russian people the advantages enjoyed by other countries, without allowing them to lose any of their own self-respect.

III. On every occasion take * a part in the affairs and quarrels of Europe; above all, in those of Germany, which country being the nearest, more immediately concerns us.

IV. Divide Poland, by exciting civil discord there; win over the nobility by bribery; *corrupt their diets*, so as to have influence in the election of kings; get partizans into office—protect them; † bring to sojourn there the Muscovite troops, until such time as they can be permanently established there. If the neighboring powers start difficulties, appease them, for a time, by parcelling out the country, *until you can retake in detail all that has been ceded.*

V. *Take as much as you can from Sweden;* and cause yourselves to be attacked by her, *so as to have a pretext for subduing her.* To accomplish this, sever Denmark from Sweden, and Sweden from Denmark, carefully keeping up their rivalries.

VI. *Always choose as wives for the Russian princes, German princesses*, so as to increase family alliances, to draw mutual interests closer, and by *propagating our principles in Germany*, to enlist her in our cause.

* “To steal and to lie,” said Bulharyn, one of the best Russian writers, “are the two auxiliary verbs of our language.” Certainly Peter I. has made good use of them in his will, adding now and then the verbs, to *extend*, to *advance*, to *divide*, to *share*, to *dominate*, to *subdue*, to *corrupt*, &c.

† Stanislaus Poniatowski, lover of Catharine II., and last king of Poland, was elected by the influence of the Princes Augustus and Michael Czartoryski, his parents being declared partisans of Russia.

VII. England requiring us for her navy, and she being the only power that can aid in the development of ours, seek a commercial alliance with her, in preference to any other. Exchange our wood and the productions of our land for her gold, and establish between her merchants, her sailors, and ours, a continual intercourse: this will aid in perfecting the Russian fleet for navigation and commerce.

VIII. *Extend* your possessions towards the north, along the Baltic; and *towards the south, by the Black Sea.*

IX. *Approach as near as possible to Constantinople and its outskirts.* HE WHO SHALL REIGN THERE WILL BE THE TRUE SOVEREIGN OF THE WORLD. Consequently, be continually at war, sometimes with the Turks, sometimes with Persia. Establish dockyards on the Black Sea; get entire possession of it by degrees, also of the Baltic Sea; *this being necessary to the accomplishment of the plan.* Hasten the decline of Persia; penetrate to the Persian Gulf; re-establish, if possible, the ancient commerce of the Levant through Syria, make *your way to the Indies*—They are the emporium of the world. Once there, you can do without the gold of England.

X. Seek, and carefully keep up an alliance with Austria; acquiesce, apparently, in her ideas of dominating over Germany; at the same time clandestinely exciting against her the jealousy of the neighboring provinces. Endeavor that the aid of Russia should be called for by one or the other, so that, by exercising a kind of Guardianship over the country you prepare a way for governing hereafter.

XI. Give the House of Austria an interest for joining in banishing the Turks from Europe; defraud her of her share of the booty, at the conquest of Constantinople, either by raising a war for her with the ancient States of Europe, or by giving her a portion which you will *take back at a future period.*

XII. Attach to yourselves, and assemble around you, all the united Greeks, as also the disunited or schismatics, which are scattered either in Hungary, Turkey, or the south of Poland. Make yourselves their centres, their chief support, and lay the foundation for universal supremacy by establishing a kind of royalty or sacerdotal government; the Slavonic Greeks will be so many friends that you have scattered amongst your enemies.

XIII. Sweden severed, Persia and Turkey conquered, Poland subjugated, our armies reunited, the Black and Baltic Seas guarded by our vessels, you must make propositions separately and discreetly—first to the court of Versailles, then to that of Vienna, to share with them the empire of the universe.

If one of them accept—and it cannot be otherwise, so as you flatter their pride and ambition—make use of it to crush the other; then crush, in its turn, the surviving one, by engaging with it in a death-struggle, the issue of which cannot be doubtful, Russia possessing already all the east and a great part of Europe!

XIV. If—which is not likely—both refuse the *proposition of Russia*, you must manage to raise quarrels for them, and make them exhaust one another; then profiting by a decisive moment, Russia will bring down her assembled troops on Germany; and at the same time two considerable fleets will set out—the one from the Sea of Azov, the other from the port of Archangel—loaded with Asiatic hordes, under the convoy of the armed fleets from the Black Sea and the Baltic. Advancing by the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Ocean, they will invade France on one side, whilst Germany will already have been invaded on the other. These countries conquered, the rest of Europe will easily pass under the yoke, without striking a single blow.

XV. Thus Europe can and ought to be subdued.

PETER I.,

Autocrat of all the Russias.

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks.

DANIEL IX.

24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, (the Jews,) and upon thy holy city, (Jerusalem.)

- 1st. To finish the transgression, and
- 2nd. To make an end of sins, and
- 3rd. To make reconciliation for iniquity, and
- 4th. To bring in everlasting righteousness, and
- 5th. To seal up the vision and prophecy, and
- 6th. To anoint the most Holy.

25. Know therefore and understand, THAT FROM THE GOING FORTH OF THE COMMANDMENT TO RESTORE AND TO BUILD JERUSALEM UNTO THE MESSIAH THE PRINCE, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks, the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times.

26. And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27. And he shall confirm the covenant with

many FOR ONE WEEK, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate."

In the above quotation are contained four periods, of different durations.

1st. Seventy weeks.

2nd. Seven weeks and three score and two weeks.

3rd. After three score and two weeks.

4th. One week.

In what follows we propose to adopt the following rule, viz., To reason from that which is plain towards that which is considered obscure. We therefore, from the above four periods, select that one which is most obvious, and about which there appears to be no just warrant for a second opinion. It is that which is contained in the 25th verse—"seven weeks and three score and two weeks." Of the four it is the only one which has both a marked commencement, and a marked termination. The seventy weeks simply demand the accomplishment of certain specified things inside that period, without defining with what events their beginning and ending would stand related.

"After three score and two weeks" is even more deficient in this particular. "After" without defining how long after. In the "one week" a specified work was to be accomplished, yet no event to indicate its beginning or its termination. The "seven weeks and three score and two weeks" is unique, having at the beginning "the commandment," and at the end "the Messiah." The distance between the two is sixty nine weeks. This is plain enough for the "wayfaring man." We claim it to be an exactly true statement, and protest against the addition of even half a week (which is generally done,) as an unwarrantable wresting of scripture to suit erroneous theories.

Let it be well observed that the 25th verse begins with "Know THEREFORE," admonishing us to examine in what precedes, WHEREFORE Daniel was to know and understand? The 24th verse furnishes no response, but in the verse preceding we find a good and sufficient reason stated by Gabriel—"for thou art greatly beloved, THEREFORE understand the matter, and consider the vision. Know THEREFORE (Daniel) and understand," &c.

This 25th verse we consider the true key to the unlocking of the whole prophecy, and all the other parts must bend to it—no not bend, for there is no constraint—they fall naturally into their places.

The whole argument will rest then upon the exact truth of the following statement:—
"From the going forth of the commandment to

restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks." That is sixty-nine weeks, or 483 days, which by the prophetic rule of a day for a year is the same number of years. The first thing to be done is to find the commandment. In this connection we will refer to four commandments, or decrees, not because there were four commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, but to show that only one of those decrees comes up to the requirements in the case.

The first decree was issued in the first year of king Cyrus, A. M. 3586, 70 years from the third of Jehoiakim. It was for the building of the house of the Lord God of Israel. It will be found in Ezra, chap. i.

The second decree was issued in the second year of Darius, A. M. 3603, 70 years from the burning of the temple. It may be found in the 6th chapter of Ezra, and was simply for the resumption of the work inaugurated under the preceding decrees.

The third decree was issued in the 7th of Artaxerxes, A. M. 3656. It gave the Jews in his dominions, permission to depart and go to their own land, with other privileges, narrated in the 7th chapter of Ezra.

In neither of the above can we recognize a decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, more especially when we add the additional marks, "the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times."

How is it with the fourth decree?

The fourth decree was issued in the 20th of Artaxerxes, the point at which our last table ended. It may be found in the 2nd chapter of Nehemiah. From it we obtain this valuable information, that up to this time Jerusalem lay waste—the gates were burned with fire, and the wall had not been built, (chap. ii. 17.) This fact sets aside all preceding decrees as being the starting point of the sixty-nine weeks, and establishes this latter one as their true beginning. Chapter three contains the names and order of those that builded the wall. From chapter four we may learn how troublous were the times in which it was accomplished; how they worked with one hand, and held their weapons of war with the other, ready for any surprise. To be able fully to appreciate the precision with which this decree meets the requirements of Daniel ix. 25, and how it stands out in bold relief from all the preceding decrees, (for the scriptures record none afterwards,) all the early chapters of Nehemiah require to be read.

Having indicated the beginning of the sixty-nine weeks, we shall now define their end. "Messiah the Prince." That the title Messiah belongs of right to Jesus, we offer the following as proof. Peter and John said,

Acts iv. 25, "Who (God) by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, (in the second Psalm.) Why did the heathen rage and the people imagine vain things. The kings of the earth stood up and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the People of Israel were gathered together." In Psa. ii. from which the above is quoted, the word "Christ" is "anointed." The next clause in italics, shows that Jesus was that Christ or anointed one. Messiah is the Hebrew for Christ, anointed is the English for them both. "We have found the Messiah; which is being interpreted the Christ," (or margin, the anointed,) John i. 41. He is also entitled to the name of "Prince," being "the Prince of the kings of the earth." (Rev. i. 5,) "the Prince of life," (Acts iii. 15,) a Prince and a Savior, (Acts v. 13.) Under the law kings and priests were anointed with oil, as for instance, Aaron. "Then shalt thou take the anointing oil and pour it upon his head, and anoint him, Exod. xxix. 7. Samuel anointed Saul, 1 Sam. x. 1. The oil symbolized the Holy Spirit. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power," Acts x. 38. Jesus then is the antitypical king and priest, and was anointed with the antitypical oil. When?

"And I (John) knew him (the Lamb of God) not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bore record saying, I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit," John i. 31-33. Jesus then was anointed with the Holy Spirit at his baptism. This then is the end of the sixty-nine weeks. In corroboration of this conclusion we offer the following:—"Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, THE TIME IS FULFILLED, Mark i. 14, 15. What time is fulfilled if not the time to Messiah the Prince. Surely not the seventy weeks, nor the sixty-two weeks, nor the one week. None of them will fit. We think enough has been advanced to show that, "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks," is equivalent to the following:—From the 20th of Artaxerxes to the baptism of Christ shall be 483 years.

FRANCIS COGNILL.

"The Banner Excommunicated Sister."

We are gratified in being able to inform our readers, that the sister against whom "The Bull of Excommunication" was published in the *Banner*, has so far obtained justices to have been placed in a position to receive her money in about two years from this. Certain have come forward as security for its repayment at that time. This is all the brethren in these parts were anxious for. As professors of the gospel of the kingdom, we felt disgraced by the affair. We can now breathe more freely. Our purpose is accomplished. With any side issues that may have grown out of the matter we have nothing to do. The parties to them can fight them out at their leisure, if so disposed. The Bull has been met by a defence in the *Herald*, and Miss Hayes's vindication. The parties to the Bull, we are informed (for to the dating of this writing we have not seen it,) have published a reply, to which Miss Hayes promises to respond. We have been requested by both parties to give their documents circulation. But this we respectfully decline. Miss Hayes being secured, we withdraw, and leave the belligerents to themselves. May the right prevail, and may the past have a salutary influence on all concerned.

EDITHA.

Feb. 2, 1861.

We insert the above Extract from the *Herald*, to show our readers the position our Bro. Thomas at present occupies with regard to the cause which he so zealously espoused a short time ago. It appears that he cannot afford to do justice to those he has injured by false statements. He is unwilling to acknowledge or confess his faults, in obedience to apostolic injunction—"Confess your faults (or sins) one to another, and pray one for another, that you may be healed." The minds of many of those who esteem him highly in love for his works' sake, have been hurt, and are bleeding at every pore, for the injury done to the truth and Christ's brethren, by the unreasonable, unjust, and unscriptural onslaught which he made, and caused to be made, on parties entirely innocent of the charges brought against them. We know "it is good to be always zealously affected in a good cause," but before engaging in it, we ought first to ascertain it to be such. If our Bro. Thomas had done so in this matter all would have been well.

We have been made a sufferer in both mind and body, as well as purse, on account of the unjust and uncharitable course pursued by Dr. Thomas. We have been assured by many of his best friends and most ardent admirers, that though he had done us an injury, yet they fully believed that he would ultimately do us justice. We hope it may be so, even for his own sake. We should be glad of this, though we should reap no benefit from it whatever, except the satisfaction of knowing, that he had redeemed himself in the eyes of those who know both sides of the question, and that we could also esteem him as we have in times past, a brother beloved in the Lord. We felt and still

feel pained to think that one for whom we have such tender regard and affection, should so strangely and unaccountably brand us with infamy, and cast out our name as evil. And who would not feel so? And now all the reparation he makes is,—arrogating the honor due to the Conference, and investigating Committee, and those disinterested brethren who have satisfactorily secured Miss H., by saying, “Our purpose is accomplished.” Did he accomplish it? And he still indulges in unchristian raillery—as though he had a special license from heaven to do so—about the “Banner Excommunicated” Sister, and the “Bull of Excommunication;” and very complacently says, as “Miss H. has been secured,” he begs to “withdraw,” and “respectfully declines” to let his readers have the benefit of reading both sides of the question, that they may judge impartially between brethren. And he it understood that he refused to do this before he saw the Reply. We duly and truly mailed him one two weeks before he wrote the above article, and sent him another a week or two after that, so that he might both see and read if he would. The last week in Dec. Bro. Chase, as Chairman of an investigating Committee of eight brethren, wrote Bro. Thomas, asking and beseeching him to do justice in this matter, and let the result of their labors be sent out with the *Herald*, as he had done for Miss H. Did he receive that letter? We know not, as he never replied. He served him, as he served others when they wrote to him about this matter. Though he had not seen the Reply Feb. 2nd, he knew the result, and the wish of his brethren. Bro. Mark Allen saw him some two weeks before the above date, conversed with him, and asked him to send out the Reply, but he refused.

We have several communications on hand relating to this subject, some of them very pointed and earnestly written, but with the above remarks, and the following communication from our esteemed Bro. McMillan of Rochester, N. Y., we wish to dismiss this unpleasant subject from our pages. We hope our correspondents will not be offended, or think that we slight them because of this. We cannot force any one to do right. Right action ought to spring spontaneously from the heart. We therefore leave the matter with the brethren, and “the Lord, the Righteous Judge, who will render to every man according to his deeds.”

March 14th, 1861.

EDITOR.

For the Gospel Banner.

A Letter from Bro. McMillan.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—Please permit me the expression of a few thoughts on the recent grievous and mortifying dissensions and

troubles, you and Brethren in Geneva have been passing through, which have acted like a paralysis on the whole body of the Christ, initiated into Him in the one faith once delivered to the saints. As those afflictive developments are no more private, but, alas! public property, I assume liberty to speak my mind freely in the spirit of brotherly love and kindness, as a humble member of the Ecclesia of the Anointed Jesus, whose heart for many years has beat in sweet sympathy with the truth, soon as apprehended, by my intellectual faculties, and so I fight the fight of faith, striving to bring every thought into subjection to the mind of Christ.

I cannot be otherwise than grieved, along with many of our brethren, at these dissensions and roots of bitterness in our Father's family, which should be of one heart and one mind,—each esteeming others better than themselves. And I somewhat realize I should be doing violence to the mind of the Holy one, if I were remiss, and quietly to look on in silence, without at least deploring and expressing my extreme sorrow that such things exist in our Father's household, to grieve the heart of Him who hath loved us, and given himself for us.

I knew none of these troubles transpiring in Geneva, until the *Herald* of Nov. and Dec. came to hand, and Miss Hayes' vindication. I perused it with utter astonishment, particularly Bro. T's strictures. But as regards forming or passing judgment in my mind, on *ex parte* testimony, I never allow myself to entertain for a moment the idea, knowing from long experience such judgment is very injudicious, in matters of such magnitude. Neither Bro. Wilson, nor any other man, could be lessened in my esteem, on *ex parte* testimony. Hence I paused until I might receive some testimony from Geneva. By and by it came. I perused it with no little anxiety. I weighed and contrasted the testimony to the best of my judgment, and became satisfied in my mind. And Dear Bro. as an independent minded man,—as every man ought to be,—with all due deference to every other man who may not think with me, fearless of consequences, and uncompromising in principle, meanwhile sorry to injure the feelings of any one who may differ from me, yet neither conceding to another undue benevolence, but in the fear of Jehovah, it appears to me, looking over the testimony of this financial transaction of Miss Hayes, so far as you were concerned in it, I really do not see how any one can charge you with moral culpability in the matter. Miss H. it seems came to you for two purposes, one of which it seems was to be better acquainted with the truth, and become a member of the church, the other for the ostensible purpose to loan her money.

And in answer to her request, you (as I would have done in similar circumstances;) recommended a Brother in the faith, in good standing in the church, and to your knowledge his reputation and solvency indisputable, as it seems was proved to her, and to all, by disinterested business men of high standing in the community.

And as to being legally culpable in the matter, why the fact is, the security, and the indisputable testimonies of these reputable men in business as to the integrity of the borrower, (I have been a commercial man a large portion of my life,) settle that point; and to mind, the man must have a small amount of discernment to call you culpable by any technicality in law. But why all this sensitiveness and irritability in Miss Hayes' mind, requesting a premature reimbursement of her money. It may have proceeded from evil communications corrupting good manners, which naturally produces nervous excitement, resulting in irritability; but I rather incline to think, she found out she had, in avarice, committed an overt act against the government of the State by exacting illegal interest, putting herself and money both in danger. I have known even in our Empire state, like causes produces like effects.

But Brother, with all the irritability in temper, sharp words, and rebellion against the brethren, she as yet was a sister in standing in the church. I hope then the brethren acted understandingly, and in the spirit of love and tenderness, as was testified, according to Matt. xviii. Our Lord never meant this rule to be used in the letter as a sword to smite, but in the pure spirit of love and gentleness, with a single eye, as Jesus would have done to reclaim an erring one, or as a father would with a rebellious son whom he loved. Would not his bowels of compassion be moved to woo him back to his bosom, before he would abandon him. This I understand to be the spirit of Matt. xviii. I sincerely hope the church in Geneva, dealt in this manner with this erring sister, if not, then it has violated the law of our Messiah. Again, doubtless the mind of our respected Bro. Thomas was sorely tried by the unremitting flood poured into his ears by Miss H., and a host of others from various quarters: whether for the ostensible purpose of obtaining redress, and to exculpate Miss H., or for recrimination towards you and the brethren, it is not for me to say. But however plausible, lucid, or philanthropic these addresses, either verbal or written might have been, yet with all due respect towards our Bro. Thomas, in the spirit of a tender-hearted brother towards another of our Father's family, constrained as I am in the bowels of mercy and compassion, sorrowing over

the whole matter, it seems to me indisputable in the light of divine truth whether the sum total of all the charges laid against you and brethren in Geneva were true or untrue, our Bro. T. has been thrown off his guard, and suffered his great mind to stray from the simplicity of the truth. Whether from an overt zeal to have the grievances of Miss H. redressed, or from an over-weening arrogance to lord it over his brethren, or whether for the ostensible purpose of curtailing your influence in the publication of the *Banner*, and stabbing it to the heart, as it has been said, I know not; but certain I am, and I grieve to say it, my much respected brother, with whom I have taken sweet counsel for many years, has without controversy, done violence to the law of Christ in letter and spirit, as recorded by the evangelist in Matt. xviii. Oh! Brother Wilson, as I said before, this word was never put into our hands as a sword to meet our brother with, even though erring; but in the bowels of love and with yearnings of heart, reason with him, and if possible reclaim him from the error of his ways, that the ties of comity and love may not be severed. But if unavailing, then follows the 16th verse, yet all in the same spirit of mercy. If yet refractory, still in bowels of compassion and love, apply the 17th verse, still to reclaim; then the excluding by the careful surgical operation, with as much intense feeling as possible, that the body may suffer as little as possible in the painful operation. Oh! Brother, we ought to see to it, all of us, that this rule be not violated: and whether our dear Bro. T. has been laboring under a physical nervous temperament, or from an over-excited state of mind, resulting in too much haste without mature deliberation, or else a bold attempt to exercise supremacy over the *Ecclesiastical* of our Lord Jesus, which cannot for a moment be tolerated by me, neither by any of the churches surely,—as a juror in the matter I am constrained to give in my verdict, though unsolicited by any one. But because being a senior in years and not a neophyte in the faith, I contend against any curtailment of my liberty as a humble member of the Body, and will raise my voice against any innovations or inroads which may be attempted on the One Body of the Christ.

I had hoped under the circumstances of the case, some mitigatives, or some balm to soothe the wounded minds of myself and brethren, would have been rendered through the February No. of the *Harald*, but alas! I hang my harp upon the willows and weep in silence. Yet I will hope against hope, that by the application of tenderness and love, this great sore may be healed. It is in a gangrenous state at present; but maybe, by the application of soothing tenderness and love, the con-

valesence of the patients will soon be manifest, that we all love one another as our Lord has loved us.

Rochester, N. Y. JAMES McMILLAN.

For the Gospel Banner.

Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?

[The following communication is inserted, not because we endorse the sentiments of the writer, for at present we do not, but that our readers may have an opportunity of reading what objections may be raised. Perhaps some of our able correspondents will take hold of the question in a clear, candid, concise, and scriptural manner, so that truth may be elicited. We would like to do so, but our time is too much occupied at present to permit such an examination as the subject requires.—EDITOR.]

Richmond, Va., Feb. 4, 1861.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:

I beg to suggest the following considerations as worthy, nay, as preemingly demanding the attention and discussion of all who hold the views which Bro. Thomas propounds as the Gospel of the kingdom.

1. Is not the term *king* derived from, and used in the place of the term *head*? And does not the term *head* express all that the term *king* expresses, and some things in addition which the term *king* does not embrace or comprehend?

2. What authority is there in the Scriptures to authorize any one to contend that the constituent elements of modern constitutional kingdoms are necessary to the existence of the kingdom of God?

3. Is not the legitimate jurisdiction of the Creator over the created, the dominion, or kingdom of God, and co-existent with creation, and therefore absolute, universal, supreme and eternal?

4. God has nowhere promised to set up the kingdom of God, because it is necessarily co-existent with the works of his hands.

5. The kingdom of God exists independent of the recognition, and in the face of its rejection by the children of men.

6. Although the Jews were once constituted "a kingdom of priests unto God," they ceased to be "the kingdom of God" from the time they rejected him from reigning over them, and thereby placed themselves on a level with the rest of mankind in rebellion against God, and therefore they constituted the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of David, or the royal house of Jacob.

7. God has covenanted to give the throne of David, the kingdom of Israel or rule over the house of Jacob, to Jesus as the son of David, or because he is the son of David—but that is not the kingdom of God.

8. The possession of the throne of David, and the rule or jurisdiction over the house of Jacob and the world, is absolutely necessary, in order that the kingdom of God may be re-

cognized by the nations, as nations or families, but is not the kingdom of God.

9. The visible manifestation of the kingdom of God results from the inauguration and application of the New Covenant, not of the covenant with David, or that with Abraham.

10. Its personal application commenced on the Day of Pentecost, and its national application will result as a consequence of the willing submission of the peoples to the physical rule of Jesus and his associates, when administered by them from the throne of David.

11. The throne of God is established for ever in the heavens, where Jesus now sits, because "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."

12. The throne of David in Jerusalem, at present overturned and trodden down, is covenanted to Jesus as his own, and therefore he has promised to his faithful brethren who overcome, to give to them to sit down with him on *his throne*, "even as I overcame, and am sat down with my Father on *his throne*."

13. The throne of God belongs to the kingdom of God. The throne of Jesus to the kingdom of David, or of Israel.

14. The present occupation of the throne of God by Jesus, is because he was declared to be the Son of God with power by his resurrection from among the dead; whilst his future occupation of the throne of David is predicated upon the demonstrated fact that he is the Son of David.

15. It is the province of the son of David to rule on the throne of his father David for 1000 years. Whilst it is the province of the Son of God to "take away the sin of the world," that is, to bless, or save mankind, by turning every one of them from their iniquities."

16. Physical rule is incompetent to save or bless men, because it cannot change or transform the fountain of sin—the human affections. This is the province of the kingdom of God, accomplished by the personal abode of God in his people by or through his Spirit. Hence the kingdom of God is of like character with himself, who is "the Spirit." And therefore it is said, "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit."

17. The kingdom of God is necessarily a spiritual kingdom. Whilst the kingdom of David is necessarily a physical one.

I might add a great number of other propositions all illustrative of the untenableness of the assumption that the kingdom of David is the kingdom of God; but I forbear for the present, hoping that you will permit the subject to be fully and freely discussed in the *Banner*. I have no doubt that you are alive to the fact that nothing but truth is truly valuable, and are willing to receive as the truth whatever can be proven to be true by the tes-

timonies of the Scriptures. Relying therefore upon your independent love of truth, I submit the above in all confidence and candor to you, claiming your obligation either to admit or disprove the propositions stated, and wait your reply with assured confidence.

Yours, faithfully, in the love of the truth,
G. B. STACY.

From the Harbinger.

One Baptism.

The apostle Paul teaches there is *one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism. Now it is certain that if the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the *one* baptism; then there is no such thing (or command) as water baptism. Did Jesus command believers of the Gospel to be baptized with the Holy Spirit, or in water, as he set them example, when he was baptized by John in Jordan?—Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Mark xvi 15, 16. Did Paul baptize those disciples he found at Ephesus, into the Holy Spirit? or did they not receive the Holy Spirit *after* he had baptized them? Did not Phillip baptize the Eunuch in water? And who instructed the Eunuch concerning water baptism, if Phillip did not? And if Peter may have erred on the day of Pentecost, when he instructed those who enquired of him what they must do to be saved, to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, can the same charge be brought against Phillip and Paul?

1. Baptism includes a burial and a rising up to "newness of life." "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him;" Col. ii. 12; iii. 1-4; Rom. vi. 3-5; Acts viii. 12, 35, 38.

2. Baptism is a "form," or type of Gospel doctrine;—Rom. vi. 17. The Gospel as preached by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. included, that Christ died for our sins—was buried, and rose again according to the Scriptures. Baptism gives it a formal expression.

3. Obedience to Jesus in this ordinance, honors the Gospel. It makes our life, death, and resurrection, a reality, those "buried" in the waters of "baptism," could never "walk in newness of life," if they were not "raised up" from the water, to that end. So also "if the dead in Christ are not to be raised, then they are PERISHED." All depends on the resurrection.

4. No other act of obedience secures a distinct promise of a resurrection. "If ye are planted together in the likeness of his death, you shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection,"—Rom. vi. 5. That "likeness" of Christ's "death" and burial, that being "joined in the likeness of his, (Christ's) death" is stated in the preceding ver. to be "buried with him in baptism."

We will give unquestionable testimony from the learned men of past ages. Rosenmuller says: "*Immersion* in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, beginning a new one. The learned have right reminded us, that on account of this emblematic meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian Church."

Martin Luther, after speaking of baptism as a symbol of death and resurrection, says: "On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized should be completely *immersed* into water, according to the meaning of the word; and the signification of the ordinance, as also, *without doubt it was instituted by Christ.*"

Dr. Knapp, an eminent and pious German divine says: "We are like Christ, *buried as dead persons by baptism*, and should arise like him, to a new life."

Dr. Bloomfield, one of the most profound Biblical scholars of Great Britain, says: "We have been thus buried in the waters of baptism." He adds: "There is a plain allusion to the ancient custom of *baptism by immersion.*"

Barnabas, the companion of Paul, says: "We descend into the water, and come out of it."

Justin Martyr: "Those who believed are led to some place where there is water, and then bathe in the water." In another place, he says: "We represent our Lord's sufferings and resurrection *by baptism in a pool.*"

Tertullian: "We are *immersed* in water—let down into the water and dipped. Peter immersed in the Tiber."

Dionysius Areopag: "The total concealment in water fitly represents Christ's death and burial."

Chrysostom: "We, as in a sepulchre immersing our heads in water, the old man is *buried and sinking down*, the whole is concealed at once, then as we immerge, the new man again rises."

Jerome: "Three times we are *immersed.*" Augustine: "Rightly are ye immersed three times, who have received baptism in the name of Christ."

Neander: "Baptism was originally *by immersion.*"

Tholuck, on Rom. vi. 4, says: "In order to understand the figurative use of baptism, we must bear in mind the well known fact, that the candidate in the primitive church was *immersed* in water, and raised out of it again."

Winer: "In the apostolic age, baptism was *by immersion.*"

Bretschneider: "The apostolic church baptized *only by immersion.*"

Schleusner, Whal, and Bretschneider, the three great New Testament lexicographers of Germany, limit baptism, as a sacred ordinance to immersion.

Wahn: "According to apostolic instruction and example, baptism was performed by *immersing the whole body.*"

Professor Lange: "Baptism in the apostolic age, was a proper baptism; the *immersion of the whole body in water.* Plunging under water represents death, and rising out of it, the resurrection to a new life."

In short, from the days of the apostles downwards for 1300 years, we have an unbroken chain of evidence, showing that baptism was performed by immersion, and by *immersion only.* Now, who would set at nought such testimony, if it were given on the subject of *no immortality out of Christ.* Is such testimony good for anything when it is in harmony with revelation, which shines as clear as the light of the noon day Sun, on this most glorious subject, which represents in figure the death and resurrection of Christ our life giver.—If any wish more testimony, and can procure the German book of Martyrs, they will there find, that the united testimony of the Church from the first ages of primitive christianity down through succeeding centuries, all sustain the testimony already given, that baptism by immersion in water is the "one baptism" spoken of by Paul. And with all christian kindness I would ask how believers are *buried* in baptism by, or with the Spirit? And in being baptized with the Spirit, are they *planted* in the likeness of Christ's death? If Christ did not command baptism by immersion, when he commissioned his apostles to go and preach the Gospel, and to observe all things whatsoever he commanded, what did he command? And why did his apostles teach and practise baptism by *immersion* if Christ did not set them the example when he went down into Jordan and was baptized?

I am a firm believer in the comforting influences of the Holy Spirit, and unless we possess that spirit, we have no promise of having these mortal bodies made like unto Christ's glorified body; but I remain in strong *doubt* that the "one baptism" spoken of by Paul is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and until stronger proof is given than I have yet seen I must believe as I do.

G. DILLABAUGH.

Seneca Falls, N. Y.

For the Gospel Banner.

A Dream.

The following poem is founded upon a dream which a brother in Scotland lately had. We copy it and remarks thereon from the author's letter.

"Sister Jane narrated a remarkable dream of Bro. D——'s. He thought that *the Trumpet* had sounded, and he was not caught up.

In an indescribable agony of mind he went to seek out others of the brethren, that thus he might know whether it had sounded or not. Judge then of his trouble when knocking, knocking, and no one came. He then thought him to go to the grave of one whom he was certain would have been resurrected if that event had taken place, and thus ascertain. But when he got there, the mound was green and hard. Unsatisfied yet, he went for a spade to dig, and see whether the brother was laid there yet. When he had found the spade and returned, he was joyfully surprised to find (all I believe of) the brethren there, digging up the grave for a like purpose. Upon seeing of which—he awoke. I myself have experienced this horror of being left behind, but whether in my waking or sleeping moments, I cannot tell. But a greater maddening terror, no man need experience. Oh I could we but *realize* the awful thought of being unready for the any-time appearing of the Christ, and the closing of the *first volume* of the Book of Life—could we, I say, but oftener realize this, we should most certainly live more like men who *wait* for their Lord from heaven."

I had been

Regretfully and sadly pondering
Upon the folly and the loss of those
My brethren, who, to gain the gilded pence
Of this world's gift, do risk the richer,
The heavenly treasures of the age to come.
I mourned that there should be so little care
For the rich privileges of the assembling
Together of the brethren: that common
Antepast of the great salvation—was
As nought to them.

Then before me passed

In quick review the characters of those
Who have themselves enrolled on the lists
To Life. I saw the ardent glowing zeal:
The steady earnest laborer: the quick
But loving temper: the desiring heart
Seeking to use its talents in a humble way:
The merry-eyed inspirited: the volatile:
The overflowing love: the carer for the world:
The seeker for its honors or its smiles.
But knowing, He to whom we owe account
Doth read the heart, and judgeth secret sins,
I did forbear to judge. Remembering the word,
"Judgment beginneth at the house of God,"
I wondered "who then will be of the saved?"
Which of us, should our Savior come this night
Would be found worthy of an entrance in
The everlasting kingdom, and who shut out
To darkness and despair.

Then my mind glanced

Away to the oft warning given by Christ,
"Be ye so ready, for ye do not know
The hour in which the Son of man will come:
I say unto you, Watch!" "Behold! I come,
E'en as a robber; blessed then is he
Who watcheth and is ready." "Be ye then as men
Who wait their Lord from heaven."

Thinking thus,

And knowing that his coming depends not

On time, or on events, but on the will
Of God:—that he may come at any hour,
To-night, this year, or many years yet hence,
According to the day when'er should be
Fulfill'd the number of the elect,
I fell asleep.

The waking thoughts were woren then
Into a vision which hath left its mark
Deep printed on my memory.

I dreamt
That the last angel's trumpet had been blown,
And I was not ascended. A maddening horror
Me then possess'd, such as I never wish
To feel again in waking or in sleeping hours.
With brain afire, heart crash'd, every nerve
Thrilling with pain deep from its spirit source,
I paced the room, and when that grew too small
The street I trod. The midnight starless heaven
Had not such depths of darkness as possess'd
My mind: nor wildest lightning storm
Such terrors as mine agony. The thought
Of death were happiness compared to the doom
Of being shut out from the presence of
The Lord, debarr'd from a share of power
And glory with him. That I from secret fault
Or negligence of watch or prayer or deed,
Had lost the Kingdom,—oh! 'twas misery
Unutterable.

A little longer and the throne
Of reason would have fallen, when the doubt
Inspired me—Had Christ really come?
The trumpet sounded, and the dead been raised?
I noticed the heavens, and there no sign,
Unknown and flaming, was hung out to view,
Such as besem'd the nighness of the One
Whose birth was heralded by meteor-star:
I had nor seen nor heard—only had felt,
The possibility of a reprieve was joy:
I hasten'd to seek the brethren with whom
I had communed, thus to ascertain
The truth by them—their presence or their absence.
At one, the first, I knock'd, but no one came;
I knock'd (as no one ever knock'd before
In prayer without response,) but silence met.
Again I knock'd and cried, like they our Lord
Once spoke of—but there came no answering voice.
Stricken again, I did not dare to wait
At door of any other, but with rapid step
Haste to the city of the silent, where
Were laid to rest our brothers and our sisters
Asleep in Jesus.

At the grave of one
Whose walk among us had been holiness
I stood. But what to think I knew not then.
The grassy mound was undisturb'd; the moon
Then gleaming through a rift of cloud, display'd
The fringing flowers, erect and motionless,
Forgetful all of the recorded scene
Of open graves at the Messiah's death,
I wondered if the resurrected would
By Spirit rise up through the ground, and leave
No trace behind. To solve the doubt I went
To seek a means whereby I might dig down.
Betruing then, I was o'er-joy'd to find
My brethren all were there, like me intent.—
And I awoke!

Was it then all a dream,
Or kindly warning of some angel-guard,
To spur me on to watchfulness and zeal,
By giving me a foretaste of the dread
Despair of losing Life and Glory.

Biblical Discovery.

The London *Athenæum* publishes a letter
from a correspondent in Jerusalem, dated
Nov. 17th, which after referring to the Sama-

ritan researches of Dr. Basilius Livishon, of
the Russian Episcopate at Jerusalem, says:

"But not the least important part of this
subject to be mentioned is his more recent
purchase of a MS. vellum Pentateuch of re-
markable antiquity. He believes it to have
been written during the time of the first tem-
ple in Jerusalem; and his gratitude for the
dispensation of Providence which brought
this within his reach, partakes of a strong
religious character. The reasons for assign-
ing so remote a date to this precious book are
—1. The extreme reserve with which the
priestly family in Nablus have guarded it
from the knowledge of even their own sect,
and the assertion of the priest from whom it
was obtained. 2. The fact of its not being
divided into chapters or sections of any kind,
except as books, such as Genesis, Exodus,
etc. 3. The names of the several priests
found in marginal scraps about the volume,
recording circumstances connected with its
preservation. 4. The express statement in a
marginal observation, that the volume had
escaped a peril of fire during the time of Ze-
rubbabel in Jerusalem."

The Religion of Paying Debts.

One of the religious newspapers has the
following strong remarks;

"Men may sophisticate as they please.
They can never make it right, and all the
bankrupt laws in the universe cannot make it
right for them not to pay their debts. There
is a sin in this neglect as clear and deserving
of church discipline, as is stealing or false
swearing. He who violates his promise to
pay, or withholds payment of a debt when it
is in his power to meet his engagement, ought
to be made to feel that in the sight of all hon-
est men he is a swindler. Religion may be a
very comfortable cloak under which to hide,
but if religion does not make a man deal
justly, it is not worth having.

☞ "In the day that thou eatest thereof
thou shalt surely die." Gen. ii. 17.

LOCKE, the great Mental Philosopher and
Christian, says: "It seems a *STRANGE way*
of understanding a Law which requires the
plainest and directest words, that by '*death*,'
should be meant *eternal life in misery*."

OLSHAUSEN in his comments on 1 Cor. xv.
19, "If in this life only we have hope in
Christ," &c., says, "The doctrine of the IM-
MORTALITY of the SOUL, and the name, are like
unknown to the ENTIRE BIBLE."

☞ The spring of peace and content-
ment is within, and therefore we had need
look that it be clear and undefiled.

GOSPEL BANNER.

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., APRIL 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 7.]

For the Gospel Banner.
Scripture Reasonings, No. X.
CHARITY AND LOVE.

"And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves, for charity shall cover the multitude of sins," 1 Pet. iv. 8.

We have quoted the above passage verbatim as it stands in King James version, without regard to the inaccuracies of translation, that renders the text sufficiently ambiguous to suit the purpose of almost any modern mystifier of the Word. By the term charity in its proper sense, we understand benevolence, alms-giving, grace or favor. If this had been the intention of the apostle in this case, he would have used a different word from the one in the original. But there is a different acceptance of the term Charity among modern pietists and worldlings; which we will try to illustrate, and define, as follows.—If by a candid search into the record of prophetic and apostolic teachings, we find that there cannot possibly be but one true body of Christians, and that in order to become members of that body, and partakers of the blessings promised to Messiah and his people, it is necessary to be made acquainted with a certain word or teaching called the "Gospel of the Kingdom," that sets before us a definite hope, based upon certain "covenants of promise" made with the fathers of the Hebrew Nation, without which acquaintance we have no hope,—and that being made acquainted with this, it is necessary for us to have faith, or in other words a confident persuasion that those things hoped for shall be realized, and, that in addition, it is necessary for us subsequent to a confession of this "One faith," to be immersed in water in the likeness of Messiah's death, and raised up in the likeness of his resurrection. Having thus named upon us the name of the Lord: and having submitted ourselves in obedience to the form; if we continue in that faith grounded and settled, having it perform in us its work of love, purifying the heart, and overcoming the world, we know that we are in

the right way to life eternal. And the Scriptures teach us, there is but one right way; although they do teach that "there is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof, are the ways of death." Prov. xiv. 12. Having taken this position, and started out as Abraham did, leaving even kindred and dear friends behind, we may see about us many people who are undoubtedly sincere in what they believe and teach, who are teaching for doctrine things entirely subversive of the truth, and holding as religion and christianity that which is delusive and calculated to sink them in perdition;—feeling deeply for them in their false position, and having a desire to release them from their bondage, and bring them into the light of the glorious gospel of the Son of God; we speak out and say, that such is not Christianity, that those holding such teachings are not Christians, but anti-christ;—and we are told that we have not Charity. If we are asked do you believe you are right, and all the multitudes who have made profession of Christianity, and have not professed this faith you hold are wrong? If we are honest men and not hypocrites, we must answer yes. Because the Scriptures of truth set forth but one right ground to stand upon, and we have diligently sought out and occupy that ground, hence all who are not on that platform cannot have any part in the matter, and must of necessity be wrong. Again, we are met with the same cry, no Charity. If we are asked cannot individuals have honest differences of opinions with regard to the truth or falsity of the great and momentous questions we teach? If they may not be in darkness with regard to few or many great gospel truths and yet have fellowship with God, and have part in his kingdom? We must answer, no! Because "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all; and if we say we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth." 1st John i. 5. 6. And the Spirit of YAHWEH speaking through Isaiah has said, "if they speak not accord-

ing to the law and the testimony" (which is what Jesus calls "Moses and the Prophets") "they have no light in them." Isa. viii. 19, 20. We are still called harsh, radical, uncharitable. In short, let us speak out with boldness and honesty, any gospel truth that cuts off those who are unwilling to comply with God's requirements, and we are called uncharitable. Charity with such, is putting a favorable construction upon things contrary to, and subversive of the truth, admitting that those may be right whom we know to be wrong, and confessing that it is very possible we may be wrong, when assured we are right, and in short to become positively hypocrites, double minded, unstable in all our ways, and blown about by every wind of doctrine. It supposes God himself to be incapable of presenting to the human race a plan of salvation that can and must be complied with, and makes him a variable, changeable being, who must accommodate himself to every whim and fancy of the human family, and that he must come to them, instead of them coming unto him for salvation. Such a Charity calls for compromises, and compromises are an amalgamation of right with wrong, light with darkness, truth with error. Such must ever be abominations in the sight of YAHWEH, who is always right, all light, all truth, and with him there is no variableness or shadow of turning. The truth of God admits of no compromise with the errors of men. If any one is honest and honestly desires to know the truth, and is willing to receive and obey it, he will not, when that truth is unveiled, begin to trouble himself about the consequences, whether or not there is some one else: or some body of people with whom he may have been associated, from whom he may be compelled to withdraw, unless they go with him. He will not stop to inquire whether any one man, or body of men, in the dark ages believed that truth, and held fast that one faith, or whether it is the faith of Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley, Wm. Miller, Geo. Storrs. His greatest concern will be to know if it is truth, if it is the One Faith of the Scriptures, which was held fast by the ancient Patriarchs and held and taught by Messiah and his Apostles; if it is that, he will embrace and live it out, even if it cuts him loose from all the pious men of this or any age, however amiable their dispositions, or sympathetic their feelings. To such, the text we have quoted at the head of this article is addressed; and not to everybody and anybody who may see fit to apply it to themselves. "Have fervent Charity among yourselves." The word rendered Charity is *αγαπη*, *agapee*, which means love and only love, and not *χαρις*, *charis*, which means grace, favor, benevolence, etc. The plural of *agapee*, may be

found in the 12th verse of Jude's epistle, *αγαπαις*, *agapais*, and is translated in James' version, "feasts of Charity," but it should be rendered love-feasts, which feasts were held among the primitive christians and called "*agapai*."

To show that my position is correct, I will notice a few places where the word occurs in the original, and is properly rendered in King James' Version, *love*. "Love (*agapee*) works no ill to his neighbour; therefore Love (*agapee*) is the fulfilling of the law," Rom. xiii. 10. "Who hath chosen us . . . that we should be without blame before him in love" (*agapee*), Eph. i. 3, "forbearing one another in love," (*agapee*), Eph. iv. 2. "Behold, what manner of love, (*agapee*) the Father hath bestowed," etc. 1 John iii. 1. And I might multiply indefinitely, but those I think will suffice to convince those who talk so much about charity, that the true signification of the word in the text is love, and nothing else. This is the same word that is translated charity in 1 Cor. xiii. Now I ask if it is evidence that I can have no charity, or love for a man, and believe he is in error, and a subject of delusion? If I truly love him shall I not plainly point out to him his error?—and endeavour without compromise, and without deception, to win him to the truth? Most assuredly I shall, if I fulfil the royal law. I shall love (*agapeeso*) my neighbor as myself. And shall I be silent if I see a dreadful, yet plausible delusion of the adversary spreading itself among my neighbors, friends, and those that are near and dear to me by the tenderest ties; insidiously entwining itself about their hearts, swallowing up their affections, until the delusion becomes so strong, and so finally fastened upon them, that they are ready to risk their future and eternal all upon an ecstasy of mind, and excitement of the animal feelings, that has been experienced at some time under certain peculiar circumstances, and that, in opposition to the eternal Word of God, should I not rather cry out, and in plain language too, that they may not be deceived? Shall I not if I love them, expose, denounce, and overthrow as far as in my power, all the mysterious wickedness of the Evil One? Woe be to me if I shrink from the uncompromising warfare with all his delusive manifestations.

If we have this love in its general sense, as applicable to all mankind, we shall love our enemies, but hate and denounce all evil, and make no God-dishonoring compromises. We shall be like Messiah, who although he hated the evil, hypocrisy, and unbelief of the house of Judah, yet was willing to lay down his life for the love he bore them.

Again this love in the special sense in

which it is presented in the text, will manifest itself in those who have professed the one faith, for this faith we are told "works by love," (*agapee*,) Gal. v. 6. It will cause them to love one another with pure hearts fervently. They will not bite and devour one another. We may know those in whom the faith produces its proper work, by the manifestation of this great christian principle, which is the greatest of all christian graces. "For, though I may speak with the tongues of men and angels and have not love, (*agapee*) I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. . . . though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand ALL mysteries," which will include even that mystery hidden from ages and generations, even the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery; aye, and all knowledge; yes, I may be a proficient in Hebrew and Greek, I may have great powers of reasoning, and have profound depth of thought, so that I may confound the wise, and yet if I have not this one simple principle, love, I am nothing; I am less even than the meanest disciple who possesses it. Beloved brethren in the Lord, let us think of these things. "Love suffereth long and is kind," yes, dear brethren, it is kind, not harsh, unapproachable, unfeeling. "Love envieth not." No, it is not envious of its brother, fearful of his success in anything he may undertake. Envy dwells not in the bosom of him who has that faith which works by love. "Love is not puffed up." No, it is humble and meek like the master. "Love thinketh no evil;" not continually imagining something evil of its brother. "Rejoiceth not in iniquity;" hence it will never be hasty to trumpet to the world the real or supposed delinquencies of its brethren. "But it rejoiceth in the truth." "Love heareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." And now, brethren in Christ, have we these characteristics, have we been instructed in the gospel of the kingdom; have we professed the one faith, and obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered; does that faith in us work by love, and purify our hearts? Are we uncompromising advocates of the truth as it is in Jesus? Are we willing for the love we bear him and our love to God, to take up the cross fearlessly, and confess his faith, even if it should cut off Father, Mother, Sister, Brother, or all our old associates? Are we willing to do this? To come out and be separate, (or holy?) If not we are not willing to comply with the first great commandment, to love God with an undivided heart. He does not ask of us halfway service, but whole-hearted obedience, and it were better for us never to have known the faith than to go but part way in its obedience. If then we find those who have ap-

parently very amiable and sympathetic dispositions, who may accuse us of making "Strait Jackets" and "Narrow Platforms," let us not esteem it a reproach; but as an acknowledgement of the truth of our position, knowing that Jesus has said, "Strait and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that go in thereat." Yes, it is so strait that the person who would go in must divest himself of the superfluous weights, that the will-worshippers and voluntary humility-ists, would load us with. The platform is wide enough for all who are willing to receive God's unadulterated Word to stand upon, but too narrow to uphold all the beggarly elements and machinery of the flesh, such as Revivalism, anxious bench piety, and all such artful delusions of the adversary. Upon that narrow platform of God's eternal truth let us stand firm, and immovable, and if we are not honored in this degenerate age, in the near approaching age of glory, we shall be honored with positions high and exalted in the administration of the affairs of the kingdom of God. MARK ALLEN.

March 5th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks.

Having ascertained that Christ was baptized 483 years after the 20th of Artaxerxes, we next propose the question, how long from the same period to his birth? 483 years, less his age, when he was baptized, will furnish the required information. His age at this time we obtain from the following testimony.—

"Jesus also being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, thou art my beloved Son in thee I am well-pleased. And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age." Luke iii. 21-23. 483 years less 30=453.

In corroboration of the above we submit the following.

PERIOD XII.

Embraces 453 years.

From the 20th of Artaxerxes, A. M. 3669, to the birth of Christ, A. M. 4122.

A. M.	Names and Events.	Ys.	References.
	BREAST & ARMS OF SILVER.		Rollin's Ancient History, vol. i.
3669	Artaxerxes from his 20th year,	21	page 278
3698	Xerxes II. reigned 45 days,	1	do. i. 278
	Sogdianus " 15 days,	1	do. i. 278
3699	Darius Nothus,	19	do. i. 315
3718	Artaxerxes Mnemon,	13	do. i. 464
3761	Artaxerxes Ochus,	43	do. i. 472
3784	Arses,	2	do. i. 472
3786	Darius Codomanus,	6	do. i. 543
	End of the Medo-Persian empire, having subsisted		

A.M.	Names and Events.	Ys.	References.
	for 206 years and 8 mo. from the beginning of the reign of Cyrus the Great.		
	BELLY & THIGHS OF BRASS.		
3792	Alexander the Great, "the great horn of the Goat," having conquered Darius at Arbela, and having taken Babylon, transfers the empire from the Persians to the Macedonians, in the fourth year of his reign. He reigned other eight years.	8	do. i. 576
3800	Era of the Seleucidæ begins.	12	do. ii. 25
3812	Ptolemy the Astronomer fixes the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy, King of Egypt, at 19 years after the death of Alexander the Great.	7	do. ii. 31
3819	Four years after which the the battle of Arbela was fought,	4	do. ii. 23
	Resulting in the division of the empire of Alexander among his four generals, represented by "The four notable horns of the goat."		
	SYRIAN NOTABLE HORN.		
3823	Seleucus Nicator,	20	do. ii. 39
3843	Antiochus Sotor,	19	do. ii. 634
3862	Antiochus Theos,	15	do. ii. 635
3877	Seleucus Calinicus,	20	do. ii. 72
3897	Seleucus Ceraunus,	3	do. ii. 635
3900	Antiochus the Great, having reigned 24 complete years, the 390 days of Ezekiel iv. 9 end,	24	
3924	He reigned other twelve years,	12	do. ii. 96
3936	Seleucus Philopator,	11	do. ii. 189
3947	Antiochus Epiphanes,	11	do. ii. 199
3958	Antiochus Eupator,	2	do. ii. 243
3960	Demetrius Sotor,	12	do. ii. 243
3972	Alexander Bala,	5	do. ii. 243
3977	Demetrius Nicator,	18	do. ii. 244
3995	Alexander Zabina, Cleopatra and Seleucus,	3	do. ii. 244
3998	Antiochus Grypus,	27	do. ii. 244
4025	Seleucus,	4	do. ii. 244
4029	Antiochus Eusebes, and Silene,	24	do. ii. 245
4053	Antiochus Asiaticus, the last King of the northern Horn of the Goat, dethroned by Pompey, in the 4th year of Aristobulus II. King of Judea. Here ends the empire of the Seleucidæ after a duration of 245 years.	4	do. ii. 245
	LEGS OF IRON.		
4057	Aristobulus II. reigns other two years.	2	do. ii. 274
4059	Hyrceanus II.	24	do. ii. 275
4083	Antigonus,	2	do. ii. 276
4085	Herod, the Idumean, began to reign 37 years before Christ,	37	do. ii. 277
4122	Christ born—Vulgar Era,	0	
	Total 453		

"After three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off."

Little need be said respecting the above, because of its indefiniteness, considered separately from the other portions of the prophecy. *How long after the three score and two weeks Messiah was cut off, will appear when we come to treat of the remaining parts of the prophecy.* Suffice it to say that it extends beyond the last period, for nobody can be cut off before they exist.

"And he (Messiah) shall confirm the covenant with many (of Daniel's people) for one week, and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."

This week is the complement of the seventy weeks. The sixty-nine weeks ended with the Messiah, so that the cutting off of Messiah must transpire some time in this week. Two distinct propositions are before us in the above quotation. First, MESSIAH confirms the covenant with many DURING THE ENTIRE WEEK.

Second, MESSIAH in the MIDST of the week causes the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. If it should be made to appear that the cessation of sacrifice and oblation resulted from Messiah's being cut off, and that this took place in the middle of the week, then the MIDST of the week is the END of the period "after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." This other result will also be a necessary consequence, MESSIAH confirms the covenant with many Jews for half a week AFTER he is cut off. This is at least a step in advance of the proposition gravely asserted, that MESSIAH confirmed the covenant half a week before MESSIAH EXISTED. All who give John the first half of the week necessarily endorse the above absurd statement.

We shall consider our second proposition first. MESSIAH in the MIDST of the week causes the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. In the 10th chap. of Hebrews we are plainly taught that the shadowy sacrifices of the law could not impart sinlessness of conscience, for it was not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin. "Wherefore, when he (Christ) cometh into the world, he saith, *Sacrifice and offering* (oblation) *thou* (Jehovah) *wouldst not*, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt offerings and sacrifice for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I (Christ) Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." The meaning of which we are told is, "He (God) taketh away the first (sacrifice and offerings for sin,) that he may establish the second," which is, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." Here then is the fact clearly defined which rendered useless sacrifice and oblation. But *Messiah* was to cause

these things to cease, and so he did. "But this man (Christ) after he had offered one sacrifice ('the body of Jesus Christ,') for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." "By this one offering he hath PERFECTED FOR EVER them that are sanctified." According to the common version, this cessation from sacrifice and offerings began in the middle of the week. Respecting the accuracy of the translation of the word "Midst," there is great diversity of opinion. It is well known that the common version was translated by forty-seven "scholars," who had all to come to an agreement. On the other hand some of the most eminent Hebrew critics maintain that it should be rendered "half." Generally, however, they have a theory at stake, to wit, the cross at the end of the week, with which the common version is antagonistic. This being the case what are we unlearned to do. Suppose we leave the learned to settle their difficulties amongst themselves, and ask the spirit whether "half" or "midst" is the correct rendering. We proceed to give the answer the Spirit has given to the question. First, then, sixty-nine weeks reach to the baptism of Jesus. At the time he became the "Lamb of God" which taketh away the sin of the world." This Lamb of God was slain in Egypt. "And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified," Rev. xi. 8. Jerusalem then is antitypical Egypt, and Jesus is the antitypical passover-lamb. Revert then back to the institution of the passover, and consider the lamb to be Christ. "In the TENTH DAY of this month they (the Israelites) shall take to themselves every man a lamb," Exod. xii. 3. "And ye shall keep it up until the FOURTEENTH DAY of the same month, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the EVENING," verse 6. From the TENTH to the FOURTEENTH DAY in the EVENING is HALF A WEEK, which added to the sixty-nine weeks lands us in the middle of the last week, giving us three years and a half for the ministry of Christ. This we believe was its true duration, because he was present at only four passovers; (John ii. 13-17; v. 1-9; vi. 4; Matt. xxvi. 17-30;) at the last of those passovers he was crucified, (John xviii. 28.) Also because of the message he sent to Herod—"Go ye and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to-morrow and the third day I shall be perfected," Luke xiii. 32. "Midst" then is the correct rendering.

We shall now consider our first proposition—MESSIAH confirms the covenant with MANY DURING THE ENTIRE WEEK. As the whole of the above week is inside of the Seventy weeks, its application must be confirmed rigidly to

the Jews. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy (Daniel's) PEOPLE." Christ came "to seek and to save that which was lost," Luke xix. 10. He was "not sent save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matt. xv. 24. He forbid the twelve from going "in the way of the Gentiles," Matt. x. 15. His death was for "the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament," Heb. ix. 15. He was "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made to the fathers," Rom. xv. 8, or "to confirm the covenant with many" of the circumcision "for one week." So the common PEOPLE heard him gladly," Mark xii. 3, and "among the chief rulers MANY believed on him," John xii. 42. "MANY of the Jews which came to Mary and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him," John xi. 45. These many did not cease from sacrifice—they sacrificed the passover lamb—neither did Christ—until the crucifixion, and we do not hear of them offering sacrifice after. But though the sacrifices ceased, the confirming did not.

The confirmation of the covenant with the circumcision was divided into two parts, each of three and a half years' duration. During the first half week Christ personally confirmed, and in the last he confirmed through his apostles. This division is plainly indicated in the following testimonies. "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord," second part, "and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." How? "God also BEARING WITNESS both WITH SIGNS, and WONDERS and DIVERS MIRACLES, and GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT," Heb. ii. 3, 4. The first part is even more clearly indicated in the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles. "The former treatise (Luke) have I made, O Theophilus, of all which Jesus BEGAN both to do and to teach, UNTIL the day in which he was taken up." Luke hen contains an account of the first half week's confirmation by Messiah personally. So does Mark, the title of which reason is, "The BEGINNING of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." The second part of the confirmation process is equally well defined. Luke as we have already indicated, makes the BEGINNING of what Jesus did, END at the time he was taken up. JESUS will FINISH that which he began to do. The beginning lasted three years and a half, and seeing that Jesus after he was Messiah was to confirm the covenant with many Jews for one week, we cannot do better than allot other three years and a half for the ending. Mark, after finishing his account of Jesus' personal ministry, ending at the same point as Luke, introduces us to the threshold of the second part in the following language,

"So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they (the eleven) went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and CONFIRMING the world (how?) with signs following," Mark xvi. 19, 20.

This continuance of confirmation was necessary, for the Jews had crucified their Messiah ignorantly, as Christ himself testifies, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." They had done that which God had "determined before to be done." Yet they did it with "wicked hands." In order to make them responsible for what they had done, their ignorance had to be removed. This was begun on the day of Pentecost, accompanied with the indispensable requisite confirmation. The result of one speech of Peter's was, that three thousand being pricked in their hearts, at the frightful enormity they had committed, anxiously enquired what they should do. Peter told them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins, with which they complied, and were added that same day to the church. Shortly after other five thousand who ignorantly killed the Prince of life had their understandings opened and believed the word. In this manner the Messiah confirmed the covenant with MANY Jews for three years and a half after he was taken up. But what about the vision of Peter—the conversion of Cornelius—and of Paul? *The terms of the prophecy exclude them. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people."*

We will now end at the point at which it has been usual to begin, verse 24.—"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people"—

- 1st. To finish the transgressions, and
- 2nd. To make an end of sins, and
- 3rd. To make reconciliation for iniquity, and
- 4th. To bring in everlasting righteousness, and
- 5th. To seal up the vision and prophecy, (margin prophet) and
- 6th. To anoint the most holy.

Extending beyond the seventy weeks, there is a period not defined in this place, during which the following events transpire. "The people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate," ver. 26, 27.

It does not become us to say whether or not "determined" conveys the idea contained in the original, but when Gabriel says, "seventy weeks are determined upon thy people,

and upon thy holy city," no other city than Jerusalem, and no other people than the Jews are admissible; and when we come to know that they were really abandoned at its expiration, it would seem to sanction the common rendering.

During the seventy weeks God dealt with the Jews and Jerusalem in the spirit of the following beautiful quotation. "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. BEHOLD YOUR HOUSE IS LEFT UNTO YOU DESOLATE," Matt. xxii. 37, 38.

At the end of the Seventy weeks Daniel's people and his holy city were abandoned, and they felt it, and acknowledged it at the next war they had, when Cestius Gallus, Vespasian, and Titus came against them, A. D. 67 to 70. This ended the indefinite period of verses 26 & 27 quoted above. We perceive there is in the margin an "improved rendering" of the phrase, "upon the desolate," viz., "upon the desolator." We reject the improvement, because the common version harmonizes better with the facts. We quote the passage again, and insert in parenthesis, remarks indicating that which we think the prophecy meant.

He shall make (the house) desolate for the overspreading (33 years after) of abominations of desolation, (one abomination, the Roman army under Cestius Gallus, which surrounded and attacked Jerusalem, but afterwards withdrew. This was in A. D. 67. The Christians recognized in this, the sign recorded in Matt. xxiv. 15, and fled to the mountains. The last abomination was the second Roman army, and final siege under Vespasian and Titus,) even until the consummation (in A. D. 70.) and that determined (the destruction of Jerusalem and captivity of its people) shall be poured upon the (already) desolate (house.)

The whole prophecy then will cover a period of 523 years, beginning at the 20th of Artaxerxes, A. M. 3669, and ending A. D. 70, or A. M. 4162. FRANCIS COGNILL.

For the Gospel Banner.

Weeping Rachel, &c.

MR. EDITOR—Dear Bro.:

Seeing several queries propounded for solution in No. 2 of the Banner, I venture to offer the following remarks, not knowing as to whether it may prove satisfactory or not, or whether the right view of the case may in all its aspects have been elucidated. But such as it is, I leave it to the inquirer's and to the reader's own judgments, hoping that abler minds may expone these matters yet further if need be, that all the light may shine which can.

W. S. KNIGHT of Indiana, asks, how he is to understand Jer. xxxi. 15-17 compared with Matt. ii. 16-18? Also Mark x. 13-16 with ix. 37?

The first of these texts reads as follows: "Thus saith the Lord: A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not. Thus saith the Lord; Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and thy shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." This portion of the prophecies of Jeremiah is quoted by Matthew and applied to the massacre of the infants under the age of two years in Bethlehem and its vicinity, by the cruel orders of Herod; to ensure (as he thought) the destruction of the infant Messiah, the new-born KING OF THE JEWS. This reads in the Common Version: "Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying: In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not." Matt. ii. 16-18.

In the New Translation, the *Emphatic Diaglott*, it is rendered: "Then Herod perceiving that he had been deceived by the Magians, was greatly enraged; and despatching emissaries he slew all the male children in Bethlehem and in all its vicinity, from the age of two years and under, according to the time which he accurately learnt from the Magians. Then was verified the word spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying: A voice was heard in Ramah, weeping and great mourning; Rachel bemoaning her children; and unwilling to be comforted, because they are no more."

These texts are almost invariably quoted as though Matthew meant to convey the idea that this portion of Jeremiah's prophecies was all fulfilled at the massacre of the infants of Bethlehem. And upon this ground, because that in Jeremiah there is a promise of comfort to weeping Rachel in that her children "shall come again from the land of the enemy;" the doctrine is inferred that a promise is here given of the *restoration to life again* of the little ones slain by Herod. The "land of the enemy" is said to be the grave, and therefore the *enemy* is Death, the last foe of mankind; and together, it signifies deliver-

ance from its captive bonds. If the prophet had any *special* or *primary* reference to this event—then this inference might hold good, and be a legitimate one, that these slaughtered babes shall be raised up from their premature graves. But it should be considered that Matthew only quotes the *former part* of this passage from Jeremiah, and does not apply those *promises* given by the prophet, to comfort the bereaved mothers of Bethlehem, as he ought to have done if it had had a special reference to this event. And there are several serious difficulties which we will present for those who hold to the above opinion.

1. Jeremiah says that 'the lamentation' was heard in *Ramah*, and does not mention Bethlehem. The first was in the tribe of Benjamin, Josh. xviii. 25; the second in that of Judah. It is true these two places were not very many miles apart, yet since they were *not* the same, why substitute Bethlehem?

2. Can it be demonstrated that the babes slain in Bethlehem were of *Rachel's* posterity, seeing that there had been so many captivities, and foreign nations introduced?

3. Is not the prophecy as given in Jeremiah, shown by the context to have more connection with Ephraim, (Joseph's descendants) than any other tribe?

4. Does it not seem altogether more applicable to the restoration of Rachel's children from a state of captivity and dispersion, than to the slain infants at Bethlehem?

5. Why does Matthew only quote and apply a part of this prophecy?

6. In what sense will these murdered boys "return to their own border?"

With regard to this last phrase, we may remark that those who advocate the above theory, do not often find it very convenient to look this expression full in the face, but generally evade it. It is a phrase that indicates *locality*. Will those who thus apply this prophecy, venture to assert that the children slain by Herod will come and live again in RAMAH? If so, will they come forth as babes or as full-grown men? Bear in mind that *it is taught on other occasions* by these same parties, that—

"Just as the tree's cut down, which fell
To north or southward—there it lies:
So man departs to heaven or hell
Fixed in the state in which he dies."

If this doctrine of *no change after death* be true—(setting aside the other ideas of the poet,) then it follows that these infants must "return to their own border" as *babes still!* And what then? We leave its advocates to make out the rest. These texts are quoted in this vague and loose manner, not only by sectarians in general, but also by many classes of Adventists who ought to know better. They seek first to have Jeremiah's prediction

all fulfilled in this event, so that they may be able to apply the *promises* given in the prophecy to the bereaved parents at Bethlehem; and then reason that if these infants are (as they say, but erroneously) promised a restoration to life, and that, eternal;—therefore all they of Adam's race who die in infancy will obtain the same by virtue of their innocence, helplessness, and non-accountability. But Matthew does not so apply it. He only quotes that portion which refers to the *lamentation*, and not that which contains the comfort. But whether there is any ground for this doctrine furnished by other portions of Holy Writ or not, we venture to affirm that no support for it can be legitimately drawn from this passage in Jeremiah, nor does it even have reference *primarily* to the murder of the infants at Bethlehem.

We will now state what we think is the evident meaning of both portions. And first, of the passage in Jeremiah.

The language quoted by Matthew occurs in the midst of a series of glorious predictions of the Restoration of Israel to their own land, with their glory and blessedness afterwards; which extends from the 30th to the 33rd chapters of this book. This (31st) chapter opens with promises of favor and love to outcast Israel, ver. 1, 3; the prosperous condition of the people and the fertility of their land in ver. 4, 5; the manner of their return, 7-9; an announcement to the nations of the Divine guardianship of Jacob, and the extraordinary blessing of his land, 10-14. Here I may remark, that when the terms Jacob and Israel are used interchangeably as in ch. xxx. 7, 10, 18; xxxi. 4, 7, 10, 11; and many other places where either term is used separately or in connection, they are to be understood as comprehending all the twelve tribes who sprang from the twelve sons of Jacob, *alias* Israel. But when the terms Israel and Judah are used either separately or coupled in the same connection, the former is to be understood as expressing the *ten* tribes, and the latter the *two* tribes alone. Ephraim was the chief of the Ten Tribes which constituted the Kingdom of Israel, and Samaria, the metropolis, was in the territory of that tribe; and both these terms are often put for the whole *ten*, like the phrase "Israel," in contradistinction to Judah, especially by the prophet Hosea. See Isa. vii. 2, 9, 17; Jer. xxxi. 2, 4-6, 18, 20, 21, 27, 31, and ver. 9. The prophets sometimes address one and sometimes the other, and often both conjointly, of these two great sections or "houses" into which the nation had been divided.

In verse 15, a sudden change is thrown in, which gives a striking effect to the passage. The prophet abruptly leaves the description of the people's happiness, to bring in a scene

of woe. By a sublime figure, Rachel—the beloved wife of Jacob, (and one of the two mothers who built up the house of Israel, (Ruth iv. 11,) who died and was buried near Bethlehem, (Gen. xxxv. 18-20,) is represented as having risen from her grave, after her children have gone forth into exile, and finding the land desolate, and her posterity not to be found, she bursts into a flood of passionate grief, filling Ramah with loud lamentations, utterly refusing to be consoled, till the Lord himself comforts her with two cheering promises and hopes. These are—1st, "Thy work shall be rewarded, * * * and they shall come again from the land of the enemy." 2nd, "And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." A promise and a hope, to each, or if you prefer, three promises and one hope, are held out to condole this disconsolate mother. After which the glorious strain of millennial felicity is resumed.

Now who were Rachel's children? From Gen. xxxv. 24, 25, we learn that they were Joseph and Benjamin—Rachel's *own*—Dan, and Naphtali by her maid, Billah. And as Ephraim and Manasseh, the offspring of Joseph, were adopted by Jacob, and became powerful tribes, they are to be reckoned in place of Joseph; thus making—Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh, Dan and Naphtali—*five* of the tribes of Israel, as Rachel's posterity, and especially the first three. These occupied the centre of the land, all except Benjamin, belonged to the kingdom of Israel or the ten tribes, after the division.

Where had Rachel's children, or these five tribes gone? Answer. Into captivity—in "the land of the enemy." What enemy was that, and where was his land? We find the answer in 2 Kings xvii. 6, 18-22; where we learn that four out of these five shared the common fate of all that had constituted the kingdom of Israel; and were carried away by the king of Assyria, and placed in certain districts of Media, from which dispersion they have never returned. And from chap. xxv. and Ezra i. 5, that Benjamin along with Judah, was taken captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar; from which but a part of them returned with Ezra and Nehemiah, and their descendants were finally dispersed by the Romans. So that nearly all of Rachel's children have been in exile since the Assyrian invasion. It is not requisite that they should have remained in the same country of Media, all the time, any more than that the "enemy" should be the same, for as "the balance of power" has passed from one race and one empire to another, so has Israel been "sifted" from land to land, as foretold in Amos ix. 9. So long as they are kept in exile and "Jerusalem trodden down by the Gentiles," so long

are they in a great measure under the *power* and in the *land* of the enemy.

But they shall be restored. The promises of their *second* exodus are scattered thick as star-gems through the prophetic pages. Of these, there are few that are more strikingly to the point than Zech. x. 6-12; ix. 13; Isa. xi. 11-13; and Ezek. xxxvii. This last cited chapter is its own best commentary and verification of the foregoing exposition. See also Jer. xxxi. 4, 5, 8-10, 21; xxxii. 44; xxxiii. 13, 14, 24, &c.

After the Lord has comforted the mother, by a natural transition he passes to Ephraim her descendant. He hears him penitently lamenting his waywardness like the prodigal son that he is, (ver. 18, 19,) to which Jehovah responds with more than a father's tenderness, 20, 21; Hos. xi, 8-11; xiv, 4, 5; Obad. 17-21. Thus we see that they shall be gathered back to Palestine, and if not to the identical sites they once occupied, yet many of them near to their former "BORDER," especially Benjamin.

Such then, will be Rachel's comfort. How glorious the time when this mother of Israel shall have risen from the dead, and beholds her children all brought home to their fatherland, after their long and weary wanderings. For, bear in mind, that she will *actually* rise *long before* they return! This fact therefore, may have more to do with the right apprehension of the text than most would imagine, or admit. We think it is *assumed* quite too readily, that the resurrected saints will not be subject to or sensible of the feelings and emotions that once animated them. But this we have not time nor space to reason out now. See Rev. vii. 17; xxi. 4.

But some will be ready to object that the foregoing exposition reflects upon Matthew as having mis-applied the prophet's words. To this we reply, that we would be far from impeaching the judgment of the inspired Evangelist! We trust that we have as great a reverence and jealousy for the honor and integrity of God's holy Word, as any one else, and have no favor for unbelief thereof by whomsoever manifested. Here then is an apparent discrepancy between the prophet and the evangelist. How shall they be harmonized? Infidels boldly charge some of the New Testament writers, and especially Matthew, with *mis-quoting* and *mis-applying* various portions of the Old Testament, (of which this is one) to serve their purpose in the New. And at first sight it does seem to be so. But knowing as we do, that all has come from the same Spirit, we can not, we dare not entertain for a moment what would be a reflection on him. The fault always lies in our own imperfectness of knowledge or comprehension. There must be harmony somewhere. Let us therefore

seek for an answer in a humble, teachable spirit,

This text in Matthew is one of a class which if we compare their connections in both Testaments, seem to be contradictory. Such is the one quoted in verse 15 of this (2nd) chapter: "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Here this is applied to Christ. But in Hos. xi. 1, from which it is taken, this language is used in reference to the exode of the Hebrews from Egypt under Moses. What then, is it a contradiction? By no means, for the language will equally apply to Israel and Christ, since both *did* come out of Egypt. The history, fortunes, and destinies of Israel and Jesus, so closely resemble each other, that the language affirmed of one can often be appropriately applied to the other. Because this is applied to Jesus by Matthew, it neither proves that Israel did not come out of Egypt, nor that it was predicted with special reference to Christ; for Hoshea's language is *not* a prophecy, and Matthew has simply *borrowed* a very appropriate sentence to illustrate a corresponding event in the life of Jesus, which was *like* a fulfillment of this sentence, *without its being the very thing* referred to by the prophet. So with the other. Will not the words in reference to the "lamentation" at Ramah, apply with great propriety and force to the cruel murder of these innocent children? Was not there "great mourning," "bitter weeping," and inconsolable grief then? Most certainly. So much so indeed, that Matthew borrows language from the prophet to depict the scene, as the most appropriate illustration thereof. It was therefore like a fulfillment yet *not* the accomplishment of the prophet's meaning. Then Matthew was justified in applying both these quotations as he does.

These citations belong to the class called *accommodated* quotations. We will here give in brief, a few remarks from Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*, vol. ii. pp. 438, 439.

"Accommodations are passages of the Old Testament, which are adapted by the writers of the New Testament to an occurrence that happened in their own time, on account of correspondence and similitude. These are not prophecies, though they are said sometimes to be *fulfilled*; for anything *may be said to be fulfilled* when it can be *pertinently applied*. This method of explaining Scripture by accommodation will enable us to solve some of the greatest difficulties relating to the prophecies. For the better understanding of this important subject, it should be remembered that the writings of the Jewish Prophets, which abound in fine descriptions, poetical images, and sublime diction, were the classics of the later Jews; and in subsequent ages, all their writers affected allusions to them, bor-

rowed their images and descriptions, and very often cited their identical words when recording any event or circumstance that happened in the history of the persons whose lives they were relating; providing it was *similar* and parallel to one that occurred in the times, or was described in the books of the ancient prophets. It was a familiar idiom with them when so doing, to say,—*that it might be fulfilled which was spoken* by such and such a prophet; not intending it to be understood that such a particular passage in one of the sacred books was ever designed to be a *real prediction* of what they were then relating, but signifying only, that the words of the Old Testament might be properly adapted to express their meaning, and illustrate their ideas. * * * The prophet Jeremiah, describing the miseries of captivity by a sublime figure, represents Rachel as deploring the loss of her children, bathed in tears, piercing the air with loud lamentations, and indulging inconsolable grief. When Herod imbrued his hands in the blood of the innocents in Bethlehem and its vicinity, how applicable were the prophet's words to such a cruel scene! and how happily are they cited by the evangelist, to exhibit to his reader the mourning caused by that sanguinary tyrant. They are a beautiful quotation, and not a prediction of what then happened: and yet, upon the murder of these babes, the sacred historian says, according to the Jewish phraseology, when they cited Scripture,—“*Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah.*” &c.

As Horne shows, such a quotation by the evangelist does not always prove that this was the thing intended by the prophet, neither should any one dogmatically build thereon. The *Emphatic Diaglott* renders it “*verified*” instead of “*fulfilled*,” but we humbly suggest that it would be best to read and understand all such accommodated citations thus: “*Then was an exemplifying of what was spoken,*” &c. And where there is no discrepancy, but harmonious *positive* accomplishment, as in Matt. 22, 23; *then retain the word fulfilled.* This would remove many difficulties.

So we do not see that these texts lend any support to the doctrine of Infant Salvation as they are often adduced to prove, which if there is any ground for, must be sought elsewhere. But as this is a subject to itself, we forbear to enter on it here.

The passage in Mark x. 14, reads in the *Diaglott*: “*Allow the LITTLE CHILDREN to come to me, and forbid them not, for to SUCH LIKE belongs the kingdom of God.*” The exposition usually given is, that our Lord refers to *such like*, not in stature, but in character or disposition. Thus in verse 15, and ch. ix. 34-42, we see this brought out more in detail, in which the humble, gentle, loving, confid-

ing, and forgiving disposition of children are made use of, as an example and reproof to older disciples. See also, 1 Cor. xiv. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 2, and others. In the First Epistle of John, Christians in general, are addressed by the venerable apostle, by the endearing words, “*Little children,*” though this *may* refer more specially to the youthful members of the flock. Even sectarian ministers themselves, give the same as the sense of these texts save when they have a purpose to serve. Yet there is an idea occurs to me that has both the advantage of being more easy and more literally in keeping with the narrative, whilst it does not clash with the above. Were not these children *old enough* to be *believers* in Christ? Who can say they were not? The common notion that they were mere babies is not necessarily correct. The child referred to Mark ix. 36, 37, 42, was a believer, for Jesus implies as much.* Children sang his praise in the temple, Matt. xxi. 15; and when we read of a Josiah fearing the Lord at the tender age of eight years, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 2, 3; a Samuel, and a Timothy, 1 Sam. iv.; 2 Tim. iii. 15; we have strong ground for this view. Many parents among our brethren, through laboring under the voluntary delusion that children cannot understand gospel truths till they are well through their *teens*, neglect their religious education; yet inconsistently enough, allow mentality to be crammed—precociously developed. This is *wrong*. If the moral and religious part is suffered to lie waste—if flowers are not planted there, then weeds and thorns will take their place. Christian parents see to it!

DELTA.

From the Crisis.

A Question.

“Did any of the early christian writers teach the total unconsciousness of man in death? If so, who? and in what language?” W.

ANSWER.

“The soul, O Grecians, is *not* IMMORTAL in its nature, but MORTAL. For it *dieth* and is *dissolved with the body*, if it be ignorant of the truth. But riseth again in the consummation of the world, together WITH THE BODY, suffering death in immortality itself by way of penalty and torment.”—Tatian, A. D. 172. *Oatio. Contra Grecos. Sec. 13, p. 59.*

“He (Tatian) fancied that the soul was dissolved with the body, and rose again with it at the resurrection. For as he makes *all* souls to die with the body, so he makes them

* Our correspondent, we think, has got a little astray from the record here. It is evident that the child mentioned in verses 36, 37 was a *little child*, for Jesus took him. (Gr. *it*, as applied to infants,) in his arms; and was different from the “*little ones*” which believe in me,” alluded to in ver. 42. Those “*little ones*” were disciples. See Matt. x. 42.—Ed.

all to rise again with it also."—*Dr. S. Clarke Letter to Dodwell.*

About A. D. 245, the Arabian Christians, where Paul had preached, were found to be entirely out of the line of false philosophy. "These asserted that, the human soul as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but was raised again at the time of the resurrection." And as a considerable council was held on account of this, Origen being again requested, likewise here discussed the point in question.—*Eusebius' Eccl. Hist. B. 4. ch. 37.* Observe:

1. These were called *heretics*, men who, like Paul, who had preached salvation in Arabia, worshipped after the way that men called "heresy."

2. This doctrine prevailed so much that "a considerable council" was held about it.

3. Origen had met the question before, for here "being again requested" he discussed the point in dispute.

4. The champion brought to teach the Arabian brethren to reject Christ's truth and receive heathen philosophy, was an old, half-converted *heathen philosopher*, who believed in the PRE-EXISTENCE of souls, (I think also their transmigration)—in the *restoration* of all *wicked men* and *DEVILS*; who brought more fooleries into the church than any other man who had lived, who interpreted one scripture so literally that he made *himself an eunuch* in his holy fanaticism, and who interpreted other scriptures so figuratively, as to spiritualize, not only almost all the Old Testament but even the *Egyptian midwives!* Exod. 1. He of course would be just the man to "spoil" the Arabians "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ," and of course on the spiritualizing principle could prove that life was death, and death life; sleep waking, and waking sleep; curse was blessing, and blessing curse; light darkness, and darkness light; good was evil, and evil good; sweet was bitter, and bitter sweet.

Enough. This is only a scrap from Old Paths, Part II. If the rest of that work is ever finished, more upon this subject will perhaps appear. Meanwhile I forbear, lest I should provoke the ire of some who are wiser than fourteen men that can render a reason; who deny all facts that they have not searched far enough to know; who teach the consciousness of the dead and prove it by quotations from *pseudo-Josephus*; who demonstrate that Luther taught consciousness in death (contrary to his own words) by large extracts from books that he never *verole, saw, or sanctioned*; who give us slices of bad translation from Justin Martyr, to prove that souls never die, and who settle forever the question as to

the character of *demons* by constant repetitions of a rash and *mistaken* ASSERTION of ALEXANDER CAMPBELL'S. From all such critics, "good Lord, deliver us." H.

For the Gospel Banner.

Brotherly Love.

Brethren, let us love one another, for it is God's commandment that we should love one another as He has loved us. It is impossible to please Him without it. "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love," 1 John iv. 7, 8. "Therefore if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. Let us all try that our love may be made perfect as sons and daughters of God, that we may all stand with boldness at the great day of judgment. Let us have pure love for one another, for "there is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment. He who feareth is not made perfect in love," v. 17, 18. If a man say I love God and hateth his brother, he is not speaking the truth, for he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen, v. 20, 21. "This commandment have we from Him that he who loveth God, love his brother also." If we do His will we must love one another; for we are all one in Christ, and heirs according to the promise. "Therefore let us not love in word only, but in deed and in truth." for by our works are we to be judged. "Faith without works is dead." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life." In this God showed his works, therefore let us do the same, as far as we can. Let us be as faithful as Abraham when he was commanded to take his son Isaac, and offer him for a sacrifice. He loved God more than all things else, heshowed faith with his works. We are not to love the world nor the things that are in it; "if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," 1 John ii. 15. We must not set our affections on things of the earth, but on heavenly things.

God is faithful to them that love him and obey his commandments. He says, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be obedient therefore and repent." His eyes are over us all the time. "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him," James i. 12.

Brethren, let us count it all joy when we are tried, for if we were never tried, we should not know how strong our faith was. God will reward us if we overcome the trials and temptations of this world. He will crown us with a glorious crown of immortality. Is it not

worth all we can do in this present age? and how thankful we ought to be for such grand promises. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is," 1 John, iii. 1-2. "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day and not to me only, but unto all those also who love his appearing." 2 Timothy iv. 8. I hope we shall all love his appearing, and be ready to receive the King. The Judgment day will come as a thief in the night, therefore let us be preparing every day. It will be an awful day for those who are not ready. Let us endure the troubles of this age, for it is but for a short time. I count the trials of this life as nothing in order to attain to that immortality. Let us hold fast to the end, and let works accompany faith.

South Northfield,

H. B.

Extracts of a Philadelphian's Letters from Syria.

JERUSALEM, July 1st, 1860.

When I came here in 1844, this city was in a miserable condition, streets crooked and dirty, houses poor and uncomfortable, business dull, and there was not a single building or improvement outside the Jaffa gate except the American cemetery. Now there are many new houses, a large school, gardens all walled in, with hundreds of thousands of olives, figs, vines and mulberries planted, roads and walks straightened, and stones gathered out, and many cisterns built, coffee-houses built in all directions, where all classes of people of all nations, go in the cool of the day to smoke naragalias and tontoons, with sartokia or tobacco, and the fumes of them wafting all around, under the shade of large terebinth trees, accompanied with the soft and delightful tunes of the cannon (a kind of horizontal harp,) and violin, and tamborines.

Forts and guard houses are now built all the way between here and Jaffa, within rifle-shot of each other. Within the walls of Jerusalem a person would hardly know it now, for streets have been straightened, new stores built, and business of all kinds revived. Large and beautiful churches, synagogues, hospitals, dispensaries, consulates of all nations erected, good hotels, large and fine dwelling houses built, in all directions, and over the streets, new and substantial arches have been sprung. Indeed rich men from Constantinople, Babylon, Bagdad, Damascus, Egypt, France, England, and from all parts of the known world, seem to be now vying with each other in the improvement of Jerusalem.

The "Great Eastern Question" is, and has been, who shall possess this land? Russia makes the first grasp, and possession is nine-tenths in law. It is certainly true that Russia has actually taken possession of, not a small piece of this city, but a piece quite as large, west of the Jaffa gate, as the present city is east of it, and is enclosing it with a high and strong wall, and is now engaged in building very extensively upon it.

The nephew of Louis Phillippe and suite, also Rothschilds, of Vienna, were here during the month of April last.

JERUSALEM, July 25th, 1860.

In a few weeks the Russians will have finished their great wall. There are twelve to fourteen hundred more of these ravenous and rapacious Northern bears expected here by the next steamer. The mother of the Russian Emperor will move at the same time. The Russians have their women to assist them in carrying dirt and stones. They build substantial and well, but in a very singular manner, their windows being eight to ten feet from the ground. Their building stones are squared and dressed well. They are extending and building up Jerusalem between one thousand and eleven hundred steps, or yards, (which is two-thirds of a mile) west of the main gate, building walls and houses, and digging out great cisterns for water; making roads, laying out gardens and walks, planting thousands of olives, pomegranates and mulberries. They have repaired the roads all the way from Jerusalem to Jaffa, (thirty-five miles) casting up the highway, preparing the way for the people by gathering out the stones. The Sultan has given the Emperor of Austria a firman to make a carriage road all the way from Jaffa.

He has built forts every half hour (which is $\frac{1}{3}$ miles) between Jerusalem and Jaffa, which will make thirty-five or thirty-six in number, all of them looped (holed) with cannon holes, so that the whole distance can be reached by the best rifle or cannon shot. They are now blowing rocks, and making another carriage road from Jerusalem to the Convents of the Cross and St. John, and have got it partly walled and finished. They build the walls about four feet thick, and edge each side with large dressed stones, and fill the middle full with small stones; and strange to say this is all done by strangers, to a man; not a single Jew have I seen engaged in the whole work, much as they desire work at this dear time.

☞ Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit: but the upright shall have good things in possession.—*Solomon*.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign, for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., APRIL 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 8.]

The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

A LECTURE BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, LONDON,
CANADA WEST.

Being a reply to the Westminster Review, No.
135, Article 5.

Delivered before the Young Men's Christian In-
struction Society of London, March, 1860.

CONTINUED.

II. We come now to consider briefly the
PROOF THAT JESUS ROSE FROM THE DEAD.

A resurrection is an astonishing event, yet it involves no contradiction. The Author of life can, if he deems it wise, rekindle the flame. There are things of which it is safe to affirm that they can never appear within the confines of the possible; such as, a rainbow in the absence of light, and a circle the diameter of which shall be greater than its circumference. But the human mind too frequently rests not content with excluding the contradictory; in many instances that which now forms a portion of the actual, and facts to awaken surprise, was for years enrolled under the head of impossibilities. Indeed, among the many valuable lessons taught as the ages move forward is this one;—to be remarkably cautious in affirming what has not been, and what cannot be. Any morning the pompous oracle may find to his humiliation, that the wildest fancies have become sober realities. Even the wonders of nature have ceased to be marvelous, merely because they are familiar; but if any one should, for the first time, be presented with an egg and told that out of such came yon Condor floating above the Andes and clouds; or an acorn, and informed that similar was the origin of the oak under whose wide-spreading branches the conversation was held, and it seems to me inevitable, that the hearer would rotate his neck in hopeless skepticism.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ was a singular phenomenon, yet not altogether unexampled in anterior authentic history. Though extremely singular, though an event

by no means likely to occur, let us admit with candor that evidence could make it credible by the human intellect. Affirm that no amount of evidence can establish, and then have we not dogmatism as to proof exactly analogous to the ostracised dogmatism as to fact? We admit that the more extraordinary the occurrence, the more ample and the more cogent the proof must be: but to exclude any fact or incident from the archives of terrestrial history by simply declaring it incapable of confirmation by human testimony, is to trample on the first axioms of a sound philosophy, and to beggar the world by contracting the bounds of legitimate inquiry.

Our Lord was buried in the manner already described; and we are now waiting for the issues of the third day, so frequently commented on by himself. Let us picture the scene. We find ourselves in a garden outside of the ancient city, about four o'clock in the morning: from the west the moon is flooding the hills and valleys with its mellow beams; many strangers are sleeping beneath the olive trees, or on the open ground, for the passover has brought myriads to Jerusalem, who can obtain no accommodation within its limits. There, a little way in the distance, is a rocky tomb in which the Savior reclines, closely enveloped in the linen and the shades of death: what an immense stone is placed against the door—ten men are likely unable to shift it from its seat. But we dare not approach nearer the sepulchre, for a band of stern Roman soldiers, armed to the teeth, have charge of the tomb, and defy mortal to touch the seal: their swords and helmets glisten in the moonbeams, and we distinctly hear the tramp of sentry on his beat. Some of the guards are leaning against the rock; others are engaged in conversation while reclining on the grass. Every eye is vigilant; every hand ready for a soldier's work. Friend or foe steal the body in these circumstances! As well may we conceive an infant lifting the stone and pitching it into the Mediterranean, some forty miles away. But lo! what

a blaze of light suddenly bursts forth close to the sepulchre; all around is illumined as by day. The keepers rush from their posts, but, overcome with terror, drop like men suddenly struck dead. Enveloped in light more beautiful than morning, an angelic being of majestic stature, rolls aside the stone without an effort, and Jesus leaves the vault clothed with the radiance of health and the grandeur of immortal being. "The Lord has risen indeed."—Let us return to the city and meditate in our hearts on the glorious events of which we have been spectators.

The Reviewer gives no explanation of this celestial ambassador: had he done so he probably would have delivered himself to the effect, that instead of an angel from heaven, it was an eagle from the mountains of Lebanon, which had come to sharpen his bill in Joseph's garden; and that during the alarm of the soldiers, Jesus, who had been re-animated by the cordials, pushed open the door and made his exit. After the same manner we doubt not this literary worthy would maintain that the transfiguration was done by moonshine; the thousands said to have been miraculously supplied were biologized into the conviction that they had eaten their dinner; and every other Biblical phenomenon would be accounted for with equal skill.

It was not suitable to the Reviewer's ends to exhibit the fact, that when some of the watch fled into the city, and reported what had occurred on Joseph's property, the high priests and elders bribed them to affirm that while they slept the disciples of Jesus came by night and stole him away. Here were two gross blunders which his enemies committed. (1.) In supposing that the disciples of Jesus could have any motive, by stealing his body, to feign that he had been resurrected, when they never understood him to affirm that he would rise again. (2.) Another blunder was in making the soldiers testify as to what occurred while they were asleep. The poor men were corruptible, but it was disgraceful for the hierarchy to convert them into fools. In spite of the exertion of the officials, the truth was disclosed, for the whole company had not been bribed; and the rest of them would unquestionably dilate on the prodigy, and, as heathens, most likely rejoice at the interpositions of the Gods, as they would explain events, on behalf of one, who had been inhumanly treated by his own countrymen. Unfortunately for their cause, the priests neglected to tie the other tongues with the golden chain: their loss, however, was the world's profit.

In estimating the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus Christ, it must never be forgotten that the chosen witnesses—the eleven Apostles—were the most incredulous

of men. Nothing but ocular and tangible demonstration had any effect on their minds. Thomas was not convinced till his Master said to him:—"Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing." Their very doubts—their extreme caution—their lack of confidence in each other's word when the burden of the speech was, "the Lord is risen:" all these circumstances mightily enhance the truth of their individual and conjoint asseveration.

And here it seems judicious to press the fact into notice, that the resurrection of Jesus was a literal and not spiritual one: he appeared as the conqueror of the grave, not a shadowy, impalpable thing; on the contrary, he was no less tangible than before his death. As we have just noted, he invited Thomas to handle him, and so gather assurance that he was no apparition: on another occasion he said to his disciples, who were alarmed by his sudden entrance into their company: "*handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.*"

Some inconsiderate Christian writers have contended that the resurrection body of Jesus was ethereal; and taking advantage of this admission, the Reviewer insists that identification was a hopeless matter to his friends. The impalpability or non-materiality, is based on the imaginary fact that he, on several occasions passed through doors and walls, after the manner of heat and the electric fluid. But the sacred writers never declared that he passed through these solid obstacles. We read that he unexpectedly stood in their midst, the doors being shut for fear of the Jews, but surely though the doors were locked, he who could quell the storm, and reanimate the dead, must have found it an easy matter to make a bolt retire, and a door turn on its hinges. In this way, we apprehend, his entrance was effected, and no more miracle was required.

The Reviewer obviously rates the following extract from Greg's "*Creed of Christendom*" as a master-piece of argumentation:—

"A marked and most significant peculiarity in these accounts, which has not received the attention it deserves, is, that scarcely any of those who are said to have seen Jesus after his resurrection *recognized* him, though long and intimately acquainted with his person. After that he appeared in another form to two of them. Now, if it really was Jesus who appeared to these various parties, would this want of recognition have been possible? If it were Jesus, he was so changed that his most intimate friends did not know him. How then can *we* know it was himself?"

In answer to all this I have to submit three remarks. *First*,—those to whom he first pre-

sented himself had not the least expectation of ever seeing him again; not one friend appears to have had faith in his resurrection, though as already noticed, he repeatedly foretold it during his ministry. His enemies, it is a singular fact, understood him well, and knowing the import of his words, determined to show how great an impostor he was. *Secondly*. There must have been an immense change in his appearance after his resurrection: he awoke not the same as when he fell asleep on Calvary. His disciples remembered him as weary, now he was vigorous; they remembered him as "the man of sorrows," now his eye was radiant with heavenly joy; they remembered him as being more "warred than any man," now they beheld a countenance from which every wrinkle was banished; they remembered him as a child of mortality, he now stood before him in the loveliness of perennial existence. He appeared first to Mary, and she did not recognize him: the outward was transformed; but as soon as his voice filled her ears, she knew him at once. "Jesus saith unto her, Mary"—it sounded just as it had lovingly sounded before. "She turned and saith unto him Master." The human voice comes loaded with character: the visage alters with years and health; but the tone of the voice outlives the external signs of identity. "The voice," said the venerable Isaac, "is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

Finally, though they had some difficulty in recognizing him at first, they were all at length convinced that it was the same Jesus who on divers occasions, within forty days, presented himself before them. Not one attendant, and they were a skeptical band, pronounced the evidence of identity insufficient, and as a natural result, withheld homage from him who claimed to be his risen Lord. With one heart they loved him supremely; with one voice they paid him reverence; and if they, with such opportunities for examination were satisfied of his identity, the demand is not unreasonable that we, so far down time, should repose confidence in their testimony.

TO BE CONCLUDED IN NEXT.

"Come over and help us"—a loud and urgent call.

In the month of January, amongst many communications of a varied character, we received the following. We insert this letter in full, that our readers may be benefitted and interested by its perusal.

Louisiana, Mo., Jan. 15th, 1861.

DEAR FRIENDS:—Not Cornelius and his household, but another man with all his house, was fasting a short time ago, to know the will of the Lord, and the way that leadeth

to life eternal, and the door into that Kingdom which is to come; when, though we saw no angel, yet we seemed impressed with the idea, send to, (not to Joppa for a Peter,) but to another place, for there are those abiding there who have the words of eternal life, hear ye them. And now, my dear friends, "whatsoever God hath cleansed call not common or unclean;" for we have long been searching the holy scriptures to know God's holy will concerning us, and we still feel to say that which Peter did, that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God is excepted of him." We have for a long time followed the people called Mormons, and after the strictest sect of that religion, like Paul, we have lived Pharisees; but on searching the scriptures more clearly, we find ourselves like one of the seven churches of Asia, whom Jesus addresses thus: "I know thy works, and thy labors, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil: and thou hast tried them that say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: and hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted. Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place except thou repent." This we have, however, that we despise office and office-seeking in this present state of existence, but would like Abraham of old seek a country where kings and priests may abound to the glory of God. And while we pray we feel the deep impressions of the spirit of truth, thy prayers and thine alms have come up before me, now send a letter to Geneva, to one Thomas Wilson, he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do. And now this household are united as one in writing this letter to you. And when this reaches you, if you are on your house top and it is the sixth hour, and you are very hungry, remember whatsoever God hath cleansed call not common or unclean, but on the morrow, take certain of your brethren and come unto us, and we will call together our friends to hear the words of eternal life, and will give you a scriptural reason of our faith, and of our calling for you. Our household is eight in number, the others sleep; some six or seven we trust are able to obey from the heart that form of doctrine spoken of in the scriptures of divine truth, and are waiting only for a Peter to arise, and say, who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who look for all nations to be blessed in Abraham's seed. One of the *Gospel Banners* was sent to us some time ago, which we have purused with

much gratification. It was sent from my brother and his wife in Iowa, Ira and Sarah Potter. We expect as they take the *Banner*, to receive all back numbers, and all those in time to come from them, as we claim the promise, the poor have the gospel preached to them—without money or price. We have forsaken all to follow the Redeemer of the world, and like him have not where to lay our heads, and can call naught our own, save the promises of God to the honest in heart. We care but little about this world's goods, for we have learned long since that affliction worketh patience, and to take joyfully the spoiling of our goods on account of his most holy name. We are alone. We have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. We have many things to say, which time and paper would fail me to mention here. As I said before, we are poor and helpless—no team nor money, else we would come to you. We would not be inactive in any good word or work, but poverty forbids us to make a move at present, save by writing to you, and we want to be initiated into that kingdom which is to come, that we may with unshaken faith lay hold on the promises made to faithful and wise stewards. We wish to become heirs together with Christ to that inheritance, the center of which is Mount Zion, and the capital city Jerusalem, whose territory is the land of Canaan, and the dominion shall be under the whole heaven. In this way we wish to lay aside our poverty, by being adopted members of that most holy band, the body of Christ. We feel there is a famine in the land, not for bread, nor for water, but for hearing of the words of God in its ancient purity.

And now, dear friends, if there are any among you who feel for the welfare of souls, come over to Missouri and help us. We feel if once we could be made heirs of the covenant of peace, and live among God's chosen people, our longing hearts would be at ease, while thus founded on the rock Christ Jesus, and feel a holy calm, while the desolating scourges pass over the earth to make room for the reign of peace which is to come. Please answer this letter immediately, and be sure to come.

ANGELINE ANDRUS PAGE.

On the reception and perusal of the above, we were much impressed with the want of more efficient means for rendering assistance in such cases. Bro. T. Wilson did not feel able to answer the call; and even if he had, the means were wanting to pay expenses. In the meantime brethren in this vicinity were consulted, and the opinion expressed by all was,—*some one ought to go*. Also a letter was sent to the parties from whom the application came, making more particular inquiry as to their antecedents, their present

and future prospects, the neighborhood in which they resided, etc. In about four weeks after the first letter was received, the following came to hand, which we here copy.

Louisiana, Mo., Feb. 13th, 1861.

DEAR BRO. WILSON—if you will permit me to call you brother. I received yours yesterday, which brought great consolation to us, although it found us bathed in sorrow and deep mourning. What shall I say to you, since I wrote you, my eldest daughter has been snatched by death from our circle. Her age was fourteen years seven months and four days. Oh dear brother, (for such relation I intend soon to claim with you by the rule of adoption,) nature mourns, her comforts fled, and withered all her joys; nor do I know how to hope for future consolation, as regards my child. When I wrote to you she was able to be about the house, and was greatly desiring to get the *Banners* from her uncle in Iowa, which she lived in great anticipation of reading, and looking up the passages in the Bible referred to by them. She counted almost the hours that should bring some one from you to us that we might be baptized. She was reading the Bible through by course to find the true promises made to Abraham, and the boundaries of the promised land. She had taken her atlas and looked out and located in her mind the inheritance of the saints; but, oh! alas! on Friday, the 18th of Jan. she was taken with congestive chills, and in the third chill she expired, or fell asleep in death. When she was first taken she said to me, "Mother, I shall die, I cannot live; but oh, cried she, "if God will but spare my life this once, I will try to be more attentive to search the scriptures than I ever have done before." In the agony of distress, (for her suffering was intense,) she cried, "Oh, let me go home, to my long home, where sickness, sorrow, nor pain can never enter." She was delirious for the most of the time, but on coming to herself at one time, she said, "O Mother, where shall I find Christ;" and at another time, she said, "I want to go to Asia Minor." I asked her, why. She said, "because Christ used to be there, and he will be there again." She was baptized by the people called latter day saints when she was a child eight years old; but as I did not recognize that faith as valid any longer, neither did she, and expressed an anxiety to yield to all the requirements of the law of Christ. We then believed baptism was essential to salvation, and believed the promises made to Abraham, as we do now, but we were deceived in regard to the priesthood they professed to hold; so you see the state of my mind regarding my child.

Now, my dear brethren or friends, I will try to relate to you in my imperfect way my

anxiety. I have already told you, one of our number is less, and another has been married to a man, called by some a Campbellite, and others Christian. She is now very sick with a fever, perhaps never to recover. So you see our household is reduced to six; but nevertheless we have only a stronger desire to become obedient to the true faith as it is in Christ Jesus, and to put on the whole armor of God.

Dear brother, (perinit me to say so seeing I desire salvation as well as you,) I will try to answer your kind inquiries, after returning to you my sincere thanks, and warmest gratitude, for the packages received from you, which we acknowledge as containing eternal truth, the glad tidings, which causes us to rejoice even in affliction. You wished me to give you a few particulars about my former history. I am the daughter of Alanson and Selphina Potter, I was married to a man 34 years old, when I was but a child of 14 years and 8 months, contrary to the wishes of my parents, consequently it like all other disobedience became productive of evil, of which I have not space here to speak particularly. Suffice it to say, from my earliest recollection I was always very desirous to be saved in the kingdom of God, and as misfortune so ordered, I did not consider the strength of sin attached to disobedience to parents, although I do not attach all the blame of my youthful rebellion to myself. My husband and I lived together in friendly terms, while I suited myself to the forms and customs of the world, for as yet I had never united with any creed or sect, but being naturally inclined to want to know something about my future state, I would often mention the subject to him, but never without persecution. He was a man of morality, yet not of piety; however, he did oppose me very much at first. At the tender age of 19 we rented our farm and moved to Chicago, Ill., where we became acquainted with the people called Mormons; one of the elders boarded with us, we did not know his faith however, but he taught so much Bible doctrine I thought proper to inquire what church he belonged to; he said, the church of Christ. This was curious to me, as I was not used to hearing of a church by this name. I said immediately, I would like to belong to such a church. His answer was to make himself known as an elder. This gave my husband no small uneasiness; but as faith was the object in question I commenced in defence of what I considered to be faith and truth. Here my wild career commenced. I insisted on my being immersed into Christ's church, or to put on Christ, in the waters of baptism. My arguments were good, and had the doctrine of these usurpers been as good, I should

doubtless have been with them now a very happy woman. But alas! how changed the scene! I felt willing to lay aside my good name among the Gentiles, to be counted a fool for Christ's sake and his cause. I believed the church was to be built on the foundation of apostles and prophets, and was very zealous for the same, and accordingly gathered to Beaver Islands. Now I tell you I was an honest believer in that faith, and lived to that and that alone. Shortly after we went to Beaver Islands, my husband was immersed, but soon after became disaffected and left; but it being the faith of the church that a brother or a sister was not bound, if the unbelieving saw fit to depart, I concluded to stay with the people of God, as I firmly believed them to be, choosing rather to suffer affliction with them, than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. It may be well to state that previous to my husband's departure we sold our possessions in Ill., and brought the income, as we termed it, and laid it at the apostles' feet. We owned a house and lot in Elgin, Kane Co., Ill., and the most beautiful farm in Lake Co. was in our possession, but all was now sold, and the money brought that the saints of God might be one in temporal things, as well as spiritual. You must understand this people join themselves together in households for the purpose of being scaled into the tribes of Israel, so we joined ourselves to brother Page, he becoming the head of the household. We had the promise by our prophet that the kingdom of God there set up was never to be thrown down, nor given to another people; but soon our kingdom was divided against itself, and consequently the saying of our Savior must be verified; it could not stand, but must fall, and dreadful was the fall. My husband had left me with three children. The mob came, and drove us from our remaining property; but the justice of God demanded that we should suffer. I repine at neither justice nor judgment, but thank God that he has left me still on praying ground, and has not altogether given me up to believe a lie, that I should be damned. Our sufferings were great beyond the power of pen to describe, nor would I regret if it had proved to have been for the true Messiah, but like Paul, we verily thought we were doing God's service, but as it were great scales have fallen from our eyes.

When we left our Island-home we went to Chicago, half insane, and without the necessary comforts of life. I still remained in the household to which I was joined, concluding that we might suffer with each other, as we had vouched to be each other's friends. In Chicago, we buried two of our children; they were infants. Then confused and half-

distracted we left Chicago for Iowa to visit our friends, which I had formerly forsaken, with my good name and living. We begged assistance from the County to help us on our way, expecting to try to procure land at government price, by way of preemption; but we found things very different from our anticipation. Our friends in Iowa had embraced a new faith, which they presented to us, but we were all sick, for coming from a northern climate to Chicago had fitted us for disease and death. We were filled with Mormon delusion, and the feebleness of our bodies forbid us to investigate the truth, as we should otherwise have done. Some of my friends believed in one thing, and some another, they were divided among themselves; and the believing part began to think our case hopeless. We do not wish to charge them with wrong, yet we think they did not fully arm themselves with charity, nor take into consideration fully the fearful dilemma from whence we were just emerging. I do not wish to treat much on this subject. I had embraced Mormonism it was true, which had excluded me from the confidence of my friends. My faith in my religious views were blasted, and this was my greatest trouble, I now felt that all was lost forever and I would now prefer to die anywhere than beneath the frowns of my kindred, so I sold my last feather bed to pay my way to Dunleith. We had buried another child in Iowa. When I say we, I mean the whole household to which I belong. Soon after I left Iowa, Mr. Page and family followed me. They were all sick. I now had two children and myself to provide for among strangers, and all of us sick with the chills and fever.—no bed to lay on but leaves put into a straw tick. Mr. Page's people were with me once more, and finding it impossible to procure a living in Dunleith, we concluded to join together and starve ourselves to get money to build a flat boat, which cost about ten dollars, and we floated down the Mississippi River to Louisiana, which is situated on the bank of this River, 50 miles below Quincy. * * * If it was possible for us to earn the money to send to you we would go out washing, or do anything by way of labor to bring you hither, for we count not our lives dear unto ourselves if so be we can obtain admittance into God's everlasting kingdom. Mr. Page is the only male member belonging to our family, and he has been sick ever since we left home till last fall, when he began to recover, and has been working to get him a yoke of oxen to go somewhere to procure him a home. Since I wrote to you he has finished paying for them. The Slave States do not like free people to live with them, and we do not wish to take up sword

against our neighbors, so we want to remove to a free State. We do not know what to do, and care but little that so we obtain salvation. * * * We have taken great pains to distribute your tracts among our neighbors. We want to have public lectures, and think we can get a liberal hearing; the sects here are of various kinds, and if any one be the most predominant it is the Campbellite. We do not know as to the the truth, whether they have ever heard whether they be any truth or not, and we have considered that we had need to be taught, rather than teach the truth, for we acknowledge that wherein we ought to be teachers we have need that some one give us the unadulterated milk of the word.

Now, Brethren, I told you what God has cleansed call not common and unclean. Remember how much rejoicing there is in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, and here are more than one. Arise, and come, and God speed you on your way. We want you to pray God to keep us alive until you can find some means to send us a kind messenger of truth to induct us into the true vine. Make no delays, but arise and come before the night of death overtake us, and we shall hear the words of the great Judge in the last day, "yet one thing thou lacketh." It seems to us if we can but just live to behold the face, or have the privilege of washing the feet of one of the true disciples of Jesus once in this life, we can say with old Simeon, "now let thy servants depart in peace." Oh if you could but conceive for one moment the anxiety that pervades our lonely bosoms, you would arise and come without delay. We want to see the face of one who brings glad tidings of things to come. We are strangers in a strange land. You may think we are getting in a hurry all at once; but we are not. We have just become thoroughly convinced of the truth, and we fasted and prayed that God will not suffer us to be deceived any more, for misspent time cannot be recalled. I have already wearied you. I wish my paper was larger I would tell you more. Do not wait so long before you write. ANGELINE ANDRUS PAGE.

With such an appeal as the foregoing we could no longer resist. Many things conspired against our leaving home, at this time particularly. Having always a certain amount of work on hand connected with the *Diaglott* and *Banner*, and being considerably behind time, as well as out of health, we were anxious for some one else to fill the appointment. But now it was time that something must be done. Accordingly we sent word that some one might be expected in a few days; and on Thursday, Feb. 28th, we stepped on

board the cars at Batavia for Quincy, at which place we arrived a little after midnight. As there is no connection between Quincy and Louisiana, except by boat, we had to wait for a down boat from Keokuk, which arrived about 11 A. M. We took passage, but did not leave Quincy till after four P. M. on account of having to take in so much freight, consisting of Pork, Lard, and Corn for the southern market. At a little past midnight we were put on shore at Louisiana, Mo., and with another fellow-traveler were led by a colored man to the "Hotel," where we found comfortable, though homely lodging for the night. In the morning, after breakfast, we took our valise, and followed the directions sent. After a walk of nearly an hour, we found the humble domicile of our anxious friends, some 2½ miles west of the River. We received a cordial welcome, and though perfect strangers to each other, yet the common faith we had soon made us banish all feelings of restraint, and find pleasure in an interchange of thought. We felt that death had made an inroad upon a very poor, but intelligent family, and that this bereavement had made its mark. The writer of the foregoing letters was well nigh prostrated. The watching and anxiety attending her daughter's illness, followed by her sudden death, had given a shock to her already shattered nerves, almost too great for her to sustain. And now the delay experienced in realizing the greatest desire of her heart, connected with the fact of her rapidly declining health, caused her to think that, like her daughter, she too would die without a chance of obeying the law of faith in baptism.

After a few hours' conversation arrangements were made to hold a meeting in the evening, and for the immersion to take place Sunday morning at about 9 o'clock A. M. The neighbors were informed that a stranger would speak at Mr. Page's house at "early candlelight;" and as some of them had already been made acquainted with the object of our visit, quite a number turned out to hear. We spoke to the people on the importance of receiving and adhering to the apostolic word—even "the word of faith" which they preached, and showed them that no other word could be safely relied on for salvation. At the close of the meeting, we announced, that as the object of our visit was known to some of them, the immersion of our friends was appointed to take place at 9 o'clock the following morning. And that if they chose to attend we would speak to them on the subject of baptism.

We learned that some of the neighbors thought it strange that our friends should attach so much importance to immersion, and appear to be so anxious about it, and yet

never apply to the parties in the immediate vicinity who would gladly have served them. The Baptists recommended their minister, and the Campbellites theirs. To this their reply was, they could not consistently ask *unbelievers* to do the work of a disciple; and therefore they had written for a disciple to come and administer the rite. Though, perhaps, in some urgent and particular cases, it might be right for an unimmersed *believer* to baptize a believer at his or her request, yet where a proper person can be obtained, it is best to follow apostolic precedent. That the validity of baptism consists in the faith and disposition of the subject, rather than in the *administrator*, we are ready to admit; but it does not seem appropriate to the institution, nor according to the teaching and practice of Christ and his apostles, for unbelievers or disobedient believers, to have any participation in this work.

Sunday morning, March 3rd was ushered in with thunder, lightning, and rain, ending with a snow storm. Snow fell heavily for several hours, which interfered with our arrangements somewhat. The rain had made the roads very bad, so that only few persons turned out. About noon, the storm having passed, we proceeded to a Creek, perhaps two thirds of a mile distant, conveyances having been kindly furnished by some friends to take the parties both to and from the water. There we buried four persons in the likeness of Christ's death, and raised them from the tomb of waters to walk in newness of life. Then like the Eunuch they went on their way homeward, rejoicing.

In the afternoon we all partook of the emblematic bread and wine in memory of Jesus, and had truly a refreshing season. We sung, we prayed, we read the scriptures, and spoke to each other; and though we were only a few of the poor of this world, met in a log cabin, yet we trust "the Lord hearkened and heard," and that something will be noted down to our account in his book of remembrance.

Another meeting was held at "early candlelight," and had a good attendance. The subject of the previous evening was enforced, and connected with "the promises made to the fathers"—"the Gospel preached to Abraham"—and "the faith once delivered to the saints." There is little doubt but some present saw things in a new light, as they seemed interested in the things presented. On Monday and Tuesday evenings we still further elucidated the subject by opening up the prophetic Word relating to Messiah and his kingdom, as the means through which the glad tidings announced to the fathers would be fully realized, and a glorious reign of peace and righteousness established, which would

continue for one thousand years. We also showed that "without *faith* it was impossible to please God"—*faith* in the promises of God. Faith has an intimate relationship to hope, in fact is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." But if the future things concerning Christ and his kingdom made known to us in the Bible, which form the glad tidings published for salvation by the apostles, are not apprehended, then indeed, there can be no faith. The faith of religious people in general is altogether another thing than this. Hence when we speak "none other things than what Moses and the Prophets did say should come," like Paul did when he preached the Gospel, we are looked upon as a setter forth of strange doctrines.

At the close of the meeting, Tuesday evening, a gentleman who had only been present about half the time, took the liberty to ask a few questions. This person we afterwards learned, was a Rev. Mr. Rice, stationed in Louisiana over the Campbellite Church there. Some of the said organization had been interested listeners for a few evenings previous, and probably had invited their minister. May be they thought that he would be able to detect heresy somewhere, and expose it. The questions he propounded indicated this. The doctrine of the kingdom was too hard for him to receive. It did not exactly harmonize with his Campbellite notions of the kingdom being set up on the day of Pentecost. And he also thought he had made a discovery which his flock had failed in making, viz. that we were all *soul-sleepers*. Having ascertained this, as he thought to his satisfaction, he denounced us in unmeasurable terms, and warned the people against such persons and doctrines. This gentleman, as is common with such like persons, seemed to think that declamation was argument, and that assertion was proof. We announced, as a setoff to his remarks, that on the following evening we would speak on the nature of man and his destiny, and endeavor to show the Scripture doctrine concerning souls and their salvation; and invited all to attend. Wednesday was the last day we purposed spending in Missouri, and consequently this would be the last meeting we could hold with the people. As it happened it was perhaps just as well that it was so, for when evening came, there was a diminished attendance. The preacher's advice had been reduced to practice. Some of those present got more Bible doctrine on the non-immortality of the soul than they were prepared to receive; so they took refuge in the usual objections, such as, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Paul being absent from the body, and present with the Lord, &c.

How strange it is that men's minds should be so blinded, as to think that the *plain* and *positive* declarations of the Word of God, can be set aside by the *obscure* and *infractical* portions! It may truly be said of this generation as it was of the Jews by Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul,— "Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive. For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

On Thursday morning, after taking leave of the brethren, we turned our face homeward, with the intent to leave for Quincy on the first boat. On arriving at the Levee we found that the regular boat would not pass Louisiana till about four o'clock the following morning, though a transient one might pass during the day. As time was likely to pass away unimproved, and at the same time to drag heavily, we decided to retrace our steps, and spend a few hours more in the society of our friends. Another hour found us seated with them busily employed shelling corn, and conversing on sundry interesting topics. Bro. Page and family had resolved to leave Missouri for Northern Illinois as soon as he could make the necessary arrangements. In order to accomplish this he had been working very hard during the winter; exchanging his labor for a yoke of oxen and an old wagon, by means of which he intended to remove his family in the Spring. He was now preparing for the journey, and if nothing serious occurred to prevent, he intended in a few weeks to settle at or near Geneva. While writing this we have learned that the family has left, and is now on its way.

Evening coming on, Mr. Page accompanied us back to the river, as we deemed it prudent to lodge at the "Hotel," to be ready for the boat. About five in the morning we were on our way up stream for Quincy, at which place we arrived about 11 A. M. After spending several hours in loitering, and traversing the streets of the city, at four o'clock we were en route for Camp Point, some 22 miles from Quincy, a place we visited three years ago, at the invitation of Bro. Robins. We had purposed to spend Friday evening with him and then take the morning train home. So on arriving at the station we stepped off, and sought the dwelling of our friend and brother. We received a most hearty reception, and spent a very agreeable evening with Bro. Robins' family, and Bro. and Sister Cooper. Our friends wished us to spend a day or two with them, and speak to the people, but we objected as

we wished to be home the following day. But after all circumstances went against us, for a mistake of five minutes in the morning made us into a spectator, instead of a passenger of the morning train; so we had to bide our time. Now we acquiesced to the proposition of our brother. The Methodist Church was obtained, and Bro. Robins went round the village and gave a personal invitation to a majority of the residents to come out on the next day, and hear a scriptural exposition of the Gospel.

At 11 o'clock and 4 meetings were held, but only a moderate attendance. The people at Camp Point have become tolerably well acquainted with Bro. Robins, and his principles, as he is not ashamed of the Gospel. Neither Methodist, Baptist, nor Campbellite can stand before him. His guns are too heavy for them. A little while ago he was forced into a discussion with a Methodist divine on the non-immortality of man. Though Bro. Robins is not much accustomed to public speaking, yet he sustained himself creditably during a two days' debate, to the complete discomfiture of his opponent, and the great satisfaction of both the moderators and the public.

We had also the pleasure of once more grasping the hand of Bro. Wing of Clayton, Adams Co., whose acquaintance we formed at the time of our former visit. He attended the meetings, though some 9 or 10 miles distant.

On Monday morning, after bidding a final adieu to our friends, we went to the station, and after waiting a few minutes, found ourselves once more on board the train, wending our way over the prairies of Illinois, towards home, where we arrived at 5 P. M. and found all well, after an absence of twelve days.

EDITOR.

For the Gospel Banner.

Astounding Facts!

BRO. WILSON:—I am not using an improper caption—unless it be to a few (few indeed) whose understanding of the *sure word* has prepared them for such developments of the deep workings of Popery as appear in the article below. *Where* is this success? *Aye, where?* *Not* in Asia—*not* in Africa. Then, where? In the "bulwark of Protestantism!" Sad misnomer indeed! Oh! Cardinal Wiseman, you were not so frustrated as many simple people thought you were ten years since. You and your co-workers have not been asleep!

It has seemed Bro. W., that since that open display of hostility to Popish claims in or about the year 1850 in Britain, there has been less said concerning the spread of Catholicism there than for some time previous to the date: as if the system had received a

check so mighty that recovery was as yet scarcely apparent! But look at the *facts*; and figures don't lie: a *check!* No—*unprecedented and imposing accession!* How mistaken the notion that because of political troubles at home, the papacy is shorn of its influence! Dead indeed? No living! Mighty even in reactionary potency in France itself: the deep under-current there being too strong already for the equanimity of Louis Napoleon.

Further thought and reflection on this most interesting subject I forego the utterance of for the present. Let the readers of the *Banner* see what the British correspondent of *The New York World* says.

In hope and trials, yours, H. HEVES.

Near London, Feb. 20.

The increase of popery in this kingdom is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful minds; and well it may, for it is really alarming. It may interest your readers if, at the beginning of another year, I furnish some statistics; all of them taken from reliable sources. I will take the year 1829—the year in which Roman Catholic emancipation was conceded—and compare things as they are with what they then were. In 1829, there were in this country 447 priests; now there are 1342; being an increase of 895. Then there were 449 chapels; now there are 993; an increase of 544. In 1859 we had 37 monasteries; now we have 47. In the same year we had 123 convents for females; now we have 155. And we have also 12 colleges. In 1847 the government, for the first time, appointed chaplains for soldiers, and in 1853 there were eighty-five such chaplains, but now there are 145, being an increase of sixty—their salaries were then £2,702, now, they amount to £7,220, an increase of £4,527. But, besides this enormous increase in the number of chaplains, their status has been altered and improved. The queen, by a royal warrant, dated Nov. 1858, made them all commissioned officers; and by another royal warrant, in the same month, they are divided into four classes, the lowest of whom stands on a level with captains. They have clerical uniforms, soldier servants, horses, and all privileges in common with Episcopalian chaplains. Many of these chaplains are foreign Jesuits, and thus owing allegiance to foreign governments. The Jesuits, too—whose very presence in the country is contrary to statute law—are making strenuous efforts to get hold of the education of our youth. And to a fearful extent have they already succeeded in their efforts. Beside large sums for the support of schools, amounting to many thousands annually, there has been, between 1839 and 1859, £21,462 voted for building of schools, of which we have now in England alone 414, having teachers, male, 373, female, 743; in all, 1,-


116; with scholars, boys, 19,338; girls, 26,522; in all, 45,860. In the colony of Victoria, Australia, a similar course has been pursued. In 1848 there were only five Roman Catholic schools, now there are 116 schools and nearly 6,000 scholars, and the grant of public money in 1858 amounted to upwards of £14,000. In Ireland in 1859 nearly 480,000 Roman Catholic children attended the national schools, cost the country about £205,000.

The extension of institutions under the designation of reformatory schools is another object largely sought by the Jesuits. The grant to their schools in 1859 amounted to £10,707, yet the one of them to which £5,337 was paid, the government inspector reports, that the "misconduct and inefficiency of the brothers caused much anxiety." By the brothers, he means the Jesuit officers who are charged with the moral and industrious training of the schools. Now is it not strange to see a Protestant government handing large sums of money to the management of Jesuits, whose presence is illegal, and who, if any one take the trouble of raising a prosecution by putting the law in motion, are liable to be transported for the term of their natural lives! The sum of nearly £30,000 is by the act of 1845, annually paid for the support of Maynooth college, an institution devoted entirely to the train of Roman Catholic priests, not a few of whom emigrate to your land, where they act as missionary priests. About £1,000 is paid to chaplains to prisons and poorhouses in Ireland. In most of our colonies, too, such as Gibraltar, Malta, Mauritius, Australia, Canada, and India, large sums are regularly voted for Roman Catholic objects; so that the following summary, whilst showing that large sums are paid to Roman Catholics for their sectarian purposes, by no means includes all that is devoted to its support by the government and parliament of Britain;

Army Roman chaplains.....	£7,229
Education grants in England.....	33,034
Romish reformatory schools.....	10,707
Maynooth grant.....	26,000
Irish schools (proportionate part).....	205,000
Irish prison and workhouse chaplains.....	10,000
Colonies and India.....	40,000
Irish reformatory schools [unknown.]	

Total amount of payment.....£331,970

The British sovereign swears on the Gospel, on her accession, that the peculiar doctrines of the church of Rome are 'damnable and idolatrous,' and yet the British parliament annually votes the above sum for the propagation of those same doctrines, and for the education of the men who teach them!

 The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his delight.

From the Harbinger.

The Four Horns and the Four Carpenters.

"Then lifted I up mine eyes and saw, and behold two horns. And I said unto the angel that talked with me, what be these? And he answered me, these are the horns which have scattered Judah, Israel and Jerusalem. And the Lord showed me four carpenters. Then said I, what come these to do? And he spake saying, these are the horns which have scattered Judah, so that no man did lift up his head; but these are come to fray them, to cast out the horns of the Gentiles, which lifted up their horn over the land of Judah to scatter it." Zech. i. 18-21.

It is evident that the four horns, which have for long centuries scattered Judah, Israel and Jerusalem, are the same as the four beasts of Dan. vii. But Zechariah wrote this vision in the second year of the reign of Darius, at which time but two of the four horns had come into being. So it is evident that the captivity in Babylon was not the whole scattering time indicated by the four horns. We must, therefore, look further down the stream of time, through Grecia, the third beast of Daniel, and the third horn of our text, to Rome, the fourth beast and horn; for it is evident that the scattering of God's holy people must continue through the whole time of the four horns. And we know that Greece and Rome have not been behind even Babylon herself in their oppressions of that people. Nor are we to expect that oppression to cease until the ten sub-divisions of the fourth horn are frayed or cast out. It is now very certain that the Papacy is shorn of its civil power, and the last vestige of the fourth horn totters on the brink of sudden ruin.

And next comes the four carpenters. They come "to cast out the horns of the Gentiles which lifted up their horn over the land of Judah to scatter it." Now since they came "to cast out the horns of the Gentiles," they must come while the Gentile horns exist, else they would have nothing to cast out. And now on the eve of the breaking up of Gentile powers, we ought to look for and expect the carpenters. Two of them have already made their appearance, viz: England and France—and they have undertaken to "fray" the Gentile horns which have lifted up their horn over the land of Judea.

The four horns did not all arise at once, nor are we to expect the four carpenters all at once. But this exposition of the vision may be objected to by some, on the ground that two things so totally different from each other as horns and carpenters could not both represent political powers. But it must be borne in mind that these powers were shown in the vision under such aspects only as they related to Judah, Israel and Jerusalem. The first four were destructive to the welfare of Israel, were oppressive and belligerent, and consequently were represented by horns;

while the second four were of quite different character, and differently disposed toward Judah and Israel. They come to build up what the first four destroyed, and consequently were represented by carpenters.

But we have plainer testimony that that land and people will be built by certain Gentile nations; for it is written, "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers and queens thy nursing mothers." It is still further evident that the time of the carpenters is many centuries later than the return of the Jews from Babylon; for just previous to the vision of the four horns and the four carpenters, the prophet had a vision of a man riding a red horse, and standing among the myrtle trees. In the explanation these were made to say, "We have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold, all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest." Then the angel asked, "how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem?" etc. And the Lord answered with good and comfortable words, and closed by saying, "And the Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall choose Jerusalem." And then follows the vision of the four horns. From these circumstances, it is evident there must be a time when all the earth sitteth still and is at rest, before the Lord will comfort Zion and choose Jerusalem. But the earth was not still and at rest when the prophet wrote; for he wrote of things future, not present.

This time of general rest to the earth cannot be earlier than the day of Bonaparte—the first who struck the first decisive blow at Papacy, and inspired the Italians with the love of liberty; and soon after his career ended, all the earth was still and at rest. And here we may date the inquiry, "How long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah?" Since this time of universal rest, the nations have turned their attention favorably to the scattered people and to the land of Judah.

And now, even at this present time, the four horns have nearly done their work, two of the four carpenters, have come, and in alliance, to cast out the Gentile horns. The other two will soon show themselves, and join the alliance to complete the most powerful, Gentile nations ever brought to bear upon the enemies of that cast out and afflicted people. But how does all this concern the Christian? It is evidence that his redemption is nigh, and the kingdom of God is near at hand; therefore, let us pray more fervently than ever, "thy kingdom come."

Z. CAMPBELL.

☞ Correction is grievous unto him who forsaketh the way; and he who hateth reproof shall die.

From the Crisis.

Is it Heresy?

Is it heresy to believe that "the first man is of the earth EARTH?" and "that as is the earthy such are THEY also that are EARTHY?" 1 Cor. xv. 47, 48.

Is it heresy to believe that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of LIFE; and man became a living soul?"—Gen. ii. 7.

Is it heresy to believe that when man sinned "now LEST he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and LIVE FOREVER; therefore the Lord God... DROVE OUT the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims, and a flaming sword that turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of LIFE?"—Gen. iii. 22-24.

Is it heresy to believe that "the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God" ... "is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who ONLY hath IMMORTALITY?"—1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16.

Is it heresy to believe that Christ "hath abolished death and brought life and IMMORTALITY [incorruptibility] to light in the GOSPEL?"—2 Tim. i. 10.

Is it heresy to believe that God will render "to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life?"—Rom. ii. 7.

Is it heresy to believe that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence?" "The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth?" "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in (sheol) the grave whither thou goest?"—Psa. cxv. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 18; Eccl. ix. 10.

Is it heresy to believe that "As the waters fail from the sea, and as the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not AWAKE, nor be raised out of their SLEEP?"—Job xiv. 11, 12.

Is it heresy to believe that Christ took part of flesh and blood "that through death he might DESTROY HIM that had the power of DEATH, that is, the DEVIL?"—Heb. ii. 14. That "the last ENEMY that shall be DESTROYED is DEATH?"—1 Cor. xv. 26.

Is it heresy to believe what Jesus told his disciples, "Whither I go, ye cannot come?" John xiii. 33: or that "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man?"—John iii. 13. "For David is not ascended into the heavens."—Acts ii. 34.

Is it heresy to believe that "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet

in your sins; then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED?"—1 Cor. xv. 16-18.

Is it heresy to believe "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust?" That "the hour is coming in the which ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall COME FORTH; they that have done GOOD to the resurrection of life; and they that have done EVIL to the resurrection of damnation?"—Acts xxiv. 15; John v. 28, 29.

Is it heresy to believe that "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and THEN shall he REWARD every man according to his works?"—Matt. xvi. 27.

Is it heresy to believe that "The wages of sin is DEATH, but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE through Jesus Christ our Lord?"—Rom. vi. 23.

Is it heresy to believe that "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, . . . are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire?" so "the wicked shall depart INTO everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels?"—Jude 7; Matt. xxv. 41.

Is it heresy to believe that the wicked shall "go away into everlasting punishment," and "shall be punished with everlasting DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall COME to be glorified in his saints and to be admired in all them that believe?"—Matt. xxv. 46; 2 Thess. i. 9, 10.

Is it heresy to believe that "the soul that sinneth it shall die?" "That he that converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a SOUL from DEATH, and shall hide a multitude of sins?"—Ezek. xviii. 20; James v. 20.

Is it heresy to believe that "the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings, and ye shall grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked, for they shall be ASHES under the soles of YOUR FEET in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts?"—Mal. iv. 1-3.

Is it heresy to believe that "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life?"—1 John v. 11, 12.

Is it heresy to believe that "the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and

idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the SECOND DEATH?"—Rev. xxi. 8.

Is it heresy to believe that God's kingdom shall "come" and his "will be done on earth as it is in heaven?" That "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed?" That the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High?" That "the wickedness of the wicked" shall "come to an end?" That "transgressors shall be rooted out of the earth?" That "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever?"—and that all things "shall be subject to him," that God may be all and in all?"—that there shall be "a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness?"—Matt. vi. 10; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 27; Psa. vii. 9; Prov. ii. 22; Rev. xi. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 28; 28; 2 Pet. iii. 13.

Is it heresy to believe that which Jesus spake when he said "Thy word is truth?"—John xvii. 18.

If THIS be heresy, then "This I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things written in the law and the prophets; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a RESURRECTION of the DEAD, both of the JUST and UNJUST. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men."—Acts xxiv. 14-16. H. L. H.

For the Gospel Banner.

Queries.

BRO. WILSON:—Will you be so kind as sometime to explain for the benefit of those who are not of us, but who read your paper, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, also Matt. x. 28; 2 Cor. v. 1-8; xii. 1-4; Phil. i. 21-24; which passages are their strong-holds for the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

In what manner will those who are not witnesses of the descent of our Lord upon the Mount of Olives, be informed or convinced of the fact of his return to earth?

When will be fulfilled the 19th verse of the 4th chapter of 1st Thessalonians? Will it be immediately on the approach of Christ to the earth, and before He stands upon Mount Olivet?

Paul says, we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and that every one of us shall give an account of himself to God. Where will this be, and at what time after the coming of our Lord? M. K.

Answers to the above queries are deferred to some future time.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., MAY 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 9.

"Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?"—Questions by G. B. Stacy.

REPLY BY A LEARNER.

By the general invitation of yourself, not as "an able correspondent however," I will try "to take hold of these questions in as clear, candid, concise scriptural manner" as far as I can, "so that truth may be elicited."

Question No. 1.—Is not the term *king* derived from, and used in the place of the term *head*? And does not the term *head* express all that the term *king* expresses, and some things in addition which the term *king* does not embrace or comprehend?

I answer, yes! The truth of which is so eloquently set forth by Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. There is one Jehovah, to whom alone belongs the ascription of being "The great, and only Potentate, who is the King of kings and Lord of lords, who of, and in himself only hath immortality, dwelling in the light whom no man hath seen, nor can approach unto, to whom be the ascription of honor and power everlasting. Amen!" Paul again says, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5—There is only *one* (*universal*) *head*, while there are many delegated lords and gods, both in heaven, and in earth. But David says, Psa. xcv. 3—Jehovah is the Great God, and the *great king*, head above *all Gods*. Hence in regions of His *universal* domain, or kingdom, it is affirmed by the Scriptures, that there is only *one head, that head*, the unoriginated, self-existent Jehovah.

Second part, question No. 1. "Does not the term *head* express all that the term *king* expresses?" Yes!

Query! Does not the term *king*—when applied to *mortal*, and visible "headship," signify something less than that *headship* which David and Paul say belong to Jehovah? Deut. xxxiii. 5—"Moses was *king* in Jeshurum" (the political body of Israelites,) "when the heads (or kings) of the people, and the tribes of Israel were gathered together," at the giving of the law. These words were written by the historian who completed this

book. Identifying himself with the people of Israel, says, "Moses gave us a law," which law they recognized, as constitutional statutes.

David recognized this constitution as his guide in life, and in the administration of public justice. Psa. cxix. 111. These testimonies of Paul, David, and Dent., show that in the sense of *universal* dominion over *all heads, divine or human*, Jehovah is absolute. But that there are heads, called kings, lords and gods, some of whom are upon the *earth*, others in heaven. HE the *supreme*; they the *delegated*. Hence in the history of the Israelitish kingdom, He had a delegated, mortal and visible *head*, named Moses, acting as His vice-gerent, *before* they rejected Jehovah. 1 Sam. viii. 5.

If as alleged by some—the mere fact of their asking a *visible king*, were sufficient to disrupt the "kingdom of God" how could this nation have actually *been* the kingdom of God, while Moses was their *visible king*?

Question No. 2.—What authority is there in the Scriptures to authorize any one to contend that the constituent elements of modern constitutional kingdoms are necessary to the existence of the kingdom of God?

The proposition is too indefinite. It needs explanation. If the writer mean to point the question to the particular "element" of *territory*, as a necessary part of "modern constitutional kingdoms," I answer, "*Much every way*."

This Supreme Head, rules over lords, gods and kings, or heads, whether in heaven or in earth. The *territory* of all worlds, ruled by kings, etc., He claims as His. Psa. ciii. 19-22. "Jehovah hath prepared his throne in the heavens;" hence, his dominion is over all his works, in all *places* of his dominion. Moses says, "In the beginning God (this great and only Potentate, Rev. iv. 11, "he created all things for his *pleasure* and *glory*;") created the heavens and the earth," as one of the *places* of his *dominion*. And on the sixth day of the creation week, He created Man in his own image and likeness, male and female

created he them. He constituted Adam his delegated head, or monarch over all the earth and its occupants. He the absolute head, held man personally responsible to him. What especial *place* was chosen for this man to reside, where his God communed with him, and made known his will by Elohim? We read—"The Lord planted a garden eastward *in Eden*, and there He put the man whom He had formed, to till it, and dress it. The Scriptures say, "The *heavens* are Jehovah's throne." But here on this new *place*, He must exercise rule. What is the nature of His rule? Like all governments, it must consist of laws. What was the nature of these laws to Adam? *A covenant of works*. Gen. ii. 15-17. God commanded him to eat of every tree, but that of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The penalty for disobedience, was, "In the day thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt die." They walked by sight. They broke the statutory law of works, and were driven out of the sacred enclosure of the garden *in Eden*. The *visible* intercourse between them and Elohim ceased. Henceforth their *faith* was tested. The possibility of re-entering was denied them by God's placing Cherubims (burning ones, or the light-conveyers of Ezekiel's millennial chariot-wheel, illuminated by the eternal Spirit which rested upon and filled Jesus the Christ, as that once slain but now living creature,) and the flaming sword which turned every way. These symbolic representations of Deity were there when Cain was in Eden, (but *outside the garden*.) Gen. iv. 14. Cain having received the sentence dire to a fratricide, complained that his punishment was greater than he could bear. "Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth (Eden,) and from thy faces (literally cherubic faces,) I shall be hid." These faces became the communicators of God's plan by which was the knowledge of "His *reay*" to obtain God's righteousness. Where was this *special place*? compare Gen. ii. 10-14, with Gen. xv. 18. The extreme boundaries north and south, are the rivers of Euphrates and of Egypt;—which was the place of the manifestation of the glory of God. Jehovah promised it to Abraham and to his seed, the Christ, Gal. iii. 16, for an everlasting possession. God, is not man that he should lie, nor can He ever change his promises covenanted to Abraham his seed, the everlasting possession of this land *by faith*. God chose a man who has been contemporary with Noah for 50 years, whom improbabilities could not stagger, where God was concerned. He was a *faithful* man, made the Federal head in the *faith* of all those who *believe* in the *same promises*. His fleshy posterity also were to be multitudinous as the stars of heaven. God promised from his loins, by Isaac, Kings should come—even a race of *Immortal kings*. Though Abraham had some noble descendants, whose deeds of moral heroism are chronicled by God and Paul, Heb. xi,—such as Isaac, Jacob, and Moses; yet the race had so degenerated while bondsmen in Egypt, that of the whole population of 601,730 which came out of Egypt, (Numb. vi. 51,) only two—Joshua, and Caleb survived of that generation to enter Canaan, Numb. xiv. 38. Paul gives the reason, that they were such *sinner*s, Heb. iii. 17, that their carcases fell in the wilderness. The Abrahamic gospel though preached to them, it was not ruminated upon, so as to give them that spiritual life, which God provided. Hence there was need to add a codicil to that will which God made to Abraham. It was now a covenant of *works*, added by reason of transgression to last only till *the seed* (Christ) should come, who was symbolized by the cherubic faces in the *Paradise*. And when *He* shall *possess* it; He will "remember" the penitent thief *as promised*. Hence in the calling of this people, God prepared a visible depository, by which the means were provided for adoption, by proselytism, of the heathen. To this nation was given "the Ark," the embodiment of God's cherubic glory, 1 Sam. ii. 21; and "the covenants," (plural) the Abrahamic—Acts iii. 25, and the Mosaic—"the giving of the Law," Psa. cxlvii; 19; "and the (Divine, Heb. ix. 1.) service of God;" and "the promises" (plural) of the land to Abraham, with a Divine Ruler over that land, 2 Sam. vii. 13, 14. They were the children of the twelve Patriarchs. In that memorable national anthem, Exod. xv. sang in the national exultation, by Moses and the children of Israel, wherein they poured forth to Jehovah, the swelling emotions of gratitude for the exercise of his strength; they acknowledged Him as their God; because He had destroyed the tyrant Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea. They were told by Moses, that this was a guarantee that His arm should again be revealed. That the people who heard of these mighty achievements should be afraid. Fear should seize hold upon the Kings of Edom, Palestine, Canaan, &c. When they arrived in the wilderness, they would naturally enquire "where are we to go?" Moses pointed them to the land once possessed by Adam, then covenanted to Abraham—the land at that time occupied by Canaanites, &c. Here was marked out *plainly a place, a territory, as a basis*, where He would place the *faithful*. God constituted Moses his delegated head, or king. This person had been their *prophetic* head. God had separated him at the burning bush. Moses was now separated also as the Royal lawgiver. And in the very giving of that law,

became by the will of God, and the wish of the people, their *Mediator*. That law was a covenant of *works*, (though *in it*, the *germ* of God's righteousness,) upon the obedience of which was predicated the certainty of their entering the land of promise as *lease-holders*, God never gave up his sovereign right of possession but said "the land is *mine*." Lev. xxv. 23. The *everlasting Rest*, Joshua could not give, though he spoke of that *day* (of 1000 years,) because faith therein and obedience were the everlasting conditions. This Israelitish code of laws is contained in Exod. xx. to the end of xxiii. When Moses came and told the people all these words, (or statutes) of the Lord, *all* the people answered with one voice, and said, "all the words which the Lord hath said *will we do*."

It is highly important to ask what Jehovah promised to do for the nation, upon their (not saying "Lord, Lord," a *promising* to do his will) *doing* actually, as he required, and as they *promised*. Exod. xix. 15, 16. "Now therefore, if ye will *obey* my voice, *indeed*, and keep my covenant, *then*, (upon you having so *done*) ye shall be unto me a peculiar treasure, above all people, for all the earth is mine, (which is a *place*, and as such I have given to Abraham and his Seed, the Christ, the heir, Rom. iv. 13.) "If ye will *obey* my voice, ye shall be unto me (as a nation) a *Kingdom of Priests*" (*visibly*.)

They were *conditionally* to occupy so distinguished a political and ecclesiastical relationship between Him and the all nations of whom Abraham's seed is to be the possessor, and benefactor. It is a divine scriptural proposition, that "Jehovah hath made of one blood (of Adam) all nations of men, to dwell upon the face of the earth." Acts xvii. 26. He made Abraham the federal head of *all* his children whether descended from Sarah, the the allegorical maternal ancestor of all the *true* "children of promise" as Isaac was, or of all nations as descending from Hagar, Keturah, &c. The glorious truth, that through this seed of the *Christ*, (individual and collective,) *all* nations shall be blest, and that visibly, is enough to cause Paul to exclaim, in view of his mercy, "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*!" To this let all his faithful, obedient, and hopeful brethren say, Amen!

Paul describes *this* abnormal state of mankind, whether nationally Jews, or Gentiles, to be absolutely destitute of any righteousness in God's sight. He declares "the *unrighteous cannot inherit* the kingdom of God." Also that "flesh and blood" cannot. David says of Messiah's kingdom, Psa. cxliii. 13, "Thy kingdom is an *everlasting king-*

dom." Daniel says, ch. ii. 44—Jehovah the God of heaven *will* set it up, and it shall be an *everlasting* kingdom, and will *fill* the *whole earth*. He says ch. vii, the Ancient of Days (being the owner,) makes a present of it to His Son, (by paternal descent, but of his human maternal stock as proceeding from Mary.) "the *Son of man*." The duration of *this* kingdom is *everlasting*. Now as *no* man is righteous, so as to claim possession of this *everlasting* kingdom, because he is a sinner, therefore mortal; David says, Psa. cxix. 142, *Jehovah* has a righteousness which is an *everlasting* righteousness. He therefore provided "a *body*," the offspring of Mary—made of flesh and blood nature, "in all *things* like unto his brethren." When Jesus was Christed, or anointed with the eternal spirit, his body, which was *the* body then prepared, as *the lamp* (to use the scripture figure, Jno. i. 9) became illuminated by that spirit or divine "light," which David says, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, "Spake by me, His words being in my tongue," so that it became like the pen of a ready writer. So Paul says, *God* was the *speaker through* the ancient prophets and *through His Son*. This Son declared John xii. 49; xiv. 14, the words you hear communicated, and the mighty deeds you see done, are *not my own* words, or works, but the speaker and doer, is *my Father*. Hence the *same speaker* saith, "Before Abraham was *I am*." Hence Isaiah says to his nation, that when the time should come, for Zion to arise, and Jerusalem to shake off the dust of her humiliation, they should be blest with perpetual prosperity, chap. lx. 9. So that "thy sun shall no more go down, but the Lord (whom the spirit was to anoint, see Isa. lxi. and Luke iv.) shall be thine *everlasting light*, and thy days of mourning shall be ended." Then comes the time for this anointed Jesus to restore Israel, chap. xlix., and make that nation a holy nation, separated for the political and ecclesiastical office of mediating between the kingdom of God and *all nations*, who shall come to God's holy temple, built by a greater than Solomon, 2 Sam. vii. 13; Zech. vi. 12,—which is to be a house of prayer for *all nations*.

In Ezek. xl. to end, the temple service is given in detail. There must be some priests to officiate in offering the sacrifices. *Who are these Priests?* Truth is eternal. Jehovah when speaking through Jesus says, "Salvation is of the Jews." The same author proves it in Ezek. chapters named. Out of this restored nation of Israel—settled again according to their tribes—He points out *I.e.* vi—the *priestly* tribe—whose duty and privilege it is, to offer the sacrifices both for themselves and for the "all people" who come up to Jerusalem and keep the solemn

feasts. The nature of the priests is mortal—proof, they will marry and be given in marriage; again, there are to be priest's *widows*, how can that be, if their previous husbands are not dead? *This class* of priests, cannot be resurrected ones. Here then is a *visible* priesthood which that nation shall possess in the tribe of Levi.

Now for a *visible* but *delegated royalty* or headship. Isaiah says, ch. xlix. 23, that certain persons called "kings," shall come before or into the presence of Zion's sons, who shall "bow down" towards them, (a mark of abject submission) and they shall *lick up the dust of their feet.*" See ix. 16: "Kings shall render tribute" as evidence of their *subjection*. John says, Rev. xxi. 24; "The Kings of the earth do bring their glory" into that future city, which Abraham and others looked for to come.

Isa. ix. 12, testifies that the same nation which had once been smitten, shall be so exalted in political supremacy, that "the nation and kingdom that *will not serve thee* (Israel) shall *perish*; yea, those nations shall be *utterly wasted.*" Now, none will contend that when he (Jesus) whom the heavens must retain only *until the times* of Israel's national restoration and regeneration arrives, and He administers to "the people of the saints" (the righteous saved of Daniel's saints or separated nation as well as all other true faithful children of Abraham) that kingdom of God which he received as the "Son of Man" with its world-wide dominion, and all its glory; in order that "all nations, peoples, and languages shall serve and obey him,"—the unlimited extent of which shall include again whoever "dwell under the whole [canopy of our blue ethereal] heaven;" that in "that day He will any longer allow any *one*, much more *many* nations, to *select* their own kings and queens? No! But as the time will then have arrived to take out of Israel a *visible Royal race*, to be the mortal and *visible* kings; Jesus and his resurrected brethren the Royal High Priests, all of whom will be immortal—made so by faith, obedience, and resurrection, after the order of an endless life; being the next higher order, will form a link above Israel, between them and Jehovah. So that out of Abraham's loins, a fleshly and mortal race of king-priests, and a spirit-body race—an immortal dynasty of Royal high priests—also proceeds, as the literal *ful-fill-ment* of Gen. xvii. 6.

Q] Question No. 3.—Is not the legitimate jurisdiction of the Creator over the created, the dominion or kingdom of God, and co-existent with creation and therefore absolute, universal, supreme and eternal?

I answer, Yes!

Question No. 4.—God has nowhere promised to

set up the kingdom of God, because it is necessarily co-existent with the works of his hands.

I have shown this to be false.

Question No. 5.—The kingdom of God exists independent of the recognition, and in the face of its rejection by the children of men.

If by God's kingdom is meant, in the language of Psa. xc. 3, His *universal dominion*, I say, Yes; otherwise—No.

Question No. 6.—Although the Jews were once constituted a "kingdom of priests unto God," they ceased to be "the kingdom of God" from the time they rejected him from reigning over them, and thereby placed themselves on a level with the rest of mankind in rebellion against God, and therefore they constituted the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of David, or the royal house of Jacob.

Answered to No. 2.

Question No. 7.—God has covenanted to give the throne of David, the kingdom of Israel or rule over the house of Jacob, to Jesus as the son of David, or because he is the son of David—but that is not the kingdom of God.

False!—see Dan. ii. 44; xii. 9-27.

Question No. 8.—The possession of the throne of David, and the rule or jurisdiction over the house of Jacob and the world, is absolutely necessary, in order that the kingdom of God may be recognized by the nations, as nations or families, but is not the kingdom of God.

Granted.

Question No. 9.—The visible manifestation of the kingdom of God results from the inauguration and application of the New Covenant, not of the covenant with David, or that with Abraham.

False as was the language of Cain, when he denied any knowledge of Abel, after his fratricide. Because in Jehovah's absolute and universal dominion, no man hath ever seen Him as a visible ruler. Yet Moses, His *delegated head or king* in the *delegated kingdom* of Israel, was a visible king. Again, the *Lord* hath chosen Solomon to sit upon (this delegated) *throne of the kingdom of the Lord*, over Israel, 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. The visible manifestation of *God's kingdom* results from the covenants made both with Abraham, and David. See answer to No. 2.

Question No. 10.—Its personal application commenced on the Day of Pentecost, and its national application will result as a consequence of the willing submission of the peoples to the physical rule of Jesus and his associates, when administered by them from the throne of David.

The Pentecostian Feast, Acts ii, was the beginning of the proclamation of *God's righteousness, through Jesus the Christ*, whose mission was, as a Priest at that time "with-in the holiest of all" where he had gone to make reconciliation by the presenting an everlasting propitiation, his own righteous body. Being accredited as such, he offered first to Israel remission of sins, a righteousness, through *his name*. Hence the Gospel of the kingdom of God was preached, wherein was presented an invitation to the hearers

thereof, to induce them to procure an imputation of his righteousness, which if accepted by them, they, *though* "the poor of this world" were accounted rich in their possessing, and using such faith, making them "heirs of the kingdom" of God, of Israel, of Jacob, or David.

The same righteousness. Peter made known to Cornelius and the faithful ones of his household. The result was the obedient acquiesced [in Peter's command, "and were baptized in the name of the Lord," he being no other person than Jesus the Christ, whose announced word about the kingdom of God, Cornelius *aloud knew*.

Question No. 11.—The throne of God is established forever in the heavens, where Jesus now sits, because "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."

The throne of Jehovah in the heavens does not "belong to His Son." Though He has so distinguished him by such an exaltation, as that *none* but Jehovah is his superior, none is his fellow or equal. It is never said that God has committed any dominion to him, but that of angels, and Acts xvii. 31, *this world of ours*, where he once suffered, and where he rose.

Question No. 12.—The throne of David in Jerusalem, at present overturned and trodden down, is covenanted to Jesus as his own, and therefore he has promised to his faithful brethren who overcome, to give to them to sit down with him on his throne, "even as I overcame, and sat down with my Father on his throne."

That throne which Jesus is to occupy, [2 Sam. vii. 12-16; Jer. iii. 17;] is to endure for ever. Hence Jesus while a sufferer, was mortal; though the Son of God, yet he could legitimately claim that throne by true and lineal descent from David, Jesse, Judah, Abraham, Adam, and God himself. Yet he could not then hold it for ever. Hence the need of God again anointing him with eternally energizing spirit, and He did so, *declaring* him to be the Son of God in a higher sense than ever, endowing him with the power of an endless life, according to the Holy Spirit, by resurrecting him from the dead. Rom. i. 3, 4.

Question No. 13.—The throne of God belongs to the kingdom of God. The throne of Jesus to the kingdom of David, or of Israel.

Read the universal throne of God belongs to Jehovah, and the delegated throne over Israel and the nations to Jesus, then the writer and the Scriptures agree.

Question No. 15.—It is the province of the son of David to rule on the throne of his father David for 1000 years. Whilst it is the province of the Son of God to "take away the sin of the world," that is, to bless, or save mankind, by turning every one of them from their iniquities."

Seeing the duration of David's Son's reign is alleged to be for 1000 years, Jesus as a mortal son could not hold possession even for

that time without being resurrected. God's mortal Son never did, nor ever could bless or save from sin, by forgiving iniquities in his own name. First, there is no evidence existing to prove that he did so. Second. The Law of Moses under which he lived and died, pronounced a death penalty upon "any stranger" not of the family of Aaron, who should officiate as priest. Numb. xvi. 40; Heb. vii. Third. Paul says, "If the Christ be not raised from the dead, you [Corinthians] are yet in your sins," unblessed and unsaved. 1 Cor. xv. 17.

Question No. 16.—Physical rule is incompetent to save or bless men, because it cannot change or transform the fountain of sin—the human affections. This is the province of the kingdom of God, accomplished by the personal abode of God in his people by or through his Spirit. Hence the kingdom of God is of like character with himself, who is "the Spirit." And therefore it is said, "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit."

God's, Israel's or David's kingdom will not only embody "physical" or omnipotent rule, but omniscience, infallible wisdom, omnipresence, indestructibility, justice, mercy, &c. For this purpose of strength, Ps. lxxx. 17, Jehovah has made the Son of Man who is upon His right hand, strong for himself. See Isa. xi. Ps. lxxii. lxxix. He will not only hurl the mighty of the present earth—gods from their thrones, but will exalt and bless the poor with bread, &c. Associated with him will be those living creatures of Ezekiel ch. i. and Rev. iv. v. Unsymbolized by John—literally the redeemed out of every kindred, tongue, people, and nation; who as God's delegated "kings and priests" reign on the earth 1000 years. The eternal Spirit of Jehovah which anointed Jesus, and now rests upon that once slain but now "living creature," will also universally illuminate all the "wheels" of that Cherubic Millennial chariot of Jehovah, the increate, Eph. i. 20, &c., Himself the great and only undervalued Potentate, riding in majestic grandeur! Here all language fails to give expression to the sublime accomplishment of the system of "God-manifestation" in immortal flesh. No [mortal] eye hath seen, nor ear heard the swellings of triumphant gratitude, and praise, and honor, and glory, then chanted by that glorious throng of the redeemed, who though they passed through "great tribulation," yet kept their righteous robes unsullied by the indwelling of the word of the Lord which liveth and abideth for ever, because they took heed unto it that their feet could not slide. Such sublime things and realities never did nor ever can enter the carnal mind of Cainites, who mind only earthly, sensual, devilish gratifications. Those then, are the things which God hath in his character of a tender merciful Father revealed unto us by His Spirit.

Question No. 17.—The kingdom of God is necessarily a spiritual kingdom. Whilst the kingdom of David is necessarily a physical one.

Spiritual and physical are in antithesis. What can the writer mean? If by spiritual, he means immaterial, then such a notion has no counterpart in *things* in God's universe. I ask the querist for proof, before he claims my admission to such a proposition. The vestibule of truth is the only shrine where I worship. If found to be offering incense not in accordance with its Deity, let it be shown by any one. Adieu.

* * *

The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

A LECTURE BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, LONDON, CANADA WEST.

Being a reply to the Westminster Review, No. 135, Article 5.

Delivered before the Young Men's Christian Instruction Society of London, March, 1860.

CONCLUDED.

Before his ascension to heaven he had been seen in different localities, and in one instance by no less than "five hundred brethren at once." When he left the world the eleven were present; the event occurred after they had been in close conversation with him, and just when he was giving them his final blessing; it happened not in darkness, when they might have been deceived by an apparition, but in open day, and on an elevated ground, whence they distinctly beheld him in royal majesty glide calmly through the fields of space, till lost in the depths of the unfathomable azure. Eleven simple, honest, truthful men were witnesses of the sublime occurrence; and ever afterwards referred to it as being to them no less indubitable than the shining of sun, and moon, and stars. Let us grant it to be unparalleled in the history of our race; but surely the depositions of the spectators need not stagger no one who can believe that Jesus survived a crucifixion and a spear-thrust; an envelopment in grave-clothes, and confinement, with rankling wounds, in a stifling vault.

Not many days after his departure, Peter, along with his associates, appeared in the thoroughfares of Jerusalem, and protested that Jesus, whom the rulers had crucified, was risen from the dead. He charged them with murdering his Lord; and showed that by reanimating his Son, God in heaven had pronounced him innocent, and his oppressors guilty. It was an appalling oration. The whole metropolis was thrown into commotion; vast multitudes believed the witnesses and bowed to the dominion of the translated Messiah. The authorities commanded the preachers to be silent; but they would make no compromise;—they would submit to the

will of God rather than man, let the consequences follow as they might. How different it would have been had these men departed to China, or India, or Gaul, and proclaimed the resurrection of Jesus; an opportunity would then have been given to a man like the Reviewer to exclaim, "they were too prudent to attempt a ministry in Jerusalem, where every statement they uttered could be instantly exposed!" But in Jerusalem they actually did commence; and soon as they spoke, the testimony ran.

If our Lord was not resurrected, the Apostles were insane to defy the authorities, who, they must have been aware, had a host of facts wherewith to annihilate their pretensions. For what did they ordain a watch at the tomb? Was it not to meet just such an emergency as this? And now was their time. Let them bring forward the Roman guard to declare the seal was never broken; let them exhibit the remains of Jesus, and in one hour Peter and his confederates are overwhelmed in disgrace. But in lieu of evidence to shield the populace from deception—instead of saving their flock out of regard for their fleeces at any rate, they fulminate against the speakers; and while the flame-crowned witnesses are sublimely heroic, the high powers skulk into retirement, and are agued with fear.

It has been well observed by a masterly writer, that "If Christ did not rise from the dead, most assuredly he did not preach to them (his disciples) after his crucifixion; upon which supposition, I apprehend, it must be very difficult to account for their returning to their faith in that Master, whom in distress they had abandoned and disowned. But if Christ did rise from the dead, and did after his resurrection, converse with his Apostles, I suppose it will easily be granted, that they had sufficient reason for believing in him, and for acting in obedience to the command given them by him, to preach the gospel throughout the world, especially when they found themselves so well qualified for that important commission by the miraculous powers conferred upon them by the Holy Ghost, and particularly the gift of tongues, so apparently and so easily calculated to carry on that great and universal service."

These men persisted to the last—and holy, self-denying men they were—in their undaunted and harmonious protestations that the hope of the world had returned a conqueror from the kingdom of hades; with probably only one exception they sealed their testimony with their blood. Be it observed, it was not an opinion they died for; they were martyrs primarily to a fact—the resurrection of their Lord. Men may resign their breath in defence of conjectures as to the

nature of a Trinity; the action of a Holy Spirit in conversion; the authorized form of ecclesiastical polity, and the perplemment of the stars; but their martyrdom in such instances is logically no more than a demonstration of the sincerity and intensity of their opinions,—no sweeping assurance of their truth; but when a company of excellent men submit to a death of agony rather than revoke what their eyes have seen, and their ears have heard, and their hands have handled, we have not merely the utmost evidence of sincerity, but the highest conceivable reason, based on human testimony, to esteem their affirmations eternal verities.

Nothing could these men gain by attesting what in their conscience they knew to be false; their preaching conducted them to scorn, and poverty, and suffering, and death. Were these a prize to reward an imposition with? That they should act as they did in propagating an invention of their fancy would be more astonishing than the very truths they announced. In a lie there is no courage, no nutriment, no fire, no force; mostly does it resemble a windbag, fit for no mortal purpose beneath the sky.

There stands on the field of Waterloo a giant monument, and in one of the streets of London a column having at its top a carved emblem of flames; the one commemorates the European battle in which Napoleon was overthrown; the other the great fire by which a large portion of the English metropolis was desolated. Would any person ever suppose that merely by erecting these monuments the world would have been convinced that an engagement had taken place, or that flames had raged to such a terrific extent? The sculpture in both instances presupposes the events, and the marble lion and the marble flames are enduring records of their anterior existence. Well then, it is an acknowledged fact that ever since the date when our Lord is said to have appeared, the simple ordinance of the Eucharist has been solemnly commemorated by his followers. That ordinance was intended to commemorate his death, which took place, to foreshadow likewise his return to judgment (which presupposes his resurrection,) since according to Paul it is to be observed till his reappearing in glory. "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

Will any mortal have the audacity to affirm that the primitive Christians, of whom mention is made by the Roman historian Tacitus, as well as the Jewish Luke, began this celebration, but without a reason—erected this monument descending the stream of time to commemorate nothing? There was a time when the institution was first observed, and

the impelling motive was the command of Jesus; but if he had not returned from the grave, what was there to commemorate in one who had disappointed their hopes, and left them a prey to agonizing fears? Inevitably they must soon have forgotten him. Some of the first generation might have recalled his services with gratitude; but we may hazard the assertion that the next would have cancelled his fame. On the supposition that Jesus rose from the dead—that, in fact, things just happened as they are ingeniously described by different pens, the existence of Christianity can alone be explained; his exit from the tomb is the necessary cause of a stupendous result, that, like the circles in a lakelet when a stone is cast upon its bosom, has endured and spread for nearly two thousand years.

Those who assail the resurrection of Jesus are like a battle-ship firing at a rocky island—wasting their ammunition and only causing the sea-gulls to tremble. The doctrine of the revivification stands on the page of history as indubitable as the Fall of Babylon, or the poisoning of Socrates. Many have tried to sink it beneath the waves of oblivion but there it rises with ancient stability. It is the wonder of heaven, and the Pharos of the world. It is enrolled among the facts of the universe, that none can dismember, none annihilate. Yonder in the far past the occurrence stands, an eternal verity, looking down on the world as Mount Blanc, with its "diadem of snow," looks on the vale of Chamouni. It may be ignored, but there it shines; cursed it may be, but from it comes to the recipient mind what honied blessings it contains. The sacred writers have given us an explanation of the resurrection, and drawn inferences from it, and if these are unsatisfactory, yea, if they are even preposterous, my advice to thinkers is, furnish us, if you can with a better explanation and with better inferences; at all events, leave us the fact itself in its majestic proportions, and pregnant significance.

Christianity, in her own native and divine simplicity, invites the most rigid investigation; let genius, and acumen, and learning come up to the task, she has nothing to fear. Her pretensions are lofty, nevertheless they can be sustained. But let the investigation be fair, not partial, not malignant. Contradict it who may, it is hard to get justice from opponents; they would determine her claims and her virtues after the ancient Gothic customs of trying witches. The old woman suspected was tied hand and foot and cast into the water. If she swam, then she was instantly carried off to be burnt as a witch; if she sank, then indeed she was acquitted of the charge, but drowned in the experiment.

But it is time to close. Exercising that independence of thought which is the birth-right of every man, and believing that simple untrammelled individualism in religion is the noblest form of piety, I protest in my own name—and because I am so independent in my religious views and habits, my protest may have little more weight with liberal minds than if it came from the organ of a sect, or a professional dependant on Christianity—I protest against this rude attempt of an unknown writer to dash out with one sweep of his pen the great facts of sacred history. Though I have sometimes ridiculed his far-fetched theories, my excuse is, that I am acquainted with no better method of encountering such an antagonist; and it cannot fail to bring me consolation, primarily because in that case augmented stability must have been given to your faith, if by the sword of truth in our feeble hands the Reviewer's arguments are so wounded, that not even Pilate's cordials and surgery could revive them.

For the Gospel Banner.

Social Worship.

MR. EDITOR—Dear Brother: That it is the duty of Christians to meet together for the worship of God, no one will deny; but how often they should meet, and how the social worship should be conducted, may not be so clear to all minds. We propose then to enquire—1st. How often should the church meet for social worship? 2nd. When met together, what are the acts of social worship to which the church must attend?

1st. First then we are to consider, how often, and when the church of God should meet together for social worship.

It is recorded as matter of fact that the Apostolic churches kept the first day of the week, and that the members of those churches assembled together to observe the ordinances of divine worship: and as they did this under the direction of the inspired apostles, we may reasonably conclude that the first day of the week, was divinely appointed for the social worship of the church. When John wrote the Revelation, this day was known as the "Lord's Day," which intimates that it was instituted by the Lord Jesus himself, sacred to his honor, and commemorative of his work, even as the "breaking of bread" is for these reasons called "the Lord's supper." But should any one object to this as testimony to the point, on the ground that the phrase "Lord's Day" in Rev. i. 10, does not indicate the first day of the week, but rather that it was the subject of the vision brought to bear on John's mind, viz., the Day of Christ, the thousand years' reign, I will not dogmatize on the subject, and am

willing that this passage be given to that side if it belongs to it, with this remark, that it seems to me that the subject matter of a great portion of the Revelation refers to the period that was to transpire between John's time, and the future coming of Christ, viz., the past 1800 years; but if this passage is doubtful, we have sufficient testimony which is incontrovertible. The first day of the week, seems to be peculiarly adapted to the purpose of social worship, as it commemorates the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and memorializes God's acceptance of his Son, as a sacrifice, to bear the sins of many, in that he raised him from the dead. In the 20th chap. of John's testimony, we have an account of the resurrection of Christ on this day, after the (Jewish) sabbath was past; and at ver. 19 we find the following language, "then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, "Peace be unto you." That the disciples assembled again on the next first day, is proven by the 26th verse—"And after eight days again, his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." Let no one for a moment suppose that this last quotation does not refer to the first day of the week, for it is a phrase that is used to this day by the people of Scotland; they often say, this day eight days, and they understand by it, just one week from the time specified. The first day of the week, and the eighth day are synonymous; what is indicated by the expression eight days is, that it was just a week after, and that it was also on the first day of the week, as was the former meeting. Here then we have the evidence that the first day of the week is the proper time for the disciples of Christ to assemble: since Jesus himself sanctioned the practice by meeting with them personally on two successive first days after his resurrection. Let us look into the importance of this testimony a little closer. It is said that the law and the prophets were until John. John came as the forerunner of Jesus, for the purpose of manifesting him to Israel, by baptizing him in the Jordan when the spirit descended on Jesus, and a voice declared "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." From this time forth the kingdom of God was preached by Jesus; and although he was born under the law, and obeyed it in all its precepts, yet he styles himself, "Lord of the Sabbath." The law had been a school-master to direct its adherents to Christ, and he now having come and fulfilled it, and made it honorable, tri-

umphed over it, nailing it to the tree; so that after his resurrection, the sabbatic law was of no force. Hence says Paul, that the sabbath days were a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ. So then the law being accomplished, there was no specified day binding upon Christ's disciples, until he had himself indicated his approval of the first of the week, by appearing unto them again. He chooses the first of the week for the memorable fulfillment of his promise unto his disciples, for said he, "Tarry ye in Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high;" and so when the day of Pentecost was fully come, being the first day of the week, (as is proven by the law in Lev. xxiii. 15, 16, for the time of the wave offering is the 50th day, or the morrow after the seventh sabbath, which is undoubtedly the first of the week,) the disciples were together with one accord in one place, and their ardent expectations were realized, and they were fitted, and prepared to preach the gospel; the miraculous power imparted to the disciples, was to them proof that Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God, Acts ii. 33. Peter could now use one of the keys committed to him, by unfolding the hidden mystery of the gospel of the kingdom, in the name of Jesus. The things of the kingdom, and of the name associated together, were for the first time promulgated by the apostles on the first day of the week. The gospel had been preached before, by Jesus, by the twelve, and by the seventy, and of old time it had been preached to Abraham, Gal. iii. 8; but not until the day of Pentecost, or first day of the week subsequent to the ascension of Jesus, was it preached in his name. Luke xxiv. 47.

That the first day of the week was observed by the primitive disciples, is further proven by the fact, that when Paul came to Troas he had to wait seven days, in order it would seem that he might see the disciples together. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." &c. Acts xx. 7. From this last scripture quoted two things seem very plain to my mind; first, that it was the custom to meet together, on the first of the week; and secondly, they had a specified object in meeting, viz. to break bread, they don't appear to have been expecting, or depending upon having a preacher, to officiate for them, but incidentally Paul happened there, and they were so pleased with the good things that he presented to them, that they were willing to hear him all night long. But perhaps some brother is ready to say; "I admit that the first day of week, is the proper time for Christians to assemble together, but the scriptures do not say every first day, and therefore, I think we are not

under obligation, to meet every Lord's day." To which I answer, such an objection could only come from one who does not understand the design of the observance of the Lord's day, or whose heart is cold and indifferent upon the whole subject of Christianity. It is true we are not bound by the solemn sanctions of a positive law, yet we have sufficient authority for it in the example of Christ, his Apostles, and the first Christians. And here allow me to remark, that there is perhaps no item of Christian obligation so little appreciated, or so much neglected, as the weekly meetings of the disciples, on the first day of the week. Go to the house of God where the numerical strength of the congregation is perhaps from 30 to 40, and you will perhaps meet eight or ten, or at most fifteen, seldom one half of the Church! Where are the rest, they are most probably at home, or spending their time in idle gossip in the neighborhood, thus saying by their example, we have no interest in the social worship. This is discouraging to the true disciples of the Lord, and it also exerts a very unhappy influence against the cause of Christ, over those who are without. This is not true of every congregation, (for there are honorable exceptions) but I am sure the brethren will admit that it is true to the letter of some. But go to the same place, when some popular preacher is expected, and you will most likely see all who can get there. Query: whose disciples are those who only go to meeting when the preacher is to be there. The Lord has promised, that "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst." The faithful few who meet punctually on the first day of every week, appreciate this promise, and come to meeting because the Lord has appointed to be there; and they are never disappointed. The others go to meeting because the preacher has appointed to be there, and they are sometimes disappointed. We therefore conclude that such are the "preacher's disciples." No wonder then, that coldness, strife, and contention, and sometimes division should retard the progress of the truth, where two thirds of a congregation are preacher's disciples. We are not opposed to brethren preaching the Word, but would gladly see more laborers proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom, and the Name of Jesus Christ, through the length and breadth of the land; but one thing we would suggest, that those who preach the Gospel ought to follow out the instructions which Jesus gave to his apostles contained in Matt. xxviii. 20, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Now if we want to find out what these *all things* were, we must examine the scriptures to find out how the apostles acted

with the people who received and obeyed the truth, through their instrumentality. In Acts xx. 26, 27, Paul says, "Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you, *all* the counsel of God;" and in Thess. ii. 14, he says, "for ye brethren, became followers of the churches of God, which in Judea, are in Christ Jesus." From this testimony, there must have existed, a certain order of organization, and social worship, in the Churches established by the apostles in Judea, else the Thessalonians, could not have copied after them. Having demonstrated then, the fact that the first disciples did meet together on the first day of the week, we now take up our second part.

2. When met together, what are the acts of social Worship to which the church must attend? As we have already intimated, the Thessalonians copied from the churches in Judea, so to Judea we must also go; and as Jerusalem is the capital, and the head-quarters of the church, thither would we enquire of the sacred historian, Luke: "How did the church at Jerusalem act in the social worship of Jehovah?" and we have his answer in Acts ii. 41, 42:—"Then they that gladly received the word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about 3000 souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Here we see, 1st,—They continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine. They not only held fast what the Apostles had already taught them, but constantly attended their public ministry in the church, that they might be further confirmed and edified in the faith, and instructed to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them. And although the apostles do not now teach in the churches personally, yet what they have taught is contained in the sacred writings of the New Testament: and therefore if the churches would continue in the apostles' teaching, they must carefully attend to the reading of these inspired writings in their public assemblies, not forgetting what Peter says in his 2nd Epistle, i. 19-21, of the prophetic teachings; and what Paul says of Timothy, having "known the holy (Old Testament) scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Jesus." They must not believe every spirit, nor implicitly follow uninspired teachers: "but try the spirits whether they be of God," and the standard by which to try them is the teaching of the apostles. John says: "We (the apostles) are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us, hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error," 1 John iv. 1-6. It is said of the Jews

that they divided the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms into 52 equal parts; a portion of which was read to them every Sabbath day in the synagogue, so that during the year they heard the whole; and Paul evidently desired the same use should be made of New Testament scripture, when he directed that his Epistles to the different churches should be read unto all the holy brethren, see Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27. Timothy is exhorted to give attendance to reading, as well as to exhortation and doctrine. From all of which we learn, that the reading of the Scriptures is a public ordinance in the church of Christ: and this is what she has now in place of the personal ministry of apostles and prophets, To attend stedfastly to the apostles' teaching, means more than simply reading or hearing read in the public assembly what they have taught. We must be obedient in all things to what God has commanded by them, and thus conform our lives to the maxims of Divine wisdom. We are required to exhort one another, and so much the more as we see the day approaching; and in order to do this we must not forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is. We must redeem the time with double diligence, earnestly endeavoring to build up each other in our most holy faith, and if we would do this to the greatest advantage, we must follow the example of the primitive churches of God, which in Judea, were in Christ Jesus; that we may enjoy all the privileges and immunities of God's children, who are all one in Christ, for there is no distinction of clergy or laity in the church of God. They are all of the same account, none ought to be idle, preferring to be always a listener, taking no active part. They are a Royal Priesthood, a peculiar people, and ought to be zealous of good works; living stones, devoted to the service of God, and to the well-being of the One Body. But perhaps enough is already written for one article, should you deem it worthy of a place in the *Banner*. All being well, I will continue at another time. Yours for the truth's sake.

JAMES WOOD.

Harvard, Ill., April 7, 1861.

☞ In attempting to convert a sinner from the error of his way, one should be as careful as though he were endeavoring to revive a rapidly expiring fire. Not tumble in a scuttle full of dogmas all at once, so that the faint spark which gives indications of spiritual life is so overwhelmed by the mass that it can with difficulty force its way through it, or perhaps is smothered entirely; but drop a truth here, a maxim there, always striving to keep the spark alive. Fan it—do not blow it out.

For the Gospel Banner.
Chronological Queries Considered.

Exodus xii. 40, 41.— Gal. iii. 17.—“The Now the sojourning of covenant that was confirmed before of God in (who dwelt in Egypt) was *Chr. st.* the law which was *four hundred and thirty four hundred and thirty years.* And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day, it came to pass that all the hosts of the Lord went out of the land of Egypt.”

Gen. xv. 13, 14.— God spake on this wise, “Know therefore of a that *his seed* should *sojourn*, that thy *seed* shall *sojourn* in a strange land, be a *stranger* in a land [Canaan] and that they that is not theirs, (Canaan) and shall *serve* them [in Egypt] and they shall *entreat* them *evil four* afflict them *four hundred hundred years.* And the nation to whom they shall nation whom they shall be in bondage will I serve will I judge, and judge, said God, and afterwards *shall they* ter that *shall they come* come out with great sub- *forth* and serve me in this *place.*”

On comparison, it will be seen that the quotations all terminate with the same event—the Exodus. If that be so, then they cannot all begin at the same time, for four hundred cannot be equal to four hundred and thirty. The scriptures seem to indicate that *they do not all begin at the same time.* The periods in Exodus and Galatians, being equal in length and terminating with the same event, must also begin at the same time—the *confirmation of the covenant.* AT THIS TIME ABRAHAM HAD NO SEED. But the periods of Genesis and Acts *begin with Abraham's seed.* Therefore they begin later than the preceding quotations. Clearly then, the *four hundred years* beginning later and not extending further than the *four hundred and thirty years,* must be *comprehended within them.*

The Spirit was bestowed to guide into all truth. We take the latest affirmation of the Spirit, viz, Gal. iii. 17, to guide us to a *harmony* of the foregoing apparently conflicting statements. First then in regard to Exodus xii. 40, 41, your correspondent affirms, that “Moses speaks positively that the children of Israel were actually 430 years in Egypt.” Our guide on the contrary teaches us—whatever the passage *seems* to say—that the sojourning was 430 years. This begins with Abraham. “By faith he (Abraham) sojourned in the LAND OF PROMISE,” (Canaan) Heb. xi. 9.

Following the same guide, we understand Gen. xv. 13, quoted in Acts vii. 6, in the following manner. The 430 years being the duration of the sojourning, and the 400 years being comprehended within it. The four hundred years are also all sojourning years. Yet they are divided into two parts—the first, so-

journing *simply,* the next, *bondage.* The *whole* occupying *four hundred years.*

As to the translation, we can say nothing, but we think this is an instance of the care which the Spirit has taken to preserve the truth from serious errors and obscurities of translation. *An ANTIDOTE is furnished.*

Regarding the generations, we consider them as establishing the foregoing explanation.

Gen. xv. 15. “And thou (Abraham) shalt go to thy fathers in peace, thou shalt be buried in a good old age. (16.) But in the *fourth* generation (from the time they go into Egypt) they shall come hither (to Canaan) again.”

The generations are Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses. Now it is not reasonable to give 400 years to these *four* generations, when the nine immediately preceding had only 510 years.

FRANCIS COGNILL.

Reverence.

“Without natural affection.”—PAUL.

Where is the reverence of the olden time? Men with gray hairs, women with wrinkled faces, and some who have not so far advanced in life, speak of it as a thing that was, and they mourn that they do not see it now—days. Once age was respected because it was age without regard to titles or riches; the very children in the street paused as the old man tottered by them, leaning on his stick, his long white hair fluttering in the wanton breeze, and his dim eyes lighting up at sight of their pleasant smile.

We were visiting lately in a family where were several pretty girls. Beautifully attired, well educated, literally loaded with accomplishments, for they could sing, dance, play, embroider, chatter French, translate Latin, sing Italian, and withal were very handsome. The door opened and in came an old lady—very old. She looked about her as she slowly moved forward; not a head bowed in token of her presence—no one moved to give her a seat.

“Louise,” whispered one, “give grandmother a chair.”

“I shan’t; she might as well stay up stairs,” was the ungracious reply.

Presently one of them (ashamed at our disapproval, for we immediately arose and conducted the aged woman toward our own chair) offered her the seat with rockers, but she declined it, preferring to take what was given ungrudgingly. During all her stay, these very genteel ladies noticed her no more than if she was not in the room, except when she made an odd or ungrammatical expression, they tittered and ridiculed it among themselves.

O, it was thoroughly revolting to see this crown of gray hairs despoiled of its glory,

mocked by these thoughtless creatures. And soon those trembling feet would be treading the verge of the grave, and the mould would crumble and fall on a coffin, and they would think of her as the old woman whose presence was a nuisance—a check upon their pleasure—one who was always quoting old-fashioned songs, or singing them through her nose, whose homely gown, with its crossed handkerchief, was distasteful to their fashionable eyes, and of whom even the matron would say—"well, really, mother was growing so very childish, I could hardly mourn that she was gone."

Thus it is, and in this way that many of the aged are treated at the present day. Their sorrows, their tears, their sacrifices, their humble, hard toils, for children who have grown to manhood, are all forgotten, and those to whom they have given birth are ashamed of them. Alas! that it should be so—that while God, the great being to whom we owe all that we are, treats the gray hairs with reverence, calling them crowns of glory, we insult them in our conduct toward them, both in public and in private. Let no one who has any regard for his own character, his own purity and integrity, treat the aged with irreverence—they stand very near God.—*New York Tribune.*

Scriptural Sentiments in Poetry.

At one of the anniversaries in New York, Dr. Tyng recited a short poem from the pen of the late Charlotte Elizabeth, every line of which he regarded as containing a sentiment sustained by some passage of the Bible. He has appended to each line a scripture in which its sentiment is taught.

When from scattered lands afar, Matt. xxiv. 6, 8
Spreads the voice of rumored war; Luke xxi. 25
Nations in tumultuous pride, Haggai ii. 7
Heaved like ocean's rolling tide; Heb. xii. 26, 29
When the solar splendors fail, Matt. xxiv. 29
When the crescent waxeth pale, Rev. xxi. 12
And the powers that starlike reign Matt. xxiv. 29
Sink dishonored to the plain,— Joel ii. 3
World do thou the signal dread, Luke xxi. 26, 35
We exalt the drooping head— Luke xxi. 28
We uplift the expectant eye, Eph. i. 14
Our redemption draweth nigh, Rom. viii. 9, 23
When the fig-tree shoots appear, Matt. xxiv. 22, 23
Men behold their summer near; Luke xxi. 29, 31
When the hearts of rebels fail, Isa. lix. 18, 19
We the coming conqueror hail, Rev. xix. 11, 16
Bridegroom of the weeping spouse, Rev. xix. 7, 9
Listen to our longing vows— Rev. vi. 10
Listen to her widowed moan— Luke xviii. 3, 7, 8
Listen to creation's groan, Rom. viii. 22, 23
Bid, O bid thy trumpet sound, 1 Thess. iv. 16
Gather thine elect around; Matt. xxiv. 31
Gird with saints thy flaming ear, Jude 14
Summon them from climes afar; Isa. xxiv. 13, 15
Call them from life's cheerless gloom, Matt. xxiv. 40, 41
Call them from the marble tomb, Rev. xx. 4, 6
From the grass-grown village grave, Luke xiv. 14
From the deep dissolving wave, Psa. xlix. 14, 15

From the whirlwind and the flame, 1 Thess. iv. 17
Mighty head thy members claim! Col. i. 15
Where are they whose proud disdain Luke xix. 27
Scorned to brook Messiah's reign? Matt. xiv. 41, 42
Lo, in waves of sulphurous fire Luke xvii. 27
Now they taste his tardy ire; Rev. xix. 20, 21
Fettered till the appointed day, Rev. viii. 3, 5, 9
When the world shall pass away, 2 Pet. ii. 9
Quelled are thy foes, O Lord, Rev. xix. 1, 5, 21
Sheath again the dreadful sword; Psa. cx. 5, 7
Where the cross of anguish stood, Isa. liii. 3, 5, 12
Where thy life distilled its blood, Mark xv. 27
Where they mocked thy dying groan, Mark xv. 26
King of nations plant thy throne, Isa. xxiv. 23
Send thy law from Zion forth, Zech. viii. 3
Speeding o'er the willing earth— Dan. ii. 35, 44
Earth, whose Sabbath glories rise, Isa. xl. 1, 9
Crowned with more than Paradise, Psa. lxxvii. 6
Sacred be the impending veil! 1 Cor. xiii. 12
Mortal sense and thought must fail, 1 John iii. 2
Yet the awful hour is nigh; Luke xxi. 31
We shall see thee eye to eye, Rev. i. 7
Be our souls in peace possessed, 2 Thess. iii. 5
While we seek thy promised rest; 2 Tim. iv. 8
And from every heart and home Rev. xxii. 20
Breathe the prayer, "O Jesus, come!" Isa. xlix. 9
Haste to set the captive free, Rom. viii. 19
All creation groans for thee.

Remarks on the Gift of Healing, &c.

BRO. WILSON:—I am requested to lay before you that passage in Jas. v. 14; with the following remarks, if you think proper to insert them in the *Banner*. It reads as follows: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

The question has been settled at some of the Conferences, that the Elders of the first Christian churches were qualified and chosen for the office before the Apostles laid their hands on them. We think this passage is a message from the Holy Spirit to the Church, and these powers were intended to remain in the Church. We think this was to be a sign to show which is the church, or where it is. Again,—Can the church be complete without it? Again, If we endorse all the words of the Holy Spirit to bring into the church to build it up, and make it fit for the reception of our Lord the king; why not this? Is there any reason that the church should not now adhere to it? Let some brother show it. We think this was taught to the churches as their privilege. Again, It would have the effect to influence the members of our churches to walk orderly and humbly before God. We believe it would have a tendency to lead those beloved brethren whom the churches have thought fit to call to take the Eldership, to live every day in an acceptable state before their God, that they might be ready to perform their duty at any time.

S. G. CLARK. G. SNEATH.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., MAY 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 10.]

For the Gospel Banner.

"Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?"—Questions by G. B. Stacy.

REPLY BY J. M. STEPHENSON.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—In compliance with your request, and that also of a number of others, I will endeavor to the best of my ability, to answer G. B. Stacy's questions. The frank and candid manner in which they are presented demand a response of the same character.

Question No. 1.—Is not the term *king* derived from, and used in the place of the term *head*? And does not the term *head* express all that the term *king* expresses, and some things in addition which the term *king* does not embrace or comprehend?

Ans. No. The term *head*, is derived from the Greek word κεφαλη, *kephale*, which, according to Greenfield, signifies, "the head, (Matt. v. 36; Eph. v. 23; Matt. vi. 17,) top, the head of the corner, i. e. the chief corner stone; *met.*—the head, superior, chief, principal, one to whom others are subordinate." Hence, a father is the *head* of his family, the *husband* of his wife, the teacher of his pupils, the general of his army, the president of his cabinet, etc. etc.—but are they *all* therefore *kings*? Certainly not. The term *head* abstract from regal honor, or royalty, conveys no idea of kingly position whatever. It is only by implication this term denotes that of king. The term *king* in our English version of the N. T. and the Sept. of the O. T. is translated from the Greek words βασιλειος, *basileios*, royal, regal state, βασιλευς, *basileus*, a king, monarch, or possessing regal authority; whence βασιλευο, *basileuo*, to possess regal authority, to be a king, reign, to rule, govern." I suppose the Hebrew equivalents are of the same import. The term *head* never denotes that of king, unless associated with other terms expressive of royalty; and then determined by its *concomitants*, and not by its *philology*. Because this term is sometimes applied to a king it by no means proves that it is synonymous therewith; and that the Greek terms "*ecclesia*," which signifies

simply a congregation, and *basileia*, which signifies kingdom, are synonymous also. Christ is the head of the church in the same sense in which the husband is the head of the wife, 1 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. v. 23, 24. "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. For the husband is the *head* of the wife, even as Christ is the *head* of the church, and he is the Savior of the body. *Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.*" Hence the fact that Christ is head of the church, no more proves that he is a king, and the church his kingdom, than that every husband is a king, and his wife and children his kingdom also. The term *head*, therefore proves absolutely nothing, as far as its *import* is concerned, in favor of king, or kingdom. It is dependent upon other qualifying terms;—whereas the term *king* explains itself, independently of all other terms. There is not a more *ambiguous* term in any language than that of *head*. This word conveys no definite idea. It is equally applicable to anything in *art*, science, or natural things animate, or inanimate, and mere qualities or principles, which are *uppermost*, *first in order or quality*, *chief* in importance or position; whereas the term *king* is one of the most *definite* terms in all languages, ages, and countries. The term *head* is just as applicable to *ecclesiastical* position, or power, as that of *civil*; whereas the term *king* invariable conveys the idea of civil position and power. The term *head* does not convey the idea of royalty at all; whereas the term *king* always does. The term *head* does not intimate the existence of a kingdom in God's universe; whereas the term *king* is the *root* or predicate of the word kingdom, and therefore always implies its actual or supposed existence.

There being so many points of disparity between these two words, it would do great violence to both of them to substitute one for the

other in all cases; yea, in one case out of a hundred in the common use of the terms.

Question No. 2.—What authority is there in the Scriptures to authorize any one to contend that the constituent elements of modern constitutional kingdoms are necessary to the existence of the kingdom of God?

From the analogy between the kingdom of God, and the *kingdom of Israel*, which under its Davidical constitution, and when restored to its former nationality, is denominated the kingdom of God; and the analogy also between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdoms of the world. Also, from the analogy between the kingdom of God as the fifth kingdom, and the four successive kingdoms which precede it. Dan. ii. and vii. "These great beasts which are four, are four *kings* (*kingdoms*, ver. 23,) which shall arise out of the earth." "But the saints of the Most High shall *take the kingdom*, and *possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.*" The saints and Christ possess the fourth—the Roman kingdom.

"The *fourth beast* shall be the *fourth kingdom upon earth*. And the kingdom (i. e. the fourth kingdom,) and *dominion* * * * shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven * * * and there was given him *dominion*, and *glory*, and a kingdom, that all *people, nations*, and languages should serve him." In all the foregoing quotations, no essential difference in the constituent elements of the kingdoms of the world, and the kingdom of God, are noted. But in the last quotation, the son of man is the *king*, *all nations his subjects*, and the *earth the territory*. In the others, the saints are kings, the nations the subjects, and the earth the territory. And that they will *subordinate and govern* the nations by laws appears from Isa. ii. 1-4; Micah iv. 1-4; Jerusalem will then be the metropolis of the world, from whence shall issue laws for the subjugation and government of all nations. Again in Rev. xi. 15, it reads, "The *kingdoms* of this world are become the *kingdoms* of our Lord, and of his Christ." Now we must understand the kingdom of God according to the acceptance of the *tern kingdom*, when used with reference to earthly kingdoms, or show a good and valid reason why it should be understood in a different sense; for certainly, the whole force of analogy, goes to prove that they are identical in their essential and constituent elements. The *identity* between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of God will be investigated under another head.

Question No. 3.—Is not the legitimate jurisdic-

tion of the Creator over the created, the dominion, or kingdom of God, and co-existent with creation, and therefore absolute, universal, supreme and eternal?

God unquestionably has a supreme right and title to govern the workmanship of his own hands forever; but when he gave this right and title to Adam, (Gen. i. 26,) it then belonged to him; (that is, as far as the whole earth was concerned;) and when he gave it to David, (over the kingdom of Israel) it belonged to him; and when he shall give the kingdom of Israel, and the whole world to Jesus Christ, they will belong to him. Isa. ix. 6, 7; Luke i. 31-34; Psa. ii., Dan. vii. 13, 14; 2 Chron. xiii. 5. *Satan* and his allies, the *kings, governors*, and *potentates* of earth, are *usurpers*, and doomed to an eternal overthrow. The gift of the dominion of earth to the *first* and the *second Adams*, for a limited period of time, by no means infringes the dominion of the great God over the countless millions of worlds and intelligences, besides this little planet of ours; also his primary and reserved right to the endless dominion of the earth, after Christ shall have subjugated or destroyed the last enemy, and delivered up the kingdom to the Father, "that God may be all and in all," (1 Cor. xv. 23-28) through the endless ages of eternity.

Question No. 4.—God has nowhere promised to *set up the kingdom of God*, because it is necessarily co-existent with the works of his hands.

This is not a question, but a positive assumption without a particle of proof. But inasmuch as it is the real basis of all Mr. S's difficulties relative to the difference between the church and kingdom, I will endeavor to establish the affirmative of this position, so confidently denied. And even upon Mr. S's hypothesis of the Theocracy of Israel, during the reign of Judges, being the kingdom of God, I can prove the restoration of their Judges "as *aforetime*." But it is my desire to meet the real issue between a large body of Adventists and Mr. Stacy, viz. that the kingdom of Israel was originally the kingdom of God, and consequently when restored, will be the kingdom of God again. In this investigation I will not be confined to the wording of the phrase "set up." We want the truth on this important point. It is with great Bible ideas I have to do. The people selected Saul to be their king; but God selected David the son of Jesse to be his king; and the kingdom of Israel to be his kingdom, i. e. to be the kingdom of God. "And the Lord said unto Samuel, how long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Bethlehemite; for I HAVE PROVIDED ME A KING among his sons." 1 Sam. xvi. 1. "Now, therefore, thus shalt

thou say unto my servant David, thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, even from following the sheep, that thou shouldst be ruler over my people Israel. * * And it shall come to pass when thy days be expired, that thou must go to be with thy fathers, that I will raise up *thy seed* after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish *his* (thy son's) *kingdom*. * * * But I will settle him in *my house*, and *my* (God's) *kingdom* forever." 1 Chron. xvii. 7, 17, 11, 13. Thus God positively declares that the *kingdom* of David's son is *his kingdom*. "I will settle him in *my kingdom*," i. e. *God's kingdom*, or the *kingdom of God*.

And by reference to Samuel's version of the same promise, through the prophet Nathan, the same will appear, "and thine house, and *thy* (DAVID'S) *kingdom* shall be established forever." 2 Sam. vii. 16. Thus, the *kingdom of David*, the *kingdom of David's Seed*, and the *kingdom of God*, are one and the same kingdom.

Of the same import is the language of David in 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, 5. "Howbeit the Lord God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father to be king over Israel forever; for he hath chosen Judah to be the ruler; and of the house of Judah, the house of my father; and among the sons of my father he liked me to make me KING OVER ALL ISRAEL. And of all my sons (for the Lord hath given me many sons) he hath chosen SOLOMON MY SON TO SIT UPON THE THRONE OF THE KINGDOM OF THE LORD OVER ISRAEL." Thus, the kingdom of *David*, of *Solomon*, of *Israel*, and the kingdom of *God*, are used synonymously. "*The kingdom of Israel*," is positively declared to be "*the kingdom of God*." The Queen of Sheba understood the throne of Solomon and the throne of the Lord to be one and the same thing. 2 Chron. i. 8. "Blessed be the Lord thy (Solomon's) God, which delighted in thee to set thee on *his* (the Lord's) *throne*, to be king for the Lord thy God; because thy God loved Israel to establish *them* forever, therefore made *he thee king over them*," (*Israel*.) Hence the throne of Solomon was the throne of God, and the kingdom of Israel the kingdom of God. See also chap. xiii. 8. "And now ye think to withstand the *kingdom of the Lord* in the *hand* of the sons of David." Also ver. 5: "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons." Thus, the *kingdom of God* in the hands of the sons of David, was the *kingdom of David*—the *kingdom of Israel*. Hence the kingdom of God, the kingdom of David, the kingdom of David's sons was the same kingdom—in one word the kingdom of Israel was the kingdom of God.

I have also proved that the kingdom of David's *seed*, is Christ, and the kingdom of David, is the kingdom of God. Indeed, it would follow as a legitimate sequence, from the *promise* demonstrated by the foregoing testimony, viz. that the kingdom of Israel before its subversion was the kingdom of God. If the kingdom of God before its subversion, then when *restored*, *brought back*, or *replaced* in its former position, it will be the *kingdom of God again*. Thus God being the possessor of David's throne and kingdom—the house of Jacob—will have them to give to the "Son of God," and the "Son of David," according to his covenant with David. 2 Sam. vii. 12-15; 1 Chron. xvii. 11-14. For the fulfillment please read the testimony of the angel Gabriel, Luke i. 32, 33, "He shall be great, and shall be called the *Son of the Highest*; and the *Lord God* shall give unto him the *throne of his father David*. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Hence as the *Son of God* and the *Son of David*, he will reign upon the throne of both his father God and David.

TO BE CONTINUED.

J. M. STEPHENSON.

[Will the Harbinger please copy?]

For the Gospel Banner.

What is the Age of the World?

CONTINUED.

Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks.

Having expounded, as we understand it, verse 24 of this interesting prophecy, in its chronological aspect, it remains only to notice the six items that were to be accomplished inside the *defined* period. This we shall do as briefly as possible.

1st. "*To finish the transgression*" of Daniel's people. It would appear from the parable of the husbandmen and vineyard, that the crowning act of their transgression was the crucifixion of the Messiah, whom they put to death with the wicked hands of the Romans. They had beat one, killed another, and stoned a third of the servants God had sent. This they did twice. *Last* of all God sent his Son, saying, "they will reverence my son; but when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, this is the heir, come let us kill him, and seize on his inheritance." They did kill him, and in the act irrevocably sealed their fate, and that of their city. They were from this time forsaken of God and desolate, awaiting their impending doom—the justice of which was acknowledged by the chief priests themselves, who when asked by Jesus, "*What will he (the lord) do unto those husbandmen?*" answered, "*He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which*

shall render him the fruits in their seasons," which is equivalent to the language of Jesus, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Sentence was not immediately executed, for reasons which have been already stated in connection with the confirmation week.

2nd. *To make an end of the sins of Daniel's people.* "Once in the end of the world (age) hath he (Christ) appeared to PUT AWAY SIN BY the sacrifice of himself." Heb. ix. 26. "This man (Christ) after he had offered one sacrifice for sins FOR EVER sat down on the right hand of God," Heb. x. 12. "For by one offering he (Christ) hath perfected FOR EVER them that are sanctified," ver. 14. These quotations are sufficiently obvious without comment.

3rd. *To make reconciliation for iniquity.* "all things are of God, who hath RECONCILED us to himself by Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. v. 18.

4th. *To bring in everlasting righteousness.* in contradistinction to the righteousness of the law under which there was a remembrance made every year.

5th. *To seal up the vision and prophecy.* Sealing contains two very different ideas. That of marking or indicating; and that of closing or concealing. In the Scriptures, sealing is used in both senses. Thus Abraham received "the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." "Him (Jesus) hath God the father sealed," which was done when he was singled out by the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. In these two cases, the idea of indicating seems to be conveyed. It is very questionable, however, whether this meaning can be used in the passage under consideration. "To seal up the vision" seems to be explained by, "shut thou up the vision," Dan. viii. 26. In all cases where sealing stands related to "books," "words," "visions," the idea of concealing obtains; as, "O Daniel shut up the words and seal the book, even to the time of the end," Dan. xii. 4. "Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up, and sealed, till the time of the end," Dan. xii. 9. "Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not," Rev. x. 4. The converse of this latter passage is, seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. Rev. xxii. 10. The meaning of this passage is obvious, and no good reason appears why item, No. 5, should not be construed harmoniously with them. This conclusion leads to the rejection of a favorite theory, not devoid of plausibility; namely, give sealing the sense of marking, change prophecy to prophet as per margin, and the prophet Jesus was sealed at his baptism. Plausible as this

interpretation is, it contains a weak point, which we fear is fatal to it. In dismissing it, we do not hope to supply its place with anything as plausible. This phrase seems to have been a real puzzle to all expositors. It is doubly so to us from the fact that short as it is, there are several different translations.

To seal up the vision and prophecy.

To seal up the vision and prophet.

To seal up vision and prophecy.

To seal up visions and prophecies.

To consummate the vision and the prophet.

These are all by learned Doctors, except the last, which is Sir Isaac Newton's. It is unfortunate for us, and the reader, that we did not learn Hebrew, or the language in which the book of Daniel was written, for then we could have selected the right translation. As it is, we may adopt the one which is farthest from the truth. On second thought, we feel disposed to recall the foregoing, in view of the possibility of another various reading being added. We console ourselves in our misfortunes with the consideration that not much is lost, when they who do understand Hebrew cannot agree amongst themselves whether a noun is singular or plural, whether there is an article, and if so, whether it is definite or indefinite. Dismissing then the translation, we inquire, was the vision and prophecy to be kept sealed during the seventy weeks, and afterwards opened? or, was the vision and prophecy OPEN DURING the seventy weeks, and closed up at their end? The former of these questions seems to meet with an affirmative response. In the fifth chapter of Revelations, a "book" is introduced "written within and on the backside, and sealed with seven seals." An angel asks who is worthy to open and unseal it; but no man was able to do so, and John weeps. One of the elders tells him to "Weep not, behold the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof." John then sees "a Lamb as it had been slain," who takes "the book out of the right hand of him that sat on the throne." The beasts and elders then sung the following new song, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, FOR THOU WAST SLAIN, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." From the foregoing we see that the Lamb, or Jesus, was able to unseal the book, because he was slain. This he doubtless did immediately on his arrival at the right hand of the Father. This would be at the end of sixty nine and a half weeks. The prophecy demands that "the vision and the prophecy" should

be sealed for *seventy weeks*, in relation to Daniel's people; and so, though the Lamb knew the secrets half a week earlier, he did not reveal them until the seventy weeks had quite run out. The time having expired, Paul was honored by revelation with a knowledge of the mystery which angels and prophets desired to look into. Summarily it is as follows—"In the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth," Eph. i. 10. The mystery will be finished in the *seventh trumpet* portion of the *seventh seal* period. "And when he had opened the *seventh seal* there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour. And I saw the seven angels which stood before God, and to them were given *seven trumpets*," Rev. viii. 1, 2. "And in the days of the voice of the *seventh angel*, when he shall begin to sound, the *mystery of God should be finished*, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets," 10. "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying, the *kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever*," Rev. xi. 15.

"The dispensation of the fulness of the times," then, is the *sounding of the seventh angel*, and the *gathering together of all things both which are in heaven and on earth into Christ*, of Eph. i. 10, is the *kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ*. Thus then the vision and prophecy were kept sealed throughout the whole of the seventy weeks, and on their expiring was revealed to Paul.

6th. To anoint the most holy, (Christ.) This has already been explained in connection with the period to Messiah the prince.

EZEKIEL'S 390 DAYS.

It will be remembered that the period from the end of the captivity to the 20th of Artaxerxes, comprising 66 years, was submitted on the authority of Rollin, without Scripture corroboration. We stated that we had corroboration of it which would be forthcoming at the proper time. That time is now come. It will likewise be remembered that we used Ezekiel iv. 4, to substantiate the 430 years of the duration of the temple. In interpreting that prophecy we purposely omitted the 390 days of verse 9, considering that if introduced now it would be of more service than at that time. We mean to use it now for the purpose of corroborating *all* the years that intervene from the destruction of the temple until the birth of Christ. The periods are as follows:—

Period 10, The Captivity,	YEARS.	70
Period 11, Darius,		34
Xerxes,		12

Artaxerxes, 20— 66
 Period 12, To the birth of Christ, 453

Total 589

The captivity will not be the worse for being corroborated further, inasmuch as many able chronologists have considered it to have only one beginning—the 4th of Jehoiakin; one ending—Darius the Median; thereby losing 19 years. The next period had no Scripture basis whatever, and it is for its especial benefit the present corroboration is designed. The last period we think was put beyond all peradventure. In its case assurance will be made doubly sure. The passage from Ezekiel is as follows;—"Take thou also unto thee wheat, and barley, and beans, and lentils, and millet, and fitches, and put them in one vessel, and make thee bread thereof, according to the number of days that thou shalt lie upon thy side, *three hundred and ninety days shall thou eat thereof*," Ezek. iv. 9. The reader may if he choose peruse verses 10, 11, 12. We do not quote them, because the gist of the whole prophecy is contained in verse 13—"And the Lord said, even thus shall the children of Israel *eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles*, whether I will drive them." By reference to the context from which the foregoing passages are quoted, the reader will perceive that the 390 days begun at the siege of Jerusalem. In order that it should receive a literal accomplishment, all that is required is, *that the Jews should eat defiled bread among the Gentiles for three hundred and ninety years*. There is no ground whatever to expect a restoration of the Hebrew Monarchy, in any shape or form whatsoever. The reason for this latter remark will appear hereafter. But what are we to understand by eating defiled bread? A practical illustration is given in the first chapter of Daniel. Daniel, Hananiah, Michael, and Azariah, were of the captives. The king of Babylon appointed them a *daily provision of his meat*, and think you that he respected the law of Moses? Nay, rather would he not as all conquerors do, coerce them to embrace his religion and worship his God? the first step to which is, to make them violate their conscience towards their own. The daily provision is not indicated, but "Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not *defile* himself with the portion of the king's meat," importing that the diet was legally unclean. And here we find a striking illustration of a God-fearing man, recorded for our admonition. He is uncompromising, yet temperate, and deferential. For his faithfulness God rewards him in his then present existence, and has God changed since? He brought Daniel into favor, and procured for him and his fellows immunity from the

decreed. Hosea further explains what defiled bread is, "Israel shall not dwell in the Lord's land, but Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and they shall eat unclean things in Assyria." Considering then that we have made plain enough what defiled bread is, we know what may be looked for at the end of 390 years from the burning of the temple. This—immunity from defiling themselves by legally unclean diet, such as is recorded of Daniel and his fellows.

Dr. Thomas has represented first in the *Herald of the Kingdom*, next in *Epis Israel*, and more recently in his new work *Eureka*, that the Jews were to eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles for 430 days. The Bible says 390. The reader is at liberty to accept whichever of these statements he chooses. Again, under a false impression that the period, *whatever it is*, terminates in restored national independence, he has connected it with the Maccabean dynasty; and according to his own showing it terminates with the death of the founder, Judas Maccabeus; an unfortunate termination, but as good as could be expected under the circumstances. No, the prophecy says nothing about restored monarchy or independence. Did anything remarkable happen at the end of 390 years? Yes, just such a thing obtained in the case of the Jews generally as obtained in the case of Daniel and his associates.

Antiochus the great, who ruled over all Asia, was contemporary with Ptolemy Philopater king of Egypt. These two kings were not on the most amicable terms. During their wars the Jews suffered greatly; their condition fluctuating with the fortunes of their rulers. At one time they were under the one king, and at another, the other. Upon their devoted heads fell the blasting consequences of the war. At length Antiochus finally defeated Ptolemy, and seized and held Judea. Ptolemy died, and his son Ptolemy Epiphanes succeeded him. Of course rivalry is resumed. Ptolemy Epiphanes sends his general Scopus against Cælo-Syria, and the Jews once more changed masters. The Egyptians however did not long retain their supremacy, for Antiochus defeated Scopus in a battle fought at the fountains of Jordan. Scopus was obliged to submit to ignominious conditions. The Jews welcomed Antiochus into Jerusalem, supplied his army and elephants plentifully with provisions, and helped to besiege the garrison Scopus had left in the citadel. Here was the turning point in the fortunes of the Hebrews. Here ended the 390 years. Here did they cease to eat defiled bread. Antiochus remembered their good offices, as the following epistles of Antiochus himself will show. They are pretty lengthy, but their importance which is manifest will

doubtless be a sufficient apology for introducing them unabridged. They are transcribed from Josephus' *Antiquities*, book 12, chap. iii. sec. 3 and 4.

"King Antiochus to Ptolemy, sendeth greeting: Since the Jews, upon our first entrance in their country, demonstrated their friendship towards us; and when we came to their city (Jerusalem) received us in a splendid manner, and came to meet us with their senate, and gave abundance of provisions to our soldiers, and to the elephants, and joined with us in ejecting the garrison of the Egyptians that were in the citadel, we thought fit to reward them, and to retrieve the condition of their city, which hath been greatly depopulated by such accidents as have befallen its inhabitants, and to bring those that have been scattered abroad back to the city. And, in the first place, we have determined, on account of their piety towards God, to bestow on them, as a pension, for their sacrifices of animals that are fit for sacrifice, for wine, and oil, and frankincense, the value of twenty thousand pieces of silver, and six sacred artubrac of fine flour, with one thousand four hundred and sixty medimni of wheat, and three hundred and seventy five medimni of salt. And these payments I would have fully paid them, as I have sent orders to you. I would also have the work about the temple finished, and the cloisters, and if there be anything else that ought to be rebuilt. And for the materials of wood, let it be brought them out of Judea itself, and out of the other countries, and out of Libanus, tax free: and the same I would have observed as to those other materials which will be necessary, in order to render the temple more glorious. And let all of that nation live according to the laws of their own country; and let the senate and the priests, and the scribes of the temple, and the sacred singers, be discharged from poll money, and the crown tax, and other taxes also. And that the city may the sooner recover its inhabitants, I grant a discharge from taxes for three years to its present inhabitants, and to such as shall come to it, until the month Hyperboreatus. We also discharge them for the future from a third part of their taxes, that the losses they have sustained may be repaired. And all those citizens that have been carried away, and are become slaves, we grant them and their children their freedom, and give order that their substance be restored to them."

Such is the first epistle. We see plainly in it a recognition of the law, and as the law required the temple it also receives attention. Likewise are the Jews encouraged to return—even brought back; and such as are slaves freed. Such would of course once more enjoy the inestimable privilege of living according to their own law—the law of Moses. Thus is an end put to eating defiled bread among the Gentiles. But there is more pointed testimony regarding defiled bread forth-coming.

Antiochus also published the following decree, through all his kingdom, in honor of the temple.

"It shall be lawful for no foreigner to come within the limits of the temple round about; which thing is forbidden also to the Jews, unless to those who, according to their own custom, have purified themselves. Nor let any flesh of horses, or of mules, or of asses, be brought into the city, whether they be

wild or tame; nor that of leopards, or foxes, or hares, and, IN GENERAL, THAT OF ANY ANIMAL WHICH IS FORBIDDEN FOR THE JEWS TO EAT. Nor let their skins be brought into it; nor let any such animal be bred in the city. Let them only be permitted to use the sacrifices derived from their forefathers, with which they have been obliged to make acceptable atonements to God. And he that transgresseth any of these orders, let him pay to the priests three thousand drachmæ of silver."

We think the foregoing dissipates every doubt about this being the true termination of the "defiled bread" period; and of course sets aside the death of Judas Maccabeus. The only question that remains is as to the time when the preceding decrees were issued. They were issued just three hundred and ninety years after the destruction of the temple. The expiration of the period has already been noted in period 12.

We will now turn this prophecy to the account for which it was held back so long. We have attempted to show that the years from the burning of the temple are five hundred and eighty-nine, terminating with the birth of Christ. Rollin gives the date of the decrees as B. C. 198. Now if no error has occurred, on deducting from the 589 years, Rollin's year B. C. will just be left, for the 589 ends at the birth of Christ, and the 390 begins at the burning of the temple. Thus

The whole number of years from the burning	589
of the temple to the birth of Christ,	390
Deduct Ezekiel's years,	199
	198

Rollin's date of Decrees,

Discrepancy

1

Even the discrepancy is explained by considering Rollin's as complete years; if so, then it was in the hundred and ninety-ninth year before Christ the decrees were issued—the very figures required. Thus then is a period of 66 years verified, which has no Scripture basis whatever. This 4th chapter of Ezekiel has been of good service; for taking our stand at the burning of the temple, with our measuring line in our hand, we stretch it back into the past 390 years, and we set it down at the rebellion in the 4th of Rehoboam—other 40 years, and we lay it down upon the building of the temple. Once more from the stand point we extend our tape into the future 390 years, and the Jews emerge from their long period of defilement. This is not all—it spans unerringly as has been shown—all the years to the birth of Christ.

From the destruction of the temple it reaches	390
back into the past, first	40
Then	390
Down into the future,	390
Directly proven,	820
Indirectly other	199
Proven by the 4th chap. of Ezekiel alone,	1019

FRANCIS COGHILL.

The Messiahship of Jesus.

In a course of Lectures on "the Messiahship of Jesus," by Samuel C. F. Frey, the lecturer makes the following remarks to his brethren the Jews:—

THE TIME PREDICTED FOR THE ADVENT OF THE SHILOH OR MESSIAH.—It is evident that he was to come before the scepter ceased from Judah, or rather during the existence of the tribe of Judah, distinctly known by genealogy. The Hebrew word *sheret*, translated scepter, is not in use as a verb, and as a noun it signifies literally a rod or staff of any kind, but it is used figuratively for a scepter, the ensign of royal authority; a tribe, a branch of a family or nation; or the ensign of tribunal jurisdiction, exercised by the head of a tribe. It is evident that the word in this passage [Gen. xlix. 10] has no reference to royal authority, and should not be translated by the word scepter, but "the tribe of Judah," for (as Bishop Sherlock and others have justly observed) that it could not, with any sort of propriety be said, *the scepter should not depart from Judah*, when Judah had no scepter, nor was to have any for many generations afterwards: besides, the royal authority departed from Judah above five hundred years before the birth of Christ. The true and legitimate meaning, therefore, of the word *sheret* is the tribe or tribeship, the same as in verses 16 and 28 of this very chapter: "Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel." "All these are the twelve tribes of Israel." The import of this part of the prediction, therefore, is plainly this, that the tribe of Judah should not be scattered and confounded as the rest of the tribes of Jacob would be, but should remain a distinct tribe, known by genealogy until the Messiah should come. Hence great care was taken by numbering this tribe more frequently, to preserve its genealogy. See 1 Sam. ii. 8; 2 Sam. ii. 4; 2 Chron. xii. 15.

The next sentence descriptive of the time of Messiah's advent, is thus expressed: "Nor a lawgiver from between his feet," or "of his off-spring." The word *Mechokek*, a law-giver, is variously translated. The radical meaning is, "to engrave." Hence are derived laws, statutes, kings, rulers, leaders, scribes and teachers. It cannot mean in this passage "a law-giver," for no tribe has a right to make any laws; for God himself was their Law-giver, and by his laws the king himself was to be governed; but each tribe had its prince or ruler, not to make laws, but like magistrates to judge the tribe by the laws, but like, or as the three Targums and other Jewish writers expressed it, the scribes and teachers of the law.

From what has been said, it is evident that Shiloh, the Messiah, was to appear while Ju-

dash was a distinct tribe, having its genealogies and its magistrates, lawyers, and expounders of God's laws.

Hence great care has been taken to keep up the genealogy of this tribe until the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. But it is an undeniable fact that the tribe of Judah as well as all other tribes, has lost its genealogies for more than 1700 years; and therefore the Messiah must have come or the prediction is false. To assert the latter would be blasphemous; to deny the former, is unreasonable.

In a manuscript book written by a Mr. Barnett, one of our nation, who lived and died a pious Christian, is the following judicious observation: "The word *shecet* here mentioned in Jacob's prophecy, and commonly translated scepter, meaning royal dominions, should, in my opinion, be literally understood *the tribe*, as expressed in the 28th verse of this chapter: "These are the tribe." Judah was not to cease being a tribe (although ten were removed and carried away,) distinguished and known by its genealogies as such, until Shiloh came; nor till then was the Law-giver to cease from between his feet, for the Sanhedrim were still in Jerusalem when our Savior came, and these genealogies subsist only to prove him, in his human nature, son of Abraham, son of Judah, and son of David. The tribe at his coming was to withdraw from Judah, and unto Shiloh were the nations to be gathered. This prophecy was literally fulfilled, for the ten tribes were carried away captives, but Judah remained; and remained a tribe distinct from Levi and Benjamin in the days of Jesus, even to the destruction of the temple. Until the days of Jesus the genealogies of the tribe of Judah as a known distinct tribe, were preserved; and the Jews themselves allow that Jesus was of the tribe of Judah; but as soon as the Christian church was established, or the aggregation was to Shiloh, then fell down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile. He came for whom was ordered the distinction of tribes and genealogies, to mark his descent. For him they subsist, and having finished their design and destination they exist no more.

Was the law-giver, ruler or magistrate not to cease until Shiloh came? This also was fulfilled. There were always up to the time of the last captivity rulers in Israel, either a king or governor, as there were unto the time of Christ under the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks and Romans, such as Gedaliah and Zerubbabel, and particularly the Sanhedrim, a court of judicature, the members of which chiefly consisted of the tribe of Judah; and the Nasi or prince of it was always of that tribe, and which retained

its power till the latter end of Herod's reign when Christ had come, but soon after it lost its power.

From the Crisis.

Melchisedec.

A friend wishes for an answer to the following questions through the "Crisis";—

1st, Who was Melchisedec?

2nd, Did he exist before the foundation of the world?

Various have been the conjectures advanced in regard to the first question. Some have supposed that it was Enoch; others that it was Shem, the son of Noah, and others that it was the Son of God: but all these suppositions prove nothing. The only reliable answer that can be given must be in harmony with the Scripture. The question undoubtedly arises from the account of him as given by Paul in Heb. vii. 3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life: but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually." If this text teaches that Melchisedec had no father or mother, and that he had no beginning of days, nor end of life, then the second question is answered; he not only existed before the foundation of the world, but co-eternal with God; and yet he is called a man,— "without end of life,"—then he will live as long as God lives; and we must come to the legitimate conclusion from the premise, there are two self-existent Gods, or beings that never had a beginning, and never will cease to live. "He abideth a priest continually," that is, as long as he lives; hence we have two priests officiating at the same time, and will continue to all eternity.

The above conclusions are absurd, and grow out of a false premise in relation to Melchisedec's having no father, or mother, or beginning of days. To get a right understanding of this, it is necessary that we take into consideration the subject under discussion by the apostle. The subject properly commences with the first verse of the fifth chapter: "For every high priest taken from men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins; and no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but He that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." By this we learn that the subject Paul is discoursing upon, is the calling and ordaining of priests; and that Christ was called of God and made a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not after

the order of Aaron. The argument of Paul in his discourse goes to show, first, that if the priesthood is changed there must be a change of the law. Chap. vii. 11-12.—“If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” Second, that the priesthood is changed from the order of Aaron to that of Melchisedec, chap. vii. 21, 22.—“For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath, by him that said unto him, the Lord sware and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec; by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.” In the first verse of the 8th chapter we have the whole argument summed up:—“Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: we have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” This gives us a view of what Paul was trying to prove: namely: that the priesthood was changed from the Aaronic order to that of the Melchisedec.

Now we are prepared to examine in relation to Melchisedec and his order of priesthood in contradistinction to the Aaronic. The claim to the office of a priest, under the Aaronic order, was in the pedigree. The Jewish priests were obliged to produce an exact genealogy of their families, showing that they were of the tribe of Levi, before they were allowed to officiate as priests. When this was produced they could act as priest, whether they were righteous or not. To show that the order of Melchisedec is more perfect than that of Aaron, Paul commences by giving us the signification of the name of Melchisedec. Chap. vii. 1, 2.—“For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the field of slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after that also king of Salem, which is, king of peace.” This man was king of Salem. His name interpreted, signifies, “First, king of righteousness, and after that king of peace.” It was a name given to a man to signify the position that he occupied; as Abraham was given in place of Abram, to signify that he was a father of many nations; and as Israel was given to Jacob, to signify one of faith; so Melchisedec was a name given to signify one that was king of righteousness, and a priest

of God at the same time. Then to show that this order of priesthood is not dependent upon the tribe of Levi, he says, that Melchisedec was a priest of the Most High God, “Without father, without mother, without descent, (margin, pedigree,) having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.”

Paul explains what he means by saying without father, or mother, beginning of days, or end of life; when he says he is “without descent,” or as margin reads without pedigree, or genealogy; that is, this man was called to be a priest of God, without proving that he was of some special tribe, for he had no genealogy, or pedigree, by which he could show who his father or mother were, consequently he could not tell when he began life, and there is no account of the man to show when he died. Hence, as far as his genealogy is concerned, he is without father or mother, beginning of days or end of life.

Now we notice the last clause of the verse; “But made like unto the Son of God abideth a priest continually.” Under the Aaronic order they must prove their genealogy, and were not allowed to commence until they were thirty years old, hence they must prove when they commenced life, and then they were not allowed to continue as priests after they were fifty years old.—Num. viii. 24, 25. “But this man abideth a priest continually;” that is, as long as he lives. Christ being made a priest after this ORDER shows;—

1st. That there was no necessity of his being of the tribe of Levi. Thus Paul answers an objection that might have been in the minds of some as to Christ being priest.

2nd. Being of the order of Melchisedec, he could, or must be priest and king at the same time. The priest under the Aaronic order could hold but one office.

3d. Under the Aaronic order at the age of fifty they must cease to officiate, but under this order they remained in office without any regard to age. So Christ can continue priest without any regard to his age.

Who Melchisedec was cannot be told from the fact that Paul says there is no pedigree or genealogy of the man, his father or mother, or when he began his days, or ended his life; but this we know, that he was a man; for Paul says, “Now consider how great this MAN was, unto whom even the Patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.” It was not Enoch, Shem, or Christ, for we have the genealogy of those, and of their fathers and mothers, and the beginning of their lives. Melchisedec was a king, but there is no genealogy of Melchisedec, from the fact that

the name signifies one that is both king and priest, and is not a family name. He did not exist before the foundation of the world any more than any other man. The text does not teach the man had no father or mother, that he was without beginning of days or end of life: for that would prove too much; hence, it must have reference to his having no genealogy of father or mother, beginning of days or end of life, yet he was a priest of the Most High God.

If we find out who Melchisedec was, we must be before Paul, and be able to tell his genealogy, age and death; at what age he was called to be a priest, and many other things of which there is no account.

J. H.

A Doubting Epistle and Remarks.

Lewiston, March 10th, 1861.

Mr. Wilson:—Excuse my boldness in writing you, but my desire to know the truth prompts me. I was brought up to believe what you teach; but I do not know about its being the truth. My ideas are confused. I can see the way to be saved perfectly well, but the rest of the Bible is as a blank book to me. If the disciples could not agree in their teachings how do you expect we can. The Bible teaches, and so do you, that God has a body of some substance, it also teaches that God is a spirit. Jesus says a spirit has not flesh and blood, (bones) as ye see me have. I might refer you to a number of passages that I cannot reconcile. I do not wish to be a sceptic, but then I cannot help it. I have taken the *Banner* for nearly a year. There is one remark worth noticing, namely, you teach there is not one promise in the whole Bible of a soul going to heaven. What an idea! has not Christ said that He has gone to prepare a place for us? did He not tell his disciples they could not come then, but would hereafter? Does not the Bible say, that the body returns to dust as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it? and yet you teach that the dead sleep. I know that the Bible says that the dead know not anything, and this is why I am confused. I am sometimes tempted to reject the whole. I profess to be a Christian, but if your doctrine be true, I shall be lost, because I have rejected it. Oh I wish I could believe the word of God! I wish the Bible was such a book that you say it is—a chain well-linked together. I am willing to be anything for Christ's sake. I am very willing to embrace your ideas, if I could believe they were true. I cannot prove that they are, and I do not believe you can by the Bible.

A TRUTH-SEEKER.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent would do well to study

the evidences of Christianity, and especially the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, in order to exorcise the spirit of scepticism which at present seems to possess her. Read works treating on these subjects till you are satisfied that the Bible is a compendium of the writings of those "holy men of God, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," to whom the various books are ascribed. Having become fully satisfied with respect to this, then open the book with reverence to ascertain the will of its author, being confident of one thing, that as the various books were written under the guidance of one spirit, there are no *real* contradictions there. All *seeming* ones may be carefully and candidly examined in order to find out the truth; and, if in some cases, the desired result cannot be satisfactorily obtained, attribute it to want of light, or to dulness of intellect, rather than on that account ignore the whole book as a fable, or unworthy of credit.

Our correspondent is laboring under a mistake when she says the Disciples did not agree in their teachings. What doctrines did they teach contradictory of one another? When the Bible says "God is a spirit," we are not to attach the common idea of spirit, or phantom, as the meaning; because such a spirit is immaterial, and therefore nothing. In 2 Cor. iii. 17, Christ is called the "Lord, the Spirit," and we know that he is a tangible being. "Handle me and see," said he to his disciples, "for a spirit (or phantom) hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," Luke xxiv. 39. And he is "the image of the invisible God," "whom no man has seen or can see." Angels are also called "spirits," yet they are material beings. In order to understand the Bible doctrine concerning *spirit* and *spirits*, the mind must be divested of sectarian ideas about the ghosts of dead persons being spirits, or *immaterial* personalities. We repeat again, there is not a promise in the whole Bible for a *soul* or *spirit* of any one to go to heaven at death; and yet everybody knows that this is the universal belief, and the doctrine taught at almost every funeral which takes place in both Protestant and Catholic countries. True, Christ has gone to heaven, but he went as a resurrected *man*—not as we are taught by sectarian divines in the way people now go there. They go without their bodies—naked spirits—to a place where Jesus told his disciples they could not go. Our correspondent is mistaken in saying that Jesus told them, that though they might not go then, they should hereafter. He told them, that *he* would return, and receive them to himself—that where he is, there they might be also. And we know that when he comes again, it will

be to reign on the earth, with his saints for one thousand years.

There is no contradiction in the Bible doctrine of the dead not knowing anything and the spirit returning to God who gave it. Our correspondent has the sectarian notion of a spirit in her mind. Gen. ii. 7, shows what kind of a spirit was given to man at his creation. This spirit which returns to God is that which he gave at first—the breath of lives which animates all flesh. It is called the breath of the Almighty, Job xxxiii. 4, because he breathed it at first into man. This spirit is also called *breath* by the Psalmist—“Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom is no help. His *breath* goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Psalm cxlvi. 3, 4. And we know what the Scriptures further affirm is true, that there is “no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave;” that it is a place of darkness, silence, and repose—the “land of forgetfulness”—where there is no remembrance of Jehovah, or the voice of thanksgiving and praise. It is as king Hezekiah declared, “the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth,” Isa. xxxviii. 17. Hence death is spoken of by Jesus and his apostles frequently as a *sleep*—or a state of repose and unconsciousness. See Matt. xxvii. 52; Acts vii. 60; xiii. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 6, 18, 20, 51; 1 Thess. iv. 13–15. The *spirit* or *breath* of man which returns to God who gave it, is in the neuter gender, has no personality, no consciousness—and therefore cannot be what divines say it is, “immortal”—“deathless”—“a spark of divinity,” &c. These are terms not found in the Bible. That book is consistent with itself—“a chain well-linked together.”

Let “Truth-seeker” seriously and candidly examine these matters, with a child-like disposition rather than a sceptical mind, before she comes to the conclusion to reject the whole. Important interests hang upon the adoption or rejection of Bible truths. It is a matter of life or death. “This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,” John xvii. 3. Peter said that Jesus had “the words of eternal life,” and he himself said, “the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” Hence the importance of believing and obeying the Word, which is the record which God has given of his Son, and a transcript of his will concerning us.

EDITOR.

Can You Believe?

1st. Can you believe that God is *not a person*, when Paul says, that Jesus is “*the ex-*

press image of his (God's) person?” Heb. i. 3.

2nd. Can you believe that he has no form, when the word so plainly says, that Jesus was “*in the FORM OF GOD?*” Phil. ii. 6.

3rd. Can you believe that God made man, and then put his image into him, when God says; that “*in the image of God MADE HE MAN?*” Gen. ix. 6. It was the MAN MADE in the image of God, and not an image PUT INTO the man. Gen. i. 26.

4th. Can you believe that MAN is *part* earth, and *part* God, when the Scriptures so plainly teach you, that “*God MADE MAN of the dust of the ground,*” and that the first man (Adam) is of the EARTH, EARTHY? Gen. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 47.

5th. Can you believe the creeds of men to be consistent, when they assert that God is “*without parts,*” and yet teach you that man has got a PART of God in him? which divides God into a multitude of *parts*.

6th. Can you believe that the breath which God breathed into man was a part of God's very immortal nature, when the Bible says, that man and beast have “*ONE BREATH?*” Eccl. iii. 19; which would prove that beasts were immortal as well as men.

7th. Can you believe that God made man's body, and put an immortal soul into it, when God says, that “*MAN became a living soul,*” and Paul says, that “*The first man Adam was made a living soul?*” Gen. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 45. It was the man that became a *living soul*, and not that God put a soul into the man's body.

8th. Can you believe that man is immortal, when God tells you that *man is mortal?* Job iv. 17.

9th. Can you believe that man has an immortal soul, when the apostle teaches that we must *seek for immortality* by patient continuance in well-doing? Rom. ii. 7. Why seek for it if we have it?

10th. Can you believe that man is now immortal, when Paul declares that God “*only hath immortality?*” 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

11th. Can you believe that the heathen Socrates brought immortality to light, when God's word shows it was *brought to light by the gospel?* 2 Tim. i. 10. The way it was brought to light was by Christ abolishing death at his resurrection to immortality, and not that men have immortal souls. Rev. i. 18.

12th. Can you believe that man gets his immortality at his birth into this world, when the Bible shows that it is not put on until the resurrection of the dead? 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

13th. Can you believe man to be immortal, when the word of God nowhere teaches such an idea, and when the word *immortal* is used but once in the Scriptures, and then it is applied to God? (1 Tim. i. 17;) and the word

immortality but five times;—once, that God *only* hath it; once, that we should *seek* for it; once, that it is brought to light through the gospel; and twice, that it is not put on until the resurrection of the dead. 1 Tim. vi. 16; Rom. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 52, 54. These are the only places where it is used in the Bible.

14th. Can you believe the soul will never die, when God says, "the soul that sinneth it shall die?" Ezek. xviii. 4.

15th. Can you believe the testimony of dying Christians in preference to all others? if so, do you believe Samson told the truth when he said, "let my SOUL DIE with the Philistines," and when Balaam said, "let my SOUL DIE THE DEATH of the righteous?" Judges xvi. 30; Num. xxiii. 10. (see margin of these quotations, which is the correct rendering.)

16th. Can you believe that Job endorsed the heathen dogma that the soul will never die, when he said, "my soul chooseth *strangling* and DEATH rather than my life?" Job vii. 15.

17th. Can you believe that David embraced the doctrine that the soul would never die, when he proclaims, that "none can *keep alive his own soul*?" again, "he (God) spared not his *soul from death*," Psa. xxii. 29; lxxviii. 50.

18th. Can you believe that when the breath or spirit goes forth from man at death, and when man returns to his earth that his thoughts *continue* to live on, when the Bible says, "in that *very day* HIS THOUGHTS PERISH?" Psa. cxlvi. 4.

19th. Can you believe that the dead are praising God, when the word of God so plainly says, that "the *dead praise* not the Lord, neither *any* that go down into *silence*?" Psa. cxiv. 17.

20th. Can you believe that the dead know more than the living, when God declares, "the *dead know not anything*?" Eccl. ix. 5.

21st. Can you believe that *Sheol* or *Hades* is a place of consciousness when the Scriptures say, that "there is no WORK, nor DEVICE, nor KNOWLEDGE, nor WISDOM, in the *grave*," (Heb. *Sheol*, Greek *Hades*,) whether *τιου* goest?" Eccl. ix. 10.

22nd. Can you believe that in death men remember God, when David says, "in *death* there is *no remembrance of thee*?" Psa. vi. 5.

23rd. Can you believe that David is now in heaven, when Peter says, "For David is not ascended into the heavens," Acts ii. 34, and that "he is both *dead and buried*?" ver. 29.

24th. Can you believe there is any necessity for a future judgment and resurrection, if man receives his reward at death? would it be consistent to judge him at death then

take him from hell or heaven, in the day of judgment, judge him and put him right back again, making a double judgment?

25th. Can you believe that man would have a future state *without* a resurrection, when we are told by the apostle, that if the dead rise not, "then they who are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED?" 1 Cor. xv. 18.

26th. Can you believe that Paul expected to have a future life or be with Christ, *without* a resurrection, after having said, "*what advantageth me if the dead rise not*, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die?" 1 Cor. xv. 32.

27th. Can you believe that at the resurrection, men are called from heaven and hell to judgment, when Jesus says, "all that are IN THEIR GRAVES shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; THEY that have done good, to the *resurrection of life*, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation?" John v. 28. Thus it is plain that men are called from their graves in the day of judgment.

28th. Can you believe that eternal life was given to us through our parents, when the Scriptures say, "*the gift of God is eternal life* through our Lord Jesus Christ?" Rom. vi. 23.

29th. Can you believe that the wicked will live forever in hell, when God declares, "*all the wicked will he DESTROY*?" Psa. cxlv. 20, and "they shall be as though they had not been;" and "*shall not be*;" "*perish*;" "*be as nothing*;" "*be burned up root and branch*;" "*be consumed*;" "*lose life*;" "*not see life*;" "*be devoured*;" burnt up with an "*unquenchable fire*;" &c., &c. Obad. 16; Psa. xxxvii. 19, 20; Isa. xli. 11, 12; Mal. iv. 1-8; John xii. 25; Psa. civ. 35; ci. 8; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20; Matt. xiii. 36; Rom. vi. 23; Heb. vi. 8, 26-29; Gal. vi. 7, 8; Matt. iii. 12.

30th. Can you believe the everlasting punishment of which Christ speaks is everlasting *misery*, when Paul tells you, it shall be "*everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord?" Matt. xxv. 46; 2 Thess. i. 7-9.

Finally. Can you believe that God will leave you uncondemned in the day of wrath if you discard all these plain facts, which are so plainly taught in his blessed word? Tho phrases, "immortal soul," "never-dying soul," "immortal spirit," "deathless spirit," "spirit-land," "land of spirits," &c., which you so often hear from the Clergy, and read in hymn books, ARE NOT in the word of God; you cannot find one of them in the Bible. Then why believe such heathen dogmas, and reject the plain word of the living God?

Therefore, we say believe his word and obey it, and you will gain a resurrection to life, and a glorious entrance into the kingdom of everlasting peace.

H. V. REED.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JUNE 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 11.

For the Gospel Banner.

Jesus the Christ.

In this modern day of Mystic Babylonish dialect, in Christendom, (or the domain over which it is supposed the Christ rules as God's Son,) great confusion of tongues is heard about that distinguished personage, whom Jehovah has appointed as His Vicegerent, by whom He intends to "bless all nations," and to work out that angelic exordium, (Luke ii. 14,) "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

The followers of Athanasius, dogmatize that this delegated personage is, and ever was, co-eternal, and co-equal with God. Hence it has for centuries been asserted that *Christ* is a *person*, who *pre-existed* from all eternity, ultimately born of Mary.

I respectfully submit to your readers that the main cause of all this confusion, arises from the false premises assumed at the basis of the question. (For it is purely accidental that any author can arrive at correct conclusions, when his foundation premises are false.) Consequently the assumption that *Christ is a person is not true*. Jehovah had covenanted with David, 2 Sam. vii. 11-16, that he, David, was to be the progenitor of a Son, who also was to be the Son of God, in whose person was to reside the government forever over the twelve tribes. God named the birth place of this future "Ruler in Israel." See Micah v. 2. He appointed the character of his mother as "a Virgin." See Isa. vii. 14. He made known to Joseph, Matt i. 21, that Mary "shall call his name *Jesus*." This then gives the appellative or proper name of him, whose genealogy Matthew has produced from the national records of his own people, as proof of the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the special prediction to David, that he was to be God's Son, (by the formative power of that Spirit, which first moved upon the face of the waters, Gen. i. 2,) as well as David's Son according to the flesh.

The proper name—*Jesus*, which Mary's Son bore, has also a proper meaning, that of *Savior*, but even this relationship to man, he did not realize till *after* his resurrection, for Paul says, 1 Cor. xv. 17, "And if the Christ, be *not* resurrected, your faith is vain, and *you are yet in your sins*."

Jesus, therefore, is the *personal name* given to him by inspiration. But *Christ* is not an appellative name. The Greek word is equivalent to the Hebrew word *Messiah*. The meaning of each being *anointed*; which ceremony of anointing, separated any person, place, or thing to some special purpose. The word therefore denotes an official use, or character.

The Bible describes *things*, as "*altar*," Ex. xxix. 36, which Moses was to anoint (or christen.)

Places, as the Tabernacle, and the Ark which he also was to anoint.

Persons were anointed for various offices,—Moses anointed Aaron and his sons, Exod. xxviii. 41—to the *Priestly office*. Samuel anointed both Saul and David to the office of *Kings* over Israel. See 1 Sam. ix. 16; xvi. 3. Elijah anointed Elisha to the *Prophetic office*. See 1 Kings xix. 16. The appellative names of all these persons are all given, but until the ceremony was performed, they were not separated to the specific office designated. It did not affect or add to their individual personalities.

The very word *anointed*, necessarily implies some *anointers*. These were of two kinds, (though God was the author of both.) They were human, as in the person of Moses, Samuel, Elijah. God, as the divine anointer, separated Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 1, for an especial use in relation to Babylon and to the house of Judah. Peter told Cornelius, (Acts x. 38,) that "God anointed *Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power*." *When?* See Matt. iii. 16. Jesus was identified as the anointed *prophet* to his nation, John vii. 40. Nathaniel, whose character as set forth by Jesus, John i. 47, to be a most reliable wit-

ness, identified him as the *anointed king* of Israel. For at this time he had been anointed by God with the Holy Spirit and with power. But though separated to the two-fold office of prophet, (see Isa. lxi. 1; Luke vi. 16-21,) and king, yet by that *first* anointing he was not separated to the *Priestly* office. He descended from the royal tribe of Judah, from whence the national law-giver was to come, therefore he could legitimately claim the *right* to the *royalty* over his people. But Jehovah intended to consecrate him a *royal high priest* after the order, or pattern of Melchisedec, Psa. cx. 4. This priestly office he could not fill during the time the law of Moses remained in force as the medium of God's righteousness. Though imperfect as was the Levitical priesthood, (Heb. vii. 11,) as constituted by the law of Moses, yet it was sacredly guarded by the threatening of death-penalty upon any stranger who did not belong to the tribe of Levi, upon his venturing to assume the official character of a priest. See Num. iii. 10. Also the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, Num. xvi. God told Moses verse 40,—it was to be a *memorial* unto the children of Israel, that *no stranger* who is not of the *seed of Aaron*, come near to offer incense before Him, that he be not as Korah. Had Jesus assumed that office before his resurrection, he could not have magnified that law, but would have been a sinner worthy of death.

Paul also asserts that Jesus the Christ was "declared to be the Son of God by a resurrection from the dead," through the agency or anointing of the Spirit. Rom. i. 2, 3; viii. 11. He told the Hebrews that "our Lord"—was that other priest, constituted by a resurrection—immortal, "after the power of an endless life," ch. vii 14-16, therefore "this man hath unchangeable priesthood," verse 24. Much has been said about the nature and rank of this person, Jesus, whom God anointed as His prophet, king, and priest. Endless theories have been propagated, and numerous councils arraigned about the divinity of Jesus, &c. A "thus it is written" avoids the need of exploring these. Paul says, Heb. ii. 9-18, "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels," (not in form, or in likeness, because Adam I. was like God in His image and likeness, Gen. i. 26, so Adam II. was the image of God, Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3; was the effulgent mirror of Jehovah's glory, and the exact representation of His person); "by the suffering of death," hence his *nature* was not angelic, for their's is deathless, but it was human, and mortal. It could not be divine, for such a nature is incapable of dying. Jesus also took upon him a flesh and blood nature which was susceptible of death, that through

death, he might destroy the Devil. For *verily* he took not on him angelic nature, but the seed or human nature, such as Abraham had. Therefore in *all things* (as to his flesh and blood nature) it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, &c. By resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand he is exalted equal in nature, and in *rank* far superior to angels, for Jehovah hath anointed him with the oil of gladness, *above his fellows*. So that angels are commanded to *worship him*.

Jesus though made of flesh and blood nature, yet was a human creature, of divine paternity. None of the angels could claim such a being for parent as Jesus did, Heb. i. 5; Luke ii. 49.

Now the question may be urged how many self-existent Gods are there, who are unoriginated—not created? The Bible says plainly, 1 Cor. viii. 4-6; "There is none other God but one. Though there be Gods, (elohim-vicegerents) whether in heaven, or earth, (as rulers were to be called by Moses,) but to us, (as sole and primary authority,) there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we by him. And one anointed ruler, the Christ."

Jesus, the Son of God, had a beginning, for he is God's only begotten Son. When was this only begotten brought into existence? This question is answered by the narrative of Luke i. 28-35, where Gabriel told Mary, the Holy Spirit, (which spirit—power or energy of Jehovah moved upon the face of the waters as they lay in the chaotic womb, Gen. ii,) was the begetter, causing or creating that creature which was to be born of her. This was the flesh or human begetting. Paul also speaks of another begetting, which resulted in a birth of a first-born from the dead, that in all, or among all, "he might have the pre-eminence." (Col. i. 18.) "Far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named." See Eph. i. 21. Hence in regard to these two productions of His Son into the world, first by his creation from Mary, next by his resurrection from the dead; we are not to understand Paul as stating, Heb. i. 6, as referring to the human nature of Jesus in his first birth, that *then* he was exalted above angels, but that when he was Christed the *second time*, he was declared after being perfected by sufferings, (Heb. i. 10,) His *faithful witness*, the first begotten of the dead, (possessing an immortal nature by that spirit,) exalted *then* as "the prince of the kings of the earth."

Instead therefore of puzzling each other with the scholastic riddles about "the divinity of Christ," or "the pre-existence of

Christ, or Jesus," the scriptures give ample information by which we can ascertain *who* it was, God anointed? *When* he anointed him? *For what purpose* Jesus our Savior was anointed? and what he was anointed *with*; as well as to the kind of *nature*, and *rank* he possessed *before*, and *subsequent* to his resurrection.

From what has already been written, this is the sum. Jesus was the Son of God and Mary. He is now about 1860 years old. His nature *was* human—flesh and blood. In rank, he was while a sufferer, a little lower than the angels, being mortal.

From his birth till the time of his baptism, he showed no evidence of anything superhuman in word or deed. By the anointing of God, he became God's anointed prophet and king, and was that body prepared for the eternal spirit to do the will of God, as well as to *testify* His will. He became as it were God's telegraphic wire, by which He sent his dispatches, and displayed wonders. For the purpose (John says, ch. xx. 31.) "that you might believe that *Jesus is the Christ*, the Son of God; and believing you might have *life through his name*."

The nature of Jesus the Christ was changed by his resurrection, for his *first nature* was *human*, but "*afterwards* that which is *spiritual*," or *incorruptible*.

His rank *now* is *super-angelic*. Having the preeminence over every creature. Jehovah alone *his superior*, none other *his equal*.

I respectfully submit the above, asking the candid consideration of all concerned, and the verdict which reason and revelation justify. If I am wrong, let the errors of premises or conclusions be exposed. Truth will be made brighter by polishing, and error recede wherever the divine rays of the Scriptures shed their influence.

I will take up the examination of some of the popular objections in my next. I subscribe myself yours in love with, and search for God's truth,

J. LUXFORD.

For the Gospel Banner.

Waiting for God's Son from Heaven.

No event is more prominently set forth in the sacred writings than the coming of the Lord Jesus in power and great glory; it is one of its most glorious themes, or rather the most glorious of all: connected with which is the establishment of His kingdom, and the resurrection of the saints to possess it—with all the glory and honor pertaining thereunto. Associated with these events also, are the overthrow of all existing governments, the restoration of Israel, and the consequent blessing which (God who cannot lie promised) should come upon all nations through Abraham and his seed. See Psa. lxxvii: xcviii;

cii. 13-16; Isa. lii. 8-10; Isa. xlix; Rom. xi. So universal will be these blessings that they will reach every family of the earth.

Well may all the prophets speak of those times of restitution, and prophesy of the glory that shall fill the whole earth—and all the ancient worthies look forward to the same with such intense interest and delight. This was the joy set before the Savior, for which He endured the cross, and despised the shame, and is now sitting at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, from henceforth expecting (waiting) until his enemies become his footstool. In view of this, (the crowning consummation of all prophetic declarations,) it is no wonder that the Bible everywhere represents the church as in a waiting position; and so much was this the case in the days of the Apostles, that we read, "they had need of patience, that after they had done the will of God they might receive (the fulfillment of) the promise; For yet a little while, he who is to come will come, and will not tarry."

Paul in the close of his second letter to the Thessalonians, prays that their hearts may be directed into the love of God, and *into the patient waiting for Christ*. The reasons for this are obvious; for we find in his first letter to them, he repeatedly makes mention of the coming of the Lord. Read Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. It cannot be denied that professed believers in the present day are very far below the primitive saints, as it regards the exercise of hope, and the enjoyment of consolation; and the reason is, they are very far below them in knowledge and faith, particularly in reference to *the coming and kingdom of Christ*. If we examine their brightest expressions of joys or contemplate their highest soarings of hope, we shall find them connected with faith in that great and glorious event. 1 Thess. iv. 14-16; Phil. i. 6; Titus ii. 13, 14; 1 John iii. 2; Rev. xxii. 20. These texts, with many more, show that this subject was to them as *practical*, as it was consoling. This "Blessed hope" supported them under all their trials, both outward and inward, and enabled them to purify themselves after the pattern of Christ.

It will not, then, be unprofitable employment to endeavor to trace *what* their views of this subject were, and how their faith and hope were exercised daily upon it. The advent of Christ was one of those future hoped-for things, which their faith was to them the full assurance and earnest conviction of. They looked at it, thought of it, and were influenced by it, as though they knew not that it *might* take place soon, even in their time. *But now this feeling is almost gone*, and instead of the "glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ," the

certain coming of the "king of terrors" is set before the Christian, as the ground of encouragement, or the time when their hope is to be realized. Thus, has the coming of Christ ceased to be what it once was—the object of hope, the fount of comfort, and the mainspring of holy walking. 2 Pet. iii. 11. But though this subject is nearly gone from the professed churches, it still remains in the word of God, and it becomes us reverently to inquire what God hath spoken, and, diligently to seek to understand the same. It is important and desirable that all believers in our Lord Jesus Christ should have clear views of all that relates to him. Unless we rightly know him, we cannot fully believe in him; and if faith be defective, our hope and comfort must necessarily be defective too.

Out of the mass of professors how few who are waiting for God's Son from heaven, even Jesus whom he raised from the dead. It is at this glorious epoch, that all creation is to be blessed, hence universal nature is represented as rejoicing at his coming to judgment, and to begin to throw off her mourning attire, when she hears the sounding of his chariot wheels. "Let the heavens rejoice, let the earth be glad, let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof, let the field be joyful and all that is therein. Then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge (rule or govern) the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth," Psa. xevi. The 149th Psalm is another divine ode which the blessed Spirit has caused to be written in order to express the joy of the creation on that sabbath,—that jubilee of the earth. The rapturous singer ranges through creation's ranks from the noblest seraph or brightest star, to the lowest worm, or meanest inanimate thing, and calls upon all to join the glad some song. (It is most kind of the Creator thus to be a mouth for his creation; and most ungrateful of man not to listen to the melody.) Then it is declared that "the lion shall lie down with the lamb;" that "God will make a covenant for his people with the beasts of the field," Hosea 13-22; Isa. xi 6-8; Ezek. xxxiv. 25-23; Joel iii. 15; Amos ix. 13, 14; Psa. cxlv. 10; This view of the subject may help to show us the meaning of Romans viii. 19-22. It will be seen that the apostle in the context is evidently referring to the resurrection morning, and the day of millennial rest; and having touched upon the subject of the glory to be revealed in the saints, when their first heirship is made manifest, (18th verse,) he then shows that the creature or creation longs for that day; for though the creature be made subject to vanity on account of man's sin, yet it shall be delivered at the manifestation of

the sons of God (which will be at the adoption or redemption of the body,) and be brought into a participation of their glorious liberty, even a liberty from the effects of sin, which now manacles the creation; for this deliverance, he saith creation groans and travails in pain together until now. The sons of God who now groan in themselves with the creation, shall cease to groan when this corruptible puts on incorruption. They shall then begin their song and enter into the joy of their Lord, and creation enter into their glorious liberty. If the mere manifestation of the sons of God to the creation shall bring down such blessings upon creation, what blessedness, what glory, what recompense for suffering must be in reserve for the corporate heirship! *

Again, they are said to be "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. i. 13. We see from this that they who are sealed with the Spirit, receive their inheritance on the redemption of the purchased possession. What is this possession that is purchased? It cannot be heaven, for heaven needeth not redemption, it never was defiled. It must, therefore mean either the church, or the world, or both; now both are redeemed, and *both shall be delivered*. "The creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption;" we are expressly taught in Rom. viii. and the same all-instructive passage tells us,—"*not they only*, but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of the body." It is a very common error to speak of heaven as bought for the church. This stands upon no foundation of Scripture. The inheritance promised to Israel is Cannan, and by incorporation into the same body with Israel, by being engrafted into the same olive, partaking of the same *seed* to whom the promise was made, the Gentiles acquired an equal right to the covenanted land, and shall with Jesus, the seed of Abraham, enter upon its eternal occupation. But then the inheritance of the saints is not confined to the Holy Land or kingdom proper; there is also a dominion extending over the entire globe; in which consists the glory and the greatness of the king-

* The word *ktisis*, rendered *creature* three times, and *creation* once, in Rom. viii. 19-22; is the same word precisely as that found in Mark xvi. 15, and Col. i 23; from which we infer that *mankind* is here intended, and not the rest of the *animate and inanimate* creation. The revelation of the sons of God will inaugurate the day of the world's ultimate deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the glorious freedom of the children of God, when all nations shall be blessed in the Seed of Abraham.—*ΕΙΡΗΚ.*

dom. What an exalted privilege! What a high calling! to have an invitation to such a kingdom and glory. How we should see to it that we come not behind in any gift, waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, waiting for God's Son from heaven, waiting for that grace, that will be brought to them at the revelation of Jesus Christ—waiting for that salvation which will be realized when he appears the second time, and which is also connected with the redemption of the body, and the manifestation of God's sons, and for which the whole creation groaneth; these are themes which shine forth on almost every page of the Bible, none of the prophets forgot it. God hath spoken of these times of restitution by the mouth of them all: it is also shadowed forth in the writings of Moses. It was the burden of many of the songs of David; his last words referred to this blessed era; this he says was all his salvation and all his desire. 2 Sam. xxiii. 1-8. It was the good news of this kingdom which was preached by Jesus and his apostles, and during the interval of 40 days between his resurrection and ascension, he spake to his disciples of the things pertaining to this kingdom; and Paul also in all his writings is rich with the unsearchable riches of Christ, and his kingdom. In view of this should not we who are eighteen hundred years nearer the consummation—"deny ourselves of all ungodliness and worldly lusts, live soberly, and righteously, and godly in this world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ," having our loins girt about with truth, and our lights burning, and we like unto those servants that wait for their Lord. Now there will be a class of persons that will be found in this position, and who will (when the time arrives spoken of by the Prophet Isaiah, xxv. 6-10) say, "Lo! this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Who of us shall be found in this happy condition? "Blessed is that servant whom the Lord when he cometh shall find giving meat in due season." Let us see that we be not without the wedding garment, so that we be not ashamed before him at his coming.

Knowing the crisis in which we are living; how important to take heed to the admonition, Rev. xvi. 15, "Behold, I come as a thief, blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." By the foregoing we learn, that although Christ is entered into heaven itself, and as he is not to remain there forever, he is from henceforth expecting (waiting) until his enemies be made his footstool; the heavens at present are only retaining him;

the time is rapidly approaching when he will appear to the salvation of his waiting ones.

Now we may learn in what sense our hope is laid up in heaven; it is because Christ is there. He has entered within the veil; therefore our hope is like an anchor cast within the veil; and also that inheritance which is "incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away," is represented as being reserved in the heavens, for those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. But is it reserved there forever? No! it is ready to be revealed in the last time, 1 Pet. i. and this last time is rapidly approaching,—if we have not already entered upon the initiatory stages or signs,—in the shaking of the heavens, or nations, and kingdoms of the earth; in connection with which the desire of all nations is to come.

If those scattered strangers to whom Peter wrote greatly rejoiced in view of this glorious consummation, surely we have tenfold more reason to rejoice in the same. And, if, like them, it is necessary for us to have manifold trials;—it is that "the trying of our faith, which is much more precious than gold which perisheth, might be found unto the praise and glory at the appearing of Jesus. Whom having not seen we love, in whom though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

In view of this lively hope, or hope of life, to which we have been begotten again by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope unto the end, for the grace that will be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." "Seeing we look for such things what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness." Let us all be diligent that we may be found of him in peace without spot and blameless.

And now to those who are yet out of Christ, I would say one word; you cannot be waiting for God's Son from heaven. You are not looking for him to appear the second time to your salvation, for you have not as yet been brought under covenant relation with God by believing the Gospel and being baptized. The Gospel invites you as well as me to become an heir of that kingdom and glory which is promised to them that love him. Then come in the way of God's appointment. Learn the things he has revealed in his word, for faith and obedience, believing the same with a heart unto righteousness, and being baptized into his name, that you may become a joint heir with him, in sharing the glory, honor, and immortality belonging to his kingdom.

JOHN O. WOODRUFF.

May 10th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

A Sermon for the Times.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." 1 John ii. 15, 16.

In this important scripture, man has God-given counsel and instruction, by which he can correctly test his condition, and decide at once, whether he has been "chosen out of the world," or, is still "of the world."

But that the teachings of the Spirit, here given, may be properly understood, and practically applied, it becomes necessary to grasp more fully and more distinctly than is usually done, the term "world," which occurs several times in our text. Its signification is so vague and indistinct to most minds, that it would be difficult for them to fix on any one thing as being that designated by this word. Yet there is a something called "the world," which is not to be loved, for the love of it effectually shuts out "the love of the Father." That something, whatever it may be, is comprehensive of "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life."

If we turn our eye back upon the past history of our race, and inquire what "lust" has prompted man to seek the most ardently to obtain, we shall find it is *power*, the privilege of directing, controlling, and governing others. To acquire this elevated position among the children of men, millions of precious lives have been sacrificed, and millions of gold expended. The right to govern, however acquired, brings with it dominion or territory, and this territory gratifies "the lust of the eyes," and affords a grand and extended theater on which to display "the pride of life." Recognizing this deep-seated love of power in man, and the tendencies of his nature to acquire it at all hazards, the tempter approached "the man Christ Jesus," and proffered him "all the kingdoms of this world, and the glory of them." His only hope of success lay in exciting "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." But to his mortification and chargin, he found the truth demonstrated, which the tempted one subsequently attested, "I am not of *this world*," "The prince of *this world* cometh and hath nothing in me."

The leading, exciting and agitating question in all the past has been, who shall rule, who shall reign, who shall govern? The time allowed for mortal, erring man to hold the reins of government in such an unsettled state, is demonstrated in the word, "*this world*," but the time, when this war-making question shall have been settled, as a matter of fact, "and the government shall be on his shoulder," is called "*the world to come* where-

of we speak." Thus we see that *government* is the primary element of what is termed "the world."

"*This world*" with "all the kingdoms of men, and the glory of them," is "*the world*" which we should not "love," for it "lies in the wicked one." No one, until these things are clearly seen, is prepared to appreciate the teachings of our text. And no one until he learns from God's published programme, that "the world passeth away, and the lusts thereof," that all human governments, represented by the Man-Image of Daniel, are to be "dashed to pieces" and give place to a divine government, administered by "the Son given, and the child born," will be able to "overcome the world," and "crucify the flesh with the lusts thereof."

Never, no never, will a child of Adam be able to accomplish this great work, and say of himself, "not of this world," until he has not only learned, but also believed in, and become reconciled to, this "way of the Lord," this plan by which to bless man, and fill the earth with his glory. Not until he can rejoice in God's purpose to bring a new administration into power on the earth by sending His Son to take the throne of David, and execute judgment and justice in all the earth, will he rise above, or conquer this "love of the world," so that he can pray with all his heart, "thy kingdom come." Until he sees the utter incompetency of all human governments, and the perfect adaptation of the divine government promised to meet all the wants of suffering humanity, "the gospel of the kingdom" will never be "glad tidings of great joy" to him. But having the faith of the Gospel, and "*understanding* the word of the kingdom," he can testify with the spirit, "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

If these things are so, we are prepared to inquire, who then is a christian? Not according to the popular standard, but according to these Bible positions and Bible principles. Is it he who "seeks" the glory and honor and emolument of the world, or worldly governments? or, is it he who puts no trust in princes, but "seeks first the kingdom of God and his righteousness?" Are they christians who can eulogise patriotism as a God-given *grace*, and talk themselves and others into a perfect ecstasy of joy and delight, about "*our beloved country*," "*our glorious republic*," "*our national flag*?" or they who call themselves pilgrims, strangers, sojourners only, foreigners far, far away from home, who plainly say they are seeking a better country? Is it he whose inmost being is moved because a *gentile banner* is dishonored and trails in the dust? or he who mourns and weeps at the dishonor and con-

tempt poured upon the "Gospel Banner," the Cross of the "Anointed One," the Inscription of which reads, "Jesus, King of the Jews?"

There is such an apparent oneness and intimacy existing between the so-called "children of God," and the "children of this world," that the thoughtful and observing are forcibly reminded of the illicit intercourse of the "kings of this earth" with the "great harlot" of Revelation. This adultery is indulged and even honored in all the public acts and walks of life to such an extent, that we are almost or quite prepared to say "this is that." Armies, Navies, and Legislative bodies must have their Chaplains and Ministers, must attend political demonstrations, party conventions, union meetings, secession meetings, and even pole-raising, to give to each and all a kind of sacred outside show, by committing interests involved to the care and guidance of their God. How appropriate to the times the language of James, "ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of this world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world, is at enmity with God." The apostate church has been taken in the same snare which so signally failed to tempt the great head of the church. The "kingdoms of this world" have been all-powerful in leading her away from the "True God," to fall down and worship "the god of this world."

Beloved reader, test yourself. Do you not know that Christians should be a "peculiar people," not loving "the world, and the things of the world?" Where are you then? Are you so sick and disgusted with this world's vain shows, that your whole being cries out, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly?" Are you *waiting* and *watching* for "His Son from heaven?" If so, wait on, hope on, and in due time deliverance will come, for "God is not slack concerning his promises." The sons of God shall shout aloud again for joy, not indeed over creation's birth, but over "groaning creation's" redemption. The Lord hasten it in his own good time.

E. G.

For the Gospel Banner.

A few Words of Counsel.

Brethren; a scourge has come on the land. Circumstances will be changed with many or all of us. Shall we take the sword? Shall believers in one State appear in hostile and deadly strife against believers in another State? Is not the very thought too dreadful to be entertained a moment? Then harbor it not! If called on to take up arms for South against North, or North against South, refuse! And give your reasons for refusing. If threatened, be firm! Let persecution in

any form, or death itself, come; be enduring and faithful! It may be that the time of purification, making white, and trial, is upon us more emphatically than hitherto. If we have not taken due heed to personal preparation, the season just opening will be the more severe; too severe for those whose *hearts* have been untrue to the profession made; while severe, but we hope not overwhelming, to some who love the truth indeed, yet have duly maintained the holy converse and jealous care essential to the enjoyment of God's favor continually upon them.

Are there any of us who may not justly tax ourselves with remissness? And in the language of one of old, say with contrition, it is of Yahweh's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not.

The counsel we offer is given from a sense of duty; and however distasteful it may be to the worldly and fleshly-minded, who dread the *crucifying* process, is nevertheless according to the Word, and will be acceptable to the few who pass the time of their sojourning in fear, and whose purpose truly is to receive the MASTER'S WELCOME. To these I say

1st. Beloved, seeing we are not *our own*, but *purchased ones*, let us always bear in mind the obligation, the bounden duty, to glorify our God in both body and spirit. Impurity in mind, language, and person too, should be scouted and abhorred; cleanliness in every way; in yourself, family, and dwelling, is, we opine, *adorning* to the profession we make. Every species of flesh-filthiness put away; all manner and action, savoring of defilement, free yourselves from! Let your own example be strict in this respect, then your rebuke of others will have weight. Frequent and thorough ablation of the entire person, abstinence from stimulating and clogging diet, such as fat pork, pastry containing lard, strangled and imperfectly bled animals, (these are *forbidden*, see Acts xv,) occasional fasting—these observances are promotive of agreeableness in the individual and the habitation; and, we may justly add, of spiritual growth.

2nd. Seek with all earnestness to *abound* in the graces of the Spirit. Beware of *neglect* in any duty whatever. Take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to *withstand* as well as to *stand*. Let no unholy or careless example, be he or she whomsoever, teacher or taught, private or public, individual or numbers united or dismembered; ensnare you. If you *lose*, the loss will be your own and irrecoverable; if you *gain* the gain is *yours*, and an eternal one! The warfare is uncompromising; but do the *right*, and the Great God who sustained Elijah, and delivered Shadrack, Meshack, and Abednego, will be with *you*. Fatal will it be to any who delude themselves with the idea

that because they have been baptized on profession of the truth, they are sure of admission into the kingdom! To such I will say, if ye have taken no heed to perfect holiness in the fear of God; or if you did run well for a time only; you will be rejected as a withered branch, because you have been unfaithful in temptation. Negligence of becoming demeanor, negligence of heart-searching closet exercises; shunning the confession where the confession should have been made; vacillating; talking as the world talk; lax in family government, letting your children go here and there to learn fables and imbibe the spirit of the world, while you are required to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; remaining in membership with this or that Society, or order of men, whose very articles of association and constitution are incompatible with the requirements of the Gospel of Christ,—these and such like manifestations of inconsistency make you as unworthy walkers, and cannot be indulged in by the true disciple. If not too late for your recovery may Paul's language, "Awake to righteousness and sin not," thunder in your ears! and that of James iv. 8, 6, 10. Short is the remaining time of preparation; the *overcomer* will be rewarded; the truckling rejected.

3. If troubles arise in the Church, pertaining to individuals, avoid the spirit of strife and partisanship. See good in either or both parties, and wink not at the evil in any. Without being meddlesome do your duty faithfully, remembering that while you may have to oppose some whom you tenderly regard, you must be true to Christ. God's honor must be the foremost consideration. Stand then up for the right, discarding all unholy sympathy. Woe to those that cause offence! Let us take heed that by us offence shall not come. Good bye for the present.

H. HEYES.

Wallingford, Conn. May 5th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Kingdom of God.

Mr. Editor:—With your permission I wish to present a few thoughts to your readers, on the above subject, suggested by articles which have lately appeared in your columns.

The Kingdom of God in its entirety, or broadest sense, may include all the works of his hands. "His kingdom ruleth over all," *Psa. ciii. 19.* All worlds are included in his dominion. Also his kingdom is an abiding one—"Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion throughout all generations," *Psa. cxlv. 13.* But because it is thus in its most comprehensive sense *universal* and *everlasting*, it does not follow, therefore, that any one part of that whole is

not included in it, or may not be called the "Kingdom of God." Hence, when Jehovah promised to make of Israel "a kingdom of priests," and that he would be their king, then they would be "the kingdom of God" on earth; but, of course, not in its entirety, or to the exclusion of other parts of the universe being included in his *universal* dominion.

I think that we are warranted to say, that the *kingdom* of which Daniel speaks in chap. ii. 44, which the God of heaven will set up, is "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of the heavens." It is called such in other parts of the testimony. This is the kingdom to be given to the Son of Man, *Dan. vii. 14,* and to be possessed by the people of the saints of the Most High, *ver. 27.* This kingdom is to destroy or consume the kingdoms of men, or of this world; for they are to belong to our Lord and his Anointed;—*Rev. xi. 15.* It is the same for which Jesus has gone into the heavens to obtain the royalty, *Luke xix. 11–27;* and the affairs of which he will administer on his return.

The kingdom which God will set up and give to the Son of Man, is called also the kingdom of Israel, and of David. Isaiah shows that the "Child to be born" was to administer the affairs of David's kingdom from David's throne, *ix. 6, 7;* and from what the angel Gabriel says to Mary, the mother of Jesus, we learn that Jesus is the one designated to sit on David's throne, and fulfil the work appointed, *Luke i. 31–33.* He has been raised from the dead to sit on his throne, *Acts ii. 30,* and is the man appointed by God to judge the world in righteousness, *xvii. 34.* He is the "Righteous Branch raised up unto David," the king who shall reign and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth, for a period of one thousand years, till he has subdued all enemies under his feet, *Jer. xxiii 5, 6; Rev. xx. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 24–26.* Jesus is to rebuild the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and to restore the ruins thereof, and he is the one to restore again the kingdom to Israel, and all things spoken of in the prophets, *Acts xv. 16; i. 6; iii. 20, 21; Isa. xlix. 5, 6; Rom. xi. 25, 26.*

This kingdom of Israel or David restored, is the kingdom to be established at the coming of the Anointed One. Then it will be *his* kingdom, *1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 1;* his *heavenly* kingdom, *ver. 18;* the kingdom of *Christ,* *Eph. v. 5;* the kingdom of his (God's) *dear Son,* *Col. i. 13;* the *everlasting* kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, *2 Pet. i. 11.* And this is synonymous with "the *kingdom* which God has promised to them that love him," to which the saints *now* are *heirs,* *James ii. 5;* but when Jesus comes in power and great glory, he will make the

heirs of the kingdom participants or *inheritors*. To his apostles he said—"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father has appointed unto me, that you may eat and drink at my table in *my* kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel," Luke xx. ii. 29, 30. This was *that* promised to them, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you *the* kingdom," namely, the *kingdom of God*, which Jesus exhorted them to seek, Luke xii. 31, 32. The righteous ones at the coming of the Son of Man in his glory, will hear his invitation from the throne of his glory, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit* the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Matt. xxv. 31-34. This is *that* kingdom concerning which the apostles published the glad tidings, which the primitive disciples believed, and for which they were to prove themselves worthy and to suffer. Hence Paul and Barnabas told them that "we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God," Acts xiv. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 12; and that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5.

Now, in view of these scripture testimonies, I conclude, that the *Kingdom of God* is identical and synonymous with *the Kingdom*, under its other numerous, and distinctive features. If it is called the kingdom of David, of Israel, and of Christ, it is because God has *given* it to them, until his great and glorious purposes are accomplished in the subjecting of the world to his authority; and it is no less the kingdom of God on that account. It takes on their names inasmuch as they are related to it, and for an appointed time are connected with the affairs of his government. It is an *heavenly* kingdom, or of *heaven*, or the kingdom of heaven, in contrast to *earthly* dominions, and because all its appointments, laws, and officials are of God, or from heaven. It is the kingdom of God in contradistinction to the kingdoms of men. It is the everlasting, abiding, and immovable kingdom when compared to the kingdoms preceding it, which can be shaken, removed, destroyed, and pass away for successors; this never till Jehovah's purposes are accomplished.

Seeing, then, that we are called by the Gospel to the honor and glory and immortality of God's kingdom, "let us walk worthy of God, as dear children," that we may have "an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ."

MATTHEETES.

Can Matter Think?

Shall I be told that thought is inconsistent with matter; that we cannot conceive how medullary substance can perceive, remember, judge, reason? I acknowledge that we are

entirely ignorant *how* the parts of the brain accomplish these purposes—as we are how the liver secretes bile, how the muscles contract, or how any other living purpose is effected—as we are how heavy bodies are attracted to the earth, how iron is drawn to the magnet, or how two salts decompose each other.

Let us survey the natural history of the human mind—its rise, progress, various fates, and decay; and then judge whether these accord best with the hypothesis of an immaterial agent, or with the plain dictates of common sense, and the analogy of every other organ and function throughout the boundless extent of living beings. The senses and brain begin to be exercised as soon as the child is born; and a faint glimmering of mind is dimly perceived in the course of the first months of existence: but it is weak and infantile as the body. As the senses acquire their powers, and the cerebral jelly becomes firmer, the mind gradually strengthens; slowly advances with the body, through childhood to puberty; and becomes adult when the development of the frame is complete. In the perfect period of organization the mind is seen in the plentitude of its powers; but this state of full vigor is short in duration, both for the intellect and the corporeal fabric. The wear and tear of the latter is evidenced in its mental movements; *with the decline of organization the mind decays*; it becomes decrepit with the body; and *both are at the same time extinguished by death*.

What do we infer from this succession of phenomena? The existence and action of a principle entirely distinct from the body? Or a close analogy to the history of all other organs and functions?

The number and kind of the intellectual phenomena is different animals, correspond closely to the degree of the development of the brain. The gradation of organization and of mind passes through the monkey, dog, elephant, horse, to other quadrupeds; thence to birds, reptiles, and fishes, and so on to the lowest links of the animal chain. In ascending the steps of our ladder, following in regular succession at equal intervals, where shall we find the boundary of unassisted organization? Where place the beginning of the immaterial adjunct? In that view which assimilates the functions of the brain to the other organic parts, this case has no difficulty. As the structure of the brain is more perfect, exquisite, and complex, its functions ought to be proportionally so. It is no slight proof of the doctrine now enforced, that the fact is actually thus; that the mental powers of brutes, so far as we can see, are proportional to their organization.

If the intellectual phenomena of man require an immaterial principle superadded to the brain, we must equally concede it to those more rational animals which exhibit manifestations differing from some of the human only in degree. If we grant it to these, we cannot refuse it to the next in order, and so on, in succession, to the whole series—to the oyster, the sea-anemone, the polype, the microscopic animalcules. Is any one prepared to admit the existence of immaterial principles in all these cases? If not, he must equally reject it in man.

Thought, it is dogmatically asserted cannot be an act of matter. Yet no feelings, no thought, no intellectual operation has ever been seen, except in conjunction with a brain; and living matter is acknowledged by most persons to be capable of what makes the nearest possible approach to thinking. The strongest advocate for immaterialism seeks no further than the body, for his explanation of all the vital processes, of muscular contraction, nutrition, secretion, &c.—operations quite as different from any affection of inorganic substance, as reasoning or thought; he will even allow the brain to be capable of sensation.

Who knows the capabilities of matter so perfectly, as to be able to say that it can see, hear, smell, taste and feel, but cannot possibly reflect, imagine, judge? If the mental processes be not the function of the brain, what is its office? In animals which possess only a small share of the human cerebral structure, sensation exists, and, in many cases, is more acute than in man. What employment shall we find for all that man possesses over and above this portion, for the large and prodigiously developed human hemispheres? Are we to believe that these serve only to round the figure of the organ or to fill the cranium?—W. LAWRENCE.

Baptism.

1st. The word Baptism is Greek, (*baptisma*, the final *a* cut off,) and signifies a dipping, plunging, immersing, or immersing. Sprinkle comes from the Greek word *raino*, and means to sprinkle. The two words do not mean the same. *Raino* is nowhere applied to Baptism.

2nd. There is but One Baptism, for Paul so says, "One Lord, one faith, ONE BAPTISM," Eph. iv. 5.

3rd. That One Baptism is in *water*; for says Peter, "Can any man forbid WATER, that these should not be baptized?" Acts x. 47.

4th. This One Baptism in water is a *burial*; "Therefore we are BURIED with him by baptism into death," Rom. vi. 4; Col.

ii. 12. Hence it cannot be sprinkling, for that is not a *burial*.

5th. A man is not in Christ before he is baptized, for we are plainly taught that we must be baptized INTO HIM; "For as many of you as have been baptized INTO CHRIST, have PUT ON CHRIST," Gal. iii. 27.

6th. Again, Baptism is for the *remission of sins* that are past. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS," Acts ii. 38.

7th. Baptism, like all of God's commands, is *essential to salvation*. "The like figure whereunto *baptism doth also now save us.*" 1 Peter iii. 21. To say that Baptism is not essential, is to say that God gave a command which he does not require men to obey.

8th. The One Baptism 'is preceded by a gospel faith, and that is the "One Faith," Eph. iv. 5, without which "it is impossible to please God," Heb. xi. 6; or in other words, it is *preceded* by a belief in "the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ."

Proof, "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women," Acts viii. 12. (1st.) Philip preached the things concerning the kingdom of God; (2nd.) and the things of the name of Jesus Christ; (3rd.) they believed; and (4th.) were *then baptized*. They were not baptized first, and then learned the Gospel afterwards. Christ taught his disciples to go and preach the Gospel or good news, Isa. lxi. 1-4; Luke iv. 16-21; and this was the Gospel of the kingdom, Matt. iv. 23; Luke viii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 14; Luke iv. 43. Men were required to believe this Gospel of the kingdom, and then be baptized, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not (the Gospel) shall be damned," Mark xvi. 15, 16. Hence we are taught by the word of God.

1st. That we should believe the Gospel, which is good news of the kingdom of God.

2nd. That we should repent of our sins, or *reform*.

3rd. That we should then be baptized INTO the Christ, be *buried* with him by Baptism, for the remission of our sins, and thereby become heirs to the promises made to Abraham, (Gal. iii. 29,) and "heirs of the kingdom" (James ii. 5,) which is to be "*under the whole heavens,*" Dan. vii. 13-14, 27; ii. 44; Matt. xxv. 31-34.

Hence a man cannot have a Gospel Baptism without a Gospel faith going before it, and to be baptized without a Gospel faith and then get the faith afterwards destroys the order of God. This Gospel to be believed before Baptism is the Gospel preached to Abraham, Gal. iii. 8, 24-29; Gen. xiii. 3, 7; xiii. 14-17.

Reader, do not be deluded with the idea that

What some call a *Baptism of the Spirit* will answer the purpose, or that it is the *Baptism* enjoined. It is not. Jesus was the baptizer with the Holy Spirit, Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5; ii. 1-4; xi. 14, 15. The disciples on the day of Pentecost, and those believing Gentiles in the house of Cornelius, were the subjects of this Spirit Baptism. This, however, did not exempt them from an immersion in water. Hence when Peter saw that God had given the Gentiles his Holy Spirit, he said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit, as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts x. 47, 48. The Apostles were commissioned to make disciples by teaching and baptizing—"Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," Matt. xxviii. 19. They first taught the people, and then baptized the believers. There were no exceptions to this rule. The law of the faith—Baptism—was obeyed by all in the primitive Churches. None were esteemed as Christians, as saints or holy ones, until washed in the waters of Baptism. They all became "obedient to the faith," Acts vi. 7; Rom. vi. 17; xvi. 26. Eren John's baptism would not suffice. Apollos was taught by Priscilla and Aquila "the way of God more perfectly;" and twelve men, John's disciples, were "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," Acts xviii 26; xix. 1-5.

The above has been printed as Tract No. 9 of the "Rays of Light." See advertisement of "Geneva Christian Publication Company," on the third page of Cover.

The Future Reign of Christ.

In framing any suitable conception of the "better country" reserved for the true Israel of God, we must remind ourselves of its government. The accounts given of various nations include their political institutions, or the different frames of society among them, whether rude and simple, or complex and elaborate. We distribute all the modes of government known under such names as patriarchal superintendence, despotisms, limited or constitutional monarchies, aristocratic and popular representations, and pure democracies. Much account is made of these forms as related to the well-being of the people. We boast, even excessively, of that under which we live. From our national self-congratulations, one might infer that this alone is what other lands need, and then, upon comparison, he might doubt if this be on the whole any considerable advantage, or more than a desirable exchange of evils—a mitigation of the abuses found in all political institutions. We only wonder that the contemplation of these differences does not offend lead devout minds to brood over the conception of a government immeasurably superior to any yet maintained on the earth, and that must make any part of the universe a better country than ours or all others. In a company where the conversation turned on the different forms of government, a thoughtful man sat silent, till on being asked which he preferred, he answered, "A monarchy, with the Lord Jesus Christ at its head." We confess that no other

method of administering the affairs of mankind, no other scheme for ordering and ruling society, satisfies our desires or kindles our enthusiasm, but this. No regal, no popular sovereignty, fills its offices without as much to censure as to praise. No people can manage their own affairs, can devise and execute their own laws so well as can be done by such a monarch.

The subordination of reason, conscience, and God's word to transient interest, mercenary calculation, and blind passion; the neglect and even contempt of vows to God and covenants with men; the indifference of the many to all grievances and all rights but their own; the strife and bitterness of faction, the misrule of corruption, imbecility and violence; the reckless ambition of demagogues, and popular stupidity or madness,—these are among the evils from which a government we have reckoned the best does not exempt us.

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?" "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." The earth needs her returning Lord, "the Lord of lords and King of kings." This revolted realm of sin and woe will never know perfect peace and unqualified prosperity till he shall "come to his own." *His people individually enter into rest, being with him in Paradise, "his pavilion," "the secret of his tabernacle;" but their final abode will have this pre-eminence, that they will all be compacted into one commonwealth under his perfected and glorious reign. Their country will be the consummated, visible kingdom of God, of Christ, of heaven, the restored realm of Messiah the Prince, David's Son and Lord, seated on the throne of David established forever, whose name is "Wonderful, Counselor, mighty God, everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." His reign has the strength and gentleness of God, alone realizing the fond dream among monarchists of a paternal government, never oppressing the weak nor succumbing to the strong, inaccessible to corruption, favoritism, fear, or caprice, incapable of wrong or error, originating not from beneath, in the ambition of a usurper, or the zeal of a populace, but from above, in the all-comprehending wisdom and might and goodness. Better the country where King Jesus is palpably enthroned, which is subject to his kingdom, that is not of this world, than all the monarchies or republics that mankind have hailed with admiration, and then seen

* This sentence ought to read—"His people will then individually enter into rest," &c. "and their final abode," &c. His people do not now enter into rest, or Paradise. Where Jesus now is they cannot go. He said so to his disciples, John xiii 33. He is in the Holy Place, and his people are waiting without for his return. Then shall they enter with him into Paradise. Error.

go down in the ruins of time; and better not only in itself, but in its duration—for his kingdom, and his alone, shall endure forever.—*Independent.*

Correspondence.

Dayton, O., May 6, 1861.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—

* * * * * Bro. Mark Allen of Woburn, Mass., sojourned with us, by request of the Brn. of Dayton, about ten days recently.

He arrived on Friday, April 5th, and commenced a course of Lectures, or Lessons, on Lord's day following, and continuing them every evening through the week, giving the gentiles of Dayton an opportunity to hear the same glad and joyous message that old Father Abraham was so ready to believe, and which confidence, or belief in what God promised him, made him the Father of the faithful, or, all such as place the same confidence or faith, in the same promises made to old Father Abraham, and an heir of that righteousness which comes by faith or a confidence in God's ability and willingness to perform all He has promised.

He closed on the following Lord's day evening. His last discourse was an able one, in which he proved, by sound and Scriptural arguments that modern Experimental, Anxious Bench, Good-feeling Religion is a Grand Delusion, and not at all the Religion of the Scriptures, etc. His meetings were all well attended, and good attention was paid to these (to them) strange and incredulous doctrines, but I fear men's minds are too much absorbed just now in the business of admiring the Stars and Stripes, and in trying to perpetuate the Government over which they float, little thinking, judging from the current manner in which it is spoken of as immortal or perpetual, that it, like old Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, must pass away, and in time give place to the rule and dominion of God's Kingdom. The time has been, when such a course of lectures would have produced a faith accompanied by corresponding works, making the possessor an heir of the righteousness which is of faith, but laboring as they are, under this strong delusion, (of which Paul speaks,) they give no credence to the promises of God, and know not, that faith, a Scriptural faith, which is the only one that the Almighty God will recognize, comes by hearing! and that hearing comes by the word of God. But they have a faith that may come by Prayers, or by Feeling, or, by hearing the words of man. Mankind have come to that pass, that they can believe anybody, and anything, no matter how incredulous, rather than believe the Living and True God! What greater dishonor could they cast upon Him who has said, "My cov-

enant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David, his seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me." But what have they to do with "the promises made of God unto the Fathers?" Their hope is made up of promises of priests and preachers to the laity! This fondly cherished hope is discoursed upon at almost every funeral occasion: and what is it? Is it the hope of a resurrection at the coming of Christ? No! Is it the hope of Paul, or of Peter, or of Abraham? No! But as true as God is immutable, their hope is a delusive one, for they hope for that of which the Scriptures do not speak. It nowhere promises us an abode in some far-off world. It never once intimates that we shall dwell beyond the bounds of time and space, or, around the dazzling throne of God! Protestant Hymn Books, and Sermons are running over with this "mystical wine of Babylon," and men and woman will eagerly and persistingly drink in (to the very dregs) from this "golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornications," the effect of which is said to be, to make "the inhabitants of the earth drunk!" Hence we need not expect any very great results from the preaching of any one, for they refuse to "hear Moses and the Prophets," and says Christ, "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

The present unsettled state of the nations seems to be ominous of good to the Christian; for it indicates a fulfillment of that spoken by Joel the prophet to the Gentiles in the 3rd chap. from the 9th to the 18th ver. And by the Revelator, John 11th chap. 18 ver. But who may abide the day of his coming?

Very truly, your Brother in Israel's hope,
GEO. NELLIS.

Plum River, Jo Davies, Ill., May 17, '61.

BRO. WILSON:—Perhaps some of the brethren would like to hear from me, how I am. I have been ill with disease of the lungs and chest for some three months, caused by colds and exposure to night air, and speaking in tight rooms, not ventilated. I do not know that I shall ever labor much in the word and doctrine again. But I am in the hands of God, and He will do right. If there ever was a time more than any other for laborers in the Lord's vineyard, it seems to be now. Let us see to it that we are doing what we can in harmony with present truth. See to it that our work is well done, that we may hear the welcome sound: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord," is the prayer of your brother, looking for speedy redemption,
ROBR. CHOWN.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JUNE 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 12.]

For the Gospel Banner.

"Paternity of Jesus."—No. 2.

On my first reading of the article under the above caption, which appeared in the *Banner* for last September, although every point in it was objectionable, yet the leading monstrous doctrine which I have already noticed, claimed my first attention, namely, "that Joseph was the father of our Lord, by Natural Generation." The other points in it, being perfectly harmless, I passed over at that time. These points I now proceed to examine, and show the utter unsoundness of the foundation of Mr. N's "opinion," which he has sent forth to the church, and the world, demanding implicit obedience, or, the terrible alternative of being excluded from all participation in the things of the kingdom, or the name of Jesus, as he distinctly states that all candidates for these blessings, if brought in by any other means than the adoption of his "opinion," will be "begotten by a false word!" Consequently will be spurious! not genuine children of the kingdom! What a pity that the opinion was not sent forth sooner! however, instead of performing this act of excision, if Mr. N. laid any claim to modesty, to say the very least, he would have left this an open question, it being quite possible that objections might be raised, perchance successfully so.

In his second paragraph Mr. N. tells us, "that the Scriptures cannot be broken," meaning of course, those mangled portions which he brings forward to bolster up his peculiar tenet. Those Scriptures which do not assist him, (and they are thousands,) he does not attempt to break, but disposes of them whole, and wholesale, by the process of repudiation. What ribaldry, to talk about breaking Scripture, and quoting others, in defence of his bald, and peculiar illfavored bantling! He next arraigns Matthew for bringing forth the "things offensive" to his chaste eye and ear! and what he and his friends say, "we believe to an untruth;" "Very modest indeed! and well-becoming a

professor of the Gospel! Such a sentiment coming from Hume, Gibbon, or Paine, Volney, Voltaire, or Rousseau, would be quite natural, and what might be expected, but coming as it were from a follower of Jesus, who pretends to take the word for his standard, to say the least, renders his profession of Christianity, more than suspicious!

But why not arraign Luke? his testimony is almost identical with that of Matthew; if anything more plain and more to the point, in his beautiful narrative, i. 26-35. Mr. N. says it is only in reference to his resurrection that Peter calls Jesus "a holy child." Luke is authorized to call him so before he was born! and why still more explicit, and go deeper into the "untruth" than does Matthew! And again, why does Mr. N. rely so implicitly upon the testimony of Matthew, with regard to the fact that Joseph was in reality the father of the Christ? I mean the father by natural generation. To any man who is "*Compos Mentum*," and who has read the whole, this latter looks much more like an "untruth" than the former. Do not Mr. N., and his friends, completely stultify themselves, by accepting one part of Matthew's testimony in the matter, and rejecting another? Why not repudiate both points alike? surely if Matthew was capable of an untruth in the one case, so he might be in the other. But the fact is, Mr. N. had a creed to make out, and he takes what suits him, and proclaims the others unworthy of "credit?" Is he not on a par with all other creed and sect makers? No apparent difference!

As to the genealogy of Jesus, Mr. N. seems not to understand the matter at all. Why is the name of Mary mentioned in connection with this fact, if not to show the fulfillment of the original promise as to "the seed of the woman," and why does Paul use the expression, "made of a woman," if not for the same purpose? Mr. N. says that the "names of women were never allowed to appear in the Jewish Genealogies," then why

was Mary's allowed? This arrangement has been proclaimed by the Holy Spirit, through all those men, Mr. N's "opinion" to the contrary, notwithstanding. The quotation from 2 Sam. viii. 12 is a mistake, it should have been vii. 12, where David is promised a son from his own bowels, to sit upon his throne; and this promise has been fulfilled in the birth of Solomon, and in his accession to the throne. So says Solomon himself, see 1 Kings viii. 24, also 2 Chron. vi. 10, 15, 16. "Thou hast kept with my father David that which thou hast promised him, and hast fulfilled it, this day." The promise in Psa. cxxxii. is identical with this; the same promise recorded twice, as any one may see by looking at the marginal chronology; in both cases, each living 1042 years before Christ. These are all the promises made to David of a son from his bowels, the rest were according to Acts ii. 30, "the fruit of his loins according to the flesh," in other words his seed. How could David or any other man have a child from his bowels, more than one thousand years after his death. Mr. N. employs his good sense" by repudiating elsewhere whatever is not "consistent with nature," why not employ it here, in a fact totally inconsistent as well as an utter impossibility! in fact the whole of his ideas in the article, are as gross as could be well imagined, and he has not given a sound Scripture proof, nor yet a reasonable argument throughout!

The matter of his third paragraph is almost unworthy of notice. He wants us to take his "opinion," that most, if not all, were under a delusion, since the days of Abraham, until his present appearance in the world, when forsooth! he has cleared up the whole matter, by his more than apostolic inspiration and talent. He also brings out a number of consequences, for which it is difficult to find a name, they are, if possible in advance of blasphemy; namely, "the illegitimacy" of the Savior, "His false claims to the throne," and "consequently justness of his crucifixion!" All of these enormities will lie at the door of every one who does not reject the testimony of five inspired individuals!! and build their faith, hope, and expectation, upon the "opinion" of Mr. N. and his friends, taking the shreds of Scripture mangled by them as proof! And what have they proved to the satisfaction of any brother, or sister, or any other person of sound mind; nothing but their own blindness, and ignorance; this they may have done satisfactorily.

Now in answer to those blasphemous insinuations, I say the birth of Jesus Christ is in all points just what Jehovah promised it should be, and in an exact agreement with those testimonies of inspiration as already mentioned, namely, Isaiah, Matthew, Luke,

John and Paul, and thus the foundation of the truth is built upon "prophets and apostles," and not upon any such absurdity, as the mere "opinion" of Mr. N., or any one else! and as to the legal claim of Jesus to the throne of universal empire it is good, and would be equally good, if Joseph was not in question at all! I say good at his mother Mary's side, her line by Luke, running through Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, the chief parties, with whom, and to whom, all the covenants, and promises were made, although Mr. N. asks, "could it be possible that a woman should have any right to the throne?" I answer, why not? if the next heir apparent, and in absence of a male heir! her line is quite as good as Joseph's, and the claims of Jesus would be good through her, equally as if he had come naturally from Joseph. If I might be allowed to make such a comparison, for a moment, I would instance a case in point—the present Queen of England, and her son, the Prince; all his claims are from his mother, without the slightest reference to his father, through whom he has not the shadow of a pretension; all comes from his mother. Of course Mr. N. or any other objector, might require proof here, that the evangelist Luke was really tracing Mary's line of descent, but I have not space enough to enter upon the full proof of this point, without extending my remarks, so as to trespass upon your columns, but if spared, may bring it under notice another time; for the present, however, I would merely observe, that any one possessing no more than ordinary discernment, can see without much difficulty, that both the Evangelists are not tracing the line of descent of the same individual. Matthew runs the line of Joseph, from Abraham, through David and Solomon, and makes a man called Jacob, the father of Joseph, whilst Luke runs the line of Mary, from Abraham, through David and Nathan, another son of David, and makes a man called Heli, the father of Joseph! Certainly Joseph had not two fathers! Nor yet did he descend through two brothers, both sons of David, 2 Sam. v. 14. So that Mary's line is as good by blood and descent as Joseph's, and I re-iterate that the claims of our Lord would be acknowledged by Jehovah, if Joseph never existed.

I say good at his mother's side! and further, if in the absence of a male heir Mary had been called to the throne of David, she would not be the first woman who sat upon it! Athaliah the mother of Ahaziah, did so, although she was a murderess! and an usurper! still Jehovah allowed her to reign in Jerusalem, six or seven years! See 2 Kings xi. How much more legal would have been the reign of Mary, had the necessity of the

case required it, she being descended from the royal house of David and Abraham, as above.

But what are the facts in the case? they are these. Mary was the daughter of Heli, and Joseph by marrying her, becomes the son of Heli, according to the Jewish genealogies, customs and usages. Any one who is even partially acquainted with Jewish history, knows this to be so; besides the word of God will furnish abundance of evidence on this point. See Joshua vii. 19, in the case of Achan, "My son, give glory," &c. Achan was not the son of Joshua. Also, 1 Sam. iii. 6, 16. Again, Ruth i. 11, 12, 13. Ruth was not the daughter of Naomi, only her daughter in law, just as Joseph was the son of Heli. Repeated ch. ii. 8-22; also in the case of Boaz, ch. iii. 10, 11, 16, 18. Ruth was not the daughter of Boaz, though he called her so according to the custom. Again iv. 17, at the birth of Obad, Ruth's son, by Boaz, "the neighbors say, Naomi hath a son born unto her." The child was not the son of Naomi. These passages are merely to show that there is no mystery connected with the fact of Joseph being called the son of Heli, in consequence of marrying his daughter Mary, although in reality, only his son-in-law, so we are under no necessity of admitting Mr. N's Ebionite, heretical "opinion," in order to prove the truth and authenticity of the Scriptures! All these precious truths stand upon their own merits, and are perfectly intelligible, and in harmony one with another, although revealed at different times, and proclaimed by different persons, according to the sovereign will, choice, and unerring wisdom of Jehovah, and why not? When all taught and dictated by the same spirit of holiness and truth, which Spirit most assuredly has not spoken through or by Mr. Nevius, nor any one else, who would attempt to reduce the character of Jesus, "the Son of the living God," to the level of a mere natural animal, man! and such persons God never did, nor never will use, except for some purpose, or act, as that performed by Judas!

Next he comes to deal with the Scripture character of Joseph, which (supposing Matthew's testimony to be true,) he attempts to ridicule, in language quite in keeping with the other expressions used by him. He contends that the Scriptures, or the Spirit who dictated them, had no right to designate him as "a just man." Characteristic modesty again! Now it may be fairly presumed that Joseph knew his duty in carrying any point of Jewish law into effect, much better than Mr. N., and it may be seen that in certain cases of this kind, a provision was made to meet them, Deut. xxiv. 1; at all events Joseph had been thinking seriously of the

line of duty which he should follow, and while he did so, an angel appeared to him, setting his mind at rest upon the question, but Mr. N's "good sense" will not allow him to "credit" this! hence he resorts to repudiation! But angels were sent to others upon less particular occasions, and why not, upon this glorious manifestation of God's power, in the fulfillment of his promises to guilty fallen man!

But again, if Jesus Christ was the son of Joseph naturally, and in consequence nothing but a mere natural man, does Mr. N. see the predicament in which the whole human race would be placed, (himself not excepted!) There would be no redemption for any mortal son of Adam! In Psa. xlix. Jehovah challenges the whole earth to hear, "low and high, rich and poor," including every man in every state, and He tells them distinctly, that not one of them can effect the redemption of his brother; "nor can redeem his brother, and give to God a ransom," ver. 7; "not by any means;" it follows then, that if Jesus Christ was no more than a mere man, God has never yet got a ransom! No man can do it, all is lost!! But is that so? No, thank God, Mr. N., nor Mr. any one else has got the privilege of adjusting this matter. Jesus Christ was what He professed to be and has made a sacrifice of Himself, which God has accepted as a ransom, and of this He has given assurance unto all men, "inasmuch as He has raised Him from the dead, and has set Him at His own right hand," and now proclaims pardon for guilty man through His name! But whilst upon this point, I would ask how many direct allusions has Jesus made to God as His father, using the expressions, "Father," "my heavenly Father," and "My Father?" fully seventy allusions! as recorded by the evangelists, besides over seventy indirect allusions, using the word "the Father," evidently speaking of matters between themselves, as having received power, commandment, work to do, etc., making over one hundred and forty references of this kind! and how many direct and indirect allusions has He made to Joseph, as His father, in the same scriptures? *Not one!!!* nor have we any account that Jesus even mentioned the name of Joseph!! and yet in the face of all this, Mr. N. proclaims to the church and the public, that he knows more about this matter than prophets and apostles, and more than the Christ himself!!! in fact, Mr. N's. creed amounts to this, that if any is to be saved at the appearing and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, they must throw aside the declaration of Jehovah, Jesus himself, and also the testimonies of Isaiah, Matthew, Luke, John, and Paul, and take his "opinion" instead, as the rule of faith and practice! No other

way of escape, according to his peculiar theory! what a pity that he is not an occupant of Peter's chair, in the harlot's dominions! so that he might have fair scope for his legislative powers, and Apollos-like show his mighty knowledge of the scriptures, Acts xviii. 24.

The next act of repudiation which he attempts, is that sign or prophecy given in Isaiah vii. 14, in the reign of Ahaz; a promise which was as true, as the passage containing it is beautiful, and which promise was the stay and support of every faithful son and daughter of Abraham, who looked for, and longed for the redemption of Israel, Luke ii. 23-38, but on this point Mr. N's "good sense" again carries him triumphant! he will not "credit" it, and he states further, that Matthew, and all who believe him, in referring to this prophecy as fulfilled in the birth of the Savior, Matt. i. 23, "are begging the question." His assertion here, however, ranks fully as high as his "opinion," and shows quite as much knowledge and intellect! Or in other words, they are both alike worthless, and in making the assertion Mr. N. commits himself beyond the possibility of extrication, saving and excepting by repudiation. In rejecting Matthew i. 23 as the fulfillment of Isaiah vii. 14, he is fairly bound to show how the prophecy by Isaiah was fulfilled, in order that his assertion may merit the slightest attention, he must show when and where this child, Immanuel by name, Isaiah vii. 14, was born, previous to the birth of Jesus Christ, or Matthew's Immanuel, Matt. i. 23, if he does not, (and I know that he cannot,) then it will appear perfectly plain to every unbiased, honest mind, that Mr. N. and his friends are the "beggars," if not something very much worse! There is no living man can show from the Bible, any such transaction as having taken place, from the delivery of the prophecy, to the present hour, except the record by Matthew. The name Immanuel does not occur only in one instance more in the whole Bible, that is, Isaiah viii. 8, and it is the same Immanuel which is there mentioned. The language used indicates invasion by the Romans, or subsequently by the Turks, or Saracens, or by Ezekiel's northern army, and yet future, is implied, does not at all alter the case. The land mentioned does not belong to any other than our Immanuel, whom we expect almost immediately to claim it, which claim will be recognized by Jehovah! See Ezekiel xxi. 27, but this is rather a digression, and only intended to show that the name does not occur elsewhere in the whole Book! If Mr. N. says it does, I call upon him to find it, and show it. And as to this sign being given for the special benefit of Ahaz, and to be fulfilled

in his lifetime, it is difficult to see why it should, as he was one of the worst of the kings of Judah, and no favorite of Jehovah! which any one can see who will turn to 2 Kings xvi. 2, 4, and satisfy themselves.

Further, as to the land being forsaken by both her kings," the language of the prophecy will not justify Mr. N's conclusions. Pekah and Rezin never were kings of one land, or one kingdom. Pekah was a conspirator, and usurper of the throne of Israel in Samaria, and Rezin was king of Syria, about two hundred miles distant; the language would require that the (one) land, should be forsaken of both (two) her kings, but this was not done by both her kings, as Pekah and Rezin never sat upon the same throne, nor owned one land, nor governed one kingdom, they were totally distinct, and separate, as to government and territory, I apprehend that the two kings which was to forsake it in connection with the prophecy, belonged to a different affair altogether.

As to the sally of wit displayed concerning the age of the child, &c., Mr. N. ought to know that the time intervening between the delivery of a prophecy and the fulfillment of it, is of no account in the estimation of Jehovah. Paul fully establishes that point, when speaking of Abraham being made (in the past tense) the father of many nations, before the seed Isaac, through whom the nations should come, was born. See Romans iv. 18, quoted from Genesis xvii. 5. God's predictions are so certain of accomplishment, that he "speaks of things that be not as though they were," and Peter tells us, "that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." So that the length of time brought forward, (740 years,) by Mr. N. as an insuperable difficulty, would not be one day in the calculations of Jehovah.

Those quotations from the apostle John's writings should not be brought forward by any man who was acquainted with the very first rudiments of Christianity, in support of the carnal heretical doctrine which is contained in the article of Mr. N. Have the brethren in Washington denied that Jesus Christ, has come in the flesh? I trow not, but they deny and rightly so, that he has come according to "natural generation." So also does the apostle John, and all others to whom the Son is revealed! Why the whole of John's writings have been written in order to disprove, and combat, this one single error! he has taken very little notice of anything else, and Mr. N. could not have made a more unfelicitous choice, than he did by bringing forward anything from John, as the beloved apostle had not the slightest sympathy with the fundamental error, into which

Mr. N. and his friends have unhappily fallen.

And now, Bro. Wilson, I have done with this article, if you choose to let it go to the public, it is at your service, the first vacant sheet you can spare, and I am only sorry that any necessity ever existed, which has obliged me to write as I have done, against an unknown person, who ought to be a brother! but I cannot recognize as such, any person holding such views of our beloved Lord. I have not written, to hurt the feelings of any man, nor yet have I written to attempt to claim a victory over any one; I have written in order to discharge my bounden duty to my Lord, and my brethren, as I am fully persuaded, that an error of this kind, striking as it does at the very root of Christianity, should not be lightly passed over, nor softly dealt with.

I remain, dear brother, yours in faith and glorious hope.

THOS. CHURCHILL.

Toronto, April, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

Social Worship.

CONTINUED.

MR. EDITOR—Dear Brother:—In my former article on this subject, in canvassing the question, “when met together, what are the acts of social worship, to which the church must attend?” the first point in that summary contained in Acts ii. 42, was under consideration, viz., continuing steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine, etc., some testimony was adduced to show, that it was required of the first Christians, that they should read the scripture in their public assemblies, and that they should exhort one another to love and good works. I shall now offer additional testimony for this practice. The reading the scriptures publicly, was not peculiar to the Christians, it was practiced by the Jews in the synagogues, for we find that Jesus as his custom was, “went into the synagogue, on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read; and there was delivered unto him, the book of the prophet Isaiah, and when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, ‘the Spirit of the Lord is upon me,’” etc., contained in chap. lxi. And having rolled up the book, he returned it to the attendant and sat down. Although apparently not possessing a copy of the prophecies himself, yet he was aware of their contents, and therefore read a short portion bearing directly upon himself, and so peculiar were the circumstances of the occasion, his sitting down so soon, and his saying, “to-day this scripture which is now in your ears is fulfilled, that the eyes of all who were in the synagogue, were attentively fixed upon him,” Luke iv. 16, it is supposed by some that the section to be read by course that day, com-

menced where our Lord commenced. And that it was the custom in other synagogues of the Jews, see Acts xiii. 14, 15. Paul and his companions having arrived at Antioch, “went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down, and after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue, sent unto them, saying, “brethren, if any one among you have a word of exhortation, speak.” Here was liberty and freedom, even under the Mosaic institution, which was far in advance of many in this age, who profess to participate in gospel liberty. The invitation, was a general one, but especially to strangers. As Jews they were on a common level; the invitation was not to Paul only, but also to his companions. Again, “For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues, every Sabbath day.” That was an age of positive law, yet there were some that were righteous before God, “walking in all the commandments, and ordinances of the Lord blameless,” Luke i. 5, and with this corresponds the prophet Mal. iii. 16, “then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another, and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon his name, and they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day, when I make up my jewels.” Whether this passage is descriptive of the children of God under the Mosaic, or was prophetic of this our age, matters not, as it well applies to both, and shows the marked interest that Jehovah takes in the voluntary free will offerings of his people, who meet in his name. We are called upon “by the mercies of God to present our bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service,” and not to be conformed to the world. Peter says, “you are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people, that you should declare the perfections of him, who has called you from darkness into his marvellous light,” etc., 1 Pet. ii. 9. Paul enjoins christians to be imitators of him, as he was of Christ, and to hold fast the traditions he had delivered to them, 2 Thess. ii. 15, also iii. 6. Now Paul did not forsake the assembling of himself together with the disciples; and of the traditions it was one, that they should come together on the first day of the week to break bread, and so openly publish the Lord’s death till he come. I have before shown that Paul tarried at Troas seven days, in order to meet with the brethren; and I also find that when he came to Puteoli, on his way towards Rome he was desired to tarry seven days, with them, which was no doubt for the same purpose. He delighted to meet with his brethren.

ren. In his letter to the Romans, he expresses a longing desire to see them, that they all with him, might be mutually benefited by the expression of the faith of each other; and when they did meet at Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns, Paul thanked God, and took courage. None, save apostates, in those days, forsook the assembling themselves with the brethren. Then it was the custom never to be absent, unless of course some insuperable obstacle interfered. They came together then with alacrity, that they might be mutually comforted and consoled, amidst the trials, and combats they had to sustain in a hostile and pagan world. Now, if one had a right to absent himself at pleasure, all the disciples had, and if all had acted so, there would have been no offering of spiritual sacrifices to God through Jesus the Christ, no declaration of the perfections of God, no imitators of the apostle, no holders fast to his traditions, no celebration of the Resurrection of Jesus, no publication of his death, no public remembrance of him, and no continuing steadfast in "the all things" which he commanded. If all the disciples had done this, they would in effect have refused to continue in obedience, and have completely abolished the institutions of Christ, and what all would have been guilty of, so would one. But all the disciples have no right to discontinue the worship of God; or without some insurmountable impediment, almost to habitually absent themselves therefrom; for they are not their own, they are bought with a price, therefore they are under lasting obligations to serve him with all their powers which are his. If then all have no right to do this, individual disciples have no right, for in the church of Christ there are no directly constituted privileged orders, no exempted ones, no autocrats, nor aristocrats, but all its members are on one common level, (calling no man Father, on the earth, in a religious capacity,) and equally bound in all things to obey. Being then all the children of God by faith, they are called upon to draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, holding fast the profession of the faith, without wavering, considering each other's welfare, provoking to love and good works, not forsaking the assembling themselves together, as the manner of some was, even in the apostles' day, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as the day of his coming approaches. The apostle in writing on this subject in Heb. x. intimates in strong terms that the neglect of these things is a treading underfoot the Son of God, and accounting the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and doing despite unto the spirit of grace. The meeting together of the saints, is both a privilege and a duty. Their

coming together does not appear to have been for the object of hearing preaching, for they had already been initiated into Christ, and associated with his people, by their ready obedience to the proclamation of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, and having once fully understood these proclamations, they progressed, or grew in faith and in knowledge, adding to their faith courage, and knowledge, temperance and patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and love; the great object of the gospel, being to transform or mold over again, men and women, to develop a different character, a peculiar people zealous of good works. And as this character, is not developed all in a moment, but requires a mortifying and crucifying process, therefore the giver of all good in his plan of saving men, by turning them from their sins, has instituted the school of Christ for this purpose. Wherefore, leaving the first principles of christian doctrine, let us progress towards maturity, was the admonition of the apostle to the Hebrews. They were not to rest satisfied with the knowledge of first principles, but as it were forgetting the things that were behind, and pressing forward to the things that are before, in order that they might be found worthy of a glorious resurrection.

The apostles Paul and Barnabas and others that were separated unto the work of the ministry, did not locate themselves long in a place, proclaiming the same things to the same audience repeatedly, for the word was then soon received or soon rejected. Those who received it were added to the church, and then taught to continue in the favor of God, and to work out their salvation with fear and trembling. They received the special care of the apostles, to know how they should walk and please God, and then were left to their own resources, and it was to such little companies, that the epistles were sent to inform them how to act, and to bring to their minds, things which the apostles had before instructed them in. Under such circumstances, they copied after the Jerusalem church. Paul in writing to the congregation at Corinth, says, "How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you, hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying, for ye may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." Again, in writing to the Thessalonians, he says, "wherefore comfort one another with these words;" that is, with the preceding words that he had written. One thing is very apparent, that when Paul wrote to where there was an ecclesia of believers, that his epistle was addressed to them as a whole, and not peculiarly adapted

to a head man, that might do all the teaching, or all the exhorting; and as we are also informed that he taught the same things in every church, so then we can safely say, that it was the universal custom, to teach one another, to school one another, to edify one another; and while thus engaged, the apostles and evangelists were travelling far and wide, proclaiming the truth to those who knew it not, and when they had opportunity they called round to see the brethren, confirming them in the faith, and giving them an account of their labors, their persecutions, and their deliverances.

It was not until Christianity became corrupt that the disciples went to meeting for the sake of hearing preaching. It was when the time arrived, that Paul warned Timothy of, in 2 Tim. iv. 3, "for the time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts, shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables." The mystery of iniquity begun its work, even in the Apostolic age, producing at least one Diotrophes, who loved to have the preeminence, to lord it over God's heritage. The great Apostle of the Gentiles knowing by inspiration of the awful apostacy, and the establishment of the one man system, charged the Ephesian elders, "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves. and to all the flock among whom the Holy Spirit made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath acquired by the blood of his own, for I know that after my departure rapacious wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock; and of you will men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." It is incumbent upon us in these last days of Gentile rule, and superstition, to examine the great chart of our liberties, that we may the more effectually grow in favor and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and if we have been stunted in our early training, having been cramped under the withering and blighting influence of modern priestcraft, let us be roused up to our privileges, that we may enjoy the simplicity that is in the Christ, to quit us like men, and return to New Testament principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity; "that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but speaking the truth, in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted, by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase

of the body unto the edifying of itself in love;" standing fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel; for the Church in its entirety is the pillar and support of the truth, and so much all its component parts ought to be "blameless, and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, shining as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life." What! are all the disciples called upon to hold forth the word of life? Yes, to all intents and purposes. Christ's disciples are all preachers of the word, or ought to be to the best of their abilities;—"living epistles known and read of all men." The primitive disciples when they were persecuted in Jerusalem, "went every where preaching the word," Acts viii. 1-4, and xi. 19; and this subject received the special attention of the Lord in the closing part of Revelation, which is applicable to all Christians, whether of high or low degree, and extending through all the period of his absence: "the Spirit (Christ) and the Bride (the Church) say come, and let him that heareth say come;" so there are no exceptions, for every individual, that has heard the word, and has proved the fact by obeying it, is called upon by this last and great commission, to follow in the steps of the first Christians, both by word and deed, to show the world that he has been taught of Jesus, and is looking for his second appearing; and thus he will be a faithful witness to the truth of God, in endeavoring to draw his friends or his neighbors, by the powerful weapon which he is permitted to use, "the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God." This instrument will be his guide, when met with the disciples for social worship. He is not to speak his own words, but "to the law and the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." "Let every one according as he has received a gift, minister it to the others, as good stewards of the manifold favor of God; if any one speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any one minister, let him do it as from the strength which God supplies; that in all things God may be glorified, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory, and the power, forever and ever, amen," 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11.

I must now conclude for the present. I had intended to have examined the subject of the fellowship, and given some thoughts on the administration of the supper, but short articles are probably more interesting; and as you have many contributors to your columns, it is not fair to crowd too much at a time. What I have written is for the truth's sake, which is mighty and will eventually prevail.

JAMES WOOD.

From the Messenger of the Churches.
Reasons for Re-Immersion.

The institution of baptism, or, more correctly, immersion in water in the name of the Lord, is generally admitted to have been of divine appointment; and as such to have occupied an honored place in the doctrine and practice of the first churches. It is therefore necessary that in any restoration of primitive christianity it should be allocated correctly; so that its value in relation may be ensured to the same extent as in the primitive age. It is but to be expected also that men who had so long been trained amiss should sometimes stumble in the twilight of their transition era; and, satisfied of some things, that they should overlook others; and prone to a common failing, should generalize and systematize at too early a stage of their reforms.

Experience has shewn this to be the fact. The Baptist reformers of Britain and America have done well in rescuing from its disuse and dishonor the old fashion of believer's baptism by immersion; but they should not blame us if we try to do more—seeking, on their own principles, to ensure *believing* before being baptized. It is surely as needful to have the faith sound as the obedience of faith prompt.

Now, because of imperfect faith in the first instance, many have found it their duty to be re-immersed. We say *re-immersed*, in accommodation to the style of speech which most persons use in this matter; not from a persuasion of its correct mode of speech, for wrong or invalid immersion is no immersion at all. The whole virtue of such an act must surely depend upon the correctness of its antecedents. To render this apparent, and to show the reasons which should induce any one to consider this as a personal matter, pressing upon him or his friends, the reader is requested to ponder the following considerations:—

1. In apostolic times belief of the gospel in all cases preceded immersion into the name of the Lord. This proposition contains the whole strength of the baptist controversy, and is absolutely irrefragible. It can never be shown that Jesus or his apostles contemplated any other order in this matter than faith first, obedience second; nay, the pedobaptist virtually admits this when he pleads for faith on the part of parents or sponsors at the christening of infants. The matter of faith which should precede baptism is designated by the comprehensive New Testament term—the gospel—in accordance with the order of the Lord,—“Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” We need not linger at this point, as the proof

is patent to all, and admitted on all hands.—But consider.

2. The gospel embraces “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ.” This is apparent from the instances in which anything like an analysis of the preaching of the apostles is given in the New Testament; thus, in Acts viii. 12; xxviii. 31, we have it expressed categorically: and in Acts ii. 22–36; iii. 13–26; x. 36–43; xiii. 23–41, more in detail. As the organization and constitution of the church were not matters in which the unconverted were interested as matters of faith preceding their immersion, we cannot reckon these to be the things concerning the kingdom of God then preached, particularly as the church of God is never called the kingdom of God. And as there is no hope held out of an abiding entrance into the heaven of heavens, by translation, or by assumption after resurrection, we are shut up to the conclusion that that which otherwise in the Scriptures is called the kingdom of God, is what is meant in this connection too—that is the dominion of the Lord of Hosts by a king, or by His Christ, over Israel and the nations. The things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, of course embrace the doctrine of his priestly relation, and the facts by which that is displayed—the death for sin, the resurrection to life, and the ascension into the heavens, there as Lord to sit till Jehovah sends the rod of his strength out of Zion. Whether or not at all this may be expressed or implied in the things of his name, certainly at least they are altogether embraced in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, which, as we have seen, constituted the burden of the apostolic teaching, reasoning, and proclamation. As our purpose however is to address those who are presumed to have believed these things, we need not extend the demonstration of their truth, but notice,

3. If any one believes only part of that which the apostles set forth for faith, he cannot, in the Bible sense of such term, be called a believer. Thus—if a Jew believe only what was the burden of John the Baptist's first teaching—“the kingdom of God is at hand,” (which truth is caught up and spoken by the Lord and his apostles—being embraced in their declarations and proclamations) and denies that Jesus is the Christ, he is no believer. Or if a Gentile should deny that Jesus has died for sins according to the Scriptures, although he believes Jesus to be the promised Messiah, he is no believer. Likewise, if any one, Jew or Gentile, should admit that Jesus has lived on earth, has died for sins, risen again, and ascended to the right hand of God, yet makes no account of

his return from the heavens, in virtue of the purpose of his Father to set him up as His king upon the holy hill of Zion: substituting for such doctrine and faith those popular figments—that Jesus is now seated on the only throne he will ever occupy, and that those who believe in his death, burial, and resurrection, shall at their death, or it may be at their resurrection from death, be translated to realms of bliss beyond the sky, there to abide in the blessed occupation of praising God to all eternity—such an one cannot be said to be a believer in the right sense of the term. It should be remembered,

4. That the act of immersion (even though under an avowedly christian formula,) if the antecedents be not properly fulfilled, is of no account at all. Mere immersion in water is nothing in itself; it is the washing of water *by the word* by which the church is sanctified and cleansed. The votaries of a false religion may and do practise immersion, but they only mock God by such acts. All the Greek church, and even some individuals of the English church immerse babes; but those babes have no faith. Whether is the wrong faith, or no faith at all preferable? Here we must again remind the reader that we have presumed he acknowledges that the faith in which he was formerly immersed is not now held by him to be *the* faith.

5. As the only secure promised results is to fulfil stipulated conditions; so when we find our error in any case, through neglect, ignorance, or perversity, we endeavor to do over again in right style that which we had formerly done amiss. We cancel that leaf of our book in which we have written incorrectly, we retrace our steps on the wrong road, we apologise for the evil word we have spoken to our friend. Now God is our friend, and if we have misunderstood his wishes, and gone in a wrong road with a sincere enough intent, let us return; and if such reversion of our acts and purposes necessitates the cancelling of even that which we have well written in the page of our history, still let us do it heartily. If this should include in it the reversing of a solemn religious act which has been done amiss, let not our pride stand between us and safety, between us and honor, dignity, and the fear of the Lord. Thus stands the obedience of faith; thus is related the immersion of believers, not only to their own personal safety, but to the glory of God—and God is glorified in the way and by the means He has appointed. What! shall it be to our shame before the Lord that we have been ashamed of our duty before men; and hesitated so long in the doing of an act which at once settled all uncertainty, and dispelled all doubt?

If there is no *Scripture* precedent for the

re-immersion of those who have had faith in Jesus, let it be remembered that the apostles were no bunglers who did their work so imperfectly as to require patching and correction; and that therefore such cases as we have become familiar with could not have occurred under their supervision. Still there is one case in which we see distinctly that the disciples of John were re-immersed, and that into the name of the Lord Jesus—(Acts xix. 1-5) a case which prompts a question whether the apostles and others were not immersed again by Jesus when they left the charge of John the Baptist, and came under him. But as our reasoning and warrant, as stated above, do not depend on such a promise, we may leave that case to the discretion of the intelligent.

It is a good and necessary thing to be fully persuaded of our duty; but a noble thing to be always ready and prompt to do it.

G. DOWIE.

From the Dublin University Magazine.

Tischendorf and the Codex Sinaiticus.

The name of Tischendorf does not now appear for the first time in connection with Biblical literature. The course of authorship of this distinguished savant began as long ago as 1838, when an edition of the Greek New Testament proclaimed his qualifications for the textual criticism, and decided his career. The patronage of his own sovereign furnished him with the means of visiting Paris for the purpose of exploring its manuscript treasures, especially its *Codex Ephremi Rescriptus*, one of the most valuable palimpsests in the world. Since then Great Britain, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Malta, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Constantinople, have been traversed in the prosecution of his researches, and have borne witness to his combined learning and zeal. To sum up his publications were to fill a paragraph; suffice it to say, that his "Codex Friderico-Augustanus," his "Monumenta Sacra Inedita," his "Evangelium Palatinum," his "Codex Amiatinus," his "Codex Claromontanus," his "Palimpsest Fragments," his "Apocryphal Acts," "Apocryphal Gospels," "Apocryphal Apocalypses," and his successive editions of the Greek New Testament, have established his reputation as the largest contributor to the textual criticism of his day, and made the name of Tischendorf celebrated far beyond the bounds of his quiet university.

In the volume before us* we have record made of one of his latest journeys, and certainly his greatest acquisition—a very an-

* *Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici*. Edidit. Ainoth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus. 1860.

cient manuscript, containing the most important parts of the Old Testament in Greek, and the entire New Testament, without omission or erasure, *ne minima quidem lacuna deformatam*. Any manuscript of the Holy Scriptures, in any language, with a credible date reaching above the tenth century, would be considered a valuable addition to our stores of critical matter for settling the sacred text, for even these are comparatively few; but to meet with one whose date is assigned, unhesitatingly, by its finder to the earlier half of the *fourth century*, was enough to turn Tischendorf crazy with joy. His record of his emotions at the moment of discovery is quiet, but the exultation of his feelings could not be disguised:—" *Quae res quantam in admirationem me coniecit, dissimulare nequibam.*"

It appears that in his two previous journeys to the East, of the earlier of which he makes interesting report in his *Reise in dem Orient*, 1845-48, he had been, beyond expectation successful in the acquisition of materials for publication, of one sort or another. The second journey—that of 1853, nine years after the first—bears more the character of a great disappointment than the preceding, as a narrative of the circumstances will explain.

In the year 1844, the King of Saxony furnished Professor Tischendorf with funds, to enable him to prosecute his inquiries after parchments and old books in the East. Amongst the acquisitions of that trip was a fragment of a Greek Septuagint rescued by Tischendorf from the destruction awaiting it, and other unvalued scraps and loose leaves, where they were carelessly tossed to rot in the damp, or be consumed by ants. A larger fragment of that MS., containing Isaiah and Maccabees, he begged for in vain, because the importunity of the stranger taught the ignorant monks to set a value on their relic which they had not had independent knowledge of their own to appreciate. He obtained, however, enough of the disjointed leaves and smaller portions to constitute a satisfactory specimen of the whole. These fragments Professor Tischendorf published in 1846, under the title of the *Friederico-Augustan Codex*, in compliment to his royal patron. But the lengthened period of nine years from his first journey did not abate his longing for the remainder of the precious manuscript (*ipsis membranis pretiosissimis*) which he had left in such unsafe custody, and which his own publications had made so widely known. He expected that, during the interval, the MS. would have found its way into a European library, through the care of some appreciative traveler; but no tidings came of such a destination. This prompted the journey of

1853, undertaken with a determination to transcribe all that remained of the document, and to publish it on his return. But, on his presenting himself at the Convent of Mount Sinai, to his dismay, the document could nowhere be found. Describing his disappointment, in his *Mon. Sac. Ined.* of 1855, he expresses his belief that it must have come to Europe, and that it lay somewhere concealed. Should it, however, be irrecoverably lost, he very fairly declares himself innocent of neglect of the manuscript, for he had frankly informed its custodians of its value, and urged upon them its careful preservation.

Matters remained in this position for six years longer—Tischendorf engaged with his professorial duties, and editing his laborious volumes of antiquarian research, together with his Critical Greek Testaments—when, by the intervention of the Prince Von Falkenstein, Prime Minister of the King of Saxony, and the successive Russian Ambassadors at Dresden, the Baron Von Schroeder, Prince Wolkonsky, and Baron Von Kotzebue, aided by the intercession of Von Noroff, Von Kovalewsky, and Theodore Von Grimm, the eager professor's wish was gratified with the injunction to return to his former scene of action, and secure for the Emperor of Russia what spoil he might of ancient Greek and Oriental literature. On the last day of January, 1859, Tischendorf reached his old quarters in the Convent of Catherine, and opened his campaign, or rather foray, with so little success, that four days afterwards he completed his arrangements, by hiring horses and camels, for returning to Cairo on the 7th of February. But an unexpected and most delightful event occurred, mean while, that rendered this last journey memorable above all others undertaken by the professor; for, conversing with the sub-prior, on the Septuagint translation, of which Tischendorf had brought with him printed copies, along with his Greek New Testaments, the conventual brother turned out of a piece of cloth, for his inspection, the very document of which he had come in search.

This revelation was a light rising upon his darkness—the flashing of an instantaneous dawn. Turning over the coveted folios, he found them to contain a considerable part of the Old Testament, the whole of the New, and the Epistle of Barnabas, along with the first part of the Shepherd of Hermas. Xenophon's returning ten thousand never hailed the waters of the Black Sea with more glad-some *Θαλαττα, Θαλαττα*, after their wearisome march and perilous adventure, than Tischendorf the resurrection of his buried love. Unable to sleep through the excess of joy, he bore the treasured parchments to his cell,

and spent the night in copying the recovered Barnabas. Starting, nevertheless, on the appointed day, he obtained the promise of the superior that the mutilated Codex would be forwarded after him to Cairo, to be copied, as soon as the licence to do so should reach the convent from their ecclesiastical head in Egypt. A very few days sufficed to obtain the required permission, and Tischendorf rejoiced in his prize, retaining it in his possession till, with the aid of two friends, he had copied its every word, letter, sign, and variation. Two months sufficed for this Herculean task, which comprised the transcription of upwards of one hundred thousand lines of Greek. This done, his joy was complete.

The original MS., it was suggested, might very appropriately be presented to the Emperor of Russia, a distinguished professor and protector of the Christian faith; and the hint met with unanimous compliance.

From May to September Tischendorf was free to traverse Palestine in search of hidden MSS., and was at Jerusalem at the same time with the duke Constantine, who lent his royal countenance to his labors. In Constantinople the Russian ambassador, Prince Lobanow, received him as his guest in his palace, a circumstance we feel pleasure in recording, the priesthood of letters receiving due homage at the hands of the Princes of the people. From this enlightened nobleman, Tischendorf learned of the existence of another notice since his own of the Sinaitic Codex, namely, one from the pen of the Archimandrite Porphyry, who, in 1846, had examined its peculiarities, when he visited the monastery in the desert. These he describes in his publication of 1856 at St Petersburg, but makes such mistakes as would naturally occur in the case of a person not conversant with textual criticism. The Greek divine, for instance, supposes the MS. to follow the Euthalian prescript in its stichometry; and, as this arrangement of the text dates about four hundred and forty-six, that the MS. may be of the fifth century. From this surmise he conjectured that its corrections belong to the same age, and that, by means of these, a peculiar text—call it the Alexandrian—was brought into harmony with that of the universal Church. These suppositions are gratuitous and incorrect. The arrangement is not Euthalian; nor if it were, would its age be decided thereby—its upward limit would, indeed, be fixed, but not its downward. Its corrections are made by many distinct hands, the two most important being of a date several centuries after the original writing of the MS.; and the corrections, though often concurrent with the orthodox and received text, more fre-

quently diverge from it. The learned priest, moreover, though duly impressed with the archaic aspect of the document, adopted no measures for transcribing it, or making it available for critical purposes. He knew nothing of the fact that the Shepherd of Hermas in Greek was a desideratum of scholars, as well as the earlier part of the epistle of Barnabas, or he would probably have had these, at least, transcribed for the satisfaction of the Christian world. The venerable Archimandrite was evidently more of the amateur than the connoisseur. No man is great in every line. *Non omnes omnia possumus.*

On his return to St Petersburg, in October, 1859, Tischendorf was graciously received by the Emperor and Empress, who examined *seriatim* the professor's stores. By Alexander's command they were exhibited publicly for a fortnight, and the Sinaitic Codex was ordered to be prepared for the press with the least possible delay. The preservation of such a monument of ancient learning and piety, where such losses had accrued to its contemporary literature, was providential; and in recognition of the divine care, the precious boon should no longer be withheld from the world of letters and religion.

The plan of publication pursued will be to represent the original text by facsimile types, the regularity of the letters greatly favoring this method; but even minute varieties of character will be exhibited also. The alterations by the chief correctors will be given in the margin, together with other peculiarities, such as punctuation, accents, etc., while the less important or most modern alterations will be exhibited in the commentary. Twenty pages of lithographic facsimile, drawn from photographs, will exhibit to the eye of the student an exact picture of the appearance of the original. Approved artists at St Petersburg will make the drawings; the firm of Giesecke and Deverient, at Leipzig, are to be the printers, and each page, as it issues from the press, will engage the ever-vigilant and active supervision of the learned editor himself. What an acquisition this will be to the Church and the learned world we need not say, and what a monument of the industry, talent, and ingenuity of the German textuary, who publishes a great work like this in the course of a couple of years, leaving nothing to desire on the score of accuracy, cheapness, and accessibility after the painful disappointment we have so recently experienced in the wretched, unscholarly, and extortionate Vatican imprint of Cardinal Mai.

The three hundred costly facsimile copies the Emperor of Russia will retain himself, for the purpose of gifts to the learned bodies of Europe; but cheap editions, in ordinary type, to be printed with equal accuracy and

beauty at the same time, will gratify the curiosity of purchasers and diffuse the information the manuscript contains as wide as the world.

The whole imprint of the Codex will occupy three volumes, of which two will contain the Old Testament and one the New. A supplementary volume will include the facsimile plates, and a lengthened commentary upon all the emendations in the manuscript and its palaeography. F. A. Brockhans, of Leipzig, is to have charge of the ordinary Greek type edition. The whole work is designed to be completed in the middle of 1862—a year memorable in the annals of Russia, as it will be the thousandth year of its existence, and it is desired to associate this great literary achievement with the celebration of the military and social progress of the empire.

From the Laws of Life.

Why do Children Die?

"When God gives me a babe, I say, I thank God for this lamp lit in my family. And when, after it has been a light in my household for one or two years, it pleases God to take it away, I can take the cup of bitter or sweet: I can say my light has gone out; my heart is sick; my hopes are desolated; my child is lost! or I can say in the spirit of Job: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.' It has pleased God to take five children from me, but I never lost one and never shall."

This extract is said by the New York Tribune to be from the pen of Henry Ward Beecher, and if so, is a good instance of that distinguished man's views. The Tribune thinks it manifests a profound sentimentalism, and that it is worth exemplifying by all who have lost children. For myself, I feel called on as a Christian to *protest* against it, and to affirm my utter disbelief of its soundness. I do not believe that the Bible, or Science, or Common Sense, or our Spiritual Instincts, or all combined, support the view, that the Creator is to be held *responsible* for the deaths of little children. The truth lies in the opposite direction. Their deaths are to be laid at the door of the Destroyer. God takes no pleasure in the deaths of *little children*, and among the derelictions of duty for which parents will be held strictly accountable, are those of so relating the conditions of their children to earthly existence as to render it quite impossible for the Creator under the ordinary operation of Physical laws to keep them alive.

Why, then, when children die, as in ninety-nine cases in a hundred they do, from neglect to obey the Creator's laws, should one take an outburst of a pious heart like that of Job, when in very extraordinary circumstances, which led him to say, "the Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the

name of the Lord;" and quote it to justify events for the occurrence of which there is no *necessity*? Depend upon it all such *resignation* is blind, is forced, is unnatural, is unwarranted by the teachings of the Gospel. Who believes that in order to bring these five babes to untimely graves their Creator interposed as to *violate the laws* upon whose operation the continuance of their lives depended? Who believes that had God's laws, as written in and upon the bodies of these babes, been obeyed they would have died? Who then is responsible for their deaths? Most certainly not God, whoever else is.

It seems to me that it is not at all needful to be illogical in order to be pious, or irrational or unjust in order to show resignation. No parent is justified either by the teachings of his own Nature or by the teachings of the Gospel—and he ought not to be by Public Opinion—in being *resigned* to the deaths of his children, who have died not by act of God, but by violations of Physical laws, obedience to which would have kept them alive. Ninety-five children in each hundred who die, with proper care and nursing might have lived! Of this there can be no well-founded doubt. For, a much larger percentage of the whole number born, live than die, and while some of those who die, do so from casualties, or Providential interpositions, the vast majority die from neglect to train them to obey the Laws of Life and Health.

Now with such wholesale slaughter of Innocents going on before our eyes are we to have *resignation* preached to us? And are we to accept it, and argue ourselves into the belief or feeling that their deaths are *by act of God*? Never! One might as well be *resigned* to Murder, Rapine, or Arson. *Submit* we must—for we cannot help ourselves, but resigned—not at all.

I have lost one child. I was not, I never have been, and I never shall be, resigned to her death. But for her parents' ignorance, and the still greater ignorance of her Physician, she might have lived. Her death I doubt not was as displeasing to God as it was distressing to me, for she was as clearly the victim of Drug Poisoning as though she had been intentionally poisoned. When will Christians learn to make distinctions and cease to think and act as though it were incumbent on them to ascribe every such event to such directly Divine interposition as to shift the responsibility off human shoulders. The Creator governs Mankind as well by Laws as by Special Providences, and it is wise in us to recognize the former as the *general* rule by and through which his government is administered. Only in so doing can we hope to grow into His image and represent Him.

—James C. Jackson.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, I must preach the KINGDOM of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JULY 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 13.]

For the Gospel Banner.

Scripture Reasonings, No. XI.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL.

"When, therefore, they were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom unto 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." Acts i. 7, 8.

Inasmuch as some opposers of the truth as it is in Jesus, who have labored, and are still laboring artfully for the subversion of the Gospel teachings, and obedience, have asserted that the kingdom of God spoken of in the Bible is not the kingdom of David, nor the kingdom of Israel restored, and that the kingdom of God is a spiritual, and not a physical or earthly kingdom, we shall in the present number undertake to show the falsity of such assertions, and present the true teachings of the scripture with regard to the same. In doing this we shall not undertake to dispute such a proposition as this, that the eternal God rules over, guides, and orders by his almighty power the affairs of the whole universe, "that he ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and that he doeth according to his own will in the armies of heaven, and that none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou?" This we admit to be self-evident, and apparent to all, except the fools that say in their hearts there is no God. But we shall attempt to prove, that that kingdom, called in the New Testament both the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, is to be the kingdom of Israel and kingdom of David restored; a literal, physical, (and not a spiritual) kingdom, upon earth, in Palestine.

The question asked Jesus by the disciples in the text we have quoted at the beginning of this article, is not whether he will, or he will not restore again the kingdom unto Israel; they manifest no doubt with regard to the fact of such a restoration being determined in the purposes of God, but their question is simply one of time, when that event shall be accom-

plished.—"Will thou at this time restore," &c.; the answer he gives, ought to be sufficient to convince any honest mind that there is a time appointed for such restoration, and that that time was then in the power of the Father. Having then in view this determined purpose of God to restore again the kingdom unto Israel, we will show,

I. THAT ISRAEL, COLLECTIVELY AND NATIONALLY, ARE GOD'S PEOPLE. In proof of which we notice the declaration of Yahweh by Moses, "For thou (Israel) art a holy (or separate) people unto Yahweh thy God; Yahweh thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth," Deut. vii. 6. Also in chap. xiv. 2, we find almost the same language used. Again, "The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, * * * and to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honor, and that thou mayest be an Holy people unto Yahweh thy God, as he hath spoken," Deut. xxvi. 18, 19. Again, "Hear, O my people, and I will speak; O Israel, and I will testify against thee; I am God, even thy God," Psa. i. 7. These passages we consider sufficient on this point, and will proceed to show,

II. THAT GOD IS THE KING OF ISRAEL. By reference to the lively oracles we learn, that when Samuel the prophet was displeased because the people of Israel desired a king to judge over them like the nations around, that the Lord said, "Hearken unto the voice of the people: in all they say unto thee, for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should reign over them," 1 Sam. viii. 6, 7. Again, Samuel declares this to be the word of Yahweh unto Israel; "Ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities," 1 Sam. x. 18, 19. Again, "And when ye saw that Nahash, king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us, when the Lord your God was your king," 1 Sam. xii. 12.

Again we read in Hosea xiii. 9-11, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thy help. I will be thy king; where is any other that may save thee in all thy cities." Likewise the Spirit by another prophet says, "Thus saith YAHWEH your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; * * * * I am Yahweh, your holy one; the CREATOR OF ISRAEL, YOUR KING," Isa. xliii. 14, 15. By these quotations two points are proved, viz. that Israel was specially chosen to be the people of God, and that God was their king; hence so long as that relation continued the kingdom of Israel was the kingdom of God. But as we read they rejected God, and desired a king like the other nations, so we are told by the prophet that God gave them a king in his anger, and took him away in his wrath," Hos. xiii. 11. After this, God gave them a king of his own peculiar choice, whose throne and kingdom should be perpetuated forever. That king was David, and his throne was on Mount Zion, and the subjects of that kingdom were the twelve tribes of Israel; hence David's kingdom was the kingdom of Israel; and keeping this in view we will proceed to prove,

III. THAT DAVID'S THRONE AND KINGDOM WAS GOD'S THRONE AND KINGDOM. 1st. *The Throne.* This Throne of David was upon Mount Zion in Jerusalem, which strong-hold he took from the Jebusites, (one of the ten nations promised to Abraham,) after he reigned in Hebron seven years. With regard to this locality the Spirit says, "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the Great King. God is known in her palaces for a refuge," Psa. xlviii. 2. "Yahweh hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation; this is my rest forever; here will I dwell, for I have desired it," Psa. cxxxii. 13, 14. From these passages we learn, that God hath chosen Mount Zion for a place in which he is to be known for a refuge. We likewise learn from other passages, that the throne of David in Mount Zion was Yahweh's throne, as for example, we read upon the occasion of Solomon's succession to that throne, which was the throne of David and of Israel, "Then Solomon sat upon the THRONE OF YAHWEH, in the place of David his father," 1 Chron. xxix. 23. By this we prove, that notwithstanding it was occupied first by David, and subsequently by Solomon and others, it was still God's throne. But we are taught further, that in the future God is to delegate and anoint another servant of his, a descendant of David to sit upon that throne, concerning whom he says, "yet have I anointed my king upon MY HOLY HILL of Zion," Psa. ii. 6.

2. *The people or subjects of David.* The

Spirit by Nathan the prophet to David said, "Thus said Yahweh of Armies, I took thee from the sheep-cote from following the sheep to be ruler over MY PEOPLE ISRAEL," &c. 2 Sam. vii. 8. Again we read, "He (God) chose David also his servant and took him from the sheep-fold, and brought him to feed Jacob his (God's) people, and Israel his inheritance," Psa. lxxviii. 70, 71. From these passages it is proved that the people whom David was called to rule over, were God's people; hence David's people and God's people were one people; therefore the throne being God's throne, and the people God's people, it follows, that the kingdom of David is God's kingdom, and whoever sits upon that throne is Yahweh's representative, or vicegerent.—his Messiah or anointed one. That kingdom is now perverted and overturned, but when it is restored under a new constitution of things, it will still be the kingdom of God, and its king will reign by divine right; therefore we notice,

IV. THAT THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST ARE ONE. On one occasion, (we read) the mother of Zebedee's children came to Jesus the Messiah, and asked that he would grant that her two sons might sit the one on his right hand, and the other on his left in his kingdom. Jesus taught her that such could only be granted to those for whom it is prepared of the Father, thus showing that the kingdom of Christ is to be ordered or arranged of God. See also Matt. xx. 20-24; Mark x. 35. And in the record given by Luke we read what Jesus declared to those who had continued with him in his trials, "I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink with me at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging (or ruling) the twelve tribes of Israel," Luke xxii. 28-30. Here we find that in that kingdom of Christ which is of God's ordering and appointing, God's people Israel are still kept in view as subjects, as also in Gabriel's announcement to Mary, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob," &c. Luke i. 32, 33. Here also we see that the throne of David, (which we have before proved, to be Yahweh's throne,) as well as that people proved to be God's people, are to be given to Christ; thus making the kingdom of God, the kingdom of David, and the kingdom of Christ, identical. We have in other passages additional proof that the kingdom appointed to Christ, and to be shared with his disciples notwithstanding its Israelitish and Davidian constitution is the kingdom of God, the Father; as for instance, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I

shall drink it new *with you* in my Father's kingdom," Matt xxvi. 29; see also Mark xiv. 25, where it is called the kingdom of God. We will show from the Scriptures,

V. THAT THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS A PHYSICAL AND LITERAL KINGDOM, TO BE ESTABLISHED ON EARTH AMONG THE NATIONS. In the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream given by Daniel, we read, that in the days of certain kings, "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed," that "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. ii. 44. In this quotation there are several points that claim our notice; first this kingdom is to be set up by God, hence it is the kingdom of God. Second, the God that is to set up this kingdom is the God of *heaven*, therefore it is the kingdom of heaven as well. Third, we learn from the preceding context that the symbol of this kingdom was a stone cut out without hands, that became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. Hence its location is on the earth. Fourth, the kingdoms in the days in which this kingdom of God is to be set up are real physical kingdoms; kingdoms that by physical force break in pieces and subjugate; and these physical kingdoms are to be broken in pieces and consumed by the kingdom of God, for which consumption physical force must be employed; therefore, the kingdom employing that physical force must be a physical (and not a spiritual) kingdom. To this agree other teachings of the law and the testimony; as for instance, the language addressed by God to the personage anointed to sit on David's throne, "Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession; thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel," Psa. ii. 8, 9; or as in this language of the Spirit; "ΑΒΟΝΑΙ (or the Messiah) who is at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath; he shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill with the dead bodies; he shall wound the head over many countries," Psa. cx. 5, 6; or thus, "by fire and by his sword will Yahweh plead with all flesh, and the slain of YAHWEH shall be many," Isa. lxvi. 16. Again, "Let the saints be joyful in glory, let them sing aloud upon their beds, let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand, to execute vengeance upon the heathen, (i. e. nations,) and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgments written. This honor have all his saints. Praise ye YAHWEH," Psa. cxlix. 5-9.

These passages, and many others we

might present, teach in plain and unmistakable language, the employment of physical force, in subjugating nations and peoples unto the rule of the Messiah, or the anointed king of Israel; hence the kingdom or government using such physical force must be physical to all intents and purposes, and not the sublimated quintessence of gaseous immortality, commonly denominated spiritual, by the ignorant twaddlers of the nineteenth century, whose kingdom of God and kingdom of heaven is something calculated to make poor sinners feel very happy in their precious immortal (?) souls, and to make them perfectly reconciled to, and willing to yield up their life to that great enemy death, whose power is vested in the Devil.

We might add much more to this already lengthy article, but we deem the foregoing sufficient to show conclusively, that the kingdom of God, the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of David, all signify the same thing, namely, that kingdom which the God of heaven is to set up on the earth, in the establishing of which he is "to rule the habitable in righteousness, by that man whom he has appointed, (ΥΑΘΟΥΣΙΑ,) whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, by raising him up from the dead." That kingdom is the kingdom of Messiah, and his separated ones, and is to be a physical kingdom; and when that obtains, then will be fulfilled this language of the Spirit, "The kingdoms of this world;" (literal physical kingdoms,) "have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his ANOINTED one, and he shall reign forever and ever." Rev. xi. 15.

MARK ALLEN.

Woburn, June 9th, 1861.

Twelve Minor Prophets.

The Twelve Minor Prophets were so called in reference to the brevity of their compositions, which in the Hebrew canon formed only one work, called by Stephen, the Book of the Prophets. [Acts vii. 42.] These prophets described with striking accuracy, the advent of the Messiah, and the fate of Babylon, of Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, and Nineveh.

During the Theocracy, and perhaps for some time after, the Jewish prophets followed each other in succession, but previous to the captivity and during the continuance of that period of affliction, God was pleased to raise up a greater number of prophets to console his people, and to cheer them with the approaching promised deliverance by the Messiah.

1. HOSEA, who is supposed to have been the most ancient of the twelve minor prophets, was the son of Beeri, and according to tradition, he was of the tribe of Judah. He entered on the prophetic office between the

years 3194 and 3219, and he continued to prophesy under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, a period of above sixty years.

Hosea was nearly contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, and Jonah. The book is quoted by Matthew and Paul, as an inspired production, and also by Christ himself. [Matt. ix. 12, 13, and xii. 7.]

Hosea is believed to have been the first of the prophets by whom the destruction of Samaria was predicted, and which, soon after the death of the prophet, was accomplished by Salmaneser, King of Assyria.

2. JOEL is supposed to have lived in the reigns of Uzziah, King of Judah, and of Jeroboam, King of Israel, who reigned at the same time, between A. M. 3194 and 3219; he was the son of Pethnel; according to tradition, he was of the tribe of Reuben, and was born at Bethhoron, between Jerusalem and Caesarea. He is said to have died at the place of his birth, but nothing is known of his life or of his age, at the time of his death. The Jews regarded Joel with great reverence on account of the important prophecies which he delivered, and he is quoted as a prophet by the Evangelical writers.

3. AMOS, the third of the minor prophets, was a native of the small town of Tekoa, situated about four leagues to the south of Jerusalem, and not far from a vast wilderness where he occupied the humble station of a herdsman.

He appears to have been called by an express command of God to assume the prophetic office, without having been regularly educated in the schools of the prophets, which is supposed to be implied in the assertion that he was no prophet, neither was he a prophet's son.

The particular period when his prophecies were delivered cannot now be ascertained. They relate chiefly to the kingdom of Israel, and the prediction of the captivity and destruction are followed by assurances that God should again restore the kingdom of David. The zeal with which he rebuked the transgressions of the people, and the denunciations he uttered against the court of Jeroboam, and the idolatries practiced at Bethel, drew upon him the indignation of the priests and the princes of the people, and it is related that Uzziah, the son of Amaziah, in revenge for the censures and prophecies directed against him by the prophet, put him to death.

4. OBADIAH, whose name implies, "the servant of the Lord," is said by tradition to have been of the tribe of Ephraim, and a native of Bethacamar, a town situated in the hilly part of Judea.

The completion of the predictions he delivered, and the admission of his book into

the sacred canon, prove that he was favored by divine revelations, but the period at which these were received is involved in uncertainty. It is supposed that he was contemporary with Ezekiel and Jeremiah, and that he prophesied a short time after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; an event which happened about A. M. 3416.

5. JONAH, the prophet, was the son of Amittai, and of the tribe of Zabulon. He was born at Gath-hepher, a town situated near Siphonim, in the land of Zabulon. He is generally supposed to have prophesied in the reigns of Joash and Jeroboam the Second, Kings of Israel.

Jonah was commissioned by God to preach against Nineveh, a city even greater than Babylon, and the metropolis of that kingdom which was used by God as the "rod of his anger against Israel and Judah."

The name Jonah, or, as it is written in the Greek, Jonas, signifies a dove, an appellation singularly descriptive of the gentle and timid disposition of the prophet, who, fearing to encounter the insults and persecutions of those to whom he was commissioned to carry the message of wrath, resolved "to flee from the presence of the Lord." But,

"Who can resist th' Almighty arm,
That made the starry sky?
Or who elude the certain glance
Of God's all-seeing eye?"

The prophet was arrested in his flight, and compelled to deliver the awful warning: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown."

In the last chapter, the Almighty is described as deigning mildly to reprove the prophet for his unreasonable displeasure on God's mercy being extended to the devoted inhabitants of Nineveh, on their turning to him with prayer and supplication, and by the beautiful illustration of the gourd, God justifies his conduct towards the Ninevites, and appeals to the compassion of the prophet, who finally confesses the goodness and equity of God.

6. MICAH is supposed to have been a native of the village of Morasthi, situated in the southern part of Judah. He prophesied between A. M. 3246 and A. M. 3305, and he is believed to have died during the reign of king Hezekiah. In the book of Jeremiah he is mentioned as a prophet. "Then rose up certain of the elders of the land, and spake to all the assembly of the people, saying, Micah, the Morasthite, prophesied in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and spake to all the people of Judah, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of a forest." This prediction is said to have saved the life of Jeremiah, who would have

suffered death during the reign of Jehoiakim for prophesying the destruction of the temple, had it not been proved that the same prophecy had been delivered by Micah 100 years before.

The prophet distinctly foretold the Assyrian invasion, and the destruction of Jerusalem; the deliverance of Israel from the Assyrian and Chaldean captivity; the birth of the Messiah, the spread and influence of the gospel, and the blessings of Christ's kingdom upon earth.

7. NAHUM is supposed to have been born at Elkosh, a small village in Galilee, and to have been of the tribe of Simeon. The period of his birth, and his place of interment are alike unknown. He is thought to have delivered his prophecies between A. M. 3253 and A. M. 3294, the time when Israel was carried captive into Assyria by Shalmaneser, and when the destruction of Jerusalem was meditated by Sennacherib. At this eventful period Nahum was raised up to proclaim destruction "to him that imagined evil against the Lord;" and to repeat denunciations against Nineveh, which were afterwards so unexpectedly fulfilled, "while they were folden together as thorns, and while they were drunken as drunkards," this great city with her fifteen hundred towers, and defended by walls a hundred feet in height, fell a prey to the conqueror; and so complete was the destruction, that scarcely a trace remained to mark the spot on which it had stood. This remarkable prophecy was accomplished a little more than a century after it was delivered.

8. HABAKKUK, who foretold the same events as Jeremiah, is supposed to have lived after the destruction of the Assyrian empire, and to have delivered his prophecies in the reign of Jehoiakim, who ascended the throne of Judah A. M. 3395, and reigned eleven years. He is said not to have followed his people into captivity, choosing rather to remain in his desolate and forsaken land, where he appears to have died. He is said to have been buried at Cela, in the territory of Judah.

It is supposed that the very beautiful prayer with which this book concludes was set to music and performed in the service of the temple.

9. ZEPHANIAH was the son of Cushi, and is supposed to have been of the tribe of Simeon, and of high descent. He is believed to have entered on the prophetic office towards the beginning of the reign of Josiah, who ascended the throne A. M. 3364.

The inspired prophet begins with an announcement of God's judgment against Judah; and he foretels "a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness

and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers."

The prophet then goes on to predict woe to the Cherethites, Ammonites, Moabites, and Ethiopians; and he describes in animated and impressive language the destruction of Nineveh,—prophecies which were chiefly effected by the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar. He concludes with promises, that those who trust in the name of the Lord should be restored to the divine favor, and of blessings partly accomplished by the gospel dispensation, but which will receive their final completion in the general restoration of the Jews.

10. HAGGAI, who is rendered the tenth in order among the prophets, is supposed to have been born during the captivity, and he accompanied Zerubbabel on his return to his beloved city to build the walls and temple of Jerusalem. He began his prophecy, A. M. 3484, in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, and about fifteen years after the foundation of the temple, a work which was greatly promoted by the exhortations of the prophet. He encouraged the people in their labors, by declaring to them, in the name of the Lord that however inferior they might deem the present temple, compared with the magnificence of the building prepared by Solomon, yet that it should infinitely excel it. "For thus saith the Lord of hosts, yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land: and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts," with a greater glory, even the appearing of the Prince of Peace.

The hallelujah is said to have been first sung in the temple by Haggai and Zechariah.

11. ZECHARIAH was the contemporary and fellow-laborer of Haggai. He was the son of Barachiah, and grandson of Iddo, and probably of the sacerdotal race. He is supposed to have been born in the captivity, and nothing is known of the time and place of his birth. He began to prophesy A. M. 3484, in the eighth month of the second year of Darius Hystaspes, and about two months after Haggai had entered on his office. Zechariah prophesied above two years: he is said to have lived to witness the completion of the temple; of which the building, as we are told by Ezra, "prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo."

One of the most remarkable of the prophecies delivered by Zechariah, is that in which he describes the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem, "upon an ass and upon a colt the foal of an ass;" and that wherein mention is made

of the precise sum of money which Judas would receive for betraying his divine Master.

12. MALACHI, the last of the prophets, is said to have been of the tribe of Zabulon, and a native of Sapha, where he died at an early age. He was raised up to call the Jews to repentance about 400 years before the birth of Christ.

"After a period of nearly 4000 years, 'the testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy,' in the divine oracles of the Old Testament, ceased in the predictions of Malachi. He terminated the illustrious succession of those 'holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' He sealed up the roll of Old Testament prophecy, by proclaiming the sudden appearance of the Lord, whom the pious sought in his temple, preceded by his herald messenger, who should prepare His way before him. The fulfilment of these predictions, by the preaching of John the Baptist, the ministry and miracles of Jesus, during the existence of the temple, as recorded in the New Testament, proving him to be the true Messiah, cannot be read by the pious without gratitude and joy. May every reader attend to these truths with faith and prayer, lest, like the unbelieving Jews, he perish, neglecting so great salvation!"—*Key to the Sacred Scriptures.*

From the Occident.

The Serpent Rationally Investigated.

[We present our readers with the following short article on the Edenic Serpent, extracted from the *Occident*, a Jewish paper published at Philadelphia. The article is one of a series, entitled "The Original Week," some of which have already been inserted in the *Banner*. If the remarks of the writer will help any one to the better understanding of the subject, the object of its insertion will be accomplished.—Ed.]

The voice of the Apocrypha, the voice of the Targums, the voice of the Christian Scriptures have just been heard; now perhaps a reasonable intelligence has just the same voice. Let us test this point:

The common and highly pernicious idea is, that the serpent which entered the Garden of Eden was a crawling and inferior animal as now bears the name of serpent. We must first try to correct this idea, and obtain the true idea of the figure which the serpent made in paradise. We will first try to prove that the serpent was a *seraph*. In the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah and twenty-ninth verse, we read: "For out of the serpent's root shall come forth a crocodile, and his fruit shall be a fiery flying serpent." If we examine the original Hebrew, we will find that the first word translated serpent in this text is *nahash*, and that the *serpent* at the end of the text is *seraph* in the original. Now, if serpent (*nahash*) generates the cockatrice,

and the fruit of the latter is the flying seraph, it is not a wild conclusion that the serpent and the seraph belong to the same family. Farther, if we examine the Hebrew of the twenty-first chapter of Numbers and sixth verse, we will find that certain serpents are pointed out particularly as being seraphs or seraphim. The brazen serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness to cure the people that were bitten, was called a seraph. The geologist, in all his searches among the strata of the earth, finds the serpent as the most marked specimen of animal degradation. Let us suppose that the seraphs or fiery flying serpents in the time of Moses were specimens of physical degradation—a vast degradation from the seraphs that moved on the earth when Adam was still a holy being. And let us suppose that Isaiah in the vision of his sixth chapter, when he saw the heavenly seraphim before the throne of God, then saw that noble form of the serpent or seraph which it originally had on earth. How noble was the form of the seraph as Isaiah saw it! The Lord was sitting on the exalted throne, and then Isaiah saw the seraphim above: "Each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." The interesting conjecture to which these texts lead us is, that the animal, serpent, or seraph had, before the curse of sin came on the earth, the same glorious form in which the heavenly seraphim appeared to Isaiah, that it was elegance of form and sagacity, the head of all the beasts of the field, and that it was in this glorious form that the angels of heaven visited paradise, and appeared before our first parents to hold conversation. If this conjecture is true, it follows that the lying serpent was not the first seraph that stood, or walked, or flew in paradise. Dismiss, then the pernicious idea, that it was a footless, venomous, sneaking serpent that spoke to Eve, and discussed religion with her; believe rather that it was a splendid seraph, having six wings, with two covering his face, with two covering his feet, and flying with the other two,—that it was the same figure in which the angels of light often came down from heaven and appeared before Adam. It was admirable wisdom and deceit in the angel of death when he entered the garden to deceive, to assume the same figure which an angel of light would assume. Behold Satan himself transformed into an angel of light, more a reality than a fancy.

M. R. M.

☞ Abstain from all appearance of evil. Prove all things—hold fast the good.

For the Gospel Banner.

To the Pilgrims and Strangers.

"If ye then be risen with Christ," says Paul to the believers at Colosse, "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." This does not imply, we conceive, that the things to be sought are themselves ever to be (located) where the Anointed now sits; rather does it signify—secure the good things in store for you, which Christ will enrich you with when He appears. Seek by a watchful, earnest, and persevering course, to obtain abundant entrance into the Kingdom—a full reward. Be not drawn aside from diligence, and severe and daily self-examination, by any fleshly notion springing up in the mind, or started by this or that person, at all excusing laxity of purpose. For mark: it may be to your destruction not to say loss of riches in the kingdom, merely. How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? To hold fast with a tenacity exceeding a mortal life-struggle, is necessary; on no account suffering yourself to be moved away from the Gospel Hope.

"Set your affection on things above, (heavenly things,) not on things on the earth." And a sufficient reason is given. "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." While in this world we cannot avoid dealing with it. And we cannot avoid witnessing much of its evil manners, though we mingle not with its politics, societies, companies, regiments, orders, caucuses, balls, and the like. (Woe unto such as disgrace the holy profession by association with them! Woe unto believing parents, who instead of bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, indulge them in these vanities! Think of your responsibilities, and if space is given you to repent, improve it ere it be too late.) In divers ways does sin in its deceitfulness tempt the Christian. Let him give no heed to the subtily of the serpent; spurning all approach to corruption!

"When Christ, our life, shall appear! then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." But the affections now must be pure; the character formed and perfected, though in the midst of sinful flesh, and in contact with impure scenes. "Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth:" "fornication"—sexual intercourse, save in its holy matrimonial use; "uncleanness"—self-pollution; "inordinate affection"—sensuality in the conjugal relation; "evil concupiscence," indulgence of fleshly appetite in any wise—beware of your fondlings and caresses—keep the heart pure; "and covetousness, which is idolatry." What! is covetousness classed with the vile category foregoing. 'Tis even so. Look at it you wealthy

"brother:" and if you call to mind an occasion, or more, where you knew how much relief you could have afforded a suffering member of the Body by sparing a very little of your abundance, it may be well for you, if you so call to mind as to repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance; and crucify your covetousness; a sin, detestable in the sight of the Father and of Jesus, as is idolatry—indeed the two are identical.

"For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." The children of disobedience, here meant, are those, we judge, who having once known the way of righteousness, are turned again to sin: like the dog to his vomit, and the washed sow to her wallowing in the mire. Let us all be wise, brethren and sisters, and apply the apostle's counsel to our own hearts faithfully; remembering that if indulging in any of the sins enumerated, whether in body or spirit, we are not fit to appear with Christ in glory when He comes to reign.

"In the which ye also walked some time when ye lived in them." But, though not altogether perfect, as we presume from chapter ii., this charming body of believers at Colosse had given up their evil walk in these vices, as was their situation when Christ was first preached to them: they turned from the course of destruction into the path of holiness: and other corruptions too they put off.

"But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth." Discountenance all language tending to impurity of thought: stop it where you can, and where you cannot, let the company know you have no love for it.

"Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Here, brethren, let it be understood that while perhaps few utter a point blank falsehood, deception is lying—all its varnish notwithstanding. If you from delicacy or cowardice give a false reason for doing this or that you are guilty. Sincerity, the pure flow of truth from the heart, is justly required. Act then in all matters one to another without guile, so will you have a good conscience; and your truthfulness of conduct will surely meet its blessed result in the end. Malice, deceit, envy, etc., are of the Serpent—overcome him!

"And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." No matter of what nation: whoever believes the Gospel and truly puts on Christ, has claim equal with all others to the good things to come. They constitute One Body, the Church: she with

Him heirs of all things. What then? What is our befitting course of conduct? How should we walk? Hear Paul. "Put on THEREFORE, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies," (*abound* in mercy; love it;) "kindness," (of all manner and word and *Heart*;) "humbleness of mind," (so contrary to the spirit of the world, and to much often witnessed in churches where love of pre-eminence exists. Brethren, you who wish to rule, remember that this is a desire frequently *carnal*: it demands very close testing, and though the process be *mortifying*, it would be best for yourself and the *ecclesia* with whom you are identified to test this same wish in you, faithfully and severely. If it is found on examination to be the wish to rule for the sake of ruling; instead of gratifying it, you should *kill* it by the hard mode of crucifixion—) "*meekness*," haughtiness of mien and of spirit, a characteristic of the flesh, must be overcome: God will not suffer it. Moses excelled in meekness; and when the King in His majesty rides prosperously (Psa. xiv) it will be *because* of truth, *MEEKNESS*, and righteousness. *The meek* shall inherit the earth, and delight themselves in the abundance of peace. Put on then this grace with the rest: this grace, despised by the aspiring children of earth, but *adorning* the heavenly-minded pilgrim. "*Longsuffering*"—the impetuous easily provoked temper, despoiling many an hour's comfort in families and among avowed disciples, needs subjugation. There are those excelling in manifold virtues, who at times, because unwatchful, utter rash expressions, causing trouble and mischief, taking hours, days, or months, to heal. Oh! the unruly member. Yet it can, through grace divine, be kept within due bounds, and moved only to glorify God; and like droppings of the honeycomb afford delight, sweet counsel, and just rebuke to all.

"*Suffer long*," be patient with all: you have your weaknesses and temptations: others have theirs.

"Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." Here is precept and example. *Forbear* in any case of wrong to yourself: overcome the evil with good and forgive! Christ forgave freely and fully: and *naturally* vexing as the wrong may be, give no place to Satan, but *forgive!* *forgive!* and don't suppose yours to be the hardest case to forgive; very likely others have suffered more deeply than yourself yet conceived of, and they have *forgiven* too. Begone then all harborings of spite and retaliation; such are of the Devil—walk you in the Spirit—yea be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

"And above all things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." Where pure, heavenly love prevails, there is a glorious bond of harmony. Evil is subdued. Love vanquishes, love triumphs. Perfectness cannot obtain where love is lacking: but where it exists and grows, contention vanishes and the body becomes "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." *Then* is the company of believers a *light* which cannot be hid. We sigh to think of what can be, and has been in Rome, Ephesus, Colosse, Thessalonica, Smyrna, and Jerusalem, and what now really exists. Perilous indeed is the time, brethren. Let us each do our best—so whether scattered, or enjoying each other's society during the rest of our pilgrimage, we may gain the joy set before us!

"And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful." Peace was left by the Lord Jesus to his disciples. Peace of mind is an inestimable treasure. Rich indeed are the gifts freely given to the honest-hearted follower of Christ. Peace comes after the faithful conflict with temptation: peace comes after the patient endurance of chastisement: peace is the Spirit's gracious fruit: peace is a serene result to the long tried, the long afflicted. Peace comes at length, O suffering child of God whose tribulation has seemed long, but all has been necessary for thy purification: peace crowns the declining days of thy pilgrimage: an antepast of the approaching day of peace. Ye chosen few here and there, let the peace of God *rule* in your hearts; not a peace implying any fellowship with error and sin: no, indeed! Purge out such leaven, that you may be prepared to enjoy the peace of God. Ye are called in one body to this; keep it, prize it, and let it thenceforth *rule*. Guard against any bitter root of what kind soever. If cherished and preserved in the heart of each, the body will be built up and blessed.

"And be ye thankful." Yea in everything give thanks. For daily blessings; things needful for this life; and for the favor shown you by God in opening your eyes and turning you from darkness unto light—give thanks. And for trials too, give thanks. Afflictions are blessings; chastisements are evidences of the Father's care and love. Endure them with patience, be they of long or short continuance; and the yield will be rich in profit to the soul.

"Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Observe the word *richly*. Eat the truth: digest it: day by day ponder

it in the heart. If you lack wisdom and understanding in the Word, ask of God to afford you the aid needed: ask in faith, nothing doubting: ask from pure motives, and you will receive. Persevering, prayerful study of the Scriptures, will certainly be rewarded. Difficulties will disappear: the truth become sweeter and sweeter: communion with God, the only *pure* happiness man can know, will be enjoyed: and the word *dwelling* in you in all wisdom, you will be well qualified to teach and admonish in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, as is your duty and privilege to do, one towards another; and see to it that you faithfully *admonish* as well as instruct. Don't *excuse* faults in yourselves or others: *correct* them and "restore the overtaken in fault" in the spirit of meekness "Singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Yes: brethren and sisters. Humming silly ditties is not doing as Paul directs. Sing with *grace*: let *this* be worship; exalted, heavenly *worship*; the *heart's* incense, understandingly and continually offered to God. "Sing ye praises with understanding." Psa. xlvii. Or as the margin reads, "every one that hath understanding." *Truly* praise God.

"And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." It were well indeed to test our words and actions so. All would be sanctified then. The faithful query, can I do this, (is your occupation just?) or say this, in the name of the Lord Jesus? would quench a world of evil, and make ourselves blessings and blest. But where duty demands deeds and words, *speaking* and *do* in Jesus's name: and be the immediate result, agreeable or not to those concerned, the *end* will be happy to the *overcomer*. "Giving thanks," &c. Thankofferings to the Father by Jesus are always accepted. Give thanks then, O saint: and let thy actions be done and thy words uttered in a *thankful* spirit. The Hebrew Christians, to whom Paul wrote, had their sufferings: nevertheless they were exhorted to offer the sacrifice of praise continually; the fruit of lips, giving thanks to his name. Let us then endure: giving thanks for mercies now, and the exceeding great reward in the near and glorious future. For the present, adieu!

H. HEYES.

Wallingford, Conn. June, 1861.

From "Testimony of the Rocks."

Mosaic Vision of Creation---No. I.

Nor be it remembered, has the recognition of a purely *optical* character in the revelation been restricted to the assertion of any one theory of reconciliation. It was as certainly held by Chalmers and Dr. Pye Smith, as by Dr. Kurtz and the author of this treatise; nay,

it has been recognized by not a few of their opponents also. Granville Penn, for instance, does not scruple to avow his belief, in his elaborate "Estimate of the Mineral and Mosaic Geologies," that both sun and moon were created on the first day of creation, though they did not become "*optically visible*" until the fourth. "In truth, that the fourth day only rendered visible the sidereal creation of the first day, is manifested," he says, "by collating the transactions of the two days. On the first day, we are told generally, 'God divided the light, or day, and the darkness, or the night,' but the physical agents which he employed for that division are not there declared. On the fourth day, we are told referentially, 'God commanded the lights [or luminaries] for dividing day and night, to give their light upon earth.' Here, then, it is evident from the retrospective implication of the latter description, that the lights or luminaries for dividing day and night, which were to give their light upon the earth for the first time on the fourth day, were the unexpressed physical agents by which God divided the day and the night on the first day." Now whatever may be thought of Mr. Penn's arguments here, there can be no doubt that it demonstrates at least his own belief in the purely optical character of the Mosaic account of the sidereal creation. It is an account, he held, not of what God wrought on the first day in the heavens, but of what a human eye would have seen on the fourth day from the earth. And Moses Stuart, in his philological assault on the geologists, is scarce less explicit in his avowal of a similar belief. "Every one sees," he says, "that to speak of the sun as rising and setting, is to describe, in common parlance, what appears *optically*, that is, to our sensible view, as a reality. But the history of creation is a different affair. In *ONE* RESPECT, indeed, there is a resemblance. *The historian everywhere speaks as an optical observer stationed on a point of our world, and surveying from this the heavens and the earth, and speaking of them as seen in this manner by his bodily eye.* The sun, and moon, and stars, are servants of the earth, lighted up to garnish and to cheer it, and to be the guardians of its times and seasons. Other uses he knows not for them; certainly of other uses he does not speak. The distances, magnitudes, orbicular motions, gravitating powers, and projectile forces of the planets and of the stars, are all out of the circle of his history, and probably beyond his knowledge. Inspiration does not make men *omniscient*. It does not teach them the scientific truths of astronomy, or chemistry, or botany, nor any science as such. Inspiration is concerned with teaching *religious*

truths, and such facts or occurrences as are connected immediately with illustrating, or with impressing them on the mind." Thus far Dr. Stuart and Mr. Penn,—men whose evidence on this special head must be sufficient to show that it is not merely geologists who have an *optical* or *visual* character in the Mosaic history of creation. And certainly the inference deduced from the admitted *fact*, that is, the inference that the optical description must have been founded on a revelation addressed to the eye,—a revelation by vision,—does seem a fair and legitimate one. The revelation must have been either a revelation in words or ideas, or a revelation of scenes, and events pictorially exhibited. Failing, however, to record its own history, it leaves the student equally at liberty, so far as *external* evidence is concerned, to take up either view; while, so far as *internal* evidence goes, the presumption seems all in favor of revelation by vision; for, while no reason can be assigned why, in a revelation by word or idea, appearances which took place ere there existed a human eye should be *optically* described, nothing can be more natural or obvious than that they should be so described, had they been revealed by vision as a piece of *eye-witnessing*. It seems, then, at least eminently probable that such was the form of the revelation in this case, and that he who saw by vision on the Mount the pattern of the Tabernacle and its sacred furniture, and in the Wilderness of Horeb the bush burning but not consumed,—types and symbols of the coming dispensation and of its Divine Author,—saw also by the vision the *pattern* of those successive pre-Adamic creations, animal and vegetable, through which our world was fitted up as a place of human habitation. the *reason* why the drama of creation has been *optically* described seems to be, that it was in reality *visually* revealed.

A further question still remains: *If* the revelation was by vision, that circumstance affords of itself a satisfactory reason why the description should be *optical*; and on the other hand, since the description is decidedly *optical*, the presumption is of course strong that the revelation was by vision. But why, it may be asked, by vision? Can the presumption be yet further strengthened by showing that this visual mode or form was preferable to any other? Can there be a reason, in fine, assigned for the *reason*,—for that revelation by vision which accounts for the optical character of the description? The question is a difficult one; but I think there can. There seems to be a peculiar fitness in a revelation made by vision, for conveying an account of creation to various tribes and peoples of various degrees of acquirement, and

throughout a long course of ages in which the knowledge of the heavenly bodies or of the earth's history, that is, the sciences of astronomy and geology, did not at first exist, but in which ultimately they came to be studied and known. We must recognize such a mode as equally fitted for the earlier and more modern times,—for the ages anterior to the rise of science, and the ages posterior to its rise. The prophet, by describing what he actually saw in language fitted to the ideas of his time, would shock no previously existing prejudice that had been founded on the apparent evidence of the senses; he could as safely describe the moon as the second great light of creation, as he could the sun as its first great light, and both, too, as equally subordinate to the planet which we inhabit. On the other hand, an enlightened age, when it had come to discover this key to the description, would find it *optically* true in all its details. But how differently would not a revelation have fared, in at least the earlier time, that was strictly scientific in its details,—a revelation, for instance, of the great truth demonstrated by Galileo, that the sun rests in the centre of the heavens, while the apparently immoveable earth sweeps with giddy velocity around it; or of the great truth demonstrated by Newton, that our ponderous planet is kept from falling off into empty space by the operation of the same law that impels a descending pebble towards the ground! A great miracle wrought in proof of the truth of the revelation might serve to enforce the belief of it on the generation to whom it had been given; but the generations that followed, to whom the miracle would exist as a piece of mere testimony, would credit, in preference, the apparently surer evidence of their senses, and become unbelievers. They would act, all unwittingly, on the principle of Hume's famous argument, and prefer to rest rather on their own *experience* of the great phenomena of nature, than on the doubtful testimony of their ancestors, reduced in the lapse of ages to a dim, attenuated tradition. Nor would a geological revelation have fared better, in at least those periods intermediate between the darker and more scientific ages, in which ingenious men, somewhat skeptical in their leanings, cultivate literature, and look down rather superciliously on the ignorance and barbarism of the past. What would skeptics such as Hobbes and Hume have said of an opening chapter in Genesis that would describe successive periods,—first of molluscs, star-lilies, and crustaceans, next of fishes, next of reptiles and birds, then of mammals, and finally of man; and that would minutely portray a period in which there were lizards bulkier than elephants, reptilian whales furnished with necks sluu

and long as the bodies of great snakes, and flying dragons, whose spread wing greatly more than doubled that of the largest bird? The world would assuredly not receive such a revelation. Nor, further, have scientific facts or principles been revealed to man which he has been furnished with the ability of observing or discovering for himself. It is according to the economy of revelation, that the truths which it exhibits should be of a kind which, lying beyond the reach of his ken, he himself could never have elicited. From every view of the case, then, a prophetic exhibition of the pre-Adamic scenes and events by vision seems to be the one best suited for the opening chapters of a revelation vouchsafed for the accomplishment of moral, not scientific purposes, and at once destined to be contemporary with every stage of civilization, and to address itself to minds of every various calibre, and every different degree of enlightenment.

From the Christian Pioneer.

De Captivitate Babylonia.

(The Captivity in Babylonia.)

Dear Sir;—With your permission I will offer some thoughts on the Jewish and Christian Captivities, comparing the two together, and showing their similarity to each other. I do this the more cheerfully because the great anti-christian Babylon is soon to come to remembrance before God, to receive the cup of wine of the fiercest of the wrath of Almighty God. Rev. xvi. 19. Ancient Babylon was situated on the river Euphrates, and was the capital of the Chaldean or the Assyrian empire, which was destroyed by the arms of Cyrus, king of Persia, in the days of Belshazzar, the son of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, according to the prophecy of Daniel, chap. v. Babylon signifies confusion, mingling, and as this ancient city had been a noted enemy of God's ancient people, the Jews; enticing them to idolatry, and tyrannizing over them with relentless cruelty; marching their armies into the country, spoiling the inhabitants, and carrying them captive into their country where they treated them as slaves, its overthrow and destruction became a leading topic in the writings of the Hebrew prophets long before the event took place. Isa. xiii. xiv.—also xxi. xl. xliii. xlv. xlv. Jer. l. li., and the Lamentations of Jeremiah. It was founded by the first descendants of Noah, 2234 years before Christ. It was enlarged by Nimrod, the grandson of Noah by Ham, 2000 B. C., and in a manner rebuilt about 1200 B. C. by the Assyrian queen Semiramis, the foundress of the city. It was by Nebuchadnezzar and his daughter, Nitrocris, that it was brought to such a degree of magnificence and splendor, as rendered it one of

the wonders of the world. Jeremiah says, chap. li. 7 verse, "Babylon has been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that made all the earth drunken; the nations have drunk of her wine, therefore the nations are mad. I will do judgment upon the *graven images* of Babylon." Such is the prophetic account of ancient Babylon; and these things were all fulfilled to the very letter. Babylon of old was a *type* of Antichrist, the Christian apostasy. It was the symbol of the Papal hierarchy, for such is the explanation given us of this matter in the 17th chapter of Revelations. This church is the head of the grand apostasy from Christ, and carries on a continual opposition to him. And with respect to all other corrupt churches, to which the name Babylon may be applied, according to the measure of their conformity to her, she is the *Great Babylon*. She is the Great Harlot, and mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, instead of being the Spouse of Christ, and the mother of God's children, as she would have us believe. The old and renowned city of Babylon was remarkable for Idolatry; so is mystical Babylon the Great. Rev. xviii. Old Babylon was a great persecutor of God's ancient people, the Jews; so is the anti-christian apostasy. In France alone it is computed 1,000,000 perished. An eminent German writer computes, that since Luther's Reformation in the different countries of Europe, since the year 1520, in forty years time, 40,000,000 of persons were destroyed, nicknamed heretics, that is, Christians, the most holy, pure and devout people then on the earth. The Jesuits destroyed 9,000,000. In the Netherlands 36,000 were destroyed. The Inquisition destroyed 150,000,000. Besides an innumerable multitude of Wickliffites, Hussites, Lollards and others.

Old Babylon was a great enemy to the Jews; so is Rome or modern Babylon to Christians. Old Babylon was the mistress of Idolatry; so is Roman Babylon, the church of Rome. The Jews first lost their language, and then their liberty in old Babylon; so have Christians lost the pure speech of the Bible in modern Babylon. No two Sects now speak the same language religiously. The Methodistic dialect is not spoken by Presbyterians, nor do Episcopalians speak the language of Presbyterians, and so on. God's people have lost their liberty in the Roman Babylon. Old Babylon was strongly fortified. So, is modern Rome or Babylon strong in riches, in traditions, speculations, parties, sects, creeds, churches.

There are two sorts of conquerors: one of the body, such as Nimrod, Alexander, Bonaparte; the other sort enslave the mind, such as the inventors of superstition, false religion, Papal and Protestant superstition. The

clergy of sects enslave the infant mind; the one does it bodily, the other slyly; one forges chains for the body, the other for the mind. Chains are chains, whether made of iron, gold, or silk. One person enslaves by force, the other by subtily. Old Babylon was the throne of despotism; so is the Holy Catholic Church and her daughters—they enslave the infants. Old Babylon was proud, so is the Roman Catholic Church. She says, she sits as queen and shall see no sorrow. The object of Rome is to increase her power and dominion, and not her religion. She thirsts for universal dominion and sway; that which ancient Babylon was to old Zion, or the Jewish Church, modern Babylon is to the Christian Church, the enemy, the persecutor—oppresses, enslaves and conquers.

In the 16th chapter of the Revelation of John, we have a sacred ode, much resembling that which Isaiah composed on the fall of Old Babylon, in the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of his prophecy. The subject of this New Testament ode is the downfall and destruction of mystical Babylon, the antichristian apostasy, in all its ramifications through the Protestant sects and parties; an event so fully determined in the counsels of God, and of such consequence to his glory and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, that the visions and predictions concerning it are repeated. Let all who may chance to read these lines, listen to the merciful warning which God gives to his people in connection with these churches, to come out of them. He calls us to come out of them as he called Lot to come out of Sodom before he rained fire and brimstone on it. "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, come out of her, my people, that you be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities," Rev. xviii. 4, 5.

The Transgressor's Fate.

"In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Gen. ii. 17.

If Adam died a spiritual death he lost a spiritual life (as death is the loss of life;) but it cannot be proved that he had a spiritual life to lose. Therefore it cannot be proved that he died a spiritual death.

Those who say that a spiritual death is the penalty inflicted for Adam's transgressions, define it to be a loss of all desire to do good, under the dominion of sin, etc. Buck says, "Spiritual death is that awful state of ignorance, insensibility and disobedience, which mankind are in by nature; and which excludes them from the favor and enjoyment of God." *Theological Dictionary*.

If spiritual death is a loss of all desire to

do good, it follows that Adam died a spiritual death before he transgressed; for he certainly lost the desire to obey God before he gave the consent of his mind to disobey him. This being true, eating of the forbidden fruit is the result of his having died a spiritual death. This reverses the order and makes a cause of the effect. But if spiritual death is disobedience, as Buck says, then Adam transgressed while in the act of dying. But if it is being under the dominion of sin, then the crime and penalty are amalgamated.

The above are not the worst inconsistencies in the theory which we are examining.

To be spiritually dead is to be unconverted. To be spiritually alive is to be converted. According to the spiritual-death theory God made use of means to keep Adam from becoming spiritually alive after he had died a spiritual death. Gen. iii. 22-24: "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

But, says the objector, the text says, *In the day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. That is true; but still there is no difficulty in understanding the text. At least the difficulty is not sufficient to justify us in inventing a spiritual-death theory. The margin says, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, *dying* thou shalt die." Dr. Clarke says, "Thou shalt become mortal, and continue *in a dying state* till thou die. This we find literally accomplished. Every moment of man's life may be considered as an act of *dying* until soul and body are separated. Other meanings have been given to this passage, but they are in general either fanciful or incorrect." *Com. on Gen. ii. 16*.

The ostensible meaning of the passage is this: In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt become mortal, subject to death, a dying creature; shalt enter upon a state which shall terminate in death.—*M. Hull in Advent Review*.

"I will never dare to think," says Justin Martyr, "nor speak, that the Scriptures can be adverse to themselves, but if any Scripture seem to be so, and has a color as though it did contradict some other Scripture, I will rather confess that I understand not the things there spoken, being certainly persuaded that no part of Scripture can be opposite to any other part thereof."

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., JULY 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 14.]

For the Gospel Banner.

What is our relation as Christians to Gentile Governments?—No. 1.

"SHALL WE FIGHT FOR THE DEVIL?"
"LET SATAN FIGHT THEIR OWN BATTLES."

The sentences above in small capitals, are quoted from the *Herald of the Kingdom* for June, where they appear at the head of two articles; one a communication from C. Packham with regard to the present troubles in our country, and the relation of Christians to the same; the other is the reply of Dr. Thomas to the inquiries of this and other correspondents, with regard to the same subject; the substance of all, however, is contained in the head-lines above quoted. The question presented is, "Shall we fight for the Devil?" The assumption of the inquirer is, that existing powers and governments are the Devil, and, as Christians are liable to be called upon by the powers, alias the Devil, to do military duty, the Dr., is appealed to, to settle the question as to what is duty? His answer is as above, "Let Satan fight their own battles," still assuming Satan to be the powers or governments, who have battles to fight. In the light of Bible teaching this looks very much like speaking evil of dignities; however we shall charge that to ignorance, which may be overlooked, if those who are in error turn from it when the light shines. Questions, which in times past may not have been deemed of sufficient importance to have claimed our serious consideration, have now become practical, and their investigation becomes more essential in order that we may not be found occupying a false and untenable position. Such questions as the following—Have Christians any interest in, or any thing to do with, sustaining earthly governments? Do they owe any allegiance to, or have they any citizenship under, existing powers? Is a military calling incompatible with Christianity? Are there any circumstances under which a Christian is in duty bound to take the sword?—are worthy of a candid consideration. They are questions not to be answered

by rash assertions, without proof or argument. The teachings of the Scriptures are as plain with regard to these as to many other questions, if we choose to follow them. If we prefer men's assumptions; we may be led astray and have our minds so prejudiced that we cannot see the truth when it is presented. It is an easy matter to raise false issues, and call persons and things hard names, but it is not satisfactory to a candid, thinking mind, to have theories presented for belief and obedience without testimony. It is quite easy to call human governments, (or, as Paul has styled them, "the powers that be,) Devil and Satan, but I think it will be hard to prove they are such. It is with the desire of setting before the minds of those who read the *Banner* what the Scriptures teach with regard to these matters that we have undertaken to pen this article; and in examining the subject we shall proceed to show,—

FIRST.—*That human governments are not (as affirm'd by some) the Devil or Satan, be he a personality, or sin in the flesh, or whatever else may be claimed for him.*

The Scriptures teach that Satan is something antagonistic to God, not acting in harmony with his designs; but at all times in rebellion against him, and ever endeavoring to thwart his purposes. Such is the character of the Satan from the first temptation in paradise to the last revolt in the end of the Millennial Age. The Satan as the name imports is always an adversary; always adverse to God, to his saints, and to all good, "as a roaring lion going about seeking whom he may devour." But the "powers that be," are in harmony with God's purposes, and of his own arranging. One of the great foundation-principles of God's economy is government, and rebellion to it is sin, even as the sin of witchcraft. "The powers that be are ordained of God," Rom. xiii. 1. The word here rendered ordained, has all the force of being established, fixed, or arranged. The powers are of God's arrangement. If the apostle Paul was properly instructed in the

truth, we need not be at loss to know from whom or by whom came the governments that exist. Neither are we at a loss to know from whom or by whom came that, which a favorite theory of the Editor of the *Herald* makes to be the Devil himself: viz., sin in the flesh. Now to my mind there seems to be a strange inconsistency in making the Devil two distinct characters, antagonistic the one to the other, and each deriving its origin from opposite sources. This is certainly dividing Satan against Satan, and thus bringing Satan's kingdom to an end. But in order that the inconsistency may be more apparent, we will present in connection the two following passages—

"The powers that be are ORDAINED OF GOD." Rom. xiii. 1.

"By ONE MAN SIN entered into the world," Rom. v. 12.

In order to suit the dual character of the Gentile-Government and Sin-devil theory combined, this language of Paul ought to read as follows:

The Devil and Satan are ordained of God; By one man Satan and the Devil entered into the world.

But leaving these inconsistencies for those to harmonize to whom they belong, we will proceed to show that the apostle's teachings are in perfect harmony with the teachings of the Spirit in the Prophets on this subject. "There is no power," says the apostle, "but of God;" and when we turn back to the "law and the testimony," we find that to have been the belief of Daniel, as expressed in prayer to God, by him, as follows: "Blessed be the name of God forever, for wisdom and might are his, and he changeth the times and the seasons, he removeth kings and setteth up kings," Dan. ii. 20, 21. Again in his address to the king of Babylon he says, "This matter is by the decree of the Holy ones, to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men," Dan. iv. Of this fact Nebuchadnezzar became satisfied, and made acknowledgment at the end of his times of humiliation, as we find in the following; "I blessed the Most High, and I honored him that liveth forever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation. And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his own will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth, and none can stay his hand or say unto him; what doest thou?" Dan. iv. 35. The following language of the Psalmist is also to the question; "Promotion cometh neither from the East, nor from the West, nor from the South. But God is; judge; he putteth one

down, and setteth up another." Psa. lxxxv. 6, 7. Likewise Jeremiah xxvii. 4-9, which the reader will do well to examine carefully at leisure. Jesus the Messiah acknowledged the great principle laid down in these scriptures when he said to Pontius Pilate, a heathen ruler; "thou couldst have no power against me except it were given thee FROM ABOVE," John xix. 11. The Roman governor's power was derived from above, hence its origin was heavenly, not diabolical. And there seems to be in the testimonies we have produced enough to convince the candid and unprejudiced, that the powers that be are in perfect harmony with God's arrangement, ordained and established by him, in accordance with his own will; hence not the Adversary, Devil or Satan.

SECOND.—It is the duty of all God's people to be subject to and obey the powers that be; for the very reason that they are established by God.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers," says the apostle, "For there is no power but of God." The term *υποτασσεισθω*, *hypotassethoo*, rendered be subject, literally means to come under obedience to a certain order or arrangement of things, and that order of things the apostle tells us subsequently is arranged or established by God. This is a command of the apostle, to be subject; it is imperative and binding upon all who hold themselves under obligation to obey the apostles' teachings. Now we nowhere find a command of the apostles or their master to come under subjection, or yield ourselves servants to Satan, or to sin in the flesh, (if that be the very Devil himself?) But on the contrary, the apostle Paul says, "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness UNTO SIN," Rom. vi. 13. This is a positive prohibition against becoming subject to sin, which if not the Devil, is of his works. In view therefore of the doctrine previously established, that the "powers that be are ordained of God," that which is subsequently set forth by the apostle necessarily follows. "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, RESISTETH THE ORDINANCE OF GOD." Christians then are commanded not to resist the powers. Yet they are commanded to "resist the Devil," see James iv. 7. Consequently the apostles could not have understood both to be the Satan. "They that resist," saith Paul; "shall receive to themselves damnation," (or judgment) and why? because they resist God, who setteth up the powers for government, and for a terror to evil-doers. "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." We find from the Scripture teaching the Devil to be exactly the opposite to this. "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good,

and thou shalt have praise of the same," (i. e. of the power.) [Query will the Devil praise us if we do that which is good?] "For he" (the authority) "is the minister (or servant) to thee for good." (Query—is the Devil God's minister to us for good?) "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid of the power, for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil," Rom. xiii. 1-5. In the last passage quoted we have a key to the understanding of that part of the previous context, found in the 19th verse of the 12th chapter. "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but give place to the wrath," (*μη οργην, tee orgyn*), "for it is written, vengeance is mine, and I will repay, saith the Lord." This is equivalent to telling the dearly beloved ones, not to take the law or the sword into their own hands, to avenge their own wrongs, but rather give place to the wrath, the execution of which belongs to God, and he will revenge and repay; and to perform this work of vengeance, (we are told in the continuous teachings of the 13th chapter,) He has ordained certain powers, who are designed to be the administrators of the wrath upon the evil-doers. "They, the powers, are a revenger." Wherefore we must needs be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.—"For this cause pay ye tribute also.—Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor," verses 6, 7. We find the same doctrine set forth in other portions of Paul's writings. See his directions to the first bishop of the Ecclesia of the Cretians.—"Put them in remembrance, to be subject to principalities and powers, to OBEY magistrates, to be ready to every good work," Titus iii. 1.—Peter treats the same, in language as follows, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as chief, * or unto governors as unto them who are SENT BY HIM for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. * * * Honor all. Love the Brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King." 1 Peter ii. 11-18. Now if Peter had held the modern notion, that Kings, Governors, Rulers, and all authorities were either the Devil, Satan, or Emissaries sent forth of Satan, he could not consistently

have commanded, (as he does here,) obedience to the same, and in the 5th chapter of the same epistle commanded resistance as follows, "Your adversary, the Devil, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour;—Whom resist." 1 Pet. v. 8, 9.

Third.—It is our duty to pray for authorities and magistrates.

Says the apostle Paul to Timothy, "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men. For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. To this also agrees the word of the Spirit by the prophet Jeremiah, to God's separated people of old, who were taught to pray for the peace of Gentile governments. "Thus saith YAHWEH of armies, the God of Israel, unto all that are carried away captives, whom I have caused to be carried away from Jerusalem into Babylon: "Build ye houses and inhabit them, and plant gardens and eat the fruit of them, * * * and seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto YAHWEH for it, for in the peace thereof ye shall have peace," Jer. xxix. 5, 8; see also Ezra vi. 10. From this we learn it was not sin for the sons of Israel while sojourners in a heathen land to possess property, build houses, and plant gardens, or pray for the peace of the city. In the peace and prosperity of the city alone could they have prosperity; if the city suffered adversity, they being sojourners in it must suffer likewise. These things happened for ensamples for us; and at the present time it is with us, as it was with them of old, whether as citizens or sojourners. If the nation is prospered, in its prosperity we may have prosperity, if the nation suffers adversity, we of necessity suffer with it. And it is no sin, but a duty in the light of God's word, for us to pray for the government, and for the prosperity of the nation.

Fourth.—God's people may be administrators and executors of the affairs of the earth without sin, or without renouncing their relation to God and his future kingdom.

I know of some whom I highly esteem as brethren, who deem it to be incompatible with Christianity for the disciples of Christ to hold an office, or have anything to do with the affairs of the governments that are upon earth, arguing something as follows;—If we own allegiance to any earthly power we renounce allegiance to Christ and his kingdom. Let us look at this argument in the light of sound Scripture teaching. 1st. If we bear allegiance to any of the powers that be we bear allegiance to God, because the powers that be are ordained of God. If we refuse to

* The term supreme used by James' translators seems objectionable, and was probably adopted to conform to the received dogma of the Church of England, as well as of Rome, that the king was not only the civil but the ecclesiastical ruler, the head of Church as well as State; an idea not found in the original. *ὑπερῆχος, hyperchos*, signifies literally to hold above, or to hold over; that is to occupy the chief position. The apostle is reasoning with regard to civil and not ecclesiastical relations.

obey the powers, we refuse to obey God's ordinance. If we resist them we resist God, in the person of his delegated ministers to us for good. 2nd. We cannot renounce allegiance to a government or kingdom that does not exist in fact. Christ's kingdom, which is the future kingdom of God, and the kingdom of Israel restored, is not as yet established or set up, Messiah does not now reign on David's throne, and until that kingdom does obtain, we cannot renounce allegiance to it. But for the present state, God has instituted a certain arrangement of things for our government and well-being. The authority of which is vested in certain powers that be, whether they be Kings, Presidents or Governors. These powers under God are subjected to the angels, (God's messengers or holy ones,) see Dan. iv. 17, and to this arrangement of things, so long as it may continue to exist, we are to submit ourselves and be obedient. "But unto the angels he hath not put in subjection the future habitable, (*την οικουμενην την μελλουσαν, τεχν οικουμενην τεχν mellousan.*) whereof we speak," says the apostle, Heb. ii. 5. That future habitable is a matter of hope; and by the gospel we are invited to become heirs, not immediate inheritors of honors, both executive and administrative in that state yet future. If we comply with the conditions of the gospel invitation, we are not immediately taken from this present state and transferred to that more glorious one, but must wait for it with patience, until it be ushered in. That state is to be subjected, not to angels, but to the Son of God. When that time comes the present arrangement is to be superseded, and we shall be absolved from all allegiance to the present powers; they too must become subject to that arrangement or be swept away. See Isa. lx. 12. That future glorious state of things still forms part of the subject matter of the One Hope and Faith.

Joseph was one of the great cloud of witnesses for that holy faith which the apostle makes mention of in Heb. xi. 22. He was as much an heir to the future glory and honor of Messiah's kingdom as any of us; yet he found it not inconsistent with his calling to administer the affairs of the government of Egypt, consenting to be placed in a position of authority next to the king.— Daniel likewise, another heir, and one greatly beloved, one who has assurance of that better resurrection, one "who by faith stopped the mouths of lions," had no conscientious scruple against holding office and administering the affairs of Babylon. Those three Hebrews, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who by their "faith quenched the violence of fire;" who passed through the furnace rather than worship the great image, refused not to be

promoted to places of honor in the province of Babylon. Mordecai, the Jew, also we find was placed in a high position next to King Ahasuerus, in the empire of the Persians. Esther x. 3. We find likewise among those contemporary with the apostles, Erastus still holding the position of chamberlain or steward of the city at the time Paul wrote his epistle to the Romans. See Rom. xvi. 23 Here we have examples of children of God by faith, heirs of the promises, pilgrims and sojourners upon earth holding high offices, administering the affairs of gentile governments, and yet renouncing no allegiance to God or his Messiah. If it was not incompatible with their high calling to be thus engaged, where is the warrant for saying that it is not in accordance now with Christianity, and that all who have ought to do with earthly governments, are aliens, reprobates, and do renounce their allegiance to Christ and his kingdom? Where is the Scripture authority for it? I have seen nothing yet but mere unwarranted assumptions of men brought forward to sustain such notions. Notwithstanding the basest of men may be set up in authority, as we have seen many painful examples, so also we have had bright illustrations in the names adduced from Scripture: and in view of such a desirable contingency, we read, "When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice; but when the wicked bear rule the people mourn." Prov. xxix. 2.

By what we have thus far presented it seems pretty clear, that the powers that be are not of the Devil or Satan, or emissaries of the same; that they are of God's own arrangement, and that our duty is to be subject and obedient to them as to the ministers of God; that we are in duty bound to pray for, to respect, and honor all in authority, whether Kings, Governors, or Presidents; that we cannot rebel, or take part with those who are in rebellion against constituted authorities without setting ourselves in opposition to God, and rendering ourselves obnoxious to judgment; that it is not a sin for the people of God to hold positions of authority and honor under the present arrangement of things.

In another number we will take into consideration another branch of the subject, which we have not room for here; viz. is a military calling incompatible with Christianity? May Christians under any circumstance take the sword? The foregoing is kindly submitted for the candid consideration of those who love the truth, by

MARK ALLEN.

From "Testimony of the Rocks.

Mosaic Vision of Creation---No. II.

I have referred in my brief survey to extended periods. It is probable, however,

That the prophetic vision of creation, if such was its character, consisted of only single representative scenes, embracing each but a point of time; it was, let us suppose, a diorama, over whose shifting pictures the curtain rose and fell six times in succession,—once during the Azoic period, once during the earlier or middle Palæozoic period, once during the Carboniferous period, once during the Permian or Triassic period, once during the Oolitic or Cretaceous period. Dr. Kurtz holds, taking the Sabbath into the series, that the division into seven scenes or stages may have been regulated with reference to the importance and sacredness of the mythic number seven,—the symbol of completeness or perfection; but the suggestion will perhaps not now carry much weight among the theologians of Britain, whatever it might have done two centuries ago. It is true, that creation *might* have been exhibited, not by seven, but by seven hundred, or even by seven thousand scenes; and that the accomplished man of science, skilled in every branch of physics, might have found something distinct in them all. But not the less do the seven, or rather the six, exhibited scenes appear to be not symbolic or mystical, at least not exclusively symbolic or mystical, but truly representative of successive periods, strongly distinctive in their character, and capable, with the three geologic days as given points in the problem, of being treated geologically. Another of the questions raised, both by the German doctor and the writer in our own country, must be recognized as eminently suggestive. "We treat the history of creation," says Dr Kurtz, "with its six days' work, as a connected series of so many prophetic visions. The appearance and vanishing of each such vision seem to the seer as a morning and an evening, apparently because these were presented to him as an increase and decrease of light, like the morning and evening twilight." And we find the Scottish writer taking essentially the same view. "Each day contains," he says, "the description of what he (Moses) beheld in a single vision, and when it faded it was twilight. There is nothing forced in supposing that, after the vision had for a time illumined the fancy of the seer, it was withdrawn from his eyes, in the same way that the landscape becomes dim on the approach of evening. . . . From this point of view, a 'day' can only mean the period during which the Divinely enlightened fancy of the seer was active. When all continued bright and manifest before his entranced but still conscious soul, it was 'day' or 'light.' When the dimness of departing enlightenment fell upon the scene, it was the evening twilight." The *days*, then, are removed, we find, by the

holders of this view, altogether from the chronology to the province of prophetic vision; they are represented simply as parts of the exhibited scenery, or rather as forming the measures of the apparent time during which the scenery *was* exhibited. We must also hold, however, that in the character of symbolic days they were as truly representative of the lapse of foregone periods of creation as the scenery itself was representative of the creative work accomplished in these periods. For if the apparent days occurred in only the vision, and were not symbolic of foregone periods, they could not have been transferred with any logical propriety from the vision itself to that which the vision represented, as we find done in what our Shorter Catechism terms "the reason annexed to the Fourth Commandment."* The days, must have been prophetic days, introduced indeed, into the panorama of creation as mayhap mere openings and droppings of the curtain, but not the less symbolic of that series of successive periods, each characterized by its own productions and events, in which creation itself was comprised. Nothing more probable, however, than that even Moses himself may have been unacquainted, with the *extent* of the periods represented in the vision; nay, he may have been equally unconscious of the actual extent of the seeming days by which they were symbolized. "Visions without dark speeches,"—visions, not of symbolical apparitions, but of actual existences and events, past or present,—may, nay must, have differed from what may be termed the dark hieroglyphic visions; but we find in all visions an element of mere representative value introduced when they deal with time, and that they occur as if wholly outside its pale. These creation "days" seem, in relation to what they typify, to have been, if I may so express myself, the mere *modules* of a graduated scale.

Such a description of the creative vision of Moses as the one given by Milton of that vision of the future, which he represents as conjured up before Adam by the archangel, would be a task rather for the scientific poet than for the mere practical geologist or sober theologian. Let us suppose that it took place far from man, in an untrodden recess of the Midian desert, ere yet the vision of the burning bush had been vouchsafed; and that, as in the vision of St. John in Patmos, voices were mingled with scenes, and the ear as certainly addressed as the eye. A "great darkness" first falls upon the prophet, like that which in an earlier age fell upon Abra-

* "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

ham, but without the "horror;" and, as the Divine Spirit moves on the face of the wildly troubled waters, as a visible aurora enveloped by the pitchy cloud, the great doctrine is orally enunciated, that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Unreckoned ages, condensed in the vision into a few brief moments, pass away; the creative voice is again heard, "Let there be light," and straightway a gray diffused light springs up in the east, and, casting its sickly gleam over a cloud-limited expanse of steaming, vaporous sea, journeys through the heavens towards the west. One heavy, sunless day is made the representative of myriads; the faint light waxes fainter,—it sinks beneath the dim, undefined horizon; the first scene of the drama closes upon the seer; and he sits awhile on his hill-top in darkness, solitary but not sad, in what seems to be a calm and starless night.

The light again brightens,—it is day; and over an expanse of ocean without visible bound the horizon has become wider and sharper of outline than before. There is life in that great sea,—invertebrate, mayhap also ichthyic, life; but, from the comparative distance of the point of view occupied by the prophet, only the slow roll of its waves can be discerned, as they rise and fall in long undulations before a gentle gale; and what most strongly impresses the eye is the change which has taken place in the atmospheric scenery. That lower stratum of the heavens occupied in the previous vision by seething steam, or gray, smoke-like fog, is clear and transparent; and only in an upper region, where the previously invisible vapor of the tepid sea has thickened in the cold, do the clouds appear. But there, in the higher strata of the atmosphere they lie, thick and manifold,—an upper sea of great waves, separated from those beneath the transparent firmament, and, like them too, impelled in rolling masses by the wind. A mighty advance has taken place in the creation; but its most conspicuous optical sign is the existence of a transparent atmosphere,—of a firmament stretched out over the earth, that separates the waters above from the waters below. But darkness descends for the third time upon the seer, for the evening and the morning have completed the second day.

Yet again the light rises under a canopy of cloud; but the scene has changed, and there is no longer an unbroken expanse of sea. The white surf breaks, at the distant horizon, on an insulated reef, formed mayhap by the Silurian or Old Red coral zoophytes ages before, during the bygone yesterday; and beats in long lines of foam, nearer at hand, against a low, winding shore, the seaward barrier of a widely spread country. For at the Divine

command the land has arisen from the deep,—not inconspicuously and in scattered islets, as at an earlier time, but in extensive though flat and marshy continents, little raised over the sea level; and yet a further fiat has covered them with great carboniferous flora. The scene is one of mighty forests of cone-bearing trees,—of palms, and tree-ferns, and gigantic club mosses, on the opener slopes, and of great reeds clustering by the sides of quiet lakes and dark rolling rivers. There is deep gloom in the recesses of the thicker woods, and low thick mists creep along the dank marsh or sluggish stream. But there is a general lightening of the sky over head; as the day declines, a redder flush than had hitherto lighted up the prospect falls athwart fern covered bank and long withdrawing glade. And while the fourth evening has fallen on the prophet, he becomes sensible, as it wears on, and the fourth dawn approaches, that yet another change has taken place. The Creator has spoken, and the stars look out from openings of deep unclouded blue; and as day rises, and the planet of morning pales in the east, the broken cloudlets are transmuted from bronze into gold, and anon the gold becomes fire, and at length the glorious sun arises out of the sea, and enters on his course rejoicing. It is a brilliant day; the waves, of a deeper and softer blue than before, dance and sparkle in the light; the earth, with little else to attract the gaze, has assumed a garb of brighter green; and as the sun declines amid even richer glories than those which had encircled his rising, the moon appears full orb'd in the east,—to the human eye the second great luminary of the heavens,—and climbs slowly to the zenith as night advances, shedding its mild radiance on land and sea.

Again the day breaks; the prospect consists, as before, of land and ocean. There are great pine woods, reed-covered swamps, wide plains, winding rivers, and broad lakes; and a bright sun shines over all. But the landscape derives its interest and novelty from a feature unmarked before. Gigantic birds stalk along the sands, or wade far into the water in quest of their ichthyic food; while birds of lesser size float upon the lakes or scream discordant in hovering flocks, thick as insects in the calm of a summer evening, over the narrower seas, or brighten with the sunlit gleam of their wings the thick woods. And ocean has its monsters: "great *tanninim*" tempest the deep, as they heave their huge bulk over the surface, to inhale the life-sustaining air; and out of their nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a "seething pot or cauldron." Monstrous creatures, armed in massive scales, haunt the rivers, or scour the flat rank meadows; earth, air, and water are

charged with animal life; and the sun sets on a busy scene, in which unerring instinct pursues unremittingly its few simple ends,—the support and preservation of the individual, the propagation of the species, and the protection and maintenance of the young.

Again the night descends, for the fifth day has closed; and morning breaks on the sixth and last day of creation. Cattle and beasts of the fields graze on the plains; the thick-skinned rhinoceros wallows in the marshes; the squat hippopotamus rustles among the reeds, or plunges sullenly into the river; great herds of elephants seek their food amid the young herbage of the woods; while animals of fiercer nature,—the lion, the leopard, and the bear,—harbor in deep caves till the evening, or lie in wait for their prey amid tangled thickets, or beneath some broken bank. At length, as the day wanes and the shadows lengthen, man, the responsible lord of creation, formed in God's own image, is introduced upon the scene, and the work of creation ceases forever upon the earth. The night falls once more upon the prospect, and there dawns yet another morning,—the morning of God's rest,—that Divine Sabbath in which there is no more creative labor, and which, "blessed and sanctified" beyond all the days that had gone before, has as its special object the moral elevation and final redemption of man. And over it no evening is represented in the record as falling, for its special work is not yet complete. Such seems to have been the sublime panorama of creation exhibited in vision of old to

"The shepherd who first taught the chosen seed,
In the beginning how the heavens and earth
Rose out of chaos;"

and, rightly understood, I know not a single scientific truth that militates against even the minutest or least prominent of its details.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Cross---its purpose.

I. SACRIFICIAL TEACHINGS.

The main-spring of all the arguments for the expiation theory is—the meaning of sacrifices. It is argued that the sacrifices under the Mosaic ritual were *typical of Christ, and derived their value from the blood of the anti-type*. But was such their import? True, the Jews now attach a substitutionary meaning to those sacrifices which they offer *at this day*; an ex-rabbi informs me that previous to killing the fowls they wave each round their heads, saying thrice, "this dies instead of me." But does this warrant *our* making the Mosaic sacrifices have this interpretation? We think not. The Jewish sacrifices now are altogether human in their thought and result, and have been such since "He caused the sacrifice and the oblation to

cease," Dan. ix. 27. Hence they can be no basis for any arguments on the primitive meaning; the raggedness of the present spiritual clothing forbids decision as to the texture of the old garments. Neither can we admit reasonings founded upon the Pagan practices. The Word of God, and it alone, can be permitted to explain itself where it needs any explanation. "To the Law and the Testimony" let us therefore go.

Paul says "the law was added because of *transgressions*;" and also that it was "a *shadowing of good things to come*," thus that it contained in symbols the principles of religion. *Religion is the binding again of severed parties, otherwise the reconciling of man to his God*. This purpose the law served in some measure by being to its hearers a *written conscience*; Rom. ii. 12, 13; iv. 15; vii. 7, 12, 14; Gal. iii. 23, 24; being weak through the flesh it was impotent to justify and give life; Rom. iii. 19, 20; Gal. ii. 21; iii. 10, 11, 12; Heb. vii. 19. The law however was not to blame for this; it "was holy, just, and good,"—a stern, but equitable disciplinarian, Gal. iii. 24, but man's transgressions caused its severity to appear, ever to bringing under its curse an innocent Jesus, Gal. iii. 13. This however reflects not upon the law, which was good, having provisions for healing the sin-made breaches, and binding man to his God again. The devout Jew could avert its punitive awards which concerned this life only, but he had to look forward through the telescope of the *promises* for a prospect of future existence. However, all it called for previous to making a believing subject acceptable was a *covering over of his sin*; and this was provided in the sacrifice, all sins which were "by" or adverse to the law of God were regarded as an offensive nuisance, and needed to be hidden from the view of Him who "cannot look upon iniquity." The law wrote against each indictment the sentence "judgment," "death," but issued a reprieve to all who would claim it in the appointed way. This was the sacrificial institute, which had value individually, and not derivatory. The sentence was therefore only carried into effect upon the impenitent. By divine ordinance any criminal might have forgiveness extended to him upon his pleading guilty and confessing his penitence by a sacrifice. The sacrifice was a means and a lesson, teaching to every one concerned that he was a sinner in the sight of God, that he had no life in himself, and merited only death, but that God would not visit the penalty upon him *immediately* if he acknowledged his transgression. It was instituted as a visible and material testimony of repentance, the like whereto immersion doth *now* save us, and by it the sincere and understanding

offerer showed that he laid down that sin which made him at enmity with his God, and thus he became reconciled. That such was the meaning and intention of the rite of sacrifice we think is proved in many ways.

1. These offerings were instituted after the transgression, and thus early are appraised as reliable only in connection with the moral character of the offerer. Gen. iv. 4-7; Heb. xi. 4.

2. The whole Levitical teaching is of a symbiographic kind. For instance, blood, the actual matter of value in the sacrifice, is expression of mortality. Lev. vii. 26, 27; xvii. 10-14. It was to be poured out into the dust whence the man came and whither he goes; Gen. iii. 19, when not used as a "covering" (at-one-ment) for the life's sins. The red heifer of Num. xix, is very significant of sin and death; teaching in symbol what Paul does by words; Rom. vi. 18-23. Read also Heb. ix. 13. The holocaust of Lev. i. is to a similar import—a dedication of the donor's person and life to Jehovah as his duty. Rom. xii. 1. The sin and trespass offerings were very plain "paintings of evil-doing and its consequences. Read Lev. iv., v., vi. 24-30; vii. 1-7, which teach that there was no conciliation and forgiveness previous to confession and restitution. The Hebrew names of both offerings are confessional;—"to be guilty," "to miss the mark."

3. They were counted by God as *valueless* when not offered with this spirit and purpose; (which depreciation would be contrary to all rule were their value *derived* from their typical character.) Mark how dependant the estimation of the sacrifice is upon personal holiness and true conception of God as set forth in the following passages. Psa. I. 13, 14; li. 16, 17, 19; Heb. x. 4-9, 15-18; Isaiah l. 11-17; Micah vi. 6-8. When this, the life of the rite is left out, and it is offered as a matter of rote, it is rejected; Jer. vii. 21-23; 1 Sam. xv. 22, 23. "To obey is better than sacrifice," hence "by the *obedience* (not death) of one many are being made righteous."

4. And most stubborn argument of all—the *sin offering will be reinstated in the coming age*, Ezek. xliii. 19-27; xliv. 27, when, according to popular theology, it will be unnecessary and useless. *The type will again be brought into operation when the mission of the anti-type is perfected.* What a transgression of the laws of divinity-logic is this!

The sacrifice appears to have been instituted by God as a remembrancer of his promise to Adam, Gen. iii. 21, "coats of the skins" of sacrificed animals; as also to Abraham. The same use is made of the living animal betwixt *men*. Gen. xxi. 27-32; Isa. xvi. 1. So in the law; the lambs in the daily and

other offerings were a testimony concerning the covenant made between God and Israel, and a continual ratification thereof. Exod. xxix. 38-46; 1 Sam. vii. 9-12; 1 Chron. xxix. 10-21. All sin was a *cutting across* of the divine contract, and hence the lamb was not incompatible in the sin-offering; though as we have seen, used only secondarily, and therefore not applicable to him who holds the first place in everything divine. Jesus was God's medium or mediator, and thus he justly superseded the animal mediator of the law, which were incompetent to express God's designs in His covenant. Gal. iii. 19, 20; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24. Jesus speaks of his disciples, (who are constituted as himself,) as lambs, John xxi. 15, see also Luke x. 3, evidently using the word, like John the baptizer, as expressive of character: a meaning which the original bears out much better than our English word—"no anger," "gentle," "mild." The same idea is evident through all the Apocalypse—the strength of the contrast lying between the nature of "the Lamb as he had been slain," and "the Lion of the tribe of Judah;" or the once meek "LAMB in righteousness making war." All which makes up our idea of a lamb, Jesus had, and the display of his love in his life-witness is what makes his character and his teachings so winning. When we view him it is not any thought of blood, any incarnated spectacle of death which has power to move us to our inmost hearts, so much as the perfect law of LOVE which was set forth in him and by him. Meekness is the idea which clings inseparably to our conception of a lamb, and such is also the recognized hieroglyph of the law and the prophets. Thus the Psalmist uses it as expressive of unresisting suffering. Isaiah speaks in this language when he says, Isa. liii. 7,

"He was oppressed, and he was afflicted,
Yet he opened not his mouth.
He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter;
And as a sheep before her shearers is dumb,
So he opened not his mouth."

Thus Luke understood when he quotes the above, Acts viii. 32, with such a notable exchange of names.

We have shown thus far the mind of the Spirit concerning the doctrine of at-one-ment. We find here no warrant for the supposition that God required any appeasement; expiation, or propitiation, by blood, of His justice. Far from it. Neither law nor Gospel teach any other principle than that he requires obedience, pure and simple, as a passport to His favor. They teach us only,—that we have rebelled against Him in doing wickedly:—that He can hold no communion with His children whilst they are at enmity with Him;—that we must confess our iniquities

and change our doings before we can be at peace with Him. For HE is ever the same; holy that He can have no connection with sin, Psa. v. 5; Hab. i. 13; just, in that He must punish the sinner, and can accept no man's righteousness or merits in payment for another's short-comings, Exod. xxxii. 31-35; Psa. xlix. 7, 9; equitable, also, in that He will forgive the sins of every one who confesses them, which is *all* His justice requires, as we must believe if we accept the apostolic testimony, that, "If we *confess* our sins, He is faithful and *just* to *forgive* us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," 1 John i. 9. He is merciful too, so whilst He could justly hold aloof from His revolted subjects till we came seeking His face, yet He took the initiative in the treaty of peace, inviting, yea, wooing us to come be reconciled, even sending His Son to witness of Him, and to show His exceeding love toward us. This is the true doctrine and meaning of atonement, or as we may prefer to write it, at-one-ment. This was the etymology of the word in the days of the translators, and so they plainly use it in Rom. v. 11, the only New Testament passage where it occurs. "By whom we have received the at-one-ment," i. e. God's offer of reconciliation, as set forth in the previous verse, "If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Popular theology just inverts the grammar of the above and following scripture, saying in fact it ought to be written, "God was reconciled to us by the death of His Son, &c." Not so however writes the pen of the Spirit. "God hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ; and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation" (atoning;) Paul specifies the item in terms deserving of letters of gold:—"To wit, That God was in Christ reconciling the world to HIMSELF, not imputing their trespasses to them: * * * * * Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech by us: we as ambassadors for Christ, pray, be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. v. 19-20. Blessed message!

Oh! how noble, how good, how beautiful, how like to the true God's character is such teaching as this. How could any but fleshly minds imbued in sin, and ignorant of any good God, ever have imagined a being who was implacably set against His creatures, and needed the sight or scent of blood, blood of beast and man in sacrifice, to propitiate Him to look in favor on His children. Such thought could only have arisen in the mind intoxicated with the reeking of gore. But how brightly the character of the great Jehovah shines out against this. Babylon and

her daughters may raise a lurid veil before the Sun, but blessed be God, they cannot change the Sun itself. And thus it is that the character of LOVE stands out all the whiter and fairer from the contrasting of the dark cloud of expiatory superstitions. He is ever the same Jehovah, Jehovah Elohim, *merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abounding in mercy and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, yet who will by no means clear the guilty.* And his thoughts toward His people are ever alike,—"*I have loved thee, therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.*" Yes, that is His process of reconciliation, to allure by a message of Love. Never yet has He shown Himself as anything but a Father delighting to forgive His repentant children, a monarch who esteems mercy as the best scepter, who pardons the crime of rebellion, but in justice causes the sin to bring its own punishment by means of irrevocable physical laws; like a parent who, forgiving the disobedience to His commands when repented of, yet takes no step to avert the sickness which is caused by that disobedience, till he may see fit.

We are exhorted to follow the Divine principle and example of forgiveness. "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, *forgiving one another even as God, through Christ, has forgiven you.*" We say *through*, for the words "for Christ's sake," besides being a mistranslation, completely negative the exordium which they are intended to confirm. Expiatory theology would compel us to paraphrase the sentence thus, "forgiving one another, even as God has done, by exacting the full penalty of your brother's offence against you from an innocent person." As this practice would not for a moment be tolerated how much less ought the idea which is so dishonoring to God. No, such is not God's way. His forgiveness of offences against Himself is extended at the instant of penitence, and so must ours be, neither before nor after. There is as much misconception about forgiveness as about atonement. How common it is to hear, when such an one has sinned against another, "well you must forgive and forget." We answer, "yes, so we shall when he repents and confesses, till then *he* is at enmity with us. We will do him any kindness which may be needful, we harbor no rancour, but he must lay down his enmity before we can be at-oned." The common error lies in thinking that malice is harbored when two are estranged, harbored, we mean, by the offended party. But the distinction is easily seen. And to do otherwise shows the person to be a mean-spirited wretch, no nobler than the dog which caresses the whip-hand. Dear readers, do

you learn with us out of the word the doctrine of true forgiveness. "Let that mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus," who being "the expression of His Father's character," cried upon the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!"

But we must now conclude this article. We have endeavored to set forth the sacrifices in their relation to the cross—in our next we shall consider the personal questions, (propitiation, &c.) which pertain to the death of the Christ. *

Report of the Ninth Semi-Annual Conference,

Held at Geneva, Ills., June 30th and July 1st, 1861.

Agreeable to adjournment at the December Conference the brethren from various localities assembled on the morning of June 30th, it being the Lord's day, and united in worship at the Disciples' Meeting House—Bro. Benj. Wilson of Geneva, Ills., presiding.

Fifty-nine brethren and sisters were present, from Geneva, Aurora and Dundee, Kane Co., South Northfield, Cook Co., Chemung, McHenry Co., Manchester, Boon Co., Washington Grove, Ogle Co., Melugin's Grove, Lee Co., all of Illinois, and also Fredricksburgh, Chickasaw Co., Iowa.

The ordinance of the Lord's supper was first observed, after which the time was occupied with praise, prayer, and thanksgiving. Bro. Innes of Aurora informed the assembly that a lady present, Mrs. S. Rogers, was anxious for baptism if the brethren thought her qualified for it.

After consultation with the brethren from Aurora it was concluded that she should be immersed during the intermission, after the meeting concluded.

The assembly then adjourned to 2 o'clock P. M. During the intermission Mrs. Rogers was immersed.

2 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment, and opened the afternoon meeting by singing a hymn and reading a portion of scripture, after which, brethren Page of Geneva, Stewart of Chemung, R. Appleyard of South Northfield, edified the brethren for sometime with their excellent remarks.

The meeting then adjourned to 6½ o'clock P. M.

6½ o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment. Bro. Johnson Whaley moved that Bro. R. Appleyard act as chairman of the Conference during its session. Motion sustained.

Bro. R. Appleyard then opened the meeting by reading a hymn which was sung, and after a prayer was offered by Bro. H. Fish the Conference proceeded to discuss the subject left over at the December Conference, viz. "What means are best adapted to in-

fuse a more energetic spirit amongst us, that will be instrumental in spreading the truth?"

The brethren entered into the discussion at some length, but not having exhausted the subject when the hour of adjournment came, it was decided to continue the discussion in the morning after the regular business of the Conference should have been attended to, on the latter part of the subject,—the means to be used in spreading the truth. Adjourned to 9½ o'clock A. M. of the following day.

July 1st, 9½ o'clock A. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion, Bro. H. B. Peirce was chosen Secretary of the Conference.

The Minutes of the last Conference were read and approved.

The Finance and corresponding committee reported, that Bro. Benj. Wilson had been to Missouri in pursuance to an urgent call for help from Mr. Page's (now Bro. Page's) family, and had immersed four of them, and that Bro. Wilson's traveling expenses were \$20,50 which had been advanced by himself, and other brethren at Geneva; that there had been received from the brethren at South Northfield, \$6,50, and from the brethren at Aurora, \$9,00, leaving a balance still due Bro. Wilson of \$5,00 unprovided for. Bro. Wilson having been away from his business to Missouri some 11 days, it was moved by Bro. Fish, that the sum of \$15,00 be assessed upon the Churches represented in the Conference, to be paid to Bro. Wilson for expenses and time spent in attending the above call. Carried.

The same Committee also reported a letter received from Mr. Lamport of Wisconsin, calling for help, for some one to go and immerse him and others who had become enlightened in the truth.

Moved, that the subject matter of the letter be entertained, and that some one of the brethren go at once and immerse the applicants. Carried.

Bro. Henry Fish of Manchester, Ills., volunteered to go, and it was agreed that the Churches represented here should pay the expenses of the trip.

On motion, Brethren Jos. Wilson, J. B. F. Page, and H. B. Peirce, were appointed corresponding and finance committee for the ensuing six months.

Bro. B. Wilson having reported that he had received a letter from a Mr. Brown of Carroll Co., Ills., desiring some one to go and "preach the word" in that section, and also immerse a believer, on motion of Bro. Vining, the Corresponding Committee was directed to communicate with Mr. Brown, and ascertain whether any one had been with him for the purpose of preaching the one faith or not. If no help had been received

then the committee should suggest some brother to go, and the brother appointed must go.

The brethren from the various localities represented then gave oral reports, (no written reports having been received,) of the past, present, and future prospects of the cause of truth in their districts, from which we learn that there has been some few additions to the followers of Christ since our last Conference, and that the prospects for the spread of the truth in some of the localities are encouraging.

On motion, Brethren Whaley, Fish, and Stewart, were appointed a committee to prepare subjects for discussion at our next Conference. Adjourned to 2 o'clock P. M.

2 o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment, and sung a hymn.

The committee on subjects for discussion for the next Conference reported three propositions. On motion, the following one was adopted. "What constitutes Christian character?—that which the Scriptures teach will be acceptable with God at the appearing of Jesus."

The question under discussion at the adjournment last evening was again taken up, and discussed under the phase of the means to be used to spread the truth, and draw together more closely those brethren who do not attend to the "all things" on the first day of the week. The brethren entered into the discussion with a good deal of earnestness, and much light and information was elicited, and the conclusion pretty unanimously arrived at, that the work should not *all* be put upon paid Evangelists, but that the churches should send out their own members whenever opportunity offers, and that tracts on important subjects would be a good auxiliary in spreading the truth. Adjourned till 6½ o'clock P. M.

6½ o'clock P. M.—Met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion, it was decided that a circular be prepared and sent to various individuals who have understandingly obeyed the truth, scattered throughout the West, exhorting them to withdraw themselves from the organizations with which some of them may stand connected, which are not built on the foundation of prophets and apostles, and to associate together, or unite with Churches already existing, for the purpose of attending to the "all things" appointed on the first day of every week, and that the same be published in the *Banner*.

Moved, that Bro. B. Wilson and H. B. Peirce be appointed a committee to prepare the circular, and get 500 copies printed, and sent off in pursuance of the wishes of the Conference. Motion sustained.

Moved, that our next Conference be held at Geneva, Dec. 29th and 30th.

The remainder of the time to the adjournment was occupied by some of the brethren in practical exhortations, by singing and prayer, and the brethren from the expression of feeling doubtless thought and felt that it was indeed good to be there, and separated with renewed vigor for the Christian strife.

The assembly then adjourned to Dec. 29th, A. D. 1861, and dispersed.

H. B. PEIRCE, Sec'y.

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.

At Home, Adrian, July 3rd, 1861.

BRO. WILSON,—I thought I would give you and others, a short sketch of my travels in Wisconsin. I left home on the 6th of June, attended the Conference at Eureka, formed a very happy acquaintance with many intelligent brethren and sisters who live in that section of country: who have mostly been brought into the obedience of the gospel of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Messiah, through the faithful labors of Bro. J. M. Stephenson. Bro. Stephenson is a very faithful, energetic, and successful proclaimer of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and the Name of *Jesus the Christ*. I spoke four discourses during the Conference; *First*, the order of God in converting sinners according to apostolic teaching; *Second*, the one Faith; *Third*, the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; *Fourth*, the order of God in teaching, and comforting his people by his Spirit. I would here ask Bro. Reed, who it is that takes hold of the sword of the spirit and wields it to so good advantage? is it the spirit, or is it Bro. Reed? I think it is Bro. Reed. First, Bro. Reed learns the mind of the spirit by studying the word, and then Bro. Reed takes the sword of the spirit, and makes himself conspicuous in converting sinners; is this so? will Bro. Reed state whether I am wrong or right?

I continued to hold meetings after the Conference was over, some three evenings, and had good attendance. The last evening but one, a Methodist divine had his Methodism somewhat assailed, and he exhibited the common spirit of anger, called it infidelity, etc. But I told him he might occupy the next evening to reply. But he said he was not posted, and would want longer time. Bro. Stephenson told him to set his time, and he would reply to him if Bro. Chase were gone. But he concluded he would not reply before next winter sometime. I told him if the salvation of the people depended on hearing his reply, they might half of them be dead and to hell before that time; and if he was what he pretended to be, a called and sent minister

of God, He (God) would hold him responsible for not being posted. Paul taught Timothy to study to show himself a workman, that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of God; and I told him, if I could not show the fallacy of one short discourse, in less than six months, I would not attempt it.

I would here state, that Mr. Jacob Blain, and some other pretended friends have been very diligent in sending their warnings to Bro. Stephenson and others of Eureka, (and I suppose to other places also) to beware of Bro. Chase, for he is a dangerous man; that he is preaching human tests, and dividing the flock; thus exerting an unholy influence against me and the truths I advocate; so that when I arrived at Eureka, I found in the minds of some prejudice against me mountain-high. But it was laid low as the valley of Fox river by the force and power of God Almighty's truth, which I believe they are abundantly willing to testify. If such pretended friends would mind their own business, and preach their one-idea Gospel, we would be much obliged to them. But some build up themselves, by trying to pull down others. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

The morning after I concluded, Bro. Stephenson took me to the depot, where I took the cars for Le Roy, in the vicinity of Brn. Allerton; where I delivered six lectures in the Campbellite house; had good attendance, and much interest manifested in hearing the truth. From thence I took cars for Milwaukee, staid one night with my old friend Ransom Rice; and from thence took cars for Hartland, and was received with christian courtesy at the house of Bro. Miles Taylor. In this place is an intelligent band of believers, who are engaged in sustaining the ancient order of things, who are looking, and waiting, for Christ's coming and kingdom. I lectured three evenings in the Presbyterian Chapel to a large and attentive audience. The Priest attended one evening, and acknowledged he had gained some important ideas upon the Gospel, which he never had before; hope it may do him much good. From thence in company with Brn. Taylor and Baxter, went to a flourishing village called Waukesha; lectured in Jackson's Hall. Had a good attendance, considering the time of notice, and good attention. We then returned to Hartland, and next morning Bro. Taylor took me in his carriage to Milwaukee. Here I was introduced by Bro. Harper to a Mr. Brown, who professed to be very friendly to what he called Adventism, having heard something of that doctrine in 1843. He solicited me to speak in Spring Street Church, (Presbyterian) of which he was a member and deacon. He also was very active in getting an appointment in the Baptist Church for me, some five

miles from Milwaukee—the name I have forgotten—and also agreed to take me in his carriage to that place. But as I had an appointment on Saturday evening at a friend's house by the name of Logan in the city, Mr. Brown attended. My subject was Ancient and Modern Conversion contrasted, and Mr. Brown's Adventism exploded; he went home, and by his own account he lay in his bed through the night as a pea would in a hot skillet. He came over next morning and said he could not countenance such doctrine, and was going to recall the appointment. I told him to do his duty, as for drawing in his traces I should not do it. I then met on first day with the Brotherhood in the one faith at the house of Bro. Robert Harper. We had a good meeting. In the evening I spoke on the Gospel of the Kingdom in a private house. Had a good attendance. Mr. Logan attended and was much interested. He is an honest seeker after truth. He accompanied me to the depot, and also contributed liberally to help me on my way. There is an intelligent little band of believers in Milwaukee. I left for home on Monday morning at 10 o'clock, and by riding all night arrived home next day; found my family all well, after an absence of 28 days.

I would here state to Bro. Stephenson the reason why I did not fill the appointments for him I agreed to. It was on account of the unsettled state of the money currency. I had to pay from 12 to 50 per cent for eastern currency, and I thought best to get home whilst I had means to do so. I hope this will be satisfactory. I would have been glad to have visited those places, but circumstances would not permit. I hope my labors have been of use for the advancement of the truth. I leave the event for the great day to decide. May we all be steadfast until the king comes, and gives us an honorable discharge.

L. H. CHASE.

Zion, Ky., June 22, 1861.

Brother Wilson;—The truth is gaining ground in this benighted land. It is with pleasure I inform you that seven intelligent in the faith, have become obedient within the last two months. And I think there are some others who will put on the Lord in baptism before very long. The people are taking more interest in our meetings—and some of our opposers are beginning to say, you are right, and are constrained to acknowledge the truth of the things for which we contend. We feel greatly encouraged because the efforts which have been made here are not in vain. Seeing the signs bespeak the coming of Jesus in power and great glory, let us lift up our heads and rejoice, because our redemption draweth nigh.

A. C. NORMENT.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., AUGUST 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 15.]

For the Gospel Banner. What is the Age of the World?

CONCLUDED.

RECAPITULATION,

Showing the Age of the World at one view.

Chn.	Names and Events.	[Ys.]	References.
1	From the Creation to the Flood,	1656	Gen. v. & vii. 6.
2	From the Flood to Terah's 70th year,	292	Gen. xi. 10-26.
8	From Terah's 70th year to the birth of Abraham, in Terah's 130th year,	60	Comp. Acts vii. 4 with Gen. xi. 32.
4	From the birth of Abraham to the Covenant in Abraham's 85th year,	85	Gen. xvi. 3.
5	From the Covenant to the Law,	430	Gal. iii. 17.
6	In the Wilderness,	40	Josh. v. 6.
7	Division of the Land,	6	Comp. Josh. xiv. 7; Num. x. 11. 12, 33; xi. 32; xii. 15; Josh. xiv. 10.
8	Judges,	450	Acts xiii. 20.
9	Saul,	40	do. xiii. 21.
10	David,	40	2 Sam. v. 4.
11	Solomon to the beginning of the Temple,	4	1 Kings vi. 1.
12	Duration of the Temple,	430	Ezek. iv. 1-6.
13	Captivity ending in the 2d of Darius,	70	Zech. i. 7.
14	Darius reigns after,	34	Rollin's An. His. 12 do.
15	Xerxes,		
16	Artaxerxes to "the commandment" in his 20th year,	20	Neh. ii. 1.
17	To Messiah the Prince, 69 weeks of years from the commandment, or 483 years, less 30 years, Christ's age at his baptism,	453	Dan. ix. 25; & Luke iii. 21-23.
	Age of the World at the birth of Christ,	4122	
	Add the years of the Vulgar Era,	1861	
	A. D. 1861 is A. M. 5988	17	
	A. D. 1878 is A. M. 6000		

The chronological chain from the creation

to the nativity is composed of seventeen links, as above. Down to Terah's 70th year is nineteen hundred and forty-eight years, unquestionably, as the Scriptures referred to will show. They require neither comment nor explanation, the figures being merely the sum of the generations from Adam to Terah in his 70th year. From this point to the birth of Abraham is self-evidently 60 years, as stated in the scheme; for Abraham removed from Haran to Canaan, after his father Terah died, who died aged 205. Abraham at this time was 75. If then Abraham was 75 when his father was 205, he must have been born in his father's 130th year, or 60 years later than No. 2, making the world at Abraham's birth two thousand and eight years old. So far there seems to be no room for a second opinion. It is not so however with the next connection. We have long thought and still think that if the chain is defective, here will the defect be found. We should be gratified could we answer as satisfactorily the question, What was Abraham's age when this covenant was made with him? as can be done the other question, How old was Terah when Abraham was born? This accomplished, and an unerring stride is made down to the Exodus; thence to the 4th of Solomon, by Paul's rectification of 1 Kings vi. 1; thence again to the birth of Christ by Ezekiel 4th chap.

"In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham," Gen. xv. 18. Four hundred and thirty years after the "same day" of the foregoing quotation the law was given from Mount Sinai. But in what day was it? How old was Abraham at the time? The date in closest connection with it is, Gen. xvi. 3, "After Abraham had dwelt 10 years in the land of Canaan," that is to say, when he was 85 years of age. The current opinion however is, that the law was 430 years after Abraham's 75th year, the making of the covenant and the confirming of it being mentioned in Gal. iii. only incidentally—the period starting from the main fact not

from its appendages. This has been the beaten track for centuries, and it may be correct, in which case the year A. M. 6000 would be A. D. 1888. Within our information only one author, Dr. Thomas, has deviated from it. We have preferred to follow him in this matter, dating the 430 years from Abraham's 85th year. The promise is one thing, the covenant is another thing, and so is the confirmation of the covenant. The promise was made when Abraham was 75; the covenant was made with him when he was 85, unless we are mistaken. The covenant was confirmed by an oath on Mount Moriah after the trial of Abraham's faith. There seems to be no clue to the time when the latter event took place, so that there would be little use in knowing that the law was 430 years after it. We take that Gal. iii. 17 means, that the law was 430 years after the covenant. This covenant was a confirmed covenant, and being so, could not be disannulled, making the promise of no effect. It will be seen that we have modified our views on this point somewhat since we were engaged upon the details. This has been brought about by the investigations of others, which we have encountered. Figures however remain unchanged. As has been said before, Abraham was born A. M. 2008, to which adding his age at the covenant, and after that the 430 years to the law, we reach A. M. 2523. Forty years more in the wilderness, which every one knows is correct, makes A. M. 2563, and introduces us to another controverted period, to which some give 5, some 6, and others 7 years. To our view 6 years appear to be correct. We have set it down at that.

The time of the division of the land is ascertained from Caleb's age respectively, at two events in his history. Caleb was one of those whom Moses sent from Kadesh Barnea to spy out the land. When he was sent on this mission he was 40 years of age. Josh. xiv. 7. This was 1 year 2 months and 2 days after the Exodus. Thus, the journey from Sinai was 1 year 1 month and 20 days, Num. x. 11, 12. This journey lasted 3 days, Num. x. 33. Then they gathered quails for 2 days. Num. xi. 32. Miriam was shut out from the camp 7 days. Num. xii. 15. Then they remove from Hazeroth, and pitch in the wilderness of Paran, from whence the spies are sent out. Chap. xiii. If Caleb then was 40 years of age, 1 year 2 months and 2 days after the Exode, at the end of the 40 years in the wilderness, he must have been 78 years 9 months and 28 days old. But he was 85 when he presented his claim for his portion of the land, Josh. xiv. 10, clearly bringing the chronology down 6 years 2 months and 2 days later than link No. 6. That 6 years

is the true interval from the end of the 40 years in the wilderness to the division of the land, is confirmed by the fact, that 6 is the only number that will bring out 580 years from the Exodus to the fourth of Solomon. The division of the land then, "after the destruction of seven nations in the land of Canaan," Acts xiii. 19, took place A. M. 2569.

Between this point and the 450 years of Judges, it has been the habit to insert a period of considerable length. It is a matter to us of great surprise that the fallacy of such a proceeding has not presented itself to some the learned and gifted men, who have given their attention to the subject. Here again we depart from the beaten track, and for doing so there are at least two weighty reasons. Let any one read carefully Acts xiii. from the 18th to 22nd verse, and he will be convinced that the history therein condensed is consecutive. Paul specially mentions that after the division of the land, God gave Judges during the space of 450 years. No interval can be reconciled with such a statement. Again insert even one year and we fail to bring out the 580 years of 1 Kings viii. 1. We think we are safe then in omitting the customary inserted years. The end of the 450 years of the Judges would be A. M. 3014, to which adding Saul's 40 years, and David's 40 years also, Solomon's 4 years, about which there can be no controversy, makes A. M. 3103—500 years after the Exodus.

In reference to link 12 it will be remembered, that in treating of the details we put together the reigns of all the Kings of Judah, from the 4th of Solomon to the burning of the temple. The result was 430 years. The reference in the present table, Ezek. iv. 1-6, establishes beyond question the accuracy of the details, scattered over Kings and Chronicles. The temple was burned A. M. 3333. In regard to the captivity there are no two opinions as to its duration. The only question is, do these years begin with the 4th of Jehoiakim, or do they begin with the burning of the temple, nineteen years later. This question has we think been settled by the 390 day-years of Ezekiel, which having been the subject of our last article need not be recapitulated here, further than to say, that if the captivity had only one beginning—Jehoiakim's 4th—then No. 13 would only be 51 years, in which case Antiochus' decrees concerning "defiled bread," issued B. C. 198, would be only 371 years after the burning of the temple, instead of 390. Similar results would also flow from any alteration of the figures of Nos. 12 and 15, therefore they too are correct. So also of 16. Date the period to "Messiah the Prince" from Artaxerxes

first decree in the 7th of his reign, as is very generally done, and from the destruction of the temple to Antiochus' decrees, B. C. 198, would be only 377, instead of 390 years. In fact, Ezekiel iv. 9, *fastens all the years between the burning of the temple and the birth of Christ*, just as 1 Kings vi. 1 in connection with Paul's speech in Acts xiii. binds all the years from the Exodus to the 4th of Solomon at 580, the unfortunate misapprehensions of almost all authorities on the subject to the contrary notwithstanding.

As to No. 17, we have attempted to show in treating of the prophecy of the seventy weeks, that the decree in the 20th of Artaxerxes is the only appropriate starting point for the 69 weeks of that prophecy to Messiah the Prince—that the end of the period was the baptism of Christ—that at this event he was 30 years of age; consequently his birth is 453 years distant from the 20th of Artaxerxes. This conclusion was shown to agree with the profane chronology of the interval. Again Ezekiel's 390 days makes assurance doubly sure. The prophecy leads us to the beginning of the vulgar era, of which 1861 years have elapsed.

In the pursuing this investigation our plan has been to advance from details to whole periods. We will conclude our tables with the following still further

CONDENSED SCHEME.

To the flood,	1656
To Terah's 70th year,	292
To the birth of Abraham,	60
To the Covenant,	85
To the Law,	430
To the 4th of Solomon, 1 Kings vi. 1, rectified by Paul,	580
390, 40, and 390 consecutive year-days of Ezekiel iv.	820
Terminating according to Rollin and Prideaux, B. C.,	198
	4121
Discrepancy,	1
Commencement of Vulgar Era,	4122
Year of the Vulgar Era,	1861

A. D. 1861 is A. M. 5983

The result, with the exception of one year, is the same as by the longer statement. The two processes mutually corroborate one another, furnishing strong presumptive evidence, with the exceptions already pointed out, that the world is now *five thousand nine hundred and eighty-three years old*.

The question that has stood at the head of these articles is now answered. It is the reader's province to say whether the answer is correct. If it is not, we hope we have at least contributed towards the solution of the question. In this case our labors will not have been thrown away. But arrived at this point, another question presses itself upon

us—Why trouble ourselves about the age of the world? What matters it to us whether it is five or ten thousand years old? Seventeen years and we reach the year of the world six thousand; but what interest have we in the six thousandth more than in the five thousandth year? To these questions we cannot at present attend, but it is plain that till they be met nothing is accomplished.

FRANCIS COGILL.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Cross—its purpose.

THE PROPITIATION.

Our preceding article took a view of the relation of the Christ to the sacrificial institutes of the Mosaic Law, wherein we endeavored to read the lesson of God's free mercy. The MERCY-SEAT, however, was one of the means instituted for the exhibition of his favor, to which we would now invite attention. The MERCY-SEAT overlaid the *Ark of the Covenant*, and was situated in the Holy of holies. Once every year, on the great day of atonement, did the High Priest enter into this secret habitation of the High One, this veiled apartment in Jehovah's house: on this occasion carried with him in a golden basin the blood of the bullock for himself, and of the slain goat in behalf of the people, which he sprinkled upon the Mercy-Seat eastward, and seven times before the Mercy-Seat. And why? One cause is to hallow or cleanse the holy, the tabernacle, and the altar, but the primary intent was greater. What was that? Even to make atonement between the two parties in like manner as we have shown previously. This was done with every solemn accessory which we can well imagine,—the sanctified anniversary, the blood of confessed sin and mortality, the allotment of the goats, the sin-bearing Azazel, the solitude and stillness of the sanctuary at the entrance of the High Priest within the veil, the cloud of incense, the sprinkling, and the acceptance. And also the waiting people outside the sanctuary, abiding till the High Priest came out to bless them, and to remit their sins into the uninhabited region. Lev. xvi. All this formula we cannot conceive to have been for its own sake. No, it most assuredly subserved a purpose, and it is always so understood, the opinions differ as to that object. It is commonly considered as propitiating Jehovah to clemency—as offering Him a compensation for the people's guilt, so that in consideration of this purchase price the guilty are suffered to go free. This view is however unauthorized. Shall we go with the High Priest within the veil? What do we see? With blood in his hand he stands before a seat of mercy, upon which, toward the east, he sprinkles the blood, and then in front

of this locality of mercy he sprinkles it seven times, amidst the fragrant perfumes of ascending incense. Does this signify that the blood so sprinkled has inclined God to be merciful? No. For no change has been produced in that seat upon which Jehovah rests. It was from the beginning a MERCY-SEAT, not a judicial, and it is still the same. To this habitat of a prerogative of Jehovah did the high priest bring a symbolic profession, not a symbolic price. As he sprinkled the blood upon it toward the sun's rising, he virtually said—"We thy people, imperfect, sinful, cast ourselves upon thy mercy. O lift up the light of thy countenance upon us, as the sun rising in his beauty, for another season. We covenant ourselves to thee once more on Thy terms, and therefore before Thee we sprinkle this representative of our lives." Thus the appeal was made to MERCY, and mercy accepted it, as it ever does true penitence, and the sin was there pardoned, not paid for—freely blotted out, not expiated.

Even so was the Christ set forth to be the MERCY-SEAT for our offenses. 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10; Heb. ii. 17. He is the new medium of reconciliation—a more direct representative and localization of the Divine attributes. The veil was rent by him, and the whole world instead of the High Priest may freely approach the Father through him with their penitential offerings. To Jew and Gentile, who are both under sin, and between whom "there is no difference, for all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God," he became a new instrument of mercy. Paul's argument upon this matter is worthy of careful perusal.

"Now we know what the Law saith, it saith to those who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the (Jewish) world may stand convicted before God. Therefore by the works of the Law there shall be no flesh justified in His sight, for through the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the works of the Law is manifested, being attested by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus the Christ to all, and upon all those who believe * * * being justified freely by His grace through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus: whom God hath fore-appointed to be a Mercy Seat through faith in his blood, to show forth His mercy in the remission of sins which are past, through the forbearance of God; to show forth at this time His justice;—that He is just, even in justifying him who believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 19-26.

The whole argument, you will see is based upon the Kosmical principle—that the Mosaic Law was for a special purpose; i. e. to cause

its subjects to comprehend sin, its nature, vileness, and results, and consequently to estimate the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It is evident we could never appreciate the light of day unless we knew the darkness of night. Even so with the Mosaic Economy; being set forth as a Teacher of Sin, Rom. vii.; (not to sin, but what sin is;) by the deeds of the Law there was no flesh justified in God's sight. But it contained ordinances which as "shadows" showed forth redemption. These candle lights of the darkness of the Sin-Kosmos were enough for the purpose God had with them.—The whole ordinances being to cause the people to see their condition; these, the remedies, were enough to cover over the revealed sins, that the people died not, either nationally or individually, so long as they were performed in truth. To this, as we have seen, the Mercy-Seat served among others. Indeed it may be said to hold the first rank therein, seeing the Hebrew word rendered "atonement" is a derivative of the name of the Mercy-Seat. The great atonement with which the same is connected, was one of those works which made righteous the doer—i. e. the nation of Israel. The term righteousness has more than one meaning; beside rectitude, pureness, or cleanness from sin, (which are really its specialities,) it has the aggregate or result acceptation of a state of reconciliation to Jehovah, otherwise justification. The Law had in this sense a righteousness; but only a temporary one;—the righteousness, or the full and complete justification, was outside the Ritual Law, being pertaining to the Faith as centered in Jesus the Seed of Abraham. The observing Jew would therefore understand that the Law showed forth divine mercy in FORBEARANCE—the instructed Jew of the Pauline sort would discern the need for a higher manifestation of the same, even one which, by removing the sin which the Law exemplified, would advance the subject to complete accordance with the divine attribute. This he saw depicted in the New Mercy-Seat, Jesus, who having redeemed him from the dominion of sin itself, freed him also from the obligations of a sin-exemplifying and sin-visiting Law. Perceiving that "the Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, had made him free from the Law of Sin and Death," he would be able to understand how God might be just, "in justifying him who believeth in Jesus."

In all this then we discern God as the primary worker in the Propitiatory or Mercy-Seat, and man as the object of its operation, whether applied nationally or individually. Paul as we have seen sets forth the Mercy-Seat in its Kosmical relationship—its mean

ing is not however altered in the least when John individualizes it. Expounding God's merciful justice he argues, "If we say we have no sin,—we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins,—He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all iniquity. If we say—we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His Word is not in us. My dear children, these things write I to you that ye sin not. But if any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous one; (i. e. pleading and acting jointly with the Father to reclaim us by the presentation of the beauty, the value, the excellence of the righteousness tending to age-lasting life; which was, in the Son, manifested and love-worked,—i. 1-5; ii. 5, 6.) And he is a propitiation, ("Mercy-Seat" or meeting-place, whereat the Father receives the aforementioned confession,) for our sins; and not for ours only, (who are the children, but His mercy is so great that he extends it to all who will have it, and hence the Son is the Mercy-Seat) also for the sins of the whole world," 1 John i. 8-10, ii. 1, 2. Again, "God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, in that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love—not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the Mercy-Seat for our sins," 1 John iv. 9, 10. All this speaks in language pointed enough to set aside any appended comment of ours.

If there is any virtue in language, then propitiation is not expiation, nor connected therewith. The blood of the Mercy-Seat we find is not for the purpose of placating the Divine Being. No, among all the applied properties it has not that one. It has however many objects which it is well to glance at, these etymologies of sacrificial language being needful to a comprehension of its ethics. Firstly then, blood served, if we may so express ourselves, as the ink of the contract signing. It was also a witness; and again, a moral sanatory agent. In this latter sense it was spoken of by the apostle in connection with the purpose of the Cross.—"Almost all things are by (under) the Law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was needful, therefore, that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things with better sacrifices than these." Heb. ix. 22, 23. The common acceptance of this expression, "without shedding of blood there is no remission," apart altogether from the context, we hold to be very erroneous. As water washes away

filth, so blood-representative purges from sin. Hence the blood of Christ purges our consciences from dead works," Heb. ix. 14, and so remits sin. Words and grammar get strangely inverted on their way into the camera of orthodoxy. This passage is a notable example, for commonly remission of sin is understood as the withholding of punishment. But if we only think for a moment we shall see at once that it is sin which is remitted, or sent away, not punishment. However in this quotation no mention is made of sin remission, the writer's argument being upon the Law and the ordinances, the remission here spoken of being that of the Mosaic Covenant. "He taketh away the First that he may establish the Second." Heb. x. 9.

The argument of the apostle in the 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of the Hebrews appears to be this:—That the Mosaic Kosmos, being only a shadowing of the Heavenly Economy was incomplete, and imperfect, to bring man into full relationship to the perfect condition of Heaven. Its High Priests were mortal, its media [animal, its promises limited and temporary. The whole system was therefore inefficient to bring man and his habitation into harmony with the Things of the Universe of God, though very good as temporary expedients to reflect them, and to teach the infant mind of man till the "time of re-formation" and of better ministrations of knowledge arrived. To bring about this complete harmony, it needed immortal, divine, eternal agencies and powers. For this purpose it became necessary to remove the faulty to make way for the better Covenant. To this end the Christ suffered; "Christ being come a High Priest of good things which are to be, hath entered at once into the Holiest of all, through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;—neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood,—having obtained eternal redemption." For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctify to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ * * * * purify your consciences from dead works to serve the living God. And to this end he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that his death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions under the first Covenant, they who are called might receive the promise of the Age-Inheritance."

The apostle by this would seem to have us know that the great object of the death of the Messiah was that he might confirm the New Covenant, and extend the operation of salvation to all the called, Jew and Gen-

* *Parakitos*—one called near to us, John xv. 16.

tile. To enable him to do this he had to obtain the right to remit the first Covenant, and to buy or bring back its powers; otherwise to redeem the transgressions under it. This he effected by becoming an innocent criminal under it. Thus he "redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us." Gal. iii. 13. His Cross served as the means to his "blotting out the hand writing of ordinances which was against us, * * * taking it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross." Col. ii. 14. By the introduction of the New Covenant thus, in his blood, he became the peace betwixt Jew and Gentile, the latter being brought nigh by the blood of Christ, "for he hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, (having in his flesh abolished the cause of enmity, even the Law of commandments consisting in ordinances;) that he might make in himself of the two one New Man, so making peace, and might reconcile both to God in one Body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Eph. ii. 13-16.

Thus far the dispensational aspect of the question. To this may be added many others had we time to pursue them; as it is we must limit ourselves to one or two matters thereof.

*
TO BE CONTINUED.

A Word of Admonition.

To Brethren of "like precious Faith," whether in an isolated condition, or at present may be connected with various organizations, commonly known as "Advocates," &c., scattered throughout the North-Western States, Greeting:—

A Company of brethren of the "One Faith," from various localities in Northern Illinois and Iowa, being assembled in Conference at Geneva, Kane Co., Ill., June 30th & July 1st, 1861, venture to address this Circular to you, on a subject which they deem of vital importance, especially to those who are looking for the speedy Apocalypse of the Anointed One, in power and great glory. You we have every reason to believe have heard the "Word of the Kingdom," and we hope have received it into good and honest hearts. You profess to have believed, in common with us, that the God of heaven is about to set up a kingdom in the land of Palestine—the territory promised to Abraham and his Seed the Christ—that he will soon send the Anointed Jesus to restore again the Kingdom to regathered Israel, to build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and to govern the world in righteousness; you have believed the glad tidings concerning *that kingdom*, and also concerning the *name* of Jesus the Christ,—“for there is no other name under heaven given among men, where-by we must be saved”—and upon a confession

of your faith have been immersed into Christ. So far you have done well. Brethren, for what purpose did we become "obedient to the faith?" Was it not to obtain the promised blessing—salvation? Were we not baptized in *hope* of attaining a share in the honor, glory, and incorruptibility of the kingdom of God? Most certainly we were. We are called by the Gospel to the obtaining of glory and honor at the appearing of Jesus Christ; and as the called ones from amongst the Gentiles, our duty is to walk worthy of our calling, and to make our "calling and election sure." A belief of the gospel, and a subsequent immersion, will not ensure eternal life to the careless or negligent disciple. There are duties absolutely necessary to be attended to by all immersed believers. Our risen and exalted Jesus has been appointed the Head of the Church, and as such he has subjected each member of his body to law. "He has become the author of eternal salvation to all those who obey him."

Beloved, you know Jesus has said, "If you love me, keep my commandments," John xiv. 15; "He that has my commandments, and keeps them, he it is who loves me," ver. 21; "If a man love me, he will keep my words," ver. 23; "If you keep my commandments, you shall abide in my love," xv. 10; and "You are my friends, if you do whatsoever I command you," xv. 14. We will not enumerate all his precepts and commands, but more especially invite your attention to what he expects of his body—the Church—during his absence.

Jesus requires his Church to submit to the authority of the apostles, and to learn his will through them. Hence he left them to preach the Gospel, and baptize the believers, with this injunction, "teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you;" backed up with this assurance, "*he who hears you, hears me*; and him who hears me, hears him who sent me." The apostles knew their authority, hence they said—"We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us," 1 John iv. 6. Acting by the authority of their Master, and under the immediate guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit, they formed and governed the primitive congregations, and whatever they taught them to observe comes down to us with the force of law. Did they gather the disciplined ones together into congregations? They did so because it was their master's will, and as then, so now, all the disciples ought to be associated together. It is necessary for them thus to be united, in order to accomplish the designs of their Lord. Such was the order of the Church in primitive times. The epistles were mainly addressed to congregations. Those from the glorified Jesus in Rev. ii. iii.,

were to the seven churches of Asia; and the apostle John addressed the whole book to them. How important then that all the disciples should be in close relationship with their brethren! They are members of *one* body, and therefore must be associated and united together.

It is not only necessary for the disciples to be gathered into congregations, but also to be scripturally organized, in order to the proper observance of the duties devolving upon Christians in their united capacity. Each primitive congregation had its government, or constituted authorities—*elders* and *deacons*. See Acts xiv. 23; Titus i. 5; Phil. i. 1, etc. We shall not dwell however on this point, but further observe, that it is necessary for disciples thus to meet together at stated times to observe the ordinances or commandments of the Lord and his apostles. We are informed that Jesus commanded his disciples to observe an institution called "the breaking of bread," or "the Lord's supper," in remembrance of himself. The apostles gave this institution to the Churches. The Jerusalem congregation "continued steadfast in the teaching of the apostles, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the bread, and in the prayers," Acts ii. 42. The disciples at Troas came together for a similar purpose, Acts xx. 7. The congregation at Corinth evidently did the same. See 1 Cor. xi. 20-34; xii. xiv. xvi. 1, 2. What Paul appointed at Corinth he appointed in all the churches. Hence his expression—"So ordain I in all the churches," and also the allusion, "for we being many are one bread, and one body; and are partakers of that one bread." The "one body" were all partakers of that bread—were "partakers of the Lord's table," 1 Cor. x. 17, 21. In order to thus eat and drink they met with each other at *stated* times. On the *first* of the week the disciples at Troas met for this purpose. On the *first* of the week the Corinthians were to deposit their gifts in the treasury for the poor saints, by order of the Apostle. The same injunction had been given to the churches of Galatia. This implies that the brethren met together on the *first of the week*. Unless there was a stated time for worship, it could not be said of the disciples at Jerusalem, that they "*continued steadfastly*" in the things appointed; nor could they be commanded, "Not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is." Heb. x. 25. We are bound to admit that there was an *uniformity* of both faith and practice in the primitive churches. What congregation was exempt from attending to the "all things" commanded? Or what individual member of said congregations, could possibly do his duty, and prove his love to Jesus and the brethren,

without thus *statedly* meeting with his brethren? That obligation exists *now*, and is binding on *all* the disciples of Jesus. Brethren, examine yourselves! whether you be in the faith. How can individuals living habitually in neglect of the commandments of the Lord be acceptable to him? Or how can such be fed and nourished with the sincere milk of the word, while *practically* refusing to obey that word?

Brethren, how does the matter stand with you? Are you isolated from brethren of "like precious faith," and therefore have no opportunity to associate with others as often as the law requires? Then we think it is necessary for you to make every exertion in your power to either make brethren, or to call brethren around you, or to move where there are brethren with whom you can associate in keeping the ordinances as they are delivered to us. This effort may cost you *labor*, and perhaps *money*, but if done with an eye single to the glory of God, you will be the gainer ultimately.

Or, perhaps you are associated with organizations called churches of Jesus Christ, who either neglect or ignore the apostolic practice: and maybe are composed of individuals believing a different gospel to that which you have received. If so, then we conceive it is your imperative duty to withdraw from such. Primitive congregations were composed of persons who had all believed the *same* things, and obeyed the *same* law of faith in baptism. It ought to be so now. None but those who are built on the same foundation with them have a *right* to the name Christian, or to *dispense* or *participate* in Christian privileges. We are aware of the difficulties which would immediately surround you, if you should adopt this course. Persecution would immediately set in, and former friends and associates would cast out your name as evil—but remember who has said, "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." As disciples of Jesus you have duties to perform, and those obligations must be conscientiously discharged, if you would honor the name you bear. Your first duty, we conceive, is to come out from amongst those who are essentially sectarian in their belief and practice, that it may be seen whose you are and whom you serve. Your next duty would be to associate with those of like faith for the purpose of attending to Christian duties in a scriptural manner—that is, those duties which can only be performed in a collective capacity. By so doing, when the Lord comes, you may be found "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless."

Brethren, there are some of you who are actively engaged in offering the word of life

to others, and from all that we can learn successfully too; but permit us to say, your labors are in a great measure lost, for want of following out and adhering to the apostolic plan. The disciples need separating from former associations, gathering together, and teaching to observe all things commanded by the Lord. You have not been sufficiently careful to keep the Church pure. You have been in a transition state yourselves—light breaking in upon your minds by degrees—until at last you found that even you had not obeyed the truths you preached to others; but now have yielded obedience. Much depends on you. Many have believed the gospel through your instrumentality, and now are in connection with those with whom you associated prior to your change of views. This makes confusion; and "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." It is your duty, then, especially, to be prompt in this matter. It is your duty and privilege, as a disciple, to obey the Lord, and your extra ability to make known his truth does not in the least exempt any of you from keeping the ordinances.

In conclusion, brethren beloved in the Lord, suffer the word of exhortation. It is only because of our desire for your future welfare that we have thus undertaken to address you. We all need, at times, a friendly hand and a warning voice. We see and know the danger you are in—the privileges you are deprived of—the future glory you may lose, by continuing in your present position; therefore, we press upon you to seriously consider this matter. Paul himself feared, lest after he had preached to others he should be a castaway; and says to the Hebrew Christians—"Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." Oh let us all be found not only believing, but *obeying* the things written, "*working out* our salvation with fear and trembling," and endeavoring "to make our calling and election sure."

Signed, in behalf of the Conference,

B. WILSON.

H. B. PEIRCE.

For the Gospel Banner.

"Spirits in Prison."

BY H. V. REED.

This part of the divine testimony has been considered as sufficient evidence to prove a *post-mortem* gospel, as though that Christ had an especial mission to the spirits of the dead, between his death and resurrection. Others claim that the preaching was done in the days of Noah, and that those spirits are now in prison, and are awaiting their future judgment trial. To me both views are equally inconsistent and untrue. Christ's

soul could not have been preaching while his body was in the grave, for we are told by the word of God, that his soul died; "Because he hath poured out HIS SOUL UNTO DEATH," Isa. liii. 10-12; and Jesus says of himself, "*My soul is exceeding sorrowful UNTO DEATH*," Matt. xxvi. 38. Again he laid down his *life*, (*ψυχη, psuche, soul*.) In all those places where it says Jesus gave his life the Greek word is *psuche*, and properly means the soul. Hence the conclusion is a scriptural one, that Christ was dead during the period between his death and resurrection. But his soul was not left dead, or in the grave; for the word teaches that it was brought out of the tomb. "He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that HIS SOUL was not left in hell, (*αιδης, hades*, the grave,) neither did his flesh see corruption. The second position is equally untenable, for the testimony is, that Christ did the preaching, and not Noah. If it be said that Christ preached by the same spirit that Noah preached by, and that Noah preached by that Spirit to the Spirits *now in prison*, it would be grammatically true that Noah did the preaching here referred to, but as it now stands, both in English and Greek, Christ was the preacher, and it would require more ingenuity and a love to evade plain language than I possess, to make Noah do this preaching instead of Christ. Hence this position is not tenable, and cannot be sustained from the grammar of the language. Therefore Christ neither preached a *post-mortem* gospel, nor a word of salvation to the antediluvians, neither was Noah the one that did the preaching in his day to spirits now in prison.

We are now prepared to investigate this text by the light of the word which God has given us. Christ's testimony, as left us on record together with what the prophets have written, will I trust make it clear to all minds that are desirous of knowing the truth. "*By which also he (Christ) went and preached unto the spirits in prison*," 1 Pet. iii. 19.

Christ was "put to death IN THE FLESH," (and not that his flesh was put to death, and his soul lived on, for we have seen from the word of God that his soul died,) "*and quickened by the spirit, by which (spirit) he went and preached*," etc. Now, we are here informed, that Christ was quickened by the same spirit that anointed him to preach. When did Christ preach? Not until he had received the spirit of God after his baptism by John, Matt. iii. 16. Then he was anointed of the Spirit to proclaim the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, Matt. iv. 23; Luke viii. 1. The subject upon which he preached was the kingdom of God, and those to whom he preached were the "spirits in prison," and this he did in fulfilment of

prophecy. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound," Isa. lxi. 1. In Luke iv. 21, we hear Jesus saying, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Hence the prophecy shows that Christ is to open the prison to them that are bound, etc. Isa. xlii. 6, 7, reads, "I the Lord, have called thee, * * * for a light to the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes; to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." Now by turning to Matt. iv. 15-17, in connection with Isa. ix. 1-3, the reader will perceive that Christ had a mission to men represented as in prison, and in darkness; but these allusions have no reference to dead men, but living ones.

Having then established from the prophecies that Christ had a mission to perform to men in prison, and to prisoners in moral darkness, we will proceed to show the harmony of the text,—“By which (Spirit) he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.” It will be well to know what is here meant by “spirits,” and what is meant by “prison.” Some may object to our construction, of applying this to men in the flesh. But we find the word spirit frequently applied to men in that condition. 1 John iv. 1. “Try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” See Heb. xii. 9, 23. Here we have direct proof that spirits mean men in the flesh. Hence it is not out of bible usage to say, that “spirits in prison” means men in the flesh. And the word is defined by all Lexicons to have this meaning also. The word “prison” in Greek is (φυλακη, *Phylakce*), and occurs 47 times; and in no instance does it denote the grave or a place of departed spirits. It denotes simply a place of confinement, or a watch or guard. It is translated in the following way in King James’ version. *Watch*, (Matt. xvi. 25;) *prison*, (Matt. xxv. 36;) *ward*, (Acts xii. 10;) *hold and cage*, (Rev. xviii. 2.) To say that the phrase “spirits in prison,” means *dead men in graves*, is the height of assumption. The word *spirit* must apply to something animate, but it never applies to anything in an inanimate state; and to say, that the word *prison* means a place of *departed spirits* is wild in the extreme. Hence the grammar and meaning of words confines this text to men in the flesh. I will here present several translations of the verse to show the constructions given above is not at variance with the original.

* Barnes—“Having gone”

Dr. A. Clarke introduces several readings from different MSS. One reads, “By which he came *in spirit* and preached to them who were in prison.” He says, that he had before him one of the first, if not the *very first* edition of the Latin Bible, and the verse stands thus, “By which he came *spiritually* and preached to them that were in prison.” These translations are in perfect harmony with the prophecy, that Christ should proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the PRISON to them that are bound,” Isa. lxi. 1, which certainly applies to his ministry in this dispensation. The Gentiles are in this prison, and so are the Jews, and Christ proclaimed a system of light to them that “sit in darkness, and in the prison house,” Isa. xlii. 7, 8. But some may object to this position, on the ground that its grammar teaches that those persons or spirits were *disobedient in the days of Noah*. But Wakefield’s translation will remove this difficulty fairly. “By which he (Christ) went and preached to the minds of men in prison, who were disobedient as those upon whom the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.”

This translation is clear and evidently presents Peter’s meaning upon the subject. Christ preached to those who were as disobedient as those in the days of Noah, only eight of whom were saved: so salvation through baptism will save but few now. Hence Peter here speaks *comparatively* of those to whom Christ speaks, and those to whom Noah preached anciently. Therefore there is no testimony from this text to prove immortal soulism, or a *post mortem gospel*.

We trust that the foregoing exposition, though brief, will satisfy all inquiring minds upon this much perverted text. I submit the same in candor, remarking, that we must compare scripture with scripture, so that we may know what the mind of God is on this as well as all other subjects. Further comment is not necessary. May we gain the home of all the weary pilgrims, through Jesus, the light to them that “sit in darkness and in the prison house.” Amen.

For the Gospel Banner.

Divine Sonship.

“Now are we the sons of God.” 1 John iii. 2.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—With your permission I wish to present a few thoughts for the consideration of the brethren on the above text of scripture. My object in doing so, is simply to elicit light on the subject, as I consider it an important one, and one that should be scripturally understood amongst us; for says the Apostle, “if children, then heirs,” etc. Rom. viii. 17. Now if we are not scripturally and understandingly the children of

God, the reverse must be true, that we are not heirs with him. How then do we become the sons of God? Some will tell us we must have an instantaneous change of heart, which they term, a birth of the spirit. Others again will contend that we are not born at all in this life, but are merely begotten, and are only the children of God in faith or figure, and not in fact, until the resurrection. Now, for my part, I must confess I cannot agree with either one of these two, as I consider they are both on the extreme. The word of God teaches me, and I believe it, that if we are the children of God at all, we are *now* his children, (not shall be,) Rom. viii. 16; Gal. iv. 6; we are all (not shall be) "the children of God by faith (not in faith) in Christ Jesus," Gal. iii. 26. I understand in the first place, that we are begotten by the word of God, or Gospel of the Kingdom. See 1 Cor. iv. 15; Jas. i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 25; Matt. xiii. 17, 23. Faith in this word or Gospel produces a crucifixion of ourselves, (or the body of sin in us,) with Christ. Rom. vi. 6; Gal. ii. 20; v. 24; and as the crucifixion with him will produce a death in us to sin, Rom. vi. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 24; we are then buried, Rom. vi. 4, and having obeyed the law of the spirit of life given by Christ, Rom. viii. 2; John vi. 63, we are quickened or made alive by that spirit, in whose name we are baptized, Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 12, 13; Rom. vi. 11, 13; and having thus complied with the conditions of the Gospel, or in other words, having met the demands of God, on our part, God owns and accepts us in Christ as his adopted children, and creates us such, and seals us by his spirit, Eph. i. 13, 14; ii. 10.

I understand that we are born of God in this life, John i. 12, 13, by the word of God, 1 Pet. i. 23. In obedience to that word we are born out of (or from) the water, John iii. 5; thereby manifesting our faith in Christ as the true Messiah, or promised king of Israel; and also our faith in our resurrection to eternal life, through him, to reign with him in his Kingdom. When we understand the word or Gospel of the Kingdom, and believe it, there is a motive in it that is sufficient to cause us to be willing to forsake sin and all its pleasures, that we may inherit the kingdom. We lose all confidence in ourselves, and enter with our whole heart, mind, or spirit, into the mind or spirit of God; our will is swallowed up in the will of God; we do therefore "Obey from the heart that form of doctrine," Rom. vi. 17, at which time we become new creatures in Christ, 2 Cor. v. 17; thereby being in the spirit, and the spirit in us, Rom. v. 9. We thus become the actual, real, living children of God in Christ, by the spirit or law of adoption, Gal. iii. 25; Rom. viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 6, 7; not in faith, figure,

or fiction, but reality. If then we are begotten by the word of God, or Gospel of the Kingdom, quickened or made alive in Christ, and born of God, in obedience to his word, out of or from the water, in order to constitute us the children of God and heirs of the Kingdom, can those be counted such who were not in the faith before they were baptized? No; for how can we yield obedience to the faith before we have it? See Rom. i. 5, and xvi. 26. We must understand God's purpose or plan of salvation as revealed in his word before we can be saved in or through that plan. We must know what the doctrine is before we can from the heart obey that form of doctrine, Rom. vi. 17. We must have the faith of Abraham that we may be counted his children, Rom. iv. 11, 12; Gal. iii. 7; and by our becoming Christ's in obedience to that faith, to us the promise is sure, Rom. iv. 16; Gal. iii. 22; 2 Cor. 1-20.

Some may object to the view I have taken of this subject and say, that if we are once quickened or made alive in Christ, we can never fall back, but ultimately be saved in the kingdom. This I consider a wrong idea. I understand that when a person is made alive in Christ, he then enters upon a new life, which is a dependent one, centered in Christ, who is our life, until he comes, Col. iii. 3, 4. In the act of baptism we receive Christ, and Christ receives us, and justifies and seals us with the Spirit's promise, Gal. iii. 27; Eph. i. 13, 14. Christ becomes all things necessary to the child of God, 1 Cor. i. 30; Col. ii. 10; but we must abide in him by continuing in the faith, or by keeping his commandments, Col. ii. 6, 7; John xv. 10; or if we add to our faith those Christian graces spoken of in 2 Pet. i. 5-11, we shall never fall. But if we do not those things, or if we through wilful sin, or open rejection of Christ are broken off from him, we shall fall to rise no more, or become as a dead branch fit for nothing but fire. John xv. 6; Heb. x. 26, 29.

This then is the light in which I view this subject. It looks very plain and clear to me; much more so, than I can explain it to others; though I might say much more than I have said. But I must close for the present. If I am in error on this point I am willing to be corrected, not however by the opinions of men, but by the word of God. If any one can show me from God's word that I am wrong, I will give it up at once; till then I shall hold my present views, and as an obedient child of God, may I be willing at all times to learn of Jesus, and be led by his Spirit, through the word, into all truth, Matt. xi. 29; Rom. viii. 14; that at last I may have an inheritance in the kingdom to which I have been called. 1 Thess. ii. 14.—R. B. S. Prince Albert Reach, C. W., July 8th, 1861.

An Anecdote Illustrative of trust in God.

In a large, lonely house, situated in the south of England, there once lived a lady and her two maid servants. They were far away from all human habitations, but they seemed to have no fear, but to have dwelt there peacefully and happily. It was the lady's custom, with her maids to go round the house every evening to see if all the windows and doors were properly secured. One night she had accompanied them as usual and ascertained that all was safe. They left her in the passage close to her room, and then went to their own, which was quite at the outside of the house. As the lady opened the door, she distinctly saw a man under her bed. What could she do? Her servants were far away, and could not hear her if she screamed for help, and even if they had come to her assistance, these three weak women were no match for a desperate house-breaker. How then did she act? She put her trust in God. Quietly she closed the door, and locked it on the inside, which she was always in the habit of doing. She then leisurely brushed her hair, and putting on her dressing-gown, she took her Bible and sat down to read. She read aloud, and chose a chapter that had peculiar reference to God's watchfulness over us, and constant care of us by night and by day. When it was finished she knelt and prayed at great length, still uttering her words aloud, especially commending herself and servants to God's protection, dwelling upon her utter helplessness, and dependence upon him to preserve them from all danger. At last she rose from her knees, put out her candle, and lay down in bed, but did not sleep. After a few minutes had elapsed she was conscious that the man was standing by her bedside. He begged of her not to be alarmed. "I came here to rob you, but after the words you have read, the prayers you have uttered, no power on earth could induce me to hurt you, or touch a thing in your house. But you must remain perfectly quiet and not attempt to interfere with me. I shall now give a signal to my companions which they will understand, and then we will go away and you may sleep in peace, for I give you my solemn word no one shall harm you, and not the smallest thing belonging to you shall be disturbed." He then went to the window opened it, and whistled softly. Returning to the lady's side (who had not spoken or moved,) he said, "Now I am going. Your prayer has been heard, and no disaster will befall you." He left the room, and soon all was quiet, and the lady fell asleep, still upheld by that calm and beautiful faith and trust. When the morning dawned, and she awoke, we may feel sure she poured out her thanksgiving and praises

to him who had "defended" her "under his wing," and "kept" her "safe under his feathers," so that she was not "afraid of any terror by night." The man was true to his word, and not a thing in the house had been taken. Oh, shall we not hope that his heart was changed from that day forth, and that he forsook his course, and cried to that Savior "who came to seek and to save that which is lost," even on the cross did not reject the penitent thief. From this story let us learn to put our whole trust and confidence in God. The lady's courage was indeed wonderful, but the Lord was her defence upon her right hand, and "with him all things are possible."

ADDITIONAL.

We have received an extract from a letter fully corroborating the remarkable anecdote of the lady and the robber, in our October number, and adding some facts that embrace the wonder and mercy of her escape. We quote the words of the letter:—"In the first place the robber told her that if she had given the slightest alarm or token of resistance, he had fully determined to murder her; so that it was God's good guidance that told her to take the course she took. Then before he went away, he said, 'I must have the book you read out of,' and carried off her Bible, willingly enough given you may be sure. This happened many years ago, and only comparatively recently did the lady hear any more of him. She was attending a religious meeting in Yorkshire, where after several noted clergy and others had spoken, a man arose, saying he was one of the book hawkers of the society, and told the story of the midnight adventure as a testimony of the wonderful power of the word of God. He concluded, 'I was that man.' The lady rose from her seat in the hall, and said quietly, 'It is all quite true, I was that lady,' and sat down again."—*London Packet.*

The Unity of the Bible.

As in Bethoven's matchless music there runs one idea, worked out through all the changes of measure and of key—now almost hidden, now breaking out in rich natural melody, whispered in the treble, murmured in the bass, dimly suggested in the prelude, but growing clearer and clearer as the work proceeds, winding gradually back, till it ends in the key in which it began, and closes in triumphant harmony; so throughout the whole Bible there runs one great idea—man's ruin by sin, and his redemption by grace—in a word, Jesus Christ the Savior. This runs through the Old Testament, that prelude to the New, dimly promised at the fall, and more clearly to Abraham; typified in the ceremonies of the law; all the events of sa-

cred history paving the way for his coming; his descent proved in the genealogies of Ruth and Chronicles; spoken of as Shiloh by Jacob, as the Star by Balaam, as Prophet by Moses; the David of the Psalms; the Redeemer looked for by Job; the Beloved of the Song of Songs. We find him in the sublime strains of the lofty Isaiah, in the writings of the tender Jeremiah, in the mysteries of the contemplative Ezekiel, in the visions of the beloved Daniel, the great idea growing clearer and clearer as the time drew on. Then the full harmony broke out in the song of the angels, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." And evangelists and apostles taking up the theme, the strain in the same key in which it began; the Devil, who troubled the first Paradise, forever excluded from the second; man restored to the favor of God, and Jesus Christ the key-note of the whole.—*Evangelist.*

Life, in the Sense of Conscious Existence, the Great Offer of the Gospel.

The gospel originated in the benevolence of God, and its provisions were adapted to the emergencies of the condition of man. Man being mortal, and not having access to the tree of life, in consequence of sin, became liable to suffering and death; but Christ being offered a sacrifice for sins, has ransomed his people from death, by a promised resurrection from the dead at the coming of their deliverer to establish his kingdom over the land promised to our fathers, to Abraham and his seed for ever. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting LIFE." "I am come," says Christ, "that they might have LIFE." The very object for which the gospel was written was to teach two great truths. John xx. 31, "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have LIFE through his name." 1 John ii. 25, "And this is the promise that he hath promised us, (even) aionion life;" iv. 9, "God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him;" v. 9, "This is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not, makes God a liar; because he believeth not the testimony that God hath witnessed concerning his Son. And this is the testimony, that God hath given unto us (zœn aionion) the life pertaining to the use of the Messiah, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life, (or this life; ten zœn,) and he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life."

In the Syriac version, all these passages occur; and in the place of the Greek words *save, salvation, and Savior*, appear the words *live, life, and Life-giver*. Indeed the Greek word for life (*zœn*), is from the same root as is the Syriac word for life, and the giving of life and salvation are made synonymous terms. Christ says, "I am the resurrection and the LIFE;" and Peter accused the Jews of killing the Author of *Life*.—*Bible vs. Tradition.*

Signs of the Times.

The *New York Observer* finds in the events that are transpiring in the world evident signs of the approaching millennium. After reviewing the indications of the religious progress in the East, it says of England and France:

"Both of them will yet co-operate in opening up a highway through Syria into the heart of Asia. It is in vain for the politics of the world to set up against the will of God and the ways of providence. There is a system in the divine administration of the world that embraces the revolutions of empires, the setting up of one, the downfall of another. The Jews are turning their eyes toward the land of their fathers. Believers in the false prophet are frantic in the evidences of an approaching catastrophe. China and India are yearly becoming more accessible and placable. These are signs of the times. Do they not promise a new and glorious day at hand? There are those who see in the signs of the times, the dark, portentous signs that appear in our own and other lands, the most convincing proofs that the day of the Lord is at hand. The great tribulation has come. Hosts are gathering to battle. Europe will in all probability be convulsed with war before the year is over. The western continent now trembles under the march of armies more numerous than ever trod its soil before. These are looked upon as harbingers of a coming crisis in the world's history. Let us be ready—Watch and pray.

EQUALITY.—After all that can be said about the advantage one man has over another, there is still a wonderful equality in human fortunes. If the rich have wealth, the poor have health; if the heiress has booty for her dower, the penniless have beauty for theirs; if one man has cash, the other has credit; if one boasts of his income, the other can of his influence. No one is so miserable but that his neighbor wants something he possesses; and no one so mighty, but he wants another's aid. There is no fortune so good but it may be bettered. The sun that rises in clouds may set in splendor; and that which rises in splendor may set in gloom.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., AUGUST 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 16.]

For the Gospel Banner.
The Cross—its purpose.

THE PROPITIATION.
 CONTINUED.

We have seen that the Cross removed the barrier betwixt the Jew and Gentile. Further testimony proves that the combined life and death mission of the Righteous One was to condemn sin in the flesh. Rom. viii. 3, 4. This he accomplished by varied means. Firstly, by condemning the Sin-Law, as previously argued. Secondly, by showing the beauty of holiness in his own character, and also the possibility of humanity being stainless of acts of transgression. 1 Pet. ii. 22, 23; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; Rom. viii. 5. Lastly, by demonstrating the enormity of man's rebellion against his Lord and King, as instanced in his crucifixion. Matt. xxi. 33-41; John xv. 20-25. In showing forth the beauty of holiness it became needful for him to resist even to death in striving against sin. This answered a double purpose—showed the Father's abhorrence of sin, Psa. v. 4, 5, and set us an example that we should also resist sin.

The fact of Christ's death being exemplary strongly militates against its being accounted expiatory. Yet the Apostle makes its chief value to consist in its exemplification. "Let us run with patience the race set before us, looking to Jesus the Author and Finisher of our Faith; who for the joy which was set before him endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is now sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. . . . Study him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not resisted to blood striving against sin," Heb. xii. 2-4, like this glorious example. Patience also was perfect in him, as a light to us on our path. "Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow in his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again: when he suffered, threatened not; but com-

mitted his cause to Him who judgeth righteously: who himself bore our sins in his own body on the tree," (hence had perfect companionship with our feelings and weaknesses, even to death-agony), "that we, being dead to sins, should live to righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned to the Shepherd and Keeper of your lives." 1 Pet. ii. 21-25. Thus Peter speaks, making an anti-expiatory comment on Isa. liii. You see what connection there is between patient endurance and salvation. Again he repeats the strain: "It is better in that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. For Christ also hath once suffered on account of sins, the just on behalf of the unjust, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive by the Spirit. . . . Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered on our account in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he who hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin," 1 Pet. iii. 17 to iv. 2. This is the enunciation of a great principle which applies to us as well as Christ. Purification by fire is a divine law. Suffering, self-abnegation, relinquishment of dear things, resistance to temptations, are all parts which go to the making up of the sacrifice of righteousness—are all antecedent to sanctification. The death of the Christ, by its moral and spiritual action on the mind, becomes thus the coupling chain between Divine and human holiness; or perhaps we ought rather to say, the bridge whereby man may attain to the divine righteousness. "Be ye holy, even as I am holy."

If the death of the Lord's Anointed were *sui generis*, it is strange that the inspired exponents of its object so persistently couple it with the experience of believers and their own. Paul strongly desired to "have fellowship with his sufferings, being made conformable to his death." Phil. iii. 10. John brings it in as a duty incumbent on us to imitate him therein. "Hereby perceive we the Love, because he laid down his life for us:

and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." 1 John iii. 16. Again does the Apostle to the Gentiles express his community with the cross of Christ: "I am crucified with Christ"—Gal. ii. 20; vi. 14, 17. "I, Paul. . . . rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his Body's sake." Col. i. 24. Could stronger, nay rather is there any stronger language adduced in support of expiation than this? We know it not. But brotherhood in the Cross—expiation if you will—does not stop here in apostolic declaration: Jesus himself taught it. That baptism of suffering and that cup of anguish of which he said, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Mark x. 31, and against which he prayed, "Father! if it be possible let this cup pass from me!" Matt. xxvi. 39, which suffering orthodoxy says was that of the weight of the world's guilt, and the cup the bitter portion of divine wrath;—even this he himself shared with his lieutenants, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism which I am baptized with." Matt. xx. 22, 23. And even so are we sharers in the manner of his death. By immersion we die to sin-deed, even as he died to sin-flesh. "Know ye not that so many as have been immersed into Jesus Christ, have been immersed into his death? If we have been *planted together in the likeness of his death*, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that *our old man has been crucified as he was*, that the body of sin might be destroyed. . . . Now if we have *so died with Christ*, we believe we shall also live with him. . . . In that he died, he died to sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth to God. *Likewise* account ye also *yourselves to have died to sin, but alive to God.*" Rom. vi. 1-15. Now this is altogether too bold an analogy, if the key to the purpose of the death of Christ be substitutionary punishment—too weighty an argument for the beam of expiation. Vicarious death a pattern for humanity! appeasing the wrath of God by blood or suffering a duty of mortals! propitiating Him, and bearing a world's sin-anguish, the lot of "a finite creature!"—the thing is monstrous. And yet the analogy ought to bear out if the thing predicated be true. Thank God it is not.

One more question, which however we have little need to dwell upon, as it must of necessity strike every inquiring mind.—"How could Jesus bear the sins, the very agony of remorse, &c. &c. of our deeds, as some authors so fondly depict, hundreds of years before their commission?" That he did "bear our sins in his own body on the tree" is true, but as we have already shown, the

apostle teaches that it was companyary, not substitutionary. So testifies Jesus himself often, and in this understanding does Matthew quote Isaiah. "They brought to him many demoniacs: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all who were sick. Thus it was fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah, 'HIMSELF TOOK OUR INFIRMITIES, and BARE OUR SICKNESSES.'" Matt. viii. 16, 17. To "take" and to "bear" do not mean either solely or primarily 'to take to one's-self'—to *relieve* another of his burden, even though we cast it away, is perfectly correct. Again Christ, as the Good Shepherd, had "laid on him the iniquity of" the the straying sheep. Iniquity is thus accounted as an effect, or to extend the figure we may say that the Good Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep, John x. 11-13, in the attempt to rescue them from their wanderings had the result of their evil-doings laid on him, in the loss of his life by the wild beasts of the wilderness.

We lately heard a very elaborate essay on "the Atonement of Christ," delivered by one who may be regarded as the mouthpiece of a very powerful body. We mention this because one argument adduced for expiation may serve as a conclusion to this part of our subject. The proposition was that the consciousness of guilt was evidence of a substitutionary Savior. Its elimination of course formed a considerable portion of the essay, but was summed up by the essayist into one syllogism: "I have sinned, I shall suffer," and of course need a divine substitute. The sophism in this will be obvious to any well-instructed in Moses and the Prophets; still we may expose it here. From what we know of Divine arrangements we should say that man's consciousness said, "I have sinned, I have lost my inheritance." This we regard as the true witness of conscience, according also to what the Word saith, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Thus deprivation, not flagellation, is the real care of the minds of all, except perhaps the bestial. In a secondary sense we certainly might admit the syllogism; i. e. if we alter or define truly the idea pertaining to the nature of the suffering. Thus the instructed conscience would say, "I have sinned, I must suffer, for has not God irrevocably said, 'the soul which sinneth it shall die?'" Throwing to the moles and to the bats—or what is equal thereto, consigning to the apostasy its own production—eternal torments; we have remaining a sinner under sentence of death, by a law more unalterable than those of the Medes and Persians. From this there is no escape—no substitute has power to annul or to replace it. The fact is, sin is not more certain than that he will bear

its penalty, which is really its effect or *evil*, for "sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." "The wages of sin is death;" and "death is passed upon all because that all have sinned." This precludes all substitutionary salvation, and leaves us dependent upon the redemptory, i. e. the bringing back to life again him who has suffered the penalty of transgression. To prison *must* the criminal go, for the law has decreed it; when there he becomes a subject for a friendly redemption, not before. Redemption previous to subjection is a contradiction of terms. However, of this all-glorious office of the Christ more in our next.

[It will be perceived that we generally quote from Dr. Conquest's translation, the best at hand till the receipt of the proposed New "Emphatic Diaglott" New Testament.]

For the Gospel Banner.

Mark Allen's Western Tour.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:

Thinking that an account of my late Western tour might be of interest to some who read the *Banner* I have penned the following, although considerable time has elapsed and other matters have taken up my attention since my return, thus preventing my writing it out before.

Leaving home on Saturday, A. M., the 16th of February, we went to Boston, and taking the 1.30 train of cars on the Boston & Worcester R. R., proceeded to Worcester, about 40 miles from Boston, where we stopped over Sunday at the house of Bro. S. W. Gerralds, who, with his wife are uncompromizing defenders of the One Faith, at whose house we have found a home for years past, during our visits to Worcester. On Sunday, P. M., the few who compose the church at Worcester, met together at Bro. Gerrald's for worship, and we spoke to them a short time on the duty of patience during the present trials. The church in Worcester numbers about 9; who live part in Millbury, about 4 miles off, and part in Worcester. They are intelligently instructed in the One Faith, and its obedience, and know what they have believed and why they believe it, and we trust there may be yet more added to their number. Our numbers in New England have not increased very rapidly, as we have not forced the hydraulic pressure system, but have endeavored to intelligently and understandingly instruct men and women for the kingdom, before putting them under water, in order that they may understand the relations they are about to assume, and the characters to be formed; and although in about 5 years our numbers in all N. E., have only increased from some 3 or 4 individuals to about 40, and these in many instances living isolated one

from the other, yet with hardly one exception I think there has been no falling away from the faith.

Leaving Worcester on Monday, the 18th, we visited two or three places on business, and at night arrived at Springfield, 100 miles west from Boston. Our stopping here was by previous appointing, by the urgent appeal made to us by some of the Second Adventist friends in this place, not to preach the Gospel, but to unmask a hypocrite, one Eld. Geo. J. Adams, with numerous aliases, formerly a Mormon Elder, with whose career in former years I had been intimately acquainted. This individual, now with sanctimonious face, a black suit, and white neckcloth, has been for many years past in various parts of the United States, palming himself upon different religious bodies, as a preacher of the Gospel!! while at the same time, in connection with his preaching he has been performing as an actor in various theatres, and as a most beastly drunkard both on and off the stage. He had imposed himself upon the Second Adventists in Springfield as a preacher of the doctrine of the Age to Come, and a returned traveler from Palestine and the East, and by his peculiar views had led away captive quite a number of silly women and other members of the Adventist church. But as certain things with regard to his character began to leak out an investigation was called for, and the evening was appointed for it to take place. The result was the unmasking of as base a hypocrite as ever walked.

On Tuesday evening by previous appointment, we went to Holyoke, a thriving manufacturing village about 8 or 10 miles north from Springfield, and preached the Gospel of the Kingdom at the house of Bro. Alexander Fisher. This is the first time the Gospel has been presented publicly in this place, to my knowledge, and there was quite an interest awakened to hear further, as I have since learned from Bro. Fisher, who is the only one of our brethren residing in or near the place, and he has only been living there some 6 or 8 months, having gone from the church at Worcester. I feel hopeful that he may be the means of enlightening some in Holyoke to become heirs of Messiah's future kingdom.

On Wednesday morning we left Holyoke for Albany, N. Y. Having to call at one or two towns on the way on business matters we did not arrive at Albany until Thursday noon. Here our business kept us some three weeks. There seems to be but little sympathy with the one and only true faith in this large city: yet through the kind exertions of our friend, Mr. Isaac L. Allen, a place was provided, and we were enabled to present the Gospel upon two occasions to a few who overcame their prejudices so far as to listen to us

What the result may be I know not, but the prospect of gathering out many from the Gentiles in Albany, to be rulers in Messiah's kingdom seems to be very small. The great stumbling-blocks of Adventism, and good (?) religion-ism, seems to stand in the way of the obedience of faith, in one or two individuals, who seem to have given and are yet giving the truth an earnest consideration. Would that they might have strength to burst the chains that bind them to the good-feeling sympathetic compromisers, to whom they seem to be in bondage; and like Abraham of old, sunder the nearest ties if necessary for the obeying of God's requirements.

On the 18th of March, having finished our business in Albany, we left by the New York Central R. R., for the purpose of continuing our journey further west; stopping on the way at Schenectady, Utica, and Syracuse. On Saturday the 23rd, we arrived at Rochester, where we remained a week and a day, finding a hospitable home during our stay at the house of Bro. John Brown. We gave seven lectures here in the chapel that our brethren have rented for their worship. The attendance was small. The number of those in Rochester who love the truth is small. Those who compose the little Ecclesia have mostly come to the truth through the "much tribulation" of Millerism, Marshism, Cookism, and Storrism, &c., and I judge from the hard road they have travelled, have had sufficient experience (not in good religion but in the deceitfulness of human flesh,) to enable them to endure hardness as good soldiers, and to contend earnestly for the faith, knowing what they have believed, and why. The Ecclesia in Rochester meet in the brick chapel, corner of Stillson and New Main streets, which was formerly occupied by J. B. Cook. One thing I admired very much in their worship, was the chanting of the Psalms, under the direction of Brother Morse. There are a few who seem to be constant attendants of the meetings here, that have not yet rendered obedience and united with those who have taken an uncompromising stand for the truth. We hope that it may not be with these as with some of olden time, that are "ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth." Yet it would seem that these have had line upon line and precept upon precept, sufficient to determine them, either for or against. "Be ye doers of the Word," as well as hearers, says the apostle James. Having on our arrival at Rochester, received letters inviting us to visit Dayton, Ohio; and Toronto, C. W.; for the purpose of giving a series of Lectures in each place, we made arrangements accordingly, and on Monday, April 1, went to Buffalo, which had previously been the limit of our western journeyings. There

we remained till Thursday, when, having finished business, and taking the 11 o'clock train on the Lake shore line, we took our departure into a region hitherto ocularly unknown to us, arriving at Cleveland, O., about 6 P. M. We concluded to remain over night at a hotel, rather than take the rough chances for sleep and rest on the shelf of a sleeping car. Proceeding up the Bluff, and toward the town, our eye was greeted with the ever welcome New England, in bold letters upon a comfortable hotel, where we found good quarters for the night, and in the morning proceeded on our journey better refreshed than if we had continued on during the night. Taking the cars of the Cleveland & Columbus R. R., we arrived at the capital of Ohio about 1 o'clock P. M., where we tarried about an hour, and then proceeding by way of the Little Miami R. R., to Xenia, and from thence by Xenia & Dayton R. R. to Dayton, the place of our destination, where we arrived about 5.30 P. M., and was met at the depot by Bro. Geo. Nellis, and conveyed by him to the hospitable dwelling of Bro. Wm. Fish, where we found a pleasant home during our stay of some 10 days at Dayton.

Upon our arrival here we found that the brethren had made arrangements for us to give some 10 lectures in the Universalist meeting house, to commence on the Sunday morning and continue in the evening, and every evening during the succeeding week, and over the following Sunday. On Sunday morning we commenced the work laid out, by laying down a foundation to stand upon, such as was suggested by Peter in the following words, "If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God," 1 Pet. iv. 11. We showed what were the oracles of God—that they were the Old Testament Scriptures of Moses and the Prophets, that they were a revelation of God's purposes and will towards man, that they were communicated by the Eternal Spirit of God, through the prophets to the Hebrew nation, that that Spirit communicating was the spirit of truth, that its utterances were words of truth, and that all subsequent teachers claiming to teach God's purposes either by inspiration, or otherwise, must speak in perfect harmony with what Moses and the prophets taught to be entitled to any consideration whatever as teachers of the true wisdom. That in accordance with the teachings of the Spirit by the prophet Isaiah: "If they speak not according to the words of the Law and Testimony, (which is the Law of Moses and the testimony of the prophets,) it is because there is no light in them." Hence they are in total darkness, and being in this position and claiming to be teachers, and to have fellowship with God, in accordance with the teachings of the apostle John, they prove

Evangelical Revival

themselves to be liars, and do not the truth. See John viii. 19, 20; and 1 Jo. i. 6. Hence the importance of every individual before he would teach others, making himself acquainted with what God has revealed by his Spirit in the same Old Testament Scriptures that are so generally ignored by the religionists of modern times.

In the afternoon we attended with the church to break bread at the house of Bro. Fish, and in the evening continued our lectures, setting forth the nature, character, and mission of the Christ; showing what a Christ is, and the Scripture teaching concerning two manifestations of the Messiah, THE ONE ANOINTED TO BE THE KING OF ISRAEL: the first as a Man of sorrows to suffer for iniquity, the second as a Man of war, a mighty military commander, to make war in righteousness and overcome his enemies. On subsequent evenings during the week, was presented the One Hope, the One Faith, the Gospel of the Kingdom; the character, elements and constitution of the Kingdom of God; and the Obedience of Faith unto righteousness. On Sunday morning we presented the Scripture teachings concerning Death, Hell, and Mortality; and in the evening, a lecture on Bible Christianity in opposition to Modern Experimental Religion. This finished up our labors in Dayton. The attendance during the lectures was not large, but the same attentive listeners were for the most part present from first to last, notwithstanding there was scarcely a day during the whole time that it did not rain. There were some, who, previous to our coming to Dayton, expressed a great interest in, and willingness to hear the truth, and a desire for some one to come on and present it. But the fact that the lectures were to be given in a Universalist house, was sufficient excuse for certain Pharisees to give no encouragement to others to go and hear, or to interest themselves in the matter. They are of the pious sort who know it all, and are sufficiently good without further instruction; of that class to whom our Lord once said: "They that are whole need no physician, but they that are sick. I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to reformation." Though few in number, the church in Dayton has taken an uncompromising stand for the truth, which we trust they will maintain, and may the Lord add to their number such as shall be saved. We shall ever hold in grateful remembrance their kindness to us during our short stay among them. The last two or three days of our sojourn here was a time of great excitement owing to the sudden outburst of rebellion in the South, the bombardment of Fort Sumpter, &c., by those wicked men who had placed themselves in opposition to the Powers that God has ordained, and whose end is

eventually judgment. The stirring events of the times had a tendency to absorb the minds of many, doubtless, who, under less exciting circumstances might have been led to give a hearing ear to the presentation of the good news. Happy are they who have previous to these times of trouble made themselves heirs of the Gospel promises, by obedience to the faith. "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments." On Tuesday, April 16th, we bade adieu to the kind friends we had so recently become acquainted with, and taking the cars, commenced our journey back towards Buffalo. MARK ALLEN.

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Burning Day.

"But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. iii. 7.

The apostle Paul said to Timothy, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine," &c. But there are many at the present time who are saying, no matter about doctrine, only be good. Then a Pagan, or a Mahomedan may be as good as a Christian; and some of them are. It is doubtful whether we have many Christians at present who possess more moral goodness than did Socrates; but he was a Pagan.

Now, if there is anything necessary for eternal salvation except moral goodness, it must be sound doctrine; and to this end, "All Scripture, given by inspiration of God," is necessary, and profitable. Under these important considerations, we ought to carefully investigate every point of doctrine taught in the sacred Scriptures; and one of great importance, is the Burning Day. In our reasonings on this and every other subject touching the divine plan and purposes of God, every argument may be safely predicated upon the Divine Attributes of the Deity. For none of his plans, or purposes can ever mar his adorable nature. He is a being who is unchangeable in his infinite wisdom, power and justice. Such a being cannot be taken on surprise, for he sees all from the beginning, and has no need to alter or change his plan.

Now that such a being should make a world like this, to burn up, because it did not go right, looks rather suspicious that it was not made right, or made to go right in the first place. Such an idea does not harmonize with the idea of infinite wisdom. But the wisdom of man is finite; he may fail in judgment, therefore, his judgment should always stand corrected by the Word of God. So, to the law, and the testimony; if the scriptures teach the literal conflagration of the

world and all things therein, we will believe it; but not without. But whether it does or not, can only be settled by an examination of all the texts relating thereto. We will commence with the testimony of Peter, at the head of this article, and also at the tenth verse of the same chapter. To these may be added the one in Mal. iv. 1. These, alone, and at the first view, would seem to teach the literal destruction of the geographical world by fire. But on a second view of Peter's testimony, no such thing appears. For in the 5th and 6th verses, referring to the heavens and the earth that were before the flood, he says, "Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed by water, perished." Now the world that is to perish by fire is similar to the one that perished by water, and is this present world; for this is the pith of Peter's argument. Now we have the same geographical world under our feet that Noah had, and on which he built his ark, and on which it rested after the flood. So this world, or third planet in the solar system, will not burn up according to his testimony. And further, Peter and Malachi both spake by the same Holy Spirit, and one could not contradict the other; and Malachi's burning of the world must mean the same as Peter's.

It is not necessary to multiply words to prove the Scripture use of the term, heaven and earth; it is too self-evident that it means the political and ecclesiastical order of things; of which there are three; viz. one before the flood, one existing now, and one to exist hereafter, which are the new heavens and the new earth. The same mode of expression has come down to us, in the phrase, "Church and World," and "Church and State."

But to proceed: the three texts already referred to must harmonize with all others touching the same thing, and at the same time. We will here give a few of them, beginning with Isa. lxvi. 15, 16; "For behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh," &c.

No one will doubt but the time referred to in this text is the same as that referred to by Peter. But by the language used by the prophet Isaiah, not even literal fire is intended: for the agencies employed are fire, chariots and the sword, and while the two last named are not literal, there is no good reason to think the first is. But some will say, Peter argued the literality of the fire from the literality of the water that destroyed the old world. But indeed, he did not. He in refuting what the scoffer would say in the last days, showed that they were willingly

ignorant that the old world was destroyed by water, and that this would be by fire. The means by which either was, or will be destroyed is no part of his argument, or refutation of the scoffers. The whole weight of his argument is simply this;—the old world was destroyed for its wickedness, and for the same reason the present will be; but according to the promise of God, there will be a new one, wherein there will be righteousness. But further: if this must be destroyed by literal fire because the old one was by literal water; then it follows that as the water had its literal effect, the fire will also have its literal effect. And it took time for the water to drain off, and for the earth to become dry and habitable, and this it did in a perfectly natural manner, and without anything supernatural about it, that is, about the subsidence of the water. So the world, being literally melted, as a chemist melts ore in a crucible, will require time to cool off, and the time must be in proportion to its magnitude and density. Now its magnitude is known to be nearly eight thousand miles in diameter, and its density equal to that of cast iron. Now the time that cast iron balls will cool off, after being heated, are in proportion to the cubes of their diameters; and one as large as our earth would be six hundred thousand years in cooling off. And even then it would not be an arable world like this present, but a mass of vitreous cinders which would require another six hundred thousand years of rain and sunshine to disintegrate its surface sufficiently to make plow-land, before the inhabitants could—"plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them." But says one, God can cool it off, and pulverize its cinders in a short time, if he will. Well no one disputes the power of God to do anything he has promised to do; but I dispute his promise to do any such thing; therefore, until such a promise is found, the argument has no force. And finally, such an argument is of no use, only in a bad theory. God is a God of order, and consistent with himself. Where miracles are promised, miracles may be expected, and where they are not promised, none need be expected to carry out the theories of men, however long cherished their theories may have been. But there are other texts to be examined. Isa. x. 17: "And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and his briars in one day." This is not a literal fire, yet it is the same referred to by Peter, for it is to take place at the same time, as is evident from the context.

From the description David gives us of the great day of judgment, Psa. xevii, it is evident that no literal fire is employed, yet it is

a fire that burns up the the wicked. See verse 3rd. 1 Cor. iii. 13-15, is evidently against the literal world-burning theory. The burning is said to be by fire, and yet, "so as by fire." The fire is evidently employed as a figure, in this text, and elsewhere, when used to represent the just vengeance of God in the day of judgment. 2 Thess. i. 7-9, is against the literal fire theory; for it is said the Lord Jesus shall be revealed in flaming fire. But the two clothed in white said to the men of Galilee, "This same Jesus which is taken up into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He did not go up, and disappear in flames of fire; and he is to come in like manner that he was taken up. And yet Paul says he will come in flaming fire. The two statements cannot harmonize with the literal fire theory. His coming is to take vengeance on the ungodly, and is therefore, figuratively a fire, which will burn up the wicked world. But Zeph. iii. 8, is plainer still—"for all the earth shall be devoured by the fire of my jealousy." Such also is the character of the fire of Isa. xxx. 30; xxiv. 6. Ezek. xxxix. 6; Deut. xxxii. 22: "For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God." Heb. xii. 29. Peter says, the earth shall melt with fervent heat. And Sinai has so melted. See Judges v. 5. Num. xi. 1: "And the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp." 2 Sam. xxii. 9; "There went up a smoke out of his nostrils, and fire out of his mouth devoured; coals were kindled by it." Ezek. xx. 49: "And say to the forest of the south, * * * Behold I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every dry tree: the flaming flame shall not be quenched, and all faces from the south to the north shall be burned therein." In this and the twenty-first chapters, the evils threatened on divers places are caused by wars, and not by a literal fire; and yet it is called a fire.

These are but a few of the texts in which fire is used to represent the just, but severe judgments of God. The reader may read, and compare Num. xxi. 28; Deut. ii. 9; iv. 39.

These quotations might be extended to a much greater extent; but I write for the candid and not for the bigoted; and enough has been said to convince the former that the word fire is chosen, by the various inspired writers, to represent the displeasure of God, as displayed in the destruction of his enemies. He has brought about such destructions in the past, and said they were by fire, where no literal fire was employed. It is said that God himself "is a consuming fire." So when he is the immediate cause of the destruction of a people, it is by a consuming fire.

When, by the fire of his jealousy, God shall have destroyed the wicked, and the effects of wickedness upon the earth, the earth and all things on it will again be very good. Why then should it be destroyed? God does nothing without a sufficient cause.

Further, the burning up, or melting the literal earth, will not harmonize with "the promise made of God unto the fathers." He promised Abraham the land which he called him out to see, and to walk through the length and the breadth of. And to Jacob he promised the same, even the land he slept on, at a place he called Bethel, having stone heaps for his pillow."

Now if the world is burnt up, or melted, and made over again, no part of it would be the land seen by Abraham, and Jacob's bed at Bethel, would not exist; and so the promise that he should have the very bed he slept on for an inheritance would prove a failure; It is in vain to say that something like it will be the same. It is not. We have a promise that the same Jesus shall come again. Something like him, will not do; it must be the self-same divine being in very person.

Neither does the oft repeated argument, that the new earth will be made out of the ashes of the old, and therefore be the same, avail anything, for it would not be the same. Suppose a pen-knife to have a new blade and new handle, both manufactured out of the old, would it be the same old knife, or a new one? If the reader should purchase such an article, I think he would not complain, saying he was imposed upon in buying an old knife for a new one.

I am a literalist, but do not mean to be more than a literalist. Inspiration is given in the language of men, and subject to the laws of the language in which it is given. These laws are the established usages of the language. We have shown that in the language of the Scriptures, the wrath of God, in the destruction of the wicked is called a fire. And in harmony with this, all the prophets have called it so. Again, it is plainly predicted that Jesus Christ will reign on the earth, over the Gentiles, on David's throne, and that his saints will reign with him a thousand years; and that his reign will continue until he has put all enemies under his feet, and conquered the last enemy, even death, and him that hath the power of death, even the devil. Now if there is to be a literal world-burning it cannot take place until all this is accomplished. And then all, that is left on the whole earth will be righteous; and now burn it up, for what? merely because wicked men have lived in it? As well might the bodies of the saints be burnt up, because wickedness has lived in them.

No, brethren, we do not worship a God of

such inconsistency. When wickedness is entirely out of the creature man, he is just fit to live, and for this reason he will live, forever. So when wickedness is out of the earth, the earth is just fitted to remain forever, and will forever exist, for God has formed it to be inhabited. Isa. xlv. 18.

Z. CAMPBELL.

For the Gospel Banner.

Objections to Mark Allen's Views on Governments.---No. I.

BY L. H. CHASE.

BRO. WILSON:—In the *Banner* for July 15th, we discover an article from the able pen of Bro. Mark Allen, with this heading: "What is our relation as Christians to Gentile governments?—No. 1." A very important question indeed! a question which should be correctly understood by all that are in the One Covenant of life in Christ Jesus. "Shall we fight for the devil? Let satan fight their own battles." These are sentiments expressed by brethren Packham and Thomas, found in the *Herald* for June 1861, which has called forth the strictures of Bro. Allen. Bro. Allen is an out-spoken man. I like his manner of communication very much, and if he gets the same in return, I suppose he will not be offended. Bro. Allen says: "In the light of Bible teaching, this looks very much like speaking evil of dignities. However, we shall charge that to ignorance, which may be overlooked, if those who are in error turn from it when the light shines." Bro. Mark! is not this speaking rather loud on the start? Would it be saying too much to say, "thou art the man?" Would it not be nearer the truth to say, Brethren Packham and Thomas are speaking of *evil* dignities, instead of speaking evil of dignities? Bro. Allen, I do not write this article merely for debate, nor for the purpose of making myself conspicuous; I realize your superiority in ability, both natural and acquired. Yet I honestly believe you to be in error on this subject. It is the muddiest article I ever saw from your able pen. You may ascribe this to my ignorance; but I hope you will overlook it in me if I am willing to forsake the error when the light shines. There is a right and a wrong side to this subject as well as all others on which the Bible treats; and I presume that we all most earnestly desire to occupy the right side which is the truth. And I believe we may obtain the truth on this as well as any other subject, if we will but patiently investigate God's most blessed word.

You assert, 1st—That the Powers that be (and I suppose you mean *all* Powers that have been, are, or will be,) "are in harmony with God's purposes, and of his own arranging." By this I understand you to say, that all national governments that have been, are, or

may be, are *institutions* of God's own particular *arrangement*; and for Christians to refuse to comply with any, or all the demands of said Governments under which they live, are rebelling against God, and are guilty of a sin equal to witchcraft. When God had a kingdom on the earth, he would not suffer a witch to live; and we think that he will not suffer a character of that sort to live, when his kingdom is again established on the earth. Consequently, every Christian (if your position is true) that lives north of Mason's and Dixon's line, that will not gird on the sword if commanded by Abe Lincoln, and go and fight to sustain the Powers that be, is guilty of a sin as heinous in the sight of God as that of witchcraft. And so *vice versa*; If Christians *south* of Mason's and Dixon's line, will not gird on the sword, or shoulder Sharp's rifles at Jeff. Davies' commands, and go and fight to sustain "the Powers that be," are as wicked sinners in the sight of God as the witch of Endor; and consequently doomed to endless perdition. Bro. Allen can you sustain this position by the Bible? Don't you even blush at the idea? Supposing Bro. Packham was of your sentiments, and was commanded by the Powers that be in Norfolk, to shoulder his rifle and repair to Bull's Run; and you, in obedience to the Powers that be in Washington, should repair to the same place, and for the same purpose,—to fight—to kill men,—and you should discover Bro. Packham on the other side with his rifle loaded and primed. "There," says Bro. Allen, "there is my dear brother in Christ Jesus, C. Packham, of Norfolk! Noble brother! he is obedient to the Powers that be. But stop!" says Bro. Allen, "I'll bung his eye!" Bro. Allen takes deliberate aim, and shoots him dead upon the spot. He sees his heart's blood flow fresh and warm from the wound: and then Bro. Allen exclaims: "Behold an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile! Bro. Packham has fought, and bled, and died, to obey the Powers that be." And you, Bro. Allen, (your position being true) would be justified in the act, for you obeyed the powers that *God ordained*. "For the powers that be are of God's own arranging." No distinction with you. Well, Bro. Allen, I suppose all colors are alike in the dark. But we rejoice in the hope that the darkness will recede when the light shines. And in that light will be no darkness at all.

"The powers that be are ordained of God," Rom. xiii. 1. Upon this text as a foundation seems to rest your whole superstructure; and I am not disposed to avoid it, but am willing to give it all the force and latitude that the Holy Spirit intended, when it expressed the words. But I would ask, is there no limit to that saying? is it unbounded? Does it in-

clude all the powers that ever was, are, and will be, both political, and ecclesiastical? I think not. There must in the nature of the case, be some limit to the expression, or God is the author of all the most heart-sickening scenes that have ever in all ages occurred, in the governments of this world. But I shall not define that limit in this article, but shall proceed to show that all powers that have been, and that do exist, are *not* of God's arrangement, but that many of them, both political and ecclesiastical, have been, and still are purely Satanic. "They that resist the powers," says Paul, "shall receive to themselves condemnation" (or judgment.) Bro. Allen asks—"Why?" and then says,—“Because they resist God, who setteth up the powers of government, and for a terror to evil-doers. For rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil.” Now I would ask right here, if there have never been rulers who were a terror to *good* works? Were there not rulers in Paul's time that struck terror through the hearts of God's dear children for doing the good works that their Lord and Master commanded them? Was not Nero, that Roman tyrant, a terror to those who worked good by obeying Jesus Christ? and did he not *praise* those who did *evil* in joining with him in his revelry and debauch? This is only a sample of the hundreds, yea thousands, of individuals conspicuous in government. Yes, look at this embodiment of Satan, to wit, Nero, commanding his subjects to take the Christians, and daub their bodies with pitch, and hang them on a stake by the chin, and then set them on fire to light up the city! Was this God's arrangement, Bro. Allen? Will you not blush to answer, Yes? And if it was God's arrangement, He must have employed that embodiment of Satan, or human devil, as an instrument to carry out his own arrangement. Consequently, your argument falls to rise no more, or I might say, your assertion fails for want of proof, that the devil and satan power is always antagonistic to God. For if Nero in person was not that satan power or government that John in Revelations designated the Devil and Satan; one thing is certain, he was a ruler *for* that devil and satan, and was a terror to all that worked good.

I will now give a few texts of scripture in proof that the powers that have been, and the powers that now are, are antagonistic to God's law and character, and that God's children have been, and still are, justified in refusing to obey those powers, and then I must leave the subject for this time. "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image thou hast set up," Dan. iii. 18. "Daniel, who is of the captivity of the children of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree thou hast

signed," vi. 13. "And the king said unto the footmen that stood about him, Turn and slay the priests of the Lord; but the servants of the king would not slay the priests of the Lord. And Doeg the Edomite, turned and slew that day four score and five persons that did wear the linen ephod." 1 Sam. xxii. 17. Query? Which did right, Bro. Allen, those persons that disobeyed the king's authority, or the one that obeyed? "Behold, I have made thee (Jeremiah) this day a defenced city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls, against the whole land, against the king of Judah, against the princes thereof, and against the priests thereof. And they shall fight against thee, but shall not prevail." Jer. i. 18, 19. Query? Does God so arrange as to build up by one and pull down by another? If so, are not God's arrangements antagonistic one to the other? and consequently must fail. But we say Satan's kingdom is divided against itself, and in the purpose of God will have an end. Amen, so may it be. Let Satan fight Satan till his kingdom falls. Then, and not till then, will the wickedness of the wicked come to an end. And all the angels of God will shout Amen! Alleluia! All of which is most respectfully submitted to Mark Allen, and all whom it may concern.

Adrian, Mich. Aug. 3rd, 1861.

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.

Manchester, Boon Co., Ill.,

Aug. 1st, 1861.

MR. B. WILSON, DEAR BROTHER:—According to arrangement I started from here on the 12th of July, in search of Bro. Lampert. He is most certainly in an inconvenient and somewhat out of the way place; nevertheless, I did not go at all out of my way in trying to find him. I traveled from Clinton Junction, (seven miles from my house,) by rail to Boscobel; thence to Clayton, a distance of from 18 to 24 miles on foot. The first night I crossed the Wisconsin River, and traveled two or three day miles, and next day reached Bro. L's in time for dinner. I found him quite intelligent, but dissatisfied with his former immersion. We visited several of the inhabitants, and found them quite anxious for a meeting, therefore we concluded to have one on Saturday afternoon. I spoke to them as well as I was able on the Gospel of the Kingdom. The attendance was good, and the people apparently much interested. Three besides Bro. L., presented themselves for immersion, and Sunday morning was fixed upon to attend to it, but the rain hindered us until the afternoon, two o'clock, when we repaired to the water and four were immersed. I spoke to them again, on the

Restoration of Israel, and the establishment of the Kingdom, after which, we broke bread, and drank the wine in commemoration, and very particularly urged their continuance in the practice, which they promised to do.

The meetings were well attended all through; some coming a distance of five miles; but they were of opinion that many more would have been there if the weather had been favorable. Sunday evening, word came from Bell's Centre, a distance of three miles, that if I would stay they would leave work and come down to meeting Monday afternoon, but this I could not comply with, as it was quite necessary for me to be at home. Bro. L. came with me on Monday morning about sixteen miles on the way; and I walked the rest to Boscobel, and found the cars had been gone about half an hour, therefore I was under the necessity of waiting from half-past eleven until five for the next train, consequently I did not reach Clinton, until one in the morning. I walked from thence and arrived home about three.

My expenses were as follows; for Railroad fare, eight dollars and ninety-five cents,—for being ferried over the River twice, twenty cents—one night's lodging and breakfast, thirty-five cents—for the rest I kept my own Hotel, and by that means saved about two dollars.

Bro. L. had laid away \$15.00, calculating to use part of it towards paying expenses, but when the Bank failures occurred it was only worth about \$4.00. They were quite willing, but unable to pay. Wheat has been sold this summer for twenty-five cents a bushel. You must excuse blunders, and publish in the *Banner* as much as you think necessary for the information of the brethren, and believe me, Yours, in the One Hope.

HENRY FISH.

REMARKS.—The brethren at our July Conference, who united in sending Bro. Fish on this mission, will remember their obligations on reading the above report. Let them speedily respond by sending their donations to the Executive Committee, that our brother may be reimbursed for money actually expended, if no more. He has done his work well, at considerable cost of ease and self-denial on his part, and this ought to be appreciated by the brethren.

Below is a copy of a letter received from Bro. Lamport which will be seen to corroborate the above.

EDITOR.

Sommerville, Crawford Co., Wis.,
July 21st, 1861.

Dear Bro. Wilson:—It is with pleasure that I attempt to address you. By the blessing of the Lord we enjoy a comfortable de-

gree of health. Bro. Henry Fish came to my house two weeks ago last Friday, and a more welcome visitor never visited me. On Saturday afternoon he discoursed to a small congregation on the Gospel. On Sunday morning it commenced raining and continued till about noon, when we repaired to the river Kickapoo, and notwithstanding the mud and rain quite a crowd of our neighbors collected to the place to witness the immersion. Four willing subjects presented themselves for baptism into the Name of the Holy ones. Their names are as follows:—Z. W. Lamport, Allen Maynard, Amanda Maynard, Ambrose Thompson. Now perhaps you are surprised at the first name on the list, but, my brother, I have studied that subject for a long time, and I could not have done justice to my conscience short of being immersed into Christ, for at my former baptism (which I consider no baptism,) I had no scriptural idea of the Kingdom of Christ. It would be tedious both to myself and you to attempt to define my belief at that time, but suffice it to say, that I have enjoyed more satisfaction during the last two weeks than for years previous. But pardon this digression, and let us go back to the subject. After the immersion, Bro. Fish discoursed to quite a company of attentive listeners, and in that congregation were others who understood the gospel of the Kingdom well, but could not come forward and obey it. After the discourse, our brother broke bread with us and exhorted us, never, never, NEVER, to omit this imperative duty and privilege. On Monday morning I accompanied him to Marietta, (about four and a half miles from Boscobel,) when I bade him farewell, and returned home.

Bro. Benjamin, can you imagine my feelings when I viewed the coming responsibility which rested upon me? Were you ever in my situation? not that I claimed to leadership; no, but you know where I stood. Well the next first day we were all with one accord in one place, and we went boldly to the work—talked of those exceeding great and precious promises which await the faithful—partook of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord, and worshipped the God of our fathers according to the dictates of his word, which accorded fully with our consciences; and truly it was a good time with us. The next first day we were together again, and had the pleasure of assisting an honest-hearted, childlike-minded, yet intelligent believer in putting on Christ—Martha Thompson by name. We confidently hope there are more who will obey the Gospel soon. I was told last evening that we are making proselytes too fast, that it would not last, that it is excitement, &c. O how contemptible and inconsistent, when we have been meeting toge-

ther for the last year and a half to investigate the Scriptures, to know the mind and will of the Lord concerning us. Alas, how long it takes some to become divested of their Gentile foolishness, and come to understand the wholesome words of Jesus, and some I fear it will take *too long*. They will take up the lamentation, "The harvest is *past*, the summer is ended, and we are *not saved*." I must say the brethren here stand by each other like a band of brothers—like those ancient brethren in the wilderness, they are willing to hold up the drooping hands when they begin to wax feeble and to fail.

Bro. Wilson, the question has been asked me, "What will become of the little children belonging to the saints, when they shall be snatched away?" and I cannot answer it—can you? One question more, "Is currant wine suitable to represent the shed blood of Jesus, in the absence of the juice of the grape?" Yours, looking for redemption when Jesus comes again,

Z. W. LAMPORT.

REMARKS.

The reception of the above communication from our friend and brother Lamport, rejoiced our heart; and we cannot but hope that now, with a clear conscience and an easy mind so far as the hope is concerned, he may "hold fast his begun confidence firm to the end." Take courage, brother; though naturally you may be of a timid, retiring disposition, yet the truth properly understood and appreciated will make you a bold and fearless defender of the faith. Study the use of the divine armor mentioned in Eph. vi. 10-18, and put it on, and no sectarian foe, be he priest or layman—flesh and blood or spiritual adversary, will be able successfully to contend with you. Put to death the works of the flesh, and cultivate the fruits of the Spirit, enumerated in Gal. v. 19-26; and bind around you that golden chain of graces set forth in 2 Pet. i. 5-11, and you have an inspired apostle's word for it, that "you will neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," but that ultimately "an entrance will be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

As to the first query you propose, "What shall become of little children belonging to the saints when they shall be snatched away?" very little can be said, as there is nothing revealed directly on the subject. We can only infer. Children left in such a situation would be in as good a case as many are in the present age. But the saints have promised to rest upon in this matter, whether they die, and thus leave their families, or live to the coming of the Lord, and be snatched

away from them. "Leave thy fatherless children to me," says Jehovah. And why? Because "a father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows is God in his holy habitation." "In him the fatherless find mercy," for he is "the helper of the fatherless," and the "judge of the fatherless and the oppressed." These and similar declarations are sufficient to set the mind of any Christian at rest as to the lot of his children. But when we add such encouraging passages as these— "Casting all your care on him for he careth for you;" "Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee;"—there need be no anxiety as to the result. Besides, if our offspring left behind need care and attention, why cannot the changed or resurrected saints administer to *their* necessities as well as to the welfare of the world at large? We know that it will be one grand characteristic of Messiah's reign on the earth, and therefore of the saints too, for they will reign with him—that "he shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor;" therefore we need indulge no alarming fears about our loved ones. Accession to wealth and distinction in the present state is generally esteemed a blessing to the family, as far as temporal things are concerned; then why should the bestowment of immortality and honor in the Kingdom of God upon parents, militate in the least to the disadvantage of their children?

2nd Question, "Is currant wine suitable to represent the shed blood of Jesus in the absence of the juice of the grape?"

By *currant wine* we understand our brother to mean, the *fermented* juice of the currant. This we should object to even more than the *fermented* juice of the grape, because it is not in any sense the fruit of the vine, though both we think unfit to represent the blood of Jesus. The fruit or product of the vine was used by Jesus when he instituted the ordinance, as is evident from his words. "I will not drink henceforth of *this fruit of the vine*, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom," Matt. xxvi. 29. As this was chosen by the Head of the Church to be used by the members of his body in memory of himself, let no one presume to alter or amend. He chose the *wine* as a symbol of himself when he said, "I am the true vine," and he also chose the *fruit* of the *wine* as a symbol of his blood. But the gist of the inquiry is, What shall we substitute in the absence of the juice of the grape? The Word does not say. If one may use currant wine, another may use rum, or beer, or milk, or water. Once cut loose from the Word, and we know not where to stop. An idea is very prevalent that the wine or strong drink sold by liquor dealers for "sacramental pur-

poses," is the same kind as that used by our Lord. A very erroneous idea. We might quote here the language of the wise man with great propriety, and apply it to such—"Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise;" it is this that "at last biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." Such wine is not to be looked upon even, much less partaken of. It is generally understood that wine of some kind was used at the passover when the Lord's supper was instituted, and by the primitive Church when they attended to that institution; hence the mention made of the cup; yet we do not find the word wine used even once in connection with it. The Spirit has chosen the phrase—"fruit (product or off-spring) of the vine." The essential characteristic of all wines of the present day is the alcoholic or intoxicating principle, which is *not* the product of the vine, but of fermentation. And as fermentation is the leavening principle, it is very questionable, indeed, whether fermented wine could have been used at the passover at all, in connection with unleavened bread; and in view of the law, that no leaven was to be found in their houses, and that whosoever ate anything leavened for seven days was to be cut off from the congregation of Israel. Besides, leaven is the symbol of corrupt doctrines and practices; and as we are exhorted by the apostle Paul to "keep the feast with the unleavened principles of sincerity and truth," it would only be consonant with reason, and the practice of Jesus, to use those symbols which represent his uncorrupted body, and those heaven-born principles which he inculcated. Neither leavened bread nor leavened wine properly represent these things.

We would suggest that brethren cultivate the vine in order to obtain its fruit for this purpose. In the meantime let those who have opportunity gather the natural fruit, or buy of those who have grapes to sell, and press out the juice, and keep it so that it will not ferment. And those who cannot do this at present, can at any rate procure raisins (grapes with water dried out) bruise them well, and by adding water and gently simmering on the fire, can obtain "a decoction of raisins," which is, notwithstanding the sneers of some, "the fruit of the vine." This is the best plan we know of, till the more direct product can be obtained. At any rate, it is infinitely better than manufactured liquor, called wine, sold for "sacramental purposes," or any kind of fermented wine, however pure it may purport to be. How inconsistent to represent the life-giving blood of Jesus by poisonous and death-producing drinks—the product of the corrupting principle of fermentation!

For the Gospel Banner.

The Law--12 Facts. No. 1.

1. *Righteousness does not come by the Law.*
"I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness came by the Law, then Christ died in vain." Gal. ii. 21.

2. *Men are not justified by the Law or its works.*

"Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law." Gal. ii. 16.

3. *God's righteousness is manifested without the Law.*

"But now the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested." Rom. iii. 22.

4. *The Law was added till Christ came.*

"It was added because of transgressions till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." Gal. iii. 19.

5. *The inheritance is not obtained by the Law, neither did it come by the Law.*

"For if the inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Gal. iii. 18.

6. *They of the Law are not heirs to that promise.*

"For if they which are of the Law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of no effect." Rom. iv. 14.

7. *We are not under the Law.*

"For ye are not under the Law but under grace." Rom. vi. 14.

8. *The Law was added 430 years after the Covenant was made with Abraham.*

"And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was 430 years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Gal. iii. 17.

8. *This Law was an instructor to bring the people to Christ.*

"Wherefore the Law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." Gal. iii. 24.

10. *Christ has become the end of the Law.*

"For Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. x. 4.

11. *There is a law of faith in this dispensation.*

"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law?—of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." Rom. iii. 27.

12. *We are justified by faith, and righteousness comes by faith.*

"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law." Rom. iii. 28. "Even by the righteousness of God which is by faith." ch. iii. 22. Amen.

H. V. REED.

Folly and rage can dilapidate more in half-an-hour, than wisdom, deliberation, and forecast, can build up in many years.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., SEPTEMBER 1, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 16.]

For the Gospel Banner.

"Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?"—Questions by G. B. Stacy.

REPLY BY J. M. STEPHENSON.

CONTINUED.

Question No. 5.—The kingdom of God exists independent of the recognition, and in the face of its rejection by the children of men.

Answer. God's universal kingdom does unquestionably, thus exist; but the existence of his delegated kingdom to David and Solomon, was suspended upon conditions of obedience to the commandments of God. For proof, see 1 Kings ii. 1-4; Psa. cxxxii. 12.

Solomon failed to comply with the prescribed conditions; and God wrested ten twelfths of his kingdom, and gave to Rehoboam. 1 Kings xi. 4-14; xii. 20-24. Subsequently, the Babylonians and the Romans utterly subverted the kingdom of Israel, since which it has not been the kingdom of God; but when restored it will again be the kingdom of God.

God says concerning his Son, the Royal Son of David, "I will settle him in my house and my kingdom forever." 1 Chron. xvii. 14. Hence the kingdom of David,—of Israel,—is God's kingdom again, before it is given to his Son. Of the same import is the testimony of angel Gabriel: "And the Lord God shall give unto him (the Son of the Highest) the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Luke i. 32, 33. Of course the throne of David, and the house of Jacob, (i. e. the kingdom of Israel) must belong to the Most High God, before he can give his Son a valid title to them. But when given to Christ, it will be his kingdom. Thus the kingdom of God, of David, of Israel, and of Christ, are the same kingdom, belonging successively to these three kings. Yet, neither the conditional gift of the whole earth to Adam, or the kingdom of Israel to David, (Gen. i. 26; 1 Sam. xvi. 1; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, 5,) or the unconditional gift of both to Christ, has or will

invalidate the original right of the Great God to their dominion.

Question No. 6.—Although the Jews were once constituted a "kingdom of priests unto God," they ceased to be "the kingdom of God" from the time they rejected him from reigning over them, and thereby placed themselves on a level with the rest of mankind in rebellion against God, and therefore they constituted the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of David, or the royal house of Jacob.

Answer. If Mr. S. will substitute the phrase, "the children of Israel were once constituted the kingdom of God, (as was abundantly proved under Question No. 4,) instead of the phrase, "the Jews were constituted a kingdom of priests unto God," I can truly endorse what follows. Mr. S. conveys a false idea by the use of the term expressive of the twelve tribes. He also by implication contradicts as plain and positive statements as can be found between the lids of the Bible, by denying that the kingdom of David, the kingdom of Israel, and the royal house of Jacob were the kingdom of God. I must question the truthfulness of any theory which cannot be sustained without figuring away, or setting aside plain unequivocal Bible statements.

Question No. 7.—God has covenanted to give the throne of David, the kingdom of Israel or rule over the house of Jacob, to Jesus as the son of David, or because he is the son of David—but that is not the kingdom of God.

Answered under Question, or rather assumption No. 4. Why multiply so many questions of precisely the same import? Is Mr. S. so lean in ideas as to be forced to use so many different words expressive of the same ideas?

Question No. 8.—The possession of the throne of David, and the rule or jurisdiction over the house of Jacob and the world, is absolutely necessary, in order that the kingdom of God may be recognized by the nations, as nations or families, but is not the kingdom of God.

Answer. How does Mr. S. know that it was absolutely necessary for Jacob or David to line in order that God might employ them as mediums in communicating the knowledge

of his kingdom to the world? When he asserts that these are the Divinely appointed means in communicating to the nations the existence of God's dominion over the other worlds, or his absolute right to govern this revolted province, he has gone as far as he has any authority to go, unless he (God) has revealed to him the *absolute* impossibility of other available means. The term "absolutely necessary" when applied to Infinite wisdom and Almighty power, needs qualification. God positively declared that David's and Solomon's throne was his throne, and the kingdom of Israel his kingdom. Mr. S's repeated denial to the contrary notwithstanding. For proof see Ans. to Ques. No. 4. If Mr. S's denial is suspended upon the *tense* of the verb *is*, I grant it; but his repeated denial that the kingdom of Israel was ever the kingdom of God leads me to answer it without regard to the tense of the verb.

Question No. 9.—The visible manifestation of the kingdom of God results from the inauguration and application of the New Covenant, not of the Covenant with David, or that with Abraham.

Answer. There has never been any visible manifestation of the absolute and universal dominion of the Great God. As a personal ruler, or king, he has never been visible to mortal eyes; for as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, he dwelleth in the light; whom no man hath seen or can see." 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. No man hath seen God (the Supreme Ruler) at any time." John iv. 12. But David and Solomon, God's delegated Kings over his kingdom were visible, and that too according to the Davidical Covenant, as was proved under Ques. No. 4.

Question No. 10.—His personal application commenced on the day of Pentecost, and its national application will result as a consequence of the willing submission of the peoples to the physical rule of Jesus and his associates, when administered by them from the throne of David.

Answer. I am at a loss to understand what Mr. S. means by the personal application of the New Covenant. The great gospel sermon, under the great gospel commission, to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, was preached on the day of Pentecost. And three thousand souls believed, and obeyed, and were then added to the church of God. But no reference is made to any covenant, whatever, except the covenant made with David, and confirmed by the oath of God. Acts ii. 30; Psa. cxxxii. 11; 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13; Psa. lxxxix. 2, 4, 34-37, 28, 29. Peter was under commission to preach the gospel of the kingdom. Compare Mark xvi. 15, with Matt. xxiv. 14. In strict obedience to this command he preached the fulfilment of the oath and covenant of God with David. The king-

dom, therefore, which the apostles were commissioned to preach, in all the world, beginning at Jerusalem, was the kingdom of Israel. It was the good news concerning this kingdom, in the name of the crucified Nazarene, which was believed and obeyed on the day of Pentecost.

The apostles propounded a question to Christ, expressive of their views relative to the nature of the kingdom, the glad tidings of which, they were commissioned to preach. Acts i. 6. "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" They had just listened to our Savior's exposition of the *kingdom of God*, during forty days, and now they express in the most unequivocal language, their views relative to the nature of that kingdom, to wit: that it is to be the kingdom of Israel restored. Christ preached the *kingdom of God*; thus regarding these different phrases as expressive of the same identical kingdom. Did our Savior correct this false impression in regard to the nature of the kingdom of God which he had just commissioned them to preach in all the world, as a witness to all nations; (compare Mark xvi. 15 with Matt. xxiv. 14,) and to qualify them for whose fulfilment, he had just spent "forty days, speaking of the things" pertaining to this kingdom? For most assuredly it was a false impression, according to S's position. No, he *endorses* this view, and corrects them in regard to time. Hear his answer to the foregoing question. "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." Thus acknowledging that his Father had appointed *times* and *seasons* for the specific work of restoring the kingdom to Israel, or restoring *his* kingdom to Israel. He then assures them that they shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon them. Power concerning what? Ans. according to the tenor of their question, and our Savior's answer, to *know* the *times* and the *seasons* for the restoration of the kingdom to Israel; for the establishment of the kingdom of God,—the gospel concerning which they had just been commissioned to preach in all the world, beginning at Jerusalem. "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place," and the Holy Spirit came upon them. The power or inspiration to *know* and to make known the *times* and the *seasons* when the kingdom, the gospel of which, they were then and there qualified to preach, should be restored again to Israel. Peter stood forth as the oracle of God on that august occasion. And what did he preach? That the *times* or the *seasons* had arrived for the setting up of a Spiritual kingdom? Or for the personal

manifestation of any covenant which God had ever made, concerning any kingdom which he had ever promised? Nothing was said or done on that memorable day, from which such an inference can possibly be drawn. But on the contrary, Peter in that great model sermon (which every gospel minister, S. not excepted, would do well to commit to memory, and preach verbatim,) pointed down to the return of our Lord from the heavens to sit upon the throne of his father David, according to the oath of God. Acts ii. 30; Psa. cxxxii. 11. It was the *covenant* confirmed by this oath, to wit, that God would give the throne and kingdom of David to his royal Son, and through his righteous reign bring Israel and the world in subjection to him, the personal application of whose motive power ultimated in the repentance, baptism, and addition to the Church of God, (not the kingdom of God, mark you,) of near three thousand souls. Acts ii. 3, 37, 38, 41, 47. There was no other covenant adverted to on the day of Pentecost: and consequently no evidence of the personal application of any other. The only personal application of this covenant on the day of Pentecost, was the offer by Peter, the authorized agent of God, that by compliance with the prescribed conditions, they could have their sins remitted, be united, by faith, with the Anointed of God, to be, both Lord and Christ; (i. e. both king or ruler and Messiah) become a member of his Ecclesia, (body) and finally receive the *gift of the Spirit*, (i. e. of God, John iv. 24,) *eternal life*; (for the gift of God—the Spirit—is eternal life. Rom. vi. 23,) in the age to come. Mark x. 29, 30.

But the personal manifestation of this covenant will not take place until the Lord God shall, according to his oath, give unto his Son, the throne of his father David; and he (Christ) shall share with his associates the same throne and kingdom. Luke i. 32, 33. This will not take place until the *re-generation*, or the restitution, Matt. xix. 28; Acts iii. 19–21. This is the only kingdom promised Christ or his associates in the Word of God. Neither John, nor Christ, or the apostles preached a plurality of kingdoms for Christ or his associates. The apostles were commissioned to preach the *gospel*, not a gospel, a part of the gospel, or gospels—but emphatically *the Gospel*. Christ in the predicted fulfilment of this commission says, "And *this gospel of the Kingdom* shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. xxiv. 14. The only kingdom whose glad tidings they preached on the Day of Pentecost, or during their entire ministry, was the kingdom of Israel restored to Christ and his associates, with the obedient nations

for their dominion. The only covenants to which they appeal for proof were the Abrahamic and the Davidical, sometimes one and sometimes the other, owing chiefly to the character of their congregations. On the day of Pentecost Peter presents the Davidical covenant as the basis of hope to his Israelitish auditors. In his next sermon to the same class, he appeals to the Abrahamic covenant as the basis of hope and salvation. Acts iii. 25. Paul appealed to the covenant of God with David, in his masterly sermon at Antioch, as the basis of hope and salvation for believing Jew and Gentile. Acts xiii. 34. In the previous part of this discourse he gives the history of Israel from their sojourn in Egypt, to the time when the twelve tribes were united under David as their king. He then couples Christ with David as his royal seed. Having thus demonstrated his legal right to David's throne and kingdom, he declares that God raised him from the dead (incorruptible, that he might give unto them the *sure* mercies covenanted to David. Acts xiii. 16–23, 34; Isa. lv. 3. No man can fail to see the perfect analogy between Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, and Paul's sermon at Antioch. And both appeal to the covenant of God with David, whose personal manifestation will not take place until Christ and his associates are seated, personally, upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Luke xxii. 29, 30, 31.

The apostles, with James as their oracle, decided that the object of their mission, and that of Gospel ministers, until our Lord's return, was, and would be, (not to reign upon spiritual thrones over a spiritual kingdom,) to visit the Gentiles and take out of them a people for his (the Lord's) name; after which he (the Lord) would return and build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, to build again the ruins thereof; and to set it up. Acts xv. 12. Thus, again they point forward to the consummation of the covenant of God with David, as the time when their hope, and that of all the people of God shall be realized. And when David's Tabernacle, or royal Palace is restored, there will be a personal manifestation of the covenant (not kingdom) proclaimed, (not inaugurated on the day of Pentecost.) And when from that throne, with its associate thrones, shall issue laws for the government of the world, then the national application of both the Davidical and Abrahamic covenants, will result in the submission or destruction of all the nations and the kingdoms of the world; *for all kings shall fall down before him; (David's royal Son) all nations shall serve him; Psa. lxxii. 11. But "the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (him) shall perish."* Then by the influence of motive, or

moral rule, the nations of earth will be brought into submission to Christ and his associates; or by their physical rule the incorrigible and disobedient will be broken with a rod of iron; or dashed to pieces as a potter's vessel. *Psa. ii. 8, 9; Rev. ii. 26, 27.*

The most glorious reward is offered the nations in case of obedience; and force, or coercion only in case of disobedience. According to the Abrahamic covenant, blessings, not curses, mercy, not judgment, is to flow through Christ and his associates, the unit Seed, to all the nations of the earth. They will only resort to judgment as the last alternative. As well might it be argued that Christ governs his Church by physical rule, because it is a standing statute of his law, that all who will not obey shall perish, be destroyed. No, he governs by motive, by proffered reward, and will resort to force, not as a means to obdience, but to remove those who cannot be influenced by motive, out of the way, that the contagion of disobedience may be removed. But neither of the above named covenants, or rather parts of the same covenants; for the only real difference between them, is, that one embraces only one nation, (i. e. the nation of Israel,) whereas the other embraces *all* nations. But both constitute Christ and all who are his at his coming, associate kings; and the land of Canaan the territory, and the natural seed of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, their subjects.

Neither of these covenants offer Christ or his associates any other position than that of kings. They both constitute them all joint heirs up to the time of the joint possession of all the promises covenanted. All these promises are to be received by Abraham and his entire family, (Christ and his associates,) at the same time, *Gen. xii. 3; Gal. iii. 8; Gen. xviii. 18; xxii. 18; Gal. iii. 16, 29; Heb. xi. 8-13, 35, 39, 40.*

According to the foregoing references, Abraham, Christ, and all who have been, or will be Christ's, are heirs to the same promises,—all of them.

2nd. All these heirs, except the righteous living, will be dead when the time comes to fulfill the promises covenanted to Abraham and his Seed, Christ and all his associates.

3rd. They all died in faith not having received the promises.

4th. They were to receive them through the medium of the resurrection of the dead, or a change equivalent thereto.

5th. It is God's plan to perfect the whole family of Abraham at the same time, viz. when his last child shall be qualified.

How can the foregoing irrefragable positions be harmonized with the idea of Christ,

or his associates, receiving any of the promises thus covenanted, on the day of Pentecost, or before the completion of the Abrahamic family? They cannot.

But the great difficulty of S. and Campbell's (not Abraham's) whole family, consists in confounding the Bible terms—Church and Kingdom—two terms which convey as different ideas as any two terms between the two lids of the Bible. Also, using the term, *physical*, real, substantial, as the antithesis of *spiritual*; whereas animal is the proper antithesis of spiritual. Spiritual as an adjective is not an entity, but a quality of an entity. We speak of a good man as a spiritual man; not as a phantom or ghost, but as a real substantial man, having the disposition of mind which Christ had. The kingdom of Christ and his associates, therefore may be spiritual, and yet a real substantial kingdom. The bodies of all the immortalized saints will be *spiritual*. *1 Cor. xv. 44.* "It is sown a *Soma Psuchikon*, body animal, it is raised a *Soma Pneumatikon*, body spiritual." But will not the body raised be just as literal and real as the one buried, only having a different nature? Most assuredly it will. Spirit as a substantive, denotes a substantial, tangible being. Christ was a spirit after his resurrection from the dead; and yet he ate and drank, had flesh and bones; and could be handled by his disciples. *1 Cor. xv. 45; Luke xxiv. 39.* He was not a phantom. Angels are spirits, (*Heb. i. 14.*) and yet are substantial beings who live by eating, and yet in their food there was sufficient substance to sustain the lives of three millions of men, women and children during forty years. *Exod. xvi. 1; Psa. lxxviii. 23, 25.* They ate the repast prepared by Sarah; took hold of Lot and pulled him into the house. *Gen. xviii. 1-8; ix. 10.* The Saints when *re-generated* or *born again*, will be Spirits, (*John iii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xv. 44; Col i. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 20; Rom. viii. 11; Phil. iii. 21; Mark xii. 25; Heb. i. 14.*) and yet they will be seen coming from the East and West, and sitting down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. *Matt. viii. 11.* They will eat and drink with Christ at his table in his kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. *Luke xxii. 30.* In one word they will live by eating during the endless ages of eternity. *Rev. vii. 16, 17; xxii. 2.* As to that figment of Campbellism, namely, that the temporal kingdom, preparatory to an eternal kingdom, was set up on the day of Pentecost, there is no more Bible foundation to it than to the moon-stricken visionist who sings his soul away through the starry realms, "and kingdoms gain beyond the skies." Christians then and now, and during the interim between have been heirs

of a *promised* kingdom. James ii. 5. They are translated into this kingdom by faith, just as they have eternal life. Col. i. 13; John iii. 36.

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.
Social Worship.

CONTINUED.

THE CONTRIBUTION, &c.

I shall now direct the reader's attention to the Fellowship, or Contribution, as it follows next in order after the apostles' doctrine, occupying a distinct position, prior to, and just on the eve of the attendance of the breaking of bread. But as the reader may object and say, that it is fellowship, or fellow-feeling, and not contribution, we shall go back to the original, to find what it represents in this and other passages.

Koinonia, *Koinonia*, here translated fellowship, is also rendered, communion, communication, contribution, and distribution, in the apostolic writings, by King James' translators. A few specimens will suffice to prove this. It is translated fellowship, Acts ii. 42; "They continued steadfastly in the *fellowship*." 1 Cor. i. 9; "The *fellowship* of his Son Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. vi. 14; "What *fellowship* has light with darkness." Gal. ii. 9; "The right hand of *fellowship*." Phil. iii. 10; "The *fellowship* of his sufferings." 2 Cor. viii. 4; "The *fellowship* of the ministering to the saints." They have sometimes translated it by the word communion. 1 Cor. x. 16; "Is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ?" 2 Cor. xiii. 14; "The *communion* of the Holy Spirit." They have also used the term *communicate*. Heb. xiii. 16; "But to do good and to *communicate*, forget not." Where it evidently meant *almsgiving*, and would allow of no other construction, they chose the term *distribution*. 2 Cor. ix. 13; "For your liberal *distribution* to them and to all." They have also selected the term *contribution* as an appropriate translation. Rom. xv. 26; "For it has pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain *contribution* for the poor saints at Jerusalem."

It is most evident, from the above specimens, that the term *koinoniu* imports a joint participation in giving or receiving; and that a great deal depends on the selection of an English term, in any particular passage, to give a peculiar turn to the meaning of that passage; for instance, the right hand of *contribution*, would be a very uncouth, and unintelligible phrase. The contribution of the Holy Spirit, would not be much better, but had they always used the word *contribution*, when the sense required it, it would have greatly aided the English reader. For exam-

ple, Acts ii. 42; "And they were constantly attending to the Teaching of the Apostles, and to the Contribution, and to the Breaking of the Loaf, and to the Prayers," is quite appropriate, and intelligible; and there is no reason which would justify their rendering Rom. xv. 26, as they have done, that would not equally justify their having rendered Acts ii. 42, as is rendered by the "Emphatic Diaglott." In Rom. xv. 26, the context obliged them to select the word *contribution*; for the same reason they ought to have chosen the same term in Acts ii. 42. The term fellowship is too vague in this passage, and indeed altogether improper: for the Jerusalem congregation had fellowship in breaking the loaf, and in prayers, as well as in contributing; and as the historian contradistinguishes the *koinonia*, from prayers, and breaking bread, it is quite evident that it was a distinct and separate part of Social worship to which they attended. It was not a fellow-feeling that is here spoken of merely, for it is prefixed by the definite article *the*—"ΤΗΣ *koinonia*." There can be no objection made to the term, *contribution*, either as an appropriate meaning of *koinonia*, or as being unsuitable in this passage. As Christians in their individual, and social capacity, are frequently exhorted by the apostles to contribute to the wants of the poor, to distribute to the necessities of the saints; as the disciples at Jerusalem continued steadfastly in this institution; and as other churches elsewhere were commended for these acceptable sacrifices; it is very easy to see and feel that it is incumbent on all Christians, as they have ability, and as circumstances require, to follow their example in this benevolent institution of him who became poor, that the poor might be made rich by him.

That every Christian ecclesia should follow the example of those which were set in order by the apostles, is, I trust, a proposition which few of those who love the founder of the Christian institution will question. And that the apostles did give orders to the churches in Galatia and Corinth, is a matter that cannot be disputed. See 1 Cor. xvi. 1. That Christian congregations did then keep a treasury for those contributions is I conceive evident from the original of 1 Cor. xvi. 2, which Maeknight correctly renders in the following words, "On the first day of every week let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come, there may be no collections." This was that *contribution* spoken of in Romans xv. 27, designated, "a certain contribution," or an extra, separate gathering for the especial purpose of being sent to relieve the poor saints in Judea; hence when the necessary amount was raised

the collections for that particular object ceased, but this is no reason that the Lord's treasury should ever after remain empty; for said Jesus, "the poor you have always with you," and whosoever ye will ye may do them good; besides there is a constant expense incurring, in the regular attendance on the institution of the Lord's house. The elements which commemorate the Lord's death need constantly to be furnished, a place of meeting often has to be paid for, fuel and light to be provided. Now how is it to be done—has the Lord left all these things, without any instruction? I think not. There was a treasury in olden time into which the rich cast of their abundance, and the poor widow her mite, and these gifts when deposited were then the Lord's funds for the service of his house. Our Lord sanctioned the plan in having a bag, and a treasurer to disburse its contents, in buying those things necessary for the observance of the feast, or in giving something for the poor. John xiii. 29.

This then seems to be the proper place to attend to the Contribution, when assembled around the Lord's table, in view of the great love of God towards us, to consider our obligation to him in return. He has blessed us with health and with strength, to come once more to his table, what have we to offer, that the celebration of the Lord's death may be continued, that our widows and orphans and sick brethren may be relieved, and that the proclamation of the truth may be sustained. Every saint is bound, according to his means, to contribute to the treasury of the Lord. No one ought to think of eating the bread, and drinking the wine, before he has paid his quota towards them. A Christian ought to have more independence, and a greater sense of propriety, than to sit at the Lord's table, at the expense of his associates. The King's tax, therefore, ought to be promptly, cheerfully, and liberally paid, and as he leaves the amount to our own discretion, we have no just cause to complain. If circumstances happen that the disciple, during certain seasons of the year, or occasionally, is frustrated from having money in his purse, this should not hinder him from attending to his duties; he can by bearing these things in mind pay up his arrears, when he is better provided, and thus he will carry out an apostolic injunction, owe no man anything; but on the contrary, if he see his brother have need, and shut up his bowels of compassion by neglecting to attend to the contribution, how dwelleth the love of God in him; for this is God's plan in the support of the truth on the earth. The Scriptures do not recognise the practises of the present day of subscription lists, and fashionable parties,

in which trumpets are sounded to the praise of those who give liberally, and those not able to participate are held in disrespect. No, the Lord's ways are not as man's ways. Jesus enjoined a more private way of dispensing good, saying, "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." "Every one according as he has purposed in his heart, ought to give, not with regret, nor by constraint, for God loves a cheerful giver," 2 Cor. ix. 7. These moneys thus contributed, are the Lord's,—a sacrifice acceptable unto God, an odor of a sweet smell. It is not to lay dormant, but to be used in the Lord's service. It was for this purpose that Deacons were first appointed in the Church—to serve tables—not the Lord's table, but to supply the ordinary refreshments for the multitude. To prove this we have only to look at the record, and we there find that the temporal provision of the disciples, living in common, out of the bounty realized from the sale of lands placed at the feet of the apostles, was too onerous a duty for the twelve apostles, as it was "not reason, that they should leave the Word of God, and serve tables," Acts vi. 2; but by appointing men to attend to this matter, they could confine their labors to the ministry of the Word and Prayer.

Now as the office of deacon, is intimately connected with the subject under consideration, viz., the contribution, we shall quote from 1 Tim. iii. 8-12, the character and qualification of deacons. "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that use the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." From the above, we see that the character of the deacon, and wives, is very much the same as the bishops; but in point of qualification there is a very important difference. While the bishop is required to "be apt to teach," no such qualification is absolutely necessary in the deacon. The reason is obvious. Teaching does not necessarily belong to his office, while it forms a very important part of the work of the bishop. There is perhaps no office mentioned in the New Testament, which is less understood, or which has been more generally perverted, than the office of deacon. Where, we ask, does the Episcopal Church get her authority for her deacon and arch-deacons? These according to her system are only dif-

ferent orders of the clergy! We have no objection to a deacon, becoming a preacher; indeed we should rejoice if all our deacons were to use the office well, obtain "boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus," and after the example of Philip, become powerful proclaimers of the word; but what we would here notice is, that the law of Christ does not require of a deacon, that he should be a public teacher of Christianity at all. That which belongs to his office is of a different character, which is implied in the meaning of the word selected to denote his duties. The word deacon is translated from the Greek word *diakonos*, and simply signifies, a minister or servant. In the "*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*," we find the following very judicious remarks on the subject, which we commend with the exception of their theological bearing, "The primitive deacons took care of the secular affairs of the Church, received and disbursed moneys, kept the church's accounts, and provided every thing for its temporal good. Thus while the bishop attended to the souls, the deacons attended to the bodies of the people, the pastor to the spiritual and the deacons to the temporal interests of the church." How different is the popular idea and practice in modern times! Some churches seem to have no other use for deacons than simply to carry round the bread and wine, in the institution of the Lord's supper. As to the current expenses of churches a few liberal souls have to bear it all! The church has no treasury; and if the poor are relieved, it is done by private charity. Now we are bold to say, that such churches have no use at all for deacons. Waiting upon the members with the bread and wine, in the supper, constitutes no part of the deacons' duty as such. It is true, he may lawfully attend to it, as well as any other brother, but not by virtue of his office. There is often too much ceremony and show, in the carrying round the elements, which would be better omitted, by brethren associating together more like an agreeable family, passing round the bread and wine one to another, quietly and unostentatiously carrying out the meek precept of Jesus, Luke xxii. 17, "take this and divide it among yourselves."

But that we may see the propriety, and even the necessity of the deacon's office, let us consider the following points. Paul instructs Timothy to have the widows taken care of, and James says, that "Pure religion and undefiled with God, even the Father, is this, to take care of orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world." Now we ask, how a church is to take care of orphans and widows and the poor in general, if they have no means—no treasury? Individual benevolence

may be extended in some cases; but this is not the church; and through a neglect of this important part of the worship of God, which he has established, the church has been distanced in its benevolence, by the institutions of the day. The Odd Fellows, and other organized societies, which are institutions merely human, carry out more of the spirit of the Gospel in this respect. It sometimes happens that the overseers of the poor—Cesar's deacons—have to relieve and sustain "the poor of this world, that are rich in faith," because that the church had no treasury for this purpose, or if it had it was all swallowed up in supporting the minister!! Is not this a perversion of the Lord's institutions? first in neglecting to do what he has required, and secondly in doing something, which is contrary to his mind and will. But vastly different is the order in that church which understands the law of Christ upon this subject. Such a church has her treasury, which is in the care of her deacons. Into this treasury the members, male and female, contribute "as the Lord has prospered them," so that they may always have on hand enough to supply the wants of the Lord's poor among them. Does a brother or sister, through age and infirmity, or sickness, or other misfortune, stand in need of aid? the deacons immediately draw from the church's treasury, and supply their wants. Does a brother die, and leave his wife and children in destitute circumstances? the deacons of the church become angels of mercy to them in the name of the church; and the widow's heart is made to sing for joy, while the orphans are taken care of, consoled, instructed, and educated. No need that Cesar's deacons should look after their temporal welfare, since the Lord has provided for them in the church; the rich rejoice that they have the means of doing good, and the poor are made to forget their poverty; all are in a great measure brought upon equality. Does a church wish to extend the truth, to hold forth the word of life to those who are ignorant of it? she will make her contributions for that object, which are placed in the hands of her deacons, who are the treasurers of the church, and whose duty it is to disburse them as may be necessary to carry on the good work, in supplying the necessary expenses incurred by a brother travelling to and fro while proclaiming the truth. That brother is for the time being the church's servant, and to it is responsible for how he has labored: if he labors faithfully and assiduously, he is worthy of double honour, but if he does not work, neither should he eat, at the expense of his brethren. Industry ought to be practised by every one that names the name of Jesus; he is our great exemplar, and he was always engaged; for it is written of him that

"He went about continually doing good;" and the Apostle Paul enjoined on the Thessalonians; "And that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands as we commanded you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without; and that ye may have lack of nothing." And in writing to the Romans, he warns them to be "Not slothful in business," as earnestly as he does for them to be "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." The deacon in administering his duties has to discriminate to the best of his ability between cases of need and cases of carelessness and neglect, and imposition; for in the days of Christ's personal mission there were some that would follow him "because that they did eat of the loaves and were filled," John vi. 26. The great Apostle of the Gentiles labored with his own hands, that he might minister to his own necessities and to them who were with him, and he adds in speaking to the elders of the Ephesian church, "I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said it is more blessed to give than to receive."

The scripture abounds with instruction, on this subject, and it is the great and important question, that shall decide the weal or woe of all the church of God at the judgment. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungred and ye gave me meat, etc., and inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me." But the other class that have not recognised the principle of love to their brethren, he will say unto them, "depart, ye cursed, etc., for inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, ye did it not to me." In harmony with this the apostle John says, "every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen." The contribution then is the great lever by which the truth is to be supported, and the poor cared for. Some individuals have objected that they could not attend to this ordinance, because they had no poor amongst them, this is no reason why it should be neglected, let them attend to it because the Lord has required it, and they may find some use for it in assisting some poor sister Church that is burdened with more than it can well support; following out the principle that the churches of Galatia acted on in sending their surplus funds to their far off brethren in Judea. This is then a part of the

worship of God; Jesus said, they that worship God must do it "in spirit and in truth." Now to worship him in spirit and in truth, we must take heed to the Spirit's teaching; and we are told that to obey is better than sacrifice, to hearken (is better) than the fat of rams. That which pleaseth Jehovah the most, is a contrite spirit, one that trembleth at his word; the disposition of mind which says, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" by so studying his will to know the truth, and by a conformity thereto we shall thus "grow in favor and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." But I must now conclude, all being well, I intend to consider in my next who ought to administer the ordinance of the supper, &c. Yours, for the truth's sake,
JAMES WOOD.
Harvard, Aug. 7th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Cross---its purpose.

THE REDEMPTION.

"Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free," John viii. 32-34, spake Jesus to his people. But they indignantly rejected the implied reproach, and averred, "We are Abraham's children, and were never in bondage to any man; how then sayest thou, 'Ye shall be free?'" Which was true, the declaration or the denial is easily seen. The Jews however were excusable in that they misunderstood his allusion, which was to their mental subjection,—"*Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin,*"—which was equivalent to, or affirmative of their need of a Ransomer.

For all verily are enslaved. Paul represents sin as one great master-tyrant, from whom men need to be delivered. "Death reigned from Adam to Moses," Rom. v. 14. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it. Neither yield ye up your members to sin as instruments of unrighteousness. . . . Know ye not, that whosoever ye yield yourselves servants to obey his servants are ye whom ye obey; whether of sin to death, or of obedience to righteousness," Rom. vi. 12-23. Like all other tyrants sin oppresses his servants. "The motions of sins. . . did work in our members to bring forth fruit to death," Rom. vii. 5; also, Jas. i. 15. "The wages of sin are—death," Rom. vi. 21, 23. In strict keeping with these are also the designations in other scripture, "Thou art in the bond of iniquity," Acts viii. 24. "Sold under sin," Rom. vii. 14.

In this deplorable case was (and is) man. Oh what an accursed tyrant is Sin-in-the-flesh. The historian, the novelist, the poet, never imagined so vigilant a taskmaster, so galling a yoke. Egyptian bondage barely approaches it. No escape, no manumission appears, only

labor and sorrow, and that continually. The eye looks for help,—but no. "No man can redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him." With one united groan the sufferers cried, "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" But only the enlightened conscience can respond, "I thank God—He, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vii. 24, 25. Fitly is this taskmaster and his slave-service accounted as that of the devil, whose rod was the fear of death, held in terror over all his subjects. 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26; Heb. ii. 14, 15.

This then is the subjection of all mankind, "for that all have sinned." What hope? what rescue? what light in the darkness? Who will volunteer for the work of saving these groaning captives? Is there never a Moses to subdue this Pharaoh? Yes! oh yes! Here is one who will dedicate himself to the mission; here is "Jesus made a little lower than the angels... partaker of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him who had the power of death, i. e. the devil; and set free those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." This then was one object, or one phase of the object of his mission—to Ransom men from the Slavery of Sin. Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6. But how is this effected, seeing sin lives? Aye verily it does, but this only proves that his mission is not perfected, or in other words, that he shall come the second time without sin, to salvation.

The sin-tyranny is both national and individual; the ransom is consequently duplicate. It is the individual however which at present calls most particularly for remark. It is written concerning this release, that Jesus "Gave himself for our sins, that he might free us from this present evil age, (or condition) according to the will of God our Father," Gal. i. 4. "Gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous for good works," Tit. ii. 14. "Ye know that ye were not *redeemed* from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, with perishable things... but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish or spot," 1 Pet. i. 18, 19; Heb. xiii. 12. These are only a few out of many others: they are sufficient however to serve as answer to the question, how the Christ ransomed us from sin? There is a power in love potent enough to ensure obedience. Thus when we contemplate the excelling love which was evidenced on the cross; when we ask for what purpose he bore all this unmerited shame and anguish, and are told that it was to win us back to God, we are melted at once, even as the child is broken-hearted at the sight of its parent's love whilst rebellious. And when

we see what ill results accrue from sin we are led to loathe, desert, or war with them. Thus by blood-witnessing love, the desires of sinful nature are overcome, the chains of the tyrant are melted, and the oppressed goes free. He "gave himself" doubly—in his life displaying the practicability of doing no sin whilst still subject to sin-flesh; and by his death perfecting all this witnessing and ensuring full redemption. Combinedly their operation on the conscience has a moral effect such as nothing else could have. See John's letters.

There is as yet nothing in this which at all teaches expiation: the idea of a Ransom is indeed totally opposed to it. For as it would need us to consider the Father (who they say received the redemption price) a slave-master, or holder in bondage, so such doctrine would compel us to account the Son as in opposition to the Father because of his ransoming office. It is plain then that the ransom is from "the motions of sin in the flesh," and that to set us free from these he brought to bear a greater influence upon our minds, even his love to death. The price paid this object, the money, so to speak, was enough for its purpose. Hence it is properly affirmed that he purchased the church with his own blood, Acts xx. 28, that we "are not our own, we are bought with a price," 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20; vii. 22, 23, that apostate teachers deny the Lord who bought them, 2 Pet. ii. 1.

The blood has also a sanatory effect;—the same process and power which breaks the chains of sin cleanses also from it. If we may borrow from science some illustration, we would say that the blood of the Christ has the chemical virtues of a dissolvent, a disinfectant, and a clarifier. "These are they who came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," Rev. vii. 14; i. 5, 6; Eph. v. 25, 26. "The blood of sprinkling," Heb. xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2. "The blood of Jesus Christ... cleanseth us from all sin," 1 John ii. 7. "How much more shall the blood of Christ purify your consciences from dead works to serve the living God," Heb. ix. 14. All which teach the doctrine of personal purification through the moral influence of the blood of Christ.

Paul speaks of Jesus as him "By whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace," Eph. i. 7. Now as forgiveness is consequent on confession, and necessitated by the justice of God, the affirmation here is evidently that the blood of Christ acting upon our consciences causes to forsake sin, otherwise to repent; and so forgiveness is ascribed to it as a redemptory agent. To redeem we all know means to bring back. Therefore is the blood of Christ celebrated in the song of

the ransomed—"Thou wast slain, and hast brought us back to God by thy blood out of every kindred." Rev. v. 9. We were as sheep going astray, sought by the Good Shepherd, and brought back to the fold. It was this love of his which wooed and won us back to our allegiance.

God held forth righteousness and life as attainable through faith in His Son, Jesus Christ, to the better accomplishment of which he was lifted up that he might *draw* all men to him! Or to speak mechanically, he gave him over even to death to supply a *motor power to faith* by his blood. Incited, energized, elevated by contemplation of God's exceeding kindness, we are led to trust in His promises, and thus "Faith worketh Love," Gal. v. 6. This is the basis of Paul's reasoning in Romans. "Therefore being justified by faith we have *peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand...* Hope maketh not ashamed, (fearful,) *because the Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts.* . . . For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; though perhaps for a good man some would even dare to die. But God *commendeth* His Love, (and through it His Faith,) toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died on our account. *Much more* then, being now justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life," Rom. v. 1-10, which is a guarantee of ours in the Kingdom of God. All which, together with the sequential argument, leads to the conclusion, "that as sin hath reigned to death, even so might grace reign through righteousness (educed by love-vitalized faith) to eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

We must however bring this part of the Redemption—i. e. the Ransom from sin which we are considering, to an end, by a glance at the Passover. "Christ our Passover is slain for us," 1 Cor. v. 7. We cannot stay to eliminate the full meaning of the service, but must refer you to Exod. xii, where you will find the memorial of the great deliverance from Egypt. The bitter bondage, the hasty flight, the *covenanted* deliverance, are fully portrayed in the Paschal painting; itself a prefiguring of another and greater deliverance,—from the bondage of sin and ultimately of death. In the Christian Passover which we weekly celebrate we are reminded of the serfdom to sin, the flight as a bird from the fowler, the promised redemption. Not less ought the mercy of God shown to us be thought upon because in this our state we

are as if were celebrating the rite on the night before Redemption: for we know as surely that the slaughter of the firstborn will shortly take place, and that we shall have to flee as it were instantly from our mortal bondage at the command of the greater Moses.

The Redemption which is in Christ Jesus we have endeavored to keep distinct from the Ransom from our sins for greater convenience in argument, as also because they are essentially two in degree. The higher step in Divine purpose is a theme upon which we might write volumes. At this time, however, we must be content with the utmost brevity.

The Christ, "died to sin once," but now "liveth to God." This, therefore, is the foundation principle of Redemption—that probation and death must precede immortality and exaltation. Even as the diamond is eliminated from a black chemical base, so the believing mortals must be transmuted by the above process into Sons of God. To this end the Christ was made in all things like to his brethren, that he might be a perfect pattern to us—that he might also be the imaging of our future Elohim condition. Heb. i. 3. It was in this procedure that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Elohim for the suffering of death—that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man—crowned with glory and honor. It became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many Sons to glory, to make the *Captain of their Salvation PERFECT THROUGH SUFFERINGS,*" Heb. ii. 9, 10. That by his death and resurrection we are redeemed from death, and have right to Age-life, is the basis of all Apostolic teaching. 1 Thess. i. 10. Paul's climactic syllogism is, that "if the Christ be not raised your faith is vain:—ye are yet *in your sins.*" That "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," 1 Cor. xv. 17, 22. The argument of immersion (in Rom. vi.) is to the same effect. His resurrection (for the death is valueless without this) is the earnest of the promises, Acts xiii. 32-39—hence it is not false logic to say that Jesus laid down his life and took it again, John x. 15-18, to ensure the eternal life of all his people. 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.

Questions.

Will Bro. Mark Allen, please answer the following questions through the *Banner*?

1st. Are all human governments which have ever existed, or now exist, ordained of God?

If so, has not God ordained governments, not only antagonistical in their main features,

to those given by himself to Moses and to Christ but directly opposed to one another?

If so, how can there be any choice between serving God and serving man?

If not, which is to be the standard, the law of God or the law of man?

If the law of man, then, is not such law the higher, or supreme law? And God's law the lower law?

Is it not subserving the infinite wisdom of God to the fallible wisdom of man?

If the law of God is the only infallible standard of duty, in all matters whatever, then is not the only question to be decided, by Christians, *Is the edict or commandment of men in harmony with the law of God?*

2nd. Is not Christ the head and legislator for his body?

If so, ought not the members of his body to obey their own head, instead of the head of any other body?

If not, then for one member to obey the commandments of Christ, and another the commandments of men, which conflict with those of Christ, *would there not be a schism in Christ's body?* Would not Christ be divided against himself?

If so, ought not every appeal, by every Christian, be to the law of Christ? Having learned his revealed will ought not that to be a finality as far as his duty is concerned?

If all this should be granted by Mark Allen, then how can he, with any show of consistency, encourage Christians to engage in the bloody deeds of war and carnage, without one precept or example in all the New Testament, or among all primitive Christians?

If so, how can he harmonize the barbarous practice of war, with the following precepts and sayings in the Constitution of Christ? "*Love your neighbor as yourself.*" "*Do to others as you would have others do to you.*" "*Love your enemies.*" "*Pray for them that despitefully use you.*" "*If they smite you on one cheek turn the other also.*" "*Avenge not yourselves.*" "*If thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst give him drink.*" "*He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword.*" "*Blessed are the peacemakers.*" "*My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight.*" "*Be ye pure for I (God) am pure.*" "*Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.*" "*If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.*" "*Shun the appearance of evil?*" "*Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.*" "*Our weapons are not carnal, but spiritual.*" "*Whence cometh wars? Come they not of your own lusts,*" etc.

3rd. If to be subject to the powers that be involves obedience to all existing laws, or human enactments, then did not the three Hebrew children, Daniel, Peter and Silas,

and the host of martyrs do wrong in refusing obedience to the powers that be? Would a citizen of Massachusetts do wrong by refusing obedience to the requirements of the fugitive slave law? Was it wrong for the colonies to refuse obedience to the British? Is not the correct rendering of Paul's language, "*The powers that be are permitted of God.*"

Does God enslave everything he permits? May not a Christian be a passive subject of law by unresistingly submitting to its penalty, as Christ, his apostles, and all the martyrs did? Do not all governments protect foreigners without requiring assistance in return? Is it consistent for Christians to try to bolster up the wicked anti-Christian governments of the world, when God is throwing them down? If the kingdom of God cannot come until the kingdoms of the world are overthrown, how can we consistently pray for the one, and fight for the other.

4th. Is it the duty of a Christian to serve two masters?

If not, how can he take an oath to obey his superior officers (perhaps infidels) at the peril of his life?

J. M. STEPHENSON.

Eureka, July 25th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Sabbath---12 Facts. No. 2.

1st. It is a fact, that God has *no where* commanded the Gentiles to keep the Sabbath.

2nd. It is a fact, that the Sabbath was given to Israel 2500 years *after* the creation, at which time God gave it *through* Moses. Exod. xvi. 22, 29; Neh. ix. 14.

3rd. It is a fact, that the Sabbath was a *sign* between God and the nation of Israel. Exod. xxxi. 17.

4th. It is a fact, that the Sabbath was a "*feast day.*" Lev. xxiii. 1-3.

5th. It is a fact, that no one could pick up sticks or build fires on the Sabbath, without breaking the law. Exod. xxxv. 2, 3; Num. xv. 32-35.

6th. It is a fact, that the *beasts* were to rest as well as man. Exod. xx. 8-10.

7th. It is a fact, that the *feast* and *Sabbath* of the Mosaic age were also called the Lord God's, therefore there is no such distinction as *their Sabbaths* and *the Sabbath of the Lord*, for they were all his. 2 Chron. ii. 4. They were his because they belong to his law; and he gave them to Israel, therefore they became Israel's by gift.

8th. It is a fact, that God said that he would cause *all* these Sabbaths to cease. Hosea ii. 11.

9th. It is a fact, that Paul says, that we should not judge in meats, or in drinks, or

in respect to holy days, or Sabbaths, which were shadows. Col. ii. 16.

10th. It is a fact, that Christ nowhere enjoins Sabbathing upon his disciples.

11th. It is a fact, that Paul did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God, and in no place in his fourteen epistles did he enjoin the keeping of the seventh day Sabbath.

12th. It is a fact, that Paul only mentions days four times; once, that we should not judge in relation to them; once, that "one man esteemeth one day above another, and another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be persuaded in his own mind;" once, that "ye observe days, and I am afraid lest I have bestowed labor in vain;" once, that God rested on the seventh day, and Christ has entered into his rest, and that a rest remains for God's people. Col. ii. 16; Rom. xiv. 5; Gal. iv. 10; Heb. iv.

That rest will be given at the return of Christ. 2 Thess. ii. 7-10. H. V. REED.

Vineyards of Scripture.

The Vineyard is commonly mentioned in the Bible in contradistinction from the field, and is occasionally used in speaking of ordinary gardens. Vines were usually planted upon heights and precipitous crags, (Jer. xxxi. 5,) where it was sometimes necessary to build walls in order to retain the soil. The whole process of preparing a vineyard is described by Isa. v. 1. The vine dresser selects a propitious spot, with a southern exposure—builds a wall round it—loosens the soil, and gathers out the stones—erects a tower and digs a press. Then he may truly say:—"What could I have done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" (Isa. v. 4.) What must be his disappointment:—"Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?" (Isa. v. 4.) His disappointment is in proportion to the care and number of his preparations. The prophet then describes the reverse process. The failure being so decided, the husbandman says:—"I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down: and I will lay it waste: and it shall not be pruned nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it." (Isa. v. 5, 6.) The menace has been sadly fulfilled on Israel, both on its soil and on its people.

Vineyards were enclosed with a hedge or a wall, to defend them from the ravages of beasts, to which they are often exposed. A *tower* was also built as the station of a watchman. Num. xxii. 24; Psa. lxxx. 8-13; Prov. xxiv. 31; Sol. Song ii. 15; Matt. xxi. 33.

The Hebrews devoted as much care to their vineyards as to their agriculture. When Isaiah predicts the invasion of the Assyrian, he declares that the vineyard where there were a thousand vines for a thousand pieces of silver, shall be even for briers and thorns. Isa. vii. 23. When he would represent sorrow, he says, "The new wine mourneth, and the vine languisheth, and all the merry-hearted do sigh," Isa. xxiv. 7. So Zechariah (viii. 12,) foretells future prosperity thus: "The seed shall be prosperous, the vine shall give her fruit." See also Hab. iii. 17; Mal. iii. 11.

The vine thus became a familiar and frequent symbol among the Hebrew writers. "I am," said our Lord, "the true vine." The 80th Psalm contains a beautiful allegory founded on the vine:—

"Thou hast transplanted a vine out of Egypt; Thou hast rooted out the heathen and planted it.

Thou prepared'st space before it, And didst cause it to take deep root, And it filled the land.

The hills were veiled with its shadow, And with its boughs the cedars of God, It shot out its branches to the sea, And its tendrils unto the river."

How true and touching a description of God's peculiar care of his chosen people, and of their prosperity under his favor. The vineyards were fenced for protection, though sometimes the boar intruded. How appropriate the description and prayer, Psa. lxxx. 13, 14:—"The boar out of the wood doth waste it, and the wild beast of the field doth devour it. Return, we beseech thee, O God of hosts; look down from heaven, and behold, and visit this vine."

Josephus speaks of a magnificent vine sculptured on the eastern end of the temple. The branches and tendrils were formed of gold, and its fruits were precious jewels. This vine was carried to Rome, and exhibited among the spoils of Titus on his triumph.—*Eadie's Bib. Cy.*

Acelanda,

A field lying a little south of Jerusalem, where potters dug their clay. The money which Judas threw back to the Jewish rulers, being the price of blood, as they called it, they would not put into the Lord's treasury, but with it purchased this field; wherefore it was called "ACELDAMA, or *The field of blood.*" Acts i. 18, 19; Zech. xi. 12, 13. It was then appropriated as a place to bury strangers, from which the burial-ground for this purpose is, in some cities, called the *Potters' field.* Matt. xxvii. 8. The spot is still used by the Armenians for a grave-yard. It is now about 190 feet long and 70 broad, and is called *Campo Sancto.* It is surrounded by a wall, and is in fact a vast vault arched over, into which bodies are lowered through seven apertures from above.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord: I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. *"The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., SEPTEMBER 15, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 17.

From the Prophetic Expositor.

The House of the Lord.

"In my Father's house are many mansions,—if it were not so, I would have told you: I go to prepare (or procure) a place for you."—John xiv. 2.

This house cannot be located in the heavens, far beyond the burning orbits of the flashing stars, for "whither I go ye cannot come." This bright earth is waiting for its fiery ordeals of purification, when the voice of God shall again pronounce it very good, for "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth." This then is to be the home of the redeemed, curtained by sky and cloud.

We find a type of the house of God in the granite pillow of Jacob, erected between Beersheba and Haran, on which the weary traveler dreamed of the ladder leaning against the clouds, with angels passing up and down, to and from the earth, while above it stood the form of Jehovah, telling him of his inheritance in language thus, "The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee." Surely there was something tangible there as well as in the comforting assurances that followed. "And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. And he was afraid and said, How dreadful is this place, this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven. And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it," and said, "This stone which I have set for a pillar shall be God's house." And there the anointed stone remained for a memorial, the first symbol of the house of the Lord; and afterwards came the tabernacle in the wilderness, with the ark of the testimony, the altar, the incense, the offerings, the laver, the oil and the mercy-seat.

"And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony." Still

further down the stream of time, on the bright summit of Mount Moriah, the temple arose under the auspices of Solomon. Day after day it silently progressed without the sound of an ax, a hammer, or any iron tool to ring through its holy walls. Block after block of white marble, was placed each above the other. There were the candlesticks, the lavers, the censors, the basons, and the altars of gold. And when the vast edifice was complete, they carried the ark, and the tabernacle which Moses had pitched, and all the vessels that were for the ministration to the sacrifices of God, and removed them to the temple. And they set the ark between the two cherubim, and beneath their outspread wings. And when the work was complete, a soft, dense cloud came down and overshadowed it, the curtain of the Eternal which he spreads around his sanctuary.

It was at once dark and luminous,—the darkness was awful and majestic, for "He maketh darkness his secret place, his pavilion round about him," and yet he dwelleth in light inaccessible; and through the cloud was visible the bright waves of brilliancy as clear as his acceptance of the offering.

For years they there worshiped the God of their fathers; they brought offerings of flesh and oil, morning and evening oblations; clouds of incense daily floated upwards, far through the blue ether from altars erected in honor of the King of kings; their feasts were kept, their meat offerings and their drink offerings prepared, according to the mandates of the Lord, and the God of heaven threw his protecting arm around his children.

Behind the sacred veil was the ark of his covenant, the glory of the shekinah shone on the mercy-seat, the cloud of omnipotent love attested to the presence of Jehovah, and threw around the altar a supernatural sanctity. In the Jewish records were the histories of their past preservation, the clouds and flashing flames of Sinai were there, the pomp and glory of Horeb were unforgotten, and yet they wearied of the service of God, diso-

beyed his prophets, worshiped idols, and profaned the holy ordinances of the Lord.

"Moreover, all the chief of the priests and the people transgressed after all the abominations of the heathen, and polluted the house of the Lord, which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, * * * because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place. But they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, until there was no remedy. Therefore, he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young men or maidens."

They burned the temple of the living God, after it had stood 470 years, 6 months and 10 days. Years before came the clear prophecy of Jeremiah, saying, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Because ye have not heard my words, behold I will send and take all the families of the north, and Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and I will utterly destroy them. * * * Moreover, I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones and the light of the candle. And this whole land shall be a desolation and an astonishment, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 years." But they heeded not the prophetic voice of warning, and the enemy came, and desolated the land of Judah, and took her children captives, and carried them away into the city of Babylon, there to serve a haughty and oppressive ruler. Well might they sit down in despair beside the clear waters of the Euphrates, and hang their harps on the mournful willows. And then the oppressors called for one of the songs of Zion, and mournfully they replied, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." They had no desire to forget their loved city; they loved it in the days of its prosperity, when it was bright with palace and temple, with towers and domes, and sanctified with burnt offerings. Oh, could they love it less now that the foot of the invader had polluted the Holy of holies, and the hand of the desolator had laid low her towers and minarets, prostrated her altars, and removed her offerings? For 70 years the dark chains of slavery held them in bondage, until the Medes and Persians wrested the Babylonian scepter from the impious prince, removed his diadem,

and laid him low, slain by the edge of the bloody cimeter.

For Israel's sake the Lord called Cyrus to the throne, and saith of him, "He is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, 'Thou shalt be built,' and to the temple, 'Thy foundations shall be laid,'"—even as foretold by Isaiah 140 years before the temple was destroyed. And Cyrus, in the first year of his reign issued a decree for the return of the Jews, and the rebuilding of the temple; thousands returned and laid the foundations, but the edifice was not completed until the reign of Darius the Persian, (successor of Darius the Mede,) and the feast of unleavened bread was then at hand, and all the people celebrated the festival, having purified themselves; they spared no expense but offered rich offerings to God, because he had led them again to the land of their fathers, and the laws of their people. But on the death of Onias, the high-priest, a quarrel arose respecting the high priesthood, which roused seditions, and Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, took the city by storm, some of the inhabitants he slew and led away captive 10,000. He plundered the temple, and took away the golden candlesticks, and the golden altar of incense, the table of shewbread, and the altar of burnt offerings, the veils of fine linen and scarlet, and "by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down."*

He dared to build an idol altar on the altar of Jehovah, and slew swine upon it, the abomination of the Lord. The temple of the Most High he dedicated to *Jupiter Olympus*, a god of heathen mythology. He compelled them to forsake the God of their fathers, and made them build temples and raise idol altars in every city and village, and offer swine upon them every day. And while Antiochus was amusing himself amid the luxurious groves of Daphne, Judas Maccabeus raised an army, defeated the generals of Antiochus, and went up to Jerusalem to purify the temple. But, O, with what pain did they look upon their loved city, with its gates burned, its altars polluted, its holy temple defiled and dedicated to a heathen god! already were the weeds of desolation growing in the deserted courts.

Josephus says, And this desolation came to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel which was given 408 years before. Judas "chose out some soldiers, and told them to fight against those guards that were within the citadel, until he should purify the temple." He carefully purged it, and brought in new vessels, the candlesticks, the table of

* Perhaps the prophecy alludes to the Romans, but it was also literally true of Antiochus Epiphanes. See Josephus—Barnes' Notes.

shewbread, and the altar of incense, which were of gold. He removed the polluted altar of burnt offerings, and built a new one of stones, which he gathered together, and were not hewn with tools, for, "if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, *thou shalt not build it of hewn stone, for if thou lift up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it.*"

They lighted the holy lamps and offered incense, and offered sacrifices on the new altar of burnt offerings, and the incense, and the smoke of the offering floated up before the throne of the Eternal, his house was cleansed and dedicated anew to himself. They celebrated its purification eight days, the walls around the city were rebuilt, and lofty towers reared to shield them from their enemies. And yet, O ye chosen people of the Lord, why will ye again wander into by and forbidden paths? Why forget the mercies of an omnipotent Father? Why stray from the fold of the Good Shepherd? Your Pharisees have quaffed deeply from the foul dish waters of Oriental philosophy. Your elders have wound around the law the misty vapors of their own traditions. Some have taught the way of obedience, but refused to walk therein. The rich have oppressed the poor, the priests have robbed the Lord of hosts in tithes and offerings—but very few remained true to their God and themselves.

Their long promised Messiah appeared as the ambassador of heaven, and the heir sent to the husbandmen. "And the Jews' pass-over was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem, and found in the temple those that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting. And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen, and poured out the money changer's money, and overthrew the tables, and said to them that sold doves, Take these hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise."

The house was again polluted, the heir was persecuted and reviled, his pure head was bound with a chaplet of thorns, and finally he was crucified between two thieves. Surely the cup of their iniquities was filled to the brim, and a flashing sword was suspended above the devoted city a whole year, in token of its destruction! And on the 8th day of the month Nisan, when the hour of twelve was chimed beneath the flaming glories of a midnight sky, there shone around the altar of the holy house, a brilliant light that symbolized for half an hour the torch of the invader. The massive gate of the inner court of the temple, which 20 strong men had with difficulty closed, opened slowly, and deliberately rolled back on its hinges as if to admit the legions of Titus. Chariots of war

and troops of soldiers in their armor were seen at battle in the evening sky, storming battlements of clouds, and burning gates of roses; there they were before the sun was down, surrounding cities apparently formed of gems,—rare workmanship, which mortal fingers could never imitate. But the inhabitants trembled not at these dread omens, nor yet at the prediction of Divine wrath uttered long before on condition of Israel's disobedience, (Deut. xxviii. 45-57,) which now burned above their heads with the fire of eternal fulfillment.

The Lord of hosts brought up against them the Romans from far, from the end of the earth, the legions of Vespasian rushed to the attack, swift as an eagle's flight, a nation fierce of countenance, for their long-continued cruelties to conquered nations had worn off the warm feelings of humanity, and they only presented an iron-faced band, stern and unyielding as the grim monster that always followed them. They stormed the walls of the city, and as the contest grew warmer, the dark fear of famine hung over the inmates, and yet they fought even when the fear became a dreadful reality, and they were starving by thousands.

Multitudes deserted their national standard, and fled only to be taken by the Romans, who took hundreds of them every day, and put them to torture, such as only Romish minds can conceive, and Romish fiends apply. They nailed them to crosses without the city, until room was wanted for the crosses, and crosses wanted for the bodies—crucified them even as they crucified the Son of the Highest.

While within the gates the dark pall of famine hung like the drapery of the tomb, and young men and maidens, old men and children were wrapped in its folds. But why linger on the dread scene?—why speak of delicate, loving mothers who fed upon their own offspring? Deut. xxviii. 3, 4, 57. After a siege of seven years, the Roman legions conquered the city, and Titus wished to spare the temple to grace his triumph, but a soldier tossed a torch through the golden window, and the flames curled upward through the sanctuary, the veil that covered the Holy of Holies, caught the flames, and the cedar and the oil were consumed, while the terrible element swept onward with a maddening fury that defied all efforts to subdue it.

Still the slaughter went on, Roman and Jew fell together, each over the other. And when the mantle of night was cast over the city, and the pale moon came up to view the combatants, she saw a fearful sight on the summit of Mount Moriah. There was the beautiful house of God wrapped in flames, while down the mountain flowed streams of

blood, vividly seen by the light of the devouring element.

Dark forms of the soldiery and Jews appeared on the fiery ground-work, struggling in mortal combat, while Jew and Gentile sank together amid the gurgling of blood, and the crackling of flames, the dull sound of the spears as they struck another heart, and the moans of the dying and wounded. Hundreds of thousands fell by famine, and by sword, and 97,000 were carried away captive. Luke xxi. 24.

The Roman eagle flapped its dark wing in triumph above the ruins of the devoted city, and "the abomination that maketh desolate" was in the holy place. On the summit of Mount Moriah arose altars dedicated to the fabled deities of the Romans. The *god of forces* was honored there, for sacrifices were offered to Mars, the god of war. The places once hallowed by the blessing of Jehovah; became scenes of the most degrading idolatry. "For upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator." The deed was done. Roman tyrants had simply become instruments in the hand of an insulted God. "From the daughter of Zion all her beauty is departed; her princes are become like harts that find no pasture, and they are gone without strength before the pursuer."

It was their dark crimes that dimmed their prosperity, and their punishment was deep and heavy. Isa. xxix. Jerusalem is in heaps, the plowshare has been literally drawn through the soil of Mt. Zion. "The Lord hath swallowed up all the habitations of Jacob, and hath not pitied; he hath thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah: he hath brought them down to the ground. * * * The Lord hath cast off his altars, he hath abhorred his sanctuary, he hath given up into the hand of the enemy the walls of her palaces."—The walls of the temple are laid low in the dust, not one stone left upon another.

Under Julian an attempt was made to rear again that majestic fabric, but balls of liquid fire rolled from the foundations and defeated every attempt of the workmen, for the times of the Gentiles were not fulfilled, and He hath not come whose right it is. "And I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more until he come, whose right it is, and I will give it him."

The mosque of Omar now points its minarets upward over the very spot on which the house of the Lord once stood. There it stands a towering memento of the defeat of European arms; for when the sons of Judah were peeled, and scattered to the four winds of the earth, a new religion arose, and Mahomet instilled the principles of the Koran into legions in the eastern world. The

armies of Europe for two centuries sought the plains of Asia Minor, to gain the Holy Land, and the sepulcher of the Prince of Peace.

The bravest of England's knights were there, led by the famous Richard Cœur de Lion, and allied to their standard were the French legions, the chivalry of Germany, Burgundy, and Flanders, together with the passionate Italians.—Thousands of banners floated in the breeze, the glittering arms of mailed knights flashed in the sunlight; there were Latin priests in gorgeous robes, carrying crucifixes in their hands, noble steeds were there, champing their bits, and tossing their proud heads impatiently.

On the hills beyond were the millions of the foe, from the tent of their leader floated one large banner of midnight blackness, fit omen of the slaughter that followed. The armies of Europe erected the cross, while the sons of Ishmael unfurled the crescent, and the charging squadrons thundered together in the first shock of fight: dark pools of blood respond to the first onset, darker grows the scene, and the warfare rages hotter, shields are torn and lances broken.—Soldiers why faint ye? But only the tide of crimson gore answers the question, breastplates are bruised, and helmets dented. There lies a brave young soldier who fell in fighting under the standard of the cross; the scarf is on his breast, and his last thought is of her who placed it there. Warrior! that stream ripples sweetly by, but thy lip shall never taste it, the same cold moonlight that silvers its foam, will glitter on thy shield when the finger of the angel of death has quenched the sparkle of thine eye. There is no eye here to pity thee, no gentle sister to weep over thee, no loving hand is here to ease the dying posture or bind up the gory wounds;—thou art doomed to lay thy young head upon the crimson sod, far from home and friends.

The fight still thickens, friends and enemies are falling fast, together the gray-haired sire and the bright-eyed stripling kiss the sod alike. And when the din of war is closed, that crimson field seems to mock the purple clouds above it; the shields and helmets of fallen knights glitter in the moonlight, and far across the plain as the eye can see, those brave warriors lie—the gorgeous prey of death.

The white plume and rich vest, the crescent and cross, the pointed saber and sharp stoghan are levelled there together. Ah! pale moon, dost thou shudder at the scene? and yet thou art destined to witness many such ere the chivalry of Europe will retreat, and leave the Holy Land beneath the waning horns of the crescent. For centuries the nations of Europe continued the warfare, their

treasuries were drained, the blood of their bravest sons was spilt,—their millions of mothers, wives, and daughters were enveloped in the dark pool of despair; and if we look to-day into the Pere la Chaise, the national cemetery of beautiful France—that “land of the viol and the vine,” we shall there find marble monuments reared against the sky, figured with the mystic symbols of war, in memory of those brave knights who lay mouldering on the shores of Palestine. The bones of many a noble troubadour are lying in the Holy Land, unblessed, unhonored and unknown.

In the great mausoleum of England, Westminster Abbey, where marble and brazen urns safely enclose the dust of England's great dead,—far through the shadowy aisles we see the grey cenotaphs of those crusading warriors, and on their fronts the figure of a knight with his knees bowed, as if in prayer, his hands crossed above his breast in memory of his vows, and the crest above his helmet emblazoned with a cross.

The Crusades are past, and the brave crusading knights are sleeping the long, last sleep which is only to be broken by the trump of the archangel. The land of Judah is under the cold tyranny of Gentile rule, while her children are wandering up and down the rocky paths of earth, with their sad eyes looking, hoping, and longing for the Messiah which they have rejected. They are here and there, and every where, with their brows branded by a darker mark than Cain ever wore!

They begin to feel that they have sold their birthright and gained not even the pottage. And yet, O, ye first chosen of the people of the Most High, a brighter era will soon dawn over your heads; ye are not cast off forever! “But it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths, for the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord; from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” When this is realized, then our Father's house with many mansions will be seen, filled with his glory.

LIZZIE ARMSTRONG.

For the Gospel Banner.

The Cross—its purpose.

THE REDEMPTION.

CONCLUDED.

Such is in brief the Redemption which is in Christ Jesus. Men accuse us of throwing overboard the Cross of Christ. This however be far from us—we cast away only the idols of men and the vain imaginations of fleshly minds. We glory in nothing but “Christ and him crucified.” Now and ever our “glorying is in the Cross of the Christ.” We however insist on knowing and understanding that which we believe and whereof we affirm. The teaching of Moses and the Prophets is that “Christ *must needs* have suffered, and risen from the dead.” Acts xvii. 3. The “Hope of Israel” shows that “It behoved the Christ to suffer, and rise from the dead the third day.” Luke xxiv. 21, 26, 44-47. A crucified Messiah may be to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Gentiles foolishness—but to those who are called, Christ is the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God.” 1 Cor. i. 17-25. Such a scheme is indeed Divine. A Christ without a Cross might be a human creation, but then it would be nothing for our needs. None but an all-wise God could have devised so complete a scheme—could have made so wicked a crime as “killing the Prince of Life,” have such varied relations and effects. It was a dire murder when the Jews slew “the Just One,” even though he placed himself passively in their hands—even though he laid down his life that he might take it again. Still the Father “made the wrath of man to praise him,” by allying and educing such beneficial results to and from it. Not that any virtue accrues to the Scribes, Pharisees, & Co. for this, as D'Israeli claims—far from it: the virtue and honor belongs only to him who persevered even to martyrdom, striving against sin, and to the Father who sent him. To most of those good results (apart from the fulfilment of prophetic testimony) the death by that physical cause, a *broken heart*, would have answered. But not to all, hence their *malice prepense* worked good, and gave honor to their despised Messiah.

Let us gather up the various threads which we have spun thus far, and let us see “the sum of the whole matter,” in a more condensed or *memoriter* form. We have not strictly confined ourselves to one topic, for the argument is variously related, both to person, mission, antecedents, and prospects, as to make us of necessity lengthy in matter. We have had to clear out obstructions in the way, to follow first one path of reasoning, then another, and to point out others again of correlative teaching,—still we hope our labors will have the effect of increasing the know-

ledge of all who have followed us therein. This is, then what we have found:—

That the sacrifices are *temporary expedients* to promote reconciliation to God—not in themselves having efficacious value, but teaching great lessons to all who believingly performed them. That they were not substitutionary, or expiatory, but indicatory of the mind of the offerer.

That Jesus, as the Lamb of God, *was not a vicarious victim* of sacrifice, but an *embodiment of certain divine characteristics*. And also that he was the *medium* of the covenant which God made with his called ones.

That the mission of Jesus furnishes no foundation for the supposition that God's justice was opposed to man's salvation, and needed appeasing by a substitutionary offering; but the contrary—that God was wooing the world to reconciliation.

That *all* which His justice *requires* is repentance, or confession, and forsaking of sins and rebellion.

[An India in Jehovah's empire is in a state of dire rebellion. He however does not proclaim retribution, massacre, and confiscation, and send out His armies to miserably destroy those wicked subjects. Far, far from this is His beginning. He sends once and again, yea oftentimes, His messengers with offers of mercy and peace. They are slighted by all but a few; still he sends; and at last despatches His Son to show them explicitly His character. The message which the Prince-Royal brings, (and leaves with his lieutenants on his return) is that the King is desirous to have them repent.—yea all, even the vilest—showing them how His heart yearns after His erring subjects, and promising forgiveness of all their vast sins when they yield up their weapons of rebellion; also a great reward to all who will take up arms in His cause and enter His army. How much in advance this is of all human proclamations we have present evidence. Yet if these are so powerful, so readily obeyed, and so much eulogised, how much more ought those to be wherein the grace is so much greater in degree. Again, it were just as competent and proper for statesmen of this age to insist upon the death of one of the blood-royal as a substitutionary victim for the rebellious Hindoos before terms of mercy should be granted, as for the blind leaders to aver that God's justice needed a vicarious substitute to enable Him to be just, yet the justifier of all who believe in Jesus. We commend this illustration to the consideration of all who believe that God so acted.]

That Christ is, to us a *Mercy-Seat*, whereon God has placed forgiveness and at-one-ment.

That he is in all things, salvation "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile"—the scheme of redemption being based on kosmical principles. The Law is therefore the shadow of all good things to follow.

[Hence the Jews are first in rank in national forgiveness. They have sinned, Isa. i. 4; v. 1-7, wandered from God, Isa. liii.; labored under the evils of sin, Isa. i. 5-8, and nationally died. Isa. v. 24, 25; Rom. xi. 17, &c. Therefore Jesus is to be their Savior, Acts v. 31; iii. 19, 25, 26; Matt i. 21, and Rodoeam, Micah iv. 6, 7; vii. 7-11, 16-20,

to save them from their sins, and to bring them back to their own land, which is equivalent to a resurrection from their dead state, Ezek. xxxvii.; Rom. xi.; on exactly similar principles and procedure to the saints. As all national history proves that there must first be a growth of an aristocracy, then of popular inheritance, so to the Kingdom of Heaven is God choosing out now His Household—the holy nation and peculiar people—amongst the Gentiles by the Gospel; next come the people of Israel in the same relationship. Christ will therefore save his people Israel when the number of the elect are made up, and when he reveals himself to them. The beautiful connection of the Cross of Jesus of Nazareth with this national redemption was unknowingly set forth by Caiaphas. John xi. 50-52.]

That *remission* is the *sending away of sins*, not of punishments. And is therefore applicable to both individual and kosmical states.

That the death of Christ *gave cause for removing the Law of Moses*, by his being cursed innocently. He therefore removed this First Covenant that he might establish the Better.

That his death dedicated and confirmed the Second Covenant with blood.

That by his removal of the Law and its rites, he broke down the partition-wall betwixt Jew and Gentile, laying in Immersion the broad platform of Faith to form one Body.

That with his own blood he entered once into the Holiest as a High Priest: and became the Mediator of the New Covenant, thus ensuring the Age-Inheritance thereunder.

That the blood of Christ has a moral cleansing effect—the heart filled with love to God has not room for sins. Thus are our consciences purged from dead works.

That by his perfection of character, and mortal struggle with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh. In this he became an example, that we should tread in his steps.

That the death of Christ was not a substitutionary appeasement of Divine wrath, because we are enjoined to a community therewith. Matt. xvi. 24, 25. And Paul, Moses (Deut. iv. 21, 22,) and others, were Cross-bearers.

That Jesus had perfect companionship with our nature, its temptations, trials, and sufferings—thus bearing our infirmities, and taking our sicknesses.

That as there are no eternal torments in store for the sinner, there was no need for Christ to expiate a (supposed) infinite offence.

That the penalty of sin is death, which penalty all *do* pay—hence *no* being can have become a substitute for the punishment. There is therefore no need for the "imputation of merits" of any person; nor is the transference made. All do, and must "answer in body for the things done in the body," each being tried for their own deeds and rewarded for their own attainments. Each person, like Abraham, has *his own* faith and

works imputed to him for righteousness, and his alone.

The Lord accepts the righteousness of all his saints, but punishes their transgressions. Psa. xcix. 8.

That man is a slave of sin, from the dominion of which Christ ransomed us by his blood, its moral action and result being described as a purchase. The Passovers are commemorative of this Ransoming deliverance.

That Ransom from the power of sin is preparatory to Redemption from the power of death, one means securing both.

That Love contemplated, incites to Faith in the promises.

The total silence of Scripture upon the doctrine of expiation, and the absence of all the theological terms, (as in the case of immortal-soulism,) is proof that the mind of God gave forth no such ideas—even were there no direct statements to the contrary.

Need we more? We think not. Much more might be said, and said more worthily; still we have written with all honesty of purpose, endeavoring to disentangle the Truth of God from at least one covering thrown over it by the Apostacy. Or, to recur to our opening metaphor, we have tried to print the Photograph of the Divine Character as we find it in His Word, apart from the disfigurements which popular credenda has thrown upon it. Whether as a simple Photograph, or viewed through the Stereoscope of Reason, the Divine Image is very lovely. If we have succeeded in our limning, the praise belongs not to us, but to Him. And we would that some one were found who would fill in the background of our feeble calotype into a beauteous painting. The subject is well deserving it. How brightly beams the loving countenance of our Father, irradiate with all the glories of Power, Justice, Mercy. The tinted rays of His character—Benevolence, Providence, Rectitude, Long-suffering, Forgiveness, Goodness, Truth,—impinged upon the Spectrum of His dealings with the children of men; how beautifully they glow! Let men speak to the fears of men, setting forth a God of implacable justice, moved inconsistently enough by a bloody sacrifice; we do not. Let them appeal to the fear of punishment, and their terrors of an eternal tormenting in hell;—we will not. Such an incentive may suffice for the slave-spirits of Egyptian superstition; but it is without effect upon free-born children of the Truth. They may assert that the principle of Love is not a motive power sufficient to win to obedience; we know better. Men who could unflinchingly face pain we have seen to weep at the record of the unsurpassed love which was expended even to death in the cause of his enemies. No, no, we know that

love is the strongest agent, the most excellent motive. Therefore we say with Paul, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or the sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us." And this is our strong confidence concerning him;—"We are persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing shall be able to separate us from the Love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Readers! We pray that you "may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ (which indeed surpasses knowledge,) that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God."

For the Gospel Banner.

"Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?"—Questions by G. B. Stacy.

REPLY BY J. M. STEPHENSON.

Question No. 11.—The throne of God is established forever in the heavens, where Jesus now sits, because "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."

Answer. This is true of the throne of universal dominion, but not the delegated throne to David and Solomon. 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. Paul says that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," Rom. ii. 16. The great God is the original judge, and Christ the mediator between God and man, the advocate before the Judge of the whole earth. It is only as agent, and that by Divine appointment that the Son shall judge, i. e. govern the world. It is evidently only in the sense of executing the decisions of the Supreme Judge, that all judgment is given into the hands of Christ. This is our Savior's own commentary upon the text quoted by S. John v. 26, 27. Please read these verses in connection. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. And hath given him (the Son) authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." Paul in Acts xvii. 30, 31, declares that God hath appointed a day in which he will judge (i. e. rule) the world in righteousness by that man (Christ) whom he hath ordained. The Great God decides, and Christ and the saints execute. The Son receives this honor of the Father, and then confers it upon the saints; hence they shall judge (rule) the world 1 Cor. vi. 2.

They shall execute all judgments written. Psa. cxlix. 7, 8, 9.

Question No. 12.—The throne of David in Jerusalem, at present overturned and trodden down, is

covenanted to Jesus as his own, and therefore he has promised to his faithful brethren who overcome, to give to them to sit down with him on *his throne*, "even as I overcame, and sat down with my Father on *his throne*."

Answer. He promises much more than the mere honorary position of sitting upon his own throne.

He will appoint them a kingdom as his Father will have appointed him, that they may sit upon thrones of their own, judging not only the twelve tribes, but the world. Luke xxii. 29, 30; Rom. xx. 4. They will not only possess thrones of their own, and judge the world, but they will reign with Christ for a thousand years. Rom. xx. 6, 7.

Prince Albert sits with Queen Victoria upon her throne; but is not a king—does not reign. Just so with Christ, he sits upon his Father's throne, but is no where represented as being a king *de facto*; but rather as a Prince, an expectant of a kingdom. Acts v. 31. He is no where represented as *reigning* upon his Father's throne; but rather as exercising the functions of a priest as the antitype of Aaron, who was not a king, and therefore could not represent a kingdom. But as the antitype of Melchisedec, who was a king and priest, he will be a priest upon his own throne, i. e. the throne of David. Proof Zech. vi. 12, 13; Jer. xxxiii. 14-26.

Question No. 13.—The throne of God belongs to the kingdom of God. The throne of Jesus to the kingdom of David, or of Israel.

Answer. The throne of universal empire, or the supreme throne of the universe, unquestionably belongs to the Supreme Ruler, but as has been abundantly, and repeatedly proved, the throne and kingdom of David, or of Israel, belonged originally to the Great God, and will when restored belong to him again, and when given to Jesus belong to him. God said concerning Christ and the kingdom of David, "I will settle him in my house and my kingdom forever."

Question No. 14.—The present occupation of the throne of God by Jesus, is because he is declared to be the Son of God with power, by resurrection from among the dead, whilst his future occupation of the throne of David is predicated upon the demonstrated fact that he is the Son of God."

Answer. Christ himself declared in A. D. 96, that the reason why he occupied, or rather sat upon, his Father's throne was because he had overcome; and promises all who overcome as he did, the privilege of sitting upon *his throne*. Rev. iii. 21.

The fact that he is the Son of God is given as a reason why he should sit upon David's throne, both in the covenant and in Gabriel's application of it, just as much as his being the Son of David. Indeed, the throne and kingdom of David and of God being identical, it was necessary to have a valid title that he should be the Son of both.

Question No. 15.—It is the province of the son of David to rule on the throne of his father David for 1000 years. Whilst it is the province of the Son of God to "take away the sin of the world," that is to bless, or save mankind, by turning every one of them from their iniquities."

Answer. According to the prophecies concerning the throne and kingdom of Christ, and the application of those prophecies in the New Testament, he was to sit on the throne of David both as the Son of God and as the Son of David. 2 Sam. vii. 12-16; 1 Chron. xvii. 11-14; Luke i. 31-34.

The above is a discrimination which no Bible writer has ever made, and which S. has no authority to make. S. speaks of Christ as having two distinct natures, or as being a duplex entity. How can he separate the unit personality of the Son of God and the Son of David? These are two relationships of one personality. These two were indissolubly joined together. Whatever he did, or will do, as the Son of David, he would do as the Son of God. He possessed these two fathers by natural genealogy. Luke traces his lineage back through David and Adam to God. Luke iii. 23-38; "which was the *Son of David*, * * * which was the *Son of Adam*, which was the *Son of God*." Job and his brethren were denominated the "*Sons of God*." Would S. speak of Job as doing certain things as the Son of man, and others as the Son of God? No. He possessed these two relationships contemporaneously. S's statement would be more consistent for a Trinitarian, or even for one who believes that man is a duplex of two men, one of whom is a part of God. But from one who believes in the unity of man it is unaccountable.

As the Son of God and of David, he will reign upon the throne of David *forever*—of his kingdom, (as the kingdom of David, of Jacob, of Israel,) there shall be no end. 2 Sam. vii. 12-16; 1 Chron. xvii. 11-15; Psa. lxxxix. 27-30, 34-37. David's throne as the throne of Christ, according to the last quotation is to exist co-extensive with the sun and moon, and days of heaven. Again in Isa. ix. 6, 9; Luke i. 31-33, Christ reigns by Divine appointment as Supreme King of earth, having unlimited power; but at the terminus of the thousand years he delivers up the kingdom to the Father, that he may be *all* in *all*, which plainly shows that God had not, during the independent reign of Christ, occupied this Supreme position. But having brought back this revolted world in allegiance to his Father, Christ will then subject himself to the Father, and reign as a subordinate king while the sun and moon endure, and while the days of heaven onward roll, or the ages of eternity continue. Christ's rule being Supreme during the thousand years, he will be a King of kings. Rev. xix. 16. Thus

kings will be his subjects, yet they will reign in subordinate positions. All who voluntarily subject themselves to the King of the Jews will be permitted to reign as subordinate kings. Psa. lxxii. 8-11; Rev. xxi. 24. Christ having voluntarily subordinated himself to the Father will be permitted to reign as a subordinate king, contemporaneously with the rulers of all the realms in Jehovah's vast empire, while of the Great God, as the Supreme Ruler, it may be said to all eternity, "WHO IS THE BLESSED AND ONLY POTENTATE, THE KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS." 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 24-28.

In the abstract relationship of Father and Son, there is no more hope for our fallen sinful race, as far as it exists between the Great God and his Son, the Christ, than that of any other father and son who have lived since the world began. The simple fact that he is the Son of God affords no hope of salvation whatever. Adam, Job, and his brethren were the Sons of God. Angels are the Sons of God, and shouted for joy when the earth and man was made. But were, and are they all Saviors? Every Christian is by promise a Son of God; but is he a Savior? Certainly not; not all at least. It is in his sacrificial nature as the Lamb of God that he taketh away the sin of the world. John i. 29. It is in his official character as the Jesus or Savior that he will save his people from their sins. Matt. i. 21. He was born the Son of God, but had no official character, in fact, until thirty years of age. As the Son of man he had power on earth to forgive sin. Matt. iii. 6. But all his offices inhere in Christ, in his unit relationship to David and God. If Christ "takes away the sin of the world," by blessing mankind; and that blessing consist in turning every one of them (i. e. of the world, of mankind) from their iniquities;—then universal salvation must legitimately and necessarily ensue. This is ostensibly S's meaning. If not, why italicize the phrase "turning every one of them from their iniquities." Grammatically, the pronoun *them* stands for the unlimited noun *mankind*, and the distributive adjective *every*, points out, or includes every individual of *them*—of *mankind*—which the writer uses synonymously with the world.

The plan of God relative to the salvation of the world is clearly and definitely expressed in the words of our adorable Redeemer—"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," John iii. 16. Thus, as far as every individual is concerned, the Son of God will only save those who believe on him. But he will save every obedient nation in the

future age, as well as every obedient individual in all previous ages; and ultimately, he will take away the great *leading, ruling sin*, (not *sins* mark you,) or *devil* of the world, from Eden's blooming bowers down to the closing struggle for the world's dominion, viz. rebellion—or lust of power; by *saving every individual man, and nation*, who and which will ground the weapons of rebellion, and take oath of allegiance to the Almighty Ruler and his Royal Son, and everlastingly destroying all *traitors and rebels* from the face of his empire. Then too will the effect of Adam's rebellion—"the sin of the world" be effaced from this—then revolted—now restored planet of ours. The curse will then be removed from the heaving bosom of this groaning earth; and the obedient of all ages be placed upon the blooming surface of the earth made new; and the Divine fiat again go forth proclaiming *earth, man* and all things *new and every good*; and the morning stars shall sing in concert, that our lost sister has returned; and sweeter and louder still shall rise the music of angels, while heaven's vast welkin shall ring, as all the Sons of God shall shout for joy; the last repentant prodigal has returned to his father's house where there is bread enough and to spare.

Question No. 16 is answered under No. 11.

Yours for the triumph of God's eternal truth, J. M. STEPHENSON.

[Will the Harbinger please copy.]

For the Gospel Banner.

Mark Allen's Western Tour.

CONTINUED.

The season in southern Ohio, I found to be about a month in advance of New England; vegetation looked green and promising, various trees were in blossom when I left Dayton, and I had really begun to flatter myself with the idea that I had got clear of the chilling snows of the spring of 1861. But before night, travelling in a North-easterly course, we run into a snow storm. When I reached Cleveland, at about 9 o'clock in the evening, it was chilly, freezing, and uncomfortable. Having heard of Bro. R. McLaughlan residing in Cleveland, I determined on stopping over night, and to take time in the morning to hunt him up, and learn his position, and if there were any others holding the One Faith in the city. I proceeded to the Hotel where I had previously stopped, and put up for the night; and having several hours in the morning before the departure of the cars East, I took a short look around the city, and afterwards found Bro. McLaughlan at his place of business. My interview with Bro. McL. was necessarily short, but agreeable. I found him to be an uncompromising believer of the Gospel, and with his

wife, I think the only representatives of the Abrahamic faith in Cleveland. From several circumstances I am led to believe that my stop at C. was somewhat providential; at all events it served to put a stop to further operations of that shameless imposter, John Williams. From Bro. McL. I learned that he had been for some time previous preaching among the brethren in Ashtabula and vicinity, and was well received by them, they probably not being aware of his true character. He was then in Cleveland, and Bro. McL. was about to assist him in giving a course of lectures in that city. But learning from me something of his character, and the time of his marriage to wife No. 2; * (a former wife still living in the old country;) and being aware of certain things that had transpired since Wm's. wife had been stopping in Cleveland, he became satisfied that J. W. was not the man for him to give countenance to, and so I informed him after I had left. Williams afterwards wrote to Bro. Fish of Dayton, offering his services there, which were declined. He finally abandoned Ohio, and returned to Canada with his wife.

Leaving Cleveland at 10 A. M. I proceeded on my journey, and reached Buffalo about 5 o'clock P. M., remained over night, leaving in the morning. I proceeded by way of Suspension Bridge to Hamilton, where I was obliged to wait some three hours, for the train to Toronto. The weather was very disagreeable, a heavy drizzle partly rain and partly snow. While waiting at Hamilton, not knowing of any brethren in the place, I thought I would hunt up an old friend I was acquainted with some 17 years ago, as Millerite, one that was considerably troubled with "Methodistical" notions. I found him, but regretted to learn that he had made no progress since that time, but had wandered still further into darkness, and was, as he informed me, as near a Mormon as anything. Very few that I was acquainted with in those days of darkness and confusion have made much progress; some have become Mormons, some Shakers, some Infidels, some have returned back to the old Babylonian folds, and some still wander about blindly in the mazes of Adventism, but a few have had the scales torn from their eyes, and their understandings have been enlightened by the "Word of the Kingdom." I reached Toronto between 4 and 5 P. M., and first found the location of Bro. J. Shapter, who after tea, conducted me to the residence of Bro. John Coombe, where I was most hospitably entertained during my sojourn in Toronto.

My arrival in Toronto was sooner by two

* J. W. is now in confinement in Toronto, awaiting his trial for Bigamy, at the Fall assizes.—M. A.

days than I had appointed, and than the brethren expected, hence there had been no preparation or arrangements made for me to lecture until the coming Sunday; but on the evening of my arrival I had the pleasure of meeting with a number of the brethren and sisters, who met together by appointment at the house of Bro. Coombe, for mutual edification and instruction out of the Scriptures. During the two following days, I had opportunity to look about the city, and mark as far as my recollection served, what changes had taken place in the past 17 years, as that number of years ago Toronto was for some time the scene of my labors, both by preaching and in connection with the press, in promulgating the doctrines of William Miller, J. V. Himes, J. Litch, *et al.* Those are times that I cannot look back to with any great degree of pride, and can only congratulate myself in the consideration of the fact that I was then but young, and I may say but a boy that had not reached years of discretion, which at the present time I trust I have. Some that I knew at that time still remain in Toronto, but I found them in not much better position now than then, and without any inclination to investigate with regard to the great truths we were about to present for their consideration.

The Lectures commenced on Sunday forenoon, in the Old Mechanics' Institute, where the brethren usually meet for worship, and were continued in afternoon and evening. After the evening meeting the brethren remained to bread bread, and Bro. Milne, an aged brother, presided; and as the old man in his simple style administered the ordinance, it carried me back in imagination to the early times, when a few humble men and women were assembled together in some upper room, away from the busy world, and without ostentation, pomp, or display, in simplicity partook of those emblems which aid the eye of faith to look back to him, who though rich, for our sakes became poor, and whose body was broken and blood spilt for us; and forward to the time when in his kingdom, they who suffer with him here, shall be glorified together, and eat and drink with him at his table in his kingdom. I lectured again on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday evenings, and three times on the following Sunday. The subjects of the lectures, and their order, were the same as at Dayton, with the exception of the last one, which was omitted, as there was one evening we could not have the Hall, as was intended, it being occupied for other purposes. The lectures were well attended by attentive and intelligent audiences, and I trust that they were beneficial in bringing back into fellowship and communion some who had been ali-

enated by the deceitful and wicked course of John Williams. There had been a large congregation of professed believers of the Gospel in Toronto; whether all had been intelligently instructed in the Word is not for me to say; subsequent developments would serve to fasten conviction on the mind that they had not. He that had been instrumental in gathering them, also scattered them abroad, holding as he did the truth in unrighteousness, being led captive by fleshly lusts. The number of those who had set their faces against the evil course of John Williams, and still maintained worship as a church, was I think between twenty and thirty. Those of the better minded having seen plainly manifested the corruption of J. W. were gradually uniting themselves with the church; some one or two had already come forward and taken part with them when I arrived, and some while I was there, and others I have learned since I left. I think that nearly all who was connected with the church under Williams, were out to hear the lectures, and seemed much interested in the same; and I trust that all who have intelligently obeyed the Gospel, and really love the truth in Toronto, will soon be united in one body, in harmony not to be broken in upon by another grievous wolf in sheep's clothing.

On Monday morning, April 29th, I bade adieu to Toronto, and leaving behind the friends we had so lately become acquainted with, and who had treated us with so much kindness during our brief sojourn, took the steamer for Lewiston, and thence proceeded by way of N. Y. Central R. R. to Rochester, where I stopped over night with Bro. Brown, making a call in the evening on our aged Bro. McMillan, who is and has been for some 8 or 9 years past a staunch defender of the One Faith, in evil as well as good report. I left Rochester Tuesday forenoon, proceeding on my journey eastward, and stopping over Tuesday night at Albany, and Wednesday night at Worcester, with Bro. Gerald and family, I reached home at Woburn, Thursday P. M., after an absence of about eleven weeks.

MARK ALLEN.

Woburn, Aug. 30th, 1861.

Scripture God-breathed.

Truth has a wonderful freshness when it is drawn directly from the Word of God. "All Scripture is *God-breathed*:" such is the simple meaning of the one word which we expand into "*given by inspiration of God*." When we read the Word of God with faith, we feel that breath of God moving upon the soul. How refreshing, how restorative to the fainting spirit, how quickening to all the faculties, how powerful in *sanctifying* efficacy (John xvii. 17,) that breath of God

which moves in and through the Scripture,—"all Scripture!"

Holy men of God spake as they were moved by this divine afflatus. All Scripture (*all the writing*) was thus breathed of God. It is this which makes these records "living oracles," and the Bible "the word of life." Jesus *breathed* on the disciples, and said unto them, "receive ye the Holy Ghost." Then followed the wonders of Pentecost. And Jesus still breathes on us in his word. The Bible is the word of Christ. "The words that I speak unto you," he says, "they are spirit,"—breath, the breath of God,—and consequently "they are life." In and from the Bible is the perpetual *emphusesis*, (as Origin called it, in imitation of the Greek word and John xx. 22.) the *breathing* of Christ on his disciples and the communication of the Holy Ghost. In intimate, believing contact with the word, read, heard, and meditated upon, the church and the individual soul feels the breath of Christ, receives the Spirit, and finds a perpetual renovation of life, power, and joy.—*Tract Journal*.

For the Gospel Banner.

A Few Thoughts on 1 Thess. iv. 13-17

"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

This part of the divine testimony has been introduced as proof that the saints at the time of Christ's second coming will be caught up to meet him in the clouds of heaven; that is, the physical clouds of the atmosphere. This hypothesis, however plausible, is not sustained by the Word of God. The Word most clearly shows that they are not caught up into the clouds of heaven, but are caught away *in clouds*, that is, they are taken away together as a people, a multitude. Our present version reads as follows: "When we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord," (verse 17.) Our version has added one word to the Greek here. Instead of its reading "in the clouds," it is *en nephelais*, "in clouds," and not "in the clouds." They are then caught away *in clouds*, such as Paul alluded to when he called the believers a "cloud of witnesses." Heb. xii. 1.

Jude alludes to another multitude, and calls them "clouds without water, carried about of winds," Jude 12. Hence when Paul says they are taken away in clouds, it is evident he meant the multitude of believers should be caught away to meet the Lord.

Another point is the phrase "caught up." This is supposed to teach that the saints are to be taken up into the sky. But the Greek word *arpazo*, has no such meaning as caught up. That little word *up* is added. Green defines the word as follows: "to take away by force, snatch away, Mark xiii. 19; John x. 28, 29; Acts xxiii. 10; Jude 23." I have just examined Donnegan, and Grove, and they define the Greek word the same as Green. I might show the impropriety of the present translation in many instances, but enough has been said to call attention to the principal. Hence the text stands in the Greek literally—"Then we which are alive and remain, shall be taken away in clouds with them to meet the Lord in atmosphere, and consequently we shall always be with the Lord."* The saints living and dead will be taken away in clouds, in atmosphere, that is, removed through air to Jerusalem, where they gather to meet Jehovah's royal Son.

Another text adduced to sustain the assumption that the saints will be first transported to the sky, and return with him, is Zech. xiv. 5. But the grammar forbids this applying to Jesus at all, coming with his saints. The saints in other words are not to come with Jesus, but with the Jews. Let us read it. "And YE shall flee to the valley of the mountains * * * yea, YE shall flee like as YE fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, King of Ju lah, and the Lord my God shall come, and all too saints with THEE," not with Jesus, but YE, the ones, he is addressing—the saints are to come with them. This text then is directly against the skyward view, and shows that the *saints are not to come from heaven with Christ*, but are to come with the *ye* here specified. The saints will be taken away in the air, both dead and living ones, but it lacks proof that they will ever leave the earth to do that even, for it will be just as true that they will be taken away, and not leave the earth, and yet be in air or at nospere, as though they were 40 miles high.

The foregoing we submit for investigation, remarking, however, that the righteous shall never be removed, but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth, Prov. x. 30;—which shows that the saints cannot leave the earth for some fairy climes above. Search and see if this is so. H. V. REED.

* This expresses the full force of the Greek, though a few little words may be added to it to make it euphonic.

For the Gospel Banner,

Domestic.

A RECEIPT FOR MAKING TATTLERS.

Take a handful of vine called Run-about; the same quantity of a root called Nimble-tongue; a sprig of the herb called Back-bite; a table spoonful of Don't you tell it; six drachms of Malice; a few drops of Envy;—which can be purchased in any quantity at the shops of Miss Tabitha's Tea-table, and Miss Nancy Night-walker;—put these ingredients all into about seven qts. of the Spirit of the world, stir them well together, and simmer them for half an hour over the fire of Discontent, kindled with a little Jealousy; then strain it through the rag of Misconstruction, and cork it up in the jug of Malevolence; hang it upon a skein of Street-yarn; shake it occasionally for a few days, and it will be fit for use.

Use: It is employed by many that are journeying to the land of Hades. If you persevere in its use, it will be a sure assistant to that country.

Dose: A few drops. To be taken just before walking out; and the subject will be enabled to speak all manner of evil, and that continually.

Medicinal properties: It is Sudorific, Silagogue, Rubificient and Escharotic.

Note: It is not necessary to increase the dose, as a drop or two now and then will be just as efficient. You will just as certainly reach the place, as though you *doubled* and *trebled* the dose. ALUMNS.

An African Idea about the Dead.

"When a slave-trader visited him, (Matiamvo,) he took possession of all his goods, then after ten days or a fortnight, he would send out a party of men to pounce upon some considerable village, and having killed the head-man, would pay for all the goods by selling the inhabitants. This has frequently been the case, and nearly all the visitants he ever had were men of color. On asking if Matiamvo did not know he was a man, and would be judged in company with those he destroyed, by a Lord who is no respecter of persons, the ambassador replied: "we do not go up to God as you do, we are put into the ground." I could not ascertain that even those who have such a distinct perception of the continued existence of the departed spirits, had any notion of heaven; they appear to imagine the souls to be always near the place of sepulture."—*Extract from Dr. Livingston's Travels in Africa.*

Correspondents will please exercise the grace of patience; we cannot serve all at one time. We shall insert all that we can consistently for the benefit of our readers.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

[B. WILSON, Ed.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., OCTOBER 1, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 48.]

For the Gospel Banner.
The Times.---No. 1.
 BY L. H. CHASE.

It is a misfortune, as far as human approbation is regarded, for any person to have to censure the times in which he lives: for in censuring the times, it is not the seasons of the year, but the people who live in the times, that are implicated. The political affairs of the nations are approaching some momentous crisis. The Lord will ere long avenge the infidelity, ingratitude, injustice, and blasphemy of the nations, so long visited with his oracles. He that pleads the rights of men, and descants upon the political sins of tyrants of the earth, even though all the signs of the times sustain him, is not, however, exempt from the censure of those who have the people in keeping for their own interest and behoof. Much less can he expect an exemption from contumely and reproach, who implicates by hint, allusion, or accusation, direct or implied, that the religious teachers and their pupils are generally out of, and far from, the way of godliness. The religious times have become irreligious, and it is a question of no easy solution whether the religious state of the aggregate mass of the inhabitants of this country is more abhorrent to Christianity than the despotism and ignorance of Mahometanism is to the sound faith and practice of republicanism. But waving this question, we may safely say, that, although the mildness of our laws has taken from the priest, and the religious tyrant, the sword and the fagot, yet the press and the tongue are incessantly employed in turning the ears of the people from truth, and in criminating them who would rescue the conscience from the captivity of those who have long had it in their keeping. To speak of the times is, with many, equivalent to speaking against them; for they make the *times*, and if the creature be disparaged the creator feels himself insulted.

rider through all sorts of roads with more ease and respectability, than the doctrine of *metaphysical regeneration, or spiritual operations*. Some holy ghost is the soul of every popular sermon, and the essential point in every evangelical creed. If salvation were proposed to mankind upon condition that they must believe that they can do nothing, and that "the *Holy Ghost*" (I use their own phrase. It is their own: for God's Spirit was never called a *Ghost*, by any Apostle or Prophet, or any divinely instructed person,) will when he pleases, and not till then, fall down upon them, and make them new creatures by convincing them of sin, righteousness, and judgment; these notions could not be more frequently asserted, more zealously propounded, nor more strenuously defended by those who claim to be evangelical preachers, nor more greedily devoured by their deluded admirers.—I say *deluded*, for every man who supposes he was converted to God by the literal descent of the *Holy Spirit*, or by its naked influence upon his spirit, is certainly as deluded as the followers of Joseph Smith, who believe in his golden bible, or the plates of *Nephi*. Many of those visionaries are good citizens, kind friends, and benevolent neighbors, and withal *pious* in their way. So are the Mormons, the Shakers, and the disciples of Jemima Wilkinson. Others of them are evidently animal men and women. But we care not what their seeming devotion, nor their decent morality may be. Believing the testimony of God, we must pronounce them deluded. For in the New Testament no man is represented as converted by the descent, or physical influence, or internal operation of the Holy Spirit on his mind. Not one. Nay, it is positively and emphatically taught there, that "the world," or unconverted men, "cannot receive the Holy Spirit;" and it is *never promised, but to the believers*. But in the rage of sectarian proselytism, "The Holy Ghost" is an admirable contrivance. Every qualm of conscience, every new motion of the heart, every strong feeling or thrill,—all

There is no hobby which has carried his

with whom God's first great covenant of promise was made, on which the hope and faith of Israel was based. After God had promised him the land of Canaan, as an everlasting possession, he sojourned therein as a pilgrim and a stranger. Previous to this, his kinsman Lot had separated from him and taken up his abode in Sodom, one of the cities which was afterwards destroyed by fire from heaven. During the period of Lot's sojourn in Sodom, certain kings made war against the king of Sodom, and took all the goods of Sodom and Gomorrah, and took Lot, Abraham's brother's son, and his goods, and carried him away captive. Now what did Abraham under these circumstances? Did he fold his arms and say, I am only a pilgrim and sojourner on the earth, I have therefore nothing to do with human governments; I cannot interfere in this matter, Lot must remain a captive, and "Satan must fight his own battles?" Not so. When Abram heard of the affair, we learn that he put himself at once at the head of an army; "he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan, and he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them, and pursued them unto Hobath. * * * And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people." Now let us bear in mind these facts, that Abraham was at this time under the promise, and a subject of the One Faith; and that the kingdoms whose battles in part he assisted to fight, have not left on record so enviable a reputation as some others that might be mentioned, and then ask the question, was Abraham justified or condemned for the course he had pursued? From the record we learn, that God did not condemn Abraham, nor renounce him, on account of his taking carnal weapons and using them in defence of right, for we read, that Melchizedek, King of Salem, and priest of the Most High God, blessed Abraham on his return from this slaughter, and said, "Blessed be Abram of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth," and blessed be the Most High God which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And Abram gave him tithes of all." Bear in mind, this Melchizedek was a type of the Messiah, the mighty one, who is hereafter to conquer peace, and sit as a priest upon the throne of his father David. The history of this whole affair may be found in the 14th chapter of Genesis. By this we learn that in the case of Abraham, a Military calling was not incompatible with the faith of him who kept three hundred and eighteen servants trained to arms. Jesus once said to the Jews, "If ye

were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham," John viii. 39. By this it may be safely inferred, that being placed in circumstances similar to those in which Abraham was placed, we should do as Abraham did, if we were the children of faithful Abraham, and we should be justified in so doing, as Abraham was blessed of the Most High God.

2. JOSEPH. We have given this illustrious personage a brief notice in the former article, and shall but briefly notice here, that he being Chief Administrator and Ruler of a great nation, second only to the King, was of necessity backed up and sustained by the sword, having under his command the military forces of the Kingdom, and holding in his hands the power of life and death; a position which he could not possibly have held, if bearing the sword was incompatible with that One Faith, which the apostle tells us plainly he was a witness for, especially as the Egyptians were Gentiles, and as such aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenant made with Abraham.

3. By Faith, under the leadership of Joshua, a military expedition was successful, and the walls of Jericho fell down.

4. GIDEON, BARUCH, JEPHTHAH, and SAMSON, noted Military Chieftains, are presented to us as examples of who were subjects of the ONE FAITH.

5. DAVID was a mighty and valiant warrior, and

6. SAMUEL took in his hands a carnal weapon, and therewith hewed Agag in pieces. See 1 Sam. xv. 33.

But says an objector, this was in Old Testament times. Very true, but I am examining it through New Testament mediumship, such as the Apostle has presented in the 11th of Hebrews. He calls these persons by name, as subjects of the Faith, and tells what they did, by faith; he does not say they were sinners in so doing. He says, "Gideon, Baruch, and Samson and Jephthah, David also, and Samuel, and the prophets, who through FAITH subdued Kingdoms," (this required military skill and the use of carnal weapons,) wrought righteousness, * * * out of weakness became strong; waxed valiant in fight,"—(by faith; and some of them fought for Gentile governments,) "turned to flight the armies of the aliens." This Apostle tells us, that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, (the Old Testament,) might have hope." The Apostle holds up these Military heroes, these smiters with carnal weapons, as bright examples to us, and says, "seeing we also are encompassed about with

so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and run with patience the race set before us, looking unto Jesus the beginner and finisher of our faith. * * * Ye have not resisted unto blood, striving against sin," Heb. xii. 1-5. Some had resisted unto blood in past time.

But as some have such an antipathy to bringing forward Old Testament illustrations, under certain circumstances, we will present a few from the New. Upon a certain occasion when Jesus Messiah had entered Capernaum, a Centurion, (or captain of a company of 100 soldiers,) came to him and besought him, in behalf of a servant, sick with palsy, that he would just speak one word only and his servant might be healed. This was a most fit opportunity for Jesus to reprove the man on account of his Military calling, and to have denounced war, and those engaged in it, as he denounced other sins; but he did not so; on the contrary, the language he used upon that occasion was such as to lead us to suppose, that Jesus did not consider a Military calling incompatible with faith or an entrance into the Kingdom of God;—for he said to them who followed him, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel, and I say unto you, that many shall come from the east, and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of the heavens, but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out," Matt. viii. 9-13.

From the record given by Luke of John the Baptist, "a man sent by God" to prepare the way of Messiah, we read, that he exhorted those who came to his baptism "to bring forth fruits meet for reformation;" and that certain ones came to know what they should do, in order to that end; when "the soldiers came and demanded of him, saying what shall we do? John answering them, said, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse falsely, and be content with your wages," Luke iii. 7-14. It seems very plain that if John had deemed a Military calling to be incompatible with a thorough reformation, and the position of children of Abraham, he would have exhorted those soldiers to abandon their calling, and not to content themselves with the wages of a soldier, which necessitated their bearing the sword in support of that government from whom those wages were received. With regard to the expression "do violence to no man," which some may contend would preclude their use of arms in warfare, it may be well to say, that such was not the meaning of John, as the rest of the language clearly shows: for so long as they were content in receiving soldiers' wages, they must be content in doing soldiers' duty. The Greek word (Δια-

σείω, *Diasciao*;) signifies primarily to shake violently, also to terrify by threats; or to extort money or goods, etc., by violence or threats. Hence he teaches soldiers that if they would bring forth fruits meet for reformation they must not practice extortion, nor terrify by unlawful threats, or violence, not that they must lay down their arms and abandon their calling.

Let us notice next, the case of the first Gentile to whom the Word of the Kingdom was specially sent after the ascension of Messiah—Cornelius, "a Centurion of the band (or company) called the Italian, a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, and prayed always." This Cornelius was the commander of a hundred Roman soldiers; and yet feared God, and God heard and sent Peter to him to tell him words whereby he should be saved, and all his house. That word was not that he was engaged in a calling antagonistic to Christianity; which he must abandon in order to his salvation. No! That word was the Word of the Kingdom, the word of Faith, that faith by which devout Military leaders had in past times subdued Kingdoms, wrought righteousness, waxed valiant in fight, and put to flight armies. We have no intimation that Peter said aught against the calling of Cornelius, or instructed him to give up his sword, or abandon his leadership of Roman soldiers, and until this can be proved by valid testimony, it will be but folly to undertake to prove a Military calling to be incompatible with Christianity, in the face of so marked a case as that of Cornelius, the devout and the Christian Centurion, one of the first-fruits of the Kingdom's heirs from among the Gentiles.

We next call attention to Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul * of Cyprus, called in our version, the Deputy, a prudent man, who believed under the preaching of Paul, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord, notwithstanding Elymas, the sorcerer, had sought by his subtle arts to turn the Proconsul from the faith. See Acts xiii. 4-12. This Sergius Paulus, as a Roman Proconsul, was invested with consular powers, being chief magistrate of the province, and having command of the Military force, his calling therefore was a Military one. And the question here to be considered, is, was this calling incompatible with the faith he professed after hearing the preaching of Paul, or was it necessary that he should resign his official position, and disband, or give up the command of his army? Is it not reasonable to suppose that if it were so there would be some intimations of it? There is no evidence

* ἐνθουατος, *enthupatos*, a Proconsul.

presented to lead us to suppose that his relation to the Roman government, and the army, was any different after his conversion than before, any further than the One Faith made him, who was already prudent, a more prudent and exemplary man. From other teachings of the Apostle, which have been often quoted to sustain a doctrine congenial to the feelings of some than maintaining the integrity of a liberal and constitutional government, we may safely conclude, that it was not obligatory upon either Cornelius or Sergius Paulus to abandon their calling upon coming into the faith. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called. Art thou called being a slave, (*δουλος, doulos,*) care not for it." If there are slaves, there must be masters, and masters may be called as well as slaves. Presidents also may be called, Kings, Governors, Military leaders may be called; and is not either of these latter callings as honorable as that of owning and commanding slaves, black or white. Honorable mention is made of Cornelius and Sergius Paulus while following a Military calling; one was just and devout, the other prudent. "Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God." 1 Cor. vii. 20-24.

I have asked the question, "Is a Military calling incompatible with Christian character?" not because I intend to adopt such a calling, but to ascertain whether the Scriptures sustain certain views set forth by some. My honest conviction is, that they do not, and that such a calling is not incompatible with Christian character. These convictions are in opposition to certain prejudices and notions I had partially imbibed, more from human sympathy than argument. I yield prejudice and sympathy to Scripture testimony, and set before the mind of the candid and honest readers of the *Banner*, some of the Scripture testimony which has served to fasten conviction upon the mind, and which I am confident fully sustains me in the conclusion to which I have come. It is for them to treat with candor the arguments, and reasonings presented, and determine for themselves whether they are sound and valid.

II. MAY IT NOT BE A DUTY UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES FOR A CHRISTIAN TO TAKE THE SWORD?

Our conviction is that it may, and we will endeavor to present a few of the circumstances in which Christians may be placed, under which they must either bear the sword themselves, or give countenance and support to those who do.

Under the present dispensation, the religion of the Bible is not to be promulgated by the sword, and if an individual is called upon to suffer for the faith, he must be willing to

submit because he suffers for righteousness' sake. The apostle Peter says, "rejoice in as much as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings. * * * If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye. * * * But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an EVIL-DOER, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yet if (any man suffer) as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God on this behalf," 1 Peter iv. 13-17. They who speak evil of dignities, resist the powers and ordinances established by God, trample on and defy law and order, and spread terror and desolation abroad by reason of their wicked works, and are evil-doers. For the terror of such, and for the avenging of the outrages they may commit upon us, God has ordained Magistrates to bear the sword of justice, and of vengeance, for the execution of THE WRATH upon them that do evil. And as we have previously shown that it is not incompatible with the faith for Christians to become rulers or magistrates, so it must become the bounden duty of the Christian ruler to command the bearing of the sword for the enforcement of the laws, for the preservation of the peace and the civil rights of the community; and to this end he beareth not the sword in vain.

Again, we are in duty bound to give aid, and support the bearing of the sword, although we may never take a weapon in our hand. "For this cause, says the apostle, pay tribute." Money furnishes those sinews of war without which the raising and equipping of large armies would be impracticable. Every vote cast for a civil officer, every dollar paid for tax, tribute, or revenue, is for the maintenance of powers and authorities that are necessarily backed by the sword, and we must pay tax or tribute, notwithstanding we may know that that tax or tribute is levied for the express purpose of equipping armies and carrying on a war. It is lawful to pay tribute to Cesar; we must render to Cesar Cesar's things. Cesar requires obedience to laws, as well as the means to enforce them. Again, that power may require our individual and physical aid. The representative of the government may wish to arrest an evil doer, and need our physical assistance to accomplish it, and under those circumstances call on us in the name of Cesar, (or of the power,) to assist him. Shall we refuse, and by refusing suffer an evil-doer to escape from the vengeance God has ordained for such? and if we are called upon to answer to the authority for refusing to render obedience, can we set up as a defence that we have conscientious scruples against assisting in the preservation of the peace, and sustaining of authority? Surely such a conscience must be an evil one. And if we are made to suffer

the penalty of disobedience, can we claim that we are suffering for righteousness' sake? Again, a lawless mob may threaten the destruction of the town or city in which we dwell, or some portion of the same, and the administrators of the law be obliged to call upon all good citizens, and ourselves among the number, to aid in quelling the same. Shall we say we are not citizens of this world, and have nothing to do with upholding Gentile authority? I think we should not do the works of Abraham, if under such circumstances we resisted the powers. The language of Jesus in such a case would be applicable to us; "he that is not for me is against me." Placed in such a position, we *could* occupy no middle ground.

But let us consider other circumstances where wicked and ambitious men rise up in rebellion against a constitutional and liberal government, designing to subvert and completely overthrow that which under God is the conservator of our liberties, both civil and religious;—men also who for their own personal aggrandizement would deprive us of our dearest rights and privileges, to extend terror and misrule over communities where hitherto law and order had prevailed, and peace and prosperity smiled; and we should be called upon by the authority of that government which has protected us, and under which by the blessing of God we have been greatly prospered, to aid in the maintenance of *its* authority by bearing *its* sword for the punishment and overthrow of evil doers,—(the sword of the government is its armies, and they are made up of individual men,) would it not be our duty to respond to the call of that government and obey its command? If we resisted the government under such circumstances, should we not resist the ordinance of God? If the torch were applied to *our* dwelling, (as well as our neighbor's in the faith or out,) if our fair fields were laid waste by the desolating marauder, whom we refuse to resist, or aid the government in putting down, could we honestly, and with a good conscience, claim that we were suffering for righteousness' sake, and take JOYFULLY the spoiling of our goods? Think you we should be justified in thus refusing to aid the government that under God ministers to our good? If we should suffer the penalty for such refusal to obey, should we not justly suffer as evil-doers?

Lastly. If it be not duty under some circumstances for a Christian to bear the sword, was Paul justifiable in calling upon a Roman Military officer for the protection of the sword, when his life was threatened by vagabond Jews, and he was furnished with an armed battalion of 470 men for his escort to Cesarea? See Acts xxiii. 11-24.

But we must conclude; the great length of this article precludes the bringing forward of much in support of the views I have advocated which might otherwise have been presented. What I have presented, I have endeavored to set forth in a fair and candid manner, feeling assured that I have the truth and the argument with regard to the matter. In another article I purpose to examine those objections which are often urged against the views here advocated. And now in the language of Paul to the Ecclesia at Philippi, let me say, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things," Phil. iv. 8.

MARK ALLEN.

Woburn, Aug. 30th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

Pharisees.

Far back through the vista of centuries, amid the hills of Judea, and around the Holy Land, there lived a sect called Pharisees; a class of people zealous of the law, a class who stood apart from others, wrapped up securely in their own self-righteousness, rigidly exacting from others the "pound of flesh" under the cloak of zeal for the Lord and his cause. They were sanctimonious; they walked carefully around "the weightier matters of the law," and laid great stress upon some things that were easy of observance. They wove the traditions of men deeply in with the laws of God, and appeared fair unto men, but within were filled with hypocrisy and deceit. They did their good works to be seen of men, and gloried in their officious holiness and ostentatious deeds. They would not associate with others, because they were too holy to mingle with those outside of the bounds which they themselves had placed there. The bound heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, and laid them on other men's shoulders—burdens which they themselves would not so much as touch with their fingers. They shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; they devoured widow's houses, and made long prayers a seal to their villany. They paid tithes of mint, anise, and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law,—judgment, mercy, and faith. They could see no love or mercy in the word of God,—nothing but a vindictive vengeance for all except themselves.

They were whited sepulchres, appearing beautifully without, but filled with dead men's bones and all uncleanness. They were self-righteous, God-defying men, who longed for the "keys of the kingdom," that

they might close the door against every one whose views varied from their own. Upon this self-adoring sect the Lord Jesus pronounced *eight woes*,—a fearful condemnation falling from hallowed lips. They had listened to his teachings, but only to find an error there; they had heard his loving admonitions, but only in scorn; they had lingered near him, but it was to tempt; they had questioned,—but to betray him. They were too holy to heed the words of Jehovah's only Son, and upon their guilty heads he pronounced the fearful doom. They as a religious sect have passed away, their synagogues and house-tops are seen no more in the palm-shaded vales of Israel. Their long prayers and hymns echo no more over the hill-tops of Jerusalem; but is the race extinct? is not the taint of the serpent still nestling in the theology of the nineteenth century? Alas! that the world will still furnish those who claim the highest seat in the synagogue, and place a gold piece on the silver contribution plate, while "*they devour widow's houses*" with the moan of the homeless orphan still ringing in their ears. The Modern Pharisee will sign a subscription list for benevolent purposes; he will place a large sum to his name when he knows that the daily papers will find it, but have his hired servants received their dues? and how many hungry ones think you have passed in and out of his door, without being fed or clothed. Are there not still men in the world who love "the music of the dollar's chink" well enough to secure it at all hazards—well enough to grind the face of the poor, and clasp the gold tightly in their hands, (when they have secured all they can,) and go down the street singing,

"*Vain world, Adieu!*"

Alas! that the traits of the Pharisees did not perish with the sect. Alas! that sin walks the earth in gold and purple, and liveried crime sits in high places. The lofty church spire points daintily to the supposed heaven of the rich man, while the feet of honest penitence are stayed at the threshold. The cushioned seats of the beautiful cathedral of modern date, are burdened with the weight of respectability, broadcloth, and brocade—they worship the God of heaven "with their lips, while their hearts are far from him."

There are still those who stand in their own self-righteousness and say to God's humble ones "stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou;" who are only aware of their own importance, and if they ever thank God for anything it is because they "are not as other men are." Do they never think that such a course is repelling to those who would otherwise share in the hope of the gospel. They forget that he

whom they profess to follow alo "with publicans and sinners."

Beware then of the Pharisaic taint, especially we who are treading amid the dangers of the last days—we who are floating between whirlpools of destruction; in these days of corruption and deceit; of selfish wrangling about trifles, when the worship of Jehovah seems to consist merely in useless debate on the manner of that worship; in days when some are unwilling to worship *God at all*, because some one has *professed* to do it, who did not come up to their standard of faith. There are those who would not that christians should be with those outside the pale of the brotherhood even to do them good; they are zealous of the "traditions of the elders,"—traditions which selfish mortals have woven in with God's word, constituting *themselves* the judges as to whether others are sufficiently strong in the faith to partake of the symbols of the Lord's broken body and shed blood, forgetting that "to his own master he standeth or falleth."

Oh! beware, ye rigid sectarians, lest in the judgment the blood of another is found upon your garments; if your brother does not see the light as plainly as yourselves, *teach him in love*; wait patiently for him to grasp the truth, instead of driving him with the thunders of the law. Remember, we are nearing the last moments of the latter days; we can even now almost hear the notes of the judgment trump, while along our ranks is echoing the solemn watchword, "Behold, he cometh quickly." Let us then gird on our armour, and resist the temptation (so strongly offered by the enemy) to divide the hosts of God, by lines which have been drawn by frail humanity. Surely if there ever was a time when the church of God needed to lean on his Omnipotent arm, it is now, while the nations are angry and waking to contest; when the roar of cannon and clash of arms are echoing through our land; when bombs and shells are bursting in our midst, and the prophetic finger is pointing rapidly to the fulfillment of God's predictions, and whispering the warning that we are in perilous times. God grant, then, that we may watch and pray, lest we enter into temptation, and "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

E. A. REID.

REMARKS.

We give our sister correspondent's article a place in our columns, hoping that the word of admonition may not be lost on any of our readers. There is a danger of running into Phariseeism. If, like the Jew, we are keepers of the truth, let us not hold the truth in unrighteousness, nor suffer the leaven of the scribes and Pharisees, to corrupt us from the

simplicity which is in Christ Jesus. Whilst we would "contend earnestly for the faith," yet we would erect no barrier, or test, not recognized in the Word of God, in order to prevent any disciple from participating in any of the privileges pertaining to the Lord's house. Still if we, or any one else, maintain that *none are disciples*, but those who believe and practise the things taught by the apostles, and which obtained in the primitive church, and therefore that they *only* have a right to a place among the saints, let no one accuse us of a want of charity, or of Pharisaic pride. This is only "the truth as it in Jesus." We are required to be jealous for the honor and purity both of the truth and of the Church. We trust that none of our brethren are so destitute of godliness, as to deserve the charges brought by our correspondent. May we all be careful to cultivate that humility of mind which was so prominent a trait of character in the Lord Jesus, that we may be preserved from a proud and haughty spirit.

EDITOR.

A Looking-Glass for the Heart.

OR SOME OF THE WAYS IN WHICH PRIDE AND SELFISHNESS APPEAR.

1. In setting a high value on our kindness or labors for the good of others; or by excessive impatience or mortification at ingratitude, or want of success.
2. In being over tenacious of our own property, and ready to resent encroachments upon it.
3. In strictly assuming the dignity, rights, or privileges that we think our due, and being mortified with disrespect or neglect.
4. In the risings of anger or revenge at any contempt or ill usage.
5. By impatience at contradiction, and irritation if our self-will be at all thwarted.
6. In a reluctance to give up our own will to obey the will of another;—this is so strong in some characters, that when a desire is expressed to lead them, it is sufficient to excite resistance.
7. By dislike to be dictated to, or found fault with.
8. By a high esteem of our own opinion, and unwillingness to yield it to another; and a desire to rule and have everything our own way.
9. In vexation at being blamed when we deserve it, offence at being suspected if we do not, and a spirit of self-justification and retort.
10. By a reluctance to condemn ourselves, or confess ourselves in the wrong even in trifles; and a tenacious adherence to what we have once advanced in argument.
11. In prejudice against those who dislike

us, or have told us of our fault, crossed our self-will, or interfered with our interest, pleasure or comfort.

12. By a desire for the praise of men, for honors or distinctions.

13. By preferring the favor of the great only on account of their rank, fortune or influence.

14. In showing kindness to others from motives of self-interest, or self-gratification.

15. By accepting and being pleased with praise that we are not wholly worthy of; or allowing ourselves to be elated with that commendation which is our due from others, and not simply and truly desiring to give all the glory to God.

16. By jealousy of the love or preference shown to others.

17. By indulging the pride of appearance in dress, house, furniture, table, equipage, or any outward thing.

18. In a feeling of self-importance, and using the gifts of nature or Providence to feed our vanity or pride.

19. In the unrestrained indulgence in anything, however lawful, merely for our sensual gratification.

20. By feeling a cold interest in the concerns of others, listening to them merely from civility, whilst talking much of our own.

21. By relating with a secret complacency the faults or injudiciousness of others, compared with our own better judgment or conduct in the same particulars, or the good effect of our own advice.

22. By making representations to others that have a tendency to display advantages that we possess in riches, connections, reputation, &c., or good actions we have performed.

23. By imposing any little trouble or difficulty on a company, instead of willingly taking it upon ourselves.

24. In considering our own ease or pleasure in our domestic habits or arrangements, rather than making any sacrifice to those we live with.

25. In making trifling annoyances or inconveniences of importance, and suffering them to irritate our temper.

26. By withholding money, or giving sparingly, or spending any in self-indulgence which might be better applied for the relief of the poor, or to the cause of religion.

27. By spending money in some instances extravagantly, to be esteemed liberal.

28. By feeling exalted with riches, or ashamed of poverty.

29. By aiming at an appearance beyond our property and income.

30. In feeling pain and impatience at being under an obligation to any one.

31. In expecting much personal attention from others.

32. By resisting whatever is humbling to us.

May every professor of Christianity seriously seek that Spirit of Christ by which he may truly mortify and subdue the carnal mind; the grace he needs is the purchase of the Savior's sufferings, and can only be rendered effectual by a submission to the power of his cross, who emphatically declared, "Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."—*Advocate and Guardian*.

A World in Trouble.

The world is in trouble. Nations are convulsed; thrones are trembling; Governments are agitated; people are excited, and the whole social organization of civilization appears to be sensitively influenced by some strange influence premonitory of a great change. Let us take a glance at the facts:

Despite all rumors to the contrary, Pope Pius IX is really dying. A sleep is overcoming him from which nothing will probably awaken him except the trumpet of eternity. Count Cavour, his arch antagonist, has just gone before him. The Sultan of Turkey has also passed away. The Chinese Emperor is admitted to be on his death bed, and the rebel army at the gates of Peking. Louis Napoleon has been attacked by disease. The Queen of Austria has been given up as beyond the reach of medicine. The Empress of France is ill. The Queen of Great Britain it is positively asserted in private circles, is exhibiting traces of that mental aberration which is hereditary in her family.

Let us now add to this catalogue of scathed ills, that the Papal States, at the decease of Pio Nono, will probably be handed over to Victor Emanuel, King of Italy. That Francis, late dictator of Naples, only awaits the event to foment a reactionary movement among his partisans—a movement in which the exiled Dukes will join to recover, if possible, their lost dominions. That Venetia is pausing for that movement of disorder to assert her claim to independence. That Hungary is equally on the eve of a revolution, and Poland following its example. That Spain is again menacing Morocco. That France and Austria are preparing for another conflict, as a sequel to the treaty of Villafranca. That England, France, and Spain are now threatening Mexico. That one portion of St. Domingo has already lost its freedom, and that the other bids fair to follow. That the petty States of South America are nearly all engaged in civil war, and that the great North American Republic of the United States is absolutely struggling for life, a prey

to domestic discord of the most serious proportions.

What is this but a picture of a world in disorder—a world preparing itself, as it were, for some gigantic and social metamorphosis which no man may comprehend and which the visionary resort to prophesy to interpret? It may be the prelude, a few may say, to that overwhelming orgasm which is to introduce the millenium. It may be, alas! the handwriting upon the wall which betokens the downfall of free institutions throughout the globe. It may be, let us rather hope, a token of that *coup de grace* to despotism which events are about to precipitate, in order to give the spirit of human liberty one chance to fold its weary wings over all mankind.—*New York paper*.

The Earliest Copy of the Scriptures.

During the ensuing month a work of rare interest to the Biblical scholar will be published. It is a fac-simile of the earliest copy of the scriptures ever yet discovered. The manuscript contains a portion of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and was written by Nicholaus, the seventh deacon, at the dictation of the Apostle Matthew, fifteen years after the Ascension. The manuscript, together with many others, was discovered by the Rev. Mr. Stohart, in a sarcophagus, at Thebes, and was brought by him to England. On his arrival in this country he sold a portion of his collection to the British Museum, and a considerable number of the remainder he disposed of to Mr. Meyer, the celebrated archaeologist of Liverpool. Those in the Museum remain unrolled and unread to the present day, but Mr. Meyer, having obtained the assistance of Dr. K. Simomdes, proceeded to unroll the various papyri; among others of great interest was discovered one in fragments, containing portions of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and bearing the inscription, "The writing by the hand of Nicholaus the Deacon, at the dictation of Matthew, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: it was done in the fifteenth year after the Ascension of our Lord, and was distributed to the believing Jews and Greeks in Palestine."

The papyrus is much damaged, and the fragments preserved are not very numerous, but they supply two lost verses, furnish a much purer text than any other known version, and clear up many passages that have hitherto been doubtful and obscure. The manuscript is written in the Greek uncial character, and in all probability was the identical manuscript that was copied seven times by Hermodorus, during the life of the apostle, and likewise seven times after his death. The copy from which the English version of the Gospel is chiefly derived

is the eleventh copy made by Hermodorus, preserved in one of the monasteries of the East, and in this several errors have been made in the transcription. The publication of this work is one of the greatest interest to the Christian world, and will probably excite more attention than any similar discovery during the present century. Messrs. Trubner have undertaken the publication of the work, and a very large circulation is anticipated for it both in Europe and America. —*London Literary Gazette for Aug. 10.*

Palestine.

Stanley, the most picturesque writer on the Holy Land, gives an idea of the very remarkable scenery of Palestine. It is most peculiar, different in many respects from our fancy of it, yet not less wonderful for this very reason.

From almost every point in the country its whole breadth is visible, from the line wall of the Moab hills on the East, to the Mediterranean Sea on the West,

Two voices are there—one of the sea,
One of the mountain—

and the close proximity of each—the deep purple shade of the one, and the glittering waters of the other—makes it always possible for one or the other of those two voices to be heard now, as they were by the Psalmist of old. "The strength of the hills is His also; the sea is His, and He made it."

"I have set Jerusalem in the midst of the nations and the countries that are round about her." Palestine was then the vanguard of the eastern, and therefore, of the civilized world, and stood midway between the two great seats of ancient empire, Babylon and Egypt. It was on the high road from one to the other of these mighty powers, the prize for which they contended, the battle-field on which they fought, the high bridge over which they ascended and descended respectively into the deep basins of the Tigris and Euphrates. The battle in which the latest hero of the Jewish monarchy perished, was to check the advance of an Egyptian King on his way to contest the empire of the then known world with the King of Assyria, at Carchemish. The whole history of Palestine, the return from the captivity and the Christian era, is a contest between the "Kings of the North and the Kings of the South," the descendants of Seleucus, and the descendants of Ptolemy, for the possession of the country. And when at last the West begins to rise as a new power in the horizon, Palestine, as the nearest point of contrast between the two worlds, becomes the scene of the chief conflicts of Rome with Asia. There is no other country in the world which could

exhibit the same confluence of associations, as that which is awakened by the rocks which overhang the crystal stream of the Dog river where it rushes through the ravines of Lebanon into the Mediterranean Sea; where side by side are to be seen the hieroglyphics of the great Rameses, the cuneiform characters of Sennacherib, and the Latin inscriptions of the emperor Antoninus.

We have in sacred history the life of a bedouin tribe, of an agricultural people, of sea-faring cities; the extremes of barbarism and of civilization; the aspects of plain and of mountain; of a tropical, of an eastern, and almost of a northern climate. In Egypt there is a continued contact of desert and cultivated land; in Greece there is a constant intermixture of the views of sea and land; in the ascent and descent of the great mountains of South America, there is an interchain of the torrid and the arctic zones; in England there is an alternation of wild hills and valleys, with rich fields and plains. But in Palestine all these are combined. The patriarchs could here gradually exchange the nomadic life for the pastoral, and then for the agricultural, passing almost insensibly from one to the other as the desert melts imperceptibly into the hills of Palestine. Ishmael and Esau could again wander back into the sandy waste which lay at their very door. The scape-goat could still be sent from the temple-courts into the uninhabited wilderness. John, and a greater than John, could return in a day's journey from the busiest haunts of men into the solitude beyond the Jordan. The sacred poetry which was to be the delight and support of the human mind and the human soul in all regions of the world, embraced within its range the natural features of almost every country. The venerable poet of our own mountain regions used to dwell with genuine emotion on the pleasure he felt in the reflection that the Psalmist and prophets dwelt in a mountainous country; the devotions of our great maritime empire find a natural expression in the numerous allusions, which no inland situation could have permitted, to the roar of the Mediterranean Sea, breaking over the rocks of Acre and of Tyre. There was the earthquake, and possibly the volcano. There was the hurricane with its thick darkness, and the long continued roll of the oriental thunder-storm. Palestine is not merely a mountainous country, but a mass of mountains.

The approach to Palestine (from the desert,) nothing can be more gradual. There is an interest in that solemn and peaceful melting away of one into the other, which I cannot describe. It was like the striking passage in Thalaba's descent of the mountains, with the

successive beginnings of vegetation and warmth. Most striking any where would have been this protracted approach to land, after that wide desert sea—these seeds and plants, as it were, drifting to meet us.

Rounded hills, chiefly gray color—gray, partly from the limestone of which they are formed, partly from the tufts of thinly dotted, and from the prevalence of the olive, their sides formed into concentric rings of rock, valleys, or rather the meetings of these gray slopes, with the dry water courses at their feet, long streets of bare rock laid like flag stones, side by side, along the soil, these are the chief features of the greater part of the scenery of the historical parts of Palestine. In the spring the hills and valleys are covered with their grass and aromatic shrubs. But they also grow with what is peculiar to Palestine, a profusion of wild flowers, daisies, the white flower called the star of Bethlehem, but especially with a blaze of scarlet flowers of all kinds, chiefly anemones, wild tulips, and poppies. Of all the ordinary aspects of the country, this blaze of scarlet color is perhaps the most peculiar; and to those who first enter the Holy Land, it is no wonder that it has suggested the touching and significant name of “the Savior’s blood-drops.”

Incorrect Translations of Scripture.

Exodus iii. 22.—“Borrow.”—The common version represents God as directing the Hebrew women to borrow from the Egyptians what they never designed to repay. The same deception is inculcated in respect to the men in Exodus xi. 2. The original means to demand. They demanded part of the pay for their unrequited labor.

2 Samuel xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3.—David, a man after God’s own heart, is represented as sawing up the Ammonites, hacking them with axes, and burning them in brick-kilns; thus inhumanly destroying a whole nation related to the Israelites, because their king had offended him. A correct translation would show that he put them to saws, and axes, and brick-kilns, etc.; that is, taught them mechanical and agricultural arts, and made them a peaceful and useful people.

Jeremiah xx. 7.—Jeremiah is made to say, “O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived,” instead of, as the original declares, “Thou hast persuaded me and I was persuaded.”

One of the objections brought by infidels against the Bible is, that Moses declares of himself, Numbers xii. 3, “Now the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.”

Dr. Horne, the celebrated author of the Introduction to the Critical Study of the Bible, vindicates the inspired penman from

the egotism charged upon him, by proving that this passage is “mistranslated” “in our English version,” and that it ought to be, “Now the man Moses was depressed or afflicted more than any man of that land.” This affliction was caused by “the great burthen he had to sustain in the care and government of the Israelites, and also on account of their ingratitude and rebellion, both against God and himself.”—*Bible Union*.

Paul was a christian, a thorough christian; Peter was a christian, a thorough christian; but if we watch the history or biography of each of these inspired men, we shall see that grace consecrated, not quenched, in each his personal peculiarity and idiosyncrasy of character. For instance, Peter, impetuous, passionate, hasty, always ready to explode the instant that the slightest spark was applied; always first to speak, first to draw his sword, and first to run away when there was danger, and impetuous in all. Paul’s was gigantic energy, overwhelming power, irresistible reasoning; but in each was still the devoted, decided, and deeply impressed christian. John was full of all that was lovely and amiable, silent, that Peter only might speak; and yet, when people looked at John and Peter, heard Peter’s eloquence, saw John’s countenance, they took notice that both of them had been with Jesus; the silence of one as expressive as the eloquence of the other.

TRUTH.—Truth, which is mighty, must prevail. Obstacles may be thrown in its way, and may, for a little time, and to some extent, impede its progress, but they cannot entirely obstruct its course. Christianity, as has always been the case, will survive and flourish, when its opponents shall be dead and forgotten. The reason is obvious: it is based on truth, and may be despised, rejected, and trodden underfoot, but

“Truth crushed to earth will rise again.” And like the blade of grass, every time that it arises, its strength and its beauty will be increased.

ANCIENT CITIES DISCOVERED.—Mr. Graham, an Englishman recently returned from the East, in a report to the Royal Asiatic Society, gives an account of five ancient cities, deserted and forgotten, which have been discovered in the Great Desert beyond the Jordan. They were found as perfect as if the inhabitants had just left them, the houses retaining their massive stone doors. In one of the cities is a large building like a castle, built of white stone, beautifully cut. Further eastward other places were found, where every stone had inscriptions in an unknown character, resembling Greek.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the GOSPEL to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., OCTOBER 15, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 49.

For the Gospel Banner.

Is the Kingdom of God the Kingdom of Israel?

G. B. STACY IN REPLY TO "LEARNER."

The animus of the reply of your nameless correspondent to my seventeen propositions, published on page 69 of the *Banner* for March 15th, 1861, and which reply I find on page 97 of the *Banner* for May 1st, prevents me from indulging the hope that the author is "a learner," or that he writes for the elucidation of the truth because he loves it. Nevertheless his irrelevant and frequent incongruous remarks, may help me to throw some few rays of light upon the subject, by your permission. But I trust I shall not be betrayed into the spirit of which I complain in the effort I shall endeavor to make.

Your correspondent admits that "the term *king* is derived from and used in the place of the term head;" and that, "the term head expresses all that the term king expresses," but endeavors to qualify the latter part of the proposition by restricting its application "to mortal and visible headship," which is not admissible.

The idea embodied in my proposition is, that the headship, or "the Godhead," is the supreme, the most elevated, or highest *relationship* that God has created. Hence the Psalmist traces the gradations of God's relations in the 10th, 11th and 12th verses of the 29th chapter of the 1st Book of Chron. as follows, "Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel, *our Father*, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and *thou art exalted as head above all*. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all." And because relations take their names from created things, it necessarily follows, that the word head expresses the highest relationship, represents

the most elevated thing that God has created. And therefore the apostle designates it, Rom. i. 20; his "eternal Godhead; for he affirms on another occasion, "*In him we live, and move, and have our being,*" therefore, "we ought not to think that the *Godhead* is like unto gold, or silver or stones." We live in him, as the members of our body live in our head. Hence he is in very deed, our "living head"—*a relationship that includes all others*, but is equalled by none. I repeat then, that the qualification of "Learner" is inadmissible.

But "Learner" has introduced a special plea in the latter part of his answer to question No. 1. to show that "Moses was king in Jeshurun." And if all that he would claim should be admitted, in what sense would it affect question No. 1? I confess, I cannot see that it affects the proposition at all. However it would be well for "Learner" to examine a little more carefully his terms, because it is not pleasant to have a premise upon which we build much taken from us, without redress. The passage in question is a portion of the highly poetic conclusion of the Books of Moses, and its terms are used with the licence of the poet, and will not bear to be strictly construed. But if it should be insisted that the word rendered *king* in the common version must be strictly construed, it does not therefore follow that *king* is the proper rendering. According to Roy the word "Ma-lack" signifies, 1st. he ruled, reigned; 2nd. possessed power, or dominion; 3rd. consulted, admonished, directed; 4th. became head, chief, great, good, wise, powerful, noble, exalted, rich, learned. Having then such a variety of meanings the translator must have good and substantial reason for the choice of the meaning that he selects in the context of the passage, as well as the general doctrine of the Word upon the subject. We ask then, what is the general doctrine of Moses upon the subject? The answer is found in Deut. xvii. 14, 15. In which the Lord instructs the people as to the course they

should pursue when they should become weary of serving himself, their invisible king, saying, "when thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shall possess it, (which "Learner" denies that they ever did) and shall dwell therein, and shall say; "I will set a king over me, (not over the land,) like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother." He then proceeds to give instructions as to what the king whom they shall choose shall do; and in the 18th verse he uses this significant language, "and it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom." Clearly recognizing the transfer of the kingdom to the king of their choice. But if you admit it to be a fact, that "Moses was king in Jeshurun" in the sense claimed by "Learner," God's instructions quoted above, were irrelevant and inadmissible. It therefore follows that the poet used the Hebrew word Ma-lack with his wonted licence, and we must make our selection of the most appropriate of its meanings; and this the translators of the Septuagint Greek have done. Hence they render it "Arkon" in the Greek, which signifies, "a prince, ruler, governor, chief magistrate." It is true that a king is a Arkon, but it does not necessarily follow that an Arkon is a king. Now inasmuch as Jesus and his Apostles quoted from the Septuagint version, they thereby established it as a standard authority. Hence their reading of this passage is preferable to the common version. But the facts in the case are demonstrative that Moses never assumed, or exercised the kingly prerogatives, see Deut. xvii. 16, 17, and compare them with the recorded conduct of Moses. "Learner" has failed to establish it as a fact that "Moses was king in Jeshurun." Had he done so, he would have proven that Moses had displaced God in both position and relation: for the headship admits of no division. Hence, when the Father committed all judgment to the Son, it was "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and therefore he was constituted, "head over all things to the church, which (by consequence) is his body."

If then, "Learner" wishes it to be understood that "Jeshurun" whom he terms, "the political body of the Israelites" constituted "the kingdom of God," he not only limits God's jurisdiction to a very restricted compass, but at the same time claims an impossibility, viz, that a kingdom can have two heads. For every naturalist knows that a two-headed body is a monster.

The remarks of "Learner" on question No. 2 widens the fact that, he never thought unbiassedly and independently upon the subject. The land of promise, the restoration of "the house of Jacob," its priesthood and temple-service are so firmly established in his mind, that nothing which does not square with these his conceptions of what constitutes "the kingdom of God," can be penetrated by him. The proposition reads, "What authority is there in the Scriptures to authorize any one to contend that the constituent elements of modern constitutional kingdoms are necessary to the existence of "the kingdom of God?" We have affirmed, and "Learner" has admitted that the relationship of head or king is the supreme, the highest, or most elevated relationship that God has created, consequently the jurisdiction that belongs to, and grows out of that relationship is the most supreme, absolute and uncontrolled. And therefore to affirm, that the constituent elements of modern constitutional kingdoms are necessary to the existence of "the kingdom (that is, the exercise of the rightful jurisdiction) of God," is to affirm the most palpable of all fallacies. He who would make the rightful exercise of God's jurisdiction dependent upon a constitution, legislature, and executive branches of government, —a throne, metropolis and territory—would reduce God to the level of mortals, and cannot be reasoned with. What relevancy then has "Learner's" remarks to proposition No. 2? Who has denied that God has covenanted to give the land of promise to the seed of Abraham, or that it will constitute the territorial possession of the kingdom of David's Son,—the local habitation of his throne, and seat of his government? Who has denied that his government will be a priestly government, having a temple-service, and the restoration of sacrifices, as well as the most exalted of visible royalties? certainly I have not. But it does not follow, that because the Seed of Abraham, and Son of David shall possess these things absolutely, that therefore, they constitute essential elements of his kingdom. It seems very difficult to get the true and simple import of the word, that is, the essential import of the word kingdom fairly before the mind, "Learner" admits in answer to No. 3, that it is, "the legitimate jurisdiction of the Creator over the created." Webster says, "jurisdiction, in its most general sense, is the power to make, declare, or apply the law," that is, the right and power, or authority to make laws, the right and power, or authority to declare them, as also, to enforce, or administer them. Now it does not follow that because a person is invested with the right, the power or authority to make and proclaim laws for

the government of his people who occupy a certain locality, coupled with the power and authority to enforce them; that therefore he *possesses the locality* on which the persons over whom he exercises his jurisdiction happen to reside. Nor would his possession, or ownership of the locality on which they reside invest him with the prerogatives of jurisdiction over them as defined above. The right to reign, that is, to exercise jurisdiction, is perfectly independent of the possession and inheritance of the territory on which the subjects of the jurisdiction reside. Hence the right of possession and inheritance of the promised land is derived from the covenant made with Abraham, which covenant gives the absolute right of inheritance of the land, but it gives no right of Royal jurisdiction. The right of Royal jurisdiction is given by covenant with David. But if the covenant with David had never been made, and consequently no Royal right of jurisdiction created, God would have been equally bound to have given the land to the Seed, as his absolute inheritance; although he possessed no Royalty or right of jurisdiction. So that, notwithstanding the author of *Eureka* says, on page 216, "Thus we have an ample area, containing by estimation three hundred thousand square miles, for the length and 'breadth of Immanuel's land,' extending, as covenanted to Abraham and his Seed, 'From the River of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates, for a possession in the Olahm'—Gen. xv. 18. Such is the territorial paradise or kingdom of the Deity;" I say, notwithstanding the territory of the inheritance is thus affirmed to be "the kingdom of the Deity;" the affirmative is unquestionably a misnomer, resultant from the want of an analysis of the ideas essentially embodied in the word kingdom.

But why has "Learner" so elaborately argued the question of inheritance, place, or territory; it is not mentioned in proposition No. 2. There seems to be a phantom haunting him. Hence his introduction of Moses as king in "Jeshurun," under the 1st proposition. These things impress me with the conviction that "Learner" is the party who has strenuously argued that the children of Israel were notwithstanding a kingdom of priests at Sinai; because although they accepted the covenant, they did not keep it. The consequences growing out of the fact that God consummated the establishment of the covenant of the law when they agreed to accept it was ignored by him, viz. their constitution as a kingdom, that is, a jurisdiction of priests unto God. If the law did not constitute them the priestly sphere of God's jurisdiction it accomplishes nothing. It is an error to suppose that their obedience must be perfect

in order that they might be recognized as the rightful sphere, or subjects of God's jurisdiction. When they voluntarily elected to recognize God's right of jurisdiction over them they became to all intents and purposes, his kingdom, that is, his jurisdiction. It does not however follow that they were therefore the kingdom of God in its entirety,—they were a nation of priests recognizing, professing and openly manifesting their recognition of God's right to rule or reign over them, as such they manifested the fact that they recognized the invisible rule, or; reigning power of God over them, and this is all that is predicated of them as "the kingdom of God." But whilst "Learner" refuses to admit the law as the constitutory instrument for the reason assigned, he boldly asserted that they constituted "the kingdom of God" in the days of David, and when pressed for a statement of the time when they were constituted the kingdom of God, if not at Sinai, he failed to answer. But now he returns the charge under the special plea "that Moses was king in Jeshurun," as the last refuge to avoid, or break the force of the argument, that the demand, that one of their own brethren should rule over them and be their king was the rejection of the jurisdiction of God. It is of no moment in the estimation of "Learner" that God has plainly said, "You have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulations: and ye have said unto him, nay, but set a king over us." 1 Sam. x. 19. "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." This testimony goes for nothing in his estimation, whilst the literary licence of the poet is now set forth as an omnipotent argument of offence. The reader can judge of its value. Others again deny, that the word reign is the verbal form of the word kingdom, which objections are unworthy of further notice.

Lastly, "Learner" has strenuously insisted that the possession of the land was made dependent upon their obedience to the law, and that their carcasses fell in the wilderness because of their disobedience thereto. Hence he insisted that they would not be constituted "the kingdom of God" until they possessed the land, it being an essential constituent of the kingdom,—this was therefore a conclusio argumentum with him that they were not constituted "a kingdom of priests unto God" at Sinai. But what Scripture affirms that they could not enter the land because of their disobedience?—rather do they not predicate their failure to do so upon their want of faith, even as Paul reasons,

"And to whom swear he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believe not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." But as we have before proven that the possession of the inheritance is entirely distinct from, and independent of the reigning jurisdiction, we pursue this theme no further; and only name these things to show the subterfuges that have been sought to maintain the position of "Learner"*

Proposition No. 3 reads, "Is not the legitimate jurisdiction of the Creator over the created, the dominion, or kingdom of God, and co-existent with creation, and therefore absolute, universal, supreme and eternal?"

"Learner" answers, "yes." But several of his subsequent answers would indicate that he does not know whereof he affirms, or that he affirms here what he denies elsewhere. It is therefore desirable to define the kingdom of God in scriptural language that it may be seen what the Scriptures include, and what they exclude. It is already admitted that the Godhead, or headship of God is the most perfect and complete expression of the more modernly, or humanly expressed kingly relations of God. The Apostle affirms that, "His eternal power and Godhead" has been clearly seen "from the creation of the world," Rom. i. 20, and that it is manifest by the fact, that "In him we live, and move, and have our being." Hence the prophet Jeremiah says, x. 10, "But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King." Paul writing to Timothy uses the following language, 1 Tim. i. 17, "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen." Here then we have the terms, "Eternal Godhead," "everlasting King," or as in the margin, "King of eternity," and "King eternal," expressive of the duration of God's King, or Headship. Again the Apostle affirms that the great object of the personal and visible reign of Jesus is to show, "Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. If these testimonies prove anything, they prove 1st. that God is the ONLY POTENTATE, or in other words, there exists no Potentate but God.

2nd, That the Kingly authority, or Godhead is from eternity.

3rd. That the purpose of the reign of Jesus

* These last remarks are made under the conviction that "Learner" is the party I have already referred to.

is to make manifest the fact that God is the self-existent, uncreated, and only Potentate, even as Nebuchadnezzar was taught, that "God ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth them to whomsoever he will!" and as Jesus taught, "There is no power but of God," and "the powers that be are ordained of God." These things being established, the throne of God is spoken of as eternal even, as himself. Psa. xlv. 60, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter." The apostle addressing Jesus as God manifested in flesh, Heb. i. 8, says, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." Stephen said, Acts vii. 48, 49, "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Isa. lxvi. 1, *Heaven is my throne*, and earth is my footstool." Hence the apostle affirms that Jesus our high priest, is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." In xii. 2, he calls it "the throne of God." These testimonies coupled with those already cited wherein the Immortality of the King is affirmed, and not only so, but that it belongs to him alone, and who, as a consequence, "dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto, and whom no man hath seen, or can see," and who is therefore, "the invisible God;" manifest that Deity or God, Godhead, Potentate, Eternity, Immortality, Invisibility, are all cognate terms and predicable only of God, his jurisdiction, throne and power. Hence, when Daniel vii. 27, says, "The kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High," he adds, whose kingdom, (that is, the Most High's kingdom) is an everlasting kingdom, (and therefore) all dominions shall serve and obey him, viz., when Jesus in the completion of his times, shall have demonstrated Him to be, the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, even, when he shall deliver up the visible jurisdiction by which he hath put down all rule, and authority and power, or all enemies under his feet, and destroyed death, to the Father, the "only Potentate," that he "may be all in all." We affirm then that it is the object of all God's revelations and demonstrations to make at least all that shall be accounted worthy of immortality know that He is the ONLY POTENTATE, or that "THERE IS NO POWER BUT OF HIM." That His kingdom, or rather jurisdiction, and right of jurisdiction is from everlasting and to everlasting, and therefore it is "absolute, universal, supreme and eternal," and we may add indivisible. It is true it is in the nature of things invisible, but it is nevertheless as real as God himself.

Proposition No. 4 reads, "God has nowhere promised to set up the kingdom of God, because it is necessarily co-existent with the works of his hands."

"Learner" says, "I have shown this to be false." I am at a loss to know by what rule, or argument he has even attempted it, or what he considers sufficient to show, or prove a thing. If his admission of proposition No. 8 does not necessarily involve the admission of this; then, I confess I am incompetent to understand what the admission of a premise involves. If as has been shown God's kingdom is "from everlasting to everlasting," or that he is "the King eternal," or of eternity, how can a point of time be fixed for the setting up of His kingdom? The term is inapplicable to "God's kingdom."

Proposition No. 5 reads, "The kingdom of God exists independent of the recognition, and in the face of its rejection by the children of men."

The reply of "Learner" implies the recognition of a plurality of kingdoms of God. The Scriptures speak only of "the kingdom of God." We have given this definition of that kingdom, and they speak of or recognize none other as "the kingdom of God."

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.

Objections to Mark Allen's Views on Governments.—No. 2.

BY L. H. CHASE.

True believers are neither traitors, rebels, nor tyrants; but law-abiding submissionists under all governments, so far as their laws do not contradict the laws and principles of the Gospel. By what rule then are the saints to judge of these laws and principles as opposed to the laws and principles of the governmental organizations of this age? In answer to this we affirm, Jesus Christ is the infallible ruler. And in proof of this, see 1 John ii. 6, "He that saith he abideth in Christ ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." "I am" saith Jesus, "the light of the world." John ix. 5; "he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life," John viii. 12. In these words, we see whom we are to follow. See also 1 Peter ii. 21, "If when you do well and suffer, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that you should follow his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again: when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed his cause to him that judgeth righteously." "I beseech you," says Paul, "be followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." 1 Cor. iv. 16. These

are principles, that cannot be misunderstood by any one. And I ask, can any Christian walk contrary to these rules, without proving himself recreant to his Lord? "But if you have bitter envying, and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth."

Query: What is the present condition and state of things in this Government? Is not the spirit of envy and strife predominant, both North and South? We say it is. And the evils it is producing are beyond all human calculation. Query: Can a Christian drink into this spirit, in favor of either side, and carry out its influence, without giving his profession the lie? I say, No! For this spirit, or "wisdom, descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work," James iii. 14—16.

I wish now to take into consideration the language of the Holy Spirit, as spoken by Paul, found in Rom. xiii. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God." I said in my last article, I would endeavor to show that there were limits to these expressions, which I will now endeavor to do, if the Lord permit. In the first place, I presume that Bro. Mark Allen will agree with me, that all powers, and all governments that God hath set up among men, are right, righteous, equitable, holy, just and good. This is my position, whether he admits it or not; and from these premises I argue, that all powers, that have been exercised for unholy purposes, and all governments which have enacted laws that were not right; but on the contrary were unrighteous, unholy, unjust, and consequently not good, are not God's ordinances, neither has he arranged the affairs, or governments of this world. God has ordained, that men who rule, shall rule in righteousness, and men who do not rule righteously, rule contrary to the ordinance of God. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." This language would imply, powers not so high, or inferior powers. "For there is no (higher) power but God's, or, but of God. "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the (higher) power resisteth," (or fights against the arrangements, or) "the ordinance of God: and they that resist the (higher) power shall receive to themselves damnation." Why should the Apostle speak of higher powers, if all powers that be are ordained of God? Is one of God's ordinances of less consequence, or force, than another? We say, no. All, and each, of God's ordinances, are of equal force and power, and proceed from a source that is Infinite, consequently, has no equal. This then, is the higher power to which the Apostle alludes. "For rulers," (who rule according to God's arrangement,)

"are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Will thou then not be afraid of the power?" (for it is God who commands,) "do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." Praise of the same what? Same powers, or same God who ordained the power. "For he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid: for he beareth not the (power, authority, or) sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. For this cause pay you tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." What very thing is it they are continually attending to? I answer, administering justice, equity, and righteousness; suppressing vice in all its forms; executing vengeance upon all those that do evil; and protecting, and defending those who do good. Here then, we see the propriety of the Apostolic injunction to pray for those in authority, that they may rule according to the higher powers or ordinances of God; for if they do, we shall have the privilege of living peaceable and quiet lives, in all godliness and honesty.

We will next examine some of the requisitions enjoined upon Christians by the higher powers, or, the Christian's supreme law-giver. "Be ye not conformed to this age, but, be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." "Recompence to no man evil for evil." "Provide things honest in the sight of all men." "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Rom. xii. 2, 17-21. The very next verse commences with chapter xiii. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no (higher) power, but God's," or of God; "the (higher) powers (for it is of these he is speaking,) that be are ordained of God." Again, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, (the same of which he was speaking in Romans,) to obey magistrates, (for they are ordained of God, to execute wrath on them who do evil,) to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, be gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." Titus iii. 1, 2. Again, "Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and

our Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii. 12-14. Bro. Mark Allen says, "If we bear allegiance to any of the powers that be we bear allegiance to God; because, the powers that be are ordained of God. If we refuse to obey the powers, we refuse to obey God's ordinance, if we resist them, we resist God, in the person of his delegated ministers to us for good." The reader will perceive that Bro. Allen, gives no limit to his expressions. But let us examine Bro. Allen's seemingly strong fortress. With solemnity I ask, *Is not the American Fugitive Slave law, an enactment of the powers that be?* And is that law an ordinance of God? If it is I have been studying the wrong Book. But Bro. Allen says, "If we bear allegiance to any of the powers that be, we bear allegiance to God; because, the powers that be are ordained of God;" consequently, (Bro. Allen's position being true,) if the poor panting fugitive should call at my door, naked, hungry, faint, weary, famishing, cast-down and dejected, what am I to do? Must I clothe him? No. Must I feed him? No. Must I give him a bed on which to rest his weary limbs? No. Must I speak kindly to him, and point him to the star of liberty, where men will recognize him as a human being? No. Must I say begone you black dog? No. No, I must not even be as merciful as that! What must I do, for I am becoming desperate? Pounce upon him like a blood-hound! Bind him hand and foot with fetters of iron! What next must I do? Call for one of God's ministers! (the sheriff,) for he is God's minister, attending continually upon this very thing! So says Paul in Rom. xiii. 6. And what will God's minister do next? Post up advertisements, stating, that, through the agency of Eld. L. H. Chase, a faithful minister of Jesus Christ, and a dutiful subject to the powers that be, has caught, and secured in prison, a creature in the form of a man, about five feet and ten inches in height, strong-built, and well-proportioned, sandy hair, light complexioned, (tries to pass himself for a white man,) some freckles on his face, has a bad scar over the left eye, caused by kind treatment from his owner! The owner is requested to prove property, pay charges and take him away, or he will be sold to the highest bidder, for his jail fees. This, Bro. Allen, is law! enacted by the powers that be. And will you have the hardihood to say, that this law, or enactment, is ordained of God? or, God's own arrangement? It may do for you to say it is! But for me, it would be the height of blasphemy. However, I suppose you will ascribe it to my ignorance,

which may be overlooked, if I turn from the error when the *light shines!*

But my Bro. Mark, let us look for a little time into the *infallible law*, enacted by the higher powers. "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the *oppressed go free*, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward. Then thou shalt call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and he shall say, Here I am. If thou take away from the midst of thee the yoke, the putting forth of the finger, and speaking vanity; and if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noonday." Isa. lviii. 6-10. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, (and Satan-governments.) For we wrestle not against *flesh and blood*, but against *principalities*, against *powers!* (Query; were these *principalities* and *powers* ordained of God, Bro. Mark?) against the *rulers of the darkness* of this *age*, against *wicked spirits*, or, spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that you may be able to *withstand* in the (this) *evil day*, and having done all to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with *truth*, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of (war, no) *peace*; above all taking the *shield of faith*, * * * the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Eph. vi. 11-17. My dear Bro. Mark Allen, with this armor, we need not despair of victory! and from the signs of the times that are thickening around us, it becomes highly necessary that we have on the whole armor, for the time is not far distant, when *your faith*, and *mine* will be *tested*; yes, tested by the *Satan-powers* of this *ungodly nation*. Are you prepared to swear to support this Union? And if not, may God grant us help, and strength to abide the consequences: a *union* to sustain, the darkest, and most damnable system of oppression, that ever darkened the sun. Let Satan fight their own battles, for his kingdom is divided against itself; and in the purposes of God, must come to destruction. Amen. Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly! all of which is most respectfully

submitted to Mark Allen, and all whom it may concern.

TO BE CONTINUED.

For the Gospel Banner.

Remarks on Wine.

BROTHER WILSON:—In reading your reply to Z. W. Lamport's inquiry in reference to what wine was suitable to commemorate the death and resurrection of Christ, therein you say, that the fermented juice of the currant you should object too, even more than the fermented juice of the grape, we paused to reflect. What the fermented juice of the grape objectionable! can it be, when it was instituted by our Lord himself; for we infer that it must have been of that kind, or those brethren at Corinth could not have made such an use of it as to have needed such reproof that Paul the apostle of our Lord gave them. He says, "one is hungry; another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" Read I Cor. xi. 20 to end of chapter. And it is evident that such wines were used in Christ's day from many passages. In speaking of preserving wine, he says, "no man will put new wine into old bottles else they will burst." Mark ii. 22. We read that the first miracle that he did was to turn water into wine, which the ruler of the feast commended for its superior quality, John ii. 10; and we find the apostle Paul commending it to Timothy for his stomach's sake and his often infirmities. 1 Tim. v. 23. We know that "wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging," when used to excess, but we have yet to learn that it is when used after the pattern that Christ has set for us. Can there be a faithful follower of Christ that does not deny himself excess in any and every thing? Ought not Christ's brethren in all parts of the world to use one and the same thing to commemorate his death? We think so; but how can they with such a decoction as you recommend? and would not the wine purified by fermentation be a purer article than what you recommend? Paul did not say to the rest of the churches that they must not use wine because some of the brethren at Corinth used it to excess? No; but on the contrary to work out all the leaven and malice within, and to purify one's self even as he is pure, is his teaching to all who would follow him in all ages; and may we all who have taken his name, belong to that class. How careful each one of us should be not to teach anything that the word does not fully sustain. We have not seen in the word that Christ and his apostles proclaimed, total abstinence commended, nor a passage that would warrant us in setting aside the fermented juice of the grape. Therefore, from looking at their instruction, we conclude that

to abstain from using the fermented juice of the grape we do violence to their teaching, and do greatly err. When we purchase the wine we get what is said to be pure; if it should be adulterated, should we be any more blamable than those brethren at Corinth, whom Paul gave liberty to eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake. 1 Cor. x. 25, 28. There might be much more said to show that his chosen people had been justified in the use of wine, for under the old Levitical law the Priests and Levites were to have the first fruits for their use, the wine included, to be used by their sons and daughters. Read Num. xviii. 11, 12. But we will submit these remarks to the brethren in general, and if erroneous would be corrected; for our salvation depends upon knowledge and obedience.

Yours, in the hope of eternal life,
 Mrs. J. D. BENEDICT.
 Bristol, Wis., Sep. 16th, 1861.

REMARKS.

Our readers will find the reply referred to, in the *Banner* for Aug. 15, page 191, 2nd col. which they will do well to peruse in connection with the above remarks by sister Benedict. We think our sister has taken for granted, what first she ought to have proven, viz. that our Lord himself instituted or chose the *fermented* juice of the grape to represent his blood at the Supper. She says nothing in reply to the objections we made to that idea, nor even gives them a passing notice. Still the argument, we think, is worthy of being fairly met. The Supper was instituted at the Passover, when all *leaven* was to be banished from the houses of the Israelites; when nothing *leavened* was to be eaten. This, we presume, our sister will readily admit. Then, if the bread was *unleavened*, and it was necessary that it should be so, why should the drink be *leavened*? Does not this appear rather inconsistent? Suppose it was *unleavened* or un-intoxicating, would it be less the "fruit of the vine," as Jesus styled it, than after part of its properties should be destroyed by fermentation? or would it be less significant of the life-giving properties of his precious blood? By what is called the *vinous* fermentation the principal part of the saccharine matter of the grape is changed into alcohol—the different kinds of wine containing from 15 to 28 per cent of alcohol by measure. Alcohol is a death-dealing fluid, and the intoxicating principle of all wines, liquors, and strong drinks. Intoxicating wines, then, is the "fruit of the vine" deteriorated, corrupted, and partially destroyed. This is its first stage towards putrefaction. If fermentation was not arrested, and the wine confined from atmospheric air, it would soon pass into the *acetic* fermentation, or second stage towards

corruption, producing vinegar, which may be called the "fruit of the vine" further deteriorated. And this also if not preserved would pass into the *putrefactive* fermentation or rotting process, by which the "fruit of the vine" would be completely destroyed. Now which state is that to which the phrase "fruit of the vine" is most applicable? That which is the natural product of the vine, or that *corrupted* by fermentation—whether vinous, acetic, or putrefactive? We say, the juice of the grape, in its uncorrupted state. Remember what our Savior called it when celebrating the Passover and instituting the Supper,—"*the fruit of the vine.*"

Sister Benedict says, "we infer it must have been of that kind, (fermented juice of the grape), or those brethren at Corinth could not have made such an use of it," that is, get drunk with it; because our version reads, "one is hungry, and another is drunken." The Greek word *μεθυειν*, *methuein*, translated drunken, signifies in this place, as being opposed to hungry, "to be filled, plentifully fed." See Parkhurst. The word is used in this sense in the Septuagint, Psa. xxxvi. 8, 9; Jer. xxxviii. 14; Hoshea xiv. 8; also in John ii. 10. Hence some modern translators render the word as follows; "full;" "is filled;" "is satisfied." Macknight says, "according to grammarians, *methuein* literally signifies to eat and drink after sacrificing. Adam Clarke remarking upon the same word in John ii. 10, gives its derivation as from *meta thuein*, to drink after sacrificing, and that it does not necessarily mean to inebriate, but to take wine, to drink wine, to drink enough. Trollope, in *Analeceta Theologica*, vol. ii. page 410, says, "The verb *methuein*, may be extended to *eating* as well as *drinking*, and without indulging the idea of intemperate excess." Bloomfield says, "in classical use it *generally*, but not *always* implies intoxication." This will be enough to show that our sister's inference, drawn from 1 Cor. xi. 20, common version, is not sufficiently clear to prove that our Lord used the fermented juice of the grape at the Passover, or to warrant her to say, that if we "abstain from using the fermented juice of the grape, we do violence to their teachings, (viz. Christ and his apostles,) and do greatly err."

We do not wish to write an essay on wines, or the use of wine, but much more might be said about our correspondent's irrelevant remarks on certain passages where wine is mentioned. Surely no one has ever denied that intoxicating wines were used in Christ's day; all know that they have been in use from the time of Noah's drunkenness to the present day. But it does not therefore follow that wherever we find the word wine in the Scriptures, that it means *intoxicating*

wine. The Greek word *ovos*, wine, according to Parkhurst is derived from a Hebrew word signifying to *press, squeeze*, as being the *expressed* juice of grapes. This is properly *wine*, and called such in a great many places in the Scriptures; but if allowed to ferment, it is then *intoxicating* wine, and is known to be such by the effects ascribed to it.

In the Hebrew scriptures *yayin*, translated *wine*, is a generic term, and generally denotes a fermented liquor, but not always, as sometimes it is applied to the growing fruit of the vineyard or orchard. Jer. xl. 10, 12; "Gather ye wine, and summer fruits, and oil; * * * and gathered wine and summer fruits very much." *Tirosh* is another general term translated wine, and is said by some to always mean the solid produce of the vine. In the passage referred to by our correspondent, Num. xviii. 12, where wine is mentioned, the word is *tirosh*, and signifies orchard-fruit. This is very evident from the connection in which it stands. The *tirosh* is said to be found in the *cluster*. "Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sake, that I may not destroy them all," Isa. lxxv. 8. "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with (*tirosh*) new wine," Prov. iii. 9, 10. And as "the Priests and Levites were to have the first-fruits for their use, the *wine* included," as our sister remarks, read in Deut. xii. 17, 18, what they were to do with it—"Thou mayest not *eat* within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or thy (*tirosh*) wine, or of thy oil, * * * but thou must *eat* them before the Lord thy God, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, &c." See also the following passages where *tirosh* is translated wine, and judge whether it is the fermented kind or not. Gen. xxvii. 28, 37; Deut. vii. 13; xi. 14; xiv. 23; xviii. 4; xxxiii. 28; 2 Kings xviii. 32; 2 Chron. xxxi. 5; Neh. x. 37, 39; xiii. 5, 12; Joel i. 10; ii. 19, 24; Hag. i. 11. Many more passages might be cited, in which the word wine occurs, where it undoubtedly means the fruit of the garden or vineyard, rather than the product of fermentation.

It is evident, then, that there are different kinds of wine spoken of in the Word—some with commendation, others with reprobation—one having a blessing in it, and ranked with corn, and oil, and the fruits of the earth, and adapted to the sustenance of man; while the other has a curse in it, and is to be shunned, because it causes woe, and sorrow, and contentions, and babbling, and wounds without cause, and redness of eyes, biting like a

serpent, and stinging like an adder. See Prov. xxiii. 29–35. This is the wine which mocks and deceives the user, and which is ranked with strong drink,—always inebriating. Through this Israel of old erred; "the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment," Isa. xxviii. 7. Query: If priest and prophet and people had practiced total abstinence from this kind of wine and strong drink, would they have been censured for it, and thereby have done violence to God's teaching? Our sister says, if we abstain from the use of such wine, "we do *greatly* err." Were the Rechabites censured or commended by Jehovah for refusing to drink wine which was offered them by Jeremiah? They were blessed for obedience to their father Jonadab, who amongst other things commanded them to drink no wine all their days. Jer. xxxv. Did Daniel and his companions greatly err in abstaining from wine provided for them by the king? Why was the vow of the Nazarite sanctioned and provided for? Why was Samson's mother forbidden the use of wine, immediately before his birth, and he during his whole life? And why was John the immerger a Nazarite from his birth? Did these greatly err by abstaining from it? Far from it; in whatever else they might have erred, they are not once censured for this error, if error it be, but on the contrary were men eminently blessed by Jehovah.

If, then, there are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible—the *intoxicating* and *unintoxicating*—we would ask, which of the two was most appropriate to be used at the Passover, where nothing leavened was allowed? The candid will say, of course, that which was unfermented. And as the Supper was instituted at the same time, and with the same elements, it follows that if we wish to copy the pattern given, we, as "Christ's brethren, in all parts of the world, shall use one and the same thing to commemorate his death." Only think for a moment of the character of Jesus—holy, harmless, undefiled—uncorrupted by sin; the leaven of malice and wickedness had no place in him; yet as God's lamb he was slain for us. Shall we, then, who are exhorted to "keep the feast with the unleavened principles of sincerity and truth," introduce into the feast, bread and wine *corrupted* by fermentation, as proper symbols of his body and blood? In our opinion we ought not; judge ye.

But our sister asks, "Would not the wine purified (?) by fermentation, be a purer article than what you recommend?" We think not; we cannot conceive of fermentation *purifying* either bread or wine. It is the corrupting

and destroying principle. In *bread* it destroys part of the nutritive properties of the flour, and would destroy all if it was not arrested by baking; and in *wine* and other *drinks*, it destroys a large share of the sugar or nutritive qualities they contain, and converts that which was designed by a beneficent God to support life into alcohol, a fiery liquor. We do not call this *purification*, but *destruction*. Well may the Spirit of God use this kind of wine as a symbol of judgment and fiery indignation. See *Psa. lxxv. 8*; *Isa. lii. 17, 23*; *Jer. xxv. 15-28*; *Rev. xiv. 10*; *xvi. 19*. Wine containing this alcoholic ingredient we esteem as very improper to fill "the cup of blessing, which we bless." It is only calculated to stimulate, not strengthen; to excite and inflame the appetites and passions, rather than administer to man's actual necessities. It is not a purer or a better article than what we recommend or use. We recommend the juice of the grape, *unfermented*, for use at the Lord's table, always, whenever it can be obtained; and when it cannot, rather than use the *fermented* and *manufactured* article, called wine, we prefer dried grapes, (raisins,) and by preparing them obtain the juice that way—which, by the by, is still "the fruit of the vine."

Our correspondent speaks of the priests and Levites using wine. True, they did; and so may we; but we refer her to the case of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offering strange fire and their awful end. See *Lev. x*. Also, to the declaration of the Lord, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me;" and his command to Aaron, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations," *ver. 9*. And for what reason was this prohibition given? "That ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses," *verses 10, 11*. Are the wines of this day less intoxicating? or can those who now compose the "holy" and "royal priesthood" "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," in the congregation of the Lord, by the use of such wines as were forbidden to Aaron and his sons? We suggest this as worthy of a thought.

Our sister intimates, that if we purchase and use wine which is *said* to be *pure*, and if it should not prove to be so, we should be no more blamable than those brethren at Corinth, to whom Paul gave liberty to eat, etc. No doubt it is possible to obtain *fermented* wine without adulteration, but it will still contain that alcoholic principle, the product of fer-

mentation, on account of which it was forbidden to the priesthood forever, when officiating in the house of the Lord.

In conclusion, we trust what has been written will serve to call the attention of the brotherhood to a point much neglected, and apparently slighted by some. We know many of our brethren think differently, but we presume for want of investigation. Some pass it by as a matter of no moment. Others prefer wine which they have been accustomed to use, and which their appetites call for. And others again claim a large Christian liberty, to say and do that which is right in their own eyes, seemingly regardless of consequences. Well, let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind, and do that which an enlightened conscience approves. **ERRON.**

From the Messenger of the Churches.

Showing the Lord's Death till he come.

THE commemoration of the *birth* of a remarkable or distinguished person is a very common occurrence. Of late years we have had some striking instances of this desire to perpetuate the memory of men of genius, long since laid in the dust, by celebrating the centenary of their birth; but we do not remember of a single instance of a similar appointment in memory of the *death* of such distinguished individuals.

It cannot, therefore, have been in accommodation to the usages or predilections of mankind that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was appointed. The Apostle Paul, who received his instructions, regarding the observance and design of this ordinance, from the Lord, tells us plainly, that "As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we show the Lord's death;" consequently, one principal object of this observance is an exhibition—a commemoration of the fact of our Lord's death. Now, the idea of appointing an observance, one grand purpose of which was an exhibition of the *death* of the Messiah, during the whole time of his absence from the earth, is so foreign to the common usages of society, that we cannot help wondering at such an appointment, and exclaiming, "Why is this?"

The resurrection and ascension of our Lord were events in themselves so striking, and surrounded with such a halo of glory and splendor, that the appointment of a regular celebration of them would have been perfectly natural, and in harmony with the likings of mankind in general; yet, strange as it may appear, regarding the commemoration of these events by any religious observance we have no command whatever. We find, indeed, that the early disciples were in the habit of meeting for religious purposes on the first day of the week; and, it seems a fair inference, that they met on that day, for these purposes,

because it was on the first day of the week that our Lord rose from the dead; but we have no positive statement in the sacred oracles that such was their reason, far less any *command* to do so. Nowhere, indeed, do we find, in Scripture, any ordinance appointed to celebrate the birth, resurrection, or ascension of our Lord; all of which events were miraculous in themselves, and distinguished by the attendance of the angels of God. But, for the regular exhibition of our Lord's death till he come, we have a special ordinance appointed; and particular instructions given, by the Lord himself to one of his most honored apostles, regarding its objects and mode of observance. Truly, "this is not the manner of men;" and it would be difficult for those who believe the Christian faith to be simply a human invention to account for the institution of this ordinance.

The death of Jesus, looked at simply as a fact, and from a human point of view, seems to us the least remarkable or distinguished event in His history. A victim to the prejudice and hatred of the Jewish High Priests and Rulers, he was accused of blasphemy and treason, and condemned to be crucified—the most ignoble death which, in the estimation of the Romans, their laws could award. The dying of the Lord Jesus was esteemed by the people of that age so far from being great and glorious—worthy of perpetual commemoration—that they regarded it as the most ignoble and execrable event that could have befallen him. "To the Jews, it was a stumbling-block; to the Greeks, foolishness." Thus, in the dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew, the latter objects:—"We cannot wonder enough that you should expect any good from God, who place all your hope in a Man who was crucified." Again—"We doubt of your Christ, who was so ingnomiously crucified; for our law styles every one as crucified accursed." In the same dialogue, Justin Martyr says:—"They," the Greeks, "account us mad that, after the immutable and eternal God, we give the second place to a man who was crucified." "The wise men of the East insult us," says Augustine, "and ask, 'Where is your understanding, who worship Him for a God, who was crucified?'" * Had the Messiah fallen in the battle-field like a patriot, for his country's freedom; or, Brutus-like, being vanquished, fallen on his own sword, his death might have been held glorious, and his name become an object of the hero-worship of the ages. But there was really none of those conditions which the men of that or the subsequent ages esteem glorious surrounded the death of the Son of Man; and yet, we repeat,

for the regular exhibition of our Lord's death, during the whole period of his absence, we have a special ordinance appointed, and particular instructions given, by the Lord himself, regarding its objects and mode of observance. Again we enquire, *Why is it so?*

The question is asked, not for the purpose of exciting curious speculations; for, in things divine, such speculation appears to us exceedingly unbecoming; but to direct attention to the teaching of Scripture regarding the death and priesthood of our blessed Lord.

That the death of the Messiah, was not, simply, an accident that happened to him in the course of his mission; that it was not, simply, for his faithfulness in disclosing the message of God, as was the death of Stephen, but that it came within the scope of the Divine arrangements, and formed a part of the purpose of God in the salvation of men, is, we believe, plainly taught by our Lord Himself, and His apostles. When Peter took the Lord aside, and rebuked Him for entertaining the idea that He would be put to death, the Master reproved him by saying that he appreciated not the things of God, but of men. And when He appeared to His disciples after His resurrection, He told them plainly that "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead." Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, uses very strong language on this point, when he says—"It became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," as if it would have been unbecoming in God to have done otherwise. Understanding these things, "the showing of the Lord's death till he come," will appear to us an effectual means of witnessing to the truth:—"That the death of the Messiah was a part of God's arrangement in perfecting the Captain of our salvation.

Further, the scriptures not only teach us that it was "necessary" that the Christ should suffer unto death, but also that he had to *die for sins*. "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures"—"In whom we have redemption *through His blood*, the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of His grace"—"Who His own self *bore our sins* in His own body on the tree"—"Christ once suffered, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God"—"To Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood. . . . be glory, and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." In showing forth the Lord's death till He come, we thus refresh our own memories with the fact, and also testify to others, that "once in the end of the world the Lord's Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Thus, the fact of our own guiltiness, and the transcendent love

* Kitto's Pictorial Bible, vol. iv. p. 414.

and destroying principle. In *bread* it destroys part of the nutritive properties of the flour, and would destroy all if it was not arrested by baking; and in *wine* and other *drinks*, it destroys a large share of the sugar or nutritive qualities they contain, and converts that which was designed by a beneficent God to support life into alcohol, a fiery liquor. We do not call this *purification*, but *destruction*. Well may the Spirit of God use this kind of wine as a symbol of judgment and fiery indignation. See Psa. lxxv. 8; Isa. lii. 17, 23; Jer. xxv. 15-23; Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 19. Wine containing this alcoholic ingredient we esteem as very improper to fill "the cup of blessing, which we bless." It is only calculated to stimulate, not strengthen; to excite and inflame the appetites and passions, rather than administer to man's actual necessities. It is not a purer or a better article than what we recommend or use. We recommend the juice of the grape, *unfermented*, for use at the Lord's table, always, whenever it can be obtained; and when it cannot, rather than use the *fermented* and *manufactured* article, called wine, we prefer dried grapes, (raisins,) and by preparing them obtain the juice that way—which, by the by, is still "the fruit of the vine."

Our correspondent speaks of the priests and Levites using wine. True, they did; and so may we; but we refer her to the case of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offering strange fire and their awful end. See Lev. x. Also, to the declaration of the Lord, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me;" and his command to Aaron, "Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations," ver. 9. And for what reason was this prohibition given? "That ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses," verses 10, 11. Are the wines of this day less intoxicating? or can those who now compose the "holy" and "royal priesthood," "offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," in the congregation of the Lord, by the use of such wines as were forbidden to Aaron and his sons? We suggest this as worthy of a thought.

Our sister intimates, that if we purchase and use wine which is *said* to be *pure*, and if it should not prove to be so, we should be no more blamable than those brethren at Corinth, to whom Paul gave liberty to eat, etc. No doubt it is possible to obtain *fermented* wine without adulteration, but it will still contain that alcoholic principle, the product of fer-

mentation, on account of which it was forbidden to the priesthood forever, when officiating in the house of the Lord.

In conclusion, we trust what has been written will serve to call the attention of the brotherhood to a point much neglected, and apparently slighted by some. We know many of our brethren think differently, but we presume for want of investigation. Some pass it by as a matter of no moment. Others prefer wine which they have been accustomed to use, and which their appetites call for. And others again claim a large Christian liberty, to say and do that which is right in their own eyes, seemingly regardless of consequences. Well, let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind, and do that which an enlightened conscience approves. EDITOR.

From the Messenger of the Churches.

Showing the Lord's Death till he come.

THE commemoration of the *birth* of a remarkable or distinguished person is a very common occurrence. Of late years we have had some striking instances of this desire to perpetuate the memory of men of genius, long since laid in the dust, by celebrating the centenary of their birth; but we do not remember of a single instance of a similar appointment in memory of the *death* of such distinguished individuals.

It cannot, therefore, have been in accommodation to the usages or predilections of mankind that the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was appointed. The Apostle Paul, who received his instructions, regarding the observance and design of this ordinance, from the Lord, tells us plainly, that "As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we show the Lord's death;" consequently, one principal object of this observance is an exhibition—a commemoration of the fact of our Lord's death. Now, the idea of appointing an observance, one grand purpose of which was an exhibition of the *death* of the Messiah, during the whole time of his absence from the earth, is so foreign to the common usages of society, that we cannot help wondering at such an appointment, and exclaiming, "Why is this?"

The resurrection and ascension of our Lord were events in themselves so striking, and surrounded with such a halo of glory and splendor, that the appointment of a regular celebration of them would have been perfectly natural, and in harmony with the likings of mankind in general; yet, strange as it may appear, regarding the commemoration of these events by any religious observance we have no command whatever. We find, indeed, that the early disciples were in the habit of meeting for religious purposes on the first day of the week; and, it seems a fair inference, that they met on that day, for these purposes,

because it was on the first day of the week that our Lord rose from the dead; but we have no positive statement in the sacred oracles that such was their reason, far less any *command* to do so. Nowhere, indeed, do we find, in Scripture, any ordinance appointed to celebrate the birth, resurrection, or ascension of our Lord; all of which events were miraculous in themselves, and distinguished by the attendance of the angels of God. But, for the regular exhibition of our Lord's death till he come, we have a special ordinance appointed; and particular instructions given, by the Lord himself to one of his most honored apostles, regarding its objects and mode of observance. Truly, "this is not the manner of men;" and it would be difficult for those who believe the Christian faith to be simply a human invention to account for the institution of this ordinance.

The death of Jesus, looked at simply as a fact, and from a human point of view, seems to us the least remarkable or distinguished event in His history. A victim to the prejudice and hatred of the Jewish High Priests and Rulers, he was accused of blasphemy and treason, and condemned to be crucified—the most ignoble death which, in the estimation of the Romans, their laws could award. The dying of the Lord Jesus was esteemed by the people of that age so far from being great and glorious—worthy of perpetual commemoration—that they regarded it as the most ignoble and execrable event that could have befallen him. "To the Jews, it was a stumbling-block; to the Greeks, foolishness." Thus, in the dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew, the latter objects:—"We cannot wonder enough that you should expect any good from God, who place all your hope in a Man who was crucified." Again—"We doubt of your Christ, who was so ingnominiouly crucified; for our law styles every one as crucified accursed." In the same dialogue, Justin Martyr says:—"They," the Greeks, "account us mad that, after the immutable and eternal God, we give the second place to a man who was crucified." "The wise men of the East insult us," says Augustine, "and ask, 'Where is your understanding, who worship Him for a God, who was crucified?'" * Had the Messiah fallen in the battle-field like a patriot, for his country's freedom; or, Brutus-like, being vanquished, fallen on his own sword, his death might have been held glorious, and his name become an object of the hero-worship of the ages. But there was really none of those conditions which the men of that or the subsequent ages esteem glorious surrounded the death of the Son of Man; and yet, we repeat,

for the regular exhibition of our Lord's death, during the whole period of his absence, we have a special ordinance appointed, and particular instructions given, by the Lord himself, regarding its objects and mode of observance. Again we enquire, *Why is it so?*

The question is asked, not for the purpose of exciting curious speculations; for, in things divine, such speculation appears to us exceedingly unbecoming; but to direct attention to the teaching of Scripture regarding the death and priesthood of our blessed Lord.

That the death of the Messiah, was not, simply, an accident that happened to him in the course of his mission; that it was not, simply, for his faithfulness in disclosing the message of God, as was the death of Stephen, but that it came within the scope of the Divine arrangements, and formed a part of the purpose of God in the salvation of men, is, we believe, plainly taught by our Lord Himself, and His apostles. When Peter took the Lord aside, and rebuked Him for entertaining the idea that He would be put to death, the Master reproved him by saying that he appreciated not the things of God, but of men. And when He appeared to His disciples after His resurrection, He told them plainly that "Thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead." Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, uses very strong language on this point, when he says—"It became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," as if it would have been unbecoming in God to have done otherwise. Understanding these things, "the showing of the Lord's death till he come," will appear to us an effectual means of witnessing to the truth:—That the death of the Messiah was a part of God's arrangement in perfecting the Captain of our salvation.

Further, the scriptures not only teach us that it was "necessary" that the Christ should suffer unto death, but also that he had to die for sins. "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures"—"In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our sins, according to the riches of His grace"—"Who His ownself bore our sins in His own body on the tree"—"Christ once suffered, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God"—"To Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood. . . . be glory, and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." In showing forth the Lord's death till He come, we thus refresh our own memories with the fact, and also testify to others, that "once in the end of the world the Lord's Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Thus, the fact of our own guiltiness, and the transcendent love

* Kitto's Pictorial Bible, vol. iv. p. 414.

of God in providing a sacrifice for our sins in the person of His only begotten Son, is kept vividly before our minds.

There is yet another part of Apostolic preaching to which we would call attention in connection with this matter. In the epistle to the Hebrews, we have a very full and lucid statement regarding the nature and purpose of the priesthood of Christ. The points of resemblance and dissimilarity of the priesthood of Christ to that of the high priest under the law, are very fully stated, and should be carefully studied by every believer. In that statement we find it asserted that not only did our Blessed Lord lay down his life a sacrifice for sin, but that, as the high priest under the law went into the holiest of all with the blood of bulls and of goats, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, so "Christ came an high priest of good things to come"—hath entered into "Heaven itself to appear in the presence of God for us." Not, indeed, to offer the blood of slain animals, which could never take away sins, but to present his own precious blood, which "cleanseth from all sin." As, during the time which the high priest remained in the holies, the Israelites tarried outside for his return, even so, the faithful in Christ Jesus, wait for his return from the Heavens, when he shall bless them with complete deliverance from sin and all its consequences.

Thus, the showing forth of the Lord's death till he come, is admirably fitted to remind the disciples of the Lord of their present position, as waiters for their Master's return from the Heavens, and also of the important services he has gone thither to accomplish.

Dearly beloved, let us not forsake the assembling of ourselves together, but thankfully hail every opportunity to show the Lord's death till he come, lest we become weary and faint by the way. Courage, faithful ones!—"The Lord is at hand!"

W. LAING.

Seeming Contradictions of the Bible.

Since so much knowledge is proved to be necessary to a right understanding of the Bible, we may easily believe that difficulties or seeming contradictions, which occur to us in reading it, most probably arise from our ignorance or inattention; and this admits of abundant illustrations. Judges i. 19. The Lord was with Judah; and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountains, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron. Voltaire scoffs at this, as if it implied that the Lord of heaven and earth is represented as being baffled by the chariots of iron; whereas the term "he" refers to Judah and not to the Lord. Judah's faith failed him, and he found that

according to his faith, so it was to him. Matt. ix. 29. Weak in faith, he was weak in power. Voltaire was one of the most acute of infidels. But the frivolity of such objections, made by such men, shows how hatred of the truth blinds the mind to the perception of it. Prov. xxvi. 4. Answer not a fool according to his folly, etc. The next verse is, Answer a fool according to his folly, etc. But a little attention to the reason given in each case removes the seeming contradiction. We ought not to answer a fool according to his folly so as to be like him; i. e., so as to betray, in manner of answering him, the same evil temper which he showed. This Moses did at Meribah [Num. xxi. 12; Psa. cvi. 33;] and David in his answer to Nabal [1 Sam. xxv. 21, 22;] and the men of Judah and Israel in their disputes with David. 2 Sam. xix. 41-43. We ought therefore to answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit; i. e. we ought to answer him in such a manner as to expose his folly. Thus, Job answered his wife [Job ii. 10;] and our blessed Lord affords abundant instances; as when he was attacked by the Scribes and Pharisees because his disciples transgressed the tradition of the elders [Matt. xv. 2-9;] when they desired of him a sign from heaven [Matt. xvi. 1-4;] when they questioned the authority by which he acted [chap. xxi. 23-27;] and when they inquired of him the lawfulness of giving tribute to Caesar.

2 Kings xvi. 9. The king of Assyria is said to have "hearkened unto Ahaz;" but in 2 Chron. xxviii. 20, we read that he "distressed him, and strengthened him not." Both statements are true. He did help him against the king of Syria, took Damascus and delivered Ahaz from the power of the Syrians. But the service was of little value, for the Assyrian monarch did not assist Ahaz against the Edomites or Philistines; and he distressed him by taking the royal treasures, and the treasures of the temple, and rendered him but little service for so great a sacrifice. To illustrate: The Britons invited the Saxons to help them against the Scots and Picts. The Saxons accordingly came and assisted them for a time, but at length they made themselves masters of the country.

It is very expedient that somewhat should be covered, to make us more diligent in reading, more desirous to understand, more fervent in prayer, more willing to ask the judgment of superiors, and presume less on our own judgment. None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand. Dan. xii. 10. The scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not. Prov. xiv. 6; Psa. cxlix. 4—*Mine Explored.*

☞ Be not wise in your own conceits.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the KINGDOM OF GOD to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. "The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., NOVEMBER 1, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 20.

An Exposition of Matt. x. 28.

BY H. V. REED.

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

This text above all others has been quoted to prove that man is a compound of two distinct and separate natures, mortality and immortality. It is introduced for two purposes,—1st. To prove that the soul is immortal. 2nd. That the wicked will suffer forever in Gehenna. As we have but little room for criticism, we shall have to be brief upon each point made above. And first, we are led to enquire,

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

I. DOES THE TEXT IN HAND TEACH THE

The position is affirmed from this one consideration; that man can kill the body, but *not* the soul. Therefore it is presumed that the soul *cannot* die, or is immortal. But logically it only affirms that man does not possess the *power* to kill the soul, and not that it is beyond *all power*; for the latter part of the text plainly declares that God is *able to destroy the soul*. Hence the contrast is between the *power* of God and of man, and not that the soul is indestructible. All admit that if man had power to kill the soul it could not be considered immortal. Very well: now apply your logic. God has that power, and is *able to kill the soul*. Hence from your premises the argument fails. If the soul is immortal and cannot die, then its existence is placed beyond all power; but from the simple fact that God is *able to destroy it*, we cannot argue its immortality. Hence the position fails; for if it is subject to a power which can *finally kill*, it matters not whether that *power* is in God or man. The ultimate is the same in either case. But another argument for its immortality is inferred from the phrase "*soul and body*," as though the soul was something distinct from the body. If this *form* of expression proves that the soul is an *entity* distinct from its body, then it follows that man is a

plurality of *entities*; for we read that we are to *love* God with the "HEART," and with the "SOUL," and with the "STRENGTH," and with the "MIND," Luke x. 27. Now would any one argue that these were all distinct from each other as *entities*, or that these were *attributes* of a unit man? Undoubtedly the latter position would be taken by all thinking minds. But would it not be as consistent to argue that these were all separate, and would *live* separately after death, as to argue the immortality of the soul from the phrase *soul and body*? Certainly it would? But again, this position is made plainer by another quotation. Isa. x. 16, 18, "And shall *consume* the glory of his *forest*, and of his fruitful field, *both soul and body*." Says Dr. A. Clarke, this is a "proverbial expression," signifying that they should be "*entirely and altogether consumed*." It would certainly be absurd to infer the immortality of the *forest* because the phrase *soul and body* is applied to it. The expression most clearly denotes the whole being, including the idea of a future life; that is, in the text under examination; for Luke quotes the same idea from the Savior, and leaves not this Hebrew proverbial phrase. Luke xii. 4—"And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him, which after he hath killed hath *power* to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." Luke wrote in purer Greek than did Matthew, and the reader will perceive that Luke expresses the same idea, without the Hebraism, "*soul and body*." In the above text we are shown that all man can do, is to kill in this state of things, but his power extends no farther. But Jesus after he has killed, has power to cast into hell, which makes a *finality* of the being, whereas man can kill in this state, and his power extends only to the grave. But God can raise up the being, and cast into *Gehenna*. Therefore we should fear God and not man. B. Wilson in "*Emphatic*

Diaglott," gives a translation of Matt. x. 28, in perfect harmony with the foregoing position.

"Be not afraid of THOSE who KILL the BODY but cannot destroy the (future) LIFE, but rather HIM who CAN utterly destroy both Life and Body in Gehenna."

This undoubtedly presents the idea of the original more clearly.

Hence the text would simply indicate, "Be not afraid of those who can temporarily destroy you, for God can raise you up; but fear him who can finally and utterly destroy you in *Gehenna*?"

That man can destroy the soul, in Dr. McCulloch's translation, is of the same import. The sense of a temporary destruction is clear from the Holy oracles. Josh. x. 37, "And they took it, (the city,) * * * * and the king thereof, * * * * and all the souls that were therein, * * * * but *destroyed it utterly*, and ALL THE SOULS that were therein." And chap. xi. 11, "And they smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword, UTTERLY *destroying* them; there was not any left to breathe."

Says Job, "my soul chooseth strangling and death rather than my life," Job vii. 15. Says David, "none can keep *alive* his own soul," Psa. xxii. 29. And that God "made a way to his anger, he spared not their *soul from death*," Psa. lxxviii. 50. God says by Ezekiel, "The soul that sinneth *it shall die*," Ezek. xviii. 4. These testimonies will satisfy all who believe God's word, that there is a *temporal death* here inflicted on the soul of man.

Perhaps it might be well to state, the word soul properly means the *whole man*. Thus God formed man of dust, and *man became a living soul*, Gen. ii. 7. Again, there were so many souls (persons) came out of Jacob's loins. Gen. xvi. 26. No soul in Israel was to eat blood. Lev. xvii. 12. Souls went down into Egypt; souls went into a ship, &c., &c.

As some may think that the word soul signifies the immortal part of man, I will give a list of ways in which the Hebrew word *Nephesh* (Soul) is translated in our Bible. It is translated *soul* 471 times, *life* 150; and is also translated *men, person, self, body, they, breathe, appetite, lust, creature, &c.* The reader will at once see the impropriety of assuming that the soul is immortal from the meaning of the word. Says Dr. McCulloch, "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either soul or spirit in the technical sense in which we use the terms, as implying something distinct from the body." See *Cred. of the Scriptures*. Vol. 2. Says the learned Parkhurst, "*Nephesh*, (soul,) as a noun, has been supposed

to signify the *spiritual part* of man, or what is called his *soul*. I must for myself confess that I can find no passage where it has undoubtedly this meaning."

The learned, as well as the word of God, protest against the idea that the word soul means that which is immortal. From the foregoing arguments we arrive at the following conclusions:—

1. Soul means the whole man in a primary sense, or a creature that lives by breathing, and is applied to the attributes of a being.

2. That the soul dies, or may be destroyed in the sense of a *temporal death*.

3. That the learned find no such meaning as that which is now applied to the word soul. We call attention to these facts, so that the reader may see that the Bible is pointedly against the modern form of the doctrine that the soul never dies, God declaring plainly, that "the soul that sinneth it shall die," Ezek. xviii. 4. And men say it never will die; but we say, "fear him, who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." And this brings us to notice another point in the text.—

II. THE MEANING OF THE WORD HELL.

It is assumed that the wicked will live forever in torment, from the fact that the word hell denotes a place of unceasing woe, in which bad men will always exist in pain. We shall now proceed to examine the term in question, and see if it denotes any such place.

The word translated hell in the text under examination is in Greek, *Gehenna*, and is a compound from two words, *Ge* signifying earth or land, and *Hinnom*; and properly means the valley of Hinnom, southeast from Jerusalem, and was anciently celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch. It was polluted with all manner of carcases of animals and dead bodies; constant fires were kept burning to avert the pestilence which would inflict the city. In this place the Jews placed the brazen image Moloch; they not only sacrificed animals upon it, but even threw their own children upon its arms, from whence they fell into the fires at its feet, and to avoid the shrieks and groans of dying infants they would beat the *Toph* (a drum) to drown their cries. Hence they anciently called it Tophet, signifying a drum. This practise was abolished by Josiah. 2 Kings xxiii. 10. This word occurs 12 times in the New Testament, which the reader can examine. Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 33; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; Luke xii. 5; James iii. 6. These are the only places in the New Testament where this word is found. We find no place in all these references that sustains the popular view, that it

is a place of ceaseless woe. The reader will perceive that the meaning is much different than is generally supposed. It is a true principle in language, that we must determine the idea of the writer by the words he uses. Now if *Gehenna* necessarily means a place of unending woe, it could not be questioned, but what the Bible taught *eternal misery*; as the real issue is on the meaning of the word itself; and we have before said, it properly means the valley of Hinnom, southeast of Jerusalem. But here we are met with Mark ix. 43, where the word *Gehenna* occurs, and associated with the following expressions,—“*Unquenchable fire*,” and “*where the worm dieth not*,” from this it is inferred that *Gehenna* must mean endless misery, because it is clothed with such symbols as to denote eternal perpetuity. As this is the strongest argument that can be introduced upon this point, we will notice those phrases upon which the argument rests.

1st. “*The fire is not quenched*.” It is presumed from this that the wicked will endure forever, because the fire is not to be quenched. But is this a sound principle? Does it follow, that because the fire is thus represented, that whatever is cast into it must endure forever? Were this a true position, then any combustible material cast into such a fire would last forever. But, says the reader, is there any example of such a nature? Certainly there is. We have a case in point in Matt. iii. 11, 12. Christ will “gather his wheat into his garner, but he will BURN UP the chaff with UNQUENCHABLE FIRE.” Here the office-work of such a fire is clearly expressed. Chaff is combustible material, and yet it is to be burned with unquenchable fire. This, however, is symbolical of the wicked’s final overthrow. I will now cite the reader’s attention to a class of texts where the idea of *destruction* is conveyed, and in each case the fire is represented as not being quenched. Isa. i. 29—31; xxxiv. 10—14; lxvi. 24; Jer. vii. 17, 20; xvii. 27; Ezek. xx. 45, 48. These examples will show the reader that wherever the phrase occurs, it is indicative of *total destruction*. Now, can we for one moment suppose that Jesus intended any other idea than that of death when he used the expression to the Jews who had always so understood it from the Old Testament? Hence we claim it as a strong proof for destruction.

2. *The worm dieth not*.

This phrase was borrowed from Isa. lxvi. 24, and among the Jews was well understood. Around the fires of Gehenna worms were constantly feasting on parts of dead bodies which the fire did not reach; so between the fire and the worm there was a

total destruction of all that was cast into Gehenna. The worm is in all places in God’s word an emblem of death and mortality. Please examine the following texts; Job xvii. 14; xxiv. 20; xix. 26; Acts xii. 23. The worms lived around the fires of Gehenna, and consumed what was not burnt by fire; hence both these symbols are against the idea of enduring pain in hell. Now, inasmuch as the fires of Gehenna were clothed with such figures, and for over 1000 years everything that had been cast into it had been destroyed, can we suppose that Jesus intended to convey the idea of eternal suffering, when such a figure had always conveyed an opposite idea? Hence it is evident that *Gehenna*, wherever used by the Savior, was in harmony with the idea entertained by the Jewish nation, viz., *Destruction*.

Therefore, we conclude, that Jesus in Matt. x. 28, when speaking of casting the wicked into Gehenna, meant to convey the idea of death. And indeed he says, “Fear him, who is able to DESTROY (not keep alive,) both soul and body in hell.” Hence soul and body both were to be DESTROYED in this Gehenna, and not tortured forever. And this position is in harmony with the whole Bible, which represents that the wicked will experience,—

1st. *Death*. Rom. vi. 23; Ezek. xviii. 4; Rom. vii. 5; James i. 15.

2nd. *Will be destroyed*. Job xxi. 30; Psa. v. 6; Heb. xii. 29; Matt. vii. 13; Acts iii. 23; Phil. iii. 19.

3rd. *They will perish*. John iii. 15, 16; 2 Pet. iii. 9; Psa. xxxvii. 20; lxxiii. 27; 2 Cor. ii. 15.

4th. *Lose life*. Matt. x. 28; John xii. 25; Mark viii. 35.

These proofs are sufficient to show that when the wicked are cast into hell, that they will not endure forever, but must cease to be. Psa. xxxvii. 10.

We ask the candid reader, if he can behold anything in the text which we have briefly examined, that proves endless suffering in the regions of hell? Or can you find any such idea as that the soul is immortal, and will live forever? It seems to me you cannot. We leave the subject for your candid consideration, hoping that we may gain life through Christ.

For the Gospel Banner.

Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?

G. B. STACY IN REPLY TO “LEARNER.”

CONTINUED.

Proposition No. 6. “Although the Jews were once constituted a ‘kingdom of priests unto God,’ they ceased to be ‘the kingdom of God,’ from the time they rejected him from

reigning over them, and thereby placed themselves on a level with the rest of mankind in rebellion against God, and therefore they constituted the kingdom of Israel, the kingdom of David, or the royal house of Jacob."

I would correct this proposition by reading, they ceased to occupy that relation to God, instead of "ceased to be the kingdom of God." The reason for this correction has already been given, viz., they would not be recognized as the kingdom in its entirety, although they were the only visible recognizers of God's jurisdiction.

"Learner" thinks that his answer to No. 2 covers this, we can afford to let the reader judge for himself.

Proposition No. 7. reads,—"God has covenanted to give the throne of David, the kingdom of Israel, or rule over the house of Jacob, to Jesus as the Son of David, or because he is the Son of David—but that is not the kingdom of God."

"Learner's" reply is, "False. See Dan. ii. 44; xii. 9-27. Let us hear Daniel, he testifies, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom—(not 'the kingdom of God' as it should read to answer 'Learner's' purpose)—which shall never be destroyed." I presume the other quotations is a typographical error, and ought to be vii. 9-27. Let the reader turn then to vii. chap. of Dan. and read from 9th to 27th. At the 14th he will find it affirmed, that there was given to the Son of Man, who "came to the Ancient of Days," "dominion and glory and a kingdom, (not "the kingdom of God,") that all nations and languages should serve him: *his dominion* is an everlasting dominion (that is a dominion of 1000 years duration, as proven by Rev. xx. 4, and 1 Cor. xv. 24-26 inclusive) which shall not pass away, (during that period) and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." We have already shown that the 27th affirms perpetual endurance of *the kingdom of the Most High*; and not of the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven, which the Apostle quotes the Psalmist to prove, "shall perish—wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed." And so Peter affirms, that, "all these things shall be dissolved." But Paul affirms unequivocally as already shown, "That God is the Blessed and only Potentate,—*who only hath immortality*," or perpetual continuance as a Potentate. "Learner" must be devoid of modesty. Michael brought no railing accusation against the adversary, but said, "the Lord rebuke thee."

But does "Learner" mean to say that God has not covenanted the throne of David and kingdom of Israel to David's Son? let

him read again the covenant as recorded in 2 Sam. vii. 11-16. There we find the promise to establish *his* house, or dynasty,—to set up *his* seed that should proceed out of *his* bowels—to establish *his* kingdom, that *he* should build a house or dynasty for the Lord's name—and that the throne of *his* kingdom shall be established forever. See also 1 Chron. xvii. 10-14; Psa. lxxxix. 1-4; Also 19-37; Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26. And what means the language of Isaiah, "and the Lord God shall give unto him *the throne of his Father David*," which language is also repeated by the angel Gabriel to Mary. And James in the council of the Apostles held in Jerusalem says, "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, after this I will return and *build again the tabernacle (dynasty, or house) of David which is fallen down*; I will build again the ruins thereof, and *I will set it up*." This is what God has promised to set up, not his own kingdom which exists of necessity.

Proposition No. 8 reads, "The possession of the throne of David, and the rule, or jurisdiction over the house of Jacob and the world, is absolutely necessary, in order that 'the kingdom of God' may be recognized by the nations, as nations or families, but is not 'the kingdom of God.'"

"Learner" grants this proposition.

Proposition No. 9. "The visible manifestation of the kingdom of God results from the inauguration and application of the New Covenant, not of the covenant with David, or that with Abraham."

The unbridled severity of "Learner's" reply is inexplicable upon christian principles. Is there any of that "love that doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh not evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth," in the denunciatory assertion, "*False as the language of Cain*, when he denied any knowledge of Abel, after his fratricide." This would seem to imply that "Learner" means to affirm that I have murdered the truth, and now deny any knowledge of it. I leave the reader to judge whether the candor with which I have endeavored to discuss these propositions will expose me to so severe and uncompromising a judgment. But I would enquire who invested "Learner" with the prerogative of judgment, or I would say to him, "who art thou that judgeth another man's servant."

But the reasons assigned by "Learner" must be considered, viz., "Because in Jehovah's absolute dominion, no man hath seen him as a visible ruler. Yet Moses his *delegated head or king* in the *delegated kingdom* of

Israel, was a visible king." The fallacy of this conclusion has already been exposed; but he proceeds, "Again, the Lord hath chosen Solomon to sit upon (this delegated) throne of the Lord, over Israel, 1 Chron. xxviii. 5. The visible manifestation of God's kingdom results from the covenant made with Abraham and David." See answer to No. 2.

The reply to this last assertion is as follows. While it is admitted that the children of Israel constituted a jurisdiction of priests unto God, it cannot be affirmed that the Scriptures recognize that people thus constituted "the kingdom of God." They were undoubtedly a priestly jurisdiction in his great realm, or jurisdiction, but this jurisdiction or kingdom was not *concentered in them*. Nevertheless it is very proper to affirm that the jurisdiction was the Lord's, it was his of right, of possession, and of exercise, and therefore his to give to Saul. See 1 Sam. ix. 17. "And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people;" x. 1, "Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?" In 7th verse of the 8th chapter the Lord had told Samuel that in demanding a king to reign over them, "they had REJECTED (him Jeshoah) that he should not reign over them." "Now when Samuel called all the people together unto the Lord in Mizpeh, he said unto the children of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I have brought up Israel out of Egypt, and delivered you out of the hands of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of all the kingdoms, and of them that oppressed you: and ye have this day REJECTED ME YOUR GOD, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulations; and ye have said unto him, nay, but set a king over us. Now therefore present yourselves before the Lord by your tribes, and by your thousands. * * * And Saul the son of Kish was taken. * * * And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted and said, God save the king!" x. 17-24. Let the reader, read carefully the whole of the 12th chapter of 1 Sam., and mark the important reasoning of God with them; at the 12th verse he says, "And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us; when the Lord your God was your king." * * * Is it not wheat harvest to day? I will call unto the Lord, and he shall send thunder and rain; that ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done

in the sight of the Lord, in asking you a king." 17th verse. Had Saul however proved worthy of the position God would have confirmed the kingdom with him, that is, with his dynasty, or house for ever. See xiii. 13, "And Samuel said to Saul, Thou hast done foolishly; thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God, which he commanded thee: for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue: the Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee." Thus the Prophet Hosea addresses Israel, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help. I will be thy king: where is any other that may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath." xiii. 9-11. These testimonies prove that God made a preliminary transfer of his own jurisdiction to Saul, and if he had proven worthy that he would have confirmed his (Saul's) jurisdiction over Israel for ever. Let the reader carefully peruse 1 Sam. xv. Now as the kingdom belonged to God to give, and as he only made a preliminary and not an absolute transfer of it to Saul, and as the prophet Hosea says, He was provoked to the gift, by the rebellion of the children of Israel, saying, "I gave them a king in mine anger." He therefore had the right to, as he really did revoke the gift. Hence Samuel said, "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king. * * * And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return unto thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel." "He hath taken thee away in his wrath." "And the Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel? fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Beth-lehemite: for I have provided me a king among his sons. * * * Thou shalt anoint unto me him whom I name unto thee. * * * And the Lord said, Arise, anoint him: for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward." In 2 Sam. vii. 11-16, we have the record of the covenant God made with David, saying, "And since the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Israel, and have caused thee to rest from all

thine enemies. Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but my mercy shall not depart away from him as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever."

Here then we have the absolute transfer of the kingdom of God over Israel to David and his house forever, that is, to the terminus of the 1000 years of the reign of Jesus. Consequently the Psalmist says, "I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations."—Yea, "I have found David my servant; with my holy oil I have anointed him: with whom my hand shall be established. * * * * * My mercy will I keep for him forevermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven." * * * * * My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." Add to these testimonies that of Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26, and we have the strongest testimonies in proof of the absolute transfer by covenant of the kingdom, or jurisdiction of God over Israel for the time specified, that ever was furnished upon any subject. And how do the facts agree with the evidence? Has God ever permitted the throne of David to be polluted by the occupancy thereof of any but sons of David since he confirmed that covenant? But have not some of them proven as wicked, and unworthy as any of the children of men? Still God has covenanted that his mercy and his truth He "will keep with him forever." And therefore although it can be affirmed that, "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will, and setteth up over it the basest of men," this cannot be affirmed of the kingdom of David. Jeremiah distinctly affirms that the ordinances of heaven and earth shall fail before God will violate his covenanted obligations to David concerning his kingdom, throne, and seed; and

therefore rather than pollute it with a stranger, He has overturned it, that "it should be no more until he comes whose right it is, and (then He) will give it Him." There never was, or ever will be, a more absolute transfer than this to David, or one more scrupulously observed by God. Hence from the time of the transfer it is invariably termed the kingdom of David,—the throne of David. True, about the time of the transfer, in perfect accordance with the most common usage of this and all ages and countries, we find such language as the following, 1 Chron. xvii. 14, "I will settle him in mine house and in my kingdom forever." And therefore he continues, "His (viz., that which was mine) throne shall be established forevermore." Nobody denies that it was God's house and kingdom to give, and there is no impropriety in speaking of it in this way subsequent to the gift, and it seems to me impossible that any reasonable person could claim from this class of scriptures that the kingdom was still God's, notwithstanding the covenant.

Again, when David recounts the dealings of God with himself and Solomon, he naturally refers to the kingdom as being originally the Lord's. Hence he says, "And of all my sons (for the Lord hath given me many sons) he hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Israel." What more natural when he announces the fact that the Lord had not left the selection to himself, David, which of his sons should occupy the throne, that he should remind them that the kingdom and throne was originally the gift of the Lord. Hence he continues—"And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts: for I have chosen him to be my son, and I will be his father. Moreover I will establish HIS KINGDOM forever." 1 Chron. xxviii. 4-7. It seems to me that fairness and honesty can never ignore the emphasis with which the term HIS KINGDOM, or HIS THRONE is invariably found in these passages, which are relied upon as the great proof texts in this connection. The passage in chap. xxix. 23, is of like character and to be understood upon precisely the same principles; it reads, "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king, instead of David his father." That is to say, it was the throne of the Lord's direct gift, not only to David, but to him, Solomon, also. For David has told us that God himself chose Solomon from among all his sons, so that the throne was the direct gift of God to him, as well as to his father. In like manner the Queen of Sheba, refers to the same fact when she said to him, "Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on his throne, to be king for the Lord thy God: because thy

God loved Israel, to establish them for ever, therefore made he thee *king over them*, to do judgment and justice." 2 Chron. ix. 8. It certainly will not be claimed that the Queen of Sheba, spoke by inspiration, or that she spake authoritatively for God; any more than it will be insisted that all the parties whose conversations with the servants of God are recorded in the Bible spake authoritatively; and therefore we conclude that this conversation can only be taken as the expression of the impressions made upon her mind by what she witnessed and heard: and that her forms of speech were according to the ordinary custom of speaking of such things. Hence no one would for a moment suppose that she meant to affirm that he was sat upon the throne of Jehovah where "the greater than Solomon" now sits. No, she was cognizant of the fact that God himself chose Solomon, and set him on the throne, even as he chose David and set him on the throne. That it was God's gift of the throne and kingdom to him as much as it was to David, or Saul. Hence the Lord appeared unto him in Gibeon, and the second time when he prayed unto him, at the dedication of the house that he had builded for his name, "And the Lord said unto him, I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication, that thou hast made before me: I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there forever; and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually. And if thou wilt walk before me, as David thy father walked in integrity of heart, and in uprightness, to do according to all that I have commanded thee, and wilt keep my statutes and judgments; then *I will establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever*, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man *upon the throne of Israel.*" 1 Kings ix. 3-5.

After Solomon, the kingdom descended from father to son according to the law of inheritance: and therefore no other son of David is said to have sat upon the throne of the Lord, but all of them are said to have sat upon the throne of their father David, or the throne of his kingdom. And throughout the Scriptures from the 2 Chron. ix. 8, the terms kingdom of Israel, kingdom of David, or the throne of David only occur, there is no other instance where even by implication they are called the the throne or kingdom of God. With these facts before the mind it is passing strange to me that any one should persist in calling "the kingdom of Israel," "the kingdom of God," and that upon no other authority than these four incidental allusions to the fact, that the kingdom belonged of right to God to give; and that he was the giver of it to the parties in question.

But some quote Isa. ix. 6, 7, to prove that "the kingdom of Israel" is "the kingdom of God." But how the declaration of the prophet that the Son born unto the nation, and upon whose shoulders the government should be placed, and "of the increase of whose government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice," can prove it to be the kingdom of God in any other sense than it was before it was given to David, I am at loss to discover. Other Scriptures are also dragged into the controversy, but if the above fail to prove their point it is useless to examine others. Once for all, then, we affirm that in order to establish the position of "Learner," it is necessary to show that God possesses a plurality of kingdoms, and also that they distinctly declare in the most unequivocal terms that the kingdom of Israel is one of them: and fairly to do this the position assumed by "Learner" is irretrievable lost. And then what becomes of his bold and hasty charge of falsehood?

CONCLUDED IN NEXT.

From the Occident.

The American Crisis.—NO. 1.

BIBLE PICTURES OF WAR.

***** We doubt not that there are Jews both in the Federal army and the army of Secession. It is not our purpose to write anything which any reasonable and intelligent man, whether he be a Union man or a Secessionist, must consider as a particular offence to his party. We can say very many things of the very highest and most comprehensive importance, and still not say to the Union man that he deserves to be shot, or to the Secessionist that he deserves to be shot. Our object is to furnish some articles which would be good reading in either army, and might help to open the eyes of both parties, and convert enmity into affection. It is a great question how religion and war can go together. The Jews have come through so many wars, that they certainly have, in many respects, the best right to give an utterance in relation to war. Their experience of war is the longest and most wonderful to which any nation can lay claim. One of the most useful services for the world at this time would be to set this American war in precisely that light in which sound Hebrew eyes must look at it. What do those people who go to Moses, and Joshua, and David, and Solomon, and Isaiah, and Malachi, that they may drink from the fountain of eternal wisdom, say in relation to this war? what must they say in relation to it? The seed which needs most to be sown all over our land, is

the genuine Hebrew sentiment in relation to this war, its causes, the rights and wrongs in it, and its issue; and we could wish that the present flowing of tears and blood might prove to be the useful rain causing this same sentiment to flourish in all parts of the land.

The song of Moses at the Red Sea is eminently the national song of the Jews. No song has been more deeply impressed on the memory of the nation. No song shows a deeper impress of genuine Hebrew piety than this. It is a war song. The truth which comes forth most prominently at the beginning of the song, and which glows most splendidly from beginning to end, is set forth in the verse: "The Lord is the man of war; the Lord is his name;" or, according to another translation, "The Eternal is the lord of war; the Eternal is his name." The great truth learned by the delivered host at the Red Sea, was that the Eternal is the lord of war, or, that the Lord is the supreme disposer of events in war. Behold the two armies in the midst of the sea, the army pursued and the army pursuing; the pursued army is that of Israel; they have been oppressed for hundreds of years; they have been long trained to obey and tremble; the sentiment of independence has hardly yet entered their minds; there are among them the fearful, the dissatisfied, the murmuring, the trembling, the despairing. The pursuing army is that of Egypt; there is a hardened heart in that army; the brilliant chariots and the distinguished horsemen are there; military discipline, and experience, and courage are there, and there is the firmest determination either to make the Israelites captives or to leave them dead on the field. Now, who shall determine which army shall be successful? The answer is, that the Almighty is the Supreme Disposer. Where there is the greatest weakness there may be victory; where there is the most amazing combination of power there may be in the end the most terrible overthrow. Let not Moses and Aaron convince you that the crown of victory must come to such heads as theirs; and let not Pharaoh and the most splendid leader of horsemen, whose shadow now falls on the wall of hardened water, convince you that the crown of victory must drop into such hands as theirs. The Lord will assign victory to one party or to the other, or to neither, according to His will. The Lord rules in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth. Infinitely better be on the side where there is justice, even if the weakness of that side should be contemptible, than on the side which is most powerful, and yet so wrong that it must be hateful to the God of justice. Right is better than might. To be on one side with God alone, is better than

to be on the other side along with all the world.

Not only as the Jew looks back to the ancient song of Moses and Miriam does he learn that the Eternal is the lord of war, but the same truth is set still more grandly before him as he looks forward into those most remote regions of the future where any Hebrew prophet has ever traveled. The grandest visions of the future are visions of scenes of war. The prophets who have looked farthest into the future have adorned the future with the grandest warlike pictures. Who of the prophets has done more to describe the felicity, the peace, and the glory of a still future state of the world than Isaiah? The last chapters of Isaiah present the most lovely pictures of the coming felicity of man. Now, notice particularly the scene in the sixty-third chapter of Isaiah. Who is this that is coming from Edom; with dyed garments he is coming from a city of the hereditary enemies of Israel? this one glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength? Who is he as he appears in the distance? The answer is, "I, that speaketh in righteousness, mighty to save." But why this redness in thine apparel? and thy garments befitting him that treadeth in the wine-press? The answer of the Mighty One is: "I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me; for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in my heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." The question returns, Who is this warrior covered with blood as if he comes from the treading of grapes? Aben Ezra's answer is: "Some say that this one who comes is the Messiah, and some say that he is Michael, but the right view is that he indicates the glorious Name." Accordingly, this one, speaking in righteousness and mighty to save, is the Almighty. Here He appears, indeed, as the lord of war, treading the wine-press of the nations, trampling them in his fury, so that all his garments are radiant with the piercing redness of their blood. When does He thus appear? It is when the year of his redeemed has come. Connected with this scene of carnage are the greatest blessings for the world. This description of the wonderful conqueror from Edom and terror of nations, is immediately followed by one

of the grandest pictures of humiliation, piety, and prayer that is found any where in the Bible. The very next picture after the conqueror covered with blood, is the picture of the pious people. They recount the mercies of God to them in the wilderness, they remember the angel who carried them, and Moses who led them. They mournfully inquire why the mercy of God has retired from them. They acknowledge that their iniquities, like the wind, have carried them away. They mourn for their holy and beautiful house which has long since been consumed. They pray that the holy privileges of former ages may come back to them. They feel themselves to be the clay in the hand of God as the potter. Their long and severe afflictions cause them to feel that the lowest place in the dust is the only proper place for them. These chapters in Isaiah contain one of the most humble, earnest, and hopeful prayers that has ever been recorded, and they give this prayer as the experience of the servants of God immediately after the terrible scene of blood in Edom. Jewish commentators generally and many most orthodox Christians believe that it will be the restored Jews of a future day who will make this prayer, and that the whole prayer is a part of a prophecy of a still future restoration. No man knows the course which the present American war is destined to run, and it is not for us to say that this is the beginning of that august scene in which the Eternal appears as the lord of war, and comes from Edom in raiment red with blood—blood that has been shed in the wine-press of nations; we will not, however, hesitate to assert, that Isaiah and other prophets most clearly teach us to consider the greatest blessings for the world as connected indissolubly with most terrible wars. Dismal as war is, the Almighty has placed around it the brilliant rainbow of promise and hope. The garments rolled in blood and the best piety, faith, humility, and prayer that ever beautify the heart of man are quite close together.

M. R. M.

The Dead Sea.

ENTRANCE OF THE JORDAN INTO THE DEAD SEA.

Lieut. Lynch, who explored the Jordan with care, from its source to the Dead Sea, has said: "Everything said in the Bible about the Sea and the Jordan, we believe to be fully verified by our observations." Now, we have glanced at the truth regarding the stream, and all that remains is to exemplify it concerning the Sea.

In the river between the Lake of Galilee and the Dead Sea, the voyager on the Jordan plunges down no fewer than twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a great many smaller ones. As the former sea is above

three hundred feet below the level of the Mediterranean, and the latter more than thirteen hundred, the difference between the two is the measure of the descent; but as the distance, though in reality only sixty miles, is about two hundred by water, in consequence of the windings of the river, there are some portions of the Jordan sufficiently sluggish. Approaching the Sea, the river is from a hundred and twenty to a hundred and fifty feet wide, and twelve feet deep. Cane-brakes, tamarisk-trees, and various others, line the shore. The river gradually widens to two hundred and forty feet and upwards. Several islands are near its embouchure; and where the stream actually joins the sea it is a hundred and eighty yards, or five hundred and forty feet wide, and three feet deep.

We are now, then, on the nauseous waters of the Sea of Lot, for so the Arabs call this sheet of water. Portions of it at least were once "even as the garden of the Lord;" but now the scene is one of unmix'd desolation. The air is tainted with noxious exhalations; and even the foliage of the cane, generally a light green, is tawny near this sea. Except the cane-brakes, which appear near some of the streams, there are spots were no vestige of vegetation can be traced. Barren mountains, precipices which overhang the sea sometimes to the height of twelve hundred or fifteen hundred feet; fragments of rocks precipitated to the beach, and blackened by the deposits of the place; trees washed down by the Jordan, but now lying blasted and dead along the margin of this region of death; the sullen, lead-colored waters, in which no microscope can detect a trace of life; the bare, bluff mountains on the east side; the hills of Moab, and other scenes far more than classical; above all, the associations of the sea with Sodom and Gomorrah; all render this basin so sad and so sombre in appearance, as to depress even the most jubilant mind. At the sight of "such calcined barrenness," we can well justify the application so often made of the lines—

"But here, above, around, below,

In mountain or in glen,

Nor tree, nor plant, nor shrub, nor flower,

Nor aught of vegetative power

The wearied eye may ken:

But all its rocks at random thrown—

Black waves, bare crags, and banks of stone."

What a contrast between the present aspect of the Sea of Lot, and the appearance of the neighborhood when he chose it as his pasture-ground and heritage, though it proved one of wo!

And yet there are spots of unusual beauty at no great distance—fragments spared, as if to show how exquisite once was the whole. The nabk, or thorn-tree called by the Arabs dhom, the osher or apple of Sodom, the

tamarisk, the oleander, as well as some other trees, are found at some spots; and the osher seems to deserve a description, as we are now amid the scenes which are deemed its home. The blossom is of a delicate purple, small, bell-shaped, and grows in large clusters. The leaf is oblong, thick, smooth, and of a dark green hue. The branches are tortuous, and the fruit, which is about the size of a small lemon, with the color of an apple, is dry, and easily broken, like a puff-ball. Hence its peculiar character, as all ashes within.

We do not tarry to describe the masses of bitumen sometimes thrown up from the bottom, remains of the slime pits of old; or the absence of an outlet for the waters of the Jordan; nor do we dwell on the two plains now ascertained to form the bottom of the sea, the one thirteen hundred feet deep, where the bed of the river once lay, the other about thirteen, where, as some argue, the cities of the plain formerly stood;—neither do we describe the salt pillar of Usdom—that is, Sod-om: we only say, that of all dreary scenes, this is one of the most awful and depressing. Taken in connection with its history, and viewed in the light of the Bible, it is more desolate than the great Zahara—the land as well as the sea seems dead. Fetid exhalations, leafless wastes, the earth seared, the waters salt, the sky brass: behold a picture of this sublime desolation—this most solemn of witnesses for God.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: If a man's mind be open to conviction, the aspect of this Sea must fasten conviction on his mind. One who explored all its coasts, and fathomed its depths, and cleared up some of its mysteries, has said: "We entered upon this sea with conflicting opinions. One of the party was skeptical, and another, I think, a professed unbeliever in the Mosaic account. After twenty-two days' close investigation, if I am not mistaken, we are unanimous in the conviction of the truth of the Scriptural account of the cities of the plain." The facts observed tally so completely with the truths recorded, the whole condition of the wondrous region is so unique, the very structure or form of the rocks is at some places so peculiar, that the mind is forced to accept of some great catastrophe, perhaps more than one, to explain what it beholds.

Hebrews.

The following is taken from the "*New American Cyclopaedia*," and forms the introduction to a well written article, entitled—

HEBREW, ISRAELITES, OR JEWS, (Heb. *Ibrin, Bney Israel, Jehudim*.) a people of Semitic race, whose ancestors appear at the very dawn of the history of mankind on the

banks of the Euphrates, Jordan, and Nile, and whose fragments are now to be seen, in larger or smaller numbers, in almost all the cities of the globe, from Batavia to New Orleans, from Stockholm to Cape Town. This people, as such, forms one of the most remarkable phenomena in history. When little more numerous than a family, they had their language, customs and peculiar observances, treated with princes, and in every respect acted as a nation. Though broken into atoms and scattered through all climes, among the rudest and the most civilized nations, they have preserved through thousands of years common features, habits, and observances, a common religion, literature, and sacred language. Without any political union, without a common head or centre, they are generally regarded and regard themselves, as a nation. They began as nomads "migrating from nation to nation, from state to state;" their law made them agriculturists for 15 centuries; their exile has transformed them into a mercantile people. They have struggled for their national existence against the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Syrians, and Romans; have been conquered and nearly exterminated by each of these powers, and have survived them all. They have been oppressed and persecuted by emperors and republics, sultans and popes, Moors and inquisitors; they were proscribed in Catholic Spain, Protestant Norway, and Greek Muscovy, while their persecutors sang hymns of their psalmists, revered their books, believed in their prophets, and even persecuted them in the name of their God. They have numbered philosophers among the Greeks of Alexandria and the Saracens of Cordova, have transplanted the wisdom of the East beyond the Pyrenees and the Rhine, and have been treated as pariahs among pagans, Mohammedans, and Christians. They have fought for liberty under Kosciuszko and Blucher, and popular assemblies among the Slavi and Germans still withheld from them the right of living in certain towns, villages, and streets. This phenomenon, however, admits of explanation. At the very beginning they were not merely a family or tribe, but also a sect, a society or community, superior to those surrounding it in culture, morals, and ideals, too powerless to hope for great success over others, but anxious to defend their own moral condition at the price of self-isolation, and to perpetuate it by the development of peculiar customs and religious observances. The father of the people himself, Abraham, is recorded as acting under a divine mission, and leaving the land of his parents and his birth in order to preserve and propagate his ideal in "his children and house." After a hard trial in Egypt and a marvellous deliverance they received a law, at the same

time national and religious, which constituted them a "people of priests" to enlighten the nations by their example, and which by its sublimity inspired them with the natural conviction that they were chosen of God, who alone knew him and walked in his ways. The national and religious elements became more and more developed and blended, the antagonism with the surrounding idolatry and religiously instituted immorality more and more striking; a long continued struggle for self-preservation against overwhelming influences changed enthusiasm into fanaticism and self esteem into repulsive pride, which was repaid by antipathy, hatred, and cruel persecution. Their national independence* was destroyed; fanatical attempts to recover it failed; they were scattered among nations who in the meanwhile had reached a civilization in some respects superior to their own; the ancient idolatries were replaced by new religious systems drawn from Hebrew sources, the name of their God was now praised from the rising of the sun to its setting; the ruins of their Zion had become sacred to the nations. But still they clung to their faith, ceremonies, traditions, and hopes; for their religious and national characteristics were so deeply rooted and so well blended that they wonderfully supported each other. They were still convinced of their religious and moral superiority to the Gentiles: they were justified by the cruelties of the world in believing themselves to be its martyrs; they submitted to them from what they regarded as a divine obligation. Their masters punished their self-sufficiency, humiliating pride, and pretensions by crushing burdens and legal degradation, their religious enemies by calumnies, the people by contemptuous social exclusion; and it was not till the last quarter of the 18th century that a brighter prospect opened by the inauguration of the principle of religious liberty and civil equality in America, and afterward in the N. W. of Europe. This all-pervading mixture of the religious and national elements also requires a different treatment of their history from that of all other nations. It must be at once a history of the people, of its religion, and of its literature. Separate from it the religious leaders Moses, Ezra, Hillel, Rabbi Gamaliel, &c., and no national history remains. The prose

* Their national independence was destroyed in accordance with the predictions of their prophets, and especially of Moses their law-giver, who declared, that if they forsook the covenant of the Lord God of their fathers, he would root them out of their land, and scatter them amongst all nations. There seems to be a want of recognition of the Divine government under which the nation of Israel was placed, and their rebellion upon it, as the cause of all their troubles, all through the article of which this is only the proface.—Ed.

writings of the Pentateuch, the effusions of Isaiah or Micah, the Psalms, the Lamentations, the Hebrew writings of Maimonides or Mendelssohn, can as little be separated, as merely literary works, from the history of the people, as can the Philipics of Demosthenes from that of Athens, Cicero's orations against Catiline from that of Rome, or the declaration of Independence from that of the United States. Having thus stated the character of our subject and the only natural way of treating it, we must also refer the readers of this brief sketch for further details, criticism, and illustrations, to the respective special articles of this work, as well as the "book of books" itself, which is in the hands of each of them.

Seeming Contradictions of the Bible.

Acts i. 18. Now this man (Judas) purchased a field, etc.; but Matthew tells us [chap. xxvii. 7] that the chief priests bought the field with the money which Judas threw down in the midst of them. Many commentators remark that an action is sometime said in Scripture to be *done* by a person who was the *occasion* of doing it. Thus in one place [John iii. 22] it is said that "Jesus baptized;" in another [chap. iv. 1,] that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." The passages are easily reconciled: his disciples baptized by his authority, but he did not baptize with his own hands. See Gen. xlii. 38; Exod. xxiii. 8; 1 Kings xiv. 16; 2 Kings xxii. 16; Rom. xiv. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 16.

Acts xvi. 12. Luke, in relating the first introduction of christianity into Europe, speaks of Philippi in Macedonia as the chief city in that part of Macedonia, and a colony; while verse 21 implies that it was a Roman colony. The silence of contemporary profane history as to this fact rendered it a difficulty, even to learned men, and threw the suspicion of inaccuracy upon Luke's narration; but some ancient coins have been discovered, on which Philippi is recorded under character; particularly one which states that Julius Cæsar himself bestowed on this city the dignity and privileges of a Roman colony, which were afterward confirmed and augmented by Augustus.

Sometimes (though comparatively very seldom,) the translation might be improved, or the original will admit of another rendering, and thus the difficulty might be removed. The Hebrews express their numbers by letters, and some of their letters are very much alike; hence, as Dr. Kennicott has shown satisfactorily, some seeming contradictions with regard to numbers have arisen from one number being inadvertently written instead

of another. The only apparent difference between *one* and *one thousand* is simply one little dot, so that the careless making or reading a little dot upon a letter might change units into thousands. Thus are such passages as 2 Sam. viii. 4, and 1 Chron. xviii. 4, reconciled. The letter *sayin*, with a dot upon it stands for 7,000, and the final letter *noon*, with a dot upon its sides is 700; the great similarity of the letters or characters might easily cause the one for the other, and so produce the above contradiction in number.

—*Mine Explored.*

The Bible.

From the Crisis.

It is the Book of Laws to show the right and wrong.

It is a book of Wisdom that makes the foolish wise.

It is a book of Truth that detects all errors.

It is a book of Life that shows how to avoid everlasting death.

It is the most authentic and entertaining History that was ever published.

It contains the most remote antiquities, remarkable events and wonderful occurrences.

It is a complete code of laws.

It is a perfect body of divinity.

It is an unequalled narrative.

It is a Book of Biography.

It is a Book of Travels.

It is a Book of Voyages.

It is the best Covenant that was ever made; the best Deed that was ever sealed.

It is the best Will that was ever executed; the best Testament that was ever signed.

It is the young man's best Companion.

It is the school-boy's best Instructor.

It is the house-wife's best Guide.

It is the learned man's Masterpiece.

It is the ignorant man's Dictionary, and every man's Directory.

It promises an eternal reward to the faithful and believing.

Be Sober.

1 Pet. i. 13. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be *sober*, and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you, at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

1 Pet. v. 8. Be *sober*, be vigilant, because your adversary, the devil, walketh about seeking whom he may devour.

Titus ii. 11, 12. The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live *soberly*, righteously, and godly in this present world.

Be *sober*, with watchfulness. 1 Thess. v. 6. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be *sober*, and watch unto prayer.

Classes particularly exhorted to *sobriety*.

1. *Ministers of Christ must be *sober*. 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3.

2. Likewise their †wives must be *sober*. 11th verse.

3. Aged men. Titus ii. 2—"That the aged men be *sober*."

4. The young men are exhorted to be *sober-minded*, 6th verse.

5. The young women are called to this duty, 4th verse.

Finally, all the saints are admonished of the importance of strict attention to the characteristics of our great pattern—Christ; and also in view of our high and holy profession. 1 Thess. v. 6-8.

But let us who are of the day be *sober*. The great motive—the end of all things is at hand. The Judgment is rushing us on with the speed of lightning. If found in a state of mirth, levity, drunkenness, and surfeiting, we must be cast as a cursed thing out of the earth. O God, save us and all thy people from this sin, and from every evil work until that day.

J. M. <

The House of God.

"The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." John iv. 23.

Prayer has no place peculiarly its own—

No lofty temple, with its shining throne,

But everywhere the knee may bow,

The soul may breathe in accents low,

Its humble wants.

Churches unknown within the city's mart,

Hidden within the verdure of the heart

Of each true worshiper, uprise,

With steeples pointing to the skies—

Emblems of faith.

There, meeting in the still, secluded place,

With holy prayer and upward-lifted face,

The yearnings of our spirits bend,

And all our thoughts together blend

In one desire.

The spirit's dome is gilded o'er with prayer;

And downward leaning from the arching there,

Are cherubim and seraphim,

Waiting to catch the rising hymn

Of praise divine.

There, without fear, in penitence we bow.

And our confessions make in accents low,

Owning our weaknesses and our sin,

With only tears fast dropping in

God's treasury.

But these are precious in our Father's sight,

As was the dropping of the widow's mite.

And treading the still, inner aisles,

He lighteth up the soul with smiles,

And makes it his—

And makes it his—forevermore his own—

The home, the "house of God," his humble throne,

The soul-church, where our longings meet,

And where our aspirations sweet

Make Sabbath there.

*Elders of congregations—not *ministers* in the sectarian sense. See the reference.—Ed. G. B.

† Rather Deaconesses.—Ed. G. B.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—Jesus. "The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.]

GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., NOVEMBER 15, 1861.

[VOL. VII., No. 21.]

For the Gospel Banner.
Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God?

G. B. STACY IN REPLY TO "LEARNER."

CONCLUDED.

Our labor thus far has been in reply to "Learner;" we have not touched the proposition itself; we must however endeavor to throw some little light upon it; for "Learner" appears to be entirely in the dark in relation to it. Let it be remembered then, that the acceptance of the covenant of the law was the visible manifestation that the Jewish nation recognized the jurisdiction of the invisible God. Not that the jurisdiction itself was visible, but it was manifest that they recognized it although they could not see it. They could not see the power by which the manna was spread before them, or which caused the water to spring from the smitten rock, or that brought the quails, or that opened the bowels of the earth to swallow up the rebels; still they recognized it, and submitted to it, until they sought a visible king. Their desire was to have one of their own brethren invested with kingly prerogatives, that they might be like all nations round about them. We have already proven that invisibility is a distinguished attribute of "the kingdom of God." So that when God gave them the king of their own choice, and accepted their rejection of himself, the kingdom of God ceased to have any visible recognition among men. The first covenant being found faulty has vanished away, and the New Covenant has been inaugurated. The terms first and second, or new and old as applied to the covenants are only applicable to the covenant of the law, and the covenant of favor; called the New covenant. The covenant with David does not profess to establish the authority of God, but of David and his Seed. It therefore does not because it cannot manifest the recognition by the people of the rightful jurisdiction of God. And further, the Apostle emphatically declares that, when the tabernacle of David shall be built again;

the great object to be consummated by the fulfillment of the covenant made with David, is not to make it manifest that "the throne of David" is the "the throne of God," or that "the kingdom of David" is "the kingdom of God." But rather, he affirms that, the Lord Jesus in his times, or by, and during his reign subsequent to his appearing in the glory of his kingdom; "he shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords: who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." 1 Tim. vi. 14-16. Will that be demonstrating his own visible jurisdiction to be the jurisdiction of the invisible God? or will he demonstrate himself to be, "the King, eternal, immortal, invisible?" If he will not do this, in what sense will he, or can he manifest his own to be "the kingdom of God?" Surely reason has not forsaken her throne, and left the advocates of that theory devoid of appreciation of those legitimate and weighty, nay, irresistible conclusions which the plain and ungarbled testimonies I have presented, enforce and confirm.

But our proposition affirms that, "The visible manifestation of the kingdom of God results from the inauguration and application of the New Covenant." Seeing then that there exists no visible recognition of God as their rightful king from the time He gave them one of their brethren to occupy His own place; and that the law of righteousness thus failed to accomplish its purpose, when Jesus "brought in everlasting righteousness," by the offering of his own body "once for all" "through the eternal Spirit, without spot unto God:" by that "one offering, He perfected forever them that are sanctified," or rather separated unto God, or as Paul affirms, He thereby took away the first covenant of the law that He might establish the second, or New Covenant. Hence his blood is called "the blood of the New Covenant," and there-

fore he says, "How much more shall the blood of the Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, (or law) they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." The shedding of his blood brought the New Covenant into force, and gave him a more excellent ministry than that furnished the High priest by the Law, even the ministry of the Holy Spirit. Hence the Lord describes the New Covenant thus, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest, for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."

The first covenant of the kingdom, viz., the law was inscribed on tables of stone. But the New Covenant is inscribed upon "the fleshy tables of the heart. The conditions of the first covenant was, "Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests*, and an holy nation." In this case the active obedience of the parties was required. The conditions of the New Covenant is *faith in God*, and passive submission to His indwelling and inruling authority. Surely if the obedience of the Jew to the law could be accepted as the recognition of God's jurisdiction over them, the yielding of Christians of themselves to God "as those that are alive from the dead, and (their) members as instruments of righteousness to God"—and the presentation of their "bodies as a living sacrifice (recognizing it as but their) reasonable service"—that they may always, be "delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be manifested in (their) mortal flesh."—"Know ye not (says Paul) that your bodies are members of Christ," "and he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit," and therefore, "Ye are the temple of the living God." The doctrine predicated upon these relations is, "If any man have not the Spirit of the Christ he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, *the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.* But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal

bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: *but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.* For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, *whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs: heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ,*"—even, "members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus the Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together *for an habitation of God through the Spirit.*" I say surely these testimonies must evidence the fact that the subjects of them, are the recipients of the immunities of the New Covenant, and therefore the apostle addresses such, saying, "If ye then be risen with the Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ, sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth. *For ye are dead, and your life is hid with the Christ in God.* When the Christ, who is our life, shall appear, *then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*" It appears to me nothing but the indwelling, and inruling of God provided in the New Covenant can possibly produce such self-negation, or manifest the fact that it is the inruling and invisible jurisdiction of God that produces these astonishing results. To induce men to *crucify their manhood*, by patient submission to the indignities of the seed of the Serpent, is beyond the compass of human capacity. It is the work of God—and the work of God on the human heart. The inauguration of this work might well be proclaimed as the kingdom of heaven at hand. And if the lives of Christians have not evidenced the fact that the law of the Spirit of life in the Christ Jesus (that is, the law of the New Covenant on the tablet of their hearts) has made them free from the law of sin and death, then nothing can evidence the existence of the kingdom of God."

We now leave "Learner" to make the best disposition available to him of his own fierce and bitter denunciation of falsehood and fratricide.

Proposition No. 10 reads,—*"Its personal application commenced on the day of Pentecost, and its national application will result as a consequence of the willing submission of the peoples to the physical,*

rule of Jesus and his associates, when administered by them from the throne of David."

The remarks of "Learner" upon this proposition neither affirms nor denies, nor in any way affect the terms of this proposition though they be admitted. Nor can we conceive that the proposition will be dissented from by any lover of truth.

Proposition No. 11 reads, "The throne of God is established forever in the heavens, where Jesus now sits, because 'the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.'"

The testimonies in proof of the first proposition were adduced in the remarks made under proposition No. 3, and need not be repeated here. The fact that Jesus is exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on High, that is, exalted to the power of the Majesty on High, was demonstrated on the day of Pentecost. The latter part of the proposition affirms, that he sits there, because, "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son." This "Learner" questions and refers to Acts xvii. 31. But do the facts sustain the proposition? Paul praying for the Ephesians desired that they might know, "*what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which He wrought in the Christ when He raised him from the dead, and set him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be HEAD OVER ALL THINGS to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.*" Eph. i. 19-23. When writing to the Colossians he affirms, that all things in heaven and earth, whether visible, or invisible, thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, "were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." Will "Learner" therefore deny that, "*all fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily in him?*" and that he is not as a consequence, "*the head of all principality and power?*" When he gave his commission to his apostles he said, "All power is given to me in heaven and earth, go ye therefore &c." And did not Peter on the day of Pentecost appeal to the miraculous demonstrations of the Spirit, as the evidence that "he was exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on High," and constituted "*both Lord and Christ?*" And again in his 1st Epistle iii. 22, he affirms that, "he is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; *angels and authorities and powers being made subject*

unto him." "Learner" says, "it is never said that God has committed any dominion to him, but that of angels," and the presumption is, that he means to say, that *this world of ours* will not be subject to his jurisdiction until he sits upon the throne of his father David, by his quotation of Acts xvii. 31. The quotations made—selected from a host of others, are sufficient to sustain the proposition, that from the time, that he ascended the throne of his Father he has been officiating, or administering the government of this world, and "Learner" ought to know that our affirmations are limited to things in relation to this planet, unless we clearly and explicitly affirm otherwise.

Proposition No. 12 reads, "The throne of David in Jerusalem, at present overturned and trodden down, is covenanted to Jesus as his own, and therefore he has promised to his faithful brethren who overcome, to give to them to sit down with him on *his throne*, 'even as I overcame, and sat down with my Father on *his throne*.'"

Again the remarks of "Learner" on this proposition are irrelevant. The fact that Jesus could not inherit the throne and kingdom of his father David, because of physical and constitutional weakness; does not militate against the proposition, that the throne, and kingdom of David was covenanted to him because of his descent from David. Nor does the fact that the covenant required him to be the Son of God also, do away with the necessity of his descent from David, or militate against his absolute right to it, and its disposition. In other words, none but him hath absolute right to it. His own proposition in relation to life might be used in relation to the kingdom and throne of David, for instance when he says, "As the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given the Son to have life in himself." We may read the proposition thus, as the Father possessed the jurisdiction which he gave to David and his seed in himself; so hath He given the Son of David to possess the throne and jurisdiction thereof in himself; so that as the Father disposed of it according to his own pleasure; so hath He given the Son to give it to whomsoever he will.

Proposition No. 13 reads,—*"The throne of God belongs to the kingdom of God. The throne of Jesus to the kingdom of David, or of Israel."*

"Learner's" remarks—"Read the *universal* throne of God belongs to Jehovah, and the *delegated* throne over Israel and the nations to Jesus, then the writer and the Scriptures agree."

The Scriptures use no such term as "*universal* throne of God," which implies a plurality, or more than one throne as God's.

But they say personifying Jehovah, "*The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my foot-stool,*" and they recognize none other as the throne of God proper, that is to say, as the seat of His administration.

But why did "Learner" omit proposition No. 14 which reads as follows,—"*The present occupation of the throne of God by Jesus, is because he is declared to be the Son of God with power, by his resurrection from among the dead, whilst his future occupation of the throne of David is predicated upon the demonstrated fact, that he is the Son of David.*" Did he omit it because the meat was too strong for his digestive capacities. The terms of the proposition have been demonstrated in the remarks made upon propositions 11 and 12.

Proposition No. 15 reads,—"*It is the province of the Son of David to rule on the throne of his father David for 1000 years. Whilst it is the province of the Son of God "to take away the sin of the world," that is to bless, or save mankind, by turning every one of them from their iniquities.*"

"Learner" appears very anxious to put into my words ideas they were never intended to convey. He must know that I never intended to say, and have not said that any mortal son of David, or of God ever did, or could bless or save from sin. I am sorry to say that this disposition to pervert the legitimate meaning of an opponent's words indicates a great want of candor. But he cannot even by a forced construction make my language express the sense he would try to foist upon it.

Now what is the legitimate import of the proposition? Is it not that, because Jesus occupies two classes of relations, one fleshly, and the other spiritual: he therefore derives one class of his prerogatives through the mediumship of, and on account of his fleshly relations; and the other solely on account of and through the mediumship of his spiritual relations? But it does not therefore follow, that he would be competent to the performance of the prerogatives which accrue to him on account of his fleshly relations, if he did not at the same time occupy his spiritual relations. His power to perform his fleshly prerogatives must come from his spiritual relations. But his spiritual relations independent of his fleshly ones could not invest him with the right and prerogatives which he derives from his fleshly relations. In other words, whilst the Son of David, who is not the Son of God, could not rule on the throne of David for a 1000 years, the Son of God who is not a Son of David, has no right to the throne of David at all, because participation in it, is in the gift of

Jesus the Son of God, and not in the gift of the Father himself.

Proposition No. 16 reads,—"*Physical rule is incompetent to save or bless men, because it cannot change or transform the fountain of sin—the human affections. This is the province of the kingdom of God, accomplished by the personal abode of God in his people by or through His Spirit. Hence the kingdom of God is of like character with himself, "the Spirit."* And therefore it is said, "*He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit.*"

"Learner's" remarks on this proposition are wide of the point. The majesty, power, or omnipotence of the Son of God has not been questioned, may indeed we have affirmed that the prerogatives of the Father are not only conferred upon him, but exercised by him on and from the right hand of the throne of God—even "*ALL THE FULLNESS of the Godhead dwelleth bodily in him.*" But as we had occasion to remark under the last proposition, the characteristics and capacities necessary to the performance of the functions and obligations of each relationship, are only manifested in the sphere of that relationship. For instance, as Son of David on the throne of his father David, he will be manifested as the glorious, exalted, and omnipotent king, irresistible and invisible, righteous, equitable, just and wise, "*Ruling in the fear of Jehovah.*" But as the eternal, the immortal, the invisible and the only wise God, He will not be manifested to the subjects of His personal and visible jurisdiction, that is, the jurisdiction that pertains to the occupation of the throne of his father David. His Godhead is invisible, and can never be manifested so as to be perceptible to the senses of humanity. *Immortality dwelleth in inapproachable light, whom no man hath seen or can see.*" It is the sheerest nonsense to talk about "*immortal flesh*"—a contradiction of terms. Flesh is a tangible and visible thing and therefore mortal, corruptible and destructible, for this reason it cannot "*inherit the kingdom of God.*" *Neither flesh, nor blood, because of their corruptible character can inherit that immortal, invisible and eternal kingdom.* And this accounts for what Jesus said to his disciples, "*Why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself, handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.*" He thus affirms himself to be the Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified. In other words, *he was not yet the glorified Son of God,*—not yet invested with the prerogatives of the Father as described by himself, John v. 20-27. Had not yet received "gifts for men, even the rebellious," and therefore *he was not yet "the Lord, the Spirit,"* and consequently could not yet confer this promise of the Father upon

his disciples, see Acts ii. 33-39. John tells us chap. vii. 37-39. In the last great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, "if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" He remained after his resurrection wearing his son of man phase of existence until his glorification, when he received gifts for men, and was henceforth "the Spirit,"—hence his "flesh and bones," in order that when he ascended "to the right hand of the Majesty on High," even "the Holy of Holies," he might enter there "with his own blood," and entering—his corruptible put on incorruption, and his mortal immortality, therefore he has from that time been invisible to the senses of mortals. Not that it is not perfectly within the capacity of the invisible God to put on a phase of existence which shall make a personal and visible appearance; but that which appears is not the immortal and eternal, to which of necessity pertains invisibility. *

The visible rule of Jesus will of necessity be a physical rule,—a rule of subjugation,—a rule according to a proclaimed law and enforced by the physical penalties thereof. It will therefore be a law of restraint,—a law to check and control the passions of sinful flesh, but possessing no power to uproot and transform them. Whilst the rule, jurisdiction, or "kingdom of God" is in the mind, and in the heart—"I will put my laws in your mind, and write them in your hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Such is the kingdom of God as contrasted with the visible manifestation of the personal reign of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of David.

Proposition No. 17 reads,—“The kingdom of God is necessarily a spiritual kingdom. Whilst the kingdom of David is necessarily a physical one.”

“Learner” confesses his ignorance of the Scripture doctrine of things seen and unseen, natural and spiritual, or spiritual and physical. The term physical includes all visible

* We think the writer is very wide of the truth in this proposition. According to the above, when Jesus “shall appear a second time,” and “we shall see him as he is,” it will not be the immortal Jesus that we shall see, but something else.—To be deathless is to be necessarily invisible!!! Is not this devoid of sense?—Ed.

things—everything that is governed by what we call the law of physics, and all created things that have not passed into the eternal, the incorruptible condition of existence—which is the invisible, even as Paul affirms, “the things which are seen are temporal, (or temporary, the mere pattern of things in the heavens) but the things which are unseen are eternal.” What therefore is cognizable to the senses, what we call natural or physical things, is contradistinguished from eternal things which are not cognizable to the senses. And therefore spiritual and physical are in “antithesis with each other.” To imply, that “immaterial” must necessarily be meant by the term spiritual when contrasted with physical, is to display a great lack of understanding of the sense in which the Apostle speaks of the invisible God, who is a Spirit; and of the nature of his kingdom which is spiritual, and therefore, “except a man be born again, he cannot see, (or perceive) the kingdom of God”—for “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” And therefore it is foolishness to call the visible and personal reign of Jesus of Nazareth on the throne of his father David in Jerusalem, “the kingdom of God.” Because, he must reign until he hath put down all rule, and all authority and power, yea all enemies under his feet. For he shall rule them with a rod of iron, he shall dash them in pieces as a potter’s vessel—he shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath and his arrows shall be sharp in the heart of the king’s enemies. For it is written, “As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.”

In conclusion, I have presented “Learner” with incontestable Scripture proof of every proposition. Will he now worship with me in “the vestibule of truth”—the “shrine where I worship,” for I have convicted him of offering incense elsewhere.

G. B. STACY.

For the Gospel Banner.

What is our relation as Christians to Gentile Governments?—No. 3.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

“He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly, and shame unto him.” Prov. xviii. 13.

In the two former No’s. I have endeavored in a spirit of candor and honesty, to examine certain practical questions concerning our relation to the powers that be, which questions concern us most intimately at the present time, for various reasons, a few of which I will here notice. For instance; some of our brethren have deemed it a privilege if

not a duty, to take part in political matters, and aid by their votes in the election of men to the position of administrators of the affairs of the government, and for so doing, their characters as Christians have been assailed, and they have been looked upon by some with suspicion. Again, others have deemed it to be, not only a privilege but a duty to take up arms in behalf of the government in its present hour of trial, and for this they have been deemed unworthy the name of Christians. Again, there is a possibility of some being drafted out by the authorities to do military duty, and assist in sustaining law and order in our midst. Hence as honest men, as Christians, as good citizens, as those who would provide things honest in the sight of all Gentiles, it becomes us with candor and frankness, to inquire seriously what our duty really is, in the light of all scripture teaching. But some have dear and long cherished theories, that by the strong workings of human sympathy have been inwrought into their very nature, so that even the Word of God itself must be warped and twisted to fit an unhealthy and distorted view of things. Such theories as the following have been strongly advocated:—Human Governments, or the powers that be, are the Devil and Satan, or his manifestations, antagonistic to God's plans and purposes; that Christians, have no right to take part in the affairs of Gentile governments; that they have no citizenship under them, and must not assist physically in sustaining them, but must refuse to render aid even under pain of death. In view of these, and other equally unscriptural ideas, I have presented certain propositions, designed to test, by the scriptures, the soundness of some of these theories; viz. 1st. "Human Governments are not the Devil or Satan;" 2nd. "It is the duty of all God's people to be subject to and obey the powers that be;" 3rd. "It is our duty to pray for authorities and magistrates;" and, 4th. "God's people may be administrators and executors of the affairs of earth, without sin, or without renouncing their relation to God and his future kingdom." These propositions being sustained, as I then believed, and still do believe, by abundant scripture testimony, I proposed in a subsequent number to pursue the subject still further by the consideration of the two following questions:—1st. "Is a military calling incompatible with Christianity;" 2nd. "May Christians under any circumstances take the sword." Our arguments on the former proposition have been public property since July 15th, '61. But our reasonings on the two latter questions were not given to the public previous to the 1st of October. And whether *pro* or *con*, or what their character, no one except the edi-

tor of the *Banner*, and one or two personal friends were supposed to know. But notwithstanding this, without waiting to hear before answering, some in hot haste, both in the *Banner* and privately, by replies or queries commenced the task of overthrowing what I had *not* written, as well as what I had. Perhaps after reading attentively my second number, and after a little sober reflection, these who have been so hasty to annihilate my reasonings may see that very little that has been written or published has any application to the propositions presented. My opponents have not proved by the scriptures, that the "powers that be," are either Satan or the Devil; or that it is wrong to obey magistrates, or pray for all in authority. Neither have they proved that Christians cannot administer the affairs of Gentile governments without sin, and alienation from God. These were all the subjects that up to the date above mentioned had been presented for their consideration. They have made some effort, however, to present objections to the teachings of Moses, the prophets, and apostles, that the "powers that be are ordained of God." They have likewise presented for consideration certain objections to Christians taking the sword, neither many, nor new, all of which it had been purposed to take into consideration at the proper time.—That time having arrived, I shall now proceed (without undertaking to answer all queries that have been or may be propounded) to notice as far as I have been able to learn them, all seemingly scriptural objections to what has been presented.

1st. It has been objected, that the powers that be have not, nor cannot, *all* be ordained of God, because some of the rulers, have been wicked men. Although the proposition to which this objection is made, is not mine, but the apostle Paul's, yet I have no hesitancy in undertaking its defence, so long as I know it to be sustained by the teachings of the "Oracles of God." I am asked by some, if all human governments that have ever existed, or do now exist are ordained of God? To this I will give in answer the language of Paul. "There is no *POWER*," (*εξουσια*,) if not from of God; * hence if not ordained of God they are not powers, for says the Apostle, "The [*ουσαι*] existing [powers] are ordained of God." [Literally, "From under of God having been appointed or established."] I am asked if the proper rendering of this is not—"The powers that be are permitted of God?" To this I answer emphatically, No! For the very plain reason that the verb *τασσω*,

* James' version—"There is no power but of God"—*ει μη απο Θεου*, literally rendered is—if not from of God."

tassoo, (of which *ταταμενος*, * *telagmenos* here rendered *ordained*, is the perfect participle, passive;—and signifies, to arrange, appoint or establish, and not to permit or suffer; hence our translators have very properly used the word *ordained*, though they placed it in the present tense, instead of the perfect, as it is in the original. If this is not forcible enough, the subsequent language of the Apostle makes it still more strong. "He that resisteth, (literally, setting himself in array against,) the power, resisteth the ORDINANCE of God." Here the apostle uses the noun, *διαταγη*, *diatagee*, meaning a disposition, an ordinance or appointment; from the verb *διατασσω*, *diatassoo*, meaning to set in order, to appoint, to ordain, or command. Hence we learn from the plain signification of the Greek terms which the Apostle used, that he did not mean to teach, that God was the passive object or being, that suffered or permitted, the existing powers; but that he was the active, ordaining, appointing and commanding power,—that He ordained or appointed the powers that be. But supposing that some few, or many rulers, have been corrupt and base, how is the proposition affected? Let the Spirit answer, "The Most High ruleth in the Kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the BASEST of men," Dan. iv. 17. (This testimony was presented in my first number, but evidently overlooked or not permitted to have any weight with my opponents. Nero certainly could not have been baser than the basest of men; nor Pharaoh, concerning whom it is written, "for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show my power in thee, and that my name may be declared throughout the earth." Exod. ix. 16; Rom. ix. 17;—yet notwithstanding all this, Joseph, Daniel, the three Hebrew children, Mordecai, Sergius Paulus, and Erastus, refused not to administer the affairs of government in the kingdom of men.

It is asked, may not a Christian be a passive subject of the law, by unresistingly submitting to its penalty, as Christ, his apostles, and all the martyrs did? I answer, No. The law requires obedience to its commands, not submission to its penalties. If the law says, "Thou shall not steal," or, "thou shalt not kill," the man who steals is a thief, and he who kills is a murderer, notwithstanding he may submit ever so unresistingly, or uncomplainingly to the penalty appointed. Such are neither active nor passive subjects of the law, but disobedient, law-breakers, and subjects of judgment. But Christ and his apostles did not suffer unresistingly the penalty of

the law. Christ, though numbered with transgressors; was not a transgressor; he transgressed not against law, and neither the administrator of the Roman government in Judea, nor the Judean monarch Herod, could find legal cause for death in him; but, to gratify the clamors of a lawless Jewish mob, which the sword of Caesar's representative was not powerful enough to awe into submission; "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter." I have yet to learn that the apostles were law-breakers save in the solitary case of Peter, who when he took the sword, placed himself in array against the power, and smote off the ear of the servant of the high priest. Paul was scourged contrary to law. He asserted his rights as a *Roman Citizen*, and claimed the protection of Caesar's sword, from a lawless and blood-thirsty mob of Jews; he spoke in his own defence before the magistrates, and confessed his willingness to die, if he had done anything worthy of death. The apostles so far as we can learn from their writings always exhorted, and commanded obedience to law; and we have no reason to suppose that those who suffered martyrdom for the One Faith were law-breakers. They suffered without law for righteousness' sake, and not as evil-doers.

But we read, "woe to them that decree unrighteous decrees," Isa. x. 1. Let us suppose that an unrighteous Ruler shall subvert judgment and righteousness, and decree an unrighteous decree, and call on all Christians and Infidels to obey it, what will be *our* duty then? Take for example, the decree of Nebuchadnezzar, commanding all to bow down before that great image he had caused to be set up in the plains of Dura; or that of Darius, forbidding any one to make a petition to any God or man, save to the king for a certain length of time. In such a case law and judgment would be perverted, and God himself ignored, who required *all* powers as well as individuals, to acknowledge him as over all; and their authority as subordinate to his; and punishes them when they refuse to recognize God, rather than man. And we find thus did Shadrach, Meshack, and Abednego, "who by faith quenched the violence of fire;" and Daniel, whose faith "stopped the mouths of the lions." Yet those three children were afterwards promoted to places of honor in that same nation, and that very Daniel was placed at one time in the position of third ruler in the kingdom of Babylon. The conclusion then of the whole matter is this, that it is the duty of God's people to be obedient to authorities or powers, so long as they are God's ministers to us for good; but if they pervert judgment, and decree unrighteous decrees, whereby we are called

* *ταταμεναι*, accusative plural fem. of *ταταμενος*.

upon to ignore "Yahweh, God of Israel;" or deny the faith; then the approved examples before us teach, that we are to obey God, even though our lives be imperilled; hence, when called upon by the authorities to obey an enactment with regard to which we may have doubts of the propriety of so doing, we have only to inquire if it is in harmony with God's ordinances, and compatible with that faith once delivered to the Holy Ones, of whom Abraham, Joseph and Daniel, were bright representatives. Our own fleshly sympathies or feelings should not be allowed to influence us in the matter.

2nd. "My Kingdom is not of this world— if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."—This passage is one that seems to be as much abused, and as little understood, as any one of our Savior's sayings, and a candid and careful examination of it here may enlighten us with regard to its bearing upon other questions, as well as that of taking the sword. King James' translators make Jesus say in answer to Pilate's question—"Art thou the king of the Jews?" "My kingdom is not of this world," conveying to the mind of the English reader, the idea that the Messiah can never have a kingdom upon this earth, that the expectation of the Hebrew nation of the restitution of the literal kingdom of David was unwarranted, and that something spiritual, and immaterial was meant. Carrying out this spiritual notion, a modern empirical soul-curer has taken a further liberty with the original, and in place of world has substituted the word *earth*, * making Jesus say, my kingdom is not of this Earth, which is a wholesale and wicked perversion of the original, and one that would render the subsequent question of Pilate absurd. The language of Jesus is, "My kingdom is not εκ του κοσμου τωτου, εκ τον kosmon toutou, out of this kosmos; hence to ascertain the true meaning, we need to understand the signification of the Greek word *kosmos*. There are three Greek words in the New Testament, which the translators have rendered world, only one of which means world, in the sense of that which is habitable, or the physical earth. That word is *οικουμενη, οικουμενη, and not kosmos*. The other word is *αιων, αιων, from ai, always, and ων being; meaning always being, and relates to duration, longer or shorter, and never means the material earth*. These three words have very nice distinctions of meaning, and the propriety of their use in various relations is apparent to readers of the original, who have been enlightened in the things of the king-

* Vide J. W. Ingraham's Pious Romance, "The Prince of the House of David."

dom. But their significance is entirely lost sight of in the sectarian translation of King James. The primary significance of *kosmos* is Order; or a regular disposition of things; hence it may mean the world of the people, or body politic, as an orderly system. It sometimes means the universe, that great arrangement of God, being a regular system of worlds in perfect order and harmony. It may refer to a government in its order or arrangement, or it may relate to any minor disposition of things. When Jesus was interrogated by Pontius Pilate, there was in existence a certain *kosmos*, or order of things, to which he himself was subject, known as the Mosaic or Levitical *kosmos*, or constitution of things. * There had been foretold by the prophets another *kosmos*, the Melchisedec or Messianic order; they had likewise predicted it should be ushered in by conquest, and by the sword. For proof of which, see Psa. cx. where it is foretold, that the Messiah, the rod of whose strength is to go forth from Zion, shall be a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec, and shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath, fill with dead bodies, and wound the heads over many countries. Hence we learn that the kingdom of Messiah is to be of the Melchisedecian order of things, and when that shall obtain, it will be a day of the manifestation of wrath upon kings and nations, and of fighting, and great slaughter. In the days of Pilate, and of the sojourn of Jesus in mortal flesh, this state of things, or *kosmos*, had not obtained, consequently Jesus being of the tribe of Judah, and heir to the throne of David, could not sit upon that throne as a priest, so long as the priesthood pertained to Levi. This being the case, and the Mosaic arrangement of things, together with the order of Levi, not being done away, Jesus truly said to Pilate; "My kingdom is not εκ του κοσμου τωτου, not out from this order, (or constitution of things,) if my kingdom were out from this order, (or constitution of things,) then would my servants struggle, or fight." Why? because the people of this state of things fight? No. But "that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom not hence." That is, not from this time, nor out from this constitution of things. From this we are not taught, that his servants would not under any circumstances fight, because fighting is something pertaining to the kingdoms of this world, but that the time had not arrived for that kingdom to be set up.

CONCLUDED IN NEXT.

* The first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a (αγιον κοσμικον, *hagion kosmikon*.) worldly sanctuary;—rather a sanctuary pertaining to that kosmos or order of things.

The Spread of Christianity.

The progress of Christianity during the first years of its existence, is the most triumphant proof of the presence with it and in it of the finger of God. Let us recall some of the interesting facts of its early struggles. Thirty years after the ascension of our blessed Lord we read in the pages of Tacitus, the accomplished Latin historian, who was a pagan, and hated, not merely tolerated Christianity—"This dire superstition," that is, Christianity, "was checked for a while, but it again burst forth, and not only spread over Judea, the first seat of mischief, but even introduced itself into Rome. The confessions of those who were seized discovered vast multitudes of accomplices. They were convicted of hatred to the human race." Such is the statement of Tacitus.

Another Roman writer, Pliny the younger, who was governor of Pontus and Bithynia, writing to his royal master, says, "The number of Christians is so great as to call for serious consultation. The contagion of this superstition has spread, not only through cities, but through all the villages of the country." This was seventy years after the ascension of our blessed Lord, and is a triumphant proof from the mouth of one of its enemies of the rapid spread of the Christian faith, in spite of every obstruction that political ingenuity could devise, or malice could invent.

Justin Martyr, a Christian apologist, who was born in the year 106 says, "There is not a nation, Greek or barbarian, even those who wander in tribes, and live in tents, amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered, to the Father in the name of Jesus crucified."

Clement of Alexandria, writing in the year 106, says, "The doctrines of Christianity are not limited to Judea, but are spread throughout the world, into every nation, village and city, Greek and barbarian."

Thus have we from the mouths of friends and foes, evidence the most irresistible, that Christianity spread most rapidly during the first hundred years, after the ascension of our blessed Lord.

Let us ask and answer the question, How did it spread? Was it by the aid of men, by the patronage of princes, by the eloquence of its advocates; or can we trace in its majestic progress, as I believe we can, the finger of God? Let us see what it had to overcome, and what weapons it could or would wield in overcoming; and then, I think we shall conclude that it is impossible to account for the early spread of the Christian faith upon any other hypothesis, than that it was signally sustained, maintained and spread by the presence and power of God.

First of all, it had to overcome the Jew, its earliest, bitterest, and most unrelenting foe. The Jews, we must recollect, were disappointed expectants, and of all the passions that occupy the human heart, disappointed pride is the most bitter and malignant. They expected and prophesied a glorious conqueror; they hoped for emancipation from the Roman yoke, as their supposed only slavery; they believed that the Messiah would lead them to battles, which in every case would be victorious, and enthrone Jerusalem over the nations. Therefore, when he came, and was crucified in their capitol; when they found that his emissaries were not princes and nobles, but the poor fishermen of Galilee, and the Jew and Gentile laid low as sinners in the common dust; their resistance became intense, their indignation irrepressible, their spite was keen and inexhaustible, and they left no stone unturned or untouched, that they could throw against the bulwarks and battlements of the Christian faith.

But what was the result notwithstanding? Thousands upon thousands of these very Jews were converted in a single day. Hebrew prejudices the most inveterate melted before the warm love of the gospel. The granite heart of the Jew, like Horeb's rock, when touched by the Rod of Jesse, broke into springs of beneficence, and love, and sympathy; and the most unconvinced of all the unconvinced tribes of the earth repented of their first cry, "Crucify him," and joined in the deepening swell of multiplying nations, "Hosanna in the highest!" Now how, I ask, was it that this religion, the origin and development of which the Jew thoroughly knew, the facts of which he was perfectly master of,—a religion which blasted his fond hopes, lowered his national pride, and placed him upon a level with the humblest tribes of the Gentiles—how was it that this religion so rapidly subdued his proud heart, so melted his obdurate nature, that the Jews became the most successful preachers of that Christ, whom they and their fathers crucified? Was it not the finger of God?

If I look at its progress amongst the Gentiles, I see the same evidence of a divine presence. It was said to be a stumbling-block to the Jew, and it was proclaimed to be foolishness to the Gentiles. A handful of men preaching a religion recently introduced, according to the popular notion, came into collision with the overwhelming force that sustained the religion of the Empire, the worship of Jupiter and Mercury, and the gods of the Pantheon. Polytheism had struck its roots deep in the national soil. Its gods and the names of gods were associated with their weddings, were hallowed by their funerals, and interwoven with the whole

history of their domestic and social life. Poets, painters, sculptors, earned their bread by supporting the national faith. Interest, sympathy, patronage, power, eloquence, poetry, satire—all between Cæsar himself and the meanest of his subjects, conspired to beat back a religion that they felt would revolutionize the Empire, and render insecure the throne of all the Cæsars. And yet, in spite of all this, it made way, and gained converts where it seemed impossible that a single convert should be made to the Christian faith. It was a religion, too, that did not suit fallen nature. To the guilty it proclaimed, "Repent;" to the proud it said, "God resisteth the proud," to the revengeful, "Love your enemies;" to the greedy, "Lay not up treasures upon earth;" to the rich, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven;" to the ambitious, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" to masters, who had half the population as their slaves, "Forbear threatening;" to the slaves, who formed a vast proportion of the population, "Be subject to your own masters for conscience sake;" and told all its converts, "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. They shall persecute you, and cast you into prison and put you to death." The resistance or treatment it received was just what might have been expected. The dungeon, the cross, the wild beasts—these were the arguments employed by imperial Rome, to put down the religion that Jew and Gentile equally detested. And hence Tacitus, the Pagan historian, records: "The Christians died in torments. They were nailed to crosses, or sewed up in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to the fury of dogs, or smeared with combustible materials and used as torches to illuminate the darkness of Rome." This was the treatment Christians then received. And Gibbon, generally an impartial historian says, "If the Empire was afflicted by any calamity; if the Tiber overflowed, if the earth shook, or if temporary order of the seasons was interrupted, the superstitious Pagans were convinced that the crimes and impiety of the Christians had provoked the divine justice."

I ask, how can you believe that by its own, or by any human power, a religion that repudiated fraud and force, and rolled back the current of morality and belief, and reversed the inveterate instincts of man, made so great progress? It was met by sword, and fagot, and all that ingenuity could suggest, and all that power could achieve, in order to repress and put it down—yet it gained speed at every stage, and attained increasing popularity, it subdued the wills, and conciliated the affections of its bitterest foe,—made con-

verts in the shops of Italy, and proselytes amongst the soldiers of the imperial army,—raised up its advocates from the orators of Rome, penetrated the palace of Cæsar, and literally had its detested symbol at length emblazoned upon the Roman labarum. Is it possible to suppose that such a religion, so opposed, so fitted to humble the proud and to rebuke the sinful, nevertheless spread in the face of all persecutions, using no policy, disclaiming all fraud, never employing carnal weapons, wielding only spiritual ones—owing to any other presence than a divine one, or that this is explicable or on any other hypothesis than that it was the finger of God himself?

But perhaps you will say there are elements that will explain its progress of a purely human character as I might suppose, but I will refer to an historian I have already mentioned—Gibbon, an infidel, but a very faithful narrator of facts, who assigns what he thinks satisfactory human reasons for the spread of Christianity. He was so startled, I may add, with its rapid progress, and felt it to be so much an argument in its favor, that he exhausted his brilliant and inventive mind, in order to find reasons for it without admitting that it was the finger of God. Let us see what the reasons were, and we may depend upon it they are the very best that can be invented to account for a so very extraordinary phenomenon.

First, he says that the progress of this religion is to be accounted for by the "inflexible zeal of the early Christians." In answer to this, we ask, Had the Jews no zeal? We read of their untiring and earnest attempts to repress Christianity. Had the Pagans no zeal, who kindled the martyrs' fires, and who made such efforts to repress and put down Christianity? We well know that zeal that has not good fuel very soon goes out. Zeal in a bad cause is generally the effervescence of a day, or passing hour; but the zeal of Christians seems to have had with the fervor of a passion, the fixity of a deeply-rooted principle; and instead of disposing of our assertion that the finger of God alone explains the progress of Christianity, it appears rather that zeal, so pure, so sustained, so unpolluted by any earthly element, must have been kindled from an altar of heaven; and thus what Gibbon regards as a disproof, is a positive proof of the presence of the finger of God.

But the second reason, he says would be, "the more complete manifestation of a future state," which the Christian religion revealed to its followers. I reply, both the Jews and the Pagans believed in a future state. Christianity in this respect could have no pre-eminence. But the future presented in the Polytheistic creed—the Pagan Elysium—was

far more powerfully fitted to captivate the depraved nature of man; for he was taught to believe that he would be there admitted into all voluptuous and sensual enjoyments. And therefore, if the prospect of a future state was calculated to make converts, the future state that the Pagans put forward was more fitted, because far more congenial to the natural man, than the sublime, holy, and beautiful heaven, the everlasting Sabbath, the only future rest that Christianity reveals as remaining for the people of God.

And the third cause of the progress of this religion, he says, was "the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Christian." To this I answer, If the miracles done by the apostles were impostures, there were sophists and advocates, in Rome admirably able to detect the imposition. But if they were really proofs of a supernatural presence, then the admission of Gibbon is most candid, and it is at the same time most decisive; for a miracle, such as the apostles wrought, acknowledged to be so by the bitterest enemy of our religion, is only another and incontrovertible trace of the finger of God.

The historian says, a fourth cause of the spread of this religion was "the pure austere morals of the early Christians." One rejoices to find a skeptic admitting that the morals of the early Christians were so pure; but we naturally ask, Can good fruit grow upon a bad tree? May we expect pure morals from impure men? Can thieves live honestly? Would liars speak truth? Could men who spent their days in spreading a conscious imposition and a fraud advocate whatsoever things were pure and just; and not only advocate them, but live, amplify, and illustrate them? The supposition is impossible. How hard is the skeptic pushed, in order to get rid of the only solution—"Truly this was the finger of God!"

Another reason assigned by Gibbon is "the union and discipline of the Christian army." We answer, this union of the early Christians was not the result of compulsion. There was then no person pretending to be Vicar of Christ; there was no Pope to drill and discipline the Christians into an army. If, therefore, there was union, it was the result of some common inner love and holy principle. Union in evil is a conspiracy; union without clear concord is only coalition; union that is lasting and real must be the growth of common principles, and the reciprocity of common affections and universal love toward a common Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The admission, therefore, of the union of Christians is the compliment, if so any one may call it, that a skeptic pays to Christianity.

Do any of these statements explain the

rapid progress of Christianity? Is it not much less credulous to infer, that the spread of a religion so pure in its nature, so repressing to the long-cherished lusts and passions of mankind, so fitted to make humble and lowly them who treated these graces as sins, deformities, and crimes; so spiritual in its nature, so resisted by great power, and persecuted by every mode that cruelty could invent, or calumny concoct, was the result of the presence of the finger of God?—*Dr. Cumming.*

Evil Speaking.

Evil speaking, like smoking cigars, or like profane swearing, often becomes a habit. By habit, we mean all things that men slide into with great facility, practice readily without thinking, and get out of, if ever at all, with great difficulty. Persons who are a little selfishly inclined, fall into this habit of evil speaking with astonishing facility. What they say against their neighbor seems to them so true—certainly somebody *ought* to say it. If other people had as much independence as themselves, and as much abhorrence of wrong, they too would speak out against the evil things of their neighbors. So they take to themselves the honor of being special champions of virtue and censors of wrong. Each shaft hurled against a neighbor's sin is silently passed to the credit of their own virtue. The quiet assumption is that I never do or say what I condemn in my neighbor. This assumption is often the seasoning which makes evil speaking palatable, until habit shall have blunted the nicer moral sensibilities.

The temptation to evil speaking ought to be studied. In some minds it is first tolerated, then loved as giving vent to a just indignation against supposed wrong. To others it has attractions as putting their own better ways in the light of a contrast. To others of strong talking proclivities, it has the charm of an exhaustless topic; it always supplies them something to say, just as tobacco supplies certain men something to chew, and as profanity helps men to be very emphatic and very smart of speech. That becomes a temptation which agreeably meets and fills some want.

But some one will say, What's the harm? *Why* may we not speak the evil that is in our neighbors?

You may—sometimes, in a certain spirit, for certain ends, and in a certain way.

You may—in the spirit of true love to him—for the sake of doing him good and in the way best adapted to this end. Certainly, neither God nor reason shuts you off from any suitable efforts to correct apparent evils, and to reclaim your apparent erring friend.

The Scriptures have even defined the excellent method in this case. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." That is it. You *may* speak of his evil to him—your heart being full of love and yearning to reclaim a straying friend. But you will observe this is quite different from a general warrant to speak evil of your neighbor behind his back, and to any and every body whose ear you can gain.

Certainly the Lord is willing you should do all the good you can, to suppress and cure existing evils. But he does not wish you to bring a curse upon your own soul by causeless and selfish evil-speaking.

And this opens the way to remark that one of the most fearful elements in the habit of evil-speaking, is its self-depraving power. It surely eats out of the soul all those well-wishing for others' good, in which virtue finds its life and joy.

The man or the woman who forms the habit of evil-speaking must learn to enjoy it. This point gained, they certainly cannot enjoy the good reputation and the real welfare of their fellow-beings. The law of their moral progress is toward finding their own good in others' grief and trouble—building up self on the ruin they can make of others' good name.

In the end, this sin of evil-speaking brings down a terrible retribution, for society must, in self-defence, spue out the slanderer; and in the nature of the case his resources for happiness within himself are turned to gall. Poor man!

So let us earnestly recommend that you resist this practice before it becomes a habit. Compel your tongue, if it speaks at all, to speak well of your neighbor; it will do you good. Say all the good of each neighbor that you can find to say. It will not only make your neighborhood more pleasant, but your own soul more benevolent and more pure. —*Ob. Evan.*

A Pastoral Charge—good Advice.

I charge you—my young brother, to take care of your body. Eat nothing which does not agree with your digestive apparatus—masticate it well—take regular and sufficient exercise daily—go to bed at ten o'clock P. M., and rise at six o'clock A. M.,—and maintain "a prudent, cautious self-control" over your animal passions.

I charge you to take care of your mind. Discipline and furnish it daily. "Let the word of God dwell in you richly with all wisdom." Make continual and choice additions to your stores of knowledge—otherwise constantly pouring out as you will be called


to do, "your barrel will soon run emptyings."

I charge you—to take care of your heart. Keep it with all diligence. Be watchful and prayerful. Unless the principle of grace implanted within you is kept vigorous and thriving, you will not be happy in your sacred calling, or successful in it, nor be a fit example to Christians, in charity, in faith, and purity.

I charge you—to take care of your doctrine. Let it be that which was once delivered unto the saints—preserve it uncorrupt—faithfully preach it, in season—contend earnestly for it—and see that your flock be rooted and grounded in it.

Taking this course—keeping your body under subjection, stocking your mind with precious furniture, keeping your heart right in the sight of God, and your doctrine according to divine revelation; and having it drop in public and private, in the sanctuary and from house to house, "as the rain upon the grass, and as the dew upon the tender herb"—you will make full proof of your ministry, and when the Chief Shepherd appears, will receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away—*Religious Herald.*

TWO CHRISTIANS.—Two good men on some occasion had a warm dispute; and remembering the exhortation of the apostle, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath," just before sunset, one of them went to the other, and knocking at the door, his offended friend came and opened it, and seeing who it was, started back in astonishment and surprise; the other at the same time, cried out, "The sun is almost down." The unexpected salutation softened the heart of his friend into affection, and he returned for answer, "Come in, brother, come in." What a happy method of conciliating matters, of redressing grievances, and of reconciling brethren!

 Swine's flesh is the worst of meats. God told the Jews not to touch pork, because he knew pork was bad for them. And I echo the voice of my profession from almost every civilized country when I say that this immense use of the flesh of the swine is filling all Christendom with salt-rheum, erysipelas, scrofula and other evil humors. And all this is more emphatically true when the animal is fattened in a close pen without exercise, and stuffed with every conceivable kind of filthy food.

Mutton is without doubt the healthiest meat, especially if eaten cold. Beef and fowls are good. Fresh fish is excellent if taken at the right season. Salted cod fish, if well freshened is good.—*Lewis' New Gymnastics.*

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—Rev. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, ED.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., DECEMBER 1, 1861. [VOL. VII, No. 22.]

For the Gospel Banner.
**What is our relation as Christians to
 Gentile Governments?—No. 3.**
 OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

CONCLUDED.

"All that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Not as one of my interrogators quotes it; "He that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword," a distinction which makes some little difference. The article is wanting in the original, making sword indefinite, which I think may have a peculiar significance when viewed in connection with other passages, which lack of space will forbid my noticing. The Greek verb *απολλυω*, *apolluoo*, rendered perish, can mean so in no other sense in this place than to die or be killed by a sword, and is in fact the reading of some MSS. * as also the Syriac—see Murdock's translation. A strictly correct translation of the passage would read, "All, or every one, taking a sword, with a sword shall die, or be killed." In order to make, as they suppose, a strong case of this passage, some have started the novel and somewhat fanciful theory, that the Messiah meant to teach his disciples that everyone who takes a sword in this state of things, shall perish along with the sword, that is, in the future, when swords shall perish; relying upon the force of the preposition "with," in distinction to "by." Some men are very ingenious when they have a fine-spun theory to maintain. But it so happens that this matter does not hang upon the difference that exists between *with* and *by*, but upon the force and usages of the Greek preposition *en*, here translated with; and signifying primarily, *in*, and having many subordinate significations. In the New Testament its use is various, having in this as well as many other passages the full force of *by*, *the means of*, (i. e.) of the instrument used; in proof of which I will present a few of the passages where it has this signification.

"He casteth out devils (*en*) through the prince of the devils," Matt. ix. 34. That is, by means of the prince, and not, he casts out the prince at the same time. In this case (*en*) may be translated *with*, or *by*, with equal propriety. Again, "by what authority doest thou these things," Matt. xxi. 23. Here (*en*) is properly translated *by*, as also in the 24th and 27th verses of the same chapter. Again, "And preached (*en*) through Jesus the resurrection of the dead," Acts iv. 5. There (*en*) is translated *through*, still having the force of *by*. But two or three more passages and those right to the point in question. "And I will kill her children (*en*) with death," Rev. ii. 23. I would ask the advocates of the novel theory, if this means that the children shall be killed by the means of death, or at the same time that death is killed?—"And the rest of the men that were not killed (*en*) by these plagues," Rev. ix. 20. Query; Were the men and the plagues killed together; or were the men killed by means of the plagues? One more passage must suffice, although I have quite a store of them in reserve, if needed. "He that killeth (*en*) with the sword must be killed (*en*) with the sword," Rev. xiii. 10. Here *en* is twice rendered with, and I would ask, does the Spirit mean to teach that he that killeth with a sword kills at the same time the sword is being killed? Or is the sword the instrument by the means of which he kills. Paul, who evidently understood something of the teachings of Jesus, as well as of the Prophets, in Rom. xii. and xiii. furnishes us with a key to the interpretation of this saying of our Savior, in harmony with all Scripture. And we must all acknowledge this principle, if we wish to stand upon a safe foundation, that all the teachings of Christ, and the apostles, or subsequent teachers, must harmonize with the Spirit's teaching in the law and testimony, (which is no more nor less than the Old Testament Scriptures of Moses and the Prophets,) in order to claim our obedience. If Jesus

* So MSS. read *αποθωνουντας*, *shall die*, instead of *απολουνται*, *shall perish*.

really meant to teach by this language that the use of the implements of war under any circumstance is a sin, and contrary to the Christian faith; and that all who use the sword must perish, and never receive eternal life in the future; then Abraham, Joseph, David, Samuel, Daniel, as well as Cornelius, the Philippian jailor, or Sergius Paulus, must perish. If it be said that they may be saved on the condition of repentance, and the forsaking of their sins, I answer that they could not be saved even upon those conditions, for the reason, that they never repented of, confessed, or forsook this sin, neither were they ever informed, so far as any evidence goes to show it, that they were sinners in bearing the sword. And so far as David himself was concerned, we find him praising Yahweh in language like this; "Blessed Yahweh, my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight," *Psa. cxliv. 1.* Paul as well as the prophets teaches us that God has ordained certain powers to be the bearers of the sword, to execute his vengeance and wrath upon the evil-doers. Hence, he exhorts his dearly beloved brethren not to avenge themselves, but rather to "give place to THE * WRATH: because it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." Where is this written? Not certainly among the precepts and teachings of Messiah; but in the law of Moses. See *Deut. xxxii. 35.* It was in view of Old Testament teachings that Paul exhorted his brethren not to avenge themselves; hence the Apostle presents no new relation, or new obligation to the subject of the One Faith under this dispensation, that was not equally binding upon the faithful under the Mosaic. If that which Paul quotes from the Law in the 12th of Romans, and 10th of Hebrews, (see *Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 30.*) was a reason why the Christian should not avenge himself, in the apostles' or in our day, it was certainly as fully in force, in the day when Joshua, the son of Nun, led the army of the faithful against the Canaanites. If it was a reason why Paul's beloved brethren should not take the sword, (as some of my opponents think,) it certainly was a more potent reason, why the brethren of Joshua should not, as they were living under the Law, while Paul's brethren are not. What the Apostle means to teach is, that they must not take the sword of vengeance into their own hand, but to give place to the proper authorities, who are the wrath that Paul speaks of, as he fully explains in the 12th chapter of Romans. "For he, (the Ruler or Magistrate,) is the MINISTER OF GOD, a REVENGER to execute WRATH upon him that

doeth evil." The ruler, says the apostle, "beareth not the sword in vain." He is, in accordance with Paul's teaching, the sword-bearer of Yahweh, and hence the sword that is borne for executing vengeance and wrath upon evil-doers is the sword of Yahweh and of the Magistrate. If injury is done us personally and we resent that injury, and take the sword into our own hand to redress our wrongs, then we assume the prerogatives of Yahweh; this Christians must not do, but must give place to God's constituted authorities, styled by Paul, *THE WRATH.* But if those in power call upon us to assist them in the upholding of authority, and punishment of evil-doers, then we do not avenge ourselves, we do not take the sword, as individuals, and by so doing become ourselves evil-doers, but we give aid simply to Government, in bearing the sword of the Lord and of Government. But Peter, and others of his companions upon the occasion referred to, had placed themselves in the position of evil-doers, by taking the sword into their own hands, for the unlawful purpose of resisting the officers of the law, and for their own avenging; this was done that a certain Scripture might be fulfilled. Jesus had but a short time previously said to his apostles; "he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this, that is written must be accomplished in me; 'And he was reckoned among the transgressors.' And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough." *Luke xxii. 36, 37.* It was enough for the purpose, which was so soon accomplished, when Peter became a transgressor, and in resistance to the authorities sent out to apprehend Jesus drew his sword, and smote off the ear of the High Priest's servant. It was under these circumstances that Jesus reproved Peter, teaching him the duty of obedience to authorities, by telling him that every one taking a sword, (or in other words taking vengeance in their own hands,) with, (or by means of) a sword should die, or by means of the sword-bearing authority be destroyed, come to naught, or perish. Paul taught the same thing when he said, "he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive damnation," or judgment. The efforts of the few followers of Jesus in opposition to the authorities would have been vain, and had they continued their resistance they would eventually have perished. Such was the fate of all the false Messiahs and their followers, who took a sword in opposition to the powers; they perished with the sword of the Government. And the fact that Jesus himself did not resist the authorities, but was led as a lamb to the slaughter, distinguished him from all others who came claiming to be the

* The original is *τη οργη*, *The Wrath.* James' Translators have dropped the article, rendering, it simply *wrath.*

Messiah. Those who give these reasonings due weight, will see at once that the teachings of Jesus are not meant to convey the idea that there are no circumstances under which Christians may use the implements of death, but that they must not take them in their own behalf against the constituted authorities. If he meant to teach otherwise than this, the two greatest exponents of Christianity, Paul and Peter, both mistook his meaning, and his teaching is not in harmony with that of Moses and the Prophets.

4th. I am asked how to harmonize the barbarous practice of war with certain precepts, and sayings in the constitution of Christ? Some of these have been already noticed. Some I cannot conceive of as having any application to the subject; many of them have their foundation, not in what we presume is meant as the constitution of Christ, but in the Levitical constitution of things; and as the noticing of all in detail would take up altogether too much space, we will examine only those which seem to be the most important. But first I wish to give a little attention to the proposition that war is a barbarous practice. If it be, all who practice war are barbarians, so far as the practice goes. The institutor of war must also have been a barbarian; yet we do read in the Scriptures something like this; "Yahweh is a man of war;" likewise this, "In righteousness he (Messiah) doth judge and make war." Shall we say then that God or his Messiah are barbarians? God forbid; shall we say that Abraham, Joshua, Samuel, David, and all the subjects of the One Faith that Paul enumerates, were barbarians? Nay, verily, nay. War is an evil, and it comes from the Lord's hands, who says; "I make peace, and I create evil." Isa. xlv. 7; and we who receive good at the hands of the Lord may also receive evil. But we must not resist evil, although we may resist the Devil, and strive against sin. I must deny then the proposition of my opponents, that war is a barbarous practice, and call for testimony.

But how can war be reconciled with this precept, not as we are told in the constitution of Christ, but in the Law of Moses; "Thou shalt love thy Neighbor as thyself?" This was one of God's greatest commandments, yet it did not stand in the way of God's commandment to the sons of Israel to go out and exterminate the wicked inhabitants of the land of Canaan. If the practice of war could be reconciled with it, when the Law of Moses, of which it was the 2nd great commandment was in full force, I can see no difficulty in the way of reconciling it now.

"Love your enemies." Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 27, 35. The sum and substance of this was plainly set forth under the old dispensation

as well as the new, as the reader will find by turning his attention to Paul's quotation from Prov. xxv. 21, 22, found in Rom. xii. 20, 21; also the teachings of Yahweh to the sons of Israel, in Exod. xxiii. 4, 5; yet we find that same people were as plainly taught to make war. For myself I cannot see, that war is any more irreconcilable with the idea of loving one's enemies, than the taking of the rod and punishing the disobedient child is irreconcilable with the parents loving that child.

War is God's scourge of wrath for the punishment of national as well as individual evil-doers; the powers that be are God's ordained ministers for that purpose. If men do evil against God they must be punished for their sins. Yet we read that God is love, that he loved the world; yet notwithstanding his love he will by no means acquit the guilty.

"If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." I am asked how I can reconcile war with this; it being assumed that a war spirit is antagonistic to the spirit of Christ. Whether is meant by this the disposition of Jesus of Nazareth, or the Holy Spirit with which he was anointed, it is all the same. I have yet to learn what portion of the Scriptures teach that war is antagonistic to either. The Scriptures most plainly teach that the Christ is to be manifested as a man of war; that he is to make war upon the nations in righteousness, and to subjugate the kingdoms of this world unto himself; also that in this work his saints are to share. See Psa. cx.; cxlix. 5-9; Zech. xiv.; Rev. ii. 26, 27; xix. 11. We are likewise taught that the spirit of Christ was in the Prophets, yet some of them were brave warriors; see 1 Pet. i. 11; Heb. xi. 32, 33.

"The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual," has no relation whatever to the question at issue; it relates solely to the inward struggles of the Christian against the unholy besetments of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Our attention is likewise called to the question of the Apostle James, "From whence come wars," etc. To this I would answer, If as we have always supposed the epistle of James was addressed to believers, it cannot be possible that he had any reference whatever to such wars as we have in contemplation, but simply to quarrels, discords, and fightings, rising up among individuals in the Churches, not that the Churches at Jerusalem, Corinth, Rome, or other places, ever went to war with other Churches, and when they had fought long enough to get mutually satisfied, made peace again after the manner of the nations; which must have been the case, if this expression is to be allowed the

application to the subject under consideration, that is claimed for it.

Lastly, I am asked, "*If the Kingdom of God cannot come until the kingdoms of the world are overthrown, how can we consistently pray for the one, and fight for the other?*" This seems to be a most singular query for one to put forth who claims to have become a subject of the One Faith, and a teacher of the Gospel of the Kingdom. In this question may be involved one or more of the foundation-principles of Second Adventism, but no principle of the Gospel of the Kingdom. Second Adventism teaches the destroying of all governments, and of the earth itself before the Kingdom of God can come; but the Scriptures of the prophets, in which are found the principles of the Gospel of the Kingdom, teach us that, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, but that *it* (the kingdom of God) is to consume and break in pieces other kingdoms," Dan. ii. 44. They also teach that other nations and kingdoms must first refuse to submit to the authority of the kingdom of God before they will be destroyed, "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee," (the exalted and restored kingdom of Israel or Zion,) "shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted," Isa. lx. 12. If the Governments of this world, or state of things, are to be destroyed before the kingdom of God comes, then these and other Scriptures cannot be fulfilled.

But having devoted double the time and space to this subject that I had at first intended, having hoped to have been very brief, I will now conclude. I think I have treated the subject with fairness, and I hope that others who may undertake to controvert the matter will do so in the same manner, ever bearing in mind, that personalities and witticisms are not arguments, and that those are best qualified to judge of the truth of an argument, and successfully refute a false one, who have candidly examined it, in all its bearings, and have sifted carefully the testimony on which it is based; ever keeping in mind that proposition of the wise man, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him."

MARK ALLEN.

Woburn, Mass., Oct. 13th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.
Social Worship.

CONTINUED.

ADMINISTRATION OF ORDINANCES.

BRO. WILSON:—Having in former articles on Social Worship, published in the *Banner*, shown that the primitive Christians met together on the first day of the week—and in demonstrating this point, showed that they

met for the express purpose of Breaking Bread, we have arrived at an important consideration, viz, who has the right, and whose duty is it to administer the ordinance of the breaking of bread, or as Paul terms it the Lord's supper? is there any especial official grace, contained in any particular individual that shall make the attendance to this ceremony beneficial to those participating in it? if there is any prerogative held by a certain class, that is recognised by the Scriptures, as such, we ought to know it, that we may know how to submit to them as our teachers, and guides, and pay to them all due respect. We should naturally suppose, that if the prevailing sentiment of ministerial importance be correct, that we should find line upon line, and instructions explicit on this subject, but as far as my investigations of truth have lead me, I have looked in vain for testimony of this character. We often hear of certain parties contrasted, as *clergy* and *laity*, *ministers* and *people*; and especially is this difference brought to bear, when describing the attendance to the Lord's supper. Says one, "we only break bread when our evangelist is with us." Says another, "we don't break bread every week, because we have not Preachers enough." Is not this establishing a separate caste? who authorised any individual to call any one of Christ's people, a layman; God in the beginning made a man, but it has been left to human priests to make laymen. Now as the scriptures are entirely silent as to approving of any such distinction amongst Christians; I am bold to say, the Bible being my instructor, that this Clerical assumption is not from heaven, but it is of the earth, earthy, having originated in the thinkings of the flesh, and is antagonistic to the mind and teachings of the Spirit.

I would request the reader's attention to the following reasoning out of the scriptures, in order to see the true and proper position of the disciple of Christ, the nature of his calling, his rank and position, and I trust that after examination of the same, he will be able to answer for himself the important question concerning the official grace found at the commencement of this article. I shall not confine myself to the ordinance of the supper, but shall take in the ordinance of baptism, and the preaching of the word. There was a contention amongst the Apostles on this subject, as to who should be the greatest, or in other words, who should be the "minister;" but Jesus discouraged the thought, saying, "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." Under the Mosaic economy there was a distinct class that were set apart for the more immediate attendance on the worship of God. The tribe

of Levi was dedicated to supply priests and officers of all the different grades in the service of the sanctuary, and the family of Aaron alone for the high priesthood. This was under a servile institution, a state of bondage under the rudiments of the world, hence under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the Father. Gal. iv. 2. But Christ having come, he has taken away this handwriting of ordinances, that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. While he remained on the earth, subject to the Mosaic law he could not be a priest, Heb. viii. 4; and so long as the Aaronic priesthood continued, Christian liberty could not be enjoyed. Gal. v. 1. But now he hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, established upon better promises; the priesthood then being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. Heb. vii. 12. Under the law, the high priest was of Aaron's family; now, one is High Priest, even Christ, of the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. The Apostle in writing to the Hebrew Christians, says, "Wherefore holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house," Heb. iii. 1, 2. Moses verily was faithful as a servant, but Christ ranks higher, as a Son over his own house, whose house are we if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. It is very apparent, that as Christ occupies a more exalted position than Moses, the law which was only a shadow of good things to come, having vanished away, before the brightness of that true light, which came to lighten the Gentiles, and to be the glory of his people Israel; and as Aaron's family were superseded, by the Melchisedec order, so also in keeping with the great changes brought to pass at the end of the Mosaic age, the household underwent an important change also. Under Moses, the household were under tutors and governors, having to submit to a yoke which neither they, nor their fathers were able to bear; but now we who are of the household of faith, are freed from Moses, and are espoused to another, one Jesus.

When Jesus Christ superseded the Aaronic priesthood, and abolished the Mosaic law, he did not recognize the Mosaic household of worshippers as his people, except on certain conditions, hence he labored to inductinate the truth into the minds of the servants under law; and to as many as received his teachings, to them, he granted the right or privilege to become the sons of God, even to them that

believe on his name. John i. 12. These individuals became the nucleus of his house, which is the house of God, the Church of the living God, the pillar and stay of the truth. 1 Tim. iii. 15. Israel according to the flesh, of the generation contemporary with Jesus, furnished but few participants of the invitation to become of his household, consequently the proclamation was made to the Gentiles, inviting them to become fellow-heirs with the sons of God, having been picked out of Israel's fold. The election was founded on a principle of faith. "In every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness is accepted with him," Acts x. 35. Such is the Scripture account of God's plan in developing a people for himself, a peculiar people, zealous of good works. "God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," Acts xv. 14. What then is the position of this new household,—this new people adopted into God's family of every nation, kindred, tribe, tongue, and people? Let us see what Peter designates them in his epistle, "ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ." Here the Apostle designates the believers as occupying an exalted position, a holy priesthood, and there is a service connected therewith,—spiritual sacrifices which are to be offered up in the name of the Chief,—Jesus the Anointed. He is the High Priest, and those composing his household occupy the next station in rank to him, as did the priests under the law bear the same relation to their chief, which was of Aaron's family. "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession," for we have great encouragement to enter with boldness into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus, Heb. x. 19, "by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, (believers,) through the veil, that is to say, his flesh, and having a High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water," (at our baptism, when we were set apart for the service of God, and initiated into Christ's house.) John the revelator furnishes corroborative testimony, saying, "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto our God." Rev. i. 6; also v. 10. Paul in writing to the Galatians says, "for ye are all one in Christ Jesus," evidently indicating, an equality, and a unity—a compactness. Also to the Ephesians he says, "there is one body"—their calling is one, their hope is one; their position is that

of lively stones, "a holy priesthood, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." Now have we any account of this peculiar chosen people's labors, of their showing the praises of God? It is well known, how the apostles labored and toiled, but what saith the Scriptures concerning those that occupied a less seemingly important position, those that would in this day be termed the laity,—what did they do? Let us go to the Acts of Apostles, 8th chapter; we read, "and at that time there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles.—* * * Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere **PREACHING the word.**" Now we might ask the question was it right for them to preach the word, (the gospel,) seeing that Christ had commissioned the Apostles for the especial purpose of preaching the gospel. These disciples had had no commission, no ordination, as being set apart, by a Church, or Conference, conferring the title of Elder, or Evangelist,—as preachers often claim now. No; for the title would be an unmeaning one, seeing that they all were alike. The answer to this question we shall find in Acts xi. 19-21. "Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution of Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none, but unto the Jews only, and some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus, and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord"—or in other words, a great number believed, and obeyed the truth by being baptized. This Scripture proves conclusively, that they acted right in preaching the word; they carried out the precept afterwards recorded by John, Rev. xxii. 17, "let him that heareth say come."

I would here invite the candid consideration of all Bible students to the conclusion that arises from the premises established. There was a multitude of what we might term, non-commissioned disciples, persecuted for their faith, who travelled in all directions preaching the word; we notice the result, a great number believed, and turned to the Lord; in their believing, and turning to the Lord, they certainly were baptized. And remember too, the Apostles remained at Jerusalem, they did not go to baptize them, for we have a case, showing under what circumstances it was necessary for them to leave

Jerusalem. Philip went down to Samaria, he preached Christ unto them, and many of the Samaritans believed. Was it necessary to send for Apostles to baptize them? I answer no, for it is written, "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women." Acts viii. 12. This was their turning to the Lord. "And the Apostles in Jerusalem having heard that Samaria had received the word of God, sent to them Peter and John," for the express purpose that they might communicate unto them the Holy Spirit, for it was not yet fallen on any of them, but they had only been immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus. Acts viii. 16. Would it not be a great mockery, to preach the word, convincingly, the hand of the Lord being with them, and after the people believed the report, and were willing to submit to the terms of reconciliation, then to say, "we have no authority to immerse you, we have not been appointed to this office; our province is only to preach, we cannot administer ordinances." The thought is a ridiculous one, and were it not for the false teachings of our contemporaries, such things need not be exposed, but for the purpose of enlightening those willing to be delivered from the ignorance that surrounds them, I have endeavored to show these things in their true light. Again, Aquila, a tent maker with his wife Priscilla, expounded the way of God more perfectly to Apollos, the eloquent man, who was mighty in the Scriptures, knowing only so far as the baptism of John. Acts xviii. 24-26. Again, Ananias, a certain disciple, not one of the Apostles, baptized Saul of Tarsus, to fit him for the Apostleship. Philip immersed the eunuch of Ethiopia. Acts viii. 30. Paul was not sent to baptize, 1 Cor. i. 17; but he did nevertheless baptize some believers; ergo, if Paul baptized without a special commission as an Apostle, he did it because it was his prerogative as a disciple, and what was done then in the capacity of a disciple, can be repeated now. The reason is obvious, all the disciples are priests, and can therefore minister in holy things. They can break the loaf; and it makes no difference, whether A, B, or C, breaks it first, second, or third. The disciples, did not meet together to have the bread broken for them, but they met to break bread. Acts xx. 7. The benefit attending the ordinance is not from the administrator, or the one presiding, that breaks it first, but it is derived from the attendance to the institution itself, when it is done with a single eye, discerning the Lord's body, partaking of it worthily, no matter which of the brethren for the time being is the administrator

thereof, so that all things are done decently and in order.

I shall conclude this article, with an extract from Merle D' Aubigne, the historian. In his description of the deficiencies of the Protestant Reformation, he says of human priesthood: "This great heresy, of early origin, and rapid growth, was still fostered by the reformers. That any body of men, should be called clergymen, and reverends, to distinguish them from laymen, to demark and separate them from the people; that such a class should be furnished with scholastic and classic education, delivered from the business of society, clothed in peculiar garbs, and allowed to destroy the Church's time, by weekly prayers and orations, to the exclusion of their brethren in the same community, is one of the vilest delusions which Satan has covered with the garb of reality. And, truly, it has brought forth fruit according to its nature. The primitive brethren were all alive in the cause of God. It was expected that each brother would edify the Church according to his gift; for all were spiritual priests with equal access to the throne of the holiest, and common liberty to proclaim truth and administer ordinances. But now one scholastic is elevated and salaried to deliver weekly orations, whilst the great body of laymen, is stagnated in worldly admiration. But let me not misrepresent the reformers. Many of them, and Luther especially, demolished in word the fiction of human clergy, and taught plainly the priesthood of all believers; only they went no farther; they made no practical effort to root it out of the Church; they continued to nourish it, by exemplifying it in their own Churches. In consequence, then, of the reformers not bringing out the truth of this subject into fact, but allowing it to remain in word as a naked theory, the broad, black, cold shadows of an external priesthood still hide the life of God, and the sunshine of heaven from myriads of * * * beings."

The foregoing is submitted in all candor to the reader, for truth's sake.

JAMES WOOD.

Harvard, Nov. 4th, 1861.

For the Gospel Banner.

Government of the Tongue.

We are admonished to set a diligent watch over that unruly member, the tongue, which is too often the instrument of the heart to express the evil things contained therein, for it is said that "out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh."

We might fill our mouth with good words and fine speeches, but they would be of no advantage to us if the heart is corrupt. The tongue would then be only the index of de-

ceit and hypocrisy. He that orders his tongue aright, is he that first speaks the truth in his heart.

The scriptures sometimes call the tongue a man's glory; and so it is when ordered aright; but we all have our imperfections, and the tongue will be ready to vent them, if not bridled by the rules of truth and reason. I might propose a few directions, which, if we were to follow out, would assist us greatly in the government of that unruly organ, which no one can tame, unless assisted by the word of God.

We should in the first place, avoid talkativeness. Words spoken without fit occasion, are wholly lost, and will never do us any good, if we could only think so. It might be better for us, perhaps, if we would keep in mind oftener the apostle's advice: "Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak."

We ought and must be careful of overmuch speaking; because, "in the multitude of words there wanteth not sin;" and God Himself has put the character of "a prating fool" on every over-talkative person; and has assured us that he shall fall. Prov. x. 8. In nearly all cases we shall find, that those who talk much commonly do little more than talk.

We must at all times be on our guard against biting and devouring one another; and in order to do this, we should be careful to search out the virtues which are in others, and show dislike to such as speak evil of others. When we are under the influence of anger, we should try and restrain the tongue from speaking. It is very difficult, but ought to be done. To bridle the tongue is never more needful than when anger has possession of the heart. It is the greatest weakness charged upon Moses, that, being provoked, he spoke unadvisedly with his lips, and for this cause was not suffered to enter the land of promise.

We must watch against giving occasions for anger, and be careful of provoking one another; for it is just as possible for us to sin against Christ, by causing our brother for whom Christ died to perish, through provoking him to anger, as it was for the Israelites, when they vexed Moses, and it went wrong with him for their sake.

We should avoid all immodest discourse. "Let no corrupt communications proceed out of the mouth," neither jesting, filthiness, or foolish talking. It dishonors the aged, pollutes the young, and fills the land with uncleanness. Therefore, as the apostle exhorts; "fornication and all uncleanness, let it not once be named among you, as becometh saints."

We must beware of false speaking. Falsehood is so mean a thing, that it seldom show-

itself without some mask; but truth its opposite, is so lovely, that falsehood commonly wishes to present itself in her attire. In common discourse men love to set off their stories with some grace, and will sometimes venture to embellish them by exceeding the bounds of truth; for though the tongue is but a little member, it will "boast great things." To speak the truth, if we speak at all, requires no art to adorn, but what reason and nature should prompt us to do. But to utter falsehood, requires art and contrivance, and often exceeds the wit of the most subtilo, to put off his idle tales, and vent his romances without losing his reputation. Therefore, "let us put away lying, and speak the truth" always.

"Let our speeches be always with grace, seasoned with salt." The word grace here does not only signify piety, but may include kindness and gentleness. With such language it becomes Christians to treat those with whom they converse. I do not recommend a fawning or affected mode of speaking; for the tongue of the wise is health, and will neither soothe the men in their folly, nor excite them to madness, but in a temperate manner will administer grace to the hearer, and render the speaker himself more gracious.

God would have us talk more of the glory and power of His works than we do. He commanded the Israelites to tell in the ears of their sons, what things He had wrought in Egypt. "One generation shall praise His works to another, and declare His mighty acts." No less should we as Christians abundantly talk of His great goodness and sing of His righteousness.

If we could only get into the habit of talking more of the works of God than of our own, the knowledge of Him would be advanced in ourselves, and in others; "for the lips of the wise feed many." If we love virtue, let us show it by speaking with freedom and prudence of the merits of others; good deeds should be repeated as a spur to our own dull minds, and to excite others to emulation. Paul used this art to stir up the Corinthians, when he cited the laudable conduct of the churches at Macedonia.

In worldly concerns, let us be careful to use upright conversation with all men. If we are rich, then let us avoid boasting of our wealth. If we are low in the world, then let us not repine, or load our discourse with murmurings and complaints.

Finally, though our words be transient, and may soon pass away, yet they are treasured up in His book of remembrance who will bring them to light again. For, "by our words shall we be justified, and by our words shall we be condemned."

EMMA.

Geneva, Ill.

From the Harbinger.

Who May Know a Tree by its Fruit?

"For a tree is known by his fruit." Matt. xii. 33.

This, and several parallel texts, are frequent in the mouths of the multitude; and, by the wicked, most frequently used to condemn the righteous. Hearing it quoted, not long since, by a vulgar young man against his good old father, I replied hastily and without premeditation: "True, a tree is known by its fruit; but the wicked have no means of testing its fruit." At this he was very indignant, as might be expected, claiming for himself the ample qualifications of umpirage of separating wheat from tares, sheep from goats, etc.

Afterwards, a brother in Christ, in the absence of the young man, called in question the justness of my remark; and this has led me to examine the subject carefully. It is not certain that the Savior ever gave this as a rule by which the wicked might recognise the righteous. In his sermon on the mount, he uses language similar to that of my text, and this he spake to the multitude who were not all righteous; but to the same multitude and at the same time, he also said—"Thou hypocrite, first cast the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." How then can the wicked know a tree by its fruit, while a beam is in their own eye? If he ever enjoined it on the wicked, he did it as he enjoined many other things on them, which their wickedness unqualified them to perform, such as may be found in his sermon on the mount.

Again, human nature is ever the same. What man is now, in his fallen state, he always has been since the fall. If the wicked are now capable of knowing a tree by its fruit, they always have been; and if they have not been in times past, they are not now capable of it.

Let us, therefore, look back on the past, and learn the present truth. Did the antediluvians recognise Noah as a righteous man by his good fruit? Circumstances answer, they did not; else there would have been more than eight saved. It is still further certain that Lot was not known to be righteous by the wicked; they were too wicked to test him by his fruit. And of the prophets and righteous men sent to Israel and Judah, they killed the former and stoned the latter, and knew them not by their fruits. Next came John the Baptist, neither eating nor drinking, and they said he had a devil, yet he was a righteous man, and full of the Holy Spirit, but not known to the ungodly by his fruit.

And after John, came the Son of God, eating and drinking, and they called him a

glutton, and a wine-bibber, and charged him with casting out devils by the prince of devils, and, judging him worthy of death, they finally crucified him and slew him. They did not know the tree by his fruit, though never a tree brought forth fruit so good. If the judgment of the wicked failed to be righteous respecting the green tree, what will it be of the dry? Facts answer, it errs in every instance. From the holy apostles, through the millions of martyrs, to the present "little flock," the wicked never have known them by their fruit, because a beam is in their own eye, and they cannot see clearly.

And now if the wicked of A. D. 1861, are capable of knowing a tree by its fruits, then the earth has brought forth a new generation of wicked beings, since the day of Cain and Abel, or of Noah; and yet more recently, since the day of Christ and his apostles, and they, if they existed, do not belong to the human family.

And further, it is evident that God is a God of infinite wisdom, and has, in every way, adapted religion to our fallen nature. The sinner's most ardent desire is life and happiness. These are promised to the righteous in the gospel, while to those in sin they are denied. True wisdom, therefore, will seek the greatest good where it can only be found, and he who does not seek it there, is not truly wise. And he who is truly wise, and that unto salvation, is not wise enough to know a tree by its fruits.

If I wished to purchase a good watch, I would not ask a shoemaker to tell me if the workmanship of it was good, though he were a good judge of a pair of boots. Let every one judge of the workmanship of those of their own craft. But the righteous and the wicked are not the same craft; the wicked are blind, but the righteous see, and the more clearly when every mote is out of their own eye.

Sin is indeed a dreadful thing. It has sunk man to a state of degradation, from which, without help, he can never rise. He was created with power of mind and dignity of character above all other earthly creatures. But alas! he has fallen below them—so much so, that many, or most of them, are above him by instinctive knowledge. This may be absurd to some, but let man be no better educated than a beast, and the beast would know the most. And even with a liberal and philosophical education, the man has nothing to boast of, for the beast, by intuition, seizes on the end of sciences without going over the scholastic ground; so they are better statesmen, better philosophers, better doctors, better mechanics, better navigators, better astronomers, than any that are so made by education. A bee-hive is an example of a

better form of government than fallen man has ever exhibited; and that the birds are better philosophers is evident from the fact that human philosophy or reasoning alone would never teach that a bird would spring from an egg, but the fact is known by the bird under circumstances where it is impossible for them to learn it by observation. And that they are better doctors is evident from the fact that they frequently use medicine, and are never known to kill their patients, while the man-doctor kills ten as often as he cures one. No human power can make hexagons so exact and so nice as he, or spin so fine and even a thread as a spider or a silk-worm. No navigator can put his helm to port so exact as a wild beast, which without chart or compass, will traverse the forests and deserts by night or day, be it cloudy or fair. No astronomer can tell before-hand the tide or tempest, the flood and drouth as well as the beaver and musk-rat. In all these noble attainments the brute is more correct than poor fallen man. And why all this? Because man is taught by erring man, and the brute is taught by an unerring God.

Now shall the righteous tamely submit, and give the text to the wicked, and by them be judged? No; rather expect the more knowing lions to know Daniel, and the more sagacious ravens to know Elijah by their fruits, than such deplorable forms of humanity to know a tree by its fruits.

Man, by creation, was made something more than a mere animal. He was endowed with super-animal powers, right-directed, to have raised him on an equality with the angels. But in his fall, in putting off his primeval manhood, he has found the animal, and some of them the brute. By his abnormal or fallen nature, he is blind; he thinks wrong, acts wrong, reasons wrong, and he is all wrong; and nothing can restore him back to his original manhood and human dignity, but the religion of Jesus Christ.

If the wicked are the judges of righteousness, why were they not chosen to be ministers of righteousness? But they cannot judge that which they know nothing of. They may have a Bible before them; and so the wicked Egyptians had the Shekinah cloud before them when they pursued the children of Israel; but it gave to them no light but darkness. So what sharpens the sight of a Christian, puts out the eyes of the wicked. What one calls good, the other calls wrong. The light discovers darkness, but darkness cannot discover light. Brethren, we are living in an awful time, when the wicked are hastening to fill up their cup of iniquity; but thanks be to God, they are not our judges.

Z. CAMPBELL.

The Atheist Silenced.

Being in Manchester some time since, when a certain infidel lecturer was announced to lecture on atheism, we went, out of curiosity, to hear him. After indulging in a large amount of scurrility and blasphemy for about an hour and a half, he concluded by saying that the only safe rule of faith was to believe nothing that wasn't capable of mathematical demonstration; and that as the existence of God could not be demonstrated, it ought not to be believed.

When he had set down, a gentleman whom we instantly recognized as Burlington B. Wales, Esq., whose essays and lectures on language (recently delivered at the Collegiate Institution) have won for him the reputation of a distinguished linguist, rose to reply to the remarks which had been made by the lecturer.

On being invited to take a position on the platform, he said that he had no intention of wading through the continent of mud which the lecturer had been so long constructing; he should only fasten upon his two closing remarks, namely, that nothing should be believed that was not susceptible of mathematical demonstration; and that the existence of God not being susceptible of mathematical demonstration, ought not to be believed. Now, in relation to the first position, it was a fundamental axiom in mathematics that every circle must have a center; but he need hardly tell the lecturer, that while it was absolutely necessary to admit this center, its existence had never been demonstrated.

"Let this table," said Mr. Wales, laying his hand upon a circular table which was upon the platform, "be considered a yard in diameter; now where is the center? It is not in either of the semi-diameters, for they are equal; and if it be in one it must be in the other; so you prove too much, for you to show that there must be two centers in one circle, which is an absurdity, and destroys the very thing you are laboring to establish. It cannot be between them for they are in contact. You are thus driven to this conclusion, that this mathematical center is a point devoid of parts, namely, a spaceless point—something that does not occupy space. Now, as all entities occupy space, if this center does not, then it is not an entity; ergo, it is a non-entity, that is—nothing! So much for the lecturer's first proposition, that nothing ought to be believed that is not susceptible of mathematical demonstration.

This conducts us to the second proposition, that the existence of a God is incapable of mathematical proof. Let us test this assertion. And here I hope the lecturer will signify his admission or rejection of the premises laid down as I proceed.

"First, then, attraction either resides in matter, or it does not reside in matter."

It was admitted to reside in matter.

"Secondly, it is equally diffused through matter, or it is not equally diffused through matter."

Admitted that it was equally diffused.

"Thirdly, repulsion resides in matter, or does not reside in matter."

Admitted to reside in matter.

"Fourthly, it is equally diffused through matter, or it is not equally diffused."

Admitted that it was equally diffused.

"Now mark the result," continued Mr. W. "Here are two permanently antagonistic forces, equally resident in matter, equally diffused through matter, equal in extent, and equal in power. These forces are said to be the motive power which moves all bodies; but it is one of the most self-evident propositions of Euclid, that where equal is to equal, the result will be equal; in other words, that where two forces of equal strength are in antagonism, the result will be the establishment of an equilibrium; not motion, but quiescence or rest. Thus, if you take a pair of scales and place a pound weight in each, you establish an equilibrium which will remain forever undisturbed, unless interfered with by some external agent. If on the other hand it is contended that attraction is stronger than repulsion; then, once stronger it will forever remain so, and drawing all bodies into one agglomerated mass, again the result would be not motion, but rest. If on the contrary, it be said that repulsion is the strongest, then every particle of matter dilating and expanding to its utmost tension, would fly off into space, which being filled with a concourse of disconnected atoms, again the result would be, not motion, but rest.

"But nothing is at rest; suns, systems, planets, stars, are all in rapid motion. What, then, is the power which has destroyed the equilibrium of these two antagonistic forces, and which has given to the universe that motion which they are ever striving to prevent?"

"We find no evidence of its existence in matter; yet it is evidently superior to matter, since it controls the motion of matter—neutralizes the tendency of those laws and forces which reside in matter. Now this power, which, without residing in matter, is evidently superior to it, constantly acting upon it, overcoming its inertia, and compelling it into motion, we call God. God! the inevitable word which terminates all our studies, the grand climax to all our knowledge, shining like a mysterious star upon the borders of both worlds, revealing to us the moral liberty of this, and the moral justice of that."

Mr. Wale's argument, certainly one of the most lucid, forcible and original, for the existence of God which it ever fell to our lot to hear, seemed to make a great impression upon the audience, more especially as his opponent declined to reply in "consequence of the lateness of the hour," though it was not quite ten o'clock!

On leaving, Mr. Wales was warmly congratulated by the Christian portion of the audience, (and especially by Dr. Middleton, who chanced to be present; and with whom he subsequently rode home to supper,) upon the skill and success of his argument, and for the good feeling with which it was conducted; for Mr. Wales is sometimes apt to silence an opponent by a withering sarcasm instead of a fact or argument. We rejoice that this was not the case on the present occasion.—*The Presbyter.*

The Epistle to the Laodiceans.

In Col. iv. 16, Paul gives the following instruction to the Colossians:—"And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea."—This shows that there was an epistle from Laodicea, which Paul desired to be read to the Colossians, as well as the one written to them. In Dr. Clarke's commentary may be found a translation of what purports to be the epistle to which Paul refers. Dr. C. says in reference to it:—

"I give it here from the best [Latin] copies; and add a literal translation, that the curious, whether learned or unlearned, may have what some have believed to be authentic, and what has doubtless existed, in one form or other, from a very remote antiquity."

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

"1. Paul an apostle, not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, to the brethren which are in Laodicea.

"2. Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

"3. I give thanks to Christ in all my prayers, that ye continue and persevere in good works; waiting for the promise in the day of judgment.

"4. Be not troubled with the vain speeches of certain who pretend to the truth, that they may draw away your hearts from the truth of the gospel which was preached by me.

"5. And may God grant that those who are of me, may be led forward to the perfection of the truth of the gospel, and perform the benignity of works which *become* the salvation of eternal life.

"6. And now my bonds are manifest which

I suffer in Christ; and in them I rejoice and am glad.

"7. And this shall turn to my perpetual salvation, by means of your prayers, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit, whether they be for life or for death.

"8. For my life is to live in Christ; and to die will be joyous.

"9. And may our Lord himself grant you his mercy; that ye may have the same love, and be of one mind.

"10. Therefore, my beloved, as ye have heard of the coming of the Lord, so think and act in the fear of the Lord, and it shall be to you eternal life.

"11. For it is the Lord that worketh in you.

"12. Whatsoever you do, do it without sin, and do what is best.

"13. Beloved, rejoice in the Lord Jesus Christ, and beware of filthy lucre.

"14. Let all your prayers be manifest before God.

"15. And be firm in the sentiments you have of Christ. And whatsoever is perfect and true, and modest, and chaste, and just, and amiable, that do.

"16. And whatsoever ye have heard, and received, retain in your hearts, and it shall tend to your peace.

"17. All the saints salute you.

"18. Salute all the brethren with a holy kiss.

"19. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen.

"20. And cause this epistle to be read to the Colossians; and that to the Colossians to be read to you.

"To the Laodiceans, written from Rome by Tychicus and Onesimus."

The Mountains of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem was built on three mountains—Moriah, Zion and Acra. Mount Moriah, in the north-east of Jerusalem, is where Abraham is supposed to have been directed to offer his son Isaac, and here was Solomon's Temple. Mt. Zion, in the south, is the highest ground in the city. It was taken by David, and hence is also called the city of David. For this reason it is often mentioned by him in his writings. Zion is also used to designate the city of Jerusalem and its people, for which reasons it is frequently used by the writers who succeeded David. Zion was called the upper city, and Acra, which means a citadel, the lower city. To the east of Jerusalem is situated the Mount of Olives, separated from it by the brook Kedron, and the valley of Jehosaphat. It doubtless derived its name from the number of Olives there, and which are still to be found at its foot. It has three summits. From the central one our

Savior ascended to heaven; and we are told that, after the Last Supper, Christ and his disciples went to the Mount of Olives—a favorite resort of His. Gethsemane is situated at the foot of this mountain, also Bethphage and Bethany—the residence of Lazarus and his sisters. Jerusalem is surrounded by several hills, among which are those of Evil Counsel, and Offence. Many other elevations surround the city; thus we see the appropriateness of the words of the Psalmist, "As the mountains are around about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth, even forever."—Psa. cxxv: 1, 2.—*Exchange.*

For the Gospel Banner.

Correspondence.

DEAR BRO. WILSON:—Thinking that the readers of the *Banner*, would like to know how their pilgrim brother is prospering, what he is doing in the battle-field of truth: I write. Well, brethren, as to myself, I am in sympathy with God's plan of salvation, as revealed unto us in the Living Oracles. Human creeds by me was on the altar laid in 1845, with all sectarian names! And from that altar, I have never been disposed to take them off. My confidence was never stronger in the Living Oracles than now. Truly can I adopt the language of Israel's sweet singer "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path;" consequently my only sure guide, to the glory-capt hills of the Saints' EDEN home! For 36 years have I been stemming the storm of opposition—(for I was but a lad when I started,) and 24 years of this time I have been in the front of the battle—where the darts of the enemy have been hurled with fury against me; yet I have not received a wound—so as to drive me from the field of battle, or lead me to haul in my colors, or turn my back upon the enemy. Glory be to God! My prospect was never brighter for the Kingdom of God, the home of the weary, than at the present time! That beautiful city is full in my view—its glory beams upon my soul—its orders are wafted to me—its sounds salutes mine ears—its spirit breathes into my soul, and my longing heart is there! Amen.

R. V. LYON.

Port Perry, C. W.

P. S. I have lately visited Gainsborough, C. W.—Gave 22 discourses, baptized, 10 mortal souls into the Christ for the remission of sins—organized a Church of some 25 members; which takes the name of the Church of God at Gainsborough, C. W. During the past 17 months I have immersed 76 into the Christ for the remission of sins. Brother, truth has not lost its power. R. V. L.

CURIOS CALCULATION.—The vast number of inhabitants who do live, and have lived, upon the face of the earth, appear, at first sight, to defy the powers of calculation. But if we suppose the world to have existed six thousand years; that there now exist one thousand million; that a generation passes away in thirty years; that every past generation averaged the present, and that four individuals may stand on one square yard, we find that the whole number will not occupy a compass so great as one-fourth the extent of England. Allowing six thousand years since the creation, and a generation to pass away in thirty years, we shall have two hundred generations, which, at one thousand millions each, will be two hundred thousand millions, which being divided by four persons to a square yard, will leave fifty thousand millions of square yards; there are in a square mile three millions, ninety-seven thousand, six hundred square yards, by which if the former sum be divided, it will give sixteen thousand one hundred and thirty-three square miles, the root of which, in whole numbers, is about one hundred and twenty-seven, so that one hundred and twenty-seven miles square will be found sufficient to contain the immense and almost inconceivable number of two hundred thousand millions of human beings.

A Prophecy Fulfilled.

"Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts." 2 Pet. iii. 3.

A gentleman traveling in a stage coach attempted to divert the company by ridiculing the Scriptures. "As to the prophecies," said he, "in particular, they were all written after the events took place." A minister in the coach, who had hitherto been silent, replied, "Sir, I beg leave to mention one particular prophecy as an exception, 'Knowing this first, that there shall come to pass in the last days scoffers.' Now, sir, whether the event be not long after the prediction, I leave the company to judge." The mouth of the scorner was stopped.

The Decline of Popery.

THE CIRCULATION OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ITALY still continues. According to the *Evangeliste*, the British and Foreign Bible Society editions have been sold in considerable numbers by the agency of the Jews. At Rome they have sold thousands of New Testaments, and some of them have said to a Protestant pastor that they saw in that book the only efficacious remedy for Roman idolatry, and admitted that all forms of liberty are consequent upon its reception.

GOSPEL BANNER

AND

MILLENNIAL ADVOCATE.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor—to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent."—JESUS. *"The Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."*—REV. xi. 15.

B. WILSON, Ed.] GENEVA, KANE CO., ILL., DECEMBER 15, 1861. [VOL. VII., No. 24.]

For the Gospel Banner.
What is the Age of the World ?
 CONTINUED.

IS THE "VULGAR ERA" THE TRUE ERA OF THE NATIVITY.

In our scheme we have assumed that it is, though there are grave reasons to doubt it. The common version on the other hand considers the Vulgar Era altogether erroneous. By reference to the chronology in the margin of his Bible, the reader may see that the nativity is placed in the "fourth year before the common account, called Anno Domini." What follows will contain some of the reasons for the rejection of the "common account." But first, it may not be amiss to mention a few particulars concerning the origin of the Vulgar Era.

The Vulgar Era was the conception of a Roman Monk, who flourished in the reign of Justinian. Dionysius by name, surnamed Exiguus, or *the little*; some say with reference to his stature, others from his extreme humility. The era of Diocletian, the persecutor of the Christians, was then in general use. Dionysius, in A. D. 532, proposed to abandon this era, and substitute for it the era of the nativity, which by his computation happened in the year of Rome 753. His suggestion however was not acted upon, and it fell into oblivion until nearly two centuries afterwards, when the venerable Bede, an Anglo-Saxon Monk, resuscitated it, recommended it, and even used it in his own writings. The era began to be used in France in the seventh century, though not generally until the reigns of Pepin and Charlemagne in the eighth. The last-named was the first to use in dating public documents. Not, however, until A. D. 1431 was it fairly established, when Pope Eugenius commanded its use in the public registers.

The computation of the Dionysian, however, has for various reasons, long ago been set aside. It is argued that the Dionysian "nativity" must be fallacious; in the first

place, because Christ was born before the death of Herod, who died U. C. 751, or two years before the Vulgar Era commenced. Secondly, because Christ was thirty and a half years of age in the forty-sixth year of the building of the temple. This fact, it is contended by some, locates the nativity in the second year before the death of Herod, or U. C. 749, B. C. 4; by others, in the same year that Herod died, or U. C. 751, B. C. 2. Here then we have three diverse computations of the nativity:—

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| 1st. That Christ was born | B. C. 4. |
| 2nd. That he was born | B. C. 2. |
| 3rd. That he was born | B. C. 0. |

If he was born B. C. 4, then A. D. 1861 would be A. M. 5987, and A. D. 1874 would be A. M. 6000. If he was born B. C. 2, A. D. 1861 would be A. M. 5985, and 1876 would be A. M. 6000.

It is not because we think the *vulgar* true era that we have adopted it in our scheme, but because after much labor we have been utterly unable to determine which of the other two hypotheses is correct. There seems, however, to be no good reason to doubt that he was born in the compass of them. Before the arguments against the vulgar Anno Domini can have any weight, they must be stated more in detail. This we propose to do, using as much brevity as the case will allow.

First, then, the *vulgar* nativity U. C. 753 is wrong, because Herod died U. C. 751, two years before, and Christ was born before Herod died.

That Christ was born before the death of Herod needs no proof, for all are familiar with the cruel murder of the infants of Bethlehem, and its purpose, that amongst them might be compassed the death of "him that was born King of the Jews." But that Herod died U. C. 751 is not so obvious, without the proof. For this we are indebted to Josephus, who informs us, that "Herod survived the execution of his son five days. From the time at which on Antigonus' execution he

became master of the State, he had reigned thirty-four years, but from the date of his being declared King by the Romans thirty-seven." * We quote again from the same author, to show when he was declared King by the Senate. "And thus did this man (Herod) receive the Kingdom, having obtained it on the hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad, when Caius Domitius Calvinus was consul the second time, and Caius Assinius Pollio (the first time)." † In the above quotation the author uses both a Greek era—the Olympiads, and a Roman—the Consular era. The Olympiads had their origin in the Olympic games which were celebrated at intervals of four years. They date from July 1, 776 B. C., so that the 184th would comprise the years B. C. 44½ to 40½.

The Romans connected events with the consuls under whose administration they happened, just as Josephus has done above, and as Tacitus has done throughout his entire history. Two were elected every year, and their names inscribed in the Calendars. The year in which the two mentioned by Josephus officiated was U. C. 714. From this date, then, Herod reigned 37 years. His death, therefore, must have occurred U. C. 751. But the Vulgar Era commenced U. C. 753, consequently the nativity has been post-dated at least two years. It remains to be seen whether Christ was born yet further back.

Secondly, the Dionysian nativity is erroneous, because Christ was thirty and a half years of age in the forty-sixth year of the building of the temple. This fact, according to some, locates the birth of Christ in the year that Herod died, U. C. 751, according to others two years still further back, or U. C. 749. The passage upon which the foregoing argument is based is as follows:—"Then said the Jews (unto Christ) forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days," John ii. 20.

The above was said at Jesus' first passover, and as he was 33½ at his fourth, he must have been 30½ at this. The Jews in saying "this temple," had reference to the temple in which they then were—the temple in Jerusalem. The circumstances under which the then existing temple was built, are as follows:—"And now Herod in the eighteenth year of his reign, * * * undertook a very great work, that is, to build of himself the temple of God, and make it larger in compass, and to raise it to a most magnificent altitude." † When the proposal was made to the Jews, they became greatly alarmed, lest

having demolished the old temple he would not replace it with a new one. Herod, however, promised that he would not pull down the old, until he had got the material for the new ready, and on the spot. They then fell in with the proposal. Herod then "got ready a thousand wagons that were to bring stones for the building, and chose out ten thousand of the most skillful workmen, and brought a thousand sacerdotal garments for as many of the priests, and had some of them taught the arts of stone-cutters, and others of carpenters, and then began to build, but not till everything was well prepared for the work." * The temple itself was built by the priests in a year and six months. † The cloisters and the outer enclosures Herod built in eight years. ‡ Thus was it finished and fitted for use, but the work upon it did not end, as may be learned from the same author, who describing the temple in book 5, chap. 5, of his wars, preceding the account of its destruction, says, "In which work long ages were spent, as all their sacred treasures were exhausted, which were still replenished by those tributes which were sent to God from the whole habitable earth." From the foregoing we learn that there was a "sacred treasury" which was spent, as well as "long ages" upon the work of the temple, and even shortly before its destruction, the treasury was being replenished. Josephus leaves us in no doubt as to when the temple was really finished, for narrating events that happened in the reign of Nero A. D. 65, he says, "And now it was that the temple was FINISHED. So when the people saw that the workmen were unemployed, who were above eighteen thousand, and that they receiving no wages were in want, because they had earned their bread by their labors about the temple." § Such then is in brief the circumstances attending the building of the temple contemporary with Christ; and in view of the fact, that it was not completed until A. D. 65, we must understand "forty and six years was this temple in building" as having reference to the completeness to which it had at that time attained. Christ then being in his thirty-first year, forty-six years from the beginning of the building of the temple, he must have been born in the sixteenth year from the same period. Here would be an excellent clue to the exact year of the nativity—but query, did the Jews date the forty-sixth year from Herod's proposal, or from the actual commencement to build, after the materials were all prepared, and on the ground? The proposal was made in the

* Wars, book 1, chap. 33, sec. 8.

† Ant., book 14, chap. 14, sec. 5.

‡ Ant., Book 15, chap. 11, sec. 1.

* Ant. book 15, chap. 11, sec. 2.

† Ant. book 15, chap. 11, sec. 6.

‡ Ant. book 15, chap. 11, sec. 5.

§ Ant. book 20, chap. 9, sec. 7.

eighteenth year of the reign of Herod. It has been shown that there are two starting points from which the reign of Herod is reckoned. With reference to the one he had reigned thirty-seven years when he died; and to the other thirty-four. The thirty-seven years date from the decree of the Senate U. C. 714; the thirty-four from the death of Archelaus, U. C. 717. The eighteenth of Herod in question, Josephus dates from the latter epoch. Jesus then being 30½ years of age in the forty-sixth year of the building of the temple, he must have been born 15½ years after the work was begun, which was in U. C. 731, according to the following statement:—

Death of Archelaus	U. C. 717
Eighteenth of Herod Current	17
<hr/>	
Herod proposes to rebuild the temple	U. C. 731
Forty-sixth year of the building	46
<hr/>	

of the temple is 750
It having been shown elsewhere, that Christ at his death was exactly thirty-two and a half years of age, he must have been at this, his first passover, precisely thirty and a half years, which

deduct 30 1-2

Birth of Christ U. C. 749 1-2

But the Vulgar Era does not begin till U. C. 753, therefore in fixing the nativity three and a half years have been omitted.

FRANCIS COGHILL.

For the Gospel Banner.

Objections to Mark Allen's Views on Governments.—No. 3.

BY L. H. CHASE.

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." James iv. 1, 4. "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." James iii. 17, 18. "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet, (Christ,) shall be destroyed from among the people." Acts iii. 22, 23. "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him. And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words. And ye are com-

plete in him, which is the head of all principality and power." Col. ii. 6, 4, 10. We agree with Bro. Allen as to the One Faith, and the mode by which men of all nations may be made Abraham's seed; but this is not the subject matter in controversy. The subject is this; "what is Christian duty under the present dispensation, towards the governments of this world?" Bro. Allen asks, is it compatible with this One Faith, for him who has confessed it to take the sword and adopt a Military Calling? I answer No, not for him who has confessed the Faith under Christ, for the following reasons. First, because neither God nor his Christ, has a kingdom on this earth to extend or defend; consequently no servants employed to fight. "But now is not my kingdom from hence," says Christ. Second, if God has no kingdom, he consequently has no kings clothed with authority from him to command us to fight. Third, because we are not living under the Patriarchal, or Mosaic ages or dispensations, but under Christ or the Christian dispensation; and using carnal weapons, as a Military Calling, is strictly forbidden by Christ and his ambassadors. Fourth, because we are strictly forbidden under Christ, of doing very many things that were approbated under former dispensations;—such as hate thine enemy; "eye for eye;" "tooth for tooth;" "thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths;" "a writing of divorce;" a plurality of wives; and many other things too numerous to mention. The faith of a true Israelite, and that of a Christian, as pertaining to the promises of God to the fathers, are precisely the same. Circumcision in the flesh, in connection with a belief in those promises, and a conformity to the laws of God, under the dispensation in which they lived, constituted them Israelites of hope and promise, but it did not constitute them Christians. Those under former dispensations, were called Patriarchs, Israelites, people of God, saints, &c; but never are they called Christians. But the circumcision of Christ constitutes us not only Israelites, but Christians, for in the act of immersion, we put off the body of the sins of the flesh, and put on Christ, and take the oath of allegiance to him, and acknowledge him our supreme law-giver, and to strictly obey him in all things whatsoever he has commanded. And as they were to obtain the fulfillment of those promises, by compliance with those laws given in the dispensation in which they lived, so, in like manner, the Christian is to obtain the fulfillment of the same promises to them, by a strict compliance with those laws found in the Christian institution. And for this reason, Bro. Allen has no Scriptural right to bring the act of Abraham, in recovering Lot's family from the

enemy, as an example for Christians to keep trained soldiers in their houses, and much less the examples of Sampson, Samuel, Jephtha, and David; they fought the enemies of God, by the special command of God. If they are our examples, why may we not hate our enemies, and hew them in pieces in Gilgal? Why may we not fight and kill, and take the raiment of thirty men, in order to pay them for guessing our riddles? Why may we not fight and kill, and take the fore-skins of one hundred men, in order to gratify the revenge of an old God-forsaken king, for the purpose of obtaining his daughter for a wife? Why may we not have a wife, and a concubine, as did father Abraham? Why may we not have a plurality of wives, and a multitude of concubines, as did the sweet singer of Israel? Ah, I answer, because it is not compatible with the One Faith, for the man who has confessed it under Christ, to do such acts. And on the same principle we affirm, that it is not compatible with the One Faith, for him who has confessed it under Christ, to take the sword and adopt a Military Calling. So the reader will easily perceive, that Bro. Allen's quotations, do not prove his position true. Bro. Allen says again, that Paul in Hebrews, holds up those Military heroes—those smiters with carnal weapons, as bright examples to us. What do you mean Bro. Allen? do you mean that they were bright examples for Christians, in smiting with carnal weapons? and do you mean to be understood, that the Christian is in duty-bound to imitate their example in that respect? If these be your sentiments, (and I can make nothing more, or less of your words,) would I be saying too much to say, that you in faith are antagonistic to Christ, and a stranger to the precepts and commandments which he and his Apostles taught. Christ said, "put up thy sword; they who take the sword, shall perish with the sword. But I say unto you love your enemies, and pray for, (not shoot) them that despitefully use you." And his Apostles say, "that wars and fightings come even of your lusts, that war in your members; and those who will be friends of the world, are the enemies of God." The Apostle Paul declares, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringeth into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. x. 3, 4.

And now, in conclusion of this part of my subject, I appeal to the candor of my brethren in Christ,—can you believe with Bro.

Allen, that the Apostles held up those Military heroes, those smiters with carnal weapons, as bright examples for the Christian to imitate, and that the Christian is walking consistent with his calling, to take the sword and become a suiter, and strive to excel those ancient heroes by Military achievements? when the same Apostle, in his letter to the Corinthians, tells his brethren, that the Christian's armor, or weapons are not carnal. But he does tell in his letter to brethren in Ephesus, what constitutes the Christian armor, Eph. vi. 13, 14, 15, 16. I advise all, to turn to and read Heb. xi., and then decide in your minds, whether you find the least shadow of testimony to justify a Christian in adopting a Military Calling. Bro. Allen says, "I have asked the question, is a Military Calling incompatible with Christian character? not because I intend to adopt such a calling." Why not Bro. Allen? you have been holding up, and extolling those Military heroes, as bright examples for the Christian to imitate, and now you have no idea of imitating their example yourself. You are a great Christian minister, are you not? First instruct, and exhort your brethren, and hold up examples for them to imitate, and then turn farou and tell your brethren, you have no intention of doing it yourself! Oh, consistency thou art a jewel.

We next come to notice the centurion who came to Jesus, to solicit him to heal his servant; for this furnishes one of Bro. Allen's arguments. He says, that Christ found no fault with his profession; that if he had disallowed the Military character, he would have taken this opportunity of censuring it; and that instead of censure, he highly commended the officer, and said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Matt. viii. 10. An obvious weakness in this argument is this; that it is founded, not upon approval, but upon silence. Approbation is indeed expressed, but it is directed, not to his *arms*, but his *faith*. But how happens it that Christ did not notice the centurion's religion? He surely was an idolator. And is there not as good reason for maintaining that Christ approved idolatry, because he did not condemn it, as that he approved war because he did not condemn it? And I ask, is it not singular, that Bro. Allen should bring silence respecting war as an evidence of its lawfulness. A similar argument is advanced by our Bro. Allen, in the case of Cornelius. The objection applies to this argument as to the last, that it is built upon silence, that it is simply negative. We do not find that he quitted the service. I answer, neither do we find that he continued in it. We only know nothing of the matter: and the evidence is therefore so much the less than proof, as

silence is less than approval. In position in those two cases; for none can be supposed to do everything that he does in silence of Peter, therefore Cornelius, will serve the cause a little; that little is dim against the positive evidence and prohibitions; and in ingness, when it is of a general tendency and object in the Christian instance brings for testimony to Military Calling is no Christian character, or centurion or Cornelius; their Military pursuits; every man abide in the he was called." 1 Cor. very plausible! And I steal! This looks very if any man be called, he abide in the same calling. And art thou called being for it; toil on (called being a slave-holder calling! go on and wear muscle of your fellow-without fee, or reward being a sorcerer, (as Simon we have no account the calling,) abide in the you were called! Art rum-seiler, care nothing same calling wherein thou called being a Corporal, or Private, be called and abide in the same were called! Art thou man, abide in the same Apostles did abandon above strictly accords pretation of 1 Cor. monstrous perversion for the reader will per-chapter, beginning with the language made us revelation! * but since Paul, without commandment Yet we are willing to

* Is Bro. Chase correct with reference to was—a mere human opinion sanction from the individual? We think not. When or ordains, claims to be his power as an Apostle such, "He who hears the reverse, to which refer that the matters on which not been spoken of by the courses; as verse 10, "her husband," in Mark to respect Paul's judgment authority.—Ed.

ation. Bro. Allen's is only presumed to countenance, not condemn. The in the case of Cor. of Bro. Allen but wished when urged silence of commands is reduced to nothing, proposed to the universal revelation found. Bro. Allen his position, that a incompatible with to prove that the never did abandon these words: "let same calling wherein vii. 20. This looks t him that has stolen, plausible too! That ing a thief, let him wherein he is called! ing a slave, care nothing contented! Art thou der, abide in the same ar out the bone and man in your service, d! Art thou called mon Magus was, and at he abandoned his same calling wherein t thou called being a g for it, abide in the you are called! Art ptain, Sergeant, Content with your wages, calling wherein you called being a fisher- e calling, although the their calling! The with Bro. Allen's inter- vii. 20. Which is a of Paul's judgment; ceive by looking at the the 12th verse, that e of by Paul, is not ply the judgment of dment from the Lord! show all due deference

in the idea here thrown Paul's judgment? that it ion, without dictation or ing and guiding Spirit? ul commands, or exhorts, card and obeyed because of and the Lord has said of u. hears me." The 12th e is made, only shows, i Paul was writing, and e Lord, in any of his dis- et not a wife depart from : 12. We wish not only nent, but to uphold his

to Paul's judgment, as one who had obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. Now, let us look at the text, and its connections, and see if we can come to right conclusions, as to its import. "Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised." Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." 1 Cor. vii. 18-20. And now what is the Apostle talking about? Is he talking about war, or circumcision? We say, of circumcision and uncircumcision only? Is any man called being uncircumcised, let him remain so. And if a man is called being circumcised, let him remain so; for neither of them amount to anything, but the keeping of the commandments of God. Paul's ideas expressed in these words, has no more reference to war, than Paul leaving his cloak at Troas, had with Noah leaving the ark at Ararat. Art thou called being a servant? servant to whom? The law of circumcision, "care nothing for it, for circumcision is nothing. But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." Free from what? the law of circumcision! (for this is what the Apostle is giving his judgment about,) "for he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, (to the law of circumcision;) is the Lord's free-man (from the law of circumcision;) likewise also he that is called, being free, (from the law of circumcision) is Christ's servant." Consequently, being free from the law of circumcision, he is now made a servant to the law of Christ. 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22. And in proof that circumcision is bondage from which the Christian is made free; see Acts xv. 10. "Now, therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers, nor we are able to bear." "You are bought with a price, be you not the servants of men." 1 Cor. vii. 23. Thank heaven for such a system of slavery as this; Christ the slave-holder, and the Christian the slave.

I would here notice another saying of Bro. Allen's; "We must render to Cesar, Cesar's things." This is true, I would be a dishonest man to retain in my possession, that which belonged to Cesar, or any other man. But Bro. Allen says, "Cesar requires obedience to laws, as well as means to enforce them!" Ah, that is quite another thing; suppose Cesar makes laws that are opposed to the laws of God, and then commands the Christian to obey his laws, must I obey Cesar, rather than God? What say you, Bro. Allen? or will you say that all of Cesar's laws are of God's arrangement? What say

you? * All laws that Cesar makes, that do not conflict with the laws of God, I will obey as long as I live under his beastly government. And all laws that Cesar makes, and commands me to obey, that require me to do that which God's laws forbid me to do, by the grace of God, *I shall not obey.* No, he may put me in the dungeon until the ants carry my body out of the key-hole; I will not give to Cesar's laws, the supremacy over the laws of the God of my salvation. No, never!

We come next to notice the Scripture adduced by our Bro. Allen, found in Luke iii. 7, 14. "The soldiers came and demanded of John, the immerser, saying, what shall we do? John answered them, saying, do violence to no man, neither accuse falsely, and be content with your wages." Bro. Allen remarks, it seems very likely that if John had deemed a Military Calling to be incompatible with a thorough reformation, and the position of children of Abraham, he would have exhorted those soldiers to abandon their calling, and not to content themselves with the wages of a soldier. This also, is at least but a negative evidence. It does not prove that the Military profession was wrong, and it certainly does not prove that it was right. But in truth, if it asserted the latter, Christians have, as I conceive, nothing to do with it; for I think that we need not enquire what John allowed, or what he forbade. He confessedly, belonged to that system which required "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Although it could be proved, (which it cannot be) that he allowed wars, he acted not inconsistently with his own dispensation; and with that dispensation we have nothing to do. Yet if any one still insists upon the authority of John, I would refer him for an answer to Jesus Christ himself. What authority he attaches to John on questions relating to his own dispensation, may be learned from this, "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he." And again, and lastly, "If it be not a duty under some circumstances for a Christian to bear the sword, was Paul justified in calling upon a Roman Military officer for the protection of the sword, when his life was threatened by vagabond Jews?" See Acts xxiii. 11, 27. I have only this to say in reply; that there is no testimony in the passages referred to, of Paul calling upon a Roman Military officer, for to protect his life with the sword. Please read and see. Bro. Allen says, "If it be not duty under some circumstances, for a Christian to bear the sword;" why does he say, *some cir-*

umstances? Ho has been arguing that a Military Calling is compatible with Christian character! And if so, why is it not duty under *all* circumstances, where fighting is required, for a Christian to bear the sword? It is apparent to me, that Bro. Allen has run his own argument into a mere expediency. And it may be, that Bro. Allen will take the ground, that whatever is expedient is right. We shall not quarrel with the dogma, but how is expediency to be determined? By the calculations and guessings of men, or by the knowledge and foresight of God? Expediency may be the test of our duties, but what is the test of expediency? Obviously, I think it is this; *the decision which God has made known respecting what is best for man.* And permit me to say in conclusion, they who are at liberty to guess that Christian laws may sometimes be suspended, are at liberty to guess that Jupiter is a fixed star, or that the existence of America is a fiction.

But I am reminded my article is becoming lengthy. I have endeavored to meet Bro. Allen's position fairly, both by reason, and Scripture. And I leave the reader to decide whether I have performed my task as far as I have gone. And in my next, I purpose to give a large amount of testimony from Christians of early date, as far back as the first and second centuries, as well as a large amount of Scripture testimony; in proof that our dear brother Mark Allen is in a most egregious error. But we still hope he may be willing to turn from the error, when the light shines. And we still say, let Satan fight Satan, until his kingdom falls; then, and not till then, will the Messiah reign upon Mount Zion, before his ancients gloriously. Then, and not till then, will the tumults of nations be hushed to silence, and strong nations rebuked, and compelled to throw down their carnal weapons at the feet of King Jesus, and instead of using them to slaughter their fellow-men, they will be used to plow the field, and prune the vine, and man with man shall be at peace.

Then shall wars and tumults cease, and cannon cease to roar;

They'll hang their trumpets in the ball, and study war no more.

O blessed day! may it soon come.

For the Gospel Banner.

Meditation.

My theme is not much thought upon, in the abstract, because the art of thinking is meditation; but that does not make the act any less important; if we only think in the right way. We are thinking animals; think we must, be the theme what it may. They of the flesh think of the things pertaining to the flesh, but we, who have put away fleshly

* See answer to this query in Bro. Allen's last article—Dec. 1st.—Ed.

things, and become children of the Almighty One, are bound to think of those things which will keep constantly before our minds whose we are, in order that we may serve Him with the zeal requisite to obtain an entrance into the heavenly mansions prepared for those that love Him. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," so according as our meditations are on the laws and promises of our Heavenly Parent, will our words and acts correspond. Those we love we desire to be with, to think and converse about; we treasure up and muse upon every little act of kindness; we endeavor to gratify each half-expressed wish; we constantly seek their society, and the more we enjoy of it, the more our thoughts are occupied, and our principles influenced by our intercourse, until we become to a certain degree assimilated. But how shall we become like to our God? He is invisible and dwells in light unapproachable. We are commanded to love Him with our whole heart, and serve Him with our whole strength; but how shall we love Him if we cannot commune with Him? and how shall we serve Him if we understand not His law? We must constantly refresh our souls by a knowledge of His goodness, or the love in our hearts will droop and die; we must keep alive a constant appreciation of His power, or we shall cease to revere His holy name. We who are one in Christ can frequently meet in the social circle; testify our love for each other by the cheering word and warm hand-clasp; talk of our trials and temptations, and receive the healing balm of sympathy, thus tightening the band of union that makes us one great whole. But how shall we come in contact with our God? Only through His word and works: only by "preventing the night watches," to ponder them in our hearts, can we hope to comprehend His law and mighty works, or understand the greatness of His love.

Hear the sweet singer of Israel declare, "I have more understanding than my teachers, because I make Thy testimonies my meditation." God is a teacher above all teachers, so a constant meditation upon His testimonies stored his mind with wisdom his teachers did not possess, because they knew not the fount of all wisdom. How often do we hear him declare, that he will meditate upon the statutes and works of the Lord, and as a consequence, from which of the sacred writers do we have such frequent bursts of song, praising His wonderful ways; such manifestations of trusting, child-like confidence in the power of God, to deliver him from the hand of his enemy; such faith in His sympathy when oppressed with sorrow; such heartfelt protestations of love and devotion, or such a lofty comprehension of the mighty works of God?

The Lord commanded Joshua when about to take command of the armies of Israel to meditate upon the law day and night if he would prosper, and do the things written therein. If it was necessary for Joshua to meditate upon the law of Moses, if he would obey it in every part, is it not just as necessary for us to meditate upon the law of Christ, that we do not sin through ignorance? The Psalmist says, "He that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, will delight in the law, and meditate therein day and night." True, and why? Because God is the author of the law, and he who walks uprightly in the fear of the Lord, delights in all things that come from His hand, knowing that obedience to His commands will lead to mansions where the weary can rest forevermore.

Christ often withdrew at eventime from the busy throng to commune with his Heavenly Father in silent thought. Could he so successfully have withstood the wiles of the wicked one, if he had not thus strengthened himself? and shall we not imitate him in *this*, that like him we may grow strong to resist evil?

Night, too, seems to be the time selected by the most devoted servants of the Most High, for these silent communings—night, when the loving kine no more graze the meadows; when the noise of the axe and wheel grow still, and the mighty anther which Nature chants to her God is permitted to rise unmixed with the harsh sounds of man at his daily toil. And when so fitting a time? Go, stand beneath the broad arch of heaven, when the moon-beans are streaming over hill and vale, a silvery flood;—gaze, upon the stars that "gem the brow of night;" list to the low hum of the insect hymning its nightly song, and to the sighing of the wind as bows the leafy branches, and as thought after thought flits silently through thy mind, and the greatness of these works dawn upon thee, will not thy heart be lifted up to the Creator of all, and a sense of thy insignificance in comparison constrain thee to cry, "What is man, that Thou are mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him!" Thus is our haughty pride brought low, and our hearts filled with reverence and awe for one so great, and yet so merciful.

Again, as we scan the sacred page, and meditate upon the wonders God performed in the days of old, and witness His many acts of loving-kindness and forbearance to those who so often rebelled, and provoked His righteous indignation, our hearts swell high with love and admiration. When we think of His unbounded love, in the gift of His only son, and comprehend the fulness of the plan of salvation, with bowed head, and humble grateful heart, the lips will cry, "I thank

Thee, O my God; for this will I serve Thee all my days, and continually speak forth thy praise."

We cannot be earnestly devoted Christians and neglect meditation, for as our thoughts dwell less frequently upon "those things," we shall pass from warmth to lukewarmness, from lukewarmness to coldness, and from coldness to utter neglect. Then as the human heart, must have some object to cherish, that which God loves not will take hold of the affections, and at least we shall be found among those who weep and blaspheme outside of the glorious city, when the blessed arise to occupy. Shall this be? No! the word and works of the Lord shall be our study, until he comes to take away our body of sin, and clothe us with that glorious robe in which we can show forth his praises through the endless ages of eternity.

Geneva, Ill.

From the Harbinger.

The Gospel of the Kingdom.

If the Gospel of the Kingdom was published among all nations, eighteen hundred years ago, why claim the fulfillment of this prophecy, in these last days, as a sign of the coming of Christ? Ans. The bible affords no ground for such an expectation, as the following evidence will abundantly prove; 1st. It reverses the order of events as narrated in Matt. 24th, Mark 13th, and Luke 21st. According to the foregoing chain in prophecy, the publication of the Gospel of the Kingdom in all the world, for a witness to all nations, was to be fulfilled before the death of the Apostles, before the destruction of Jerusalem. Compare Matt. xxiv. 14, with Mark xiii. 9, 10. Another class of signs are given with which to evidence the coming and kingdom of Christ, viz: the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, the shaking of the powers of heaven, and the sign of the Son of man, Matt. xxiv. 29, 30. These will be the last links in this prophetic chain, whereas, the publishing of the Gospel of the Kingdom among all nations was one of the first. The five signs above referred to, relate exclusively to the literal Jews, and will not commence being fulfilled until after the terminus of the Gentile dispensation, and the infliction of the last threatened judgment upon the Jewish race. For the fulfillment of these signs at the right time, place, and the right people, please read Joel iii. 1, 2, 9-16. "For behold in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there, for my people, and for my heritage Israel whom they have scattered among the nations.

Judah and Jerusalem were to be the subjects of captivity during the Gentile dispensation; see Luke xxi. 24. But Joel continues, "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up. Put in the sickle for the harvest is ripe; come, get ye down, for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of Decision, for the day of the Lord is near, in the valley of Decision. The sun and moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake, but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel."

The same signs in Matt. close up with the powers of the heaven; and the Jews, the subjects of both the judgments and the promises, are told that "when these things begin to be fulfilled, look up, and lift up your heads, because your deliverance approaches." Luke xxi. 28—*Campbell's Translation*. Who was to be enthralled? Ans. The Jews; consequently, the promised deliverance is to them. Hence, according to Joel, Matthew, Mark and Luke, these last signs are future to the Jewish people, and an evidence to them that the time of their final deliverance is at hand. These last signs are so many signals hung out in the political heavens, by which this despised and rejected race may know that the years of their oppression and captivity have ended.

All the foregoing signs relate to the political heavens and earth, with their emperors, kings, queens, cabinets, senators,—the sun, moon, stars, and the powers of heaven and earth. Proof.—According to Joel iii. 2-10, 11, they are all associated with the day of the Lord, and the last great battle of God Almighty. Not having quoted Joel ii. 10, 11, I will here insert those verses; "The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble; the sun and moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining; and the Lord shall utter his voice before his army; for his camp is very great; for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible, and who can abide it?"

That these signs are national is evident, 1st, from their effect upon the Gentile nations. Please read Campbell's translation of Luke xxi. 24-28. "They shall fall by the sword; they shall be carried captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be over. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth, the anguish of desponding nations,

and roaring in the seas and floods; men ex-
 piring with fear, and apprehension of those
 things which are coming upon the world
 (*oikoumene*, the habitable,) for the powers
 of earth shall be shaken. Then they [the
 Jews] shall see the Son of man coming in a
 cloud with power and great glory."

That the seas and floods which roar are
 "peoples and multitudes, and nations and
 tongues," [Rev. xvii. 15; Dan. vii. 2,] in com-
 motion, is evident from the anguish and de-
 pendency of the nations, caused by the
 shaking of the powers of the heavens, as signs
 of impending judgments upon the nations
 of the habitable. National judgments produce
 national distress. The waves of the mighty
 sea, of the nations, kingdoms, and empires of
 the world, rolling mountain high, and com-
 mingling with the dark, portentous clouds,
 which mantle the political sky, will extort
 one universal wail of despair from the de-
 sponding nations. That nations should be
 punished for oppressing a nation; that na-
 tional guilt should be punished with national
 judgments, is not only reasonable, but in
 harmony with God's dealings with guilty
 nations in other ages. Take Egypt and
 Babylon as examples.

2d. National signs would most fitly repre-
 sent national deliverance. From all the fore-
 going testimony, together with the whole
 history of God's mode of delivering oppressed
 nationalities, the Jewish nation will be de-
 livered upon the *downfall* of all nations which
 ruled over them with the rod of oppression.
 The Jews being under the yoke of *Gog*, the
 Babylonian head of all the nations in the
 habitable, will know when they shall see "the
 sign of the Son of man," [Matt. xxiv. 30,]
 that their Deliverer is coming out of Zion,
 [Rom. xi. 26; Isa. lix. 20,] before which he
 must come to Zion. They will then look
 upon him whom they have pierced, and wail
 because of him. [Zech. xii. 20.] Mark—this
 coming of Christ to extend mercy and favor
 to the Jews, is subsequent to the gathering of
 all nations against Judah: and Christ comes
 to defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem. They
 then will lift up their heads and rejoice,
 knowing that their deliverance approaches,
 Luke xxi. 27, 28.—*Campbell's Translation*.
 "Then they shall see the Son of man coming
 in a cloud with great glory and power. Now,
 when these things begin to be fulfilled, look
 up, and lift up your heads, because your de-
 liverance approaches." Or according to Matt.
 xxiii. 39, which refers to the same event, and
 the same glorious promise, they will exclaim,
 "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of
 the Lord." Jerusalem was desolated as the
 metropolis of the Jewish nation, when they
 were cursed; it will be restored as such, when
 they are blessed. They were cursed as a

nation; they will be blessed as a nation.
 Their thralldom was national; their deliver-
 ance will be national, also. The whole force of
 analogy, and all the prophecies, threatenings,
 and promises to which I have referred, de-
 monstrate this. Judah was enthralled as a
 nation, last, it will be restored first. Proof.
 Zech. xii. 7. "The Lord also shall save the
 tents of Judah, *first*, that the glory of the
 house of David, and the glory of the inhabi-
 tants of Jerusalem, do not magnify themselves
 against Judah."

But this deliverance is national, and in re-
 gard to the time in which it takes place, it is
 in connection with the gathering of all nations
 against Jerusalem, and the last great battle.
 That the national deliverance, indicated by
 the signs in the political heavens and earth,
 will not be their deliverance from among the
 nations, but their deliverance from the com-
 bined armies of the world, when "Michael
 shall stand up" to deliver Daniel's people, the
 Jews, from the dominion of "the king of the
 North"—the Gog power—who will be the head
 of that great political man who is to be broken
 to pieces upon the mountains of Israel, by
 the stone exhumed from the mountain of the
 kingdom of men—the Roman habitable—
 which, having broken in pieces this colossal
 image, will expand into the glorious mountain
 of the fifth universal empire of earth."

The Jews will be restored to the land of
 Canaan, brought back from the sword, before
 the king of the North shall head the nations
 of earth against Judah and Jerusalem, and
 having been subjugated, and half the city
 having been carried into captivity, Christ will
 come for their deliverance.

For proof upon these points, please read
 the following Scriptures: Dan. xi. 40-45;
 Ezek. xxxviii.; Joel iii.; Zech. xiv. 1-3; xii.
 7, 13; Matt. xxiii. 39; xxiv. 29, 30; Luke xxi.
 24, 31; Rom. xi. 12, 15, 25-29. Gentile be-
 lievers who "give heed to the word of proph-
 ecy," may also know, when they see the na-
 tions preparing for the last great battle, that
 the coming and kingdom of Christ are near
 at hand. But the principal cause of this error,
 (*viz*: claiming that the fulfillment of Matt.
 xxiv. 14, is a sign of the coming of Christ,)
 has been the confounding of the Gospel of
 the Kingdom, of Matt. xxiv. 14, with the
 "*euaggelion aionion*," "the good news of
 the age," of Rev. xiv. 6. But that this view
 is erroneous will appear from the following
 point of difference; 1st. In point of time, one
 introduces the Christian dispensation; the
 other will introduce the future age. 2d. Rel-
 ative to their object. One is an individual
 arrangement; the other is a national arrange-
 ment. See Mark. xvi. 15, 16; Acts xv. 13-
 16; Rev. v. 9; xiv. 5, 7; xv. 4; Psa. lxxii.
 11; Isa. ii. 1-4; Micah iv. 1-4. One pro

poses to select from among the nations; the other to save the nations. 3d. One proclaims a judgment to come; the other a judgment already come. Acts xvii. 30, 31; xxiv. 25; Rev. xiv. 6, 7. 4th. One proposes to make individual believers in THIS AGE, KINGS and PRIESTS in the COMING AGE; the other proposes to make the obedient nations the subjects of those kings, and the objects of their intercession. Proof.—Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 28; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. ii. 26; iii. 21; v. 9, 10; xx. 4-6; Dan. vii. 18-27. Compare—Psa. lxxii. 8-11; Isa. ii. 1-4; Micah iv. 1-4; Zech. xiv. 16; Dan. vii. 13, 14, 27; Psa. cxlix.; Rev. ii. 26; xiv. 6, 7; xv. 4; xi. 15; xx. 3; xxi. 24; xxii. 1, 2, 14, 15. J. M. STEPHENSON.

Assyrian Scriptures in the British Museum.

In July, 1856, there arrived a magnificent consignment of sculptures from Ninevite excavations, exhumed under the direction of Mr. Loftus, since deceased, from the ruins of the Palace of Ashurbanipal the Third, grandson of Sennacherib, who lived in the seventh century before Christ. Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, who had accompanied Mr. Layard in his earlier labors, and succeeded him as conductor of the excavations in that part of the Assyrian capital called Kouyunjik, had sent a similar collection a few months before. These last were from a palace built by Sennacherib himself, or by the Ashurbanipal in question. Mr. Loftus's discoveries came from another part of the great mound, styled by him, "The North-Western Palace." They are of later date than those previously received, their style being more complete and artistic. They represent hunting-scenes, battles, sieges, processions of captives, etc., and are executed with astonishing spirit of design and fineness of execution—so much so, indeed, that we have no hesitation in asserting that, in many qualities of really fine art, they are little inferior to the Parthenon frieze itself, made under the eyes of Phidias.

The most interesting portion of Mr. Loftus's importations is the Inscription of Sennacherib, relating to his conquest in Palestine, and the submission of Hezekiah. This is already well known to the public. The sculptures themselves are not so; even now few visitors descend the obscure staircase leading to the room which contains them. They are in flatter relief than the earlier received marbles, far more finished, and have been damaged by fire in many places. Where this has been the case, the application of a silicious solution has been tried, apparently with little success, to reconvert the scorched gypsum into marble again. We shall consider a few of them of particular interest to the Biblical student:—

Nos. 21, 22, show the Assyrians assaulting the walls of Lachish.

In a thicket before the town, archers are shooting from among the trees, and slingers slinging; the action of these last is given with extraordinary spirit, the jerk of the arm and outflaying of the thong itself could not be better shown, nor the way in which the motion comes from the shoulder. This is a vineyard, for grape-laden vines train upon the trees. The slingers cast over the heads of the archers, who draw the bow to the shoulder. Nearer still to the town, and more in the open, are soldiers with shield, apparently wicker, and lances; more archers shoot from under these shields; nearer still are men holding mantlets. In slab 23, which shows the taking of Lachish by assault, and torturing of prisoners, the ladders are reared in numbers against the walls, which are higher; the country is evidently smoother; here the tortoise is at work against the top of a shield-hung tower; beneath the line of the rampart are three little barred windows; great stones and torches in scores are being tossed against the defenders, who reply in kind by throwing over the broken ladders (even shields go down,) shooting arrows and slinging stones. It is evident defence is hopeless, for below are people escaping with valuables by a little postern. In 24, are camels, chariots, men and oxen, burthened with spoil.

On slabs 27, 28, 29, the vanquished are brought before Sennacherib, who is seated on his throne. It is noticeable that the king is (contrary to the Egyptian usage) but little larger than his people; behind him stand two eunuchs holding feather fans and embroidered scarf. The king's dress is richly decorated and deeply fringed; his left hand holds a strung bow, the right a brace of arrows. The throne is splendidly carved all over; three rows of little figures of bearded men support the side rails. Guards approach with captives, some of whom prostrate themselves; near this is an inscription in cuneiform characters. The countenance of the monarch has been defaced, evidently on purpose and of old. Behind is the great imperial pavilion, with its hooded top and ropes by which it is stayed, and square-headed door at one end. Next, a war-chariot, the fellos very broad, and carved naves; a bow-case is slung beside. A charioteer stands within:—this looks like the portrait of a veteran, one to be trusted in battle. He holds back the strong horses; at the head of each is a groom; the horses' tails are clubbed and bound; by the side an attendant holds an umbrella, with its pendant screen or scarf behind; the carving of embossed work upon this umbrella is as clear and sharp as when it left the sculptor's hand so long ago.—*Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 1.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Aceldama	294	Harvard Conference	21
A Doubting Epistle and Remarks	113	Hebrews	250
A Few thoughts on 1 Thess. iv. 13-17	215	Hell	22
A few Words of Counsel	127		
A Letter from Bro. McMillan	67	Incorrect Translations of the Scripture	228
A Letter to a young Lady	57	Is it Heresy?	95
A Looking-Glass for the Heart	225	Is the Kingdom of Israel the Kingdom of God.	69
An African Idea about the Dead	261	" " " Reply by a Learner.	97
An Anecdote Illustrative of trust in God	97	" " " Stephenson.	109, 193, 201
An Exposition of Matt. x. 28	241	" " " Stacy	229, 243, 253
A Parable	25		
A Prophecy Fulfilled	276	Jesus the Christ	121
A Question	82	Jewish Restoration	32
A Sermon for the Times	126		
Assyrian Scriptures in the British Museum	257	Life, in the Sense of Consoious Existence, the	
Astounding Facts	93	Great Offer of the Bible	18
A Sure Remedy for Bigotry	24		
A Word of Admonition	174	Mark Allen's Western Tour	163, 213
A World in Trouble	263	Meditation	283
		Melchisedec	116
Baptism	130	Mosaic Vision of Creation No. I.	153
Bards of the Bible	5	" " " No. II.	160
Be Sober	252		
Biblical Discovery	72	New Year's Salutation	3
Brotherly Love	38	One Baptism	70
Can Matter Think?	129	Palestine	227
Can you Believe?	119	Pastoral Charge—Good Advice	264
Chronological Queries Considered	107	"Paternity of Jesus"	17, 133
"Chronological Speculation" Vindicated	27	Pharisees and Remarks	223
Church Organization and Government	13	Poetry—A Dream	71
"Come over and help us"—a loud and urgent call	87	Poetry—An Orthodox Mystery	12
Constitution, Life, Discipline, and Worship of the Church	31	Poetry—The House of God	252
Correspondence 34, 45, 132, 197, 189,	276	Preparation for Christ's appearing	60
Correspondence.—A Preaching Tour	20	Prerequisites to Baptism	52
		Prerequisites to Baptism and Remarks	34
De Captivitate Babylonia	155	Questionous	202
Divine Sonship	177	Queries	22, 96
Domestic	216		
Epoch Men—The Lessons of their Lives—		Report of the Eight Semi-Annual Conference	9
V. David—Government	37	Report of the Ninth Semi-Annual Conference	166
Evil Speaking	263	Remarks on the Gift of Healing, &c	108
Extracts from Letters	47	Reasons for Re-immersion	149
Extracts of a Philadelphian's Letters from Syria	84	Review of Sundry Topics	21
		Reverence	107
		Remarks on Wine and Reply	235
"Four"	46	Salutation	9
		Reply to do	11
Government of the Tongue	271	Scripture God-breathed	251

CONTENTS OF VOL. VII.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Scripturo Reasonings—		The Objections of Mark Allen's views on	
No. X. Charity and Love	73	Government. By L. H. Chase.	
No. XI. The Kingdom of God the King-		No. 1.	188
dom of Israel	145	No. 2.	233
Scriptural Sentiments in Poetry	103	No. 3.	277
Seeming Contradictions of the Bible	240	The Religion of Paying Debts	72
Showing the Lord's Death till he come	235	The Sabbath—12 Facts, No. 2.	302
Signs of the Times	180	The Serpent Rationally Investigated	150
Social Worship	104, 137, 197,	The Splendor of Damascus	24
" Spirits in Prison"	268	The Spread of Christianity	262
		The Times, No. 1	247
The Atheist Silenced	274	The Waldenses and Bible	69
The American Crisis, No. 1	247	The Will of Peter the Great	63
"The Banner-Excommunicated Sister"	66	Tischendorf and the Codex Sinaiticus	141
The Bible	252	To the Pilgrims and Strangers	151
The Body of Moses	53	Transgressor's Fate	156
The Burning Day	185	Twelve Minor Prophets	147
The Cross of Christ	49		
The Cross—its purpose	163, 171, 181, 209	Unity of the Bible	179
The Dead Sea	249	Vineyards of Scripture ~	204
The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ	56, 96		
The Decline of Popery	276	Waiting for God's Son from Heaven	123
The Earliest Copy of the Scriptures	226	Weeping Rachel, &c	78
The Epistle to the Laodiceans	275	What does Infidelity propose to do?	33
The Four Horns and the Four Carpenters	94	What is our relation as Christians to Gentile	
The Future of England in Prophecy	29	Governments? By Mark Allen.	
-The Future Reign of Christ	131	No. 1.	157
-The Gospel of the Kingdom	284	No. 2.	219
The House of the Lord	205	No. 3. Objections Answered	257, 265
-The Kingdom of God	84, 128	What is the Age of the World?—	
The Law—12 Facts, No. 1.	193	4, 43, 54, 64, 75, 111, 169, 277	
The Messiahship of Jesus	115	Who may Know a tree by its fruits	272
The Mountains of Jerusalem	275	Why do Children Die?	144