



HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1857.

[Vol. VII. No. 1.

"Nahum's Lightning Chariots."

"Nahum's lightning chariots proclaim this to be the day of Christ's preparation."

A strange notion has taken possession of some that the railroad system of locomotion is revealed in the prophecy of Nahum as a sign of the latter days, indicating the appearing of Christ. The following, they say, relates to locomotives and their lightning speed: "The shield of his mighty men is made red, the valiant men are in scarlet; the chariots with flaming torches in the day of his preparation, and the fir trees shall be terribly shaken. The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broadways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like lightning."

In the interpretation given, the "shield made red" is the danger-signal of the railroad companies' valiant switchmen! whose uniform, however, does not happen to be "scarlet," unless by chance some of them may happen to wear a scarlet vest, or red flannel shirt. But this is not peculiar to the switchmen, who only wear such garments when they can get no better. They and the engine-drivers are "mighty men," and "valiant," because of the mighty catastrophes produced by their recklessness! The locomotives and cars are the chariots with flaming torches. The torches are the campfire lights, reflected through stained glass from the fore-fronts of the chariots! The fir trees terribly shaken are the trees cut down and chopped up into firewood for the furnace. They are thus shaken out of their forests into the fires, running on wheels like lightning! The chariots rage in the streets, though the raging iron-horse is turned off into stable, because the corporation will not let him run through the streets! This part of the interpretation is rather lame; it must be confessed; but then the class of

interpreters which has originated the exposition we are considering does not stick at trifles—the more enormous the discrepancy the more implicit the credulity. At least, so have we found it in our travels through life. But to proceed. "They jostle one another in the broadways," when one car runs off the track and blocks up the course of another. They then get into a "rage," and rage at one another; that is, the drivers and conductors, who swear at each other; and the "tickets" within, who are always on the growl! Thus "they rage in the streets, and jostle one another in the broadways." The description, however, is not complete till the rushing train is seen approaching in the night "like torches," and "running like the lightning," at Parliamentary velocity, some twenty miles an hour!

O interpretation of interpretations what an interpretation art thou! Nevertheless it is not more extraordinary than many others emanating from the same source; that is, "the thinking of the flesh," unenlightened by the gospel of the kingdom, or promises covenanted to the fathers, and evangelized in the name of Jesus, as the King of the Jews. Nahum's lightning chariots converted into New York and Erie trains, is on a par with a Swedenborgian Society, or Nauvoo, being the New Jerusalem; and the darkening of the air in the Blue-laws State in 1780 a sign of the coming of the Son of Man to Mount Olivet in Asia in 1843! Is it to be wondered at that prophecy should be brought into disrepute when heralded forth by such incompetent expositors? They hear that a "preparation" is to precede the coming of Christ, though they have but a confused notion of what that preparation consists in. They have an idea that it is something of the marvellous and terrific, and somehow connected with the increase of knowledge. This is

enough. Unlearned in their mother tongue, and unstable as the sea, they rush forth for excitement to crowded meetings, where men, as ignorant of the gospel as themselves, harangue the multitude on the fiery baptism of the earth and sky. They become intoxicated with foolishness; they catch the crotchet of the hour, and under its inspiration they swell into extraordinary dimensions, until they are lost in their own magnitude. Their knowledge of prophecy is now intuitive; and their rules of interpretation, sound and feeling. "They feel that this means thus and so; at all events, it sounds very much like it!" The sound of the words accords with their feeling, and their feeling with the sound; and therefore, with such potent testimony, who can reject or question the interpretation!

The identification of Nahum's lightning chariots with New York and Erie, or London and Manchester "lightning lines," has been elaborated after a similar fashion. The patentee of this interpretational invention saw in Nahum the phrase, "*the day of his preparation.*" This was enough. He had no suspicion that the Bible revealed any other day of preparation than that preceding Christ's appearing. He, therefore, jumped to the conclusion that Nahum spoke of it; and that, as the prophet speaks of red, of cars, of flamings, of streets and broadways, and of running like the lightnings; *he felt* that this must have reference to trains and locomotives! So he started the idea that it was so; and as foolishness is seized voraciously, while truth is spurned, the ignorant rejoiced in so visible a sign; and, like the darkening of the sun in 1780, it became with it, a fixed idea, a technic of "Adventism"—a sign of the coming of the Lord!

Seeing, then, that we utterly reject so unfounded a supposition, it is fit and proper that we present the reader an interpretation that cannot be scripturally nor logically gainsayed.

As the prophecy of Nahum is brief, we shall in so doing give him a sketch of the whole, by which he will be the better able to see the natural and necessary meaning of the part so absurdly prostituted by the patentee aforesaid.

THE VISION OF NAHUM INTERPRETED.

Nahum declares the subject of his own prophecy in ch. i. 1, where he styles it "*The burden of Nineveh,*" and the words of it, "*The Book of the vision of Nahum.*" "The burden"—מַשָּׂא, *massa*, *an oracle threatening to Nineveh.*

NINEVEH, standing on the banks of the Tigris, was the capital of the Assyrian em-

pire, which, while that city was the seat of government, is symbolized in Dan. vii. 4, by "*a Lion with Eagle's wings.*" Moses informs us that the city was built by Nimrod, the beginning of whose kingdom was Babylon, Erech, Accad, and Calneh in the land of Shinar. "Out of that land he went forth to (or invaded) Assyria, and builded Nineveh," Gen. x. 2. In the days of Jonah, who was sent to preach repentance to it in the reign of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, it was "an exceeding great city of three day's journey" through, and though the one God was known, its wickedness was great, and, as might be supposed, its populace exceedingly ignorant; for God himself testifies, that it contained 120,000 persons that could not discern between their right hand and their left. Its cattle were also very numerous. Diodorus Siculus says it was 150 stadia in length, 90 in breadth, and 480 in circuit; that is, about 21 miles long, 9 miles broad, and 54 miles in circumference. Its walls were a hundred feet high, and so broad that three chariots could drive abreast upon them. Its towers, of which there were fifteen hundred, were each two hundred feet high.

At the time of its overthrow, Nineveh was very rich; for Nahum says, speaking of its gold and silver, "there is no end of the store." These riches, however, were not obtained alone by honest industry and gain; but by the conquest and spoil of other nations. The lion being the symbol of the Ninevite power, he styles the king of Assyria "the old lion," the males of his family, "the young lions," the females of the harem, "his lionesses," and the heir apparent, "the lion's whelp;" and, speaking of the way riches were heaped up in his vaults, the prophet says, "the lion did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled for his lionesses, and filled his holes with prey, and his dens with ravin,"—ch. ii. 9-12. Besides this source of wealth, the spoil of nations, Nineveh was full of people devoted to money-making. It was the London of the ancient world, into whose bosom were poured the riches of Persia, India, China and the West, by the caravans, and navigation of its rivers. "Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven," (ch. iii. 16,) which shows that the Ninevite was a great commercial as well as military power.

The moral condition of the city at the time of its greatest glory was excessively corrupt. Modern Rome is a fair specimen in proportion to its size, or Papal Europe rather, of the impiety and abomination rampant in Nineveh; whose fate, therefore, with that of her sister, Babylon, have become the type of that entire and complete desolation

that awaits Rome and the government which support her iniquity. The moral condition of the city of Nimrod is apparent from the epithets bestowed upon it by Nahum, who styles her "the well-favored harlot," "the mistress of witchcrafts." In her day she traded in nations and families, whom she sold by lies and robbery, as Rome has done, and continues to do at the present time. "Woe to the city of bloods!" saith Nahum; "it is all full of lies and robbery; and the prey departeth not;" that is, it is not restored. For this cause he threatens her with ruin. Destruction was to overtake her, "because," says he, "of the multitude of the whoredoms of the well-favored harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms, and families through her witchcrafts: upon all of whom her wickedness passed continually,"—ch. iii. 1, 4, 19.

The spiritual merchandize of the well-favored harlot was forced upon the nations by her military power. By her riches she sent out large armies to compel the nations to receive her yoke; and to purchase, at the price of their religious liberty, civil independence, and precious metals, the lies she had prepared by the incantations of her astrologers, magicians, and soothsayers, who, when her shame was displayed before the nations and kingdoms she had spoiled, emigrated to Babylon, and became the wise men and counsellors—the clergy and ministers—of Nebuchadnezzar, the heir of her departed glory.

Nineveh's success in these expeditions of her *Propaganda* is boastfully displayed in Rabshakeh's, the king of Nineveh's general's, speech to Eliakim, the vice-governor over the household of David, in the reign of Hezekiah. This king had rebelled against Nineveh, which, in the fourteenth of his reign, had spoiled him of much gold and silver. Judea was accordingly invaded by a mighty army under Sennacherib, who, being detained before Lachish, sent Rabshakeh to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. In delivering his message to Eliakim, (a type of Messiah, Isai. xxii. 20-25,) he said, "Thus saith the great king, the king of Assyria, to Hezekiah, What confidence is this in which thou trustest? Thou sayest (but they are vain words) I have counsel and strength for the war. Now, on whom dost thou trust, that thou rebellest against me? Now, behold thou trustest upon the staff of this bruised reed, upon Egypt, on which, if a man lean, it will go into his hand, and pierce it; so is Pharaoh, king of Egypt, unto all that trust on him.

"But if ye say unto me, We trust on Jehovah our God: is not that he whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken

away, and hath said to Judah and Jerusalem, *Ye shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem?*" In this, Rabshakeh rejected the idea of the God to whom the altar in Jerusalem was dedicated, being the true God; but on the contrary, maintained that the God worshipped at the altars on the high places, which Hezekiah had demolished, a god recognized by Nineveh, was the god men ought to worship. He therefore continued, referring to that god, and said, "Am I now come up without Jehovah against this place to destroy it? Jehovah said to me, Go up against this land, and destroy it."

This sort of address in the hearing of the multitude upon the wall, was very displeasing to Eliakim and his associates. The subjects of Hezekiah were prone enough to favor the claims of the gods of the nations; and might possibly come to the conclusion, that Rabshakeh's account of the matter was correct; and that the miseries of Judea were the vengeance of the god of Nineveh, on account of the impieties of Hezekiah. If this supposition should be revived and strengthened in their unstable minds, they might rebel against the house of David, and open the gates to the Assyrians, to appease the wrath of Sennacherib and his god. Apprehensive of such a result Eliakim and his friends interrupted Rabshakeh, and said, "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syrian language, for we understand it; and talk not with us in the Jews' language in the ears of the people that are on the wall." But Rabshakeh was too much of a serpent-diplomatist for that. He perceived his advantage and was determined not to forego it. If he could not persuade Hezekiah's ministers, he might move the Jews to revolt against them, which would answer his purpose as well. He wanted the city, and cared not by what means he obtained it. Therefore, disregarding Eliakim, he turned to the men upon the wall, and cried with a loud voice, in their language, saying:

"Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria: thus saith the king. Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand: neither let Hezekiah make you trust in Jehovah, saying, Jehovah will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria. Harken not to Hezekiah; for thus saith the king of Assyria, seek my favor with a present, and come out to me, and then eat ye every man of his own vine, and every one of his fig tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his own cistern, until I come and take you away to a land like your own land, a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of the

oil olive, and of honey, that ye may live and not die: and hearken not unto Hezekiah, when he deceiveth you, saying Jehovah will deliver us. Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? Have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand! Who are they among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that Jehovah should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand?"

Here, then, was a direct and mighty issue created between the God of Nineveh and Jehovah. The great Nisroch, the god of Sennacherib, had conquered all before him (for what the conquerors of the ancient world effected in the name of their gods, they attributed to them,) while Jehovah's land was overrun, his cities laid waste, and the only thing left to him was Jerusalem, and his altar in the midst of her! The reader will perceive that the issue formed was about Zion; "which Jehovah had chosen, and desired for his habitation, that it might be his rest, and dwelling place for ever." Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. *Should Nisroch of Nineveh, or Jehovah of Jerusalem possess the city and the land?* This was the question, which in the Scripture is styled "THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION" (Isai. xxxiv. 8,) a cause docketed long before, often called, but as often adjourned, and still in abeyance, awaiting final adjudication in the latter days.

The crisis was one of "trouble, rebuke and blasphemy." Nisroch seemed to have it all his own way. The word of Jehovah appeared powerless, for Judah could not stand in the battle; and his little army was cooped up within the walls of the beleaguered city. In this extremity all that could be done was to keep the gates closed; and to wait and see the salvation of Jehovah. Hezekiah sent to Isaiah informing him of the king of Assyria's "reproaches against the living God;" and requesting him to pray to Jehovah for their deliverance, and the vindication of his own name. The prophet told his messengers to tell the king not to be afraid of the words with which the king of Assyria had blasphemed Jehovah; for Jehovah said, that "he would send a blast upon him," and he should hastily retreat, and "fall by the sword in his own land."

Rabshakeh having returned to Sennacherib, at Libnah, without an answer, he sent a letter to Hezekiah by others, saying, "Let not thy God in whom thou trustest deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be delivered

into the hand of the king of Assyria. Behold, thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands, by destroying them utterly; and shalt thou be delivered? Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed; as Gozan and Haran, and Reseph, and the children of Eden which were in Thelasar? Where is the king of Hamath, and the king of Arpad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivah?"

The prowess of the forces of Nineveh he knew to be great, for it was preëminently "the city of bloods"—the blood of all the nations had been poured out by her sword: nevertheless, he would not yield; for though reduced so low as to be unable to keep an army in the field, he had faith in the promises covenanted to his father, David's house, and in the present assurances of Jehovah. Hezekiah acted as a man who considered that the controversy was *between Nineveh and Jehovah*; and not between himself and Sennacherib. He therefore laid the king of Assyria's letter before Jehovah in the temple, where "he dwelt between the cherubim;" and earnestly invoking his attention to the document, besought his interposition, "that all the kingdoms of the earth might know that thou art Jehovah of Gods by thyself."

Jehovah did not answer Hezekiah in the temple; but communicated with him through Isaiah in answer to his prayer. Concerning the king of Assyria, he said, "The virgin daughter of Zion hath despised thee, laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? And against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? Even against the Holy of Israel. By the hand of thy messengers thou hast reproached the Lord, and hast said, With the multitude of my chariots I am come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedar trees thereof, and the choice fir trees thereof; and I will enter into the shadow of his borders, the forest of his Carmel. I have digged and drunk foreign waters, and with the soles of my feet have I dried up all the rivers of places besieged."

This was the boasting of the Ninevite power, which attributed to its god Nisroch, the Great Eagle, by whose wings its Lion soared aloft over all the earth, its exaltation and grandeur; and its triumphant invasion of Jehovah's land, which it flattered itself was destined to remain, in its totality, a vassal province of its dominion. With the ancients as with the moderns, success was the criterion of right; because with the world

at large it is a maxim, that "might is right"—yea, "divine right;" by which it justifies the most cruel despotisms, and sanctifies the most debasing superstitions. All the "order" and "civilization" concentrated in Nineveh, believed that the *Lion winged by the Great Eagle* was more powerful than JEHOVAH, the founder and proprietor of a contemptible little kingdom in Judca. Not being of faith, they judged by sight. Had not Shalmancser, the Great Eagle's vicegerent, overturned the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and at his pleasure placed them in Halah, and in Halor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes? 2 Kings xvii. 3, 6. Was not all that portion of Jehovah's land in the possession of Nisroch? Was he not the monarch of the mountains of Lebanon, whose valuable cedars and firs he disposed of at his pleasure? Had Jehovah been able to stay his conquests, or to save his cities from his power? Here were facts, and facts were stubborn things. Could the "order" and "civilization" of the world be blamed for despising the name of the God of the Jews, seeing that he could not protect his people and land from the oppression of their enemies? It was despised, and, being despised, it was reproached and blasphemed; and he was taunted as a deceiver of his too-confiding and credulous friends and partisans. "Let not thy God in whom thou trustest, O Hezekiah, deceive thee!" Could anything be more insulting, more calculated to arouse the indignation and fury of Jehovah?

But Nisroch's servants (whether the agents of the Great Eagle [Rev. xiii. 14], "the Bird of Jove," adored in Nineveh or in Rome,) judge of facts by reason's natural light, which always leaves in outer darkness those who are unfortunate enough to be led by it. They know not the ways and purposes of God; for, not being his servants, he has not revealed his plans, principles, and intentions, to them. Jehovah, no more than prudent and sagacious belligerents, reveals not his strategy to his enemies. He keeps their powers in the dark, that, in digging pits for him, they may be taken in their own traps. What the kings of Assyria had done against Israel and the other nations, was not by the power of Nisroch, which was no god; but by him whom they blasphemed. In regard to Israel, they had been conquered and broken up, not be-

cause he was unable to defend them against Nineveh and her god, but "because they had sinned against him," and because they walked in the statutes of the nations which occupied their country before they acquired possession of it, and in the statutes of the kings of Israel. "Therefore Jehovah was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight;"—"out of their own land, to Assyria."

As to Judah, she was not blameless in his sight; but walked in the statutes of Israel. Therefore it was that they also had been visited with war which hitherto had expelled them from the open country, and shut them up in their castles and fenced cities. Their calamities would have been fatal to their commonwealth, only that they had a king that loved and venerated Jehovah's name, above Nisroch and all other idols, which he detested. This zeal for Jehovah he had displayed in "removing the high places, breaking the images, cutting down the groves, and breaking in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, calling it Nehushtan," a piece of brass; "for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it." He trusted in Jehovah the Gods of Israel;* so that after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him." This high character of the King of the Jews procured for Judah an arrest of judgment, until the controversy concerning the holy land and city was settled between him and the Ninevite vicegerent of the Great Eagle, by plucking off its wings from "the old lion."—Dan. vii. 4; Nah. ii. 11. By the time this crisis had arrived, the cup of Jerusalem's transgressions overflowed. Her kings and her citizens had sold themselves to do evil against Jehovah, therefore he sold them unto the hands of their enemies to afflict them. Hence, it was for Israel and Judah's wickedness, and the wickedness of contemporary nations, that he had made Nineveh to triumph over them.

But the kings of Nineveh did not think so; for Isaiah testifies that the Winged-Lion power said, "By the strength of my hand I have done, and by my wisdom; for I am prudent: and I have removed the bounds of the people, and have robbed their treasures, and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man: and my hand has found as a nest the riches of the people; and as one gathereth eggs that are left, have I gathered all the earth: and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped."

* נִסְרוֹךְ *niser-och*, signifies a great eagle. I have no doubt that the winged lions excavated by Lagard from the ruins of Nineveh, were the symbols of his power in union with the deity, whose presence the Ninevites represented by an Eagle, whose head was one of the four faces of the cherubim between whose wings, in the Most Holy Place of the Temple, Jehovah dwelt by his glory—the *Shekinah*.

* בִּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. *by-yehovah elohai-yisra'el*: therefore he hoped in God Almighty and in his Christ, who are "the Gods of Israel," as we have rendered it.

—*Isai. x. 13.* He knew not that he was a mere rod, axe, or saw, in the hand of Jehovah for the punishment of Israel and the nations. He boasted as if he were the workman instead of a tool—"the rod of Jehovah's anger, the staff in whose hand was Jehovah's indignation." The pride of his magnificence and power was great and ostentatious. "Are not my princes altogether kings? Is not Calno as Carchemish? Is not Hamath as Arpad? Is not Samaria as Damascus? As my hand hath found the kingdoms of the idols, and whose graven images did excel them of Jerusalem and of Samaria; shall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols?" True; but says Nahum, "Thy crowned ones (are indeed) as the locusts, and thy captains as the great grasshoppers, which camp in the hedges in the cold day; but when the sun ariseth they flee away, and their place is not known where they are."—*Ch. iii. 17.*

But, in answer to his question, "Shall I not so do to Jerusalem and her idols?"—Jehovah's reply was, "No; thou shalt not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shields, nor cast a bank against it. By the way that thou camest, by the same shalt thou return, and shalt not come into this city. For I will defend Jerusalem to save it for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake, saith Jehovah." It was true that Nineveh had done terribly, and that no power had stood before her; but, said Jehovah, addressing her vicergerent, "Hast thou not heard long ago that I have done it; of ancient times, that I have formed it?" As if he had said, "Didst thou not understand that I, Jehovah, arranged all this, as the Arbitrator of nations? didst thou not know that I am the Almighty Ruler, when thou repentedst at the preaching of Jonah?" "Now I have brought it to pass that thou shouldst be to lay waste fenced cities into ruinous heaps. Therefore their inhabitants were of small power; they were dismayed and confounded: they were as the grass of the field, and as the green herb; as the grass on the housetops, and as corn blasted before it be grown up. But I know thy sitting, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me. And because thy rage against me, and thy tumult, are come up into my ears, therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest."—*Isai. xxxvii.*

Such was to be the end of the old Ninevite lion's attempts upon Jerusalem, by which "all the kingdom of the earth might know that he was Jehovah of Gods by himself." This superiority over the Assyrian, the great

est power on earth, was displayed in the overthrow of its hosts at Libna, when 185,000 perished by a blast from Jehovah in a single night.

This Armageddon was the beginning of woes to the Assyrian in its controversy with Jehovah concerning the holy city and land. The situation was remarkable, and we believe typical; the elements whereof may be thus enumerated:

1. Jehovah and the King of the Jews (Messiah's ancestor) were in Jerusalem in a time of great peril to Judah;

2. The King of the Jews breaks in pieces the serpent to which the Jews had long burned incense;

3. The land of Israel is covered with the forces of Assyria, whose object is the possession of Jerusalem;

4. The armies of Assyria, destroyed by a blast from heaven, which is the putting of a hook in the nose of its king, by which he is turned back; but the end of the power is not yet; and

5. Jehovah having expelled the Assyrian from his land, stirs up peoples to attack it in its stronghold, and to subvert it.

These circumstances and events grouped together in one epoch, which constituted the "latter days" of the first, or Ninevite Assyrian monarchy, form a *mystery in type*, and a very striking one too, of the future contemporary overthrow of the Constantinopolitan Assyrian confederacy of powers, and deliverance of Jerusalem and Judah, by "*the King of the Jews*" energized by omnipotence, in "the latter days" referred to by Daniel in his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream—*Ch. ii. 28.* But, as the putting a hook into the jaw or nose of the Ninevite power, and the turning of it back to its stronghold by the terrible defeat of Sennacherib, was not immediately subversive of the Ninevite Assyrian dominion; so, neither will the first stroke from heaven that shall fall upon Gog the Prince of Rosh, when his myriads shall cover the Holy Land as a cloud, be the consummation of the Constantinopolitan Assyrian dominion. The first concussion will deliver Messiah's land from Gentile sovereignty; and in so doing, be a hook in the jaw of Leviathan, and the turning of it back to the place of its throne. It will inaugurate "the latter days" of the Assyrian in the *Iron and Clay* period of its existence, during which, like its Ninevite predecessor, it will be reduced to chaff, and its territory become the province of a new dominion. Here, then, is a period typically defined by the defeat of Sennacherib, and the subsequent fall of the Ninevite Power; and anti-typically illustrated in the smiting

and grinding to powder of Nebuchadnezzar's image. Nineveh did not fall at the instant of Sennacherib's disaster. This was only the beginning of woes for "the bloody city full of lies and robbery." It retained its dominion nearly a hundred years after his supernatural defeat—a period beginning with the defeat, and ending with the fall, of Nineveh.

This period comprehends what is styled by Nahum, "THE DAY OF JEHOVAH'S PREPARATION;" that is, when he prepares the Medes and Babylonians under Cyaxares and Nabopolassar, for the destruction of the city. The reader will be better prepared for acquiescence in this interpretation, when he is made acquainted with the history of the period before us. We shall therefore, at this point, narrate the conclusion of Jehovah's controversy with Nineveh.

(To be continued.)

Visit to Canada and the West.

(Continued from p. 258, Vol. VI.)

Arrive at Paris—Our doings there—The Devil's Ameliorations necessarily abortive—Preaching the truth fatal to popularity—Novel Ground of Ecclesiastical Proscription—Visit to Eramosa—Protestant Ascendancy in Trouble—Roadside congregations—Questions put and answered—Translation into the Kingdom—An Official Dignitary—Return to Paris—Depart for Illinois.

We left Toronto in company with our friend, Mr. Coombe, with whom we had sojourned during our stay in that city, on Saturday, July 19, at 3.47, for Paris. This is a town containing about 2,000 inhabitants, six spiritual bazaars, called "churches" in the parlance of "Christendom," a Mechanics' Institute, bank, newspaper styled the *Paris Star*, two flouring mills, a woollen factory, three foundries, brick-yard, &c. It is situated about half a mile from the station, on both sides of a little stream called Smith's Creek, and derives its name from the plaster of Paris beds in its vicinity, and which are a source of considerable revenue to the place.

In journeying (*journeying* is too slow a word to express the transportation of living bodies from one place to another in so fast an age as this; it belongs to the slow-coach system of travel over the trackways of thirty years ago, in *lightningizing* rather) from Toronto to Paris, a distance of seventy miles, we retraced the rails to Hamilton, where we exchanged the Toronto Branch for its parent stem, the Great Western Railway. On leaving Hamilton, the road skirts the southwestern shore of Burlington Bay, and crossing the Desjardine by a substantial bridge, enters a range of hills by a heavy grade. Looking back, the view is beautiful, em-

bracing the waters of the Bay and Lake Ontario, the banks of which are studded with elegant residences and groves—the city spread out from the mountain to the bay in fine panoramic expansion, and the mountain, with its bold cliffs, combine to form a scene whose portrait cannot be adequately delineated by sketches of the pen. About three miles from the station, the road runs along the narrow ridge between the foot of "the mountain" and the verge of the valley, till a point is reached in view of the village of Dundas, romantically situated in a deep valley, and connected with Hamilton by the Desjardines Canal, which terminates in Burlington Bay.

Leaving Dundas station, the road continues a westerly course through a hilly region, mostly covered with pines, until we arrived at Fairchild's Creek, fifty-two miles from Elgin. Eight miles onward the country is still uneven, but in a better state of cultivation. At the end of this distance the road crosses the Grand River; and two miles further brought us to the Paris station, where it is intersected by the Buffalo, Brantford, and Goderich Railway, which also crosses the Grand River by a bridge about 100 feet above the water-level. We arrived here in about three hours after leaving Toronto, and had the pleasure of finding Bro. George L. Scott already waiting to receive us.

Paris, like its European namesake, contains more friends of the Old Mother and her Harlot Daughters, than of "the truth." It would be marvellous were it otherwise. There are, indeed, very few there who care anything about it; or have even conceived the idea that such a thing exists apart from the traditions doled out to them by the spiritual merchants of "Christendom." Bro. Scott's is the Jason-household of the place, which very hospitably entertained us, while he procured a hearing for the Gospel of the Kingdom as it is Jesus.

On the forenoon of Sunday we immersed our friend Mr. Coombe, who had for a considerable time been searching the Scriptures to see if the things he read in *Elpis Israel* and the *Herald* were really so. In coming to the understanding of the truth he had fallen in love with it, and determined to obey it; and will, we feel persuaded, strengthened by a continued indoctrination of its sublime precepts, "work out his salvation" to the glory and honor of Him who has called him to his kingdom and renown.

While in Paris, we spoke twice in the Town Hall to respectable audiences, and three nights afterwards at the Congregation-

al Temple by the favor of one of its trustees. On one occasion, we spoke on THE APOSTASY, which, of course, brought us into direct collision with "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and of all the Abominations of the Earth." Some of the Pope's children being present, they very naturally felt aggrieved; so that next day we heard rumors of great wrath on their part against us. They are said to be quite numerous in Paris, and not very peaceably disposed. In Canada, their "ecclesiastical dignitaries," says *The Star*, "have left the arena of spiritual contests, and entered the political. They have attacked our institutions, intrigued with our public men, and threatened our political rights. They have thus made themselves public property, and laid their actions open to the criticism of public journalists. Neither cope, crozier, nor mitre will protect the man from the shafts of truth and justice wherever a free press exists, if he trenches upon the privileges of the people. Our whole political system is now deranged by priestly interference, and we cannot, dare not be silent." To the sons of freedom these semi-pagan ecclesiastics and their tail have no answer but threats of violence and brute force. We were informed that they threatened to throw the editor of the *Star* from the railway bridge into the Grand River. They did not, however, execute their threat upon his person, though they did upon his types, which they hurled into the stream. They were reported to have threatened us with a similar defence of their diabolism; but their rage was restrained, and we finished our testimony in Paris to the torment of some, but without dismay or damage to the outward man. Many who heard, did so, we were told, with much earnestness, watching us closely to lay hold upon our words—but without result; for they confessed that we kept so close to Scripture that they had not been able to succeed.

The following notice of our lectures appeared in the *Paris Star* of July 30, 1856:

"On Wednesday evening, the 23d inst., Dr. Thomas delivered to a highly attentive audience, in the Congregational church, the last of his course of lectures upon 'The Kingdom of God.' Although differing radically in his conceptions of religious matters from the popular theology of the day, he was able to retain the interest of the majority of his hearers throughout the entire course. A wrong impression has been made upon the public mind, through the medium of a leading journal,* which, by the way, refused to insert a reply to a very one-sided article

which appeared in its columns, that Dr. Thomas's lectures are subversive of the great truths taught in the Holy Scriptures. Subversive of errors, the fruit of the great apostacy, indeed they may be; but subversive of the truth no arguments can be which are logical deductions from the writings of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles. The Doctor professed to give an outline of the religion taught in the Bible, and in doing so he showed that the coming of the Lord was the grand object of hope among the first Christians. That the Great Salvation which began to be preached by the Lord in Galilee, in the largest sense of the term, is the deliverance of the human race from sin and its consequences, so that there shall be on earth no more death, neither sorrow nor lamentation, nor any more curse nor pain. In a more limited sense it is the deliverance of the Twelve Tribes of Israel from their subjection to the Gentiles, and the consequent establishment of them as a powerful and independent nation in the Holy Land, called the Kingdom of God, and the contemporary deliverance of all other nations from the tyranny of the cruel, infidel, and profligate governments that now oppress them; so that being subdued by their conquerors, and enlightened, they might all be '*Blessed in Abraham and his seed.*' In a still more restricted sense, it is the deliverance of individual Jews and Gentiles who believe the promises of God, set forth in the prophets and in the teaching of Jesus and his apostles, from their past sins, through the name of Jesus, and from the grave to the possession of glory, honor, incorruptibility and life in the aforesaid Kingdom of God. The lectures were delivered with an earnestness which left no doubt upon the minds of the audience that he was speaking what he considered most important truth. His style is easy, clear, chaste and elegant, but more calculated to convince the understanding than to tickle the ear."

Among the three friends who were "at charges" for our visit to Canada, was Mr. D. F. Stewart, of Everton, Eramosa; a place about forty miles in a direct line north of Paris. An interesting biography makes this gentleman an exception to the ordinary specimens of our common, matter-of-fact, unspiritual, humanity. He is a native of Scotland, and the first that entered himself a student at Bethany College. Before the gospel of the kingdom shone into his understanding, he was wildly enthusiastic in his admiration of Campbellism, and in schemes for the amelioration of the human race through a wholesale emigration of the industrious poor of Britain to the unoccupied lands of the

* *The Toronto Globe.*

United States. To one acquainted with God's plan of amelioration (as, indeed, it is now to his more enlightened self), the contemplation of his speculation is amusing. He sees now its impracticability, and the fruitlessness of all individual and associate enterprise in that direction. Ungospelized sin's flesh cannot socially ameliorate the flesh, if by amelioration is to be understood bettering its condition so that justice and truth shall be the law developing the happiness of its community. A truly wise man will take this world as he finds it, using it without abusing it, and "contending earnestly" for nothing but "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." As it is, mankind have even now more good at the hands of God than they deserve. They are rebels against his precepts, and treat him as a liar, yet "he fills their hearts with food and gladness." They must first be made faithful and obedient before they can be blessed; for it is "in Abraham and his Seed," not in the Devil and his ameliorations, "all the families of the earth shall be blessed." Mr. Stewart has discovered this; and is therefore found no more in the halls of marquises and corporations, soliciting their cooperation in a speculation suicidal to their manufacturing prosperity, (they would rejoice to empty Britain of all the rogues and vagabonds of the *ground-stratum* of society; but not to expatriate the industrious poor for the bettering of their condition by whom they have their wealth;) but is now found ameliorating his own in studying the *BOOK OF THE COVENANTS*, and in extracting a living from the soil.

Mr. Stewart was formerly, not only the first-begotten of the Bethanian Alma Mater, but a zealous and acceptable preacher of her traditions, and general travelling agent for the *Bethanian Millennial Harbinger* in the United States and Britain. With the Campbellites in Canada West, and especially in Eramosa, a kind of chief lodge of the order in that province, he was a remarkable favorite. Then he knew nothing of Moses and the prophets. This was once our own case, and then, even as he, we were remarkably popular in the sect! Is it not strange, passing strange, that this fact does not give them pause in their opposition? *When men become intelligent in Moses and the prophets sectarians disown them, and seek to expel them from their synagogues; but so long as they continue ignorant, grossly ignorant, of their testimony, they approve and commend them above measure!* This has been the experience of Mr. Stewart in Eramosa. Having married a sister of a believer of the gospel of the kingdom, he became an object of suspicion. His wife was deemed heretical, though he was

still sound in Campbellism. What more natural than that his brother-in-law should send his own sister the *Herald*? Or that Mr. Stewart should read it? And that he should desire to gratify his curiosity in hearing those who preached the gospel of the kingdom? All this he did; and yet was he still true to Bethany: nevertheless, in so doing, he came under the condemnation of the wise men of Eramosa! Thus, when he went to reside in the township, knowing how popular he had been as a visitor and preacher among them, and being conscious of no offence and perfectly innocent of "heresy," he confidently applied for admission as a recognized member of their local society.

But, to his astonishment, his admission was vetoed! What had he done? It was admitted that there was no charge against him; but that they understood he had been reading the *Herald*, and might be perverted by it, and hereafter cause trouble in the church: to prevent which they declined to receive him! Thus, they excluded one of their own faith from their fellowship, not for any evil he had done, but for what he might (or might not) possibly do! Such is the wisdom of serpents, and the harmlessness of doves, in Canada West!

By such means as these, the Gothamites of Eramosa forced Mr. Stewart into separation in advance of his convictions! Having thus the reproach of "heresy" without the merit thereof, he became interested in its examination; and, although it has not resulted as yet in putting off the old man of fleshly sectarianism (at least it had not when we were with him) in the obedience the gospel of the kingdom demands, he became so far convinced of its truth as to be satisfied that his antecedents were sectarian and not Christian; and to desire a visit from us, that he and his quondam co-religionists might have the doctrine presented systematically in outline for their enlightenment upon the greatest question of the age, if demonstrated to be what we affirm, the truth of the living God by faith in which salvation can alone be obtained.

In compliance, therefore, with his request, we left Paris, July 24, for Eramosa, accompanied by his sister-in-law, who sought to improve her health, which was enfeebled by a residence in the country parts. We did not *lightningize* to Eramosa, the road being only partly by rail, the remainder by an old stage belonging to a by-gone age, and a farm wagon. The distance was only fifty miles, which, by rail, at Canadian rate of travel, might be performed in an hour and a half; whereas we were made to *journey it* for nine hours and a half. We left Paris at 8 A. M.

by rail for Fairchild Creek, *alias* the paper town of Harrisburg. We were detained here about three hours as the cars for Galt and Preston do not leave the station until the arrival of the train from Niagara Falls, or Elgin. The railway to Preston is a new line, being laid to Guelph for intersection at that town with the Grand Trunk Railway, which, when finished, will extend from Halifax, Nova Scotia, through New Brunswick, by Montreal and Toronto, and receiving on the route a branch from Portland, Maine, *via* Quebec, to Sarnia, at the southern extremity of Lake Huron, and thence across the peninsula of Michigan to Grand Haven, on Lake Michigan, opposite to Milwaukee.

After a patient waiting for the time specified, we left for Preston about fifteen miles from Harrisburg. This place is a small, but thriving village, about three miles from Galt. It is expected to become a place of importance. The houses are substantial stone buildings, and the greater part of its population, as well as that of the surrounding country, German. Galt, near by, is a flourishing place, situated on both sides of the Grand River, and contains about 3000 inhabitants. We were detained an hour at Preston, in which we dined; and, at 1 P. M., started in an old four-horse stage for Guelph, twelve miles distant. We were five inside. The weather much warmer than we expected to find it in Canada; the country pleasant, the wheat harvest abundant; but the roads an impalpable dust of magnesian lightness, raised into clouds by the rotation of four wheels and the fretting of sixteen hoofs under whip and sun. Enveloped in a halo of dust and heat, we had to endure a rough and tedious ride of two hours. We arrived at Guelph, on the Grand Trunk, an hour before the train started for Toronto, by which we had still to go eight miles to a place called Rockwood.

These two places, a few days before our arrival, had acquired notoriety in Canada as theatres of anti-Romish enthusiasm and popish brutality. The Orangemen, devoted to Protestant ascendancy in the British dominions, had their Twelfth of July celebration at Rockwood. In the evening, about seven o'clock, when the festivities of the day were over, some half-dozen of them, wearing the badges of their order, were proceeding on their arrival in Guelph to their several abodes in the town, as it is said, "in the quietest possible manner." But, on their turning the corner of a certain street, the demonic spirit of the old Roman Strumpet rushed into the head of a worshipper of the Image of the Beast, and caused him to leap

from the step of a doorway into their midst, and to distribute several rapid and heavy orthodox blows upon them ere he was himself disabled. After this, they were assailed with hootings and stones by the children of the Pope and spade, who had congregated near the Post Office from the adjacent railway. A fight ensued, in which Protestant Ascendancy was temporarily subjected to the fist of wickedness in its Popish peculiarity.

This success gave confidence to the Romans. They began to smash windows and to discharge pistol shots. The Mayor read the riot act, and swore in special constables. These arrested a ringleader, who was rescued by his militant co-religionists while the constables were bearing him off to gaol. To this point, the prospects of Protestant Ascendancy looked blue; and the orthodox railway "navvies" gave victory to the banners of Rome! But the apparition of 40 riflemen, headed by their officers, cowed the hearts of the Papists, who are ever most courageous when wreaking their vengeance upon the defenceless. The sight of forty rifles restored the fortunes of the night; and, by 10 o'clock, Protestant Ascendancy ruled the destinies of her Britannic Majesty's loyal, and hitherto peaceable, town of Guelph. The ringleader was recaptured, and committed to take his trial at the ensuing assizes; others were fined; and a well-known anti-law-and-order member of the "pisantry," was committed to gaol for twenty-four hours for contempt of court, in openly endeavoring to persuade the convicts not to pay their fines.

It being now 4 o'clock, we took our seats in the cars for Rockwood, eight miles east of Guelph. They were much crowded, as all the country-side were returning from the circus they had been to see. Before us were two Romish Sin-Pardoners, whose occiputs and parietals, with an occasional glimpse of their frontals, we had a good opportunity of studying. Their organizations were of the villainous type, one rather more so than the other. They conversed in Latin, their ecclesiastical mother-tongue; and from the trumpery they had on, and the vestment-case they seemed to carry, they were probably on a sin-pardoning expedition, merchandizing souls.

We had now arrived at Rockwood, where Mr. Stewart was to meet us with his farm-wagon to convey us five miles further, to his house near Everton. But Bro. Scott's letter informing him of the time of our arrival at Rockwood had not reached him; and we were consequently landed upon a platform where a station *is to be* with no one to direct or receive us. Here was the prospect of a fatiguing walk with more baggage than we

were able to carry without fainting by the way; or of putting up for the night in a place whose appearance indicates that strangers are taken in and done for, rather than entertained with hospitality and good cheer. Yea verily, we would have preferred to camp in the woods than to sojourn there. The scattered hovels that bear the name of Rockwood are situated on the margins of a deep hollow, very recently all rocks and forest, but now all rocks and a black-looking, stagnant mill-pond. But we were delivered from this gloomy alternative by the kindness of a Campbellite lady, whose husband being a kind of factotum (an elder, we think) among the Bethanians of Eramosa, had a year before nominated himself, and therefore been specially commissioned, to meet the President of Bethany College at Toronto, and to escort him thence to their encampment by Everton. Through our companion in travel, who was acquainted with her, and from whom she learned the difficulty we were in, she kindly invited us to seats in the waggon that had come to meet her at the cars and to convey her home. As there were two roads in opposite directions from the platform to Mr. Stewart's, and being uncertain about his movements, we sent a message by a pedestrian, who happened to be going by one road, for Mr. Stewart, if he should meet him, while we thankfully accepted the invitation to rough it over the other. The road was like the journey of life, which a fat *quasi* orthodox team only could travel without dismay. Amid all the upheavings and down fallings of the way, however, there was something to amuse in the contemplation of a Campbellite elder's "establishment" conveying our repudiated and heretical self into the very sanctum of the encampment; and we at the same time on a visit to set forth a doctrine, which reduces the principles of the Order to immateriality, and nothing more! On arriving at the proprietor's gate, the elder's wife invited us very politely to go in, and take tea; but our *compagnon de voyage* knowing the orthodox horror that existed within doors against our alleged "heresy," declined putting the elder's nerves to so cruel a test; so thanking his good lady for her politeness, and the real benefit she had conferred in the use to which she had applied the elder's waggon, we left part of our baggage with her to be sent for, and handling the rest, we started afoot to Mr. Stewart's. The distance, judging from the fatigue experienced in the walk, is from a mile and a half to two miles. Much of the way was through dust, and smoke blown from burning logs on the windward side of the road; so that with dust, heat, smarting eyes, weighty baggage, and debility from previous sickness, this walk to Mr.

Stewart's enabled us more highly to appreciate the benefit conferred by the elder's team. It was with great satisfaction we at length arrived at Mr. Stewart's. He was not at home, having gone to meet us in a *spring-waggon*. He had, however, taken the other road; but had heard of our arrival and departure by the messenger, which had relieved him of all anxiety on our account. A thorough abluion from head to foot with cold water, a change of apparel, and a cup of tea, restored us to a state of agreeable existence, which is pleasant to think of even now. That night we enjoyed a rest to which we rarely attain. Our friend did not return till late, so that we did not see him till the morning.

We spoke four times in the township of Eramosa; namely, on Thursday and Friday nights, and twice on Sunday, July 27. The place of meeting in the week was a log-building called the "Central Church," belonging to the Bethanian Disciples, and distant from Mr. Stewart's some three or four miles. Being hay-time, the people did not assemble till 8½ P. M.; but then they filled the house, and listened very attentively till ten o'clock, after which we had to travel home in the dark, or by the light of our understanding of the way, not being favored with the moon. A part of the road was very dark, being through the woods, in which our teamster's light became darkness, not knowing whither he was driving us until he anchored against a tree. The light within being of no account, we appealed to a box of lucifers and a candle, by which we regained the road; and without other interruption than the clumsy device against quadrupeds, called "draw-bars," invariably presents, regained our caravansera between eleven o'clock and midnight.

On Sunday our appointments were on the roadside under the shade of certain trees. The meeting in the morning was appointed for 9 A. M., that the members of the Campbellite body might have an opportunity of hearing about the kingdom of God; and, if they wished, of attending their own meeting likewise at 10. We were there at the hour appointed, but as yet no one had arrived; we therefore took a walk, and on return found quite a goodly number. We told them that "we had been punctual, but not they. Our time was, therefore, so reduced, that it would be impossible for us to do justice to our subject before it was probable many of them might wish to leave for another place. They could do so; but we should continue nevertheless to discourse to those who were disposed to stay until we had fairly laid the matter before them." Here a Bethanian,

reclining upon the turf, called out, "Come then, to the marrow right off." "That," said we, "is for us to determine. In the present perverted state of the public mind it is not possible to bring 'the marrow' of divine truth intelligibly before them 'right off.' There is much rubbish to be cleared out before the foundation can be laid upon which to rear a superstructure owned and accepted of God, the great master-builder through the truth. If, when 10½ arrives, you wish to leave, the way is open; if you prefer to remain, none more welcome: while we reserve to ourselves the ordering of our discourse to suit our own views of the fitness and propriety of things."

We proceeded then to address them on the kingdom of God; showing, from Moses and the prophets, that God once had a kingdom upon the earth; that he has not one there at present; but that his kingdom will hereafter be restored where it was before, by Jesus Christ, at his appearing in power; and by him be presented to his church, which is the aggregation of the brethren of Jesus, and of the *co-heirs* with him, and not the *subjects* of the Kingdom of God.

When half-past ten arrived, we perceived a movement on the part of some to go. We, therefore, remarked, that as speaking in the open air was fatiguing, we would pause for a few minutes and take a glass of water, which would refresh us, and afford an opportunity for those to retire who wished so to do, without disturbing the speaker or those who wished to hear. Upon this, our friend elongated upon the turf arose and went to his barouche, to consult his companions about a move, but they had no wish to go, so he and they remained; albeit, a few others withdrew from the declaration of God's testimony, to present themselves at "Central Church," where Moses and the prophets figure as a Hebrew almanac out of date!

On Friday night and Sunday afternoon, questions were put to us by certain of the leaders among the Bethanists; such as, "Which of the *two* Gospels we had named was the power of God for salvation?!" and, "What did we mean by Jesus not being at this time a high priest?!" and, "If there were no kingdom now, what did Paul mean by saying that God had translated us into the kingdom of his son?!"

These questions were evidently proposed as a foil to darken the truth we had set forth. If they were honestly propounded, they fairly illustrated the confusion of mind produced when the truth, scripturally exhibited, salutes the ears of people indoctrinated with the traditions of the schools—people

who have drunk of the intoxicating cup in the hand of Babylon the Great.

In the case before us, the questioners were of that order of sectarians who have been taught to believe that the Gospel was preached for the first time on the day of Pentecost, by Peter. They could not gainsay the demonstration we had established:

First. That the Gospel was preached to Abraham.

Secondly. That Paul says, it "first began to be preached," in his own day, "by the Lord Jesus."

Thirdly. That what he preached was "confirmed" to Paul and others by the apostles who heard him.

Fourthly. That salvation is predicated on the obedient belief of what Jesus and his apostles preached; and,

Fifthly. That what they preached was "the Gospel of the Kingdom of God."

These five points, we say, neither they nor any other man admitting the authority of the Scripture, can set aside. They saw there was a gospel preached before Pentecost of which they knew nothing. Now, if they admitted that this gospel, preached before the crucifixion, were the gospel to be believed for salvation, the admission would convict them of infidelity, and of being yet in their sins, though they had been immersed for remission of sins! As the lesser difficulty, therefore, they clung to their sectarian tradition, that the gospel was first preached on Pentecost; and assumed that what we had demonstrated must be another gospel, making two! Hence their question, "Which of the two gospels we had named was the power of God for salvation?"

But we did not say that the Scripture exhibits two separate and diverse true gospels. We showed that it affirms but one true gospel, whether preached to Abraham, to Israel in the wilderness, by Jesus before his crucifixion, or by his apostles on and after Pentecost, to Jews, Greeks, Scythians, Barbarians, bond or free. It is this gospel alone that is "the power of God for salvation," as Paul says; even that very gospel which, in the same chapter quoted from by our questioners, he declares he was separated to, and "which God had promised afore, by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures."—Rom. i. 1, 2, 16. But they have yet to learn that *the Gospel is a whole, composed of divers parts*; that the parts are essential to that whole; that a part or parts do not contain the whole; that a part is not the whole; that is, the divine sonship of Jesus is not the gospel, but an essential and necessary, an indispensable element thereof.

"But was there not something peculiar in the preaching of the apostles on Pentecost, that distinguished it from the preaching of Jesus before his crucifixion?" Doubtless there was; but this peculiarity did not constitute their preaching another gospel than his. He preached the gospel of the kingdom as a message from God to Israel; and himself as that Christ of God, and divine son of David that was to come. The apostles preached the same message, and setting forth THE NAME of the crucified and resurrected Jesus for repentance and remission of sins, "for all and upon all who believe" "the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ."—Rom. iii. 22; Acts. viii. 12. This was the Pentecostian peculiarity. If a man believed the gospel of the kingdom, but rejected the claims of Jesus to be son of God, and son of David, and heir of David's throne, as the unbelieving Jews did, he could not be saved; for though he believed in the kingdom, he rejected the name. So, on the other hand, if a man confessed that Jesus was Son of God and Christ, but repudiated the Gospel of the kingdom, or were ignorant of the things concerning it, as our contemporaries are almost universally, he could not be saved; for he was "alienated from God's life through ignorance," and rejected the things of the Second Will, or Abraham's covenant confirmed by the blood of Jesus; by which covenant alone men can be justified, sanctified, saved. "He that believeth not shall be condemned."—Eph. iv. 18; Rom. xv. 8; Heb. x. 9: 10.

As to the second question, it was simply sufficient to say, that we did not affirm that "the Lord Jesus was not at this time a High Priest." What we did affirm was, that since the entrance of Jesus within the veil, and through the rent thereof, he has been High Priest only "over his own house; whose house are they who hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end"—Heb. iii. 6. This definition of Christ's household, composed of "kings and priests for God," of course excludes all who are ignorant and faithless of the "One hope of the calling," though they may believe with the demons of antiquity and confess, saying, "Thou, Jesus of Nazareth, we know thee who thou art; thou art the Christ the Son of God!" Our questioners were destitute of this hope, which Paul styles "the hope of Israel," and on account of which, he says, he was an ambassador in bonds—Acts xxvi. 6, 7; xxviii. 20; Eph. vi. 19, 20; Col. iv. 3. They had not been "called to God's kingdom and eternal glory" (1 Thes. ii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 10) and, therefore, that kingdom and glory are not their hope, nor their "call-

ing." They were called by the Campbellite gospel to a kingdom men call "the church," and to a glory "beyond the skies!!" But the Bible contains no such call to *transykingdomia*, the Utopia of "Christendom." The very reverse. It invites men to "dominion, glory, and a kingdom" upon earth—to "a kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven," and not above and far beyond it—Dan. vii. 27. This hope proclaimed by Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, is not their hope, our adversaries themselves being judges. They have no "confidence" in it; neither do they therefore "rejoice" in it; and consequently they adjudge themselves to be not of Christ's house; so that he is no High Priest for them; nor for any others, who can show no better faith than that of demons, "who believed and trembled."

We affirmed and proved our affirmation from the word,

First; That had Jesus remained upon earth after his resurrection, instead of ascending to the right hand of power, he could not have been a priest in Israel, so long as the Mosaic Constitution was the law of the land.

Second; That he is hereafter to sit upon his throne in Jerusalem, as a priest after the order of Melchizedec; and

Third; That then, and not till then, will he be a High Priest for Israel and the nations.

After our discourse on Sunday afternoon, a person in some way connected with a Campbellite paper published in Canada, remarked that they had heard that the kingdom of God did not now exist upon earth; he would, therefore, like to know what Paul meant by saying that "God hath translated us into the kingdom?"

We met this inquiry by asking him, "If a person wrote a letter about a certain subject to another, would that individual be justified in interpreting it of something else; and if the writer expressed himself indefinitely as to time, would the interpreter do right in making the time definite?" He admitted it would be wrong. We remarked then, that this admission applied to the case in hand. Paul is writing concerning the change which had taken place in the position of the Colossians; not of entering into the kingdom of God, which Jesus told Nicodemus, no man could do except he were born of water and Spirit—Jno. iii. 5; and which Paul to the same purpose testified when he said, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." So long as a man is "flesh and

blood," he is not born of Spirit. He is *flesh* and not *spirit*; for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Paul did not write to the baptized in Colosse, that God had translated them into his Son's kingdom, which spirit-men can alone inherit; for Paul well knew that none of them had been born of the Spirit in rising from the dead.

What the apostle did was to write to them of that intellectual and moral qualification they were the subjects of, as compared with their position before they were enlightened—while they were under "the dominion of the darkness." Then, as he reminded the baptized in Ephesus, "they were alienated from the life of God *through the ignorance that was in them*"—they were "without Christ." They had not been "translated into" him. They were "aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of Promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." But a great change had happened to them through "the goodness of God," who had sent Paul "to open their eyes, to turn them from *darkness* to light, and from the *power* of Satan unto him." This Paul accomplished as the instrument of God. He sowed, "the word of the kingdom" in their hearts, and God, by the signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Spirit, where-with he bore witness to the truth according to his will, gave the increase—*Heb. ii. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 5.*

And because they were God's increase. Paul writes to them, giving thanks to the Father for them, "on account of the hope *laid up* for them in the heavens, which they had *before heard* in the word of the truth of the gospel." The hope was preached to them in the gospel, and they believed it. It was the hope that made the preaching glad tidings. The belief of the good news changed their relative position; for, believing they were baptized *into* God, *into* Christ, *into* the hope of his kingdom and glory, *into* the faith, &c. In their old position, they were under "the power of darkness," or ignorance; in their new, under the power of light, or of the divine knowledge, styled by the apostle "the knowledge of God"—*Col. i. 10.* The subject-matter of this knowledge was "the kingdom of his dear Son," which is set before men as the hope to which they are called or invited in the Gospel of salvation. To be translated into this knowledge, is, for a believer of the kingdom to be restored again to Israel on the basis of the Abrahamic Covenant, to be baptized into the name of God manifested in the flesh, in hope of eternal life and glory in the king-

dom of God. The baptism is the translating act, by which the *state* is changed; and the believer transferred from under a sentence of death, and comes under a sentence into life. The Colossians had been translated into this new state, *the hope* of which is the kingdom of God, but the state is not the kingdom itself. No one of spiritual understanding would confound the state and the hope of that state with the thing itself hoped for. Paul was writing about translation into the hope of the kingdom, not into the kingdom itself; and rejoices that God "the Father had *qualified* him and them for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in the light;" and that inheritance is the kingdom of God and his Christ, constituted in its full development of "the kingdoms of this world," which are to become his, when the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled.—*Rev. xi. 15.*

As to the time when they had been translated into the hope, he speaks indefinitely. He uses the aorist and not the perfect tense, which declares the fact, without specifying the time of the action. A strictly grammatical translation of the passage stands thus—"Giving thanks to the Father who has qualified us for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in the light, who himself delivered us from the dominion of the darkness, and transferred us to the kingdom of the Son of his love, in whom we have the redemption through his blood, the remission of sins."

Our questioner said, "translated" was in the perfect tense in the Greek. We replied, that it was so in the English version of the Greek, but not in the Greek itself; "made meet," "delivered," "translated," were all of the aorist, and not the perfect. He repeated that they were not the aorist but the perfect; thinking, we suppose, that the multitude, which know as little of Greek as himself (for we were told afterwards that it was all hieroglyphics to him) would mistake the repetition of the assertion for proof. Upon this we dismissed his question with the remark, that if he said, "translated" was the perfect, then he did not know a perfect when he saw it in the Greek. He said he was in good company, but in what respect we have yet to learn.

After we had finished, Mr. Stewart inquired of a Mr. Parkinson, a Bethanist, and townreeve, how he liked the discourse? "Not at all; he had never heard such perversions of the Scriptures before!" An excellent judge, this same Mr. Parkinson, doubtless; seeing that he is as skilled in Moses and the Prophets as the sagacious creature who rebuked the madness of Balaam in pro-

phesying for hire against the tribes of Jacob!

"Perversions!" exclaimed Mr. Stewart; "what are they?" "Oh, they are numerous!" "Name one, Mr. Parkinson?" But Mr. P. was more ready to assert than to prove. At length he affirmed that we had said that the apostles had learned nothing from Jesus! Upon this barefaced declaration Mr. Stewart's indignation boiled over. He denied it; and straightway appealed to us to confront the man. "The very reverse," said we, "as every one that heard us can attest." We had been particular to show that Jesus taught them more than he did the multitude; for to these he spake only in parables; but his apostles he indoctrinated in the mysteries of the Kingdom; Jesus made them intelligent in the Kingdom; and, therefore, they put a very pertinent question to him after his resurrection, saying, "Wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" Then turning towards the people, Mr. Stewart said that he was willing to meet Mr. Parkinson before them at any time he might appoint, and defend the truth they had heard so abundantly proved, against anything Mr. P. might be able to prefer against it. But Mr. P. has grown into a Reeve of one of the townships of Her Majesty's backwoods since he used to insist upon Mr. Stewart making his house his home when he came to Campbellize in Eramosa; he would not, therefore, "condescend" to have anything to say to him.

But the time of our departure had arrived. In all we had said in Eramosa we made no attack or allusion to Campbellism in particular; yet the spirit of the old Adam enthroned at Bethany could not be still; but seemed bent upon a suicidal opposition. The conviction, we were informed, left upon the minds of many was that the lights of Eramosa are flickering and expiring wicks,—"children in knowledge," but in prejudice and presumption Titanic men. May the truth presented be an extinguisher of their traditions from the hearts of many; and may they be induced by what they have heard to attend to what God has spoken to the Fathers by the Prophets, and to their posterity by his Son, that, believing, they may become obedient to "the faith once for all delivered to the Saints," (of which at present their view is blended with the densest fog.) that, having duly suffered for the truth, they may rejoice in the presence of the Lord during his manifestation and kingdom.

On Monday, July 28, we departed from Eramosa at 7 A. M., in our friend's farm wagon for Rockwood, that great city of rocks and stumps of forest trees. Rain added to the discomfort of the joltings and up-

heavings of the way, keeping us on the strain in balancing an umbrella and our own position on the unstable board. At length we arrived at the platform, where we found shelter in a sort of sentry box, lighted by a single pane; the architectural nucleus, perhaps, of the future station! Confined to this coop by the rain, which fell pretty freely, we tarried for the Toronto train till twenty minutes to nine; for to Paris *via* Toronto we preferred to go, though seventy miles further, rather than by way of Guelph to stage it on to Preston. Having bid our friends adieu, and bequeathed to Mr. Stewart an honorable contention for the faith, among his quondam co-religionists, we evacuated the watchbox, and were soon *en route* for the Provincial Capital. We arrived there at 11.15 A. M., and were detained at the station till 12.20 P. M., when the train started for Hamilton. A short distance from this place we met the Great Western cars, into which we were transferred bag and baggage, and conveyed thence over our former route to Paris the Less. At 3.30 P. M. we reached this station, a five hours and a half run from Rockwood, or 120 miles, exclusive of detention at Toronto. We were met by Bro. Scott, with whom we retired to his hospitable home. That night two Nicodemuses called to see us, and propounded many questions, which we endeavoured to answer according to the word; but whether to their conviction we are not able to affirm.

Paris was the original terminus we had proposed for this visit to our foreign relations of the Province. But through the lady who was the bearer of the letter and report from Edinburgh, whom we found there; and who had communicated with certain friends in Wisconsin respecting our visit to Paris; we received a pressing invitation to extend our tour into that State. On Tuesday morning, therefore, we were again "aboard" the Great Western on our way to Geneva, St. Charles, and Aurora, in Illinois; and from thence to Milwaukee and Pewaukee in Wisconsin. In all these places we expected to address the people in behalf of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; albeit from sickness our expectation was not entirely fulfilled.

(To be continued.)

Epistle from "the Called" in Edinburgh to their Brethren in New York City.

The following letter, with the "general Report" referred to, was received about the latter end of June or beginning of July. We should have laid it sooner before the friends of the great truth we advocate identified

with the Herald, together with our abstract of the report, and the reply of the brethren in this city, so happily expressed by bro. James Beadman, their amanuensis—but that our time has been so much occupied in travelling and disseminating the gospel of the Kingdom in Kentucky, Canada, Illinois, Virginia, and elsewhere. We are now in winter quarters, and, among other things, shall endeavour to prepare from the report a condensed view of the kingdom's prospects and present fortunes in Britain, for the information and encouragement of all who are interested in the preparation of the Bride for the marriage supper of the Lamb. In the mean time, by way of instalment we lay before our readers the following epistle and reply.

Editor.

Dec. 15, 1856.

To Dr. John Thomas for the Brethren with him in New York, U. S.

DEAR BROTHER :

Through the favor of our sister Jessy Lindsay from Dundee, *en route* for Wisconsin, we send you a copy of the Report of the position of matters as they are (or they were, rather, for this was gathered at New Year time) in Great Britain, so far as we can ascertain. The document in question will sufficiently explain itself; and we trust that the perusal of it will be interesting to all the brethren in New York. Perhaps also the friends in other places may see from it how things fare on this side of the Atlantic.

It is very natural and very proper too that we should feel some interest in those of the same faith who are scattered throughout the United States and Canada. We hope therefore that ere long we shall be furnished with as copious information on this head as you can procure. We doubt not that you, yourself, will have a sufficient clue to such places and persons as shall be likely furnish you with the necessary material, and that there are plenty of energetic men in the church in New York to undertake the necessary correspondence. It has been also suggested that you, Bro. Thomas, will be the likeliest person to know whether there are any brethren on the continent of Europe—in Germany or France, with whom we could communicate. If you know of any such, we would feel obliged by you informing us of them.

Apart from the mere statistic value of our inter-British correspondence we expect that an occasional epistle well helps to enhance our advantageousness and increase our en-

joyment of christian fellowship. As yet there has been very little done in that way; probably from the predominance of that most common element in our character—individual and associate—indifference to others. By saying this indifference is reprehensible, we condemn ourselves it may be. Let us amend our ways and, on as large a scale as we conveniently can, consider one another, to provoke into love and good works.

It is gratifying to find that the question of the Lord's coming is exciting some interest in various quarters among *religious* men: but it tends to so little good, is so barren of result, that it is a question whether any great end is served toward the dissemination and reception of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. And therefore a question whether the general mind is at all prepared for that complete submission to God's Christ, so much desiderated in all disciples. Of many preachers of this doctrine it may be said, their words shew a comprehension of things "not far from the kingdom of God"; but the hearers are only tantalised with the echo of future greatness, deriving no further good than the bulk of the community who never hear of these things. Truly there is no hope for men until they cease from following the clergy, and take to the reading of the Bible.

We are happy to inform the brethren, through you, that we are generally in good health. Of those personally known to you all, Bro. T. Renwick and Sister Agnes Arcus, we have to say they are well; the former has recovered his health so much as to be able, to some extent, to resume work. Brethren J. Forman, William Wilson, J. Cameron, A. Tait, James Lawrie, &c., are in ordinary health. We live together happily and to some profit, and increase our number by occasional addition—thus, to-day we receive amongst us Mr. Robert Norric—known to some of your number.

We all, even those who are not personally known to any of you, feel a considerable interest in the church in New York, and are somewhat acquainted with Bro. J. Thomas, through his writings. May we indulge the hope that we shall by-and-by receive a letter from you—to inform us of your welfare, to stimulate our faith and hope, to increase our joy? Farewell!

May the blessing of the God of Abraham, through our Lord Jesus the Christ, be on you all.

GEORGE DOWIE.

Edinburgh, June 1, 1856.

"The wise shall inherit glory." "The simple shall inherit folly."—*Prov.*

Reply to the Brethren in Edinburgh.

The Church of Jesus Christ in N. Y. to those in Edinburgh who have obtained like precious faith with us, favor and peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Beloved Brethren,—Your interesting letter, and the report sent by Sister Lindsay have been received and read to us by Br. Thomas, and we send you many thanks for your Christian courtesy in affording us so much pleasure. We were, indeed, pleased and surprised at the number of Churches and the number of brethren, but especially at the tolerable uniformity in their practice. Complete agreement could hardly be expected. It would be strange if so many, employed so long under the builders of modern Babel, were all found speaking the same language, especially the language of Canaan; but we are persuaded that all who have really repented, believed and obeyed the Gospel will by-and-by rectify what is wrong, and become fused into that Unit so earnestly prayed for by our dear Saviour previous to his suffering. For if we have repented, that will have brought us into unison with God's way of thinking; if we have "the Faith" we shall purify ourselves; if we are obedient children we shall do whatsoever he has commanded us, and by these means succeed more or less in attaining the character of our dear Redeemer—his dignity and humility—his gentleness and firmness—his justice and benevolence—his hatred of sin and amazing compassion for the erring.

In your letter you express the hope to be furnished with like information, respecting the Church of Christ on this side of the Atlantic, to which we beg to reply, that no concentrated effort has been made by us of that kind, owing we hope not altogether to an excess of selfishness, but partly to that and other influences inseparable from the singular position in which we stand, both to our past lives and to the religious world. You know the scales have not long fallen from our eyes; we have hardly done wondering at our past credulity and the amazing darkness in which we have been stumbling; our vision is not yet nicely adjusted to the new light poured on it from the fountain of day; the glorious things revealed still astonish us; we yet reel with the weight of glory; to keep anything like steady, demands most of our time, and, after all, as with the Magnates in the Satanic kingdom, we cannot always maintain the balance of power. We shall, it is hoped, in a little while act more as if, in the beautiful words of Harris "we wished all the saints in Christ Jesus to constitute one family, clothed in a robe of happiness, with charity for a girdle, and hailing the addition

of every new-born saint as the advent of an angel—an addition to the common fund of enjoyment, and finding greater blessedness than that of passively receiving happiness in the godlike prerogative of imparting it." And, Beloved Brethren, we again thank you for taking the first step in this direction. From what has been said we would not convey the idea that our church is quite isolated and neutral amidst the cry of "what shall we eat and drink, and with what shall we be clothed," and how fast can we make money, constantly ascending from the insane crowds around us; no, brethren, we have often brought us on the wings of the winds and lightning notes of cheer—from various and distant regions; from the north and the glowing south; from the prairies and the regions of gold. And we believe it is the intention of our beloved brother Thomas to collect information on these subjects, to collate your interesting report, and publish them in his excellent paper.

Further on you remark "that the coming of the Lord is exciting some attention among the sects, but there is no hope for the people until they forsake the clergy and begin to study the Bible." This fearful fact is too true, and from what we see and hear we feel certain that there is no well-founded hope for the people. Respecting the Gospel they seem willingly ignorant; of the nature of repentance towards God—God's way of gifting immortality to man, and the destiny of the world in the Golden Ages now rapidly approaching—they have but little more knowledge than if God had not spoken on these subjects; they are "intoxicated with the wine of the Mother of Harlots," and, like most people in that condition, they imagine themselves extra sober and sensible. In this state it is quite easy for the priests who blithly officiate in the temples to flatter excited self-esteem, and by an artful admixture of Mythology, false reasoning and perverted scripture, to persuade the deceived people that they have found a smooth highway to Heaven, and that they are leisurely walking in their silken slippers to the starry abodes of angels and of God. Now, for people so circumstanced to stand still and consider the simple truths of the Gospel of the Kingdom, and bend to its humiliating conditions, seems impossible. They have deposed reason; they have given up her clear and satisfying conclusions for mere sensuous pleasures; their delirium is too agreeable—the enchantment thrown around them is too delightful—they cannot be deceived till the sentence is pronounced, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still." Not but that the Gospel is still the "Power of God to all who believe," but they are mostly outside and beyond its saving influence. Indeed we

think we see an awful parallel between this generation and that cotemporary with the ministrations of the Redeemer. The world is full of religion, but nearly empty of Christianity. There is a good deal of sacrifice, but precious little of obedience, and hundreds of opposing sects claim the possession of the Spirit of the Holy One, while the victory of the world over the churches, and the masses of corrupting materials of which they are composed, demonstrate that the insulted Spirit has long since left them to their vain imaginations. But it is time to leave this painful subject, that we may offer a few suggestions respecting a difficulty or two noticed in your reports, as having troubled some of the brethren.

The first which we shall mention is teetotalism. We think the Spirit nowhere teaches teetotalism; the Redeemer does not insist upon, or even recommend it, nor do any of his Apostles; therefore, as Christians, we have nothing to do with teetotalism, and for Christians to insist upon it is like glorifying moonshine, and neglecting the great source of all its light—it is acting like that portion of the doctoring community, who ply all their chemistry, drugs and nonsense, to the palliation or removal of the symptoms of disease, and pay no attention to the laws of health and life. Christianity is the only remedy for the moral diseases of man,—it can cure them, teetotalism never. Temperance in all things is the great law of Christians and we would recommend that teetotalism, as a piece of useless lumber, be thrown, with a stone round its neck, into the depths of the sea.

Again, as to whether it is proper to send the Sacramental bread and wine to absentees, a few words will suffice. The Lords supper is simply a family feast commemorative of a wonderful event—an event on which hangs the redemption of the world. It is to be eaten by the church in its associative capacity, and not sent to the sick-room, except that church agrees to keep the feast in the sick-room, in consideration of the disabled brother. It ought not to be sent to the careless loiterers at home, or Sunday-visitors abroad: they don't care for it. The command to them is, "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together." There is no transubstantiation, no salvable virtue, in the bread and wine: they are symbols only of the body and blood of the dear Saviour; and the effects, when they are produced on us by partaking of them, are the result of ideality in combination with that peculiar moral condition into which repentance, faith, and the Holy Spirit have brought every true son of Abraham. The proper place for the Lord's Supper is on the Lord's table; and the proper

place for every Christian, on the first day of the week, is at that table, refreshing his memory, strengthening his faith, intensifying love, and edifying his brethren. Again, the Lanark difficulty respecting the death of Christ being the Gospel, its being the result of the love of God, &c.—although a more sober difficulty, is not very hard of solution. The death of Christ, certainly, is not the Gospel; it is, indeed, a wonderful and tragical event; but the Gospel is glad tidings. The death of Christ is not, strictly speaking, the result of the love of God: it is rather the result of a law of God, namely, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission"—that is, the sentence of death, which has passed on all men, could not be remitted except blood or life had been given for the lives to be ransomed: the life, blood, or death of Christ was the great price paid for man. Now, none of us love to pay a great price for anything: it is the object to be purchased that we love, and therefore pay the price demanded. God gave his beloved for his otherwise lost children on earth; the Jews, of their own free will, crucified him through envy. These two statements are perfectly reconcilable; it is only to the mere metaphysician that such passages present any difficulty. We Christians are willing to take such facts as we find them. We may not alter them, or explain them away: the Bible is not a book of metaphysics—it is a book of induction, from which earnest men, by careful study, may learn the nature of that God with whom he has to do, secure immortality, and obtain suggestive glimpses of a bright destiny, a long way into the future eternity. If we would be approved sons of God, we must drop metaphysics, and become earnest believers and lovers of the Bible.

We would, in conclusion, venture a remark on the subject of the Holy Spirit; but it is so vast, that we fear to place our foot on its threshold. In its comprehension it is infinite; yet, in its relation to man, it is one of the simplest in the records of light. It is difficult of apprehension, principally with the lovers of the wonderful, who are apt to remain unsatisfied with common blessings, and are always reaching after special gifts and flowers. There was "one Spirit" when God began to create the worlds. The influences of the spirit diffused themselves in mighty waves proceeding through the universe, to return again to the throne of the Eternal, laden with gladness and praise from millions of beings in many worlds, mingled with the lofty songs of the Seraphim, and the humble and fervent thanks of forgiven man. All men are subject to, and enjoy, these influences of the Spirit. Nor can we shun them any more than we

can flee from the influence of the sun, between which and the influence of the Spirit we think there is a beautiful parallel. When man was created a being, who had to develop his character and happiness out of supplied materials, but chiefly from an humble imitation of his Creator's perfections, God at proper times diffused abroad other influences of his Spirit—influences illumined with light, warmed with love, vivified with power, and dark with vengeance; and men were found with affinities (to use a chemical phrase) for those new spiritual influences, and transmitted them to future generations. Hence Moses legislated, David sang, Solomon moralized, Isaiah and all the prophets withdrew the veil from futurity, and revealed the glories of an eternal kingdom. Christ taught a divine morality, suffered, and bled. Apostles preached it to the world, and wielded the attribute of Deity to prove their ambassadorship, and to produce faith in them who heard; and we, in these last days, may enjoy the combined effects of those spiritual influences and efforts until we are transformed into the image of the Christ, and reign in the approaching kingdom. With these we may well be satisfied and thankful, without craving the gifts of powers; or, if we greatly desire them, let us bring ourselves up to the standard of faith; and then, if the gifts are not imparted, it will be because our Father deems them unsuitable for this day and generation.

Hoping this epistle will be received in the same spirit which dictated it, with love to all the holy brethren, we remain,

Yours, in one hope of our calling,

In behalf of the Church,

(Signed) JAMES BEADMAN.

New York, Sept. 10, 1856.

Christ and his brethren's Reign on Earth Defended against Campbellism.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS,—On the fifth Lord's day in November, after having met and worshipped at Zion, in this county, some of us went to Jerusalem and heard Mr. Orvis, a noted man among the "Reformers," with whom brother Magruder held debate. He read 2 Pet. iii., and commented on it, advocating the second personal coming of the Lord from the passage read, and from other passages—his second personal coming *not to reign on the earth, but to burn it up!* He dwelt particularly on his raising *all the dead, both the righteous and the wicked simultaneously.* In a word, he contends, that the Lord will judge all at his second coming: he will send the wicked into an eternal hell,

burn up the earth, and take the righteous with him to heaven, there to dwell always.

He also came down upon us for having left "the Reformation," and appearing to wish to know our reason or reasons for having done it. After he had finished, I arose and made an appointment for Zion, the next Lord's day, saying, that the Lord enabling me, I would prove, not that I believe, but that the Holy Scriptures teach, the reign of the Lord in person upon the earth one thousand years. I also stated Mr. Campbell's claim to the SUPERVISORSHIP in my presence, and my having demurred to it. Upon this some conversation ensued, and resulted in an agreement to have a friendly discussion at Jerusalem on the ensuing Friday and Saturday, December 5th and 6th. I agreed to affirm the proposition of Messiah's personal reign upon the earth for 1000 years after his second appearing: and Mr. Orvis undertook to maintain the opposite.

It was not from confidence in myself, but in the truth, and in the God of truth, I undertook this discussion. We met and discussed on the days appointed. I had been enabled to classify the testimonies I wished to adduce, and much to my satisfaction.

Class 1, was designated by the phrase, *Messiah's throne,* embracing the passages concerning David's throne as promised to his Seed, the Messiah.

Class 2, designated by *Messiah's residence on Mount Zion, the city of the Great King;* embracing passages concerning Zion.

Class 3, designated by *Messiah's land and people.*

Class 4, designated by *Messiah's inheritance among the Gentiles;* and

Class 5, designated by *Messiah's reign, and the reign of his Associated Brethren, the Saints;* embracing Messiah's times.

This arrangement enabled me to remember with quickness all the testimonies I deemed it necessary to adduce. I trust, in all humility, that my proposition was abundantly shown to stand proven in the Holy Scriptures—shown to all the unbiassed, to the noble-minded, and to the honest-hearted.

The discussion closed to all appearance in friendly feeling. Mr. Orvis, doubtless, did all he could; but he evidently appeared to me weaker than when he discussed with brother Magruder. I might name some of the passages he quoted in opposition, but they are so well known in what is styled "the orthodox world," that I deem it unnecessary.

Brethren King and Dr. Lemuel Edwards* expressed themselves as well satisfied with the effort I was enabled to make in defence of the truth. I challenged my friendly opponent to produce one passage to prove that David's throne had ever been transferred into heaven above. He maintains that Jesus has been reigning 1800 years, and says he has proven it! He asserts, that the passages concerning David's throne have no connection with Messiah's second appearing. But he made no effort to give us a testimony that David's throne had ever been transferred to heaven.

He said he would not discuss the subject any more.

In private, he said, that we would increase like the Millerites did; and in public, he limited our increase to 1866.

You can publish this communication if you think proper; it may stimulate our public advocates to hold themselves in readiness for discussion at any time an opportunity may offer. There is no need to publish every debate; if we have many, they can benefit the persons present—so many of them as are rightly disposed.

I think the friends of the truth have no need to be discouraged. God is for the truth, and is their God who faithfully advocate it. He will cause it and them to triumph when the time shall have arrived.

You, dear brother, will not be ashamed, when you stand before the Son of Man, to remember that you contended earnestly and faithfully for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

I have immersed twelve this year. This looks small; but God does not despise even a "little flock," when right.

That the good Lord may be the shield and exceeding great reward of yourself and of all who advocate his cause, is the desire and prayer of yours, in the bonds of fraternal affection.

ALBERT ANDERSON.

Acquinton, King William, (Va.)

Dec. 13, 1856.

P. S.—At the close of the discussion on

* Bro. J. B. Edwards was not at the discussion. He does not like to go to this Jerusalem house, being justly indignant at the unrighteousness of the so-called "Reformers" who excluded him and others from the use of this house, notwithstanding their having liberally contributed to the building thereof. These self-styled "Reformers" excluded them from the use of the house, and did not refund the money which brother Edwards and others of our brethren contributed.

Brother Edwards is willing for you to publish this in connection with what my letter states about brethren Hill King, and Dr. L. Edwards.

It was a knavish piece of business; but quite in keeping with the inspiration of the old Adam, by whom they are supervised.—EDMON.

Friday, your quondam friend, Mr. White, made a motion to adjourn *sine die*, indefinitely. This was seconded by another man whom I did not know; but it was disregarded. I considered this motion as a good indication.

I was pleased in having the discussion in Jerusalem, because it was carrying the war into Africa.

Let our trust be in the truth, and in him of whom Moses says, that he is a God of truth; let him be our shield and buckler, and our exceeding great reward. I understand that Mr. Orvis is to receive six hundred dollars for preaching at Jerusalem, next year; so he appears to be bound.

He says you called him a hireling.

A. A.

Scholia.

No interpretation of one part of Scripture can be correct, which invalidates another. Two testimonies, each consisting of very few words, completely overturn the earth-burning theory based on 2 Pet. iii., or any other text. These are: "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but the earth abideth forever—Eccles. i. 4; and "God laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed forever—Psal. civ. 5. When Mr. Orvis, or any one else, shall have converted these into a revelation of the burning up of our planet, it will be quite time enough to attend to their igneous interpretation of Peter.

Furthermore, when Mr. Orvis, or the Supervisor shall have disposed of Isaiah xxvi. 13, 14, they will have less difficulty in proving the resurrection of *all* the dead. Till they have scripturally and logically reconciled that with their proposition, we may rest upon our oars and float along.

Where is their "eternal hell," and what does it consist in? Let them put their heads together, and show us *from the word!* The same question may be put concerning their "heaven."

Why have we left "the Reformation?" Because it is deformation and defamation of the truth.

The reign of Jesus as "a priest upon his throne" after the order of Melchizedec for 1800 years, is 800 years too long.

Nay; we shall not increase as did the Millerites. We adhere too rigidly to the word for that. The truth never will be embraced by the multitude this side the resurrection. Sectarianism and its patrons will have the ascendancy till then. Our day will not come till the apocalypse of Jesus Christ.

After 1866, our increase will be "a great multitude which no man can number."

Mr. Orvis is to receive \$600 *per ann. prox.* for preaching his "eternal hell," earth-burning," universal resurrection, saint-emigration to Skyana, to the Bethanian Jerusalemites, according to the testimony before us! Then is the editor of the *HERALD* perfectly justified in styling Bro. Anderson's "friendly opponent," a *hireling*. If Mr. Orvis do not relish the epithet, let him cease to dull his palm with the bribe; and it will afford us great pleasure to announce that a hireling he has ceased to be.

"He appears to be bound." Doubtless the appearance betokens the reality. If the Bethanian Jerusalemites would give him \$600 per annum, to show them what Moses and the prophets teach in connection with the words of Jesus and his apostles, even though it might lead him and them to renounce what Lord Bacon styles "the idols of the den," then there would be no appearance of bondage. But, under existing circumstances, all this is reversed. He is bound to preach Campbellism (every one knows what this term imports), or forego the \$600 per annum. The proof of this lies in the fact, that he cannot preach the doctrine advocated by Bro. Anderson, or Presbyterianism, &c., and retain the fee. Therefore, we style it *a bribe*; and add, that he is bound by this bribe to serve his paymasters (and they are hard cases), or be practically dismissed. This is awful bondage, for which a paltry \$600 a year is but a fretting to the soul!

We doubt not but brother Anderson, who is a freeman, gave good account of the bondman who attacked him on the way. The "testimony for Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy," "dwells richly" in Bro. A., who "meditates on it day and night." We pity the man who ventures to parade his ignorance of the truth under the whole broadsides he is capable of booming upon him from the batteries and fortresses of God. His only defence is the greater ignorance of them that hire him. Ambrose* was, doubtless, on

* This same Ambrose, when we had fellowship in times of ignorance (out of which there is but little hope of his deliverance), was about as zealous a friend of ours as he is now of the "friendly opponent" of the word which God has magnified above all his name. In those days of zeal without knowledge, he wanted others to unite with him in settling us in King William. But a certain Bethanian, named Duval, obtaining an inkling of what was in agitation, baited Ambrose with a present of two pointers, and so caught him with galle! After that important event, Ambrose filled his sails with the Bethanian breeze; and we, like Jonah, were made acquainted with the deep! Thus this "disciple," so unlike the unstable waves of the sea (?), performed a somerset, and, as it were, sold us to perdition for two paltry dogs. Ever since, he has been balancing, heels up, kicking the air!

thorns, and anxious, by a *sine die* adjournment, to allay their prickings, and to cover his protegee's retreat! He is not wise, and too presumptuous to be taught. What can be done with such a man? Leave him to his idols, and wish him well in praying for their destruction; for then there may be some chance of his deliverance from thrall!

But we must conclude in heartily congratulating Bro. Anderson that he has satisfactorily defended the faith, and so sickened his opponent of his wretched work, that he has determined not to discuss the subject any more! "Prudence" is said to be "the better part of valor!" The wisdom of the serpent is clearly seen: shall we henceforth expect the harmlessness of the dove?

EDITOR.

Dec. 20, 1856.

A Word from the Bush.

Dear Sir,—Through the kindness of Mr. Gilmour, of Goderich, I have had the perusal of this year's *Herald*, and would long ago have possessed myself of the whole work, but for certain matters having been rather under the weather. I am greatly pleased that you have visited Canada. God grant that that visit may be the means of arousing some to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. If the *Herald* could get introduced here and there, much good, I think, would be the result. It is to this work, under God, that I am indebted for what little I hope I know of the Gospel; and I can assure you that the perusal of it at first, used almost to make my hair stand up, so contrary were its teachings to all my pre-conceived notions of God's truth. It is hard to unlearn and reject the strong Calvinistic teaching of thirty-five years—the system of religion of one's parents, relatives and acquaintances, and which, of course, from its agency in advancing the cause of civil liberty and enlightenment, was looked upon as the only true faith. Ah, yea! it is indeed hard for one, so firmly grounded in the prejudices of Presbyterianism as I have been, to be convinced that it is all wrong. I mean humanly speaking, for with God all things are easy. With me, indeed, the struggle has been a hard one; but I thank Him for what measure of light I possess, and pray for more.

I should have given much to have met you at Toronto, but this region is so remote from what may be called the civilized world, that it is not often we get down the country. Think of a man leaving, as it were, civilization, refinement at least, and

all the churches behind him, to study the first principles of the Bible in the *bush*. The ways of God are indeed unsearchable, and incomprehensible, until His own light dawns upon them, and reveals what He pleases to the creature.

If you have published the "Message," as you intimated to the good folks of "Elizabethtown," please send with the *Heralds* to Mr. Combe, 5s. worth, that is to say, a dollar's worth, for me.

It is a pity that the third volume is out of print. Could you not manage to print a new edition? It must interfere greatly with the completeness of the work. I should think that you could easily get an amount guaranteed, sufficient to warrant this step. I would willingly contribute my mite.

I am, my dear sir,

Yours very truly,

Wm. GUNN, P.M.

Inver Huron, Bruce, C. W.,

Nov. 19, 1856.

The Hope Confessed.

Dear Brother, — I have succeeded in obeying the truth. Through the assistance of T. H. Chase, I and my wife were baptized into the one hope of the kingdom of God.

It is with much interest and benefit that I have read the back volumes of the *Herald*. It is beyond my ability to express the advantage your writings have been to me in the study of the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom; especially as exhibited in that article from your pen, under the title of *The Great Salvation*, in vol. ii., No. 2. I regard it as a matchless production.

It is truly gratifying to have the opportunity, as well as the means, of procuring so great a work as the *Herald*; and also the expectation of meeting its author in the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To this end do I labor, and shall have all my desire satisfied when I awake in his likeness.

It may not be amiss to inform you that, on Christmas day, 1844, I and my wife were baptized into Campbellism, and that in 1851 I became an elder of the congregation; but now, by the shining of the word of truth, which is light, into our hearts, we have rejected it, and are confidently looking for the accomplishment of Israel's hope, in which we rejoice, and consider ourselves infinitely bettered.

Looking for and hastening unto the glorious appearing of our Lord,

I remain, yours,

GARRET W. ROBINS.

Camp Point, Adams, Ill.,

Nov. 30, 1856.

P.S.—Bear with me, brother, while I inquire if there is no possibility of my obtaining a copy of *Elpis Israel*? Please send me also a few copies of "The Wisdom of the Clergy Proved to be Folly," to the amount of one dollar.

The edition of *Elpis Israel* is entirely sold off, and no copy can be obtained until the publication of a new edition, which many have urged us to issue. One friend is so desirous of a re-issue, that he undertakes to contribute one fourth of the expense. We promised him to take the matter into consideration. We are thinking of it; and should, perhaps, conclude at once to issue a third edition, if we had not at present more on hand and in prospect, than we could attend to with such a super-addition. We have not read the work since we originally published it in 1850. We know what ought to be there, and we must examine it to see if what ought to be do really obtain. Just now, however, we have not the time for this revise.

Of the pamphlet referred to, none remain.
EDITOR.

Dec. 18, 1856.

England, Persia, and Russia.

About ten years ago we published in the *Herald of the Future Age*, and since in *Elpis Israel*, that England and Persia would become antagonist powers; and that Russia would be found on the side of Persia. We learned this from the prophets, and declared it as their teaching. The news by the *Europa* informs us that England has declared war against Persia; and that Russia has announced her intention of assisting Persia with 50,000 troops, if invited by the Shah. This may lead to a renewal of war between Russia and England, the natural and implacable adversaries of "the time of the end." This new movement is a sign of the times; for Persia is a member of Gog's confederacy.

EDITOR.

Dec. 30, 1856.

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1857.

[Vol. VII. No. 2.

The Vision of Nahum Interpreted.

(Concluded from page 9.)

BEING so terribly overthrown by the blast of Jehovah, Sennacherib returned with the remnant of his shattered forces to Nineveh. His hatred of Israel was enhanced by his late disaster. Instead of making peace with them, and doing homage to Jehovah their God by whom he had been expelled from Judea, he was filled with rage and cruelty against them. Multitudes of them resided in Nineveh, and its subject cities. Every day he caused great numbers of them to be massacred, and their bodies to be left exposed in the streets and broadways, forbidding any man to bury them. Tobit, to avoid his cruelty, was obliged to conceal himself for some time, and suffer all his effects to be confiscated. In short, Sennacherib's savage temper rendered him so insupportable to his own family of "young lions," that two of his "whelps," named Adrammelech and Sharezer, conspired against him and killed him in the temple in the presence of the Great Eagle as he lay prostrate before it. But the assassins fled to the mountains of Ararat, leaving the throne of Nineveh to a younger brother, named in Tobit, *Sarchedonius*, who was the same as the *Esarhaddon* of Isaiah.

This ruler of Nineveh had a long and prosperous reign of thirty-nine years. In the early part of his career, the line of hereditary governors of Babylon, who had made themselves independent of Nineveh in the days of Baladan (2 Kings, xx. 12), became extinct; and Babylon was filled with troubles and commotions for eight years. Esarhaddon taking advantage of this juncture, made himself master of the city, and re-annexing it to his former dominions, reigned over his united acquisitions thirteen years.

The lion of Nineveh still continued his controversy with Jehovah for the possession

of his land and sovereignty over Israel. The country having been rent from Assyria in his father's reign, he determined to re-unite it. He accordingly invaded the territory of the Ten Tribes, and took captive as many as were left, and carried them into Assyria; and then planted colonies of idolaters there in their stead. The prediction of Isaiah was then fulfilled, which said, "*Within three score and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be no more a people.*" This was exactly the space of time which elapsed between the prediction and the event: and the people of the Ten Tribes did then cease from being a visible nation, a situation from which they have never recovered until this day.

Esarhaddon having possessed himself of that part of Jehovah's land tenanted by the Ten Tribes, sent some of his forces into Judea to subject it to his authority likewise. His generals defeated Manasseh, the King of the Jews, and carried him captive to Babylon. Having remained there some time, he was at length released, and permitted to return to Jerusalem.

This national calamity is alluded to in Judith in these words: "The children of Israel that dwelt in Judea were newly returned from the captivity, and all the people of Judea were lately gathered together; and the vessels, and the altar, and the house, were sanctified after the profanation."—Jud. iv. 3. This was the captivity of Manasseh, and profanation of the temple by the Assyrians, while Jerusalem was in the hands of Esarhaddon's forces, and not to be confounded with the return from Babylon under Cyrus' decree.

Esarhaddon was succeeded by his son Sardanapalus, who is styled in scripture Nebuchodonosor. This man carried the controversy of the Winged Lion of Nineveh against Jehovah, to its *ne plus ultra* of impiety. He made proclamation that "He was the lord

of the whole earth;" and decreed the destruction of all the gods of the land, "that all nations should worship Nebuchodonosor only, and that all tongues and tribes should call upon him as god." This was assuming the position of the Antichrist of modern times. He commissioned Holofernes, the generalissimo of his forces, to go through all the countries of the West with 120,000 infantry, and 12,000 mounted bowmen, to reduce them to an obedient recognition of his godship. This vicegerent of the Ninevite Deity entered upon his mission with great zeal in the service of his lord, who swore "by his life, and by the power of his kingdom, that whatsoever he had spoken he would do by the power of his hand." Wherever the Ninevite forces appeared, everything belonging to the rebellious was wasted and destroyed. The gods of the nations were abolished, their groves cut down, and the worship of Nebuchodonosor the First established on their ruin.

But the little kingdom of Judah, confiding in Jehovah to whom it belonged, refused to acknowledge the Anti-jehovite pretensions of the old lion, and prepared for war. Achior, the chief of the Ammonites, advised Holofernes to avoid a contest with the Jews, "lest their Lord should defend them." This counsel, however, was opposed by the other chiefs, because "Israel was a people that had no strength, nor power for a strong battle." The clamour against Achior having subsided, Holofernes said, "Who art thou, Achior, and the hirelings of Ephraim, that thou hast prophesied among us to-day, and hast said that we should not make war with the people of Israel, because their God will defend them? And *who is God but Nebuchodonosor?* He will send his power, and will destroy them from the face of the earth, and their God shall not deliver them; but we his servants will destroy them as one man; for they are not able to sustain the power of our horses. For with them we will tread them under foot, and their mountains shall be drunken with their blood, and their fields shall be filled with their dead bodies, and their footsteps shall not be able to stand before us, for they shall utterly perish, saith king Nebuchodonosor, lord of all the earth; for he said, *None of my words shall be in vain.*"

This, however, was one of those "lies" of which Nahum says, Nineveh was "full;" for many days did not pass over ere Holofernes was a headless corpse by the hand of a Hebrew woman; and their encampment in the plain of Megiddo, the scene of confusion, slaughter, and dismay. Bethulia's widow, the feeble and beautiful Judith, by the help of Jehovah, silenced the vain boasting of the

"god," whose myriads "perished by the battle of Jehovah."

The wickedness of Nineveh had now become very great. The impiety of Nebuchodonosor was the culmination of its opposition to the God of Israel, to whose people and sovereignty its enmity was bitter and intense. Tobit, of the tribe of Naphthali, who had been brought to Nineveh by Shalmaneser, was still living there. But perceiving his end approaching, he forewarned his children of the sudden destruction of the city; of which at that time there was not the least appearance. He advised them to quit the city before its ruin came on, and to depart as soon as they had buried him and his wife. "Go into Media, my son," said he to Tobias, "for I surely believe those things which the prophet Jonah spake of Nineveh, that it shall be overthrown, and that for a time peace shall rather be in Media." Tobit having soon after died, Tobias removed to Ecbatana, the capital of Media, where he lived until he attained the age of 127 years. "But before he died he heard of the destruction of Nineveh, which was taken by Nebuchodonosor and Assuerus: and before his death he rejoiced over Nineveh."—Tob. xiv.4—15.

Nebuchodonosor died, and was succeeded by Saracus, a contemptible and effeminate prince. Nabopolassar, a native of Babylon, and general of his army, rebelled, and usurped the Babylonian section of the Assyrian empire, over which he reigned one and twenty years.

Assuerus, or Cyaxares I., king of Media, hearing of the defeat of Holofernes by Israel, determined to attack Nineveh and destroy it before it could recover from the disaster. He engaged the remnant of the great army, which he defeated, and drove back upon Nineveh. Pursuing his victory, he laid siege to the city, which was upon the point of falling inevitably into his hands, when he was obliged suddenly to raise the siege, and return to Media to repel an eruption of the Scythians, which, with the war against Lydia that followed it, delayed the fate of Nineveh about nine years.

In the meantime Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, having become old and infirm, associated his son Nebuchodonosor called "the Second," with him in the throne of the kingdom. This young king is the celebrated Nebuchadnezzar spoken of in the Book of Daniel. His exaltation to the joint-occupation of the throne of Babylon with Nabopolassar, occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, king of the Jews; and two years before his father's decease.

Having mediated a peace between Assuerus and the king of Lydia, Nebuchadnezzar for himself and father contracted an alliance with Assuerus, king of the Medes, for the

conquest and destruction of Nineveh. Having therefore united their forces they besieged the city, took it, killed Saracus the king, and utterly destroyed it. The two armies enriched themselves with the spoils, and Assuerus prosecuting his victories, made himself master of all the cities of the kingdom of Assyria, except Babylon and Chaldea, which belonged to Nabopolassar.

Thus Babylon and Chaldea became the nucleus of a new Assyrian empire. The wings of the Great Eagle were plucked from the Assyrian Lion, and it was made to stand upon its feet, and a man's heart was given unto it. Nebuchadnezzar commenced his career as general of the kingdom; and by the conquest of Syria and Judea, he succeeded to the sole inheritance of a throne which at his father's death comprehended under its dominion Chaldea, Assyria, Arabia, Syria, and Palestine, over which he reigned in Babylon, the capital of the empire, forty-three years.

The destruction of Nineveh by the kings of Babylon and Media fulfilled the prophecies of Nahum and Zephaniah. The latter, who prophesied in the reign of Josiah, king of the Jews, said, "Jehovah will stretch out his hand against the North, and destroy Assyria; and will make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like a wilderness. And flocks shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the cormorant and the bittern shall lodge in the upper lintels of it; their voice shall sing in the windows: desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he shall uncover the cedar-work. This is the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart I (am supreme) and none beside me: how is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in! Every one that passeth by her shall hiss and wag his head.—ch. ii. 13. Such is Nineveh, and such has she been for ages. Until the late discoveries of Layard, the site of the city was a matter of dispute. Nineveh and Babylon, the destroyers of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, are both fallen, and vanished; but Israel, Judah, and Jerusalem, the people and city of Jehovah, remain, and are preparing to "blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit!"

The historical outline presented before the reader will show him the fitness of Nahum's introduction, in which he says:—

"Jehovah is a jealous and an avenging God;
Jehovah avengeth, and is very furious.
Jehovah recompenses his adversaries,
And he reserveth wrath for his enemies.
Jehovah is slow to anger, though great in power."

Jehovah is jealous of the honor of his name; therefore he avenged it in fury upon Sennacherib Nebuchodonosor, and their

city. Of Nebuchodonosor, Nahum says, to Nineveh:—

"From thee hath there gone forth one
Who imagined evil against Jehovah;
A most wicked counsellor;"

But though this pretended god was obeyed by myriads,

"Thus saith Jehovah,
Though they are victorious and so many,
Yet shall they be cut down and pass away."

Then addressing Israel, he says:—

"Though I afflicted thee I will afflict thee no more;
For now will I break his yoke from off thee,
And I will burst thy bonds in sunder,
And Jehovah will command concerning thee,
That thy name be no more scattered abroad."

Then to Nineveh he says:—

"From the house of thy gods will I cut off
The graven and the molten image:
I will appoint thy grave; for thou art vile."

But Judah shall live in peaceful independence when her oppressors are no more. Nahum saw this in his vision as the consummation of "*the Controversy of Zion.*" Nineveh and all her successors in her great contest with Jehovah for sovereignty over his people and land, should be destroyed; for the decree is that "the wicked shall be wholly consumed, and cut off." Therefore, saith the prophet,

"Behold upon the mountains the feet of Him
That bringeth good tidings, who publisheth peace!
Keep, O Judah, thy feasts; perform thy vows:
For he shall no more pass through thee:
The wicked is wholly consumed, he is cut off"

The power of the wicked shall no more pass through Judea, because of Him who brings the proclamation of peace to Judah. But the power of the wicked is supreme there to this day; therefore, in these words, Nahum looked beyond the fall of Nineveh. He penetrated into that future indicated by Isaiah in similar words, saying,

"How beautiful appear on the mountains
The feet of Him that bringeth good tidings,
Of Him that proclaimeth peace!
Of Him that bringeth good tidings of good,
And that proclaimeth salvation!
That saith to Zion, Thy God reigneth!
The watchmen shall lift up their voice:
With their voice together shall they sing:
For with their own eyes shall they see,
That Jehovah restoreth Zion."

"Burst forth into joy; sing together
Ye waste places of Jerusalem!
For Jehovah hath comforted his people;
He hath redeemed Israel,
Jehovah hath made bare his holy arm,
In the sight of all the nations:
And all the ends of the earth shall see
The salvation of our God."—Isa. lll. 7.

The Assyrian has not yet abandoned his pretensions to Jehovah's land; there can therefore be no peace for Judah until the Assyrian's claim shall be extinguished in the utter consumption of his power. The fate of Nineveh and Babylon is the earnest, as well as type, of that of Rome and Constanti-

nople, the modern seats of the Assyrian's power. Hence, Micah, looking forward to the final deliverance of the Holy Land from the Assyrian of the Latter Days, whose dominion, as it will be in those days, Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream, speaking of the Judge of Israel born in Bethlehem, says: "He shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into the land. He shall deliver us from the Assyrian when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our borders."—Ch. v. 5, 6. It is easy to perceive that Nahum, Isaiah and Micah, all speak of the same person; that is, of the Christ. Their testimony exhibits him as the publisher, and the giver of peace to Israel—the Shiloh to whom the gathering of the people shall be. When the Assyrian falls upon the mountains of Israel after the manner of Sennacherib, peace shall be upon Israel for evermore.

In the second chapter, Nahum announces that the destroyer, the united army of the Medes and Babylonians prepared by Jehovah, marches against Nineveh to avenge the cruelties and desolations inflicted upon Israel. "Behold, saith Jehovah of armies, I am against thee; and I will burn thy chariots in the fire, and the sword shall devour thy young lions; and I will cut off thy prey from the earth; and the voice of thine ambassadors shall be heard no more." Hence the destroying army was Jehovah's preparation—his mighty and valiant men with blood-red shield, and scarlet uniform, brandishing their spears; with scythe-chariots blazing in the sun like flaming torches. As they approach the fated city there are heard,

"The cracking of the whipl, and the noise of the rattling wheels;
And of prancing horses, and bounding chariots.
The cavalry mount, and the flame of the sword,
And the glittering of the spear are seen."—Ch. III. 2.

Such in vision was the appearance of Jehovah's hosts as they approached the city. Nahum saw them moving in battle-array—an imposing spectacle. But Nineveh was fainthearted and unprepared. This appears from Nahum's words—

"Lo, thy people are as women in the midst of thee:
The gates of thy land are set wide open to thy foes."

"Thy shepherds slumber, O king of Assyria;
Thy nobles give themselves up to repose."

The issue would therefore not be doubtful, when the shock of battle came. Having passed through the gates of the land, Nahum saw them at the gates of the city preparing for assault. This is expressed by the phrase, "He shall recount his mighty men." They shall be brought into linc—they shall be arrayed for the onset.

"The chariots rage in the suburbs;
They charge one against another in the broadways:
They appear as torches, they run as lightning:

He shall recount his mighty men;
They cast down as they march on;
They hasten to the wall, and a covert is prepared:
The gates of the river are forced;
And the palace, and the citadel are dissolved."

The Assyrian captains try to rally their dismayed troops, who, they perceive, are disposed to turn their backs upon the assailants:

"Stand, stand, they cry, but none looketh back.
Their hearts melt, and their knees smite together;
And there is great pain in all loins,
And the faces of them all gather blackness.
There is a multitude slain, and a heap of dead bodies;
And there is no end to their carcases,
Over which they stumble."—Ch. II. 8-10; III. 3.

The city being taken, the victors proceed to secure their prisoners, to collect the spoil, and to demolish her towers. Referring to this Nahum says,

"She is led away captive, she goeth up;
Her maids are led away moaning as doves,
And smiting their hands upon their breasts."—Ch. II. 7.

As to the spoil, he says, speaking of Jehovah's troops,

"They seize the silver, they seize the gold,
And there is no end of the glorious store,
Because of all kinds of desirable furniture."—v. 9.

The result of this pillage is that

"Nineveh is void, and empty, and waste."—v. 10.

The walls and towers of the city, whose men of war had become effeminate, and whose king and nobles had given themselves up to luxury and repose, however thick and lofty and numerous they might be, would be but an indifferent protection to its inhabitants, and offer but a feeble resistance to the enemy. This was the case with the fortifications of Nineveh, which, as Nahum foretold, were easily subdued by her destroyer.

"All thy strongholds," says he, "shall become
Like fig-trees loaded with the first ripe figs:
If they be shaken, they fall into the eater's mouth."
Ch. III. 12.

This was not the case with Sevastopol. Her stronghold, though much shaken, did not come so easily into the mouth of the eater. A slight shaking will bring down a shower of ripe figs from the tree. The figure is, therefore, very expressive of the facility with which

"The habitation of the lions,
And the feeding place of the young lions;"

and all the dens and lairs, or strongholds of Nineveh were captured by the Medo-Babylonian army of Jehovah, the omnipotent and victorious God of the Jews. Thus, the skirts of the well-favored harlot, the mistress of enchantments, who trafficked in nations and tribes, were reversed upon her face, and her nakedness exposed to them she had deceived. She was made vile, and set as a gazing stock in a deserted land.

"And it shall come to pass
That all who see thee shall flee from thee,
And shall say, NINEVEH IS DESTROYED!

Who will bemoan thee?
Whence shall I seek comforters for thee?
THOU SHALT BE HID.

Thy people are scattered upon the mountains,
And no man gathereth them,
There is no healing of thy bruise;
Thy wound is become grievous;
All that hear the report of thee shall clap their hands
over thee:
For thy wickedness hath passed continually upon
all.—Ch. III. 5-7; 11, 18, 19.

Thus was determined in favor of the truth, the great question of the eighth century before the birth of Christ, *Is Jehovah, God of Israel, or Nebuchodonosor, God of Nineveh, the Lord of the whole earth, and ruler in the kingdom of men?*—Dan. iv. 7. The truth was established in the defeat of Holofernes, and the destruction of Nineveh, according to the word of Jehovah's prophets, in the reigns of the impious father, and his contemptible and effeminate son. The truth was mighty, and prevailed; not by argument, however, but by the sword employed by Him who has said, "I have magnified my word above all my name."

This is a world in which Jehovah's truth cannot prevail by the mere force of testimony and reason. It never has so prevailed, and never will while "sin flesh" is the nature of man. The Christianity of the fourth century was not placed on the throne of the Cæsars without war. The anti-papalism of the fifteenth century did not enthrone itself in the Protestant States without a long and bloody war. *Testimony and reason begin the strife which is victoriously consummated by the sword.* This is Jehovah's method. He dealt so with Nineveh, with Babylon, with the Rome of the Cæsars, with German Popery, and hereafter with the Rome of the Popes. When Gog, the Prince of Rosh, shall rule the Image-Empire of the Latter Days, he will not fall short of the impiety and arrogance of Nebuchodonosor the First. Like him, he will claim the lordship of the whole earth; and "Oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or an object of fealty; so that as a god, he sits in the temple of the god, exhibiting himself because he is a god."—2 Thess. ii. 4. In this assumption of divinity an issue will be formed between him and Jehovah; or rather *the old issue will be revived*, the time and person chiefly differing. By virtue of this self-exaltation to supreme godship, or lordship over all the earth, Gog will claim possession and sovereignty over Jehovah's land, and Jerusalem, the city of the Great King. "*He shall think an evil thought,*" which will impel him to follow in the footsteps of Sennacherib and Holofernes against Judea. He will occupy the sites of their encampments, as well as the Holy City. The crisis is then formed, and the nations will be taught to know

that there is a power claims Jerusalem mightier than the Sennacherib or Nebuchodonosor of the Latter Days. "Then saith the Lord God, my fury shall come up in my face; and Gog shall fall upon the mountains of Israel: for I will consume him with the spirit of my mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of my coming."—Ezek. xxxviii. 18; xxxix. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 8.

From this declaration, then, of what the Lord will do, it is evident that he has not departed from his old method of settling questions pertaining to his sovereignty over the earth, and Israel. He is now holding back until the principles of the Apostacy shall develop themselves into full maturity of blasphemy in the impiety of Gog. Some may think that it is impossible for a man to stand up in the nineteenth century, and to declare of himself in the old formula, that "There is no God of the earth but Nebuchodonosor;" but, when we find, in the "enlightened city of Boston," a paper, extensively patronised, avowedly hostile to the Bible, and declaring that "its divine authority has no foundation in truth;" and that Nature is a better guide to truth and virtue than it;—when such folly can be gravely enunciated in Protestant America, we believe that it is quite possible for the dark regions of "Holy Moscow" to present the intoxicated nations with a chief, who will not blush to affirm his own godship and omnipotence. Men, unenlightened by the doctrine of the Bible, are capable of uttering the most egregious nonsense, and of perpetrating the most flagrant absurdities. The only difference is, the way they manifest their folly. A man at the head of nations defies the God of Israel with a mighty army; a puny editor of a Boston paper insults him with a lying pen! Extremes meet. Whether armed with a sword or a pen, it is the thinking of the flesh, which is enmity against God; is not subject to his law, neither indeed can be; for the thinking is the mentality of sin. "Mental Liberty," and Romish and Muscovite Superstition all hate the Bible, and make a mock at sin. No pretensions are too impious or blasphemous to issue from the mouths of such. Infidelity and Superstition are extremes that meet; and when they shall kiss each other with fraternal and political embrace, THE APOSTACY will have produced the LAWLESS ONE in the fulness of his power, whose infidelity of Jehovah and Jehovah's word, will embolden him to claim the Lordship of the World. But enough. The sword will settle the question; and the nations will learn that there is but "One Lord" and "One God," and that Jehovah, the Avenger of Israel, and the hope of his people, is He.

Jan. 1, 1857.

EDITOR.

Visit to Canada and the West.

ROUTE from Paris to Geneva—Bigotry Reigns there—the Ecclesia at Geneva—Excellent Singers—Good Singing a Desideratum—Visit St. Charles—“Anything Clerical will do for the West”—Clergy at a discount in St. Charles—Visit Aurora—Manifesto—“35 Adventists”—Singing by Moonlight Away—Invitation to Revisit Toronto—Visit Milwaukie—Disabled by Sickness—Lako Voyage—Land on Mackinaw—Indians there—A Wrong-headed Kansas-Goose—Slavery—Excitement on board—Arrive at Toronto—Private Meeting—Arrive in New York.

WE left Paris at 11.23 A.M. and arrived at Windsor opposite Detroit, Michigan, on the Detroit river, at 5.40 P. M., a distance of 157 miles from Paris, and 229 from Elgin and the Niagara Suspension Bridge.

The route passes through Woodstock, London, and Chatham to Windsor. The first of these towns is nineteen miles from Paris. For eleven miles east of it, the region is level and highly cultivated. The town is situated on a hilly section of country, and is the shire town of Oxford county. It contains 1300 inhabitants, six bazaars called “churches,” a grammar school, and the county buildings.

To the west of Woodstock the road is bounded on either side by a range of hills, and five miles further on enters the valley of the Thames at Beachville. From this, it continues down the valley, with hills on either side, covered with a heavy growth of timber, in which there is considerable mountain-pine. From Ingersoll, 100 miles from the Suspension Bridge, the country appears newer, and continues its hilly aspect, with extensive pine woods frequently bounding the view, until a distance of nineteen miles is reached, when the road enters the city of London the Less.

London, whose population is 10,000, is situated on an elevated plain, at the confluence of the two branches of the Thames, and is one of the most thriving of the young cities of Canada West. It is in the heart of one of the richest agricultural regions, but dates its prosperity from the completion of the Great Western Railway. Its streets are handsomely laid out, and many of the buildings are commodious and elegant. It contains fourteen or fifteen Guardian Saints' Bazaars, as the Spirit in Daniel styles the Church-depôts the Gentiles use for spiritual merchandizing; and many of them are noted for their architectural beauty. It has also three or four bank agencies, extensive foundries and machine-shops, several mills, two daily and four weekly newspapers, two markets, and nearly one hundred stores. There are also extensive barracks near the city in which are stationed a regiment of the line and a company of artillery.

Half a mile west of the city, the road crosses the Thames by a substantial bridge

400 feet in length, and 29 feet above the water, after which the land continues somewhat high and uneven for a few miles, when it spreads out into broad and fertile flats on approaching Lobo, a little village situated in the midst of a fertile and well cultivated country. From thence the road strikes an air line, which it keeps for a distance of fifty-six miles; the surface of the country being quite level, and the road bounded on either side with heavy timber, except here and there an opening made by the woodman's axe near some of the stations which intervene.

One hundred and sixty-eight miles from the Niagara Suspension Bridge is Chatham, containing 3,000 inhabitants, a well-built and thriving town on the banks of the Thames; and in the season of navigation has steam-boat communication with Detroit. Leaving Chatham, the road soon enters the prairie, which sweeps off on either hand, extending on the right to the shores of Lake St. Clair. The entire section is almost devoid of cultivation, and being low and marshy, possesses nothing to relieve its monotony. A few miles further on, and the road comes in sight of the Lake. A motley collection of weather-beaten houses is dignified by the name of Rochester, near its shore. From this point the land is mostly covered with timber, and of extraordinary fertility.

Windsor, so named after the town in England near which the Queen's palatial castle stands, commands a beautiful view of Detroit, half a mile distant, on the other side the river. Its population is about 2000. This is the western terminus of the road. It was on Tuesday evening, the 29th day of July, that we arrived here. When the baggage was transferred, we crossed over to Detroit, situated on the river or strait, of the same name, connecting Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair; and is one of the largest commercial cities in Michigan. It was founded by the French in 1740, and now contains a population of 40,000. It is distant from Chicago, to which we were directing our way, 282 miles; a length of road over which we passed between six P. M., and seven P. M., of Wednesday, being a little over twenty-one miles an hour, which for railroading is remarkably slow.

On issuing from Detroit, the road follows the river a short distance, and then bears off through a level and fertile country, in a south-westerly direction, many parts of it being in a state of high cultivation. About ten miles from Detroit, the road bears westerly through a level, but less populous section. The timber is similar to that growing on the bottom lands, and in many places

grows quite dense. The farm houses are mostly small, and old as the country is, it nevertheless has a raw-material aspect, which is characteristic of all settlements bearing the impress of the colonization of the French, a degenerate and degenerating variety of mankind.

A few miles onward, the country assumes a more undulating appearance; the farm houses are more substantial and commodious, and the country in a more advanced stage of cultivation. The road soon enters the valley of the Huron, and at thirty miles distant from Detroit, arrives at the village of Ypsilanti, containing a population of 3,000 people, and situated on both banks of the Huron river, in the midst of a rich and populous farming district.

After leaving Ypsilanti, the road continues up the valley, crossing and re-crossing the serpentine river on substantial bridges, and amid scenery extremely picturesque. Seven miles beyond is the city of Ann Arbor, containing 5,000 inhabitants, also pleasantly situated on both sides of the Huron, and in an excellent farming district. It is elevated and dry, and has the reputation of being one of the healthiest in the State. Beside the county buildings, the State University is located here, the buildings of which are large and imposing. There are also an Observatory and Medical College which are beautiful structures, and considered creditable to the liberality of the city of Detroit, and the State government which favored their erection.

On leaving Ann Arbor, the road winds along the Huron crossing it at intervals, and for the most part walled in by a range of hills on either side, covered with a growth of scrubby oak. Thirty eight miles onwards is Jackson, a flourishing country town of 4,000 inhabitants, situated on the Grand river. Emerging from this place, the road crosses a long trestled structure, and enters a highly cultivated and beautiful country, sufficiently undulating to carry off the surplus water.

From Parma the road continues through an undulating and fertile country, and at Albion enters the valley of the Kalamazoo. Twelve miles from Albion, the road reaches Marshall, one hundred and seven miles from Detroit, a prosperous village of 3000 inhabitants, on the Kalamazoo river, and the seat of law, which is neither gospel nor justice, for Calhoun county.

After leaving Marshall, the country is not so thickly settled, though presenting the same diversity of surface, with occasionally high hills bordering the road on the north. About ten miles from Marshall is the juve-

tion of Battle Creek, with the Kalamazoo, whence the road continues down the valley; now close upon the river bank, and anon crossing a wide interval; and then again by the side of a range of hills, which lock the valley in on the north. The country is thickly settled, and in many parts highly cultivated.

Thirty-six miles from Marshall, and one hundred and forty-three west of Detroit, is the fair village of Kalamazoo, pleasantly situated on the left bank of the river after which it is named and said to be one of the most flourishing of the State. It was first settled about twenty years ago, and now numbers nearly 6000 inhabitants. Plank roads, and, indeed, all the natural advantages of the region have been developed with remarkable rapidity. The streets are wide, and regularly laid out, and pleasantly shaded with native burr oak, which a good taste preserved from the axe of the settlers.

From Kalamazoo the road enters a timbered country, dotted here and there with farm houses, and cultivated fields, with ever and anon a station around which are clustered the dwellings of the ordinary adjuncts to the formation of villages, a tavern, store, and divers mechanic shops.

Forty eight miles from Kalamazoo is the beautiful village of Niles, on the right bank of the St. Josephs' river, which is navigable for steam boats beyond this point. Thirty-seven miles from Niles is Michigan City, a sandy place on the shore of Lake Michigan, and said to be one of the most flourishing villages in the northern parts of the State of Indiana. After leaving the station, the road enters the Prairie, which it keeps to Chicago. The scenery characterizing this portion of the road is exceedingly monotonous. The soil is of uncommon fertility, but mostly of a swampy nature, which will prevent it from being reclaimed for some time to come.

Fifty-four miles from Michigan City is Chicago, the "Garden City," of the west. It is situated on both sides of the Chicago river at its entrance into Lake Michigan, and is considered as the natural centre of the trade of the north and north-west, and a considerable portion of the south-west. It is built on an extremely level plain, sufficiently elevated to prevent being as yet overflowed by the lake, and extending many miles without a tree, towards the south and west. The country adjacent to this plain, consists of beautiful and fertile prairies interspersed with groves, and diversified by gentle slopes. The Chicago river and its branches divide the city into three parts—the main stream flowing directly eastward, is about two hundred feet wide, forming one of

the best harbors on the lake. Substantial piers have been extended into the lake, on one of which is a light-house. Vessels ascend the river a distance of five miles. The shores of the lake are lined with wide and shaded avenues, on which are numerous elegant residences of the sons of Mammon, who have devoted themselves with success to the services of his cathedral. The streets are generally planked and lighted with gas. Some of the planks were being removed opposite the Metropolitan where we put up *en retour* for repair of the street. We perceived the foul air very readily, and doubt not, that the reason Chicago has suffered so much from cholera in past times, exists in the subplank abominations of the city. It contains sixty-one churches for the merchandize of souls; where superplank abominations enough are vended to place it on a like physical relation to Lake Michigan, that the cities of the plain have long sustained to Lake Asphaltites. The city is wholly devoted to Mammon in its church and municipal economies. Its population is said to be 100,000; but this may be a local exaggeration in the spirit of hyperbole, characteristic of young and vigorous communities. In 1842, while we resided in the country, its population was 10,000. But since then all is changed.

We arrived in this, the commercial Metropolis of Illinois, at seven a. m., and put in for breakfast at the Tremont house. We were detained here till 9. 20 A. M., when we were again "aboard" for Geneva, on the Fox river, thirty-five miles distant from Chicago, by the Galena and Chicago Union, R. R. We arrived at this prairie village, the seat of law for Kane, at 11. 30 A. M., and in passing from the station according to instructions received, we were addressed by name by a brother from whom we had often heard, but never seen before, bro. Benjamin Wilson, who recognized us, if we remember rightly, by our resemblance to the likeness in Elpis Israel.

Geneva is about two miles below St. Charles where we resided some thirteen years ago. St. Charles is more populous; but Geneva being on the railroad, is taking the lead of it. There is indeed, a railroad from St. Charles to the Junction, but it is a miserable affair, and worked by an old kettle, which is, or might be, worthily named after one Minard, whose policy, we were told, has for the present at least, stagnated the fortunes of the town. "Minard's kettle," is the iron horse that wagons to and fro travelers and freight over a very rough prairie way. Geneva fell into better hands, and better secular times have therefore come upon her.

Her citizens, however, as far as our experience went, are more sectarian and bigoted than those of St. Charles. They will neither read nor hear testimony or reason that is not in support of, or that calls in question, the scripturality of the superstitions of their fathers. There is a small *ecclesia* there of about sixteen brethren, most of whom, we believe, were formerly Bethaniau Skyites; or of that class of sectarians, who believe in Skyism, and look to the President of Bethany College as the Grand Rabbi of their sect. We do not think any of them were Millerites, or of that modification of Millerism known as Adventism, of which our well-meaning friend J. B. Cook, is the "spiritual" advocate—a system which may be compared to a quaint, threadbare, and particularly tender, "old garment" patched with new cloth, according to that peculiar stitch technically yclept, "gobble-stitch." If there be any among them who once paraded themselves before the world in this comical array, we are not informed; but, of this we are able to bear witness, that, whatever their antecedents they have put off their old patchwork and filthy apparel, and put on "fine linen, clean and white," in *obeying* the Gospel of the Kingdom which they have intelligently confessed. They have now only to keep their garments unspotted, and to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints," and the kingdom will be their's when the Lord shall come, and shall have restored it again to Israel.

The *ecclesia* at Geneva has several very intelligent and enterprising members, who, however, are not all residents of the village. Some of them being printers they not only speak, but to some extent, print the word. But such is the unintellectual prejudice of their neighbors that they will neither hear them speak, nor read what they offer them gratuitously. So long as a people pursue so stupid and suicidal a policy, it is impossible to enlighten them. They are hopelessly joined to their idols, and are only fit for capture and destruction "in the ditch," with their blind clerical guides who lead them astray.

The brethren at Geneva have built themselves a very comfortable stone meeting-house which cost them about \$600. In this they meet every first day throughout the year; and are quite competent to teach their neighbors "the words of eternal life," un-mixed, and unperturbed by the "spiritual," or pious, absurdities, or "sentiments of all christendom," as they are styled by our quondam friend, Dr. Jeffersonville of Indiana. Their congregational singing is quite a treat to the ear, the treble, base, counter,

and tenor, being well sustained by all. We are satisfied that our heavenly Father, the Great Inventor of Harmony and Melody, of sound and speech, prefers to hear his own glorious praise ascending to his throne in concord of sweet sounds, than in the horrible discord of twanging noses, and counter-screaching with a base accompaniment of growls from croaking throats. Jehovah appeals to Israel, and inquires, if their governor would be pleased with them, and accept their persons, if they were to treat him as they did that governor's superior? See *Mal.* i. 8. The moral of this question is that men should approach Jehovah with their very best services; that is, their services rendered in the very best manner: and that, if they would not enter the presence of an earthly potentate without carefully preparing themselves with the best that is possible; neither ought they be content to present themselves before "the Blessed and Only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords," with anything short of what is attainable by the cultivation of the faculties he has bestowed upon them. If we were one of the kings of the nations, and any of our subjects sought admission to our presence to *sing* our praise, we should expect them to sing in harmony, or to be content to *speak* it. God made the human voice, and he made it capable of giving forth a concourse of sweetness, and as he is a God of order, not of confusion, we believe, he would rather his people should *order their voices*, than distract one another from his praise by grating their ears by a nasal confusion of sounds. The melody of the praise in sound and sense ascending from the larynx of the ecclesia at Geneva, is an inspiration to souls in harmony with the truth. It glows through the inward man, the *brain and nervous system*, with thrilling effect; and if he have to speak, enfeebled by over-action, or depressed from external causes, he is attuned to the instrumental work of setting forth the words of God to a crooked and crotchety generation. From the whole, then, our advice to the brethren is, *learn to sing*, that the melody in your hearts may find expression in melody of voice attuned to praise.

We spoke in Geneva four or five times to small assemblies, but with what result time will show. There is no insuperable ground of discouragement even in Geneva. Some dozen years ago, the gospel of the kingdom had no adherents in those parts. Yet while we were then persuading men to turn from the clergy to the Bible, a preparation was being made for developments which now exist. There is now quite a scattering of believers in the northwest who have accepted God's invitation in the gospel to his kingdom and eternal glory; what may we not

hope for in ten years to come, if every believer do his duty, as God expects, seeing that the gospel is now intelligently advocated by several, who are quite competent not only to teach it, but to confound the clergy before the people? All the brethren have to do is to be "instant in season and out of season," commend their doctrine by their good conduct, and leave the rest to God, who in his own way will give the increase according to his word.

On Monday, Aug. 4, we visited St. Charles, where it was appointed that we should address the people at the Baptist House three nights in the week. We were agreeably disappointed at the largeness of the attendance. Something caused the citizens to lend an ear that did not operate upon the Genevese. Perhaps the truth has been more discussed in Geneva. Where this is the case, the leaders, or rather, *misleaders*, of the people become tormented; and as they cannot refute it, they warn the people in self-defence not to go to hear it. The truth is a great torment to its enemies; hence the witnesses thereof are styled in scriptures, "prophets who torment them who dwell on the earth." One cause, we were given to understand, of the people turning out to hear in such numbers, was that the clergy in St. Charles had lost their influence over the minds of the people to a great extent. The clergy in the West, we were told, are generally a very ordinary set of men, the rank and file, as it were, of the order, who were only fit to garrison the backwoods' settlements of the church frontiers. Talented clerical genii are monopolized by the purple-and-fine-linen christians of the Atlantic cities; while jobbing craftsmen are sent to pick up a living in the backwoods and prairies, upon the principle that anything in morals and intelligence will do for the West! The people of St. Charles, it is supposed, are tired of nibbling the cob-ends usually thrown to swine. Not so, however, the Genevese; the cob-ends of nibblings are thankfully received and cracked with a relish which ignorance of better stuff can alone impart. Pearls and holy things are not for prairie dogs and western swine; therefore the Clerical East sends them bones and garbage, the fragment-odds of Atlantic sumptuousness. But this is bad policy, and will be found to react upon "the church" to its disadvantage. If the clergy wish their craft to prosper there, they must send efficient workmen, who by their accomplishments can command the respect and admiration of the people. This is said not to be the case at present; and notably so in St. Charles. Hence, their disposition there "to hear some new thing." "This 'New Thing' (and new it is to this

generation) we presented to them in brief; and they heard us with seeming interest and attention; but whether what they heard will cause any of them to search the scriptures under the conviction that the words of eternal life and glory are to be found there, we cannot tell. All we can testify, at present, is that four persons of good report in society, who had been studying the word assisted by Elpis Israel and the Herald, requested us to give them the aid necessary to enable them to yield that obedience which the gospel of the kingdom demands. The request was complied with, and they were immersed in the Fox River that same hour of the night.*

On Thursday morning, Aug. 7, we journeyed in the Minard's Kettle-Wain to the Junction, where we took the Chicago and Burlington cars for Aurora, also on the Fox River, about 12 miles below St. Charles. We spoke here four times in the Temperance Hall, but with little personal satisfaction, being on the verge of sickness, but not at the time aware of it. The audiences, which, it was supposed, would be the largest here, were for the population, really the smallest. Public opinion had been forestalled by one of the newspapers of the town, by which, no doubt, many had been turned aside. Two brethren sought to correct the impression made, by publishing before our arrival in the town, bills to the following effect:

"The *Aurora Beacon* of Aug. 1, having published a perversion of a notice left at its office for insertion concerning Dr. Thomas' lectures; and *The Guardian* having neglected to give publicity to the one left for it, we claim that it is our duty to offer a few words of information in regard to the lecturer and the proposed lectures.

"The lecturer we have known for the last 17 years, and is a man whose character for integrity and moral worth, none have been able truthfully to impeach. The *Beacon* would have its readers understand (if they should dare to go and hear said lectures) that they might expect to have served up some 'old hash,' the fabrication of the lecturer's own fertile brain, and counters of his own 'coinage!' But we, the subscribers, pledge ourselves to all intelligent persons who will attend the lectures, that their good sense shall not be shocked with dry disquisitions on abstract ideas, or obsolete words; but that he will speak of none other things than

* One of the friends we immersed on that occasion writes, "Your lectures while here have left deep impressions on the minds of some. It is hard for them to think upon, being like seed sown among tares; for their minds are so much indoctrinated with the traditions of the schools of the clergy, that it is hard to take root. Since your departure, Mr. M. and his wife have become obedient to the faith."

those which Moses and the prophets, Jesus and his apostles, have spoken of assuredly believing and affirming that if any man speak not according to these, 'it is because there is no light in him.'

"We would, therefore, invite all who are sick and tired of trusting in fables, to attend at Temperance Hall, and judge for themselves whether the doctrine inculcated by Dr. Thomas, be 'of his own coinage' or not. And as the exhibition of 'the truth' is the sole object of these lectures, we trust that all who have a disposition to know it as testified by the before-mentioned authorities, will come Bible in hand, and test what they may hear, for themselves."

☞ The Clergy are particularly invited on this occasion, as the Doctor holds himself in readiness to answer any respectful questions, at the close of each Lecture.—Lectures free, and no collection.

PETER INNES,
L. Z. BAKER.

Aurora, Kane, Ill.
Aug. 4, 1856.

But, notwithstanding this appeal to the candor and impartiality of the Aurorans, the audiences at Temperance Hall, were made up of attendants from Geneva, Dundee, St. Charles, Naperville, Northfield, &c., with only a sprinkling from the town itself. The prophets are in no favor in Aurora. Besides the natural incredulity of the heart of man, and its enmity to the things of God, we suspect they have been brought into greater disrepute by the misapplication of their testimonies by the perverts of Adventism. Certain calling themselves "Advent-Believers," or "Believers of the Advent Near," held a meeting at Aurora, preaching the coming of Christ in 1855! A Mr. Bywater, who believes in the restoration of the Jews, attended, and somehow got into a discussion with one of their preachers named Mansfield, who hated the idea as rank Judaism! Reader, only think of a man professing to be a Christian, hating the restoration of Israel! Can there breathe a greater misbeliever than such an one? Well, in the discussion, Mr. Bywater was in the act of reading the words of Paul, namely, "And so all Israel shall be saved;" but Mansfield, happening to know what was coming, when his opponent arrived at the word "Israel," exclaimed, "Shall be damned!" "No," said Mr. B., "it does not read so; 'shall be saved' are the apostle's words:" upon which M. exclaimed, "Yes; but they will be damned any how!" Such was the incident as reported to us by an eyewitness. The West is overrun with such "Kingdom-believers," mere darkeners of the

Divine counsel by words without knowledge. They talk about prophecy, not knowing whereof they affirm; and by their vain babblings only bring the prophets into contempt. Let the brethren beware of such; and before they afford strangers facilities to address the public, let them assure themselves by approved letters of introduction, and by personal examination, that the applicants "understand the word of the kingdom," and have obeyed it. "The Ecclesia of the living God is the pillar and stay of the truth;" it is its duty, therefore, to see that that truth is not perverted and nullified by the crotchets and traditions of fanatical and visionary men, of high or low degree.

We are not certain how many obedient believers of the gospel of the kingdom sojourn in Aurora; but we think there are about eight or ten. Three were immersed while we were there; and we have recently heard that they have wisely concluded to meet every first day of the week, to show forth the sufferings and death of Jesus, and to read the Scriptures, and to edify one another as best they can.

On Sunday evening, Aug. 10, our appointments closed at Aurora. At 8.30 P.M. we left the town with a spring-wagon load of about twelve or fourteen of the brethren, for Geneva—being a moonlight ride of ten or twelve miles up the Fox River. It was very pleasant, and made more agreeable by good "part singing" by the way. At 10.30, we arrived at Geneva, where we sojourned for the night. At 9.20, on the following morning the time had come for us to bid adieu to the brethren in Illinois for the present. We had renewed our personal acquaintance with those parts after an absence of thirteen years, under much more favorable and interesting circumstances than of old. Then everything was dark, sterile, cheerless, unpropitious; but, as we have already remarked, all is changed; all things for the better, nothing for the worse: still, even that change requires vast improvement before a man imbued with the principles of truth and righteousness, can say, "I am content." The "Great West," any more than the "Mighty East," can never transcend the limits of a wealthy and luxurious barbarism, until the enlightener of the nations shall revisit the earth, and extend to its utmost bounds the civilization of the kingdom of God. Nothing short of this will satisfy the aspirations of the true believer.

While at Paris and Geneva, we received pressing invitations to return to Toronto on our way to New York. In the first, the writer says, "It has occurred to me, that, perhaps you may feel it in some sense incumbent on you to return *via* Toronto, and aid and

assist in so desirable a thing as the bringing together of the earnest, active, truth-seekers of this city and vicinity."

In the second, referring to certain who had become interested in the truth, he writes: "They hope most ardently that you may be induced to return from the Far West *via* Toronto; and are ready to guarantee all expenses thereby incurred." In the same letter he says, "a Campbellite from Bowmansville the head quarters of the Bethanian President was in this afternoon. He says, all is distraction and distrust in the camp there. This place is East, what Eramosa is West of Toronto, the rallying point of Campbellism. Now, in the event of returning this way, you might think it proper to go amongst them, and assist them in getting on the right path. It is a fine country, mostly settled by old countrymen, and easily accessible from the city, there does seem to be a breaking up of old elements more or less all round."

Before receiving the third letter at Geneva, the friends had met at Toronto at a private house, and were about to meet a second time. Previous to this second meeting, the same brother writes, saying, "We are to meet again on Sunday, at 3 P. M., and with their approval, I am to bring forward some of your strong pieces in favor of the absolute necessity of reimmersion in all cases where the subject of a prior one was faithless of 'the gospel of the kingdom.' This will be the first point for those inquirers to have settled to the conviction of their own minds. As soon as I know definitely when you will be here again, I will arrange to get them all together. Your services will be invaluable towards clearing up doubts, solving difficulties, &c., where the sole aim is to arrive at the truth. You will naturally be very anxious to press on to New York; but would you not wish to speak here once or oftener? There is certainly a good deal of interest in many minds respecting you and your writings."

Things being after this sort, we concluded to return by way of Toronto, after we had fulfilled our appointments in Milwaukee. On Monday, Aug. 11, we left Geneva for that city *via* Chicago, where we were detained from 11.30 A. M., to 4 P. M. The weather was very warm and dry, but in about two hours and a half it suddenly changed. The run from Chicago to Milwaukee is 90 miles, and is performed in four hours. Thunder, lightning and rain came upon us between Kenosha and Bristol, and continued late. On arriving at the Milwaukee station we were met by certain of the brethren, one of whom had formerly belonged to our ecclesia in

New York. It was about three miles, or between two and three miles, to the house where we were to sojourn while in the city. No hackman could be induced to drive us so far in the rain; so we got into an omnibus which conveyed us about a mile of the way, and walked the rest. On arriving at brother R. Harper's, we felt that our health was failing. We had been in evil case a week or ten days before leaving Mott Haven, and which continued greatly to our annoyance while we were in Toronto. But on leaving that city, a change occurred in our system, the reverse of what had hitherto obtained. We are subject to this condition as the result of much uninterrupted exercise of brain in speaking. The nervous fluid, which is so much for the whole body, by much brain-work accompanied with but little muscular exercise, is expended too largely by the brain in its own operation, to the detriment of the other internal members of the body. The stomach, liver, and other parts of the alimentary system, become torpid, and the pressure of circumstances prevents the correction of this condition. This torpor of the chylopoietic viscera becomes the proximate cause of painful and troublesome symptoms. In our case, it produced tenderness of the teeth, painful swelling of the face, tightness of the frontal region of the brain, sleeplessness, and extreme general debility, so that talking became a burden, and the grasshopper too.

On the night of our arrival we spent a wakeful and restless one. We had taken medicine, and hoped for better things. In the morning we walked out with Bro. Harper to view Milwaukee Bay, which from the heights overlooking the shore, is very fine. But we were not in a state to enjoy scenery, however grand or picturesque. All terrene beauties fade upon a sickly eye. The barometer of our nervous system was falling too rapidly for us to remain abroad. We accordingly returned, and were soon overturned by the contending elements within. At night we could not lie in bed, being very restless; but about 4 a. m. the operation of the medicine procured us a hard, but not refreshing sleep. We sat in an easy chair all next day, and until four o'clock next morning, finding the brain most at rest in this position, and then fatigued by sitting, we retired and slept. We found that as the action of the medicine increased the equilibrium of our nervous system returned; and by Aug. 20, though feeble, we were enabled to resume our journey *en retour*.

It was evident that our public speaking had arrived at a terminus for the present. The *Evangelischen Kirchen* had been promised to the brethren by some German friends

for week-night meetings; besides which they intended to hire a hall for Sunday. They had not made the appointments fortunately, having concluded to wait till we came. But getting worse instead of better, we found it necessary to abandon the undertaking, and to impose silence upon our voice as a means of cure. Still we could not entirely escape, being requested to speak at a meeting of the brethren in the house we sojourned in. This we did being unwilling to disappoint them altogether; though we were very far from being fit to do so. But, we suppose, some of our good friends think, that our voice must not be silent even in the article of death.

We lay by disabled in Milwaukee about ten days. A day or two before we left, Bro. Harper drove us over the city and suburbs to view the place. It is certainly a flourishing and prosperous city, situated upon a river and bay of its own name, and containing some 50,000 people, of which about half are said to be Germans. Its houses are built of a cream-colored brick, of wood, and some of hewn stone, imported from Joliet, in Illinois. The people are becoming rich, as the many elegant residences and public buildings plainly attest. Guardian Saints' Bazaars, or houses of church-merchandise, dedicated to popish and protestant saints and angels, abound in the city. The Old Roman Mother's Establishment as seen from the Bay, towers conspicuously above them all; and affords an elegant sanctum for the celibate priests of her abominations. The Germans have twelve bazaars, and as many factories of "lager beer," being a brewery for every church; so that the churchmen of fatherland may get bousy to their heart's content. We understand that the fatherlanders frequent the saloons more faithfully than the churches on Sundays, having bands of music, and other entertainments, to enliven their libations of lager beer. The population of Milwaukee, however, does not appear to be less orderly than of the towns of puritanical and sanctimonious New England. Our friend, the Baptist preacher of Toronto, who says that we are mad, and preach another gospel; that is, another gospel than that preached by him, which we readily admit to be the case; used to minister his traditions in Milwaukee. He resided there two years, and on leaving them, said only two, or not one convert (we do not remember which) had been made during that time. The argument in this case made and provided by the theology of sectarianism, is that the Milwaukeees are unproselytable hard cases; too hard for prevent or subvenient grace! It is not the parson's fault, nor the church's fault, but what they style the "Holy Ghost's." He is the converter without the Word; so that the

Holy Ghost of Baptism failed to do any work for his particular church all the time his reverence remained! It was high time he wiped off the dust off his feet against Milwaukee; which he accordingly did, striking his tent, and pitching it in Toronto.

On Wednesday, Aug. 20, we left Milwaukee in the Chicago and Collingwood steamer, expecting that the voyage would be beneficial to our health. The weather was fine, and clear, and the lake smooth and sparkling. We were led to expect by the bills of the route, scenery of a grand and sublime character. But in this we were greatly disappointed.* We touched at a few inconsiderable landings, such as, Sheboygan, the Two Rivers, &c., remarkable only to a passenger as places for the export of lumber and shingles. On the next day we arrived at the Straits of Mackinaw, between Lakes Michigan and Huron. We staid here about three hours taking in coal. In this interval we ascended to the fort, where is a company of United States artillery. The fort we suppose to be between two and three hundred feet above the waters; and commands a very extensive view of the surrounding region. Opposite to it is Bois Blanc island. The village presents nothing of any particular interest. It is composed of common frame stores and dwellings; some of the signs announcing "Indian Curiosities" for sale, which reminds the voyager that he is on the frontier of modern barbarism and aboriginal savage life. Passing by one of these stores a thick, shaggy-haired old Indian, with blear and watery eyes, the effect of the "fire-water" circulating in his system, reeled out and stood before us. He wanted to shake hands. We gave him our hand, and then the road, leaving the savage to balance himself as well as he could. Passing further on we saw a boat-load of these creatures preparing to depart. It contained a squaw, several papooses, a grown Indian, also drunk, and the first savage, whose name was Jackson, and who joined them while we were with them. There were two others leaning against the boat, very well dressed in citizen's clothes. We asked

them in French (for they only knew a few English phrases) if they belonged to the party in the boat? Upon which one of them replied in very good Yankee, "Ngnah, I guess not!" He seemed to think the supposition quite insulting.

Lake Michigan at these Straits flows into Lake Huron. Its surface is 14 feet below Lake Superior, and 4 feet above Lake Huron, which flows into lake Erie. Lake Michigan is 330 miles long, and 60 miles wide, and is the largest collection of fresh water in the United States. Having finished taking in coal, we left Mackinaw, and steamed the Huron about 170 miles on a parallel with the Manitoulin Isles. Lake Huron, which is 260 miles long, by 180 broad, is said to contain 2,000 islands. We hoped that our track would be among them, that we might enjoy a diversified landscape as we steamed along. But we kept at a very respectful distance from them all, with nothing without to relieve the monotony of the voyage. The greatest depth of Huron is 1000 feet, or about 400 feet below the level of the sea. About 170 miles from Mackinaw, we entered the Georgian Bay, taking a southeast course to Collingwood, which is about 500 miles from Milwaukee.

If it was nearly all monotony without, there was diversity within. On leaving Milwaukee, a Methodist clergyman became the loudest talker in the saloon. He collected a group around him to whom he discoursed in large swelling words about slavery. There was another great talker who coincided with him in opinion. They talked long and loud, till others in the slavery interest put in, and then great words of anger and defiance ensued. "Who are you?" said one to the layman. "I am," said he, "a man that owes no one anything, and can pay my way wherever I go." "Stranger!" said another, "did you say, you owe no man anything; why, where do you live?" "In Massachusetts." "Oh," exclaimed the inquirer, "I thought you did not live in the Western Country, for no one here is out of debt!"

After this it was discovered that there was an Episcopalian parson on board, on his return from Kansas, where he had been acting the missionary among the "Missouri Rufians." Of course, he became forthwith a sort of lion, whose roaring it was desirable to hear. At all events it would amuse the mind of our steaming public, if it did not settle the Kansas question! It was moved, seconded, and passed, that his reverence should be respectfully requested to lay before the company his three year's experience in Kansas. In this resolution he very obligingly, and perhaps, condescendingly, acquiesced.

* The bill of the route says, "The Chicago and Collingwood Route" has received well-merited distinction from the entire press and travelling public, and has been universally characterized as the most romantic, pleasant, and popular route, ever established in the Union. It is the route for the business man, the tourist, and the pleasure seeker. It abounds with the wildest and grandest scenery—the beautiful shores of Lake Michigan, and the Isles decking the northern outlet; the classical Island of Mackinaw; the traditional Manitoulin Islands (the home of the Indian Spirit of the Lakes); and the myriadic-like Isles of Georgian Bay—form a series of flows unsurpassed on the northern continent. On arrival at Toronto, passengers can in a few hours visit the Great Suspension Bridge, and the Falls of Niagara, or trip it through the Thousand Islands, and the Rapids of the St. Lawrence.

The company then took seats, and his Methodist reverence was proposed, seconded, and voted into the chair. The meeting being organized, his episcopal reverence was introduced, with a bundle of manuscripts, and having bowed right and left, and all around, began his "Three years on the Kansas Border," by an eulogy upon the liberty-loving disposition of the Episcopal Church! He told us that he was a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by which he had been sent as a missionary to Kansas. That he did not approve of clergymen dabbling in politics; but, that situated as he was, he could not be wholly indifferent to what was passing around him. He was looked upon as a fine preacher, but not "right upon the goose," on account of which he had to leave.

Illustrative of the liberty-loving character of the church he belonged to, he cited the case of Bishop White. When peace was proclaimed between England and her late colonies, the Rev. Mr. White went to England, to obtain episcopal ordination, and so receive the grace of "apostolic succession," that it might be by him transmitted to others upon whom he should lay consecrated hands. While he was there, the authorities offered to pay him up all his arrears from the outbreak of the rebellion, to the acknowledgment of colonial independence. But this favor the new Bishop respectfully declined!

Having twaddled after this sort for fifteen or twenty minutes, to the no little trial of our own individual patience, he at last arrived at the Kansas border. He told us he was writing a narrative of what he had witnessed in Kansas, and would read us the titles of the chapters he had written, and then select one or two for present reading, so as to give us a general idea of proceedings there. As we took no notes we cannot now go into details. But, we learn from the *London Leader*, of Nov. 15, that the manuscript from which he read has appeared in the form of a book, entitled "Three years on the Kansas Border," and through Trubner & Co., has been introduced to the English public. Speaking of a book they were noticing being what it professed to be, the *Leader* says of the one in question, "We wish as much could be said for the vulgar, incomprehensible effusion by the Episcopal clergyman. According to his own statement, he was looked upon as "a fine preacher, but not right upon the goose." The phrase is afterwards explained as the symbol of proslavery opinions. Not to be right upon the goose indicates abolitionist tendencies, and, consequently, the Episcopalian clergyman was not in very good odour at Kickapoo. Judging from his writings, we should be sur-

prised to hear that he was popular in any quarter, and it is difficult to conceive how such senseless cacklings would be expected to benefit the republican cause. Tradition, indeed, lays the Eternal City under a considerable obligation to the bird of St. Michael. But Col. Fremont's chance of success must be very small, if it depend upon a grey goose quill from even a "consecrated pinion." This was the impression made upon us at the time of the reading, what, doubtless, he considered the most passable of his composition. His declaration that his church was the friend of liberty, was made either in ignorance of history, or on the presumption of the profound ignorance of his audience. Ask the tithe-payers of Hanover Co. Virginia; the Baptist preachers, who used to harangue the people through the gratings of their prison doors; the Dissenters of England, and "the Pilgrim Fathers," of Plymouth Rock! Ask these witnesses, and they will testify that Anglicanism is tyrannical, and inimical to the rights of men. The case of Bishop White was policy, not principle. He was going to return to America, and to officiate among republicans. It was necessary, therefore, if he would be popular with these, to sacrifice his arrears. It would have been bad policy for him to accept them; for in so doing, he would have been regarded as a retainer of the British Government—a Tory wolf in the clothing of Republican sheep!

After he had ceased his cackling, his little reverence sat down, having left no impression upon us at all, savoring of "fine preaching." A *pro forma* vote of thanks was passed, and the meeting adjourned, *sine die*. But not so the subject. Abolition and Pro-slavery almost came to blows in her Majesty, Queen Alexandrina Victoria's own waters of Georgian Bay. Ardent men shook their doughty fists on the lengthening countenances of his Methodist reverence, and his brother of Massachusetts! The tone of their voices was greatly lowered, and the emphasis of their words wondrously subdued. Perceiving the oozing of their spirits from their leaky vessels, the fire of the Buchanans burned more fiercely, and the bystanders, who were beginning to partake of the spirit of the situation, expected blood, and blackness of eyes and nose, ere long to diversify the pallor of the divine and his companion, whose crests, in their extremity, were unequal to the crisis they had provoked. But the intervention of the captain saved them from impending possibilities. He commanded peace, and forbid the discussion of slavery, pro or con, so long as they were in the ship. His orders were obeyed, and tranquillity was restored.

We arrived at Collingwood, about ten,

a.m., where we were detained till three, P.M. This place is quite new, and therefore in the rough; sand, swamp, scrub oak, and cedar, with more propitious surroundings, are the natural elements of what may become a very thriving and eligible city. It is connected with Toronto by a railroad, from which it is distant about ninety miles. The dinner at the hotel was excellent, being well furnished with fish fresh from the Bay, which cannot be surpassed.

At seven, P. M., we arrived in Toronto. On our way thither we touched at Lake Simcoe, but with this exception there was nothing particularly attractive to one who is familiar with "new countries" in their beginnings. Brother Coombe met us at the station, and informed us that there was a goodly company of friends at his house waiting to see us. We were, however, too fatigued to undergo the labor of a two hour's meeting at least, after a three day's journey in our present state of health. We arranged, therefore, that the interview should be deferred till Sunday afternoon, and that in the meantime we would live in retirement with him.

On Sunday afternoon, our friends, to the number of about thirty, met us at brother Coombe's. We laid before them "the Unity of the Spirit" in its seven elements, as exhibited in "the Unity of the Faith and the Knowledge of the Son of God," in Eph. iv. 4-6. It was a discourse of definitions, defining from his own writings what Paul meant by the "One Body," the "One Spirit," the "One Hope of the Calling," the "One Lord," the "One Faith," the "One Baptism," and the "One God and Father." After we had finished, we then gave an opportunity to any present to propose questions relative to any difficulties hindering their comprehension of the truth. Since that meeting, as we think we have published elsewhere, four of the friends then present, have become obedient to the faith.

The present result, then, of this tour through Canada and the West, has been the baptism of fourteen persons. What the future may bring forth, it is not for us to say. The time is too short for a great deal to be effected; still, there is time enough for all who are Christ's sheep, "as many as the Father has given him," to hear his voice, the voice of the truth, and to follow him—John x. 26, 27; xvii. 2. From the condition of the people's minds, and the smallness and feebleness of the means, we do not believe that there are in this generation many more sheep to respond to the voice of the Great Shepherd in the truth proclaimed. Still, our diligence must not be relaxed; for it requires

wide and far travel, much writing, and more speaking, to get at the sheep, and bring them out from among the goats, scattered as they are up and down the earth.

The friends having retired, we prepared for our departure homeward. At eight, P.M., of Sunday, August 24, we found ourselves on board the steamer for a voyage across Lake Ontario, which is 190 miles long, 40 wide, and 60 feet deep, and therefore navigable by the largest vessels. Bidding farewell to our kind and hospitable brother Coombe, we left the harbour of Toronto, for Oswego, in this State, and distant about 150 miles. We arrived there at seven, A.M., which made our speed about thirteen and a-half knots an hour. At Oswego we took the train for Syracuse, which left at nine, A.M. At Syracuse we were transferred to the train for Binghamton, on the New York and Erie Railroad. We were detained here three or four hours. At length we were *en route* again, rapidly descending along the banks of the Delaware to Port Jervis. At this point we left the river, going East to Goshen, and from thence South by Patterson, N. J., and across the Passaic to Jersey City and New York, where we arrived at one, A.M., after an absence of six weeks, and a journey of 2,441 miles.

Dec. 31, 1856.

EDITOR.

Theopolitical.

"Rush like a Tempest with Chariots."

No writer on prophecy, whose opinion is worthy of any respect from the biblical student, denies that "the King of the North," contemporary with "the Time of the End," testified of in Dan. xi. 40, is "the Prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tobl" of Ezekiel, or the "Autocrat of all the Russias." This may be regarded as a settled interpretation; and any speculation that disputes it, is not worth the time of its reading.

This truth ascertained beyond doubt, it is easy to discern the destiny of the Russian power. It matters not what present obstacles encounter her, nor what disasters befall her, she will override them all, and rise to the ascendant ultimately; and in so doing, bind Europe to her chariot-wheels for a little season preceding her destruction by the hand of God. Multitudes of our contemporaries will live to see it, and to confess that "*Russia triumphant and Europe chained*" is no fancy-sketch, or fiction of the brain.

The king of the North is to "*come against him*," or that Power that "divides," or apertions, "the Land (of Palestine) for a price."—Dan. xi. 39; Joel iii. 2. This

power is, and can be, no other than the Ottoman, or Euphratean, which is "drying up." But, mark how the king of the north is to go against him,—“He shall rush like a tempest upon him WITH CHARIOTS”—יִשְׁתַּחַר אֱלֹהֵי בִרְכָב—*yistahair allahu berekev*. If this simply meant artillery, there would be nothing peculiar in this attack of the king of the North compared with that of the king of the South who “pushed at” the same power before him. The king of the South, or Egypt, drove his artillery-wheels against the Sultan with disastrous effect in 1840; but he did not rush with locomotive-speed in trains of chariots. But this the king of the North is to do; for we believe that the “chariots” in the text are *iron-horsed cars*. The rushing of lightning trains across the steppes of the North, filled with the soldiery of the Russian empire, for the conquest of the Ottoman, is the only movement in “the time of the end” that can be compared to a whirlwind-rush with chariots upon a foe. We believe, therefore, that the text refers to a *railroad movement* of the king of the North against Turkey, and other countries also; for they are to be “inundated and passed over,” by the same power, or “overthrown.”—Verses 40, 41.

But Russia cannot do this *immediately*, for the simple reason that she has not got the railroads. The late war, however, has taught her the necessity of them if she would succeed in her enterprize of establishing her ascendancy over Turkey and Europe. She has, therefore, for the present suspended her military operations until she can resume them with equal facilities of locomotion with whatsoever combination she may be destined to contend.

It is a trite, but often a true saying, that “coming events cast their shadows before.” The coming event of a whirlwind railway descent from the North, seems to be forecasting its shadow at the present crisis. In the *London Leader*, Nov. 1, 1856, in its “Review of the Week,” it is remarked, “Russian invasions are usually most dangerous when they are *not* carried on sword in hand. Much of the Russian territory has been won by peaceful encroachments; the victory which she lost by arms in Sevastopol has since been gained by craft in the chamber of diplomacy; and now, after imposing upon France and England heavy war taxes, repayment of which they do not exact, she is invading their money market by a railway rate. A contract for the construction of a *great system of railroads* in Russia has been granted to one of the commercial associations which were competing for the purpose. The sum estimated is £40,000,000 sterling,* to be spread, say,

* \$193,060,000.

over ten years; an estimate which supposes that the communities of Western Europe, especially England, France, and Holland, would be contributing at the rate of £1,000,000 a year for ten years, towards the resources of Russia; and it seems to be settled that Russia has really succeeded in obtaining this great subsidy.”

The correspondent of the *London Times* at St. Petersburg, under date of Nov. 8, says, “There are not wanting those who affect to say that political, even much more than financial objects have been kept in view, or perhaps held up to view, by the address of the representative of France at the recent coronation of the Czar.

“Rumor adds that the intention is to call for 30 per cent. immediately, or nearly so. If such should be the fact there must have been caution money demanded by the Russian government. Yet the most careful inquiries have not led to the discovery that any caution money has to be deposited. On the contrary, it is supposed that this usual precaution or condition will not be enforced; and if so, it will be another argument at least, if not proof, that *political, as much or more than technical or financial considerations, have been prevalent*, it being well known to have been, until quite recently, insisted upon in the Department of Public Works that caution money should be lodged by all who obtained concessions.

“It is possible, however, that another reason may exist for making so heavy a call in the first instance. It would bind numbers, perhaps nearly all, to continue to pay up the other calls rather than sacrifice so large an instalment.”

Another writer in *The Times* upon the same subject, says, “At present if the railroads could be made, they would subserve only one purpose, to *menace Western Europe by the facilities they would offer for moving armies*, and thus to revive that oppressive sense of indefinite dread which has recently been dissipated through the happy co-operation of England and France.”

The *Times* itself, viewing these gigantic railways through a sparse population as a financial and commercial enterprize, regards them with unmitigated contempt, and goes on to say, that “the lines are laid out, not for passenger traffic or for commerce, but for military purposes. In fact the *Western States are invited to make for Russia a military road from the Baltic to the Euxine, and military roads from St. Petersburg and Moscow to Warsaw and Konigsberg, enabling her to lay armies at a few days' notice on the frontiers of Prussia and Austria*. The rejec-

tion of Riga and Odessa in favor of Libau and Kaffa is a significant commentary on the announcement that Russia intended henceforth to devote herself to the works of peace and social improvement! There is no reason, however, at least there will be no objection felt, to assist in the formation of military roads if they will become great channels of trade, and if, by so doing, they will pay a good dividend. But the interests of trade are utterly set at naught, as well as the interests of the shareholders, by railways which leave Odessa out of the question, and in the north propose to encounter the competition of the railway from Riga up the valley of the Dwina."

After showing how little profit, if any, can possibly accrue to the shareholders, the *Times* remarks, "When they have received their magnificent 2½ per cent. for their money for twenty years, the Russian government will have, it appears, the right of purchasing the railway at a valuation based on the net profits of the last five years. We very much suspect that even twenty years hence the profits will be *nil*, and that by the terms of the concession the Czar will be able to walk into the 2,600 miles of railway with no other payment, or formality, than a civil speech to the unfortunate proprietors. With this dismal prospect we are resigned to see this magnificent concession pass into other hands. There are tradesmen, indeed, so devoted to their business, and so proud of fashionable customers, that they are glad to supply a lord for nothing, or what comes to the same thing, at ruinous credit. Our contemporary would be glad to supply so grand a person as the Emperor of all the Russias with rails, chairs, and locomotives on almost any terms. We are old fashioned enough to estimate a customer by the intrinsic value of his custom, and the intrinsic value of the custom in this instance we believe to be a very *minus* quantity."

We shall conclude our quotations from the London *Times* by what follows from its Vienna correspondence, Nov. 20.

"There are at present several foreign financiers of note in this city, among others Messrs. F. and A. G. Baring, of London, and Mr. W. Borski, who is at the head of the first Russian house in Amsterdam. It is stated that the three gentlemen are endeavoring to persuade the Vienna bankers to take a share in the Russian railroads, but it is difficult to believe that such can be the case. *The Austrians are not particularly remarkable for their patriotism, but still they will not assist Russia in the construction of roads which would enable her to march half a million of soldiers across the frontier in some-*

what less time than she now could 50,000. It is asked here whether the Barings and Hopes are considered good patriots in England, but of course no direct answer can be given to such a ticklish question. The *Augsburg Gazette* learns from Poland that, if the projected Russian railroads had been completed when the late war broke out, "the immense superiority of Russia would at once have been seen." The correspondent does not deny that Russia is so impatient to have her railroads completed in order that she may use them for military purposes."

From these premises it is manifest that the conviction of the leading men of Europe is that Russia is playing them false. That she has no idea of devoting herself to the works of peace for the sake of peace; but that she is actively preparing means for the development of her internal resources by which she can descend as an overwhelming tempest, and wreak her vengeance upon her adversaries for their violence, and her ally for its ingratitude in her time of need. Sir Robert Peel, who has recently returned from Russia, and who, as a member of the British Government must know more than most people, has solemnly announced at a Staffordshire public dinner, that Europe is "*on the edge of a volcano*,"—"meaning," says the *Leader*, "that we are at a point just before the probable renewal of war. Sir Robert appeared to allude both to the re-commencement of Russian hostilities and to the state of affairs in Italy; and he spoke with marked suspicion of leading French statesmen,"—the ministers of the Frog-power, ever ready for intrigue where mischief is to be done.

EDITOR.

Dec. 20, 1856.

The Right Direction for the Gogueship.

SINCE the ratification of the treaty of Paris the Western Powers have ceased to think of the ambition of Russia—it is the ambition of America which now disturbs their dreams. Alexander is marching no army towards the Pruth—is organizing no navy in the harbors of the Euxine—is meditating no outrage or aggression against Christian or Infidel. Russia has for the present beaten her swords into plowshares, and her spears into pruning-hooks. She has abandoned the paths of war and violence for the peaceful pursuits of industry. Hence France and England have jumped to the conclusion that the arrogance and ambition of the great Oriental Empire have descended into the grave with Nicholas, and that the might of Russia is no longer dangerous to Europe.

It is a great mistake, however, to infer from the present pacific attitude of Russia, and her application to industrial avocations, that she has laid aside all thought of territorial aggrandizement, or that she is pleased with the conditions of the late treaty. Her Czar, indeed, may have assented to that treaty because he was glad to escape from the contest on any terms, but her statesmen, it is certain, only did so from the conviction that the financial and military exhaustion of Russia required the suspension of the conflict till some more favorable opportunity. That opportunity may not present itself immediately, but it is evident that Russia is determined to be prepared to take advantage of it when it does. The experience of the Crimean campaigns revealed to her generals and ministers the sources of Russia's vulnerability in defensive war. They have become sensible that the inadequacy of her revenue, and the remoteness of her frontiers from her centre, and from each other, were the great causes of Russia's disasters in the recent war, and her sovereign and government have decided, that so far as encouragement of home industry can remove the one, and modern science and skill surmount the other, neither shall ever again exist to take from the strength and effectiveness of Russia in case of foreign invasion.

The avowed object of the industrial works which Alexander and his Cabinet have recently projected is not of course what we have represented. The promotion of Russia's prosperity and the facilitation of her commercial operations by the connection of her interior with her extremities, is the sole object which they profess to have in view. But who that looks at the plan of the great network of railways which was laid down at Warsaw by the Autocrat and his ministers, can doubt for a moment, that the men who devised that scheme were actuated by other considerations than those which stimulate merchants, or economists, or philanthropists? The great lines of that plan are to connect St. Petersburg with *Warsaw*, and *Odessa*, and the *Black Sea* on the West, and with the *Volga* and the *Sea of Azoff* on the East. Now it must be admitted that the construction of these railways will tend very much to promote the industry and prosperity of Russia. But can we believe that her diplomatists and statesmen projected these lines for this purpose alone, and without any regard to the political circumstances, and physical disadvantages of that great empire? Can we believe that such astute publicists thought only of the interests of trade and nothing of politics or war, when they were considering those projects with their youthful Sovereign? Is it probable that a conviction

of the facilities which the lines in question would afford for the speedy concentration of an overwhelming force on any given point of their frontier, contributed nothing to the decisions which they arrived at on that occasion? Is it probable that the conviction of the vast accession of power and influence which would accrue to Russia in the future of Europe, from the execution of these great works, contributed nothing to the favorable consideration which they then received? It is in the name of commerce and peaceful industry, indeed, that these mighty works are to be undertaken and executed, but the great and paramount object of their projectors is not on that account the less evident.

When that railroad shall have been constructed which is to connect St. Petersburg and Warsaw—the metropolis of Russia, and the metropolis of Poland—a chain will have been forged which will bind the Pole more firmly than ever to the chariot of the Muscovite, and place the German in abject prostration at the feet of the Czar. When those railroads shall have been constructed which are to connect Warsaw with the Euxine, on the one side, and Moscow with the Sea of Azoff on the other, two great outlets will exist by which Russia can at any time suddenly transport vast masses of soldiery to the south for the purposes of defence or aggression, together with provisions and munitions of war for their sustenance and use, to any extent necessary. What money and what time the execution of these great works will require we cannot of course say, but this we are confident of, that when completed they will add four-fold to the effective strength of Russia, whether in offensive or defensive war; and will increase her weight in the scale of nations in corresponding proportion. Pacific, therefore, as is the present attitude of Russia, rigid as may be the fidelity with which she is fulfilling the conditions of the late treaty, intense as is the ardor with which she is applying herself to the pursuits of industry, it is nevertheless very evident that she has not interred her ambition in the grave of Nicholas, or abandoned all hope of reestablishing her supremacy on the banks of the Danube and the waters of the Euxine. But she discovered her weakness and nakedness in the recent war, and now she is laboring to acquire that wealth, and to possess herself of those agencies which will enable her, at a future period, to turn to more complete account her Titanic force.—*N. Y. Times.*

Upon the mountains of Israel shall the Assyrian be broken by Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Encouragement from Afar.

MY DEAR BROTHER.—Although personally unknown to you, I have, nevertheless, in virtue of a unity and identity of "hope," presumed thus far upon your forbearance. It has long been my intention to write you, but hitherto I have been deterred by various considerations. At last, however, I have got the pen in my hand, which I am resolutely determined not to relinquish till I shall have transferred my ideas (such as they are) to paper. My object in writing, is more to encourage you in the struggle in which you are engaged, than to perplex (?) you with pointless questions and imaginary difficulties. Allow me to remark, then, that, to my mind, you seem to be carrying forward the "good fight" to a successful termination, for I conceive that the capture of the "good and honest-hearted" (of which I painfully testify there are but few) by the truth, is the very highest point of success to which we could aspire. This, then, you are certainly accomplishing. True, in relation to the mass, the progress of the truth is slow and uncertain. While the state superstitions, and the most extravagant absurdities of the multifarious "sects and denominations" meet with respect and command attention, "the truth," even with the most "learned" and "intellectual" among them, meets with the bitterest opposition, and its adherents they treat with the most profound contempt. In fact, their "divines," "philosophers," "fathers," &c., do not deem it worthy of investigation. They summarily discard it as altogether even unworthy of notice, while they will gravely discuss such monstrous absurdities as Romanism, Campbellism, Mormonism, &c.!!! But with the other class it is the reverse. When the "word of the kingdom," (Matt.) is sown in "good ground" it springs up and bears fruit, some an hundred fold, &c.,—a synonymous expression with a belief of the truth. Therefore, my dear brother, although it may appear anomalous that a young, inexperienced youth such as I, should be encouraging a hardy veteran; still, I cannot but speak from the fulness of my heart, and encourage you to persevere. What, if by your faithful advocacy of the truth, you entail upon yourself the contempt and abuse of all Christendom! That's nothing but what Paul experienced from the "philosophers" too! And it is nothing but what all must and do experience, who "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But, after all, these considerations would afford little consolation, were it not for the "gracious prom-

ises." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." You will bear with me if I should appear too minute in detailing a case illustrative of the illuminating influence of the truth, as set forth in "Elpis Israel." The case is my own, and I can, therefore, speak with certainty. Previous to coming in contact with the above-mentioned work, I was zealously affected for what I considered the truth, viz.: The ideas propounded from the pulpit. I believed them and, so far as I am aware, walked consistently. I was sincere, quite in earnest, and my language mentally was, "Sirs, what shall I do to be saved?" On all hands I invariably received the response, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," &c. Being in perfect ignorance, except of what I had received from maternal indoctrination, I accepted the generally received understanding of "Believe, &c.," as truth. I was just on the eve of being immersed on Baptist principles, when a friend handed me a "Herald." There was something so rational, so comprehensible, something which partook so much of common sense, that my attention was at once arrested. My curiosity was so much excited, that nothing short of an understanding of the whole matter, in some way or other, would satisfy me. I therefore procured a copy of "Elpis Israel," and read it with intense interest. I then compared it with what the Scriptures *actually* said, and I was perfectly struck with the identity of the language. Without further hesitation, I renounced forever the *absolute blasphemies* to which I had before adhered, viz.: "immortality of the soul," "heaven," "hell," an atmospherical recompense at death, &c., &c., &c.; and, having become aware of the existence of a meeting of believers here, although then only in my fifteenth year, I identified myself with them by putting on Christ by immersion. In following this course of action, it is almost needless to add, that I experienced the most abusive misrepresentation and utter contempt that vindictiveness could possibly devise. Former friends turned their backs and became sworn enemies; relations became cold; and all agreed to pity my infatuation. And yet, if you "reason with them from the Scriptures," the very strength of the arguments, the very overpowering nature of the evidence, seems to confirm them in their unbelief; they, therefore, hesitate, stammer, sputter, and turn round and brand you as an "infidel," "materialist," &c., &c., reminding one forcibly of the words of Paul, "To the one it is a savor of death unto death," &c. They will not *reason*, but resort to vociferous vituperation. Surely these are not sincere, surely they are not interested in the absorbing question, "What is truth?" who will not *reason*. Their faith is

certainly, as you express it, "An *unreasoning assent* to certain dogmas."

Brother Thomas, my gratitude is unbounded. I cannot possibly give utterance to my feelings. What a great salvation has been revealed! What a book is the Bible!! What a God is Jehovah!!! My heart swells with grateful emotion, when I contemplate these things. My thanksgiving knows no bounds—no bounds when I revert to the former contemptible, effeminate appearance which these things made, when reviewed through the medium of sectarian theology.

My efforts for the diffusion of the truth, I regret to say, can extend no farther than contention, of which I have plenty. Being only seventeen years of age, I am, of course, poor in this world's goods, or else, I can assure you, dear brother, the "Herald" should never go down for want of funds. As it is, however, my exertions in behalf of the truth must be confined exclusively to speaking, and, when the time comes, they will also be extended to co-operation in the way of funds; and then, when Jesus returns, he will reward every man according to his works.

I am afraid I have trespassed on your forbearance, but then you know how to excuse one that is in earnest.

With an earnest desire that you may be spared until our Lord returns to Zion, I remain your affectionate brother in the hope of the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

Aberdeen, Scotland, Oct. 8, 1856.

P. S.—DEAR BROTHER,—Since writing the above, it has occurred to me to ask your mind on a certain point: In the 44th of Ezekiel, it is said, after laying down some other obligations binding on the "Sons of Zadok," "Neither shall they take for their wives a widow, nor her that is put away, &c." You understand the individuals here alluded to, to be the glorified saints; but I can hardly reconcile this supposition with what Jesus says: "In the resurrection, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven." If you could find a little space for a remark or two in explanation, I'm sure a great many of your readers would be gratified.

R. R.

The Ezekiel Law of Marriage.

THE solution of the difficulty concerning the marriage of the parties named in Ezek. xlv. 22, will be found in a right division of the word. The fifteenth and sixteenth verses refer to "the sons

of Zadok;" from the ninth to the fourteenth, inclusive, and from the seventeenth to the end of the chapter, the subordinate rank of the priesthood, is the subject of the legislation.

They are not only not to take for their wives a widow other than the widow of a priest, but they are to drink no wine on entering the *inner court*. "They shall stand before the people to minister for them;" but, "they shall not come near unto me, saith the Lord, to do the office of a priest unto me, nor to come near to any of my holy things, in the *most holy*." "But the sons of Zadok shall stand before me, to offer unto me the fat and the blood, saith the Lord, they shall come near to my table," which will be in the most holy place.—xli. 22.

Here are evidently two classes of priests, one that may enter the most holy, and the other that may not. The Lord's table is in the most holy, and he said to the apostles, "Ye may eat and *drink* at my table in my kingdom;" but the others may not drink, and may not come beyond the inner court. They are, therefore, not the sons of Zadok, of whom marriage is affirmed; for they who may not drink are they who may not marry any other widow than the widow of a deceased priest.

Job's Tempter.

As to Job's tempter, we think that a critical reading will remove the obscurity.

Job was a priest, and the greatest of all the sons of the East; he was withal "perfect and upright, and one that feared God and eschewed evil." He was also a faithful teacher of the truth; for, saith he, "I have not concealed the words of the Holy One." He was above princes and nobles; for when he appeared among them, "the princes refrained from talking, and the nobles held their peace." Yea, "I chose out their way," saith he, "and sat chief, and dwelt as king in the army."

The excellent of the earth were his associates and friends—the sons of God, who presented themselves from time to time before the Lord, according to his appointment.

But the sons of God in all past ages have not all of them been without rebuke. Many have passed for sons of God who have been but roaring lions and ravenous wolves. "Judah was a devil;" yet, "an angel of light," or messenger of knowledge, and a "minister of righteousness"—a very satan amid the sons of God; for said Jesus to the twelve, "One of you is a devil." Yet he

sent this devil out to preach the Gospel, to proclaim repentance, and to heal the sick. He went up to the house of God in company with Jesus, took sweet counsel with him, and betrayed him. This constituted him a satan to Jesus; for Jesus had more satans than one to contend against him.

הַשָּׂטָן *hash-satan*, signifies the adversary, from שָׂטָן *satlan*, to be hostile, to oppose. The noun with the definite article occurs in Job i. 6. When Job and his friends, the sons of the Elohim, came to present themselves before Jehovah, a Judas, the adversary of Job, came in the midst of them. Jehovah, knowing the enmity of his heart against Job, opened the conversation respecting him, recorded in the book. The adversary of Job was evidently a powerful prince, according to his own account, for he seemed to march to and fro at his pleasure; only that he could not invade Job's possessions to destroy them, because Jehovah had "made a hedge about him."

But Jehovah's protection was removed from everything but Job's person, and his adversary was allowed to prevail against him. The Sabceans, fire from heaven, the Chaldeans, and the whirlwind, were the means by which Job was reduced to the greatest extremity. These were the "hand," and "power" of the adversary, or satan, of Job, who is said to have done the evil, because he moved Jehovah to do it. "Thou movedst me against him, saith Jehovah, to destroy him without cause." Jehovah did it all, but it is attributed to Job's adversary, because he instigated Jehovah to do it; and Jehovah did it, not to torment Job, but to vindicate his integrity against the assertions of his enemy.

Much might be added upon this subject; but, for the present, we must dismiss it, with the hope that sufficient has been said to remove the obscurity that may have existed.

EDITOR.

"Kingdom-Believers."

Dear Sir,—You still send me the *Herald*, for which I am very thankful. It is assuredly a noble work, and I regret that I do not pay you better for it. In money matters the "times" in this state at present are "hard." But I want the *Herald*, nevertheless; for I know of no such book in this, or any other, state or country, which is saying a great deal for it, surely. There are "religious writings," so called, enough in the country; but to me they are worthless: for by reading the *Herald* the darkness in them, and around me, becomes visible.

We have no scriptural teacher that I

know of in this part of the country. Now and then, a preacher comes along who says, he is "a kingdom-believer;" but it turns out to be Utopian in the end.

Respectfully yours,

H. W. HUDSON.

Homer, Calhoun, Mich., Dec. 14, 1856.

There are many who profess to believe in the kingdom, who do not believe the glad tidings or gospel thereof; and when examined, evidently do not know what are the principles of the oracles of God. In our travels we have heard of many such, who would confer a benefit on society if they would stop preaching what they call "kingdom," and devote themselves to some honest secular affairs. Talkers who peddle books and merchandize in souls, and speak slightly of the prophets, and call God's message to Mary by Gabriel, "Thomasism," though they may advocate "no immortality out of Christ, and all the wicked will God destroy," and speak of "kingdom" too, have really but one object—a living on easy terms. Of such beware!—Editor.

Miscellaneous.

"An Interesting Question."

We cut the following from the *Toronto Globe* of a recent date. The theological professor of Yale is behind the times in announcing the world's profound mistake, "respecting the Hebrew word, given as "Jehovah," in the Old Testament; the readers of the *Herald of the Kingdom* have long since been supplied with the proposition and the proof, that אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה *chveh asher ehveh*, the *Memorial of the Invisible*, and אֲהִיָּה *Ehveh*, his Name, signify I SHALL BE WHO I SHALL BE, and I shall be; and not, as in the English version, "I am that I am," and "I am;" and that the Memorial enigmatically foreshowed, that AIL-SHADDAL, by which name he was alone known to Abraham, would afterwards appear as a distinct person, yet plurally in the same, as indicated in the "glorious and wonderful name אֲהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּה *ath Yehowah clohekah*, the I SHALL BE THY GODS. The great mystery of spirit-and-truth worship, "God manifested through flesh, &c., and exhibited in "the wisdom of God in a mystery," as spoken by the Apostles and the Lord. See Exod., iii., 14, 15; vi., 3; Deut., xxviii., 58; John, i., 1, 14; viii., 58; xiv., 9, 10; 1 Tim., iii., 16; 1 Cor., ii., 7.

The Christ with which Jesus was Christed or christened, at the Jordan, when the Dove descended upon him, was the Holy Spirit of the Father. This was He who said "before

Abraham was I am;" and "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." That holy thing, born of Mary, and named Jehowah-shuah, Jehoshua, Jahveh, Jah, or Jesus, in the English version "Jesus," was the body or flesh of sin, prepared for Christ; and, therefore, when the Christ of the Father filled it, the body prepared was "made Christ," and "called Christ"—Acts, ii., 36.

But, we are losing sight of the notice in the *Toronto Globe*. If the book came in our way, we shall tell the reader more about it; at present, we content ourselves with having thus directed attention to it. The notice referred to is as follows:—

"An Interesting Question.—A book is about to be issued from the press of Gould and Lincoln, Boston, written by "a venerable Professor of Theology, in Yale College," entitled "Yahveh Christ, or the Memorial Name." The main object of the author is to show that the world has hitherto labored under a profound mistake respecting the Hebrew word given as "Jehovah," in the Old Testament. He undertakes to prove that it was not "Jehovah," but "Yahveh;" and it does not mean "I am," but "He who will be,"—in short, that the "Jehovah" of the Old Testament, and the "Christ" of the New, denote one and the same Being. The point is argued with great ingenuity, force, and eloquence, on both philological and historical grounds. The important bearing of the discussion upon fundamental doctrines of theology will be readily apparent."

II Signor Incognito Explains.

IN "The Expositor" for Jan. 1, 1857, our friend, the editor, has about eight pages of explanation on divers points under the caption general "Valid Immersion," in which he states that our mutual friend Joseph Pierce, "was mistaken, that is all," in saying that in relation to the "One Faith" about which, as a part of the "unity of the Spirit," they were conversing, he had no faith previous to his immersion. Elder Marsh declares (and brother McMellan of Rochester, who heard the conversation between him and brother Pierce, he says, corroborates the declaration) "that it was in response to a specific point of the gospel of the kingdom, as taught by Dr. Thomas, in which we said we had no faith previous to being baptized."

What the "specific point" referred to is, we do not see defined in the eight pages; we however, say this, as a very specific point in relation to the "One Faith," namely: that no man, since the days of Abraham, ever

existed having that faith, who was ignorant of God's purpose of setting up a kingdom in the Holy Land with Messiah upon its throne; and of giving it to the Saints with him for their inheritance.

Another very specific point is, that no man having the one faith, ever denied, but firmly believed in the indwelling of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, according to the flesh, in the Holy Land, under the government of Messiah.

Another very specific point is, that all true believers in the apostles' days, "believed the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ"—Acts viii. 12, before they were immersed.

Another very specific point is, that every man justified by faith is sanctified by the Abrahamic Covenant through the offering of the body of Christ once; and that one ignorant or faithless of the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, so confirmed, cannot be justified, washed, and sanctified thereby, though he may be dipped a thousand times.

There are other specific points that might be stated, but these may suffice for the present.

Our friend Marsh is very much mistaken in supposing that we are "determined to invalidate his baptism on some principle." We should be most happy if we could scripturally and conscientiously declare, that we believe he had intelligently obeyed "the Gospel of the kingdom of God" in being immersed; and that he had thenceforth "held fast Christ's name, and had not denied his faith."—Rev., ii., 13. Far be it from us any such determination. But we cannot close our eyes to facts; and ignore our knowledge of the truth and reason.

Three pages and a half of the eight consist of extracts from Elias Smith's *New Testament Dictionary* on "Soul," "Punishment," "Destruction," "Immortality," and "Canaan," which show that said Elias at that time was greatly in advance of his contemporaries. Elder Marsh says, "he fully endorsed and taught them more than thirty years since."

He then gives the reader Elias Smith's definition of the Kingdom, which stands thus, "The time will come when all kingdoms contrary to what is contained in the Scriptures will be done away, and men will be in obedience to Christ, live in love and peace, and honor him as the one Lord and King over all the earth."

On the word *king* Elias says, "The grace by which we are saved teaches us to deny ungodliness; for this reason the followers of Christ are called kings, and because they are

hereafter to be in authority as kings on the earth, under Christ the king of kings"—Rev., v., 10.

After all the extracts our friend remarks: "Thus it is seen what the sentiments of Elder E. Smith and a large portion of the Christian denomination were in their early history. It is true they were not fully informed on some of the great fundamental truths of prophecy, and it is also true that they held to several erroneous theories; but imperfect as they were, few writers of the present day—Dr. Thomas not excepted—are able to express these great truths in a clearer or more correct manner than is done in the foregoing extracts. As we understand Dr. Thomas, faith in these truths will qualify a person for baptism. The sentiments of Elder E. Smith and Dr. T. are nearly, if not quite, identical."

"There was another class of the Christian brethren who differed in sentiment from Elder E. Smith. They ultimately became the most numerous, and gave directions to the body, so as to cause a large majority to apostatize from the true faith, and to embrace many of the fabled dogmas of the other sects. We, however, ever stood opposed to this apostatizing party, in consequence of which our sojourn among them was not unfrequently marked with controversy and sore trials."

Our friend then proceeds to state, that he did not "stoutly deny," before and subsequent to his immersion, the testimony we quoted from the prophets in our article, "*Il Signor Incognito Demis*;" and, to prove it, reproduces an article he published in the *Christian Palladium, on the State and Prospects of the Jews*, from the London Quarterly Review. This appeared, he says, after he was immersed; and is offered in evidence that he believed in the restoration of the Jews.

From all these premises, we suppose we are expected to admit that our friend was a believer in the following principles:

1. That Man is a Living Soul; that soul is simply life; and that the theological dogma of the existence, in the flesh, of an immortal soul, is unscriptural, and therefore not to be received;

2. That punishment signifies just suffering for a crime, that a person may be brought to repentance; and that all who obey not the Gospel will be destroyed by the second death, which is the sorer punishment;

3. That destruction will take place at the day of judgment; and does not mean that the wicked will exist eternally, in a state of punishment.

4. That immortality is to be attained at

the resurrection of the just; and that all men will not be raised immortal.

5. That all kingdoms will be abolished; and that Christ will be king over all the earth; and that the Saints will reign with him upon the earth.

6. That Canaan signifies the land once possessed by Canaan the son of Ham, son of Noah; and that the Jews shall return to this land.

Now, if this were his faith, it was very well as far as it went. But we hear nothing in all this, of that to which Paul refers, when describing his preaching, he says, "We speak not the wisdom of this age, nor of the leaders of this age; but we speak the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery, which God defined before the ages unto our glory"—1 Cor., ii., 6, 7. If our friend can add this to the above, we should have no objection to his immersion.

But, leaving him to his baptism, which is his concern more than ours (any further than that we are anxious for his own sake, that he should be really and truly the subject of the One Faith and One Baptism) what shall we say to its consequents? He escaped apostasy from the true faith when Christians became *Christ-yans*; but how was it with him when Christians became Millerites? He made a bonfire of the kingdoms, the Jews, the Holy Land, and the very earth itself!!! He abandoned what he calls "the true faith;" and instead of responding to the song of the redeemed in Rev., v., 10, he denied it by burning up their inheritance! Was the apostasy of the *Christ-yans* to "the fabled dogmas of the sects," equal in enormity to this? But having confessed to the above inations of Millerism, he proceeds to remark, "We still hold, however, to the gathering of 'Spiritual Israel' at the advent of Christ into his kingdom on the New Earth." This was only adding fallacy to fallacy; for the bonfire-doctrine converted the Bible into a cunningly devised fable; and consumed into smoke all the Spirituals contained within it. The Bible says nothing about a kingdom of Christ on any other planet than our earth, which our friend says, he believed was to be burned up. We are astonished that our friend does not see, that in confessing faith in Millerism, he is proclaiming himself an infidel of the gospel of the kingdom; and, if he ever really believed and obeyed it before, an apostate from the truth. If we were in his case, we should rejoice in the invalidity of an immersion antecedent to being a Millerite. It is better to be an immersed infidel who had never known the truth; than to have known the truth and obeyed it, and afterwards to

have apostatized to the beggarly thinkings of the flesh.

But our friend inquires, "Would Dr. Thomas have us re-immersed for the commission of this mistake?" We answer, that depends upon the premises in your case. If you really did believe what Paul calls "the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery" as *revealed* in the gospel he preached, before you were immersed? we answer, *by no means be immersed again*. But, if this were not your fault, and you be an intelligent believer now, we say, certainly be immersed again, that your faith may be counted to you for remission of sins, and the sin of Millerism, not the least among the number. If, however, you have been truly or scripturally baptized, your friends can do no more than leave you in the hands of the Lord; and pray that, when you shall appear at his tribunal, he may be merciful to you in the retribution he shall visit upon you for "*denying his faith*," when you ought to have lifted up your voice like a trumpet against the seducers, seeing that you have renounced their abomination; and, as we hope, are earnestly striving to recover your balance from which you have been so rudely shaken, and overturned.

Truly, dear friend, you need not be anxious whether we forgive you or not. If God forgive you, you are safe enough; but that you cannot know until Messiah come. Can you with respect to yourself, say "Amen" with joy, to these words of Paul, "You hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death to present you holy and unblamable and unreprouvable in his sight; if you *continue in the faith, GROUNDED AND SETTED, and not moved away from the hope of the gospel*?" You know that Paul says, we are members of Christ's house on condition of "*holding fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end*;" and in another place, "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold *the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end*." But you made a bonfire of the faith and the hope; and had you been the Noah of your generation, when you turned Millerite, the faith and hope of the gospel would have perished from the earth.

Our friend says, that our theory concerning a valid immersion is "defective;—it will not even bear scrutiny." This is his opinion, though it does not happen to be according to fact. It is a very simple and intelligible "theory," and has borne the scrutiny of thirty-three years; and no man has yet appeared who can set it scripturally aside. The "theory" is this, that *no immersion in water is the "One Baptism" of which a person is the subject, whose faith is not the "ONE FAITH" and "ONE HOPE OF THE CALLING."*

There is no man, intelligent in the Scriptures, who can deny this proposition. A man who can confess no more than the trembling demons of antiquity did, when they said, "We know thee who thou art, thou art Christ the Son of God," is not fit for immersion; and if immersed, he will need to be immersed again, if he shall afterwards believe the truth, but not else. We our friend shall have obtained complete emancipation from the hallucinations of the past, he will change his opinions, as he has often done before, on the recession of his darkness before the light. We wish to see him scriptural in theory and practice, that his labors may not result in merely "beating the air." At present, many believe his teaching to be gospel mystification, and a justifying of the ungodly in their disobedience. For this cause, in Charlottesville, in Richmond, in Baltimore, and in New York city, his services are declined.* We know that the friends regret this necessity. But there is no hope for it. Elder Marsh cannot, and ought not, to outrun his convictions; neither could they justify themselves in affording him facilities for preaching what they assuredly believe is not the truth.

What our friend styles our "very singular and apparently reluctant manner," has been assumed to soften down as much as possible, without detracting from the point, the plainness of speech we are to use. Not wishing to hurt his feelings, we have veiled the person aimed at; for it is possible to speak with less risk of offending to one under a fictitious than under his proper name. We should have noticed the request before, but were prevented by circumstances beyond control.

Wishing him a happy exit out of all his entanglements, we subscribe ourself his friend and well-wisher, the

EDITOR.

Jan. 15, 1857.

The Russian Railroads.

"THE French government is determined to set its face against the Russian railroads. "I am informed," says *The Times'* Paris correspondent, "that it has been intimated to the semi-official journals that they are not to publish advertisements relating to these railroads. The same journals will probably soon open a rolling fire against the undertaking. The cause of this hostility will be attributed to the fact that the railroads are less with a view to commercial advantages, than for strategic purposes."—*N. Y.* 22, 1856.

* Of course, we mean by those who are in fellowship with us.

H E R A L D

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never perish, and a dominion that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1856.

[VOL. VII. No. 3

"Salvation by Baptism."

Continued from Vol. vi, p. 277.

Our zealous tractarian, "W. K." is certainly not only a very bold, but barefaced and reckless accuser. He says, that "for justification by faith Dr. T. substitutes salvation by baptism." To assert this is either profound ignorance or wickedness; if the former, then he speaks falsely when he says he has read *Elpis Israel*; for he can find no such doctrine there, the very reverse being maintained; but if he have read the work, it is not a mistake, but deliberate wickedness, for he knows better.

What we believe the scriptures teach is justification by faith in the obedience of the truth. This expresses the means of justification and the time when it occurs. *Δικαιοσύνην πιστεως* rendered in the common version, "the righteousness from faith," is a state of being perfect on account of faith. Paul says, this is revealed in the gospel of the Christ *εις πιστην* for faith, or, that it may be believed in; so that the good message concerning the kingdom contains in it, *εν αυτω* a doctrine of perfection to be believed in, as well as the doctrine of the kingdom. When men entered the state of perfection, they were addressed by the apostle as "the perfect." In writing to Corinth he says, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect;" and to the Philippians he says, "Let us, as many as be perfect, be thus minded;" and speaking of the means of this perfection, he observes, "The law (of Moses) made no man (v. r.) perfect, but the bringing in it was of a better hope; by which we draw near to God." This better hope, styled elsewhere, "better covenant established upon better promises," was the perfecting institution.

But the perfecting was not the absolute

and entire perfecting of the man in body, soul, and spirit. Paul was one of "the perfect," yet he could say of himself, "not as though I were already perfect." Jesus was at once perfect and imperfect; he was perfect in a moral sense, and imperfect in a physical. Paul says that "he was made perfect through sufferings;" and Jesus himself tells us when that perfecting should take place: "Behold," saith he, "I cast out demons, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third I shall be perfected." That is, his ministry was to continue during the three succeeding years; and in the third year from the time he sent the message to Herod, he would be perfected by re-nurrection. This having come to pass, the apostle says, that "being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." So also of the "cloud of witnesses" he refers to in Heb. xi. of whom he testifies that "they all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Hence, the receiving of the better hope promised, is when the faithful living and dead are made perfect by the spirit at the epoch of resurrection.

The teaching, then, is, that moral or spiritual perfection precedes corporeal or physical. The state of moral perfection is entered upon when "the answer of a good conscience" is scripturally obtained. This entrance could not be effected through the institutions of the Mosaic law. "Its gifts and sacrifices," says Paul, "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." * * * "for the law having a shadowing forth of good things to come, not the image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offer continually every year make the comers thereunto perfect. Otherwise would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purified should

have no more conscience of sins; but in those there is a remembrance of sins every year."

Perfection as pertaining to the conscience is present spiritual perfection contemplated by the better covenant. When this is attained, the believer has "come to the spirit of a justified man made perfect." His spirit or conscience is perfected; because, in being pardoned on the principles of the new and better covenant, "his sins and iniquities are remembered no more." This oblivion or covering of sins places the man in a position in which the Lord imputes to him no iniquity. Now, the man thus circumstanced is regarded as a man without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; in other words, he is said to be perfect, just, righteous, holy, clean, and so forth. In this state he is a blessed man, as it is written, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." A guileless spirit is "a good conscience;" a spirit made perfect by the principles of the gospel.

We see, then, what the state of perfection is in its moral or spiritual aspect. It will not be denied that the apostles were denizens of this state, made free from sin by the truth; yet they could say, "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing;" "we all miss many things;" "if we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;" "we also are men of like passions with you." A man may be pardoned, and guileless, and yet be much afflicted with the turbulence of his nature essentially rebellious against God. True christian virtue, however, consists in controlling and subduing this turbulence; so that it shall not break forth in violation of the divine law. This is more or less difficult in different individuals; but the greater the difficulty the greater the virtue in success. Of ourselves we are very weak through the flesh; but Christ strengthening us in his own peculiar and appointed way, no embarrassments are too great to exclude us from the prize.

When, in the present state, a man is individually "blessed in Abraham and in his seed," he is saved from his past sins, becomes a partaker of the divine nature, and a joint-heir with them of the promises of God. But though saved from the consequences of past transgression, and, therefore, no longer liable to punishment for the past, he has not attained to the salvation of the gospel, "the great salvation," in the full sense thereof. He has only entered into the state of being saved: so that to such as have been some time in that state approved, an apostle says, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we

believed,"—"nearer," and consequently not yet attained to. And, again, "Work out your own salvation with reverence and diffidence;" that is, ye have been saved from your past sins, which need not now trouble your consciences any more; "go on," therefore, "to perfection" of character—work out such a manifestation of the inner man with reverence towards God and diffidence of yourselves, as will secure your presentation before him holy, blameless, and without reproach in his sight, at the appearing of Jesus in his kingdom and glory. Hence, then, *salvation is not an instantaneous work*. The saving of individuals, and the saving of the nations, is a progressive affair. The saving of an individual begins with saving him from the sins of his times of ignorance and unbelief; and ends, or is consummated, in his deliverance from death and corruption; and in his exaltation to glory and honour in the kingdom of God. Here is an interval lying between two points, which to him is "a day of salvation;" as it is written, "Now is an acceptable time, now is a day of salvation." The heart of man being naturally "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked," it requires a period of time to break it, and to bring it into subjection to the will of God; that it may be "a broken and a contrite heart," which are "the sacrifices of God that he will not despise." To turn such a natural reprobate into a faithful and obedient son, is beyond all power save that of God's; and, though God is omnipotent, "the power" he has established "for salvation," though of extraordinary efficacy and might, is not equal to the work of breaking the spirit and hearts of all mankind. It requires hearts of a peculiar character to operate successfully. Seed, though good, will not vegetate in all sorts of soils; neither will "the power of God for salvation" prove effective in all sorts of hearts. With time, and "honest and good hearts," it can do wonders. It can break the proud and world-loving spirit of the flesh, "and make it humble and teachable as a little child's; so that the only desire will be to know what God requires, and to do it.

The interval, or day of salvation, is covered in the scriptures by words expressive of salvation as a progressive work. Thus, in Acts ii. 47, Luke says that "The Lord added to the congregation σωζομενους the being saved." This is the literal rendering of the verb in the present participle passive, which designates the action as present, or in continuance, but still incomplete. Hence, the present participle is also styled the imperfect. The common version takes no account of the present action, but refers it all to the future; as, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." But such a ren-

dering as this cannot be accepted grammatically or doctrinally; for it is as incorrect in the one as the other. Among the Lord's daily additions to the congregation, were Ananias and Sapphira, and many other such; who, as Peter informs us, "turned as dogs to their vomit again; and as washed sows to their wallowing in the mire." All these were added to the congregation by the Lord, but will never be saved; for, in Ananias' and Sapphira's case especially, they lied to the Holy Spirit, which is an offence that admits of no forgiveness; while the others, having "sinned willfully, after they had received the knowledge of the truth," have no further access to sacrifice for sins; "but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." An addition, therefore, to the church even by the Lord himself is no assurance that he will be saved.

But, if King James' courtiers have put all salvation in the future, Messrs. Whiting and Campbell, in their editions, have put it all in the past. In the former the text is rendered, "And the Lord added *those saved* to the congregation daily;" and in the latter, "the Lord daily added *the saved* to the congregation." These versions express the opinions of the editors, but not the teaching of the word. This informs us clearly enough that the Lord added to the congregation believers, whose salvation was commenced in their becoming the subjects of repentance and remission of sins in his name—verse 38; but not finished. They were *in the state of being saved*, as expressed by the tense of the word; but whether the state of being would ultimate in the salvation, depended upon their "continuing in the faith, having been unwavering and steadfast, and not being removed from the hope of the gospel, which, having been preached to every creature under the heaven, they heard."

Again, in Rom. viii. 24, 25, Paul says, "We are saved by the hope" that is unseen, and waited for with patience. The words "are saved" are not to be taken in the present; because the apostle did not write in the present tense, but in the *first aorist passive*—*εσώθημεν we were saved*; were saved by a something expected. Here the salvation was not in the past any more than in the present, except in the *aorist* or indefinite sense. An aorist salvation is a past and complete salvation, when the hope waited for is realized. This hope—the better promises upon which the better covenant is established—perfected the conscience; by not being removed from it, the conscience continues in perfection; and by realizing it, "the redemption of the body" is attained, and the salvation rendered

complete. We were saved from imperfection of conscience on account of sins when we embraced the hope of the gospel; and we were saved from imperfection of body, it will hereafter be said, when we experienced the redemption of the body in rising from the dead. The words "*are saved*" qualified by the perfecting of the conscience or spirit, and the perfecting of the body, cover the interval between the two points left undefined by the aorist. In this view, they may be accepted as expressive of a salvation as yet incomplete.

In 1 Cor. i. 18, the progressiveness of the salvation is indicated in the original, though not in the common version. "The doctrine of the cross," says Paul, "is God's power to us who are being saved"—*τοῖς σωζομένοις to the being saved*, literally. Also in 1 Cor. xv. 2, through which (gospel) also ye are saved BY A CERTAIN WORD I preached to you if ye hold it fast; unless ye believed in vain." Here the "*are saved*," *σωζεσθεῖς* qualified by the hypothesis, "if ye hold fast;" if they did not continue to hold fast the word preached, then they would not be saved. The saving process was continuous with the holding fast. If they let go the process stopped, and they were lost. In 2 Cor. ii. 15, Paul says, "We are a fragrant odor of Christ for God *εν τοῖς ὠζομένοις* in them who are being saved, and in them who are being lost"—*ἀπολλυμένοις*. The common version has it, "In them that *are saved*, and in them that *perish*;" but "*saved*" and "*perish*" are both in the same tense; so that if "*are saved*" be correct, it ought to read "*are perished*" likewise. But *perdition* is a process of decay, as salvation is of growth. Discased trees grow worse and worse until they perish, having borne only evil fruit; while good trees grow up to maturity, and yield abundantly. So that, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid from them that are *being lost*—*εν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις* in whom the god of this age hath blinded the understanding of the unbelieving, in order that the illumination of the gospel of the glory of the Christ, who is the image of God, may not shine unto them."

In Eph. ii. 5, 8, Paul tells them who are being saved, that it is "by the favor of God they are saved through the faith;" and that the saving through the faith was not their own work; but "the gift of God." The favor, or grace, of God got at them through that system styled "THE FAITH." They were not being saved by favor without the "*one faith*;" as though God were partial to them above all other people, and would save them irrespective of what they might believe or do. No; his favor was communicable to them, as to all others, through a system of means called "the faith;" but then they were not to sup-

pose that in believing in "the faith," and subjecting themselves to its divine influence, they were saving themselves by a righteousness of their own: *οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, not of yourselves*, but of God; or, in the words of David, "Not unto us, O Jehovah, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy and for thy truth's sake."

This was a very necessary intimation, as there were many in those days as well as in these who seemed to think that because they did what was granted them to do, they were performing very meritorious acts, whereby they were entitled to salvation as a divine obligation due to them. This was falling into the old error of the Jews, who went about to establish a righteousness of their own. But says the apostle in Tit. iii. 5, "It is not on account of works the which we have done for righteousness, but according to his mercy he saved us." There is no room, then, for boasting; for it is excluded by the law of faith which justifies a man *without recognizing expiation for his sins in any of his deeds*.

Lastly upon this point, we remark, that the progressiveness of the great salvation is not confined to individuals, but is extended to the nations also. This appears philologically from Rev. xxi. 24. Speaking of the saints in glory as a splendid city shining as the sun, the Spirit says, "And the nations of them that are saved, *τα εθνη των σωζομενων* shall walk in the light of it." Dr. Whiting in his edition has omitted the words *των σωζομενων*. Being a Millerite when he published it, and consequently a believer in the dogma of "all the wicked will God destroy at the coming of the Lord;" he could see no use for words that taught a day of salvation for the nations contemporary with the glory of the New Jerusalem; so he condemned them as an interpolation, and hands us the following mutilation—"And the nations will walk by the light of it!" The American Bible Union in its paragraph version has mutilated it in like manner upon the pestiferous authority of "all the recent editors." In A. Campbell's edition it reads, "the nations of the saved;" and the common version, "the nations of them that are saved;" as if the work of saving the nations were finished at "the manifestation of the sons of God." The great national regeneration has then only begun. They are manifested for the work of "healing the nations"—a progressive, not an instantaneous, work. In the healing process, all nations will be blessed in Abraham and his seed, walking in the light; nevertheless, these nations will not exist eternally; for Jehovah saith to Israel, "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee." Their

"full end" arrives a thousand years after the resurrection of the first fruits; when they are led astray from their allegiance to Christ and the Saints. But while they are walking joyously in the light of their righteous government, *men and women are being saved* as now, though in vastly greater multitudes, not by the same system of means, however, nor for the same purpose as we; but for a salvation, which, when attained after the suppression of the post-millennial rebellion of the nations, will put them in possession of immortality; and the honor and happiness of eternal residence on earth, then entirely renovated, under the glorious supremacy, no longer sacerdotal, of Jesus and the saints.

The great salvation, then, set forth in the glad tidings of the kingdom, is adapted to the necessities of mankind, individual and national, in harmony with the purpose of God. The ills that flesh is heir to are moral, social, and corporeal. His purpose is to eradicate these upon principles that will rebound to his own glory and honor. The great want of society is a just and perfect system of law, together with a wise, infallible and righteous administration thereof. This want God has in the Scriptures promised to satisfy. This promise, however, to the unbelieving mind, presents an insuperable difficulty, which is this, *the formation of such an administration*; where are the men to come from who shall be at once wise, infallible, and just? Admitting the force of this objection, God has devised a system of means by which this moral impossibility as it appears, may be overcome. "All things are possible with him;" and in the Scriptures he has told us how he intends to accomplish it; and that the result of his work will be, *men equal to angels in character, intelligence, and physical constitution*. So long as human nature is "the flesh of sin," it will be mortal and corruptible; the subject of disease, pain, passion, weakness, &c. The physical cause of these morbid conditions must therefore be eradicated before a being can be produced from our race and parentage who shall be of unerring judgment in all things; for it is from and by brain-flesh, which is as much "sinful flesh" as any other part of the body, that thought, reason, judgment, &c., are elaborated. A transformation, then, of human nature is indispensable. It must be changed into a better nature—into a nature in which the *sin-principle* has no place: it must become a *flesh-and-bones investment of the Eternal Spirit*, such as the Lord Jesus is at this present, as it is written in 1 Jno., iii. 2, "We know that when he shall appear, *we shall be like him*:" he is "the Lord Spirit," or the Lord the Spirit, *ὁ Κύριος το πνευμα*

ἔστι whose "brethren" will also be πνευμα ἀγίωσυνης *holy spirit*; for "we all with face unveiled (having our eyes open) beholding as in a mirror (the testimony of God) the Lord's glory, are changed into the same image (being renewed by knowledge after his image) from (the mental contemplation of the) glory into glory (at his appearing, when we shall be) in the likeness of καθάπερ ἀπο the Lord (who is) spirit"—a quickening or life-imparting, spirit.—2 Cor. iii. 18; Col. iii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 45.

The production of beings, corporeal beings, from the ashes of the dead, who shall be incarnations of spirit, and that the Spirit of God; and the conferring upon them authority and power to administer the affairs of the nations, will meet abundantly the necessities of the case. "To him overcoming and keeping my appointments (τὰ ἔργα, *things to be done*) till the end. I will give authority over the nations, and he shall govern them with an iron sceptre (as earthen vessels it is broken to pieces) as also I received from my Father:" and "To him overcoming I will give to sit with me on my throne, as also I overcome, and sit with my Father on his throne"—Rev. ii. 26, 27; iii. 21. This throne of Jesus and his Father, is inseparably associated with Zion by covenant with David, who reigned there; and that it does not now exist, Jehovah has said, and none can alter it, "On Zion, the hill of my holiness, set I my king:" "I have chosen and desired it for a habitation: it is my rest for ever; I will dwell there; and there will I make the horn, or power, of David to bud; for I have sworn by my holiness and truth to him, that I will set of the fruit of his body upon his throne for evermore; and I will do it." When "Zion is redeemed with judgment" out of the hands of the nations, he will perform his oath; and then proceed to give to his Son Jesus those "nations for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." They are decreed to him, but he must overcome them before he receives them. He overcomes first, and then sits upon the throne as "king over all the earth." This is "the joy set before him," which he invites all to share with him "who keep his orders till the end"—Ps. ii; cxxxii; lxxxix; Zech. xiv. 9.

From these testimonies, then, we may know, if we will not be faithless, but believing, what sort of a government is decreed for the nations; even an administration of divine law by wise, infallible, and immortal men. This implies the removal of all the governments that exist; and against which

the peoples have such impotent hatred and indignation. When this TYRANNACY prevails, there will be a world-wide "Ministration of the Spirit" through the glorified Jesus and his brethren. All nations will be blessed in him, and and call him blessed; and the whole earth will be full of his glory—Ps. lxxii. The miserable burlesque of Christianity that now obtains, will be abolished; the clergeries and ministers of Christendom, will be suppressed as nuisances; and mankind, freed from the curse of blindness perpetuated by leaders of the blind, will yield enlightened and acceptable service to God; and live in harmony, peace, and joy all the years of their appointed time, from the Imperial East to earth's utmost habitable bounds.

Here, then, is a destiny opened up to the past and present generations. This purpose of God with respect to the world is proclaimed to them; and they are invited to the high calling of cooperating with the Spirit in ruling it in righteousness for a thousand years. Is it unjust to refuse men a part in that theocracy, who declare that they have no faith in such a government ever existing upon the earth? The Spirit has given abundant testimony that it shall exist. But "the pious" of this generation almost universally deny it; and in so doing, give the Spirit, whom they profess to have dwelling in their infidel hearts, the lie. Is it unjust to exclude such people from this divine government, which is to be administered in truth and righteousness; from cooperation with that Spirit "which is the truth"—can "the truth" and its rejectors and blasphemers cooperate together? This is an incompatibility which God does not intend shall find any place in his TYRANNACY. All who shall find a place in its ranks are required to believe in it with full assurance of faith and hope, while it has no other existence than as a matter of promise. Hence, the highest kind or form of faith is made the basis of acceptance with God: so that "without faith," as defined by Paul in Heb. xi. 1, "it is impossible to please God." And by consulting that definition it will be seen, that this faith is a firm conviction of promises understood; for ὑποστανσις, rendered "substance," signifies firm, confident anticipation. &c.; and ελεγκος rendered "evidence," signifies whatever serves to convince, which implies intelligence; while "things hoped for and unseen" are matters of testimony and promise. It is evident, therefore, that the ignorant, however pious, cannot have this faith; but it is "he that hears the word of the kingdom, and understandeth," that bears the fruit unto eternal life.

The fountain and origin, then, of perfection in relation to body and spirit, or consci-

ence, is faith—such as the Scripture indicates. 'This is not faith in three or four facts; but a faith called a "precious faith;" because it comprehends "the knowledge of the exceeding great and precious promises." A faith that consists of this knowledge heartily believed, is a power. "Knowledge is power;" but this kind of knowledge is preëminently so. It is the power by which God creates men in the image of Christ; as Paul says, "The new man is renewed by knowledge (*επιγνωσις* exact knowledge) after the image of him that creates him." In another place, he says, "He saves us by a bath of regeneration, and a renewing of the Holy Spirit;" and in a third place, speaking of the renewed collectively, he says, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the bath of water *with the word.*" In these texts, "renewed by knowledge," "renewing of the Holy Spirit" and "with the word," are explanatory of each other; and testify that *the Holy Spirit creates the New Man of the heart by knowledge of the word.* So that "the word of the kingdom," which contains the exceeding great and precious promises understood, is the *renewing or regenerating power.* Therefore it is that James says, "Receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save your souls." But, be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." A word able to save is power for salvation; and must therefore be effectual for all purposes connected with it. Peter says, that by faith in this word we may become partakers of a *divine disposition.* This is just what is required. "Except ye be changed, and become as the children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of the heavens." When proud, ambitious, high-minded men, become as children through belief of God's promises, they are changed from the spirit of the flesh to the spirit that was in Abraham and Christ, which is a divine disposition. This is making new men of them. Instead of cavilling at the word, and putting "charitable" constructions upon it to save their popularity, and the feelings of their friends, they only require to know what "the word" teaches, and what it demands, to believe and do. This is a characteristic of the divine disposition but rarely met with in this day; and the reason is, that the "conversions" current are not genuine. Instead of being effected by the word, they are produced by the machinery of sectarianism. The word is neither preached nor understood; therefore its ancient, appropriate, results are not forthcoming. The "christian spirit" of the day, is not the spirit of the word; but the spirit of the creed—the theological spirit infused into

professors by the pious dogmatism of the velvet cushion. Between this spirit and the word-generated disposition, there is the "enmity" God has put between the serpent and the woman's seed. The serpent was a subtle, charming, and seducing creature. It could talk about God, and charm its victim with a spiritual interpretation of the word; and so can the "christian spirit" so much lauded by godly infidels, and pious sinners, who will believe anything, and do anything, but what the word enjoins. Beware, then, of this spirit, for it is no part of the "divine disposition;" but inimical and subversive of the truth.

A sinner, firmly convinced of the covenanted promises, and by these a partaker of a divine disposition, is prepared by "the power of God" for an introduction into that state which is styled, "the righteousness of God." In "looking narrowly into the perfect law of liberty," he will have come to see, that Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the Messiah predicted, and the Christ come. Understanding what God had covenanted to Abraham and David: and that Jesus was God, by his spirit manifested through sinful flesh, as Paul teaches; he will have learned that Jesus was the MEDIATORIAL TESTATOR of the Abrahamic and Davidian covenants, testaments, or wills; and that, therefore, he must needs have suffered death to bring them into force, ere the believers of the things covenanted, or promised, could be in any way benefited by them; and this, too, on the well-established principle of law, "that a will or testament is of no force while the testator liveth."

But, he will also have learned, that *the righteous only are to inherit the promises;* and that men being hereditary, constitutional, and practical sinners, they can only become righteous by being constituted such upon divine principles. He will understand, that to be constituted righteous is to be pardoned for all his past sins, by which he will have no more conscience of sins; so that his conscience being perfected, the pardoning act by which it is perfected, will give him "the answer of a good conscience," and it will have become "the spirit of a justified man made perfect." But in the affair of pardoning sin, he will have learned, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission, and that the blood of quadrupeds cannot expiate human transgression. This would necessitate the condemnation of sin in the offending nature; but then, as "No man can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him, that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption;" it became necessary that God should find a ran-

som, who should be exempt from the disqualification common to all mankind. A man born of the will of the flesh could not be Testator to the Wills, by which through their blood-dedication, their heirs were to be sanctified and cleansed. A mortal testator, and yet the God of Abraham and David, was the desideratum, which the wisdom of God provided in Jesus. Being "flesh of sin," but without transgression, he was unlike all other men; and being God in Spirit-manifestation, before Abraham, was he.

If Jesus had died a natural death, like other testators of wills, would not that have brought the covenants into force? No; because "it was necessary that the heavenly things should be purified with sacrifice," or blood. *God's covenants are made sanctifying to believers of their promises by being dedicated, or purified by blood.* It was so with the Mosaic, and afterwards with the Abrahamic; for "through the Second Will, we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once:" and "by one offering, he hath perfected for a continuance them that are sanctified" by the will. The blood of Jesus is the blood of the Abrahamic covenant, styled the *New Covenant*, or testament, and also the *Second Will*; because, though made and typically confirmed 430 years before the Mosaic, it did not come into force, or had no cleansing and sanctifying power, till the Mosaic "had waxed old and was ready to vanish away." About forty years before it did vanish, Jesus took the cup of the paschal feast, and said, "This is my blood, the (blood) of the New Covenant, the (blood) being poured out for remission of sins for the sake of many;" therefore saith the Spirit by Zechariah to him, "*By the blood of thy covenant I send forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water;*" that is, by virtue of thy blood, with which thy covenant with Abraham has been made sanctifying and cleansing. I send forth them, who, believing in its promises, have been purified by it, and become thine from the grave, by a resurrection unto eternal life. By the blood of Jesus being the blood of the Abrahamic Covenant, Jesus becomes a covenant, and "the Ark of the Covenant" in symbolic style; as it is written, "I will give thee for a covenant of the people:" and what for? "To establish the land, to cause to possess the desolate estates." Hence, the covenant not only has to do with purifying from sin, and resurrection of the purified, but to a recovery of the Holy Land from desolation: for to "*establish the land,*" is to restore the Twelve Tribes of Israel to their possessions, and to give them their kingdom again. The blood of Jesus being the blood of the covenant, Jesus is

the "surety of the covenant;" and therefore stands for the covenant itself, or is inseparable from it. Hence, he may well be styled a covenant. Being perfectly indoctrinated, then, in what was written of him in Moses and the Prophets, he said to his disciples on the night of his betrayal, "*I am covenanted for you, as my Father hath covenanted for me a kingdom: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit upon thrones ruling the Twelve Tribes of Israel.*" This saying accords exactly with Isaiah's about establishing the land. When this is effected the tribes will be there, the kingdom will be restored to them; Jesus will occupy its throne as the throne of his glory; the apostles will be the twelve enthroned princes of his realm; and all others sanctified by the covenant will share in their kingdom and glory.

A man who denies, or does not believe, or is ignorant of the promises covenanted to Abraham and David, and consequently, not sanctified by the Second Will, is styled by Paul "a stranger from the covenants of the promise;" that is, he is not allied to them. It is not possible it could be otherwise. Is it reasonable to suppose that, though men may profess to believe that the blood of Jesus purifies from sin in some way or other, they can be sanctified, cleansed, or purified, by a covenant, in whose promises they not only have no faith, but which they scandalize by their reproaches? Paul says, "*We are sanctified by the Second Will,*" made sanctifying by the blood of Jesus. That will promises an *everlasting* possession of Palestine in fee-simple to Abraham, to Christ, and to all that are theirs, individually and nationally; it promises that Abraham shall be the father of many nations; that those nations shall be blessed in him and in Christ; that Christ shall possess the gate of his enemies; and so forth. But a man of a certain kind of piety, says, No; Abraham, Christ, and they that are their's, have got as much of Palestine as they ever will have; they are now in heaven enjoying their reward (which, of course, sets aside the resurrection;) the natural descendants of Abraham will never have everlasting *national* possession of Canaan, nor be restored to that country; and all the blessing the nations will ever enjoy in a parental relation to Abraham, they have, and do now, experience, in the Christian civilization of the Nineteenth Century; and in salvation of their immortal souls through Christ from "an eternal hell." He affirms these things, and caps the climax of his daring by declaring, that "the times appointed by God's patience are exhausted; and that he is going to send Jesus Christ to

snatch away the faithful (of which he is a bright and illustrious example! !) and to destroy all nations root and branch in a fiery and dissolving conflagration of the earth! Those who profess these heresies are regarded by themselves and the unenlightened multitude, as the very salt of the earth. Their disposition is held up as the model of "a christian spirit," of which they profess to be most profound and exquisite judges! They prate about "grace," and "the dear Saviour," and how they love the Lord, "sanctification," and "imputed righteousness," and "the cross," and "the precious Jesus," and "saved by grace," are the technics of their pious worship. But shall we be misled by this "form of godliness," and regard them as anything else than "strangers from the covenants of the promise?" In clutching with a death grip to their heresies as they do, they deny the covenanted truth which Jesus has sanctified by his blood. How can the prayer of Jesus to the Father find accomplishment in them? So long as they thus resist the truth, how can Jesus pray for them with any prospect of his petition being answered, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth: for them I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified by the truth." Faith in the blood of Jesus cannot sanctify a man who denies the truth which it sanctifies, or makes purifying. "Sanctify them *by thy truth*" are the words; deny the truth and there is no sanctifying principle for such.

Now, a sinner having studied "the word of the kingdom," and come to the understanding of it, has a power within him, which did not exist there in his times of ignorance. Paul styles this power, "the law of the spirit of the life in Christ Jesus;" and says that "it sets free from the law of sin and death." If then, it sets free, it is "the law of liberty," as James expresses it. In another place, Paul styles this law, or power, "the gospel of Christ." His words are, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of the Christ, for it is the *power of God for salvation* to every one believing." This is, then, the *saving power*, and there is no other. If a sinner would be saved by God, and no one else can save him, he must be saved by the gospel, by the truth, by the law of liberty, which are the same, for his power is there. But this power can only save the believing. It has no power over the faithless. But before dismissing the subject, the Apostle tells us what gives the gospel of the Christ its saving efficacy. He says, "it is the power of God for salvation to the believing, BECAUSE God's state of being perfect on account of faith is revealed in it for faith: as it is written, The justified man shall live

on account of faith." Here then, is a *state of being* revealed in the gospel in which the believing are perfect. It is God's state of *in-being* perfection, as opposed to all states beyond its limits. In the English version, the state is styled "God's righteousness," "his righteousness," or "the righteousness of God." It is his system, styled by Paul, "the Faith of God," according to which he constitutes a sinner of understanding heart and divine disposition, a righteous person, or saint. In order to do this, he places his absolutely holy and just image, his Son Jesus Christ, at the door of entrance into the state, or sheepfold; who proclaims, "I am the door of the sheep; if any man enter in by me, he shall be saved." But, he is not only the door of entrance, he is also in a certain sense, "a great and perfect tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." "Destroy this temple," said the Spirit, "and I will in three days raise it up;" but says John, "He spake of the temple of his body."

Here then, is "a building of God," a tent, tabernacle, or temple, "a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens." There is but one entrance into that house, and that is by the door. The area within that building is holy ground; and the jasper wall is holy. It is the true holy place, or place of holiness, perfectness, or righteousness. It is God's place of righteousness, "a heavenly in Christ Jesus," into which they who have "purified their hearts by faith" are invited to enter. But there is "No admittance here for the unwashed."

Before this Holy Place is an altar to which faith approaches; and which was cleansed by atonement being made for it, before it was placed there. It is most holy; and whatsoever toucheth it becomes holy. Paul styles this altar, Jesus. It was cleansed, when the blood of its consecration was poured out from his side. All the worshippers who would enter the Holy Place must first *come* to this altar, that touching it they may be holy.

But, between the place of God's righteousness and this altar, is a *Laver* or bath of water, styled by Paul *το λουτρον παλιγγενειας* the *New-Birth Laver*; and in another place, *το λουτρον του υδατος* the *Laver of the Water*. The law of this arrangement is, that "when they go into the holy place, they shall wash with water, *that they die not*; or when they come near to the altar to minister, *that they die not*." Neither the altar nor the holy place could be approached without washing under penalty of death. The gospel of the arrangement is not less rigid than the law. Who are they that shall enter in

by the door, and be saved? Hear the voice of the Great Shepherd's words:—"He having believed the gospel and been baptized, shall be saved." But, may we not strike out the words "and been baptized," as an interpolation? If you do, you must also remove the "New-Birth Laver" away from between the Holy Place and the Altar; and if you do that, you approach them both under penalty of death, without the possibility of touching either. "He that believes not shall be condemned." The unbelieving have nothing to do with altar, laver, or holy place; for these are institutions only for the enlightened of the word.

Again, ask Peter, if the Laver may be abolished? What saith he? His words are, that "Baptism now saves us through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Saves whom? The man that has no faith in the things covenanted to Abraham and David? No; baptism will not save him: but it saves "us" who have faith in the blood-sprinkled covenant, by giving us access to the most Holy Altar and Holy Place. What did Peter do with Cornelius and his friends who believed what he and Jesus preached? He sent them all to wash in the laver; as it is written, "He commanded them to be baptized." Did he tell the three thousand on the day of Pentecost to believe and be saved? Nay; he understood God's righteousness too well to do that. He sent them also to the laver, to be washed that they might touch the altar, and be holy: "Repent," said he, "and be baptized unto remission of sins on account of the name of Jesus Christ." The name and the altar are inseparable; it is there that Jehovah has placed his name; and to the Altar Jesus "give all the prophets witness, that every one believing into him *εξ αυτου* shall receive remission of sins through his name."

Though Paul had seen, and spoken with Jesus, and believed, he was still in his sins until the moment he obeyed the message of the Lord by Ananias. Did he say to Paul, "Thou hast become a praying soul, and very penitent of heart; thou believest that Christ died for you, and by this belief thou layest hold of him, and his righteousness is imputed to thee for remission of sins: now then, arise and be comforted, and go, and join the church? Did Ananias speak thus; or did he not rather say, "Arise to be baptized, and to wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord?" He obeyed, and carried his sins with him to the Laver, and called upon the name by being baptized into it, and for the sake of that name he returned with a perfect conscience.

Now what he did himself he prescribed to

others. When therefore, he went to Corinth he preached the word, "and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized." When he wrote to them afterwards he reminded them, that some of them had been "fornicators, idolators, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankind, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, and extortioners; and that such shall not possess the kingdom of God" he preached: but he also reminds them *by what means* they were delivered from the perdition entailed by such horrible offences. "Christ," says he, "sent me to preach the gospel to you, which is the power of God. I declared unto you his testimony concerning Jesus Christ, and him crucified, which he confirmed with a demonstration of Spirit and power. I spoke to you of the things which God has prepared for them that love him. What you heard, you believed, and joyfully embraced, waiting for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Hearing and believing, ye were washed, sanctified, and justified, by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God." They were washed by the name and by the Spirit in believing the gospel and being baptized into the name; or in being "sanctified and cleansed by the bath of the water with the word." The bath of water cleanses, *not by virtue of anything infused into the water*, but because of the association of the name of the Lord with immersion in water. "Peter commanded the household of Cornelius to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Hence, *having the indispensable prerequisite of a Scriptural faith*, when washed they were also sanctified and justified by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God. They were saved by baptism in the sense in which Peter uses the words. But, if they had been immersed without a true and scriptural faith, they would have been sanctified, justified, and saved, neither by the name, the spirit, nor baptism. The bath of water sanctifies and cleanses no one apart from "the word;" for without faith, blood, water, spirit, bread, wine, prayer, or song, leave the sinner in his sins, and subject to death, as it is written, "He that believes not the gospel shall be condemned."

From this exposition the reader will perceive that "W. K's." accusation is false. We do not substitute salvation by baptism for justification by faith; but maintain the indispensability of them both in the right place. Baptism without faith is of no more use than faith without baptism; therefore, our sentence in regard to them is, "*What God hath joined let no man put asunder.*" Baptism gives the believer introduction to

God's righteousness, so that being in that state he is in Jesus, at once the temple of the living God, and "the Lord our righteousness."

"The Corrupt Mould of Cerinthus."

Few of our readers, perhaps, ever heard of Cerinthus or his mould. "W. K.," however, we doubt not is much more intimately acquainted with both than with the Apostles, and the system of doctrine, *τυπος διδαχης* into which the saints were delivered by them. But familiar as he may be with the Cerinthian heresy, if he have no deeper knowledge of it than of our views, he is but an archæological babbler,—a prater in archaisms, nothing more. He says, we "destroy every fundamental truth of revelation, save those of the resurrection, and the future kingdom of God, but even those cast in the corrupt mould of Cerinthus."

It is a fashion with those heretics who deny the personal reign of Jesus upon the throne of his father David for a thousand years, to attempt to discredit this fundamental truth of the gospel, by associating with it the name of Cerinthus; who is alleged, in the unreliable traditions of ecclesiastical literature, to have been a personal opponent of the Apostle John. He wrote an Apocalypse in which he spoke of an earthly kingdom, and certain sensual pleasures which the saints should enjoy for a thousand years at Jerusalem. Now, because he advocated this, and was an enemy of John's, anti-millennarian heretics (the most ignorant pretenders among theologians) rush to the conclusion, that the personal reign of Messiah in Zion is an anti-apostolic and unscriptural fiction! But the reader instructed in the word will not be so simple as to reject the personal reign because heretics and other wicked persons have acknowledged it. Judas preached the gospel, and Ananias and Sapphira obeyed it; but it is not therefore the less worthy of all reception. So with the testimony concerning David's throne and kingdom, and the possession of them by Jesus and the saints. Many of the clergy and devotees of the State Harlots and Sectarian Abominations of the earth believe in the personal reign; but mix up with it the truth-nullifying heresies of their creeds. These are "W. K.'s" brethren, and "dignities." Does he deem their articles and creeds false, because they hold with Cerinthus in expecting an earthly kingdom? Let him, then, if possible, be just, and not attempt to create a prejudice against our writings because Cerinthus happened in this particular to teach the reign of Jesus and the saints on earth. In whatever else he might be

wrong, in this he was scripturally orthodox, as the reader may easily satisfy himself by turning to Rev. v. 9, 10; xxi. 4, 6. Truth may be taught by evil men; it does not therefore follow, that they who believe "the truth" also approve their errors and evil deeds. There is truth in Mohammedanism. But because we believe with Mohammed that "there is one God," are the fables of the Koran to be palmed upon the public as our creed? Neither are we to be accused of Cerinthianism, because with Cerinthus we believe in the reign of the Saints upon the earth with Jerusalem for their seat of government. Try our views by the scriptures; by these, and not by their supposed resemblance to the opinions of ancient heretical dogmatists, we stand or fall. If this be not done, it is a tacit admission that the objector lacks the ability; and feeling his incompetence, finds it more expedient to dust the eyes of his readers, than to contend in fair and open encounter, leaving them to decide according to the evidence in the case. But justice, honour, and truth, are elements that enter not into the policy of knaves, especially of pious knaves, with whom all things are fair that will serve "the cause."

The reader will not care to inquire farther about Cerinthus, or "his mould," when he is informed, that he considered Jesus as a mere mortal, the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary; though the best and wisest of human race, selected as the worthy instrument to restore upon earth the worship of the true and supreme Deity. It was alleged, that when he was nailed to the cross, he was endowed with a miraculous apathy of mind and body, which rendered him insensible of his apparent sufferings. It was insinuated also, that if he suffered, he deserved to suffer; that human nature is never absolutely perfect; and that the cross and passion might serve to expiate the venial transgressions of the son of Joseph, before his mysterious union with the son of God! Such is the mould into which "W. K." testifies we have cast the resurrection and the kingdom of God! Our readers know that this accusation is wholly false. We do not believe that Jesus was the son of Joseph; nor that he had any sins of his own to expiate. "W. K." finds no such doctrine in *ELPIS ISRAEL*. Whatever errors it may contain, there are none analogous to this. He is a false witness, as the reader, no doubt, will admit we have satisfactorily proved. Such, then, we leave him before the world, in company with a host of others we have convicted as signally as himself. They are our enemies, not because we have done them personal wrong; but because the truth we advocate is destructive of their craft. As our enemies, we dis-

comfit and pray for them. May they come to the knowledge of the truth, and repent of the evil they have sought to do; and becoming obedient to the faith, and walking by faith in the hope of the gospel, may they at length receive a crown of righteousness in its kingdom with eternal glory! This is the blessing we invoke upon the heads of "W. K.," the Bethanian President, and all their sincere, pious, but blind and misguided friends.

EDITOR.

Open Council.

Fleshy Fabrications and Contradictions of Sinners.

Sir:—Having believed the Gospel of the Kingdom, and having been immersed into the name of Jesus, I am seeking for more of the true meaning of the Scriptures.

I have read Elpis Israel, and Anatolia, and I read the Herald when I can get hold of it. I hope you will bear with me while I bring before you certain passages of Scripture, and submit my thoughts upon them, that you may correct what you perceive in them contrary to the word; for I am open to conviction, not wishing to be led astray from that which is truly the word of God.

The first passage I shall introduce to your notice is in Phil. i. 23, where Paul says, "I am in a strait betwixt two." That two desires were in his mind, one "to depart and be with Christ, which is far better;" the other to remain in this state for the benefit of his brethren.

Now, when Paul uttered these words, did he not expect, that if he had departed this life he would be with Christ the moment his breath was gone; that is, in a conscious or knowing state? To my understanding the words imply as much. But, if the words do imply as much; and if Paul did in reality expect to be with Christ, knowingly, the moment his breath was gone, how does this square with Psal. cxlvi. 3, 4, "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help: his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; on that very day his thoughts perish." His thoughts perishing may mean, that they are not exercised on the things going on in this world, as they once were. But I do not say that this is the true meaning.

Again in 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20, "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, when once the long-

suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." I was once given to understand that this meant, that it was the Spirit of Christ in Noah that preached to the Antediluvians. But, how can this be, when it is said that "He went and preached" to the spirits in prison. By the same spirit he was raised from the dead. Now the Spirit of Christ in Noah could not preach to "spirits in prison." It is true, that Noah was "a preacher of righteousness," but it was to fleshly men and women. And we read in 1 Pet. iv. 6, of the gospel being preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit;" and thus the idea to my understanding is suggested of men that are dead living in a spirit-state, and in that state, of the gospel being preached to them. But, then, how does all this agree with the Scripture saying, that "the dead know not anything?" Please be explicit here. As it respects the dead knowing nothing, I will state freely what is in my mind, and the idea I have partly received from yourself. The dead, then, that know not anything are those who have not had the capabilities of developing a character, such as idiots and children, and are as though they never had been.

Again, it is written, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Now, here again, we have the idea thrown out, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive, although their bodies are dead.

Again, when our Lord is in Jerusalem, he meets with one that is said to be possessed, who said, "We know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. Art thou come to destroy us before the time?" Here again, it is suggested (at least, to my mind it is) that there is a spirit-state after death; and that they are conscious of their condemned state, and are only waiting for their execution; for they say, "Art thou come to destroy us before the time?" Thus they have a knowledge of the time, or why say what they did?

Or, was it the acuteness or wittiness of the man's understanding being deranged by disease, that prompted him thus to speak? To my mind the scriptures appear to teach, that some have after death a consciousness of their condemned or justified state. But, be it remembered, that I have not the least idea of man being immortal by now having in him an "immortal soul." "God only hath immortality;" but there are some who are seeking to be made immortal by a resurrection from the dead; and I am one of them.

Waiting for the kingdom, I subscribe myself most affectionately,

Your Brother in Christ,

A SEEKER AFTER TRUTH.

Nottingham, England,

January 1857.

The above is entitled to, and shall receive, all due and respectful attention. But before replying to it, we may as well permit a certain anonymous doggrelist, who appears to be very zealous for Campbellism, to give his opinion upon matters and things bearing on the points before us. The following "Original," as it is styled, is of Arkansas manufacture, and has been printed in handbill-form by "F. G. C.," "for distribution," as he tells us. We came into possession of it through the distributive liberality of one, who is as fond of darkness as "the poet" he admires; and whose opinion of the worthlessness and baseness of our character and principles, he cordially endorses. He signs himself "L. T." being ashamed, it is possible, of his name in full. We give his letter also, as a specimen with the doggrel, of the kind of weapons Campbellites wield for the defence of their traditions and the overthrow of the truth. We know not at which to be astonished the most—their ignorance, malevolence, or presumption! As ignorant as donkeys of Moses and the Prophets, and consequently of the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, who preached the prophets and expounded "the mystery" they ministered, which had been hid from the ages and generations of the Mosaic System (see Acts xxvi. 6, 7, 22; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26; 1 Pet. i. 11, 12; Rev. x. 7,) they yet rush head over heels to the condemnation and blasphemy of those, who have made them their especial study for twenty years! If Jesus styled his contemporaries blind men and fools for not believing "all that the prophets had spoken" (Luke xxiv. 26), what shall we say of "F. G. C.," and "L. T.," who belong to that class which echoes the tradition of its "sage," that "every part of Moses' law worthy of our regard has been re-published and reenacted under more glorious circumstances and with more illustrious sanctions by Jesus," and that, consequently, the prophets have fallen, as it were, from the high position of predictive heralds of Messiah's Aion, to the out-of-date recorders of old Jewish Annals! The presumption of these ignorant and foolish men is in strict keeping with their malevolence. They have no personal acquaintance with us, and know but little (nothing, indeed, as they ought to know, to qualify them for pronouncing a just and enlightened sentence upon us) of what we teach; and yet they select Voltaire,

who exclaimed concerning the Lord Jesus, "Crush the Wretch," and Volney, Gibbon, Hume, infidels and deists; and Paine, an impious and beastly sot, and affirm that these were better, and far sancer men than we! These are the disciples of him they eulogize as "THE SAGE" of Bethany, and the means they adopt for his glorification! But the malice by its intensity is deprived of all its power for evil, and defeats itself. We offer them the truth, and they spit upon and hiss at us, berating us with curses loud and deep. Alas, for them; it is the old story revived anew. Their brethren of antiquity crucified "THE TRUTH" between two thieves; but they, more villainous, not content with two, have oppressed us under five. But the Lord forgive the creatures, for they know not what they do!

Original.

For distribution by F. G. C.

Those holy men, whom God, in Christ ordain'd,
To promulgate the doctrine they maintain'd;
By whom the gospel's banner was unfurl'd,
And free salvation to a ruined world,
Proclaimed in Christ the great Messiah's name,
Who sent them forth those tidings to proclaim,
Are all now numbered with the mighty dead—
From earth, to heaven, their spirits loving sped,
To join the great assembly of the Blest,
And there enjoy their everlasting rest.

But ere their spirits left their earthly home,
They all predicted that, in days to come,
False prophets, and false teachers would arise,
And turn men's itching ears, from truth, to lies,
All which has come to pass, as then foreseen,
Known and foretold by those inspired men.

Whether by birth, of high or low degree,
Their learning what, or what their gifts may be,
Is not the question. 'Tis enough to know
(And known it is that all these things are so)
That, men there are, in this enlightened age,
Who madly dare an open war to wage,
Against the throne and majesty of God—
The Prince Messiah, and his written word.

Reckless of truth, and in assertion bold,
As were apostates in the days of old,
(Whose fables were so cunningly devised,
Their main design so artfully disguised,
And so alluring the fair baits they set,
Thousands were drawn into their fatal net.)
Bad at the best, and waxing worse, and worse,
Foes to themselves, and to the world a curse,
These dark designing men on mischief bent,
And on the ruin of men's souls intent,
To speed the vengeful missiles they send forth,
Have reared their thundering batteries in the north.

My allusion is to *him, and men like him,
(Whose ears to truth are deaf, and eyes are dim,)
Who edits Heralds of the Future Age,
(Reviles and emulates a real sage,)
In whose crack'd brain the dark idea rolls,
Of the mortality of human souls.

Men, who to speed, and carry out their plan,
Would wrest from God the destinies of man:
With iron horns would push into the tomb,
Of dark nonentity's eternal gloom,
Both sinless babes, and all of Adam's race
Except the saved through faith by pardoning grace.
Deceiving still, and being still deceived,
And hoping in the end to be believed,
They would, to keep the minds of men perplexed,
Involve in midnight gloom the sacred text,

* Dr. Thomas, of New York. † Joseph Marsh & Co.
‡ A. Campbell.

And at one blast, blow out the holy light,
Which beams from Heaven upon our mental sight:
Their own devices, rather than forego,
Wisdom's eternal counsels over-throw;
Annul the laws which God to man has given,
Then, in return therefor, give laws to Heaven:
And side by side, with God's anointed son,
Exalt grim death to an eternal throne.

Those heresies on which their names are stampt,
Are older than themselves, but newly vampt:
Still would they have the world believe them *new*,
And what is stranger still, believe them true.
Eternal justice, (if they deem it aught,)
They would forever banish from their thought:
And headlong rush into the thunder's aim,
To reach their goal, and get themselves a name:
Voltaire, and Volney, Gibbon, Hume, and Paine,
Than these, were better men, and far more sane.

Such is the rodomontade being circulated in the southwest, and enclosed in a letter of which the following is a copy:

DR. JOHN THOMAS,

Sir—As far as my acquaintance extends, with some two or three exceptions, the honest opinion both of professors and non-professors of religion is, that all that the poet has said of you, your doctrine, and designs in the piece herewith enclosed, is *literally just and true*; and that to disprove any part thereof, you will have in the first place to prove that Solomon the wise king, Stephen the proto-martyr, Paul the apostle, and Jesus the Messiah, were all mistaken, and spoke erroneously. The *first*, when he said that the spirit of man, when he dies, goeth upward, i. e., returns to God, who gave it; the *second*, when with his dying breath, he besought the Lord of life and glory, to do for him that which he had neither the *will* nor the *power* to do; the *third*, when he said that for him to depart and to be with Christ, was more desirable to him than to remain any longer in the body: the *fourth*, Christ, in sundry instances; first, when he said of God, "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living:" second, when he said of infants, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven:" third, when he said of Lazarus, "He was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom;" and of the rich man, "In hell, he lifted up his eyes, being in torment;" and fourth, when he said to his fellow-sufferer on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

Now, Sir, if you can prove all this by admissible evidence, I for one will admit, that in *your* way of proving things, you can easily prove that the earth, with all her sister planets, together with the centre round which they revolve, are self-created and self-sustaining bodies; and that you are almost equal to the great and good man whom you so much envy.

If you are not disposed to publish this letter, I will get some other person to do it.

L. T.*

Quachita Co., Arkansas.

Dec. 15th, 1856.

"PUT TO SILENCE THE IGNORANCE OF FOOLISH MEN."—*Peter.*

Now, having laid before our readers these ungodly "*thinkings of the flesh*," as Paul styles the opinions of those who criticise his words, and those of other Scriptures, being ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom which God promised by his prophets, we shall proceed to throw off a few remarks on them, beginning with the last.

And first, then, we would say that "L. T." is egregiously mistaken in thinking that we envy the President of Bethany College, who is so great and good in the estimation of that class of the Arkansas mind, which piously lies against truth, to say nothing of "the truth." We aver with all the emphasis and all the solemnity possible, that we do not envy Mr. C. On the contrary; we thank God that we do not occupy his position in any sense. We would not for earth and all its riches and honors, with the life of Methuselah to enjoy them, believe his doctrine, or act according to his policy. We honestly, and without any hostile feeling in the conviction, declare that, according to what we see in the Old and New Testaments, he has neither the faith, practice, nor spirit of a Christian. He is an enemy to the truth, a friend of the world, and a worldly man, and therefore an enemy of God. He is a man of worldly ambition, and his ambition is not controlled by conscience. Fowler, the phreologist, told him this a few years ago in a description written and afterwards printed, which description Mr. C. himself endorsed, perhaps unwittingly, but which is strictly in accordance with the crooked and disingenuous policy he has pursued towards us. All we require is to be judged according to our works. We demand just judgment, whether we are condemned or justified thereby. We have followed our convictions to our own temporal damage; when, by echoing Mr. Campbell's interpretations for lucre's sake, we might be in the receipt of \$2,000 per annum for preaching Campbellism, as D. S. Burnet is said to be at "Seventeenth Street, New York." But the Campbellites never could make a hireling of us; for straitened as we have been at times, we never could be induced to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. Envy! Base, indeed.

* If "L. T." write again, direct to Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y.; not to N. Y. City. It was by mere accident we received it.—*Editor.*

with our faith should we be to envy the president of a factory for the preparation of youthful mar-texts and perverters of the truth. Nay, nay; he is joined to the "idols of his den;" and seeing that our efforts for his redemption have been in vain, (for he declares he has not read what we have sent him for years) we regretfully abandon him to the perdition that awaits them at the speedy apocalypse of Christ.

Having disposed of this point, we proceed to say that we heartily believe that Solomon, Stephen, Jesus, and Paul, all taught the same thing concerning the living and the dead. We believe that all they said in the several languages they used was true; but we do not believe the construction put upon the English version of their words by L. T. Mart-text, the idol of his admiration, and the clerical lords of Protestant and Papal Christendom. Our readers need not be told how vast a difference there is between rejecting the words of the Spirit enunciated by Solomon, Stephen, Paul, and the Lord Jesus, and rejecting the interpretations of their words by self-constituted expositors. This is the head and front of our offending. We reject the theological interpretations of the Scriptures as nonsense—pure, unmitigated nonsense; and therefore it is that the impotent wrath of the F. G. C. and L. T. class is distributed in mimic thunders against us. But, as one of the sons of Zion, and not of Rome, Geneva, nor Bethany, we despise them. We shake our head at them with ineffable contempt, and say "Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye!"

But to return. We deny that Solomon said, that "the spirit of a man, when he dies, goeth upward;" we deny that the denial of immortal soulism is affirming that Stephen besought the Lord to do what he had neither the will nor power to do; we deny that Paul said what is attributed to him; we deny that Jesus said men had immortal souls in them, in saying that God was the God of the living, not of the dead; we deny that Jesus taught that the kingdom of heaven was made up of infants, or contained the ghosts of infants, in saying what he did; we deny that Jesus taught that angels carry either ghosts or men into Abraham's bosom before the resurrection of the just; or that he taught the punishment of dead men, rich or poor, before "resurrection to judgment;" and lastly, we deny that Jesus told the thief that he should be with him in Paradise on the day of the crucifixion. All these points we deny. But Gentile theology affirms them all; and all logicians know, or ought to know, that the burden of proof is with the affirmative. It is we, then, who deny, that are entitled of

right to call for the proof. This we do, and demand that the points be proved from *Moses and the prophets in harmony with the teaching of Jesus and the apostles*. We will accept no proof short of this; for it is written, "To the Law and the Testimony, if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Come on, then, ye quibblers on Scripture fragments, and show us at large the Spirit's teaching. Show us where, in all the writings of Moses and the prophets, the Spirit teaches the existence of the thing you call an "immortal soul" in sin's flesh; or where he teaches the "future state" of your systems, to which, at death,

"Men's spirits speed
To join the great assembly of the Blest,
And THERE enjoy their everlasting rest."

But, why challenge you to compass impossibilities. Your strongest men have tried and failed—miserably failed. They know no more about the matter than a Crow, or a Blackfoot Indian, as Macaulay truly said. "Because, therefore, of their consummate ignorance of the true doctrine of immortality, they do not see that Moses and the prophets do teach resurrection, immortality, and a future state; but while they read their testimony, (blind guides of owls and bats as blind, that they are!) they see nothing of them, because they are looking for what is not there—the everlasting rest of human ghosts in Skycana—and therefore they say truly, that Moses and the prophets are silent on the subject; and untruly affirm that they confine themselves to rewards and punishments in the present state!!! Hence it is, that the clergy being so stupid and blind, their disciples are so malevolent, presumptuous, and perverse; for the common qualities of the multitude are the consequence of the profound ignorance which clerically enslaves them. Not only not knowing the truth, but denying it, and being unable to square their foolishness with the glorious word, the policy of priest and people is to throw off the burden of proof which is too heavy for their rickettiness, upon the shoulders of their adversaries; and to call upon these to prove that this and that text does not mean what they presumptuously assume. All we are bound to show is *what the Scripture doth teach*, without regard at all to their Pagan notions. The doctrine of the Bible cannot be harmonized with these. The Bible is an exhibition of God's thoughts and ways; and it declares that these are point-blank opposed to the thoughts and ways of men; which are mere inventions and thinkings of the flesh, and always very admirable and agreeable thereto. Therefore, let "L. T.," and his "great and

good" guides in folly, cease to shirk their duty. Let them show that the texts upon which they hang their traditions, do mean what they affirm. And this they must do, so as not to make one text contradict another; for *right reason accepts nothing as demonstration which does not harmonize with Scripture in all its parts.* When they shall have accomplished this, it will be time enough to review their "vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called." In the meantime, for the satisfaction of "A Seeker after Truth," and persons of his cast of mind (of the little children type), we shall leave "L. T." and "F. G. C." to revel in all the glitter and moonshine of ghostology, and proceed to show what the Spirit signifies in the passages adduced.

"DEPART AND BE WITH CHRIST."

The first passage "A Seeker after Truth" desires information on, is that in Philippians. Although we have often in times past explained it, we shall, nevertheless, upon the line-upon-line principle, and for the benefit of new readers, interpret it again.

In the first place, we remark, that Paul did not write what is attributed to him in the common version of the New Testament. Before, then, we can interpret his words, we must ascertain what he said; and because the English does not truly report them, we decline the impossible task of scripturally expounding the English text. What, then, did the apostle say? Let us see!

"I know," saith he, "that this (the preaching of Christ in pretence or truth, see ver. 18.) will result in deliverance to me through your supplication, and assistance of the spirit of Jesus Christ: according to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be confounded. but with all boldness of speech, as at all times, also now Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether through life or through death. For to me the living is Christ, and the dying, gain. But since the living in flesh is for me a fruit of labor, what even I myself shall choose I know not. For I am straitened by the two, having the earnest desire for the returning and being with Christ, far better by much. But the continuing in the flesh (is) more needful on account of you. And having this conviction, I know that I shall continue and remain among you all, to the advancement and rejoicing of your faith."

Now, with such a translation as this, which cannot be set aside, no one would ever have thought of referring to the passage in proof of immortal-soulism in any of its details. There is one word in the Greek, however, the sense of which is uncertain, and in

dispute with the schoolmen of the Apostacy. That word is the verb *ἀναλυσαι, analusai*, aor. 1. inf. act. It comes from *αναλω, analuo*, which is compounded of *ανα, back again*, and *λω, to loose*. It is particularly applied by Homer, to loosening the cables of a ship in order to sail from port. "Hence," says Parkhurst, "in the N. Test., to return or depart, and occurs in Luke xii. 36; where Wetstein shows that this verb, followed by *απο των δειπνων, εκ συμποσιων, &c.*, is, in the Greek writers, likewise used for returning, or departing from a supper—from a banquet, &c.

The text in Luke reads thus: "Be ye," saith Jesus to his disciples, "like to men waiting for their lord; at length he shall return (*αναλυσει, analusei*) for the nuptials: so that coming and having knocked, immediately they shall open to him. Happy are those servants, whom the Lord coming shall find watching." Here the sense of the verb is obvious enough to any other than a mind spoiled by the philosophy and vain deceit of the schools. These know nothing about "the nuptials," so that in reading the text they cannot see the sense. "At length the Lord shall return for the nuptials." Or read it thus: "At length the Lord shall depart for the nuptials;" who cannot see that "depart" here signifies return; for, for the Lord to depart when the "at length" shall have expired, is equivalent to his setting out from where he is, that he may go to where the bride resides. Now, Paul tells us that THE ECCLESIA (commonly styled church) is his bride; and she is notoriously a resident on earth. (See Eph. v. 23-32; Rev. xix. 7, 8.) He will, therefore, depart from heaven to earth, to be finally and forever united to the espoused who are waiting for him. This was the earnest expectation and hope of the apostles, as it was of all whom they enlightened, and as it is now of all who have any scriptural claim to the name of Christian. This is styled in Scripture, THE RETURNING; and is thus expressed in Acts i. 11—"This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into the heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into the heaven." All true Christians, in all ages and generatious since, have been waiting and watching for this event, upon which depends their life and glory in the Aions. "Constantly hope for the gift to be brought to you," saith Peter, "at the unveiling of Jesus Christ"—1 Pet. i. 13. But we need not multiply words on this point: the returning or departing is one of the first or elementary principles of the oracles of God.

But, as return is so obviously the sense

of the word in this place (a conviction which the king's translators could not resist, for they have so rendered it)—how comes it that they have rendered it "depart" in Philippians? The answer is, they had doubts, which they disposed of by splitting the difference—giving *return* to one text, and *depart* to the other. They found that Paul said to Timothy, "I am ready to be offered up, and the time of my *analysis* (*αναλυσις*) has approached:" they concluded that Paul had a desire to be with Christ *by analysis*, or dissolution; and therefore rendered it *depart* in the sense of his immortal soul shuffling off its mortal coil, and winging its flight to glory!

But Paul had no idea of any such *analysis*. He considered, that between its occurrence and the manifestation of Christ and the kingdom, his crown of righteousness was "laid up;" and would not be given to him until the day of his return. "My *analysis* hath approached," saith he; "henceforth there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give to me at *that day*," mentioned in the first verse—the day of his appearing; "and not to me only, but unto all them also *who love his appearing*." 2 Tim. iv. 6-8. That was the day to which he looked with desire—not his own personal *analysis*, or loosing from life; but the *analysis* of the righteous Judge from the heavens, when he should weigh anchor from that roadstead, and set sail for earth.

Analuo and *analysis*, the verb and noun, are only used three times in the New Testament; the former twice, and the latter once: and the instances are before the reader.

John Milton, the poet (not, however, of the "F. G. C." craft), in commenting upon the *supposition* that Paul desired to obtain immediate possession of heavenly perfection and glory, remarks, "It by no means follows that, when the soul of each individual leaves the body, it is received immediately either into heaven or hell. For he had "a desire to be with Christ;" that is, *at his appearing*, which all the believers hoped and expected was then at hand. In the same manner, one who is going on a voyage desires to *set sail* and to *arrive* at the destined port (such is the order in which his wishes arranged themselves), *omitting all notice of the intermediate passage*. If, however, it be true that there is no time without motion, which Aristotle illustrates by the example of those who were flattered to have slept in the temple of the heroes, and who, on awaking, imagined that the moment in which they awoke had succeeded, without an interval, to that in which they fell asleep; how much more must inter-

vening time be annihilated to the departed, so that to them to die and to be with Christ will seem to take place at the same moment. Christ himself, however, expressly indicates the time at which we shall be with him; "If I go and prepare a place for you," saith he, "*I will come again* and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."—John xiv. 3.

From what he writes to Timothy, we have seen that Paul did not expect to be with Christ at his personal *analysis*. In his letter to the Philippians, he shows that he looked to his *synthesis* as the crisis of that happy event. By his *synthesis* is meant the opposite to his *analysis*. Referring to his synthetic manifestation, he says, "I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, &c.; that I may be acquainted with him, and the power of his resurrection, &c.; *if by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead*. Our citizenship *begins* in the heavens; from whence also *we wait* for a deliverer, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may become of like form with the body of his glory, according to the energy whereby he is able also to subdue things to himself."—Chap. iii. 8, 10, 11, 20, 21. This was the mark of the prize of his high calling, towards which he pressed; and as the times and the seasons, of the Lord's apocalypse, do not appear to have been known to him, at the time of writing this epistle, he thought that the time was at hand to realize the hope; for he says in the next chapter, "*The Lord is at hand*"; be careful for nothing;" verse 5. He did not, however, expect it before his *analysis*. This is evident from his expressed anxiety to attain to the resurrection, which must of necessity follow it; yet how long or short a time after his *analysis* he knew not, nor would he care; for a dead man is indifferent to all things; and to him the extinction of life at death, and the rekindlement of it at resurrection, are but the momentary succession of thought. He is utterly unconscious of the interval. Hence, if Paul meant his own departing that he desired, and not Christ's, he very properly and consistently with his other writings, associated that departing with the being with the Lord, for he will be unconscious of any interval till he attain to the resurrection of the dead. He is now, and has been since his *analysis*, "*waiting for a deliverer*." The "body of his humiliation," which is himself (for he wrote, "In me, that is, in *my flesh*"), is dust and ashes. These are all that remains of Paul, save his writings and character. His earth is in the invisible, confined there by the law of the *αναλυσις*, *analysis* common

to flesh and blood. And as the Lord could synthesize his dust in the twinkling of an eye, and bring him out of the invisible, or grave, at any moment he pleased, he is therefore the Lord's prisoner, as are also the dead saints. Hence, the righteous are so styled in the prophets. Job says, "Why did I not from the womb? Why did I not give up the ghost (was this his "immortal soul?" if so, what, then, was the "I," whose death he laments did not happen?) when I came out of the belly? For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; *την* (in sleep) had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth; or as a hidden untimely birth, I had not been; as infants which never saw the light (are abortions and still-borns immortal?) There (in the grave) the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary (as opposed to "the wicked") are at rest. The prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and the great are there."—iii. 11-19.

"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, *in the grave*, whither *την* (the thinking and immortal "I" of the schoolmen, in the second person) goest."—Eccles. ix. 10. Such is the nature of things with respect to the captives of death, good and bad, great and small, while in his custody—prisoners asleep and chained to the sides of the pit, who cannot leave their prison-house, till He who hath the Keys of the Invisible and of Death (Rev. i. 18), comes and unlocks the gates of the unseen.

It is part of the mission of Jesus to do this. Thus in prophecy, the Spirit saith to Christ, "I, Jehovah, have called Thee, and will give Thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and *την* that sit in darkness out of the prison-house."—Isa. xlii. 6, 7. And in Zech. ix. 10, 11, the Spirit saith of the King who was to ride into Jerusalem upon the foal of an ass, "He shall speak peace unto the nations;" and then addressing him as if present, saith, "As for these also, by the blood of thy covenant I have released *την* prisoners out of the pit, in which is no water." Paul is one of these prisoners. He is in a pit, in which there is no water of life; and, if ever he get out of it, as he certainly will, it will be by virtue of the blood of the Abrahamic Covenant, which was anti-typically dedicated, and made sanctifying to all the children thereof, by the blood of sprinkling, shed from the side of Jesus; and with which he was sprinkled in obeying the truth. Even when alive, and in the custody of the Roman Dragon, he styles himself "*the prisoner of the Lord;*" for he got into the Satan's

clutches in the Lord's service; and as the Lord could have released him, but did not, he was more the Lord's prisoner, than the Roman Devil and Satan's (Rev. xii. 9.)

Such, then, is Paul's present condition, "like to a man waiting for his lord," or, as he has it, "waiting for a deliverer—the Lord Jesus"—to come and change the body, of his humiliation, into a like form with the body of his glory. This will be his synthesis—the putting of him together again; the rebuilding of his dust and ashes into the human form—an incorruptible, deathless, and glorious body—with the spiritual, or mental and moral, characteristics of "*Paul the aged*" incorporated therein.

From this exposition, it will be seen, that we have nothing to reconcile between Paul's words and Psal. c. xlvii. 3, 4. We do not undertake the impossible task of harmonizing mistranslations, and clerical opinions, with the teaching of the Spirit. The supposed difficulty must be removed by those who fabricate it. If men say, "the dead are conscious and intelligent in a spirit-world;" and the Spirit say by Solomon, "the dead know not anything"—they create a contradiction by their stupid nonsense; let them, therefore, reconcile it if they can. The fact is, it is irreconcilable; and they place themselves in a strait betwixt two, which imposes upon them the necessity of abandoning their dogma or the Bible. They cannot, before God, believe in both.

At the time Paul wrote the passage in question, he was in the custody of his "*adversary the Devil,*" who, "*as a roaring lion,*" threatened to "*devour*" him.—1 Pet. v. 8. This appears, from Phil. i. 13, "My bonds," saith he, "for Christ are manifest to all the Prætorium, and to all others." He was uncertain how it would go with him; still he rather inclined to the opinion, that he should be delivered, as the result of the minds of his judges being influenced in his favor, by the preaching of Christ, in pretence, or through envy and strife, or in truth out of good will, and by their supplication of the Philippian disciples in his behalf, and by the assistance of the Spirit, when he should speak in his own defence, or rather in defence of the truth. This might result in his being set at liberty, which he styles *το ζην*, *to zain* "the living;" or, all these influences might fail, and he would be condemned to death. This he styles *το αποθανειν*, *to apothanem*, "the dying." Here, then, his body stood related to two things—a judicial acquittal, or "life;" and a judicial condemnation, or "death." Now, he saith, "My earnest expectation and hope is, that in nothing I shall be confounded, but with all

boldness of speech, as at all times, also now Christ shall be magnified IN MY BODY, whether through life, or through death." He had no conception of Christ being magnified by himself in any way apart from *body*. He never talked about Christ being magnified in his immortal soul. This is a clerical conceit, not an apostolic principle. If his body lived, it would be Christ living in him, by faith and His spirit, and working through him; so that such a living was for him "a fruit of labor," or, as we should say, "a life of labor," or a laborious life. But if his body died—if it were put to death by the judicial sentence of the Prætorian officials of the Great Red Dragon, Christ would also be magnified in the maltreatment and execution of his body to death; for the death of the body would have been incurred in consequence of his bold defence of Christ's doctrine. "The dying" would be "gain" for him; for "he that loses his life for my sake," saith Jesus, "shall find it . . . for the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and THEN he shall reward every man according to his works"—Matt. xvi. 27—and not before.

But he was straitened by two considerations—the desirableness of at once resting from his perilous labors by falling "asleep in Jesus" (as he expresses it elsewhere), and so waiting for his return; and the desirableness of continuing his labors in the care of all the churches, seeing that apostacy was revealing itself on every side. So, then, as the general good was to be preferred to his own ease, the conviction seemed to gather strength that the Lord would not permit the Devil to devour him; and therefore he ended his cogitation upon this point, in saying, "I know that I shall continue and remain among you all to the advancement and rejoicing of your faith."

"THE SPIRITS IN PRISON."

"A Seeker after Truth," having his mind more or less perplexed by the remains of the old heathen traditions indoctrinated into it by the clerical fictions in which he was trained, is in difficulty about "spirits in prison," and the preaching of the Gospel to the dead. He thinks he can see in these, *dead men alive in a spirit-state*; yet he cannot reconcile the crotchet with the Scripture declaration, that "the dead know not anything." They are irreconcilable. He must, therefore, give up one or the other. If he hold on to the crotchet, he must reject the Scripture; and if he adhere to this, he must leave his spirit-bubble to the air. But let us see if we can help him out of the

difficulty which flesh, but not the Spirit, has created.

Peter's words are, "Christ once for all suffered on account of sins—a just one on behalf of unjust ones—that he might lead us to God." How did he suffer, who said, "Before Abraham was, I am?" Hear Peter, "Having been put to death indeed for flesh, but made alive for the Spirit. By which (Spirit) also having gone, he preached to the spirits in prison; to the disobedient formerly, when one time the long-suffering of God waited in Noah's days, while the ark was being prepared—in which a few, that is, eight souls were saved by means of water; to which an antitype, baptism, also now saves us, &c.

In these words, Peter does not say that Jesus preached to them; but that Christ did. On Pentecost, Peter said, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."—Acts ii. 36. Was he "Christ" while dead in the sepulchre? No. Was he "Christ" when he came to life? Yes. How so? "God made him Christ." By what means? The Spirit of God entered into the dead body called Jesus, and *christed*, or anointed, it in all its atoms, so that it became Spirit; and, as Peter saith, "was made alive for the Spirit." Thus was he born of the Spirit, and became spirit; so that when he speaks to the Seven Churches of Asia, he saith, "He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches."

To prevent misunderstanding, we remark, further, that before Jesus died, he was Christ also; because he was "sealed of the Father;" and the Spirit filled him without measure. But he was not Christ, or Anointed (which is the meaning of the word), until his baptismal anointing. He was for thirty years "Son of God," as Adam the first was "Son of God" (see Luke iii. 38); who was to be made Christ at his baptism, and afterwards at his resurrection.

"Though we have known Christ after the flesh," saith Paul, "yet henceforth know we him no more."—2 Cor. v. 16. In speaking, therefore, of the Resurrected One in his relation to Noah's days, Peter says, "By which (Spirit), having gone, he preached." What the Spirit did in Noah's days Jesus is said to have done also, as "the Lord the Spirit." If Jesus had not become *πνευμα ἀγιοσωνης*, *pneuma haghiosunes*, by resurrection, Peter would not have said he preached in Noah's days; because it was as Spirit, not as flesh, he preached then.

Peter says, Christ's Spirit was in the prophets.—1 Pet. i. 11. Noah was one of

these, so that the Spirit of Christ was in him also. Being in him, the Spirit preached through him, warning the Antediluvians of what was coming upon their generation; and endued Noah with ability to construct a ship, which, for due proportion and convenience, has not been surpassed by the most skillful naval architects of our day.

But the longsuffering of God ceased with the completion of the Ark; he therefore swept the disobedient into the invisible by the flood. Before the waters subsided, they would have been resolved into the chemical constituents of flesh and blood, held in solution by the deep. They were no longer *bodies*; but "a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again."—Ps. lxxviii. 39. What better could Peter term them than "winds," or spirits? for *wind* is the primitive meaning of the Greek word, rendered "spirits." Chemistry has reduced animal bodies almost entirely to airs or gases; about five sixths to one of earthy matter. It is said by David, as already quoted, "*flesh is a wind that passeth away*;" so that revelation and science are here agreed. They are winds in prison, pent up in the caverns of the deep; so that they can blow no more. When preached to they were not "spirits in prison;" but "fleshly men and women," criminals at large, like the worldly religionists of our own time. The Spirit of Christ, or Christing spirit, preached to them *while the Ark was building*; not afterwards. When judgment overtook them the preaching ceased, and they became prisoners of the deep. Peter designates them "spirits in prison" while he was writing; but not as such while the preaching was in progress.

"THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THE DEAD."

"For this the gospel was preached to dead ones, that they might be condemned by men for flesh, but live by God for spirit."—I Pet. iv. 6. This is not difficult to explain. The dead referred to were persons who, previous to the time Peter was writing, had heard the gospel and obeyed it. The truth they believed caused them to cease any longer to work the will of the Gentiles, in practising their vices and abominable idolatries. This caused their former companions to speak evil of them, and to persecute them even to death; which Peter terms condemnation for flesh. Their refusal to gratify the flesh, and their reproof of fleshly gratification in others, was the ground of their condemnation. But their work shall be rewarded; for having put to death the deeds of the body, they shall live "*for spirit*," *πνευματι*. The gospel was preached to them with a view to this result—that they might become spirit "in the day

of the Lord Jesus," being born from the dust of the spirit by resurrection: for "that born of the spirit is spirit."

The gospel was not preached to them after their decease. Peter does not say that it was. But that the gospel was preached to persons, dead indeed while he was writing, but alive when they heard and became obedient. Preaching the gospel to dead men! If that does not beat everything! What piece of tomfoolery will not the clergy teach, and their dupes believe, after this. Why "a living dog is better than a dead lion;" yet the dogs of the apostacy are both deaf and dumb. What would not their corpses be in respect of truth!

But here we must pause for the present; in our next, we shall resume.

EDITOR.

Feb. 4th, 1857.

It may not be amiss to republish at the present time, the following article which appeared in our periodical in 1845, under the caption of "*Spirits in Prison*," as it contains two or three points we have not touched in the foregoing. Here is the letter and our reply:—

"THE SPIRITS IN PRISON."

Bro. Thomas—I heard one of our Evangelists, whom I esteem very highly, comment upon I Peter iii. 18–20. He said, that the Spirit of Christ, after he was crucified, dead, and buried, went and preached to the imprisoned spirits of the disobedient antediluvians, &c.; and remarked, that his idea was confirmed by ch. iv. 6, from which he concluded, that 'the gospel being preached to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh,' proves that they were *not* in the flesh, but 'disembodied spirits.' He remarked, in conversation with me afterwards, that he would like to hear your interpretation of it: so would I, although I disagree with him in his opinion *toto cælo*.

Yours faithfully,

J.

Henderson, Ky.: July 28, 1845.

REPLY.

In a few words, we understand the Evangelist to mean, that *the Disembodied Spirit of Jesus went to the disembodied spirits of the Antediluvians, and preached the gospel to them in Hades!* This is the most extraordinary dogma ever broached by living man in the face of the Oracles of God. On the supposition that their ghosts are in Hades, in the orthodox sense of the word, which is the heathen sense, how could the ghost of Jesus preach the gospel to them (which is remission of sins, and eternal life to believers of the promises covenanted to Abraham and

David, through his death AND resurrection) seeing that he had not risen from the dead? Take from the gospel facts the resurrection of Jesus, and the gospel ceases to be the 'power of God for salvation.'—If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. * * Ye are yet in your sins. Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.' Now the disembodied phantoms of the Antediluvian World held the same relation to the gospel preached by Jesus' Ghost *before he rose*, that the Hymenean Corinthians did to it preached by the Apostles after his resurrection, when they averred a principle, which, in its operation on the faith, set aside his resurrection from the dead. What could the ghost of Jesus have preached to them? Remission of sins by his name? *His name was inefficacious to that end until he rose again.* Eternal life by his name? If in default of his resurrection his name had no power in it for remission, they must have continued in their sins, and consequently entitled only to the wages of sin, which is death. The name of Jesus could not give a right to eternal life previous to his return from the dead; for had he not risen, it would have been proof that God had not accepted him as a *klaphoreth*, or COVENING for sin: and a non-resurrected sacrifice would have been of no more profit than the sacrifices under the Law. All the dead, righteous or unrighteous, who had died before his crucifixion, or since, would have eternally to sleep the sleep of death.

What else beside remission of sins and the life and glory of Messiah's Aions, can you conceive, "ghosts in Hades" stand in need of? These the gospel could give them no title to before Jesus rose; it would have been useless, then, for the ghost to go and preach it to them. But on the supposition, that the gospel of a non-resurrected Messiah could save them, what utility could there be in preaching it, seeing that, though made ever so plain, they could not understand it, being without wisdom, sagacity, or ability to do; for it is written, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave with *thou* goest?" No; the "dead know not anything;" the preaching the gospel, therefore, to physically dead men, is altogether out of the record. This speculation then is not the sense of the passage before us. Let us see what is.

In verse 18, two things are predicated of Jesus, namely, he was put to death for flesh; and secondly, he was quickened, or made alive, for the Spirit, i. e. of God. In this verse, there are two personages named, to wit, God and Christ; the Spirit of God,

which is his power, or agent, by which he affects every thing. In the next verse, it continues, 'by which also having gone he preached to the spirits in prison, to the disobedient formerly, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, &c.'—Here we have the relative *εἰς ὧ*, 'by which.' This pronoun by rule claims 'the Spirit' for its antecedent. 'By which Spirit also having gone, preached, &c.' is the reading; but the question upon which the correct interpretation of the passage turns, is—*by which Spirit of God, who went and preached?* The answer is, God went and preached to them, not Jesus, nor the Ghost of Jesus; but God went, and *by his Spirit* preached to the Antediluvians. He also preached to them in time past, as well as to us in time present, and raised up his Son Jesus, and all by his Spirit: for 'in sundry times and in divers manners, God, who spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,' and by the same Spirit. 'Many years didst thou forbear them, and testified against them *by thy Spirit in thy prophets*; yet would they not give ear.' This, though affirmed of Israel, is equally true of the Antediluvians; for the history shows, that God, not Jesus testified against them by his Spirit in Noah.

But, it is supposed, that whoever went to preach to them, did so, *in the interval between the death and resurrection of Jesus!* It does not mean, that the Spirit preached to them *while in prison*; but, that he went and preached through Noah to the Antediluvians, who were then living, but, while Peter was writing, were in the custody of Death, and in the prison-house of the deep. He did not mean to say, that the Spirit preached to dead men, or to the ghosts of dead men; but to men living in Noah's day, and dead in his.

'For this cause the gospel was preached to them also who are dead, that they might be judged according to men for flesh, but live according to God for spirit.' 'who are dead;' that is, while I, Peter, now write. Living, when the gospel was preached to them, but dead now; having been judged, or put to death by men for flesh, as was Jesus, because they would not forsake the truth, but who shall be made alive again for spirit according to the purpose of God, which cannot be frustrated. 'Being put to death for flesh,' and 'being judged according to men for flesh,' are phrases which apply to Jesus and the saints, who like him are persecuted unto death: and both import the same things:—to be judged for flesh, is to be put to death for flesh; and to be quickened for spirit, is to live according to God by the Spirit for spirit.

"If this interpretation be rejected, we should like to see something more consonant with the word of truth. 'Till then, we hold it as the only true exposition of the text.'"

EDITOR.

The Political.

New Holy Alliance.

At the present crisis, it has become the fashion throughout Continental Europe to represent the British Power in the part it enacted at the Congress of Vienna in 1815, as the victimizer of the innocent and confiding monarchs of that region; and that by its "infernal art," it placed the elements of disorder under every European throne, that it might check the industrial development of other nations, and clothe their peoples in her cottons! In short, they say, that "the treaties of Vienna were but the solemn confirmation of the absolute supremacy of Great Britain."

This absurd and ridiculous view of the matter, emanating, it is said, from that brilliant centre of wisdom and truth, the capital of the Czar, is assiduously promulgated and maintained with great literary ability by the hireling scribes of the absolutist governments of the Head and Horns of the Beast. The following remarks, which we extract from an article in the *London Weekly Times*, under the caption of "*Proposal for a New Holy Alliance*," will unfold to the reader the working of Muscovite cunning for that European ascendancy, which it is certain to compass by hook or by crook, as its manifest destiny "marked out for it by the finger of God."

"Accusations against 'perfidious Albion' find ready credence amongst populations jealous of our wealth and prosperity, and incapable of understanding the origin of our greatness. The masses of the European population have yet to learn the first principles of political and economical science. Where there is no political, religious, or social liberty, there can be no great development of industry. We have learned in this country to trust to private enterprise and to give it free scope, and we only require of the Government that it shall not meddle or interfere with the operations of trade and commerce. On the Continent the Governments protect everything, regulate everything, and paralyze industry by their efforts to restrain freedom under military repression. Where sickly manufactures are coddled up by prohibitive duties, where revenues are raised from monopolies, and the working classes are controlled in their movements by a meddling and omnipresent police, it is useless to look for a healthy growth of industrial ac-

tivity. The people of Continental Europe need not cast their eyes across the sea to find the causes of the increase or decadence of nations. They have only to turn to the little Republic of Switzerland for an example. There they may look on the spectacle of a population inhabiting a mountainous region, little favored by nature, but industrious and prosperous because they are free. There, also, they may see some two millions of people, inspired by liberty, successfully defying one of the great military Powers of Europe. The same causes operating on a larger scale have made the greatness of England. Until the Continental nations have shaken off many prejudices, and made great advances in knowledge, it will be useless to endeavor to convince them that the people of England honestly desire to see them increase in wealth and power. The commercial supremacy of this country causes distrust in the present day just as much as the arms and ambition of the French Empire excited the terror and inflamed the resentment of Europe at the commencement of the century. As, at that time, the Great Powers were intent only on curbing the power of France, and erecting barriers against her supposed aggressive spirit, so now their leading idea is to raise obstacles against the progressive industry of England. While our statesmen cherished the delusion of protection, we were taunted with our exclusiveness; and now that we have thrown open our ports, at home and in the colonies, to the produce and shipping of every country, we are charged with a design of monopolizing the commerce of the world. If we ask other nations to imitate our example, they suspect us of selfishness, forgetting that no two countries can carry on free interchange without mutual benefit. We desire to see the States of the Continent as free, as pacific, and as prosperous as ourselves; for they cannot become rich without making us richer, and unrestricted commerce is the *parent of liberty and peace*. If the British Government had been actuated in 1815 by the motives now imputed to them, they would have stipulated, in accordance with the economical notions then prevalent, for commercial privileges and advantages, which they might easily have obtained from the monarchs whose thrones they had rescued from the grasp of Napoleon. Their great error lay in the aid which they gave to the despotic Sovereigns, and their acquiescence in the acts of the Holy Alliance, to whose principles they refused their sanction. The partition of Europe into patchwork monarchies was the result of the rapacity of the Northern Powers, and the troubles of the Continent since 1815 have been caused by the gross breach of faith of Sovereigns, who, when

the danger was passed, broke every promise they had made to their people in the hour of adversity. Even now, they have but to do justice and show mercy, in order to remove the necessity for enormous standing armies, and the 'armed peace' so oppressive to their subjects and so pregnant with danger to themselves.

"But the abuse of England to which we have adverted, and the perfectly true picture drawn of the difficulties arising from overgrown military establishments, is not intended to lead to any relaxation of the repressive system which weighs so heavily on the Continent. On the contrary, the object is to *prepare the way for a new Holy Alliance*, of which the project is said to have ripened in the Absolutist Cabinets. It is believed in the higher political circles of Northern and Central Europe that *the time is favorable for establishing Cossackism as a ruling principle*, and we are assured that 'notes have been drawn up on the question, overtures made, communications exchanged, and, in a word, negotiations are at this moment carried on in the silence of Cabinets.' That some such movement has been set on foot by the renewed activity of Russian diplomacy, we have no doubt. The Anglo-French alliance is the main obstacle in the way of a comprehensive scheme for the concentration of absolutist power, and against that alliance all the force of the conspiracy is directed. England, therefore, is represented as the fountain and origin of European disturbance, and *Russia as the pacificator and regenerator*. As a first step, Russia proclaims that she has renounced all notion of aggrandisement in Europe. She professes to have learned, from the experience of the late war, that she cannot make the smallest advance in that direction without provoking a general crusade. Henceforth all her efforts will converge on *Asia*, where she may, or may not, come into collision with England; but any consideration of that contingency, she thinks, may be postponed. Seeing that Russia has abandoned all idea of aggression in Europe, the end of the alliance between England and France has been accomplished, and it may now be dissolved. *The next step would be an alliance between France and Russia*. The two Emperors have more than one point of resemblance—more than one bond of sympathy. They are both reserved, both free to choose their political relations, and the Czar, the incarnation of absolute power, is pleased with the form of the Imperial Government of France. Then the political consequences would be enormous. France united with Russia would become the centre of a *great maritime confederation*, and the British flag would no longer flaunt supreme on the seas.

'All chance of a struggle by sea would thus disappear, while by land an armed conflict would be impossible. Who, in fact, would dare to attack France and Russia united—Russia, moreover, having at her disposal the whole force of Prussia, when the aggressor would be most assuredly crushed?' France and Russia would compress Germany between them, and there would be established on the Continent 'THREE PREPONDERATING INFLUENCES, whose mission would be to secure peace, *the consolidation of thrones*, and the well-being of the people.' No more conquests would be tolerated in old Europe, and any 'modifications of territory' which might be found necessary would be decided by a general congress. Such is the proposal for the *regeneration of Europe by the establishment of Cossackism, pure and simple, based on a solidarity of despotism*.

"The policy recommended by public writers in the interest of Russia is now acted upon in practice, although it is not consolidated by formal engagements. It is possible that personal vanity, the desire of playing a great part in Europe, and the hope of placing his dynasty under the protection of a general guarantee, may lead Napoleon III. to favour the project of a new Holy Alliance. But although France is now Imperial she has a people, and her liberal politicians, although compelled to silence, are not dead. The French people have chosen their form of government, but all the force of Europe could not impose upon them a ruler or a dynasty that they did not approve. The Emperor by drawing closer to the legitimate monarchs would only obtain insincere allies, while he would alienate the heart of France. If he retain the sound judgment which has hitherto marked his career, he will close his ear to Muscovite flattery, and decline the perilous advantages of a Russian alliance. The Emperor of the French may enter into a confederation of monarchs, having for its object the consolidation of thrones, but the French people will not go with him. We do not think that Louis Napoleon will court his own ruin, and if he should forget the history of his uncle, or the origin of his sovereignty, the cause of liberty would probably gain in the end. England will have nothing to do with Holy Alliances, and it is to be desired that her Government should avoid intimate and compromising relations with the absolutist Cabinets. The alliances of the English people ought to be with peoples and not with monarchs. We do not despair of the cause of freedom in Europe, and we will best help it by throwing in our power to sustain Belgium, Sardinia, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian kingdoms against the aggressions of their despotic neighbors. For

the rest, if the Liberals of the Continent lose energy, abandon hope, and surrender themselves unconditionally to absolutism, we should be content to accept isolation in Europe, and to look for compensation in drawing closer our alliance with the free Anglo-Saxon Republic of the Western World."

The writer of the above, who has the means of being well-informed, concerning the intrigues of the Demons of the political Aerial, tells us that the project of a New Holy Alliance has ripened in the Absolutist Cabinets; and that the conviction of this Aerial is, that the time is favourable for establishing Cossackism (Ezekiel would style it *Gogueism*) as a ruling principle in Northern and Central Europe. There is no doubt that this is what things are tending to. No obstacle, not even the Anglo-French alliance, can prevent it. The Oracles of God show, that *Europe is to be subjected to the dominion of One Policy, and that that policy will be Cossack; and in its Asiatic operations and schemes furiously hostile to the British Power.* We have shown this in multifarious illustrations of the current signs of the times. We do not intend to go into the matter at any length at present; we only call attention here to what is at work in "the silence of Cabinets," illustrative of what THE FROGS are doing.

The New Holy Alliance, when consummated, will reflect the declaration of the Spirit, that "The Ten Horns have ONE MIND, and shall give their power and strength to the Beast." When these Horns are in such an alliance with the Eighth Head of the Beast, the New Holy Alliance, now foreshadowed, will be complete. Doth not the *oneness of mind* predicted, indicate *one policy*; and do not the terms of the prophecy show that the alliance is to be headed by a superior styled "the Beast;" for he is the receiver, not the giver, of the strength and power? A sovereign power receives the gifts of inferiors. On a little reflection, the reader will perceive the necessity of an alliance among the powers, with a sovereign power among them to direct their movements in "the time of the end." Let him put this question to himself, namely: "*How are the armies of all the nations to be gathered together to battle against Jerusalem, so long as each government has an independent policy of its own?*" That they are to be so gathered, see *Zech. xiv. 2*; *Joel iii. 1-2*. What was necessary before the nations could be led against Moscow in 1812? That their governments should be brought under the dominion of one policy by conquest or cunning. This was effected by Napoleon the Great. When he became the Lord of Europe, he directed its armies

against whatever stood in the way of his ambition. The same necessity obtains at the present time. One Policy must be established, preparatory to the siege of Jerusalem by "Gog of the land of Magog, the Prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tobol," and all the hosts of the nations under his command.

Will the reader also ask himself another question? What possible inducement could there be for Russia, at the head of the armies of Europe, to invade Palestine, and to lay siege to Jerusalem, if that country and city were simply, as now, in the hands of the effete and feeble Turks? Manifestly, not any. Then what follows? The answer is, that the magnitude of the invading hosts indicates the magnitude of the power to be expelled; and that, consequently, Palestine and Jerusalem will be occupied by a power independent of, or in alliance with, (we believe the latter,) the Ottoman or Euphrateans. The oracles of God show, that this power will be the *THE BRITISH*—the Merchants of Tarshish, with Sheba and Dedan. This is the natural and destined antagonist of Russia, the crowning element of the Eighth Head of John, the King of the North of Daniel, and the Gog of Ezekiel.

We need not be surprised, then, at the hatred which exists in the Absolutist Cabinets against England. They know that in the mass of England's population there exists a deadly and intense hatred of themselves; and that the British Government, though far from possessing an unblemished and spotless character for uncompromising integrity and righteousness of principle, dare not disregard the popular voice. They behold in England a free press, unfettered liberty of speech, constitutionalism, a grinning contempt for their superstitions, a secure asylum, and a generous and sympathetic reception of the enemies of their thrones, a rich and prosperous rival, and the only power occasionally willing and able to defend the weak against the strong. They behold the British active and zealous propagandists of civil and religious liberty, and unsparing denounciators of all tyranny, which is not mechanically and commercially advantageous to number one. Now, such a nation is a thorn in the sides of the Dragon and Beast which sustain the Horns. They regard it, therefore, as "the fountain and origin of European disturbance." They have no respect for such an establishment, and would illuminate their capitals for joy were it sunk like lead in the mighty waters. All this is natural enough. The devil, though outwardly a very smoothfaced and intensely fervid professor of religion, despises those who see through his hypocrisy, and are incessantly exhibiting it to the execration of

the world. He will leave no stone unturned to silence or put such an inconvenient adversary out of the way. But his favourite strategy is to proclaim his own immaculateness, and to contend zealously for reform, thinking, by this, to blind the eyes of men to his own deformity, and to attach the pious to his person, so as to make him their champion against a common foe. This is Russia's policy at the present time—Russia who is, when it becomes the Captain of the Holy Alliance now proposed, the sovereign element of Daniel's Fourth Beast, styled in the Apocalypse "the Dragon, the Old Serpent, surnamed the Devil and Satan." Only think of Russia as "the pacificator and regenerator of Europe." The Devil's peace and the Devil's regeneration! Surely, when she shall have consummated her work, it will be the devil of a peace and the devil of a regeneration!

But of such a pacification and regeneration the Anglo-French alliance is considered in the way. The key of the new position is this stronghold, which must be taken by bribery or assault. By either, the ruin of Louis Napoleon is inevitable. If he remain true to England, a coalition may be formed for his dethronement; if he fall into the embraces of Russia, England may arouse the French nation against him, and assist them in pulling him down. In every view, his position is a dangerous one. Europe is a powder magazine, and Louis Napoleon holds the match. It is, therefore, of prime importance to the bystanders to secure his good will, or to bind him fast, if they would not be blown to atoms. If they could secure him, they would not fear the magazine; but they have been unable to do that yet; therefore, it is necessary to court his favour and cultivate his good will. It is exceedingly disagreeable, however, to be living every day in expectation of being sent among the stars on a barrel of gunpowder before night. It is a cause of great anxiety and restlessness. The diademed occupants of the Thrones of the Beast are nervously alive to the perils of the situation. Hence their desire to detach the match-bearer from "perfidious Albion," and to get him into their own hands. It certainly would wonderfully promote the success of their schemes, if they could make a tool of Louis Napoleon. By involving him in a war with England, they might hope to exhaust both nations, and, in the meantime, "regenerate Europe by the establishment of Cossackism, based on a solidarity of despotism!" This accomplished, and the time would have come for a coalition against Louis in favour of the Bourbons. The French Empire is a merely temporary institution, destined to be superseded by the restoration of monarchy. The means by which this will

be effected seem to be indicated in the prediction, that "The King of the North shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over, and many shall be overthrown."

Something of this sort must happen ~~and~~ long, for the present situation of affairs will not admit of a peaceable solution. The world cannot be made to stand still, and ought not; it does not want to go back on the dial of its existence: on the contrary, its aspirations are upwards and onwards, which is the very direction in which the old dotards, who hold the reins, do not wish it to run. Hence, the peoples are straining off one way, while their riders are "geeing" and "hawing" them another, into the old track of mediæval feudality and barbarism. Unless the diademed cavaliers can get some friend to help them, their restive steeds will certainly throw them, and break their necks. They feel this, and hence their outcry for "pacification" and "regeneration;" not of themselves, but of their ungovernable peoples. "Peace, peace!" however, may be their cry; but "there is no peace for the wicked," saith Jehovah; "for they are like the troubled sea that cannot rest, whose waters throw up mire and dirt." "I will give you peace and regeneration," exclaims the Czar; "come unto me, ye kings, and I will give you rest; take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart; and ye shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light!"

And will they accept the invitation? Why should they not? Is the sovereignty of Russia terrible to such miserable reprobates as the monarchs of Naples, Spain, Greece, Rome, &c.? Is anything more terrible to them than their infuriate populations, in open insurrection, demanding good government and the rights of men? This is the alternative that awaits the Royal Horns of the European Beast of the Sea—fall before the people, or give their strength and power to the Czar. Every thing is tending to this—a sword-compelling quiet of the turbulent, the consolidation of the thrones by Russian alliance, and the well-being of official people, who profit by abuses. No obstacle can prevent this consummation. England may threaten; her fleets may sweep the seas, and blockade the Continent: the coalition will be formed, and her rival will marshal its hosts, and lead them on to Asia to contest with her there the dominion of the East: for so it is revealed of heaven—that "God hath put in the hearts of the Horn Powers to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the Beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled."—*Rev. xvii. 13, 17.*

EDITOR.

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1857.

[Vol. VII. No. 4.

"Blasphemy" and "Names of Blasphemy."

"I have heard all thy *blasphemies* which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are laid desolate, they are given to us to consume. Thus with your mouth ye have spoken *great things* against me, and have multiplied your words against me; I have heard them."—Ezek. xxxv. 12, 13.

In the above passage of Ezekiel's prophecy the word "*blasphemies*" in the original text is בְּרָאשָׁא, *nēahzoth*, reproaches, contumelies, &c., or, in the words of the prophet, "*great things spoken with the mouth against*" an object.

In the Greek, *nēahzoth* is expressed by the noun βλασφημια *blasphēmia*, which the English or anglo-Saxon reader will readily perceive is the anglicised word *blasphemies* in its Greek dress. It is derived from the verb βλασφημω, *blasphēmō*, which is itself derived from the phrase βλαπτειν την φημην, *blaptein tēn phēmēn*, to injure the reputation or fame of any object; which, if undeservedly done, is to calumniate, rail against, revile, reproach it, &c.

In scripture the objects of blasphemy are various, such as "God, his name, his tabernacle, them that dwell in the heaven," the Jews, the mountains of Israel, the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of God, the word of God, the sanctified of the Father, the king of Israel, &c.

The following passages will sufficiently establish this. In Rev. xiii. 5, 6, it is said, that a mouth was given to the Gentile Beast, or System of Powers, "speaking great things and blasphemies. And he opened his mouth (papal) in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his Name and his tabernacle, and those dwelling in the heaven;" that is, to the injury of the reputation of all these in the estimation of society.

"The Jews" are blasphemed by pretenders to that honorable community who can-

not establish their claim to citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel. Thus in Rev. ii. 9, the king of the Jews says, "I know the blasphemy of those who say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan;" and in ch. iii. 9, he styles them liars.

The text at the head of this article shows that the mountains of Israel may be blasphemed, and that in blaspheming them Jehovah is himself blasphemed.

Mark testifies to the Holy Spirit being an object of blasphemy in his day, in ch. iii. 29, 30; and Paul exhorts or commands that Christians, who are servants and wives, be respectful and obedient to their masters and husbands, that the name, doctrine and word of God be not blasphemed.—1 Tim., vi. 1; Tit. ii. 5.

To blaspheme is, therefore, in a scriptural sense, to bring divine things into disrepute; so that whatever words or doings tend to, or really do accomplish this, are blasphemies.

The punishment of blasphemy, by divine law, is death. "He that blasphemeth the name of Jehovah shall surely be put to death, as well the stranger as he that is born in the land."—Lev. xxiv. 16.

For men to say they are Jews, while yet they are not, is blasphemy, because it is a lie, whether they intend to lie or not. The intention does not alter the fact. Lying is the *hypostasis* or substance of blasphemy; for no good thing can be injured by the truth. When Gentiles, who are neither Jews outwardly nor inwardly, pretend to be Jews, they calumniate that society of which the King of Jews is the chief; and in so doing they calumniate or blaspheme him: the change of object from the less to the greater only enhances its iniquity. Verbal and practical lying are both mortal sins; but

their iniquity is aggravated when the lie is against God, his name, and his doctrine or word. Practical lying is profession contradicted by practice. Thus, "If we say we have fellowship with God and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth." "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar."—1 Jno., i. 6; iv. 20; and "If ye love me, keep my commandments;" for "ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." Thus, the truth of men's professions is made to turn upon the conformity of their actions to the words of God. When those actions are a denial of his doctrine or word they make God a liar, so far as their influence extends. If their words and actions agree, and both give the lie to God or his word, which is the same thing, though less hypocritical, they are not less impious; and the impiety is itself blasphemy.

No greater offence can be committed against God than not to believe what he has promised. The reason of this is because he "HAS MAGNIFIED HIS WORD ABOVE ALL HIS NAME;" and not to believe that word is to treat him as a liar, which is blasphemy; and "he that blasphemeth the name of Jehovah shall surely be put to death," whether Gentile or Jew: this is the reason why it is decreed that "he who believeth not (the gospel) shall be condemned." When we do not believe we walk in darkness; and walking in darkness, or unbelief, we do not the truth; for in relation to the truth no man can walk in the light of what he does not see, or do that in which he does not believe.

There is another form of lying or blasphemy against God which is brought out in the text from Ezekiel. It is this: *If men in their ignorance or impiety affirm a thing, which in its logical or practical bearing contravene the promises of Jehovah, they blaspheme, or speak evil of the subjects of those promises; and in so doing speak great words against, or blasphemies against the promiser.*

If the reader peruse Ezek. xxxv, in the light of God's covenanted promises to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and their seed, he cannot, we think, fail readily to perceive the truth of our statement. In that writing, Mount Seir, the seat of Edom's dominion, is addressed as a Power, having perpetual hatred against the descendants of Jacob; rejoicing in their calamities, and in actual occupation of their country, commonly styled THE HOLY LAND. While thus possessed of Palestine as the fruit of conquest, Seir is represented as saying of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, "These two nations and these two countries shall be mine, and we will possess it though Jehovah were there." Upon this the prophet forewarns them that

Idumea shall be recompensed according to its hatred of Israel, who shall be delivered after Idumea is destroyed; "I will make myself known among Israel when I have judged thee, O Mount Seir, saith Jehovah; and thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, and that I have heard all thy blasphemies which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are laid desolate, they are given us to consume; thus with your mouth ye have boasted against me, and have multiplied your words against me; I have heard them."

The reader will observe that Jehovah regards blasphemies, or false statements, concerning the destiny of the mountains of Israel, as great words or boastings against himself: the Idumean Seir declares that those mountains, even though Jehovah were there, would never belong to Israel, but to Edom; for it says, "they are mine, and we will possess it though the I SHALL BE were there." But why is this declaration a blasphemy against the Holy Land? and why, if a blasphemy against that land, is it a boast and multiplication of words against Jehovah? Because it states falsely the destiny of Palestine. At present the two nations of Israel and Judah, and their special divisions of the Holy Land, are in the hands of Esau, Edom, or Idumea, synonyms of the power that in the latter days inherits the hatred of Isaac's eldest son against Jacob; "for," says Adonai Jehovah, (the Old Testament title rendered Lord Jesus in the New,) "when the whole earth rejoices I will make thee desolate. As thou didst rejoice at the inheritance of the House of Israel because it was desolate, so will I do unto thee; thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumea, even all of it."

Idumea, then, represents a power to be made desolate when the whole earth rejoices with God's people, Israel, as Moses has predicted. Idumea now triumphs over Israel and their land, and blasphemies them both; the Idumeans decree that Judah and Israel's two territories shall for ever constitute integral parts of the Ottoman Empire; and, consequently, that the two nations or twelve tribes of Jacob, shall never constitute one independent kingdom and nation in the land: this is pronouncing a sore evil against Israel and their native mountains; but being a lie against their destiny it is a blasphemy against them all.

But why are these blasphemies against the Jews and their inheritance, boastings or calumnies against Jehovah? Because, if it should so happen, that Idumea, in this controversy concerning Zion, were to establish its power in the Holy Land, to the final exclu-

sion and suppression of the kingdom and throne of David there, it would make the promises of Jehovah, which he has sworn by his own life and holiness to fulfil, of none effect. It is impossible that such a result should come to pass; but to attempt to establish it, or to declare such a result, or to believe the declaration, *is equivalent to denying and rejecting the contrary*, and in effect declaring that Jehovah is a deceiver and a liar.

Now, let us see what Jehovah has said—whether he has given the inheritance to Esau or to Jacob. Read the next chapter of Ezekiel; this portion of his prophecy contains a testimony of God in direct opposition to the blasphemies of the Idumean nations, concerning Israel and their mountains; the prophecy is addressed to these—a prophecy of good things, "Because, saith Adonai Jehovah, *the enemy* (a term which stands for the Desolator who triumphs while the land enjoys its Sabbaths) hath said against you, Aha! even the ancient high places are ours in possession"—thus they boast at this day—"therefore prophecy and say, Thus saith Adonai Jehovah, Because they have made you desolate and swallowed you up on every side, that ye might be a possession to the residue of the nations, and ye are taken up in the lips of talkers, and are an infamy of the people; therefore, ye mountains of Israel, hear the words of Adonai Jehovah: thus saith Adonai Jehovah to the mountains and to the hills, to the lowlands and to the valleys, to the desolate wastes and to the cities that are forsaken, which became a prey and a derision to the residue of the nations that are round about: therefore thus saith Adonai Jehovah: Surely in the fire of my jealousy have I spoken against the residue of the nations (that 'residue' to be stamped with the feet of the fourth beast, —Dan. vii. 19,) and against all Idumea which have appointed my land for their possession with the joy of all their heart, with despiteful minds, to cast it out for a prey.

"Prophecy therefore concerning the land of Israel, and say unto the mountains, and to the hills, to the lowlands and to the valleys, thus saith Adonai Jehovah, I have spoken in my jealousy and in my fury, because ye have borne the shame of the nations; therefore thus saith Adonai Jehovah: I have lifted up my hand (that is, I have sworn,) surely the nations that are about you, they shall bear their shame. But ye, O mountains of Israel, ye shall shoot forth your branches, and yield your fruit to my people of Israel, for they are at hand to come. For behold, I am for you, and will turn unto you, and ye shall be tilled and sown; and I will mul-

tiply men upon you, *all the house of Israel, even all of it*: and the cities shall be inhabited, and the wastes shall be builded; and I will multiply upon you man and beast; and they shall increase and bring fruit; and I will settle you after your old estates, and do better for you than at your beginnings; and ye shall know that I (Adonai) am the I SHALL BE. Yea, I will cause men to walk upon you, even my people Israel; and they shall possess thee, and thou shalt be their inheritance, and thou shalt no more henceforth bereave them: thus saith Adonai Jehovah, because they say unto thee, thou land devourest up men, and hast bereaved thy nations; therefore thou shalt devour men no more, nor cause thy nations to fall any more; neither will I cause men to hear in thee the shame of the nations any more, neither shalt thou bear the reproach of the people any more, neither shalt thou cause thy nations to fall any more, saith Adonai Jehovah."

Here is a time indicated which has manifestly not come; for the Jews and their country are still subject to all these things, which at a "set time" of their history shall be no more.

There is another testimony in Ezek. which convicts "the talkers" of the Gentiles of blasphemy against the two nations and their two territories which they claim for themselves, and of calumny against God. In chap. xxxviii. 21, Adonai Jehovah saith, "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the nations whither they be gone, and I will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all; neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling-places wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them; so shall they be my people, and I will be to them for Elohim—*uaani ehych lahem lai-elohim*. And David my servant (David II.) shall be king over them, and they all (the twelve tribes) shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children, and their children's children during the age—*ad-olam*; and my servant David shall be prince over them for the age—*le-olam*; moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them, it shall be an everlasting covenant

with them; and I will place them and multiply them, and I will set my temple in the midst of them for the age—*lê-ôlām*. My dwelling-place also shall be with them: yea, I will be to them for Elohim, and they shall be to me for a people. And the Gentiles shall know that I, Jehovah, do sanctify Israel, when my temple shall be in the midst of them for the age—*lê-ôlām*."

From these testimonics, then, we learn that the following things are decreed:

1. That "the two countries," or territories of the Holy Land formerly occupied by the "two nations" of the Jews, that is, the kingdom of the Ten Tribes and the kingdom of Judah, are to be exalted to a better condition than when possessed by the Israelites in the beginning:
2. That the Gentile Power in possession of Adonai Jehovah's land is to be finally dispossessed when he makes himself known among Israel's tribes:
3. That "all the house of Israel, even all of it" are to take possession of the land, and to be settled upon its mountains, and hills, and lowlands, and valleys, and desolate wastes, and forsaken cities, after the old estates of their realm, in peace, plenty, security, and great perpetual prosperity:
4. That the nations and kingdoms of Israel and Judah shall be one united nation and kingdom upon the mountains of Israel; so that "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" any more: but as a bird of prey, "they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west (the western powers); they shall spoil them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them"—Isa. xi. 13, 14:
5. That when finally resettled in Adonai Jehovah's land, (his, by covenant made with Abraham and his seed, "who is the Christ," says Paul) the whole twelve tribes will be under one supreme head or king:
6. That they will then be a purified and sanctified people—"they shall defile themselves no more with any of their transgressions:" this implies that all their past national offences will have been blotted out:
7. That their Shepherd-King will be a David, and immortal; and reign over them during the age of their national glory, however long its continuance may

be predetermined of Jehovah—*עַד-עוֹלָם* *ad-ôlām*:

8. That all these benefits will be guaranteed to the nation by the "covenant of the age," styled also the "covenant of peace"—*בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם-בְּרִית עוֹלָם*, *bērith shālôm, bērith ôlām*;—the Constitution of the Kingdom, in the phraseology of the Gentiles:
9. That during the age, and for the purposes thereof, a Temple will be placed in the midst of the nation. Ezekiel describes it, chap. xl-xlii. The mystery of the temple is set forth by Paul, Peter and John:
10. That Adonai Jehovah, Israel's Shepherd-King, will dwell with them, and be to them *לַאֱלֹהִים*, *lailôhim*, for Elohim, or Gods—for all the saints or future kings and priests of Israel and the nations, are constitutionally or federally "in him;" *HE* is for *Gods*.

Now, these ten items, deduced from the foregoing testimonics, are the intelligible and obvious purpose of Jehovah with respect to Canaan and its heirs national. No language could have been devised to make his intentions plainer or more easy to be understood. He has not said that these things may come to pass if fortuitous circumstances favor their development; but he has declared that *he will create the situation that shall necessitate the results; and that he will accomplish them, not for the sake of the generation of Israel existing at the crisis, but for their fathers' sake, on whose account they are beloved, and for the honor of his own character.* "I have pity for my holy name, which the house of Israel have profaned among the nations whither they went: therefore say unto the house of Israel: Thus saith Adonai Jehovah; I do not for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for my holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the nations whither ye went. And I will sanctify MY GREAT NAME* which was profaned among the nations, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the nations shall know that I am the Jehovah, saith Adonai Jehovah, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the nations, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land."—Ezek. xxxvi. 21-24.

How easy to be understood, how devoid of mystification! Is it not astonishing that any man professing to believe and study the scriptures should affirm that God has utterly and for ever cast off the Jews; that there

* This name is *Yah-shua*, or in Greek, *Jesus*.

will be no restoration of them to Palestine ; and that God has no more use for them than for the gypsies! To affirm this is to speak blasphemies, or lies, against the mountains and people of Israel; and in so doing to speak great things against God with the mouth, and to multiply words against him. This is the wickedness of all the children of Esau. *Nationally* they seize upon Jacob's inheritance, slay his seed with the sword, and proclaim the independence and integrity of a dominion that incorporates the land of Adonai Jehovah and his people in its domains. " *These two nations and these two territories,*" say they, " *shall be mine, and we will possess it though Jehovah were there,*"—" *they are laid desolate, they are given to us to consume.*"—Individually, they endorse the truth of this; they preach it from their "sacred desks;" they publish it in their periodicals; they register it in their creeds; ignoring Israel and Israel's land in all the plenitude and folly of their traditions. But the issue is briefly and simply this: *If the doctrine of Esau's progeny be true, then the promises of Jehovah, covenanted with an oath, and confirmed by the blood of Adonai Jehovah, are a deceit and a bald imposition on the credulity of the Jewish nation and their friends—TO AFFIRM THE DOCTRINE OF ESAU IS TO GIVE THE LIE TO GOD.*

But with the apostles, we say, "Let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged." The sentence of God stands firm, though over thirty-eight hundred years have elapsed since it was uttered—" *The elder shall serve the younger.*" Edom shall be subject to Jacob; therefore Edom shall not always triumph in the land. He that doctrinally reverses this decree belongs to the family of Esau, sets himself against the promises of God, and becomes the enemy of Jacob. Can the reader possibly have any difficulty in discerning this principle? *We blaspheme God when we affirm the contrary of what he decrees.* It is an oblique method of telling him that he has not decreed the truth. It is taking sides against him in "THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION"—Isai. xxxiv. 8—a controversy to be decided in favor of them that believe truth!

This great controversy it is that in reality defines the seeds—the seed of the woman, and the seed of her enemy. The seed of the woman are all on the side of Zion. They believe all "the glorious things" that Jehovah hath spoken concerning her. They love Jerusalem, and rejoice in all the good Jehovah hath sworn to do unto her; while they repudiate with indignation all traditions which

reduce the promises to a nullity. This is right in every view; for to make void the future glory of Zion is to rob the faithful of their inheritance; for "salvation," saith Adonai Jehovah, "is of the Jews;" and when men are robbed of their rights, they do not feel very charitable towards the thieves.

All systems of religion, or forms of faith, are blasphemies or "abominations," which uphold dogmas subversive of the promises of Jehovah. Piety of disposition in the worshippers, or moral precepts commingled in their ethics, will not transform blasphemies or indignities into things worthy of God. *His doctrine and word are blasphemed when they are brought into disrepute, and contempt is generated in men's minds respecting the things they set forth.* This is characteristic of the thing called "orthodoxy" among the Gentiles; which assigns all the curses of God to the Jews, and all his blessings to their enemies. But all Gentilisms that do this, whether orthodox or heterodox, are blasphemies against God, his name, his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. They constitute the darkness of this world, and they who walk in them "walk in darkness," and neither believe nor do the truth. Such persons are very apt to "say they have fellowship with God," because they appear to one another to be righteous in talking piety, and making long prayers; and because, under the influence of human applause, they "feel good," profess to be "at peace with God," and are on excellent terms with themselves. But it is easy to show, that their peace with God and their conscience is all on one side. Take a disciple of Millerism, for example, and press upon his attention the promises we have adduced in this article, and you will very soon find him putting a construction upon them all which will force upon them a signification diametrically opposite to what they express. In this way he will give Jehovah the lie upon the old-serpent-principle, that God doth not mean what he says. He will tell you, in defiance of grammar, history, fact, and declaration of prophets and apostles, either, that it is all fulfilled; or that it refers to Methodists, Baptists, &c., who believe in the personal advent of Jesus to burn up the world, whom he styles "spiritual Israelites," or the true Israel of God! If you show him that it is the people who once served idols in Canaan that are to return there, and not Gentile sectarians, who never had covenant occupation of the country, you arouse all the enmity of his fleshly mind against the promises, and he contemptuously stigmatizes you as "an old carnal Judaizer," destitute of all spiritual discernment. But, such a

course as this proves to a demonstration that, though he say he has fellowship with God, he is really at enmity with him, being a blasphemer of his doctrine and word. Such a professor, however pious and sanctionious he may seem, walks in darkness, knowing not what he is at, nor whither he goes.

But the Millerite is not alone in this condemnation. Blasphemy against the mountains and people of Israel, and consequently rejection of the covenanted promises of Jehovah, is the mortal sin of all who believe not "the gospel of the kingdom," which is *the saul promises evangelized*. He that directly denies the restoration of the Jews, and the reign of Jesus over them in the Holy Land, *ad-olam*, "during the age," or indirectly denies this, by affirming that his hope, and consequently his *only* hope (for scripturally, there is but "one hope of the calling"), is the translation of his immortal soul to transkyngdomia at death, and its return for reunion with the mortal dust it left when it comes with Jesus to burn up the earth and world: he who thus directly or indirectly denies this great and divinely attested purpose of the Most High One, is under the condemnation of the sentence which reads, "*He that believes not shall be condemned.*" This infidelity is the sin of all the ecclesiastical factions of the Gentiles. They content themselves with the creed prepared for them by the Papacy, called "the Apostles' Creed," which ignores the Hope of Israel, for which Paul was a prisoner in Rome, as completely as if earth had no Holy Land, no Jewish inhabitants, and no destiny involved in their glory and independence! This popish version of what the apostles believed recognizes a resurrection of the body and a judgment; but such a resurrection and judgment as never entered into their heads to conceive of. This resurrection dogma of Gentilism is *the reunion of a fictitious celestial soul from the skies, with certain grains of dust in the earth's crust!* This is not the resurrection the apostles believed in. To admit the Gentile dogma is to admit "the immortality of the soul," which is Paganism, and not Christianity. Their "judgment" is akin to it—a judgment invented by the fleshly mind for "immortal souls;" *the judgment of nonentities!* It is a libel upon the apostles, a defamation of their christian fame, a blasphemy of their glorious faith, to dignify such nonsense with their official name. They believed in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his son, *their* Lord; they believed that he was born of a virgin, but not of an "immaculate" one, nor that his nature was immaculate, as Protestants do; they believed that

he was condemned by Pilate, and crucified unto death, and buried, and rose again the third day, and ascended to heaven afterwards; and that he will come from thence again to judge the world, but not to burn it up; they believed in remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and in life everlasting; but not in the sense imposed upon the words by Gentile theology. The Gentile "Names and Denominations" styled apocalyptically "NAMES OF BLASPHEMY," do not believe the things the apostles believed and taught, but interpretations of some of those things approved by their blind leaders of the blind. These interpretations, which are anti-scriptural discords, constitute their theology, which, making of none effect the promises of God, as the leaven of the old Pharisees did, generates a vain worship, and blasphemies against him and his doctrine.

The popish and sectarian interpretation of "the Apostles' Creed" is the gospel believed by all "Christendom." The apostles, however, did not preach the Gentile interpretation of their creed, which is therefore "another gospel." This the papal and Protestant, or sectarian world, now believes. The world's gospel is, that Jesus, a person of immaculate nature, is Son of God, who died for sins, was buried, and rose again; and that whosoever believes this, and believes that he died for him, and repents, his immortal soul shall be saved from eternal torment in liquid fire and brimstone! Some sects may modify this statement somewhat; nevertheless, as a general definition, it is the Gospel according to "the Mother of Harlots and of all the Abominations of the Earth," and of those Harlots and Abominations too. This is a gospel that has nothing to do with the promises covenanted to the fathers. When a man professes this gospel, and presents himself to the old Roman Mother, or to any of the State-Harlots, or to any of the innumerable sectarian-Abominations, or "Names of Blasphemy," all styled "Churches," from the Mother to the most insignificant of her rebellious progeny: when such a one makes application for admission within their pale, no member thereof, lay or clerical, ever thinks of inviting his confession of faith in the things promised to Abraham, David, and their seed! The unlucky zealot, or bigot (by whatsoever name they might reproach him matters not), who should presume to make inquiry as to whether the candidate's "faith" embraced "*the substance of things hoped for;*" "unto which hope the twelve tribes of Israel, constantly serving night and day, hoped to come," and on account, of which Paul was accused of the Jews:—if such should be his

inquisition that he might assure himself if the candidate's faith were justifying faith; and, finding that he knew nothing about the good things God had promised to Israel, nationally and individually in Christ, he were to object to his fitness for admission to church-fellowship:—were he clergyman or layman, who does not know that he would immediately become a marked man, an object of suspicion, and be regarded as an uncharitable disturber of the peace, a presumptuous and conceited fellow? It is well known that such is the fact. What has Gentile church-fellowship to do with God's promises to Abraham, David, and their seed, national or individual? Nothing! Only "believe in Jesus," as they define it, and a fig for Israel, their mountains, and the promises. It is enough, say they, that you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. But the demons believed this, and trembled.

This is enough for them who endorse the blasphemies of Edom. Believe a barren proposition, and be pious, and make a bonfire of the promises. I say, a barren proposition; for the confession that "Jesus is the Christ," in the Gentile sense of it, is the mere acknowledgment of "a fact," irrespective of the promises evangelized concerning the kingdom by the apostles and himself. What more natural than that the sons of Edom should delight in a gospel that ignores the promises? Is it likely that they would rejoice in the blessing of Isaac upon their brother Jacob—that he "shall be as the smell of a field which Jehovah hath blessed?" Would they, pluming themselves on having the birthright, rejoice that God should give Jacob "of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine?" Is it to be expected, that they being Gentiles, and rejoicing in Gentilism, would respond "amen!" to the eulogy, "Let people serve thee, O Jacob, and nations bow down to thee; be thou lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee?"—Gen. xxvii. 28. It is expecting too much of reckless Edom that he should delight in such promises as these. "Thou shalt serve thy brother Jacob," to a man that lives by his sword (ver. 40), is a galling and bitter humiliation. No wonder that Edom hates Jacob, and repudiates all the promises concerning him—that having acquired dominion by his sword, and for the time, broken Jacob's yoke, he should seek to persuade himself that the Millerite dogma is true, and that Jehovah hath indeed cast off his people, Israel, forever! For, if this be so, then Edom shall not serve Jacob, and the word of God becomes a lie!

Such is the blasphemy of Edom, the name used in Scripture for the enemies of the Jews; and surely they are their enemies who assign all God's curses to them, and monopolize the blessings for themselves. Upon this principle, then, all the sects of Edom are incorporations of blasphemy against God; an idea apocalyptically set forth in the words, "Upon the seven heads of the beast THE NAME OF BLASPHEMY;" and in Rev. xvii. 5, where the beast is said to be "full of names of blasphemy," and commented on above;—a gospel-nullifying fraternity, denying the truth in ignorantly maintaining the opposite; or, in mixing it up with their traditions; or, in rejecting it without qualification or reserve. The disciples of these systems are the "talkers" on whose lips Jewish affairs are taken up reproachfully. They prate against the truth with volubility inexhaustible; being "unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, whose mouths," says Paul, "must be stopped. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith."

The same apostle says, "there is one faith." Now this is the faith which justifies; but not the faith of Christendom. Justifying faith, and the faith of the unruly talkers of Edom, are antagonist and mutually destructive systems of belief. The latter has no soundness; and in the former, soundness can only be attained by an intelligent belief of the "covenants of promise." Men are justified by an enlightened and hearty faith in the gospel of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus and the apostles. This is evident from the consideration that when the Lord Jesus sent Paul to preach the faith that justifies, he sent him to "open the eyes of the Gentiles, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they might receive remission of sins (or be justified) and inheritance among them (the saints of Israel) who are sanctified by faith the which leads into him"—πιστευσηειςεμε. It is clear from this, that illumination of mind preceded the reception of remission, and a right to the inheritance. He whose eyes are unopened by the gospel of the kingdom "walks in darkness," and is obnoxious to the sentence, "he that believes not shall be condemned." As there is but one true faith, it is also manifest, that this condemnation is pronounced upon him who believes not that "one faith," or the gospel; and therefore styled "the faith of the gospel." Now we have shown often that the faith of the children of Edom is not the "one faith" which the apostles preached; nor is any other form of faith which ignores the promises covenanted to the fathers of Israel: for "faith is assurance of things hoped for, a conviction of things not seen;" and these unseen matters of hope are the

subject of the covenants of promise: for in speaking of the death of that cloud of witnesses who had obtained renown through the possession and exercise of this faith, Paul says, "these all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but saw them afar off:" and the reason he gives for their dying without receiving, is, that "God has provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect," or immortal.

The gospel, we have said, is the covenanted promises evangelized. To make our meaning distinct, a word or two must be said in regard to "evangelized." This is a Greek word in an English dress, being in its own country called *ευαγγελίζω, evangelidzo*. This is the noun *ευαγγελιον, evangelion*, with a verbal termination implying action—a putting into action the noun. Now this noun is composed of *ευ eu*, signifying *good, well*; and *αγγελια, angelia*, a message, from *αγγελω angellō*, to narrate; from which comes *αγγελος angelos*, one sent, a message-bearer, angel. *Evangelion*, therefore, signifies a *good message*, which, when put into circulation, is *evangelized*. Now, a message to be good must be something excellent, beneficial, and to be desired by those to whom it is sent; and because this is the fact, God has called the message, or "*word he sent unto the children of Israel by Jesus Christ proclaiming peace*" to them, *good*. That "peace" is the subject matter of the covenants of promise; and is the reason why we so often meet with such passages as these—"Thou shalt see the *good of Jerusalem* all the days of thy life. Yea, thou shalt see thy children's children, and *peace upon Israel*"—Ps. cxxviii, 5, 6:—"As for such as turn aside unto their crooked ways, Jehovah shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity; but *peace shall be upon Israel*"—Ps. cxxv, 5:—"Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem. *Pray for the peace of Jerusalem*: they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes (the saints) I (Messiah the Prince of Peace) will now say, *Peace be within thee!*"—Ps. cxxii:—"In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endures"—Ps. lxxii, 7:—"He will speak peace unto his people, and to his saints: but let them not turn again to folly. Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him; *that glory may dwell in our land*. Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other"—Ps. lxxxv, 8:—"I will extend peace to Jerusalem like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream"—Isa. lxvi, 12. In the song which shall be sung in the land of Judah

when Jerusalem becomes "a strong city," Israel sings, "O Jehovah, thou wilt ordain peace for us"—Isa. xxvi, 12.—Yea, "I will make with them a *covenant of peace*, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land; and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods. And I will make them and the places round about my hill (Zion) a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in its season; there shall be showers of blessing. And the tree of the field shall yield its fruit, and the earth shall yield its increase, and they shall be safe in their land, and shall know that I (Jesus) am the Jehovah (*I shall be*) when I have broken the bands of their yoke, and delivered them out of the hand of those that served themselves of them. And THEY SHALL NO MORE BE A PREY TO THE NATIONS, neither shall the beast of the land devour them; but they shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid. And I will raise up for them a *plant for renown*, and they shall no more be consumed with hunger in the land; neither bear the shame of the nations any more. Thus shall they know that I Jehovah their Gods am with them, and that they, the house of Israel, are my people, saith Adonai Jehovah"—Ezek. xxxiv, 25. The Son given to Israel is styled, "the Prince of Peace," of whom it is written, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth and during the age"—Isa. ix, 7. Then, "He shall speak peace unto the nations; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river (Euphrates) to the ends of the earth"—Zech. ix, 10: "And I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and will make Israel to lie down in safety"—Lios. ii, 18.

Now, when the time had nearly arrived for the Prince of Peace to be born, a communication was made to Mary that she should be his mother; and that, as Isaiah had predicted, the throne of his ancestor David should be given him by the most High, whose Son he should also be; and that, when seated there, he should reign over the house of Jacob for the ages *εις τους αιωνας* and that of his kingdom there should be no end. This was announcing peace to Israel through the Son to be born. So Mary understood it; and in the rejoicing of her spirit in God, said, "He helps his servant Israel in remembrance of mercy as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his Seed, for the age"—*εις τον αιωνα*.

That the mercy covenanted to Abraham was peace to Israel through the Messiah is

also manifest from the words of the Holy Spirit spoken through the father of John the Baptizer, who said in view of the birth of the Christ, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he visits and redeems his people, and raises up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been from the beginning of the age *απ' αιωνος* that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we, *being delivered out of the hand of our enemies*, might serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life"—Luke i. 68. What a beautiful comment is this upon the Abrahamic Covenant; how forcibly it exhibits the national blessedness to come upon the hereditary seed of Abraham through the Christ. But not exclusively upon them; but upon all other nations through him also; for "In thee and in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed:" therefore, it came to pass, when the birth of Jesus had occurred, that his mission was proclaimed by a multitude of the heavenly host, saying, "Glory in the highest places to God, and over the earth peace, and good will among men."

Here, then, is peace to Israel, and peace to all other nations, promised and confirmed by oath to Abraham, David, and their seed, when Christ shall sit upon David's throne as the result of "mercy and truth meeting together, and righteousness and peace embracing each other." When Abraham rises from the dead, and becomes the patriarch, or chief father, of a believing and righteous world, the multitude of its nations will become "his seed" as well as Israel, and the saints, the kings and lords of all. This is Moses' doctrine of a future state, amplified by all the prophets. Their oracles were its depository; and until Peter visited the house of Cornelius, these covenanted promises were supposed to be confined to Israelites alone. It was not conceived possible, that men of other nations would be associated with Messiah in the government of the Jewish nation and the Gentiles. The promises of the holy covenant had not assumed the form of a message of invitation to aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel. The Jews were exclusively invited by Jesus, and by the apostles for several years after his ascension. They went about explaining the purpose of God, which was full of goodness and glory for Israel; and inviting them to partake in it with endless life and honor. This was *evangelizing the promises*, or setting before

them the hope. They were called upon to become heirs of that hope by embracing it, and becoming obedient to the commands of Jesus. It was therefore styled "the hope of their calling," by faith in which, says an apostle, we are saved.

Understanding then, that the gospel or glad tidings, is *not* salvation of immortal souls from endless torment in material fire who believe that Jesus in flesh was God's immaculate Son and died for them; but, that it is the promises of everlasting peace and glory to the Jewish nation, and of contemporary blessedness to all other nations; when, as one dominion, they shall exist under the government of Christ, and of his called, chosen and faithful "brethren and companions" when he shall sit and rule as a priest upon David's throne: which promises were covenanted to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, and their seed; and confirmed by the death and resurrection of Christ: it is these confirmed and covenanted promises *evangelized*, or circulated among men in a proclamation, in which Jews first and afterwards Gentiles *who believe said promises and recognize the claims of Jesus to be that Christ as he is described in Moses and the Prophets*, are invited to copartnership with him in said covenanted kingdom and glory, *on condition of becoming the subjects of repentance and remission of sins in his name*. 'This is the Pentecostian Gospel of the Kingdom of God preached by Peter and the apostles: the other, the salvation of immortal souls from endless torture in material fire, is the Pope's gospel—the clerical gospel of Rome, Wittenburg, and Geneva—the gospel according to Christendom, by which its intoxicated peoples are ecclesiastically poisoned:—the gospel of Antichrist, which, admitting the divine sonship and sacrificial character of Jesus, ignores the promises, blasphemes Israel, and so "speaks great words against the most High," who has "formed that people for himself that they may show forth his praise"—Isa. xliii. 21. Understanding, then, these things; and that justification comes by belief and obedience, or an enlightened and obedient belief of the gospel—what intelligent man can be at a loss to perceive, that they are not justified who are ignorant of, or reject the promises, when they seek, or are sung, prayed, or scared into immersion? Belief of the gospel of Antichrist does not make water saving; and certainly none but a Romanist, Puseyite, or baby-sprinkler, would make it saving of itself alone. What makes baptism saving then? for Peter says, "we are saved by baptism." We are, *or* according to the word, *the belief of the promises*; that, is, of the gospel the apostles preached. The Baptistite, Millerite, Campbellite, Mor-

monite, and general paidorhantist, theories of belief, are not justifying; because they either ignore or destroy the promises. In doing this, they are, as we have shown, "blasphemies," and punishable with death. Can a man be justified by the belief of blasphemy? Will a pious profession of love to Jesus transmute blasphemy into justifying truth? Is the sincere belief of what the Scriptures style blasphemy, less offensive to Jehovah in a modern religionist, than in an ancient Edomite? Is it less blasphemy to say with Millerism, "God has cast away the Jews; he will destroy the nations; he will burn up the earth; and we shall inherit Paradise with dominion over the beasts after the similitude of Adam;" than to say with Edom, "The mountains of Israel are laid desolate, they are given to us to consume?" One saying is as subversive of the truth of God, and as derogatory to his veracity, as the other. If Immersed-Millerism decree the truth, Jehovah's promises, which we have set forth, will never come to pass. Hence God and Millerism are as much at enmity as God and Edom; it is logical and scriptural therefore, to place Millerism and Edom side by side against God. We say Millerism, not simply as such; but as representative of all Gentilisms ending in *ism*, whose theology does not teach for justification, and whose organizations do not require for admission to their fellowship, an intelligent belief and confession of the message of peace to Israel, as taught in Moses and the prophets.

Let any one read the faith of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, as expressed in their utterances prompted by the Holy Spirit; and then imagine the proclamation of such gospel as sounds forth from the pulpits of the Gentiles, being made to them—a gospel which assigns the Holy Land to Edom, and consigns Israel to curse and perdition: what does he think those ancient worthies would have said? Would not their souls have boiled over with bubbling and steaming indignation? Would they have rejoiced that their eyes had seen such a Saviour as the Gentile character styled Jesus? Would they have seen in him an earnest of the remembrance by Jehovah of the oath he had sworn to Abraham, and of the covenant he had made with David? No; they would have been like our Jewish contemporaries, rejectors of Jesus, because the Gentile description of his character and mission did not accord with the Messiah as defined by Moses and the prophets. Let all, then, who believe in "the exceeding great and precious promises," and who are disposed to accept God's evangelized invitation to his kingdom and glory, which he has promised to them that obey him—let such be honest to themselves and true to

God. Let them repudiate the uncovenanted traditions of Gentilism, as "blasphemies against the mountains of Israel, and boastings against their king." If dipped into Baptistism, Campbellism, or Millerism, &c., let them put them off as "filthy rags"—as garments "all tattered and torn," and "spotted with the flesh." They are investments unbecoming the divine presence of the Nazarite King of the Jews. He invites men to walk with him in white—a white which the sectarian fullers of Edom cannot produce. "What is the chaff to the wheat, saith Jehovah?" Some who read these lines may have been dipped into divers Gentilisms, sincerely believing they were obeying the truth; but, if you have studied the prophets to any good purpose; you will know that the truth according to Edom, is not "the truth as it is in Jesus"—your own good sense will teach you, that your sincerity will not transmute the one into the other. Do you find in the Bible such a dogma as, "He that is sincere and immersed, shall be saved?" This is one of the gospel-nullifying principles of Edom—a mere tare sown among the wheat. Abandon it, dear friends, and consent heartily to the wholesome, unrepealed, words of Adonai Jehovah, that "He who believes (the gospel or promises) and is immersed shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned."

EDITOR.

Ecclesiastical Cravens.

Bro. Thomas:—The refusal of the so-called "Christian Intelligencer" to insert the following well-tempered reply to an article published in that paper, is another proof of the meanness and cowardice of the "religious" editors of this generation of the Apostacy. Perhaps, however, we should not be surprised that Demetrius and his fellow-craftsmen still prefer the worship of the "silver shrine," by which they have their wealth, or popularity, to the now pecuniarily unprofitable service of the ever living and true God. For my part, I do not wonder that those who dwell in a powder magazine should dread the approach of one who brings a candle in his hand. Bro. Edwards wielded a blade too trenchant, a battle-axe with an edge too keen, to be permitted to enter the arena in which he can be assailed only at a safe distance.

I hope you will find a place for his reply in the HERALD, which I have reason to know is more extensively read by the self-styled "Reformers" than they are willing to confess. To such of them as may be of "honest and good hearts," Dr. Edwards' scriptural and powerful argument is incontro-

vertible. As to Mr. Orvis and those in his position, no one expects such to be convinced.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

Charlottesville, Albemarle, Va., }
Feb. 6, 1857. }

The article above alluded to was sent to the *Campbellite Intelligencer*, edited, we believe, by R. L. Coleman and A. B. Walthall, Knights of the Whited Sepulchre, accompanied by the following note from Dr. Edwards:

Messrs. Editors—Will you do me the kindness to insert the following in *The Intelligencer*? I would send it to the *Herald*, but think as I have been spoken of, and appealed to in *The Intelligencer* (and this is well understood here), it is right that I should answer there. If you will grant me the favor, I will make you the promise I will not ask the like favor again, even though I may be replied to, or similarly alluded to, unless you signify your willingness to hear me. If you will not grant this favor, please grant me another—mail it to me again, if not too much trouble. I send the stamps to do so. If you insert it, of course you need not return the stamps, but would be much obliged if you would send me a copy of the paper. Very respectfully,

L. EDWARDS.

Laneville, King William, Va., }
Dec. 19, 1856. }

The Faith of Abraham.

Messrs. Editors:—A friend of mine sent me an issue of the *Intelligencer*, of the 13th of December, in which I find an article on the "Faith of Abraham," which I suppose is from the pen of my neighbor, Mr. E. E. Orvis, who signs himself "A Jew," and as he doubtless alludes to me, under the complimentary or derisive cognomen of "Abraham, Jr.," I feel called upon to ask a place in your columns, that I may reply to some remarks he has thought proper to make in regard to myself. I have nothing to conceal, and therefore prefer writing over my own proper signature.

As to what my friend has to say about a certain "Sir Oracle," I can only say that Dr. Thomas is fully able to defend himself against the misrepresentations of all the second-hand hearers and wormwood enemies with which it seems to be his peculiar fortune to meet whilst doing battle for what he earnestly, and I have no doubt honestly, believes to be "the truth as it is in Jesus."

My friend and neighbor, in the plenitude

of his charity, seems to think I am a "good sort of man in my way," but my head has been "strangely bewildered by the dogmatisms and wild vagaries" of one whom he supposes to be my Oracle. I cannot conceive how he could regard me as a good sort of man in any way, led captive as I am by the will and influence of such an oracle as he represents Dr. Thomas to be. But let me here propose a sober thought to Mr. O. There is such a thing as a man's being impressed with a conviction of the truth, by the living testimonies of God's holy revelation, independent of the will of mortal man. He who accustoms himself to think that others, who differ with him on such momentous questions, are bewildered by the dogmatisms and wild vagaries of human oracles, when they have daily and nightly access to the holy and ever-living and unerring Oracles of Jehovah, by which they can try the spirits and the actions of misguided men, has surely never brought to bear practically upon himself that fidelity due to self-examination and personal safety, in view of an eternal and irrevocable destiny! If he had, he would hardly believe that many considerate men would trust such a broken cistern as a human oracle. I submit, then, to my friend, that his "good" neighbor, bewildered and superficial in the study of the good Book as he may be, has not yet entirely lost his personality, nor that deep sense of individual responsibility which constrains him in the fear of God to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, despite the contumelious insinuations of his ostensible enemies, or the more dangerous encomiums of kind-hearted and partial friends.

Mr. O. says I "was pleased to speak of this faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God," as a "Gentile faith," and being asked what kind of faith I would substitute for it, replied "a Jewish faith, or the faith of Abraham."

I do not remember ever having made such a distinction between Jewish and Gentile faith, but do remember, on being asked why I was not satisfied with the faith I once had, that I replied substantially, because it was deficient in the essential elements of the Gospel which was contained in the faith of Abraham, who is the father of the faithful. If, however, I used the term "Gentile faith," and was understood to mean that faith which Abraham had, being *uncircumcised*, I was not far from the mark. But if by "Gentile faith" I referred to the faith of Apostate Christendom, which professes to have this element that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," embodied in its many-colored Creeds and Confessions of Faith,

then, I regard this item of the true faith so adulterated by the admixture of human tradition as to be utterly void and *inadequate to the salvation of any son of Adam.*

Call it by what name you please, then, it is certainly not the Abrahamic faith I so much coveted as the one only justifying faith of the gospel of *Christ.*

Let us see, then, what this Abrahamic faith is, of which my friend believes I am ignorant, and of which he deems it a kindness to inform his bewildered neighbor. In *Rom. iv. 10*, the apostle says that "faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness when he was in uncircumcision, and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that *righteousness might be imputed unto them also who walk in the steps of that faith which our father Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised.*"

By this citation we see at a glance the transcendent importance of the Abrahamic faith, as *this alone is accounted to the Gentiles for righteousness.* But of this faith, it should be remarked, that it has two striking and important characteristics, which, however, are closely allied. The first is, that it is the *firm, unwavering conviction* of things *unseen*, or things which God has promised in the future. The other is, that it lays hold with its accompanying hope upon the *specific objects* which God has promised those who have an abiding confidence in the "word of promise." If this be so, how shall we liken it to that faith which discourages the study of the prophetic Word—that Word which opens up the glories of the future, and brings to view the thrilling objects of faith and hope, which God in mercy has placed before us as so many powerful incentives, to enable us to overcome the trials and temptations to which we are constantly exposed in this probationary state? And what shall we say of those pseudo-systems of religion which profess to have this "one faith," while they virtually ignore Moses and the prophets, and repudiate that "spirit of prophecy which is the testimony for Jesus," and whilst their adherents heap such unkind and reproachful epithets as "crazy brains," "bewildered heads," "wild, dogmatical vagarists," and such like, upon those who earnestly desire to follow the natural suggestions of the "one faith" and the counsel of the Apostle Peter, to "take heed to the *sure word of prophecy* as unto a light which shines in a dark place," and who, at the same time, labor from day to day to induce others to do likewise? Is the distasteful appellation of

"Gentile faith" inappropriate, when applied to those who, like Voltaire, Hume and others mentioned by my friend, believe *but little* in the prophetic record save that which has been already fulfilled and become historic fact, and for believing which Mr. O. thinks they are entitled to no credit?

I think we are now prepared to appreciate one very important difference between this Gentile faith and the Abrahamic—namely: Gentile faith *believes* in things past, because they are facts, and repudiates things future because they are incomprehensible. Abrahamic faith *knows* the things past, and *believes with heart and soul* the things future, because Jehovah says, "I the Lord *have spoken it and I will do it.*" [See *Ezek. xxxvi. 33-36*, which please read with the context, and remember in connection with the objects of the Abrahamic faith.] Abrahamic faith, then, in contradistinction to this Gentile or infidel faith, "is the substance of things *hoped for*, the evidence of things *not seen*, for *by it* the elders obtained a good report." "By faith, Noah being warned of God of things *not seen as yet*, prepared an Ark to the saving of his house."

Let us now look at the specific objects of Abraham's faith, as set forth in this 11th of Hebrews, verse 8—"By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a *place* which he should *after* receive for an *inheritance*, obeyed, not knowing whither he went. By faith he *sojourned* in the *Land of Promise* as in a *strange* country, dwelling in *tabernacles*, with Isaac and Jacob, the *heirs with him* of the same (land of) promise, for he looked for a city (evidently in this *place*—this *land of promise*, which he should *after* receive for an inheritance,) which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Verse 13—"These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having *seen them afar off* (in the future), and were *persuaded* of them, because being not weak in faith they were fully persuaded that what God had promised he was able also to perform, and *embraced them*, and confessed that they were (then) *strangers and pilgrims* on the land. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a *country*. And truly if they (Abraham and Sarah,) had been mindful of that country (Ur, of the Chaldees,) from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is a heavenly (or heavenly-like, as the termination *ly* implies,) for he hath prepared for them a city."

Let us now turn to the Mosaic record, and by comparing it with this, we shall be at no loss to find the objects of the Abra-

hamic faith and hope, for there can be no dispute that Abraham believed and hoped for all the things which God promised him. To economise space, we ask the reader to examine carefully the following passages: Gen. xii. 2-3; xiii. 14-17; xv. to end; xvii. 1-8; xviii. 17-19; xxii. 15-18. Deut. xi. 21, and compare them with Gal. iii. By a careful examination of all these testimonies we find—

1. That God promised to give to Abraham himself the very land which he saw with his own eyes, lying between the Euphrates and the Nile, for an inheritance—though not in his present life-time, as he was then to be only a sojourner in it.

2. That this inheritance should be an everlasting possession.

3. That a promised resurrection to eternal life was here implied, because it would be impossible to have everlasting possession in a mortal body.

4. That he should have a seed, or son, in whom all the nations of the earth would be blessed, because he was the Lamb of God, to take away the sin of the world, and thereby bless all nations.

5. That this son should also inherit this same Land of Promise as an everlasting possession—and hence it is called "Immanuel's land," "the Lord's land," "the Holy land," "the glory of all lands," &c., &c.

6. That his seed should possess the gate of his enemies—involving the authority, power, majesty and dominion of the seed, the Christ.

7. That he should also have a spiritual posterity, which should share with him in the same promise.

8. That his seed, spiritually and naturally, should be numberless as the stars of heaven.

9. That he should be the father of not one, but "many nations."

10. That the Land of Promise should become a heaven-like country.

11. That Abraham and his seed should then possess it "as the days of heaven upon the earth."

12. That God would prepare for them a city in that land, which hath foundations, a "city of habitation," whose great architect is God himself.

Now, that this same Land of Promise, with its "Jerusalem, the City of the Great King"—its Mount Zion, "a beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth"—when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, before (Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all) his ancients gloriously—when "many from

the east and west shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the Kingdom of God"—when that kingdom comes, and the "will of God is done on earth as it is in Heaven"—when "the whole earth is filled with the glory of the Lord," and "this land, which is now desolate, shall be like Eden, and its wilderness like the garden of the Lord"—I say, that this same Land of Promise, the territory of the Kingdom of God, with its metropolitan city, when these faithful sayings of the sure word of prophecy are accomplished, will be that heaven-like country and city for which Abraham looked, no spiritual son of Abraham can doubt for one moment!

But it is worthy of remark that the Abrahamic faith has passed through many editions, "enlarged and improved." Most of the promises, especially that concerning the land, were reiterated by covenant to Isaac and Jacob, "the heirs with him of the same promises," and the sweet singer of Israel sings, "Be ye mindful always of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying—unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance. 1st Chr. xvi. 15.

If it be affirmed that this promise of the land as an inheritance was fulfilled to Abraham in his lifetime, or to his seed under the law, let the Holy Spirit reply—Acts vii. 6: "And he gave him (Abraham) none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on, yet he promised that he would give it to him for an (everlasting) possession, and to his seed (which should come) after him, when as yet he had no child."

Again, Gal. iii. 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made, not to seeds, as of many, but as of one, 'and to thy seed,' which is Christ. [Not in thy seed all nations, &c., but 'to thy seed' will I give this land.] And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then the law? It was superadded, because of transgression, till the seed (or son) should come to whom the promise was made. * * For if there had been a law given, which could have given (eternal) life, then righteousness (and with it eternal inheritance) would have been by the law." But as there was no deliverance from sin and death under the law, the promise, as

well as the law, "was ordained by angels in the hands of a mediator." Moses was the mediator of the Sinaitic covenant, and could only give temporal possession of the land. But Christ, the mediator of the Abrahamic covenant, through the blood of the covenant, gives eternal life with eternal inheritance; for he is Jehovah's "messenger of the covenant" and "minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." *Rom. xv. 8.*

Again, in *Rom. iv. 13*, it is written—"For the promise that he should be heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith, for if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Verse 16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all, before him whom he believed, even God, who maketh alive the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were."

From these testimonies, it is obvious that Abraham could not have inherited the land of promise in his mortal state, and consequently must do so by a resurrection from the dead. Again: *If this promise is fulfilled, Abraham cannot look for a Canaan in Heaven*, unless he looked for that which God did not promise. *If not fulfilled, a Canaan in Heaven would not fulfil it*, unless indeed it can be shown that the land he saw with his eyes, "walked through," "sojourned in," and which extended from the Nile to the Euphrates, was in Heaven!

But what is the nature of the promise that Abraham and his seed should "heir the world?" This appears to me to embrace all things promised. "The meek shall inherit the earth." "Their inheritance shall be forever." "The righteous shall inherit the land and dwell therein forever." *Ps. xxxvii.* *Mat. v. 5*, "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." *Jas. ii. 5*, "Thou art my son. * * Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." *Ps. ii*:—"Arise, O God, judge the earth, for thou shalt inherit all nations." *Ps. lxxxii*:—"And thy saints shall be heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."—"To him that overcometh will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them." *Rev. ii. 26*, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things." *Rev. xxi. 7*. "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

Reader, would you not like to be of that seed which is "of the faith of Abraham?" Will you not try and walk in the steps of THAT FAITH which our father Abraham had?" Is not this the faith of that Gospel which is "God's power unto salvation to all who believe it?" Do you say you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God? Let me ask you does not the "Man of Sin, the son of perdition," himself believe this?—and he may adopt this element of the Abrahamic faith, for aught I know, that he may appear an angel of light, and thereby become an arch-deceiver. Let me remind you that the Demons themselves have made this confession; but I pray you be not deceived.

I know that this transcendently glorious truth that Jesus is that Christ "of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write," is the keystone of the arch of the Abrahamic faith, but as the keystone without the arch would fall, so the arch without the keystone would crumble to pieces.

In conclusion, let me say to my friend, Mr. Orvis, that I never designed any "impious ridicule" in anything I have ever said to my fellow-sufferers under the dominion of sin and death, upon these solemn and all-important subjects—neither do I design to "insult my neighbors" in warning them to flee from the wrath to come, and lay hold upon what I conceive to be the only hope for lost humanity. If they get offended, I cannot help it. I must do my duty to the best of my poor ability, and leave the result to the searcher of all hearts.

I must also say, that I have no need to "lay aside the silly conceit that the faith of Abraham, so far as its subject matter is concerned, was one whit superior to the faith of Peter," as I have never had such a conceit—believing, as I do, that Peter possessed the Abrahamic faith in a later edition, seeing he was well instructed in the sure word of prophecy.

My friend signs himself "A Jew," inwardly, doubtless because he believes he is "of the faith of Abraham," whom he claims as his progenitor in the faith; but hear his definition of this faith, in his own italicised words. He says: "In what did this faith (of Abraham) consist? Simply in believing the following fact—that notwithstanding the extreme age of himself and wife, they should be blessed with a son, through whom their posterity should become as numerous as the stars in the heavens. This, and this alone, constituted the peculiar faith which Abraham had!"

Now, I affirm upon Mr. Orvis's own premises, that Voltaire has as much right to sign self "A Jew!"

LEMUEL EDWARDS.

☞ Ecclesiastics who will not insert so well-written and scriptural an article as the above, are knaves, whose craft is to hood-wink the people for filthy lucre's sake. They are of those who make long prayers for a pretence, preach perverse things for hire, and *devour the patrimony of orphans* for their own behoof. A "Name of Blasphemy," (see our article on *Blasphemy*), and nothing else, is the denomination that glorifies such hirelings as "evangelists" and editors of its traditions. Miserable slaves are the people who are content to be led by the nose of soul-traders such as these!—Editor.

An Idolator Slain.

THE Archbishop of Paris, Archpriest of the goddess Geneviève, "the lady patroness" of that city, was slain while performing the idolatrous rites of this ghostly fiction which in France they style a "*Sainte!*" The man who slew him on the spot was a priest named Verger, an enthusiastic opponent of the Immaculate Conception, which he regarded as idolatry. When he pierced the heart of his besotted victim, he is said to have exclaimed, "*No goddess!*" On being asked why he said that, he answered: "Because I do not believe in the Immaculate Conception, upon which subject I explained myself in the pulpit. I wished to protest once more against so impious a doctrine."

The Archpriest was unquestionably an idolator, as are all worshipers of the fictions called "Saints," by the Apostacy. According to the divine law, he deserved death; and had the slayer lived under the Mosaic law, he would have been justified in his deed, and have earned for himself a name for righteousness in Israel. The following is the law in the case:

"If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, who is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers; namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of

bondage. And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you."—Deut. xiii. 6. The offence was to be established by the mouth of two or three witnesses; but by the testimony of only one witness, death might not ensue.—ch. xvii. 2-7.

There is a very interesting passage in Jewish history, illustrative of the execution of this law. It happened about 423 years after the destruction of Solomon's Temple by the Chaldeans, or B. C. 168, on this wise. Antiochus Epiphanes decreed that his whole kingdom should be one people, and abandon the laws peculiar to smaller communities. To this the various nations subject to his rule agreed. Many Israelites also consented to his religion, and sacrificed to idols, and profaned the Sabbath.

In those days, the king's officers came to Modin to make the people sacrifice to idols. Among these was a priest named Mattathias, who resided at Modin, and who was deeply moved at the tyranny of Antiochus, and the apostacy of his people, who crowded to the altar erected by his decree. Mattathias being present, the king's officers endeavored to make him conform, by fair speeches and promises of high honors and rewards. Upon which Mattathias cried out with a loud voice, "Though all the nations under the king's dominion obey him, and fall away every one from the religion of their fathers, and give consent to his commandments; yet will I and my sons and my brethren walk in the covenant of our fathers. God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances. We will not hearken to the king's words to go from our religion, either on the right hand or the left."

Now, when he had ceased, one of the by-standing Jews came forward in the sight of all to sacrifice on the altar, according to the king's decree. When Mattathias observed this, his zeal was inflamed, and he could no longer forbear "to show his anger according to judgment;" wherefore he ran, and slew him upon the altar. Also the king's commissioner, who compelled men to sacrifice, he killed at the same time, and demolished the altar. "Thus," saith the writer of Maccabees, "dealt he zealously for the law of God, like as Phineas did unto Zambri the son of Salom."—See Num. xxv.

This event illustrates the Era of the Assonians, when Israel were "holpen with a little help," about the conclusion of Ezekiel's 430 years, during which they were to "eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles."—See Dan. xi. 34; Ezek. iv. 4-6, 13.

But the vengeance of Jehovah against idolatry was not appeased by individual

chastisement of offenders. The enormity of the offence in his sight, is indicated by the terrible retribution commanded on a city that did not enforce the law against the transgressors. Nothing belonging to it was to be left alive; even the unoffending cattle were to be slain, and the spoil of it to be utterly consumed with fire. The following is the statute in the case :

"If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities which Jehovah thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, certain men, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods,' which ye have not known; then shalt thou inquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and, behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you; thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword. And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof every whit, for Jehovah thy God: and it shall be an heap during the Aion, and shall not be built beyond. And there shall cleave nought of the devoted thing to thine hand; that Jehovah may turn from the fierceness of his anger, and show thee mercy, and have compassion upon thee, and multiply thee, as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, **WHEN** thou shalt hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to keep all his commandments which I command thee this day, to do right in the eyes of Jehovah thy God."—Deut. xiii. 12-18.

Such was "the just recompense of reward" inflicted, or rather ordained to be inflicted, upon all in Israel who violated the precept, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them*; for I, Jehovah, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and **KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS.**"—Exod. xx. 3-6. This law, which the Apostasy admits to be in force, defines what Jehovah deems to be idolatry. The genuflections, bowings and crossings of Catholics before graven images, and pictures, and bony relics of fictions they suppose to be in heaven; and the dedication of spiritual bazars they call "churches" to imaginary saints, fabled to be in heaven;

and the celebration of days in honor of their sanctity by Protestants, is nothing but rank idolatry—it is bowing down, or acknowledging their existence and superiority (for the greater is worshiped of the less), and *doing service* to them, according to the ritual. The Catholic system is nothing but demon and idol worship, and Protestantism, in its church and state manifestations especially, idolatry, or rather demonolatry, in a more subtle, and less revolting form. The hierophants, then, of "Christendom" are an idol priesthood before God, and as obnoxious to his judgments as the children of Belial among the Jews, so terribly, yet justly, denounced by his servant Moses, "who," saith Paul, "was faithful in all his house."

Would *we*, then, deal with Catholics, and Protestants, and other heathen as Jehovah commanded Israel to deal with one another, in the case before us? *Not at present.* The time hath not yet come for the saints to "execute the judgment written" against the kings, priests, nobles and people of "Christendom."—Psalms cxlix. 6-9; lviii. 10, 11; Dan. vii. 22, 26. During "the times of the Gentiles," which are not yet quite expired, God permits the demon-worshippers (and all who believe in saints, ghosts or skyana, and observe the days set apart to their honor, and approve the system that dedicates spiritual bazars to them, and places cities and countries under their protection or patronage, as England under St. George, Scotland under St. Andrew, Ireland under St. Patrick, France under St. Denis, Spain under St. James, Paris under Lady St. Geneviève, and clouds of temples under all the angels, and saints, and souls that ever entered the crazy brains of barbarians and knaves to think of; all who believe in such folly, which is based on the immortal-soulism of the Apostasy, belong to the mammoth church of demon-worshippers) whom we say, "God hath permitted to walk after their own ways," *having appointed* A DAY in which, by the hand of Jesus and his brethren at the head of the tribes of Israel, who are his "battle-axe and weapons of war," (Jer. li. 10-25), he will justly punish with aionian destruction all who know not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ—2 Thess. 7-10; Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16—then first and finally to be proclaimed by the angel-class referred to in Isaiah lxvi. 19, and Rev. xiv. 6, 7.

But while *we*, whose weapons at present are not carnal, would not slay with our own hand, nor hire, nor abet a Verger to slay any of the priests of the gods or goddesses of Christendom, yet when we read of the valiant deeds of "the Israel of the Alps," of the Waldenses of Piedmont, the Huguenots

of France, and of the Ironsides of England's Oliver, marching to the battle under the inspiration of the soul-stirring melodies of Israel's king—when we read of their vengeance vomiting forth fire from their mouth, and devouring the armies of the beast (Rev. xi. 5-7), we rejoice, as Israel rejoiced when their youthful champion slew Goliath. There would seem to be something judicial in the fall of the Archpriest of Paris. His predecessor was shot at the barricades in 1848, not in combating against arbitrary power, but in giving "souls" a passport to purgatory, which is, in the sight of God, whatever it may be before apostate Christendom, a crime worthy of death. He fell into the arms of the same man, the Abbé Surat, who also caught his successor when stabbed by Verger. This happened on January 7, "at the novena in honor of the Festival of St. Genevieve, the patroness of Paris." The 3rd of January, the day on which she is supposed to have died, is always observed as the first of a series of nine days' devotions, masses, &c. On the present occasion, at 5.30 p.m., the Archpriest was accompanying a procession of "the lady patroness, St. Genevieve," when, as he was passing the outer door to enter the principal nave, and was turning round to give his blessing to the persons assembled in the lower part of the church, a knife was buried in his chest, and he fell, covered with blood. He died in the service of his demoness. "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them," is the voice of Jehovah; but the Archpriest of the Parisian deity regarded it not. No goddess! exclaimed the avenger; he was stabbed, and fell.

Paris claims to be the most enlightened of the cities of the nations; if so, what must the darkness of those cities be! The brave and intelligent Parisians acknowledging themselves under the protection and patronage of a ghostess; and celebrating her orgies for nine successive days, through an Archpriest and an ecclesiastical staff of officials, is the one step beyond the sublime, which proves them to be a braying community of dupes! An alliance with such a people in the management of the affairs of Europe, is a disgrace to the boasted morality and intelligence of Britain. No good will ever come of a copartnership with December-assassins, priestly imposters, and ghost-worshippers. It is true that Britain is far off from perfection; still she is in advance of the nations; and is desired by the friends of truth and righteousness in the earth, not to dim the little light she hath, in subjecting her policy to the brutal and corrupting influence of the Parisian harlot in Church and State.

The fate of the Archpriest of the Parisian goddess is but the earnest, as it were, of a more terrible destiny that awaits the Demonomolators at the apocalypse of Christ. The sentence of that day of vengeance impending over "Christendom" is written against it, and will then be proclaimed with a loud voice, saying, "If any man worship the Beast and his Image, and receive his mark on his forehead, or on his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out, without mixture, into the cup of his indignation, and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy messengers, and in the presence of the Lamb."—Rev. xiv. 9. This is the just recompense of reward for the vulgar herd with high-sounding titles, that corrupt and brutalize the people by their consummate wickedness and abominable idolatries. Who that beholds society without spectacles, and having his eyes enlightened by the scriptures of truth, but would heartily pray with the exile of Patmos, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!" Come, and punish the high ones that are on high, even the kings of the earth upon the earth; subdue the nations to thy will, and cause the world to rejoice in the blessedness of Abraham, thy friend!!

That will indeed be a good time when bad government shall be abolished from the earth, and mankind shall have been delivered from the "strong delusion" perpetuated by the wolves in sheep's clothing, who raven upon them for what they can extort in the form of salaries, perquisites, and fees. The priests, clergy, and ministers of the Catholic, Protestant, and sectarian apostasy, will then have been utterly abolished. Their prophesyings will be silenced in the indignation and contempt of an enlightened generation. No more will they dare to practice their present profession of lying in the name of the Lord; for truth will be the rule, and lies the exception of things in the age to come.

In that good time, when all nations shall flow to Jerusalem, many people will say, "Come, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in His paths."—Isa. ii. 3.—With such a teacher, can they fail of turning upon their former blind guides, and condemning them for fools, or something worse? Yea, the teaching will astonish them, and compel them to confess their present folly; for it is testified, that "the Gentiles shall come unto the Lord from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein

there is no profit."—Jer. xvi. 19; iii. 17. This is the scripture designation of the "NAMES AND DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTENDOM" ending in ism—mere lies, vanities, and unprofitable things. Then, if a man prophesy Romanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Episcopalianism, Lutheranism, Baptistism, Campbellism, &c., in the name of the Lord, he will be charged with lying and put to death. This is evident from the testimony of God. For, speaking of the good time when the prophets (priests, monks, clergy, &c.) and the unclean spirit shall be expelled from the land of Canaan, the spirit says, by Zechariah, "When any shall yet prophesy, then his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him,—Thou shalt not live, for thou speakest lies in the name of Jehovah: and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth. And in that day the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he hath prophesied."—xiii. 3, 4. The truth will not then be trifled with, as now; and men will learn to respect it under the penalty of death upon the spot. EDITOR.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Letter from Dr. Passmore.

DEAR BRO. THOMAS:—I for one "think the Herald worthy of support," most liberal support, and therefore send you some recipients thereof at my expense. I do not hesitate to say, most earnestly, that the *Herald* is a periodical replete with knowledge of a most inestimable character, and which the "just and vivid conceptions," "power and learning," "clear ideas," and "lucid views" of this progressive age, render it *impossible* to be obtained elsewhere. In it are exhibited the rich sublimities, the never fading glories, the infinite variety of events, which are to be unfolded through the boundless ages of eternity; these too, are delineated with a lucidness of style, a witchery of force, and conciseness of expression, which, unfortunately, is the property only of a favored few. It may be said of it, I think, as truly as of any work in the language, that it is admirably adapted to inspire a love of truth—to guide the footsteps of those who are benighted and bewildered by "a thousand phantasies"—to refresh the mind, and fill "the soul with sentiments august"—and by the attractiveness of its matter, the wisdom of its collocation, the potency of its language, to win the pure in heart and bring them to an *obedience* of the truth. It is the *only* periodical, with which I am acquainted, that can truly be

said to be unbiassed by theory, and which, *proving all things and holding fast that which is good*, can rid the community of the errors and absurdities that darken and bewilder it. And again, the political signs are so luminously considered in it, as to make it especially interesting in a political point of view. "Europe seems to be on the point of a fearful overthrow." The great statesmen, dear brother, are beginning to see now the reality of what a few years ago they considered the impossibilities of the future. Blackwood says, "The British Government should keep a sharp eye upon Syria, and timously seek to extend our influence in that important region, as a preparation for the trial of strength which assuredly awaits us there." And again, he says, "it is curious to observe how the conquering march of the three leading powers of Europe, beginning far apart, is converging towards the same point." Elsewhere, he says, "thus again are we brought back to the frontiers of Syria. Starting from most opposite points, the march of extra-European conquest is bringing Russia, France, and Britain into contact on that most important of all regions, the great Isthmus of the Old World. The necessity of speedy communication with our Indian empire, and with our Australasian colonies, destined to become a most puissant confederacy of States, renders it indispensable that Great Britain secure to herself a passage either across Egypt or Syria. And yet this portion of the earth is the very point towards which both Russia and France are advancing as the goal of their expansion. It is the cynosure of their extra-European policy. Strange region! thus attracting from afar the greatest powers of the world. Marvellous point! towards which the White oligarchs of the earth, after subduing the greater part of the world in their path, are advancing from opposite quarters, and in rival bodies, to come in collision on its plains. Can their meeting be peaceful? Can such Powers, so mighty in themselves, and each aided by a host of foreign legionaries—Arabs from Algeria, Tartars from Upper Asia, Sepoys from India—settle down in friendly juxtaposition without first trying in battle the strength of their dread armaments?"

May you live and write and lecture until Jesus in glory appear, and then may the image of God be ineffaceably stamped upon you. Farewell! and believe me,

Your affectionate brother,

WM. PASSMORE.

Lunenburg, Va., Feb. 20th, 1857.

The fearful and unbelieving shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.—*Jesus*.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

The Gallows Repentance; or, Convict-Converts of the Clergy.

[To the Editor of the Leader.]

SIR:—A disgraceful immorality is constantly exhibited whenever a convict is hanged. I do not now refer to the drunkenness and theft amongst an idle crowd, but to something worse than this, because those who are guilty are religious men, or, at any rate, pretend to be so. No sooner is it known with certainty that a man has murdered a couple of children or a wife, or ended his career as professional villain by beating in a man's skull with a life-preserver, than he becomes an object of special anxiety to "the Church." All her artillery is brought to bear upon him. He is regularly besieged night and day by a storm of addresses, exhortations, Scripture readings, and prayers, and then, after a time, in nine cases out of ten we are told that the efforts of the worthy clergyman "had a most beneficial effect" upon the wretch; that he was observed to be frequently perusing his Bible, or sedulously repeating hymns. Occasionally, as was the case with a man just executed for cutting the throat of the woman with whom he had cohabited, the murderer will shake hands with and kiss his attendants, hoping to meet them in heaven. We will not stop to inquire why all this attention should be shown to such a reprobate when thousands more hopeful than he are perishing bodily and spiritually every day. Perhaps, though, the care may not be genuine. Perhaps the poor felon is delivered over to the parson before execution much in the same way as his body is sometimes delivered over to the doctor afterwards, and for the same reason, because subjects on which to operate and refresh one's skill are scarce. However, this we do not care to investigate. We merely ask, is it not a monstrous thing that it should be publicly preached in this manner, that by some ecclesiastical hocuspocus or legerdemain all the laws of nature can be controverted, that by some religious juggler a devil can be transformed into a saint, and in a 'hey-presto!' whisked out of hell into heaven? The magic is complete. We see the prison-gates close on the fiend—and a darkened, miserable, sin-steeped fiend he is, too—and then, in a trice, they open again, and, by a most Wizard-of-the-North-like transformation, we are presented with a humble, pardoned angel, with his seraph

wings almost budding. We simple people are utterly at a loss. We know that it takes us months, and sometimes tedious years, to save ourselves from a single crime. We know full well what every step which we take heavenward costs, and that, poor fools, we are ready to weep with delight when, after long toil, we have climbed near to those "shining table-lands to which our God himself is Sun and Moon." What must be our astonishment, then, to see heaven taken at a *flying leap*; to discover that by some covenant a whole life of vice can be effaced by the momentary assent of the understanding to a few propositions. Comforting truth this, for a besotted crowd to know that a twisted, useless career can be unraveled and rewoven in an hour or two before death! And the evil does not end here. Hypocrisy and cant, like a Nebuchadnezzar image, are openly set up on the scaffold and paraded before the multitude. The people know it is all a sham, and when an honest man attempts to teach them afterwards sincerity and truth, he finds that the ground has been cut away from under his feet by those who have publicly executed these noble qualities along with the murderer. People learn to laugh at virtue, telling you that it is all cant, and that the clergyman talks about all that. *Who can tell how much of the infidelity of the masses has been caused by the infidelity of religious men?* It would be far better to dispense with the services of the clergyman and all these religious theatricals. We should then in effect be proclaiming the great doctrine that crime renders a man such a slave, that nothing we can do in a fortnight or month can have any influence on his character. We should not, then, rob the execution of half its horror by the softening thought that most likely repentance and the mediation of Christ have procured salvation. Neither would imposture be branded with the Church's approval, nor would the mob below have an additional opportunity for fortifying itself in the belief that of all humbugs in the world, religion is the biggest. The reason why we do not like to act in this way is, that we have a theory upon eternal punishments, which divides the future world by an impassable partition into two great compartments, one of which is filled with the lost and the other with the saved. Now people very naturally revolt from the thought of burning a man for ever. It is all very well to condemn men to perdition by thousands and millions, as is done in the pulpit every Sunday. That is easy enough. We are condemning imaginary thousands and millions, and do not realize what we are doing. But when the Rev. A. has to stand face to face with the man B., he naturally

shudders more at sending that one poor flesh-and-blood felon to hell than he does at sending thither all those infidels and atheists over whose awful fate he grows so eloquent every Sabbath. What, then, is to be done? *The theory must be saved, and the human instinct saved, too;* and so we can do nothing but declare both to be true. There is a hell, but the convict is not going there. The mediation of Christ, &c. &c. Now if we are content to say that the Great Future is in darkness except so far as present analogies throw a dim light forward upon it; if we say that the only thing we *know* is that crime ruins here, whatever it may do hereafter, we shall then feel that we are not launching the murderer into a sea of fire, but into the unknown world; we shall be silently saying that he is too bad for us to mend, and so we commit him to his Maker. This would be sincerity and true religion just on the occasion when it is most wanted.

Yours truly, W. H. W.

How besottedly ignorant must mankind be to regard with the least respect a set of miserable sinners like the clergy, who with the Bible in their hands, can offer what they impiously style "*the consolations of Christianity*," to the gallows thieves and assassins usually turned over by the authorities to prison-chaplains! Do not the knaves read what the Spirit saith, namely, that "*No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him*"—1 Jno. iii. 15; that "*they who do the work of the flesh shall not inherit the kingdom of God*;" that "*the unrighteous shall not possess that kingdom*;" that "*he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption*"—Gal. v. 19-21; vi. 8; and that the timid, the unbelieving, the abominable, murderers, harlotists, sorcerers, idolators, and all the liars (i. e. the clergy) shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the Second Death—Rev. xxi. 6? But, as the writer of the above truly says, "*the theory must be saved*;" and we add, to *save the hire!*—EDITOR.

Errata.

If the reader knew how much trouble an editor has to get compositors to do their duty conscientiously, he would be astonished rather at the tolerable accuracy of typography, than surprised at the blunders it displays. Compositors and binders cause us more vexation than we can express. They seem to have no ambition to excel, though they are better paid here than abroad, where the work is better done. We heard of a printer in London who used to expose his proofs in his window to the public view; and to offer a reward

for any errors that might be pointed out; but we are told by one of much experience that no printer here would be so rash as to venture on such an experiment.

Publishing, then, at the risk of being *compelled* to speak nonsense through the negligence of Typo, we must throw ourselves upon the forbearance of the reader, and request him to make all due allowance in the case.

By turning to the January No., p. 20, col. 2, line 12 from the foot, he will find the following stuff: "always reaching after special gifts and flowers. There was 'one Spirit,' when God began to create the worlds. The influences of the spirit," &c. Now this should have read as follows: "gifts and powers. 'There is one spirit.' When God began to create the worlds, the influences of the spirit," &c.

Before the February No. was finished we staid in the office waiting for the proof of "*Il Signor Incognito Explains*" (see p. 46) that we might correct it before returning home. On reading it, we congratulated ourselves that we had not trusted the correction to another, as there were some very conspicuous errors. We corrected them, and departed. Our chagrin, however, was not a little, when, on receiving the edition, we found that our corrections had been disregarded. As the only remedy, we have to request the reader to be kind enough to mark for himself the following *errata*:

On p. 47, col. 1, line 26 from the foot, for "*Demis*" read *Denies*; on same page, col. 2, line 23, for "*above inations*" read *abominations*; on line 21, for "*hold*" read *held*; on p. 48, col. 1, line 12 from the top, for "*fault*" read *faith*; line 6 from the foot, for "*thirty*" read *twenty*; line 25 from foot, for "*settled*" read *settled*; col. 2, line 9 from top, for "*We*" read *When*; line 23 from top, for "*hope*" read *help*; and on line 32, for "*are to*" read *are wont to*.

Enough mistakes in one article in all evil conscience to satisfy the most negligent!

EDITOR.

The Labor of '56.

Our journeyings and speakings during 1856 have been pretty extensive. The distance travelled has been over 6,000 miles; and our addresses, averaging two hours each, 90 in number. This is exclusive of our weekly attendance on the public in New York city during winter and spring. Our most numerous audiences have hitherto been in the south and south-west, for there we have labored most and are most extensively known. The northern countries are new ground to us; and are powerfully monop-

lized by the firm of Balaam, Jezebel & Co.— Rev. ii., 14, 15, 20. But we work on, not expecting great results at this late hour; but with full assurance that the word will accomplish that whereunto it is sent. New York city is a sort of Gomorrah, where people care very little for God or his word. The flesh reigns, and its abominations increase in enormity every day. Things could scarcely have been worse in the days of Noah; yet vast sums are squandered upon ecclesiastical establishments—an evidence that they are either positively demoralizing, or impotent for good. We are at war with the whole system, asking no quarter and giving none; therefore, every one baptized (and we are ever and anon doing something in that way) is subdued by the power of the truth.

EDITOR.

Railway to Jerusalem.

"SIR JOHN McNEILL has returned to London from Syria and Palestine, where he has been for some time past engaged in laying out a harbor on the east coast of the Mediterranean sea, and the railway which is to extend from thence to the Persian Gulf. General Chesney remains at Constantinople, to get the details of the firman completed, the general principles of which had been agreed upon by the Turkish government before he and Sir John left Constantinople for the east. The other railway on which Sir John has been employed, is one of great interest to all the civilized world, namely, that from the ancient seaport of Joppa, now Jaffa, to Jerusalem, and from thence to Damascus."

The power interesting itself most directly and actively in the Holy Land, is evidently England. Her influence has gained the ascendancy in Turkish counsels, to the no little chagrin of the French. She will, doubtless, maintain it; and in cooperation with Turkey, be instrumental in colonizing and developing the resources of the land prior to the apocalypse of Christ. It is a sign of the times not to be mistaken.

EDITOR.

Candle or No Candle.

There is quite a conflict in the Anglo-Hibernian Church, as by law established in England, the mother also of Anglo-American Episcopalianism in the United States, concerning the vastly important questions, whether wax candles shall stand in candlesticks upon the church altar, or not; and, if permitted, shall they be lighted, or shall they not? These grave religious questions have been greatly agitated of late at the "notori-

ous church of St. Paul's, Knight's Bridge." The clergy and the churchwardens not being able to agree concerning them, applied to "the Right Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of London," in whose diocese it is, for his decision. To the first question he said, "Yes;" and to the second "No." This was splitting the difference, for the clergy were for lighted candles on the altar; their opponents for no candles, lighted or not. Ye may have the candles and candlesticks upon the altar, said the Bishop, "but ye may not light them." The dense fog, however, afforded the Rev. Mr. Liddell and his curates the opportunity of raising spiritual fire under pretext of enlightening the darkness; and the candles were lighted. But churchwarden Westerton, the chosen child, and undaunted champion of Protestantism, felt called on to act in this alarming crisis. He appeared upon the scene with an extinguisher, literally as well as metaphorically, and rapidly put out the candles. But Liddell having arisen from his devotions, and discovering the incombustibility of the consecrated wicks, darted off into the vestry followed by a curate, and returned with a lighted candle. They all then went up to the altar, and proceeded to generate consecrated fire, to the amazement of the lookers-on. Thus the churchwarden was baffled; for perceiving that the repetition of his feat would lead to a fight with the candle-worshippers, he acquiesced and remained in his pew.

"To us," says an English paper, commenting upon the above, "the papistry of the candle is puerile; but the Protestantism of the extinguisher is not really more dignified. This is the church, however, with its Liddells and Westertons, for which Mr. Gladstone is asking recruits, and for which the Bishop of St. Asaph's is asking endowments. Before we give the curates, or can expect lauded proprietors to supply the endowments, we must settle the institutes of the church; we must determine whether it is candle or no candle, before we "please to remember the grotto!"

Fashionable Religion.

"We are not aware that it is any of our business to be talking about religion, either fashionable or unfashionable. But the New York Herald has an article on the above-mentioned subject, which, though designed for the latitude of New York, may not be altogether inapplicable to these parts. We are told that the Roman Catholics in the great Commercial Metropolis are very constant in their attendance at church, but the poor Protestant generally finds the temple

too fine, the congregation too much impregnated with mammon worship, and too splendid in attire, for the proper understanding of the dispensation of Him who was meek and lowly, and had no place to lay his head—and the consequence is that the Protestant churches are generally pretty empty on the Sabbath. So the poor Protestant falls into bad habits on Sunday—he reads novels or sleeps, and is speedily accounted among the ungodly that are to be cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. The *Herald* proceeds as follows:—

“The churches as well as the theatres have followed the fashionable movement up town. On all the avenues may be found religious edifices generally more expensive than tasteful—more showy than comfortable—more suggestive of the pomps and vanities of this wicked world than of the pure and holy precepts which should be inculcated within their walls. The gorgeoussness of the edifice—the magnificence of the congregation—the Pecksniffian discourse of the fashionable preacher—the gems from the last improper opera worked into sacred music for the choir—all these are the elements of religion after the modern improved style.

“Fashionable religion is generally a good speculation in a pecuniary point of view. The pews are sold at auction after the fashion that Barnum disposed of the choice seats to hear Jenny Lind. Very large sums are netted in this way. Occasionally, the fashionable churches burst like other mercantile speculations. One of the most exclusive situated in the Fifth Avenue, is now in a tight place, financially speaking. It is heavily in debt, and in danger of being sold out by the sheriff. It is a Baptist church, but the preacher is not exactly the type of him who preached in the wilderness of Judea. His raiment is not of camel's hair, but of the finest broadcloth; his meat is something more elaborate than locusts and wild honey; the water of his Jordan comes from far away in the country, and is carefully warmed for fear that the faithful might take cold in immersion. He does not cry “Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” but he preaches pleasant dulcet discourses, showing the whitest of hands—the most immaculate of pocket handkerchiefs—the most splendid of ambrosial curls. He is a sweet preacher for the ladies, and thoroughly understands the *diletantism* of modern Christianity. Decidedly, John the Baptist would be astonished at his Fifth Avenue representative. It is to be hoped that the bulls and bears of Wall street will forget their quarrels for a while, and come down handsomely for the relief of the modern John the Baptist.

“It is a curious fact that the reformation was brought about by the luxury, corruption, and effeminacy which crept into the bosom of the Mother Church, and that now those who profess Protestantism, are following in the same evil courses against which Knox, Calvin, and Luther launched their thunders. In simplicity of attire, abstinent habits of life and devotion to the interests of their flocks, the Catholic clergy now stand pre-eminent. On the other hand, the representatives of the stern old Puritans, who could not bear the sight of a surplice, are turning away to all sorts of abominations. There is no more of the solid old Cotton Mather piety left among us. There are velvet cushions, artistic music, sweet preachers, nicely worded somnolent discourses, worshipers rolled up in Russian sables and loaded with diamonds; splendid churches, where the atmosphere is redolent with perfumes, and the very light shaded with many-colored tints, heavy floating debts, crushing mortgages, but not a drop of the manna of righteousness, unless a poor sinner for a moment, under fear of the mighty sexton, offers up his lonely prayer in a free seat. Such is fashionable religion in New York in these latter days. Read Christ's sermon on the Mount, and let us have a fashionable discourse with the thirteenth verse for a text.”—*Richmond Whig*.

An Interesting Book.

MR. EDITOR: I have just been reading a very interesting book, and I felt a strong desire, after reading the last chapter, to call the attention of your numerous readers to it. I presume that many of them have already procured and read it, as it has been published some time; but such, or at least some of them, I believe, will thank me for calling the attention of the public more particularly to it. In fact, I have heard quite a number speak about its interest, and express great surprise that it had not been sought after and read to a much greater extent than it has been as yet. I know there are some who have obtained it and read a portion of it, and laid it aside as not being of sufficient interest to warrant the finishing of it; but those I have heard speak of doing so, freely admitted that they did not commence reading it with any interest, and not a few went so far as to say that it was with strong prejudice against it that they commenced its perusal; and it is not to be wondered at that such should throw it aside before reading the whole of it. I will briefly allude to a few of the objections offered by those who did not read it through.

One was, that it was not a continued nar-

rative or story; that, while one chapter speaks of some family, place, or series of events, the next treats of others that seem to have no sort of connexion with the first.

Although this is the case to a certain extent, yet each chapter or series of chapters that relate to any particular set of persons or events, is complete of itself, and of course does not interfere at all with the interest of the book. This is, to my mind, an excellent recommendation of the book, instead of an objection to it; for we have a complete history or narrative of many different scenes, instead of only one, as is the case with a large proportion of the romances and novels of the present day. Another objection to it is, that it contains some sentiments and opinions that they could not coincide with, and that might leave a wrong impression upon the mind after reading it.

I admit that there are some sentiments advanced which all would not agree to, but the book, as a whole, inculcates excellent morals, and I hardly believe that any one would err much, to follow the many valuable and noble suggestions it contains.

Another objection offered is, that we are not certain that it is true; but this is a trivial objection when we consider the source from which it comes; for some of the persons who urge it have, to my certain knowledge, read more than one fictitious tale since they laid it aside; and I venture to say that if it had been interesting, they would not have questioned its truthfulness for a moment, but would have devoured its contents with avidity.

Still another objection is, that the scenes described transpired a great many years ago; but I imagine that there were transactions in revolutionary times, or even further back than that, of as great interest as any in modern times, therefore I consider that objection of no importance.

But I have already taken too much notice of the objections urged against this truly valuable and entertaining book, and will briefly notice a few facts in its favor that will far outweigh the objections.

The language used is chaste and relevant, and the ennobling principle of love is diffused through every page. Although there are many pungent admonitions against the growing evils of the day, yet they are written in such a kind and conciliatory manner, that they ought to be received with kindness. There are suggestions in it that, if heeded, will add to the happiness of those who regard them. Some of the principles inculcated are "like apples of gold in pictures of silver." But I shall leave your readers to read and form an opinion of its merits, and I sincerely

hope that it will be obtained by many who have never perused it.

A word about the publishers of the book. As it is not a copyright work, it has been published by quite a number of different publishing houses, and has had a much larger circulation than it could have had through one publisher. In England, almost every work of much worth and merit is issued in many different styles and prices, from the cheap paper cover to the elegant unique turkey morocco, full gilt; and thus the poor man, who is generally a lover of books, can buy and read the same books that the rich man does.

In this country it is not so to any great extent; and therefore there are very many books of interest and real merit, published only in the middling or best style, which the poor man cannot obtain. But with the book of which I have been speaking it is not so, and we should all be grateful for it. I think there never has been a book published in so many different styles, and at such low prices as this one; and its reputation has gone forth into other countries, and the desire is so great to read it, that it has already been published in several different languages. There are men among us who take such an interest in it, that they have given large amounts of money toward having it circulated extensively, and many copies have been freely given to those who were really desirous of reading it, but who were not able to purchase. It may be thought proper for me to give the names of the publishers, but as I could not give the whole, I have thought it best not to name any, and will only say that one firm in this country has without doubt issued more copies than all others combined, and they will have their reward; for I believe that the man or firm that publishes a good book, and sells it so cheap that the poorest person can obtain it, does a vast amount of good, and will be blest in his affairs.

I have had the pleasure of conversing at different times with many who have read this book at least once, and there seems to be but one opinion among them. and that is, that it fills a void in literature that no other book ever yet published could fill. Some of these persons freely admitted that they read it as frequently, and placed as much reliance upon its truths and theories, as they did upon the Bible, and were willing to place it in the hands of their children, believing that it would instil great and moral principles into their tender minds. And among these were men who have been looked upon as being truly honest and devout, and whose lives have been a continued warfare against sin and error.

Now if such men can recommend a book, I should have no fear of its circulation being increased to an unlimited extent; and if those who have been so fortunate as to have read it, and become interested in it, would only speak of it oftener to others who have not done so, its circulation and usefulness would be greatly increased. "A word to the wise is sufficient."

As I read the book and became interested in it, I marked some passages which I considered very beautiful, intending to give some of them in this communication; but when I had read the last chapter, and turned to make some extracts, I found so many passages or lines marked, that it would be useless to think of trying to give them all; and the selections were so nearly alike in interest, that I really could not decide which to use and which to leave; so I concluded not to give any, but leave it for the reader to find the many beautiful and sublime passages or extracts that I had marked for insertion here.

And now it is befitting that I should, in this public manner, admit that the author of the book I have attempted to describe, or rather call attention to, merits the heartfelt thanks of every one for giving us a book of such great interest, deep pathos, excellent admonitions, and sound principles; and when we read it, may our hearts beat in unison with those who have read it and profited by it; and may we do all in our power to increase its circulation and usefulness among our fellow-men.

In conclusion, I will add that it is usually customary to announce the title of the book to be written about before speaking of its contents or interest; but my design was to awaken, if possible, an interest to procure and read, without prejudice, this book, before learning its title, as a title sometimes strikes a person's mind unfavorably, and might lead them to omit reading even a brief notice of the book. And now, dear reader, I ask if you will promise to obtain and read this book, candidly and thoroughly, if I will announce its title, and where it may be found? Methinks I hear you answer pleasantly, but with firmness and determination—Yes.

I then inform you that it can be obtained at any bookstore, and its title is—"The Holy Bible."—*Family Circle*.

Eternal Life.

ETERNAL life is a matter of promise; it is promised only to true believers; it is hid in Christ, and is only obtainable by the dead and living at his appearing.

The "Clergy" and their "Names of Blasphemy."

The following appeared in "*The Whig*," a political paper published in Richmond, Virginia.

"The Christian sect was never called Baptist, Catholic, or Protestant. Scarcely had the Christian sect been fully organized, when 'ministers of Satan' were attempting to make counterfeit sects. Three such 'wolves in sheep's clothing' appeared at Corinth to make new sects 'for filthy lucre's sake.' Their names were transferred to Paul, Apollos and Cephas to show the sinfulness of all modern sects, and the impossibility of dividing Christ to give any part of him to any modern sect. Then the apostle saith: 'Is Christ divided?' No. What, then, are Paulites?—Ah! that's the rub; they are carnal and in their sins.' Into this *mirror* all modern sects can look and behold their hideous pictures of blackest sin, painted by the spirit of the Lord, for all modern sects are an abomination to God, and the greatest curse that afflicts the world. When, therefore, the Gentile sects shall sink to *hell*, (the grave,) and rise no more, one universal shout of holy men and angels will make the earth ring from pole to pole, for the happy riddance. Modern sects were expected to increase after Paul's decease, and so they did; but Paul did not call any modern 'clergyman' by any nicer name than 'ravening wolf;' for even Christ called *hired* clergymen 'wolves in sheep's clothing;' and 'dogs,' and 'greedy dogs,' are other Bible epithets by which the Holy Spirit distinguishes modern 'clergymen' of every name, from those holy men, who ministered to the Christian sect, 'coveting no man's gold, or silver, or apparel, and eating no man's bread for nought,' while on the other hand, modern clergymen are 'covetous, proud, lovers of money and of pleasure,' but *not of God*—'resist the truth'—having eyes full of adultery—beguiling unstable souls—creeping into houses and leading captive silly women laden with sins,' and 'running greedily after hire.'

"Such are a few of the characteristics of all modern 'clergymen' now ministering to modern sects; and yet such dogs are 'wandering stars, to whom the blackness of darkness is reserved forever;'—they are 'clouds without rain—wells without water'—saith the Lord. Such are the *big* clouds and *deep* wells of all modern *sects*. Alas for the nations in such a case. Lord Jesus, come quickly.

CHRISTIAN."

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, MAY, 1857.

[Vol. VII. No. 5

Did Moses teach Immortal Soulism, or Resurrection to Immortality of Body?

"A seeker after Truth" has a suspicion that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive; in other words, that the *thinking I myself* called by those names, is in intellectual activity somewhere. He has no idea that this Abraham-I, this Isaac-I, and this Jacob-I, are the bodies, which, in the days of their existence, were supposed by their simple-minded contemporaries to be the real Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for, says he, "their bodies were dead." Now, this is equivalent to saying, that the Abraham-body is one thing; and the Abraham-possessive pronoun, a different thing. Thus the *he* is alive, and the *body* the "he" calls *his*, is dead; but Terah styled the thing that came out of his loins, Abram, and AIL-SHADDAI afterwards called it Abraham; so that between Terah, God, and our correspondent, we have an Abraham who is at once both dead and alive.

But the Scriptures know nothing about dead and alive Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs; nor of disembodied living men. It speaks of men who were dead and are alive again; but never in a single instance, of men being dead and alive contemporaneously.

They treat of man and his destiny; and in their beginning define what sort of a creature it is they style man. Moses, the go-between, or Mediator between God and the Hebrew Nation, "who," says Paul, "was faithful in all his house (or kingdom) as a servant, for a testimony of these things that were to be spoken after"—Heb. iii. 5;—the great prophet contemporary of the beginning of THE AION (ἀπ' αἰῶνος, Acts iii. 21) who have given the only authentic account of the origin of things, has given us also a

very intelligible definition of Man. He tells us that *Man is a living Soul*. He does not say, that man is an everliving, or an immortal, soul; nor that his body contains an immortal soul; but יְדֵי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ הַיָּהּ *yēhi hahadahm lēnēphēsh khayyah*, which literally rendered signifies, *the groundling shall be for a living creature*.

But, perhaps, we had better give the whole of Gen. ii. 7; and, as we have among our subscribers Jews, who accept and reject Jesus as the Messiah or Christ, we shall give it in the Hebrew as well as in the English.

וַיִּצְרַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם עֵפֶר
כִּן-הָאָדָמָה וַיִּפֶּה בְּאֶפְרוֹ נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי
הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה :

Translation.

And JEHOVAH ELOHIM, the I SHALL BE, the Spirit of Mighty Ones, Job xxvi. 13; Ps. xxxiii. 4; eiv. 29; 30, formed the groundling, dust out of the ground, and he breathed into his nostrils breath of lives, and the groundling was for a living creature.

We have rendered the word *Adam* by *groundling*, as the word in our language that is nearest to the original. *Groundling* is any thing pertaining to the ground: so also *adam* is that which belongs to *adamah*, the ground. The *adam* before it became a living thing, is termed simply "dust out of the ground." The Spirit-former, was the potter, and the dust when formed, the clay. Before breath entered into its interior, it was a clay-statue moulded into an "image" of God; and capable, when made a living creature of developing THEIR "likeness." Hence it is written, "Thou madest him a little lower than the ELOHIM, or Angels"—Ps. viii. 5. When the Spirit that garnished the heavens, that same Spirit afterwards incarnate in the resurrected Son of Abraham and

David, inspired the clay-statue's lungs with "breath of lives," the groundling became like other *breathing frames*, a living creature. It became latinically a *living human*; a word derived from *humus*, ground: hence homo, for *humo*, from *humus*, the latin for *man*, or a thing made of earth. Thus, an *adam* is a human, or ground, soul; a soul taken "out of the ground," and therefore "earthly," or a groundling, as we have rendered אדם *adam*; from its affinity to אדמה *adamah*.

The *nishmah khayim* is a compound air common to all breathing frames. It is there fore styled *khayim* of "lives." It is breathed into men and all other creatures of every kind. The *nishmah* is the atmospheric air, which is compounded chiefly of oxygen, nitrogen, and electricity. In this medium, which is the breath and spirit of Jehovah Elohim, every breathing groundling lives and moves and doth exist. This is evident not from observation only, but from the words of Moses; who in recording the threatened destruction of all antediluvian beings, says, "Behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy *all flesh wherein is Spirit of lives* (asher-bo ruakh khayim) from under the heavens; every thing which is in the earth shall die"—Gen. vi. 17. Then also, in recording the entrance of the saved into the ark, he says, "They went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of *all flesh wherein is Spirit of lives* (ruakh khayim).—Gen. viii. 15. And again lastly, in recording the execution of the judgment he says, "every man and beast, all *in whose nostrils was the breath of the Spirit of lives*, (*nishmath ruakh khayim*) of all that were in the dry land, died." Vs. 21, 22.

This death of the world was accomplished by stopping the supply of air and Spirit from the nostrils of all creatures. This was done by submerging them in a medium incompatible with the respiratory process. It was a cutting off of the supplies mechanically. In ordinary death the same thing occurs on chemical principles, which are equally the agents of God. When the vito-chemical processes of digestion and respiration are stopped, all ground-souls become נפשות נשחיתות *nepheshoth meshchithoth*, bodies of death, or dead bodies. In Scripture, the stoppage of these vital processes is termed *God's gathering of His spirit and breath*. Thus, it is written, "If he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and *man shall turn again to dust*."—Job xxxiv. 14. Hence "the breath of lives," or the "breath of the spirit of lives," are lent of God, the loan being for an appointed time, rarely exceeding three score years and ten, except by reason of

strength. Constitutional weakness may shorten the loan-period, as strength may lengthen it. The clay-statue lives so long as payment is deferred; but when the deposit is withdrawn from its nostrils, it is the resumption of the Spirit's own, the statue falls, and crumbles into its native dust.

Such is the account handed down to us in the most ancient of all records, of the constitution of the creature made in the image and likeness of God; and because he and all other animals are sustained in life by the Spirit, and not by separate and independent spirits, ghosts, or "souls" of their own, therefore Moses styles that same Spirit "Jehovah Elohim of the spirits of all flesh."—Numb. xxvii. 15.

But in all that Moses has written about the ground-soul of Paradise, he has not given the first hint of the existence of an immortal, or deathless, ghost therein. He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, who believed in metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls; the basis of which is the incorporeal migration and immortality of souls. Nevertheless, Moses takes no more notice of the dogma than if he had never heard thereof.

Rabbinized and clericized, which are other names for paganized, readers of his writings think they can see immortal-soulism in the phrases *breath of life* and *living soul*! Man, say they, has an immortal soul in him; for it was breathed into him by God as the breath of life, which coming from his mouth was a *particle of his divine essence*! This was the living soul which Adam became! Now this is driveling nonsense. As we have seen by the passages adduced, Moses teaches that the "breath of lives" is in the nostrils of all the beasts of the field, as well as in the nostrils of the groundling of Paradise; by parity of reasoning, therefore, if such it can be called, all animals have immortal souls as well as the animal man. Neither does the phrase "living soul" prove the immortality of an inner man; for Moses styles all other creatures of the air, earth, and sea, נפש חיה *nephesh khayyah*, "living soul," as well.—Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 30. In the verse last quoted, the Hebrew is

ובכל רומש על הארץ אשר בו נפש חיה
ulakol romais at-hahaleretz asher-bo
nephesh khayyah, that is, "And to every thing creeping upon the earth which (has) in it living soul." Hence, if living soul mean immortal soul, then snakes and lizards have immortal souls, which is absurd.

"There is spirit in man,"—Job xxxii. 8; but it is one and the same spirit that is in all other animals; for the Scripture saith, "They have all one spirit (*ruakh ekhad*); so

that a man hath no preëminence above a beast: for the whole is a breath. All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."—Eccles. iii. 19, 20.

This Spirit then is not the man, any more than it is the beast. It is not the *I myself*—the thinking I; but that which is lent to *Me Myself*, whether it be to *man-me* or to *beast-me*, for the necessities of the temporary existence of the *animal-me*.

The "thinking I" of the Gentile schools is a mere metaphysical abstraction; the nature of which the schoolmen, with all their boasted philosophy, have never been able to agree upon: "and there is hardly a question," says one of them, "which shows more sensibly of what human weakness is capable when guided solely by its own lights. They dispute much with each other about what the soul is, where it resides, whence it derives its origin, and what becomes of it after death. Some believe the heart itself to be the soul. Empedocles says, it is the blood which is mingled in the heart: and others, that it is a certain part of the brain. Many affirm, that neither the heart, nor the brain, are the soul itself, but only the seat of the soul; and that it is a breath, or else a fire. This last is the opinion of Zeno, the stoic. Aristoxenes, the musician, who was also a philosopher, makes it consist in a certain harmony of the different parts of the body. Xenocrates places it in numbers, as Pythagoras had thought before him. Plato distinguishes three parts in the soul. He places the principal, which is reason, in the head; and makes the two others, choler and cupidity, reside, the first in the breast, and the other under the heart. Aristotle perceiving that not one of the four principles of which, according to him, all things are made, was susceptible of the properties of the soul, as thinking, knowing, loving, hating, &c., supposes a fifth, to which he gives no name; calling the soul by a new term, that according to Cicero, signifies a continued and uninterrupted motion, but a term in effect, of which the most learned neither understand nor can explain the force.

"This is the enumeration Cicero gives us of the various opinions of the philosophers concerning the nature of the soul; and concludes this detail with these words: 'which of all these opinions is true, some god may know; we content ourselves with inquiring which is the most probable.' The system of the Academy which he espoused, was that the false is universally mingled in such a manner with the true, and resembles it so much, that there is no certain mark to distinguish them from each other. According to Cicero, in the places where he mentions

the immortality of the soul, speaks of it almost always with doubt, and as one who supposes the system for and against it equally possible and rational."

"Many of the philosophers admitted only bodies, and no pure spirits distinct from matter. Of this number were the Stoics. They did not believe that the soul was absolutely immortal, but only made it live a great while, *like crows*, says Cicero. Vossius, in his treatise upon idolatry, believes, that by that *great while*, they understood the whole duration of the world till the general conflagration. For according to the Stoics, by an ultimate revolution, *the whole world was to become only fire*. Particular souls were then, with all the rest, to be resolved into and blended with the Universal Soul, their first principle. Till then they were to inhabit the upper region, (that is, *Skyana*,) where they would have nothing to do but to philosophize at their ease. Supremely happy in the clear vision of the universe, Cicero, who, though a pagan, would have made a very good professor of popular Christianity, describes this beatitude in the philosopher's heaven with a kind of enthusiasm which the clerical rant of the pulpit cannot transcend. "Certainly," says he, "we shall be happy, when, with our bodies, we shall have thrown off all passion and disquiet. What now constitutes our joy, when, free from all care, we apply ourselves orderly to some object that engages and delights us, we shall then do with far greater liberty; abandoning ourselves entirely to the contemplation of all things, which it will be given us to know perfectly. The situation itself of the places which we shall have attained, in facilitating to us the views of celestial objects, and in kindling in us the desire of penetrating their beauties, will enable us fully to satisfy the insatiable ardor natural to us for knowing truth. And it will discover itself more or less to us, in proportion as we shall have been more or less solicitous to nourish ourselves with it during our abode on earth. What a sight will it be, when we shall be able, at one view, to behold the whole earth, its situation, figure, limits, and all its regions, whether inhabited, or desert and void, through excessive heat and cold!"

The pagan philosophers who taught the immortality of soul, give it a different employment after death. The question, however, has greatly exercised and divided the learned dunces of all ages. As to Plato, as well as Socrates, his master, and Pythagoras who preceded them, he believed the soul to be immortal. Cicero says, that Plato seems to endeavor to persuade others of its truth, and to be fully convinced of it himself.

Plato, treading in the steps of Socrates, opens two ways for souls after death: one of these lead such as have sullied themselves with crimes and violence upon earth to a *place of torments*; and by the other *ascend to the august assembly of the gods*, the pure and innocent souls, that, during their abode in bodies, have had as little intercourse as possible with them, and have industriously imitated the life of the gods, from whom they derive their origin, by preaching every kind of virtue." *Rollin*.

Such were the doctrinal speculations of the heathen from Moses to Jesus, in regard to immortality. It was "the *wisdom* of the world;" loved by the dark-minded misleaders of the multitude, who therefore, styled themselves *philosophers*, and their craft *philosophy*, from *φιλος* philos, a *lover σοφιας* sophias, of wisdom. But Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles, though great lovers of wisdom, were lovers of "the wisdom that is from above," not of the earthly, sensual, and devilish wisdom that exhales from the flesh of sin, unenlightened by the testimony of God. There is a natural antagonism, an inherent enmity in the wisdom of God, to the wisdom of the worldly wise. Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, utterly repudiated it; so that in regard to Moses and the Prophets, immortal-soulists admit, that the dogma they delight in is not to be found in the Old Testament; yet, inconsistently enough, they put fragments of Moses' writings into their crucibles, and blow hard to sublime them into vapor!

But Moses and the Prophets refuse to testify in favor of their tradition. Moses defines the *I myself* to be a corporeal reality; not a gaseous aura respired from the nostrils, or exhaled from the pores of the skin. *Thou thyself* is the second personal pronoun of *I myself*, which is the first. The definition of *thou* is therefore the definition of *I*; for "I" is "thou" when spoken to. Moses tells us in the plainest language, what the personal "thou" is; and in so doing informs us what is the *Thinking I*.

Thus, he tells us that when the animated clay statue was placed in Eden's garden, Jehovah Elohim said, "Thou mayest not eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: for after the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." But he disobeyed, and did eat. He was therefore arraigned at the bar of judgement; and being convicted, was sentenced in the following words: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Here the *thou* that sinned, was also the *thou* that was

sentenced; and that *thou* the Spirit declares came out of the ground and goes to the ground again.

How different this doctrine to that of the heathen who misled the people of old, and fill the pulpits of "Christendom" at this day! Our heathen contemporaries tell us that the *thou* that sinned was an Immortal Soul in the creature—that spark of ethereal fire given off from the substance of God. But this is destructive of their crotchet; for if this be granted, then it cannot be immortal; for the penalty reads, "dying thou shalt die." Whatever is affirmed to have sinned, it is that same thing that is sentenced to death. But, instead of approving the words of the Spirit, these pseudo-ambassadors of Christ, these transformed ministers of Satan rather, point-blank deny them, or what is equivalent, make them of none effect by their blasphemies. The Spirit said to the intelligent creature he had formed, "Thou art dust." "No," say they, "thy body is dust; but thou art a spark of heavenly flame. Eating thou shalt not die. God doth know this. Thy body, which is nothing, may go to the dust; but God doth know that thou art immortal, and shalt ascend and be as the Gods, to know good and evil." This is the lie of the Serpent and his Seed in all their generations. It pervades all their superstitions, by whatever name they are denominated. It is the basis of idolatry, both papistical and mythological; and without it the "Names and Denominations" could not exist. But for this Lie, there could be no worship of saint-ghosts, no purgatory, no mounting and flying to skynas on the down of angels' wings, &c.; the whole system of "Christendom" in theory and practice would phantasmagorically disappear, were this to be abandoned; and the world would be relieved from the hypocritical presence of the baldest imposture that has afflicted it since men began to corrupt the way of Jehovah in all the earth.

But the constitution of "Christendom" is judicial. It is a judgment entailed upon its populations for glorifying the misdeeds of their predecessors. God gave them the truth in the Scriptures; but they have done their best to suppress them; and failing in this, to pervert them in blending their theological glosses with their testimonies. They began this work in the first century, and the Apostle, seeing what it would ultimate in, recorded the following sentence against them, saying, "Because they received not the love of the truth to their salvation, God shall send them *strong delusion*, that they should believe a *LIE*; that all may be condemned who believe not the *TRUTH*, but take pleasure in the falsehood."—2 Thess. ii. 10, 12. This *strong de-*

lusion and system of falsehood, is the spurious christianity of Greek, Roman, and Protestant Christendom, all of which is founded in the Serpent dogma of sin-flesh immortal soulism, dearly loved and fondly cherished by all the Serpent's Seed. It is the lie piously and devoutly believed by the condemned. It is the lie subversive of the truth; and all who teach it are practically the enemies of the truth.

Moses, then, did not teach the system of error represented by the phrase, "the immortality of the soul;" but the very reverse. He presents us with a living creature, the head of an animal world; but with no more immortality in him than the creatures of his domain. But one inquires, "Is no doctrine of immortality recorded in the writings of Moses?" Certainly there is. Moses teaches the immortality of body; and the resurrection of body to that immortality: he does more, he teaches the immortality of body without even tasting of death, and all consequent on the Obedience of Faith.

He teaches the immortality of body by transformation of the living creature in the record of the words of Jehovah Elohim in Gen. iii. 22: "Behold the groundling was as one of us, to know good and evil: and for fear that at this time he should put forth his hand, and take also from the Tree of the Lives, and eat, and live to the Aion; therefore Jehovah Elohim sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to cultivate the ground which he was taken out of." From this it is evident, that had the man been permitted to eat of the Tree of the Two Lives, a change would have come over his nature; and instead of living only 930 years and then dying, he would have been alive now, and continuing to live until Messiah's Aion, or the Age to Come. This longevity would have been corporeal, and attained by a rebel without tasting death. But, as the length of days which Wisdom hath in her right hand is not for rebels, Adam was expelled from the garden that he might return to his mother as the penalty of his sin.

But that which the Clayman of Eden was not permitted to obtain, one of his cotemporaries experienced. Concerning him Moses writes, "Enoch walked with the Elohim, and was not found; for the Elohim took him away." Paul in commenting upon this says, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found because God had translated him; for before his translation, he had this testimony that he pleased God; but without faith it is impossible to please him."—Heb. xi. 5. Here then was a man, who 57 years after the death of Adam, became immortal by transforma-

tion; by which also the Antediluvians were taught that the immortality of the Tree of Lives was corporeal, and not ghostly.

But the writings of Moses not only teach incorruptibility and life of body by transformation, but the same also by resurrection. In Exod. iii. 14—16 it appears thus: When the Angel in the bush, one of the Elohim, as the messenger of the Spirit commanded the reluctant Moses to appear in Israel a second time, and announce himself as their heaven-appointed deliverer from Egyptian bondage—as a savior sent by the Ail-Shaddai of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—"When they shall say to me," said Moses, "What is his name?" What shall I say to them?" He did not think it fit that he should go to Israel as the messenger of another, and not be able to tell the name of Him who sent him. The Angel of the Bush was not angry with Moses in asking for the name of Abraham's friend. The Spirit that dwells in light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see, caused his Elohim, who visited Abraham's tent, and partook of his hospitality, to announce him as AIL-SHADDAI—God Almighty Ones; or the Strength of the Almighty Ones. But the time had come when the Spirit chose for himself "a New Name." As he had determined to assume the nature of Abraham, and to manifest himself as his seed, the Messiah or Christ, he chose a name with reference to that manifestation. In answer, therefore, to the question of Moses, "When they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I reply?"—The angel-Eloahh as the messenger of the Spirit, said in behalf of that Spirit, אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּהּ אֲשֶׁר אֲהִיָּהּ *chye' asher chye'*, I SHALL BE WHO I SHALL BE: and he said, thus shalt thou say to the sons of Israel, אֲהִיָּהּ *EHYEH*, I SHALL BE hath sent me unto you.

Now, whenever the word יְהוָה *Yehowah*, or as it is written in English, *Jehovah*, occurs, we must remember, that "I shall be who I shall be" is the exposition of it. Jehovah is the name of the Spirit; and declares of that Spirit that He was before Abraham; that He is with Moses in Egypt and the Wilderness; and that He shall be: first, on the Messiah; and secondly, in the Saints, both of whom, that is, Messiah and the Saints, in glorified manifestation shall be *Jehovah Elohim*; or the Eternal Spirit incarnate in the glorified bodies of the redeemed: "God the all things in all Saints" 1 Cor. xv. 28.

But what has this new name to do with the Mosaic teaching of resurrection? Very much, as we shall presently see. When the new name had been announced to Moses, the

Elohim said to him, "Thus shalt thou say unto the sons of Israel, **יהוה** Elohim of your fathers, Elohim of Abraham, Elohim of Isaac, and Elohim of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for the Aion; and this my memorial for a generation of a generation."

Now the phrase "*Jehovah Elohim of your fathers*," rendered into plain English, is "*I shall be the Mighty Ones, or I shall be the Gods of your fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.*" It is not *I am* the Gods; but *I shall be* their Elohim. But why did not the Spirit say to Moses *I am* their Elohim? Because Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead while Moses was at the bush as they are now; and the Spirit is not the God of the dead, but of the living; therefore in saying "*I shall be their Elohim*," the record teaches that **THEY MUST RISE AGAIN TO LIFE THAT THE SPIRIT MAY BE THEIR GOD OR STRENGTH.**

Moses, then, teaches the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, bodily from the dust of the earth, in which they now sleep. He also informs us what they will rise for—that they may possess the land of Canaan with their seed in the Aion; when Abraham shall be the father of many nations; his seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and all nations of the earth be blessed in him. This is the Future State which Moses teaches: a state in which the world shall be ruled in righteousness by a THEOCRACY, composed of men taken from all previous generations, upon the principle of belief of the promises of Jehovah, and obedience to his will.

From these premises it is manifest to every mind unspoiled by the vain philosophy of Jewish and Gentile schoolmen, that the doctrine of Moses upon the subject before us, resolves itself into the following points:

1. That the real man is corporeal; fashioned into the form, or *image*, of Elohim; with a natural ability, when living, of manifesting intellectual and moral attributes like theirs—**ELOHIM** said, Let us form man in our *image*, after our *likeness*."—*Gen. i. 26.*

2. That the real man existed before he breathed the breath of lives; for on inhaling that breath "man became (or was for) a living soul," or creature.

3. That the real man is either animated organized dust; or organized dust without animation: and that when the dust ceases to be organic, the man has no more existence than Adam had before he was formed out of the ground.

4. That "*a living soul*" is a living creature. The Mosaic use of the phrase is

generic; "man" being a *species* of "living soul:" "lion," "tiger," "dog," &c., being other species of living souls; to which man, untamed by divine principles, has a lively resemblance.

5. That "*breath of spirit of lives*" is in the nostrils of all living souls; and consequently, that it is not the principle of immortality or deathlessness: if it were, then all lizards, snakes, and toads, would be immortal; for they all have it.

6. That immortality is deathlessness of body; and the reward of faith in the promises of God, as illustrated in the case of Enoch.

7. That man, destitute of faith in the declarations of God, is wholly mortal; being under sentence of returning into the ground from whence he was taken; as exemplified in the history of Adam.

8. That deathlessness or immortality of the real or corporeal man (and Moses hints at no other post-mortem sort of man), is attainable by transformation without returning into the ground; or, by being taken out of the ground, through resurrection, after having returned thither.

9. That man being a living soul in common with all beasts, fowls, reptiles, and fishes (to which he is likened in Acts x. 12, 15, 28), and being animated by the same "breath of spirit of lives," is in his original formation *mortal*. That is, "living soul" is essentially a terminable organization of dust. The "*inferior species of living soul* all die, though they transgressed no law; and this is proof that living soul is a terminable nature apart from any moral consideration. "Man hath no preeminence above a beast; for they have all one spirit,"—Eccles. iii. 19; so that what is true of beasts is also true of man. *Man-soul* is terminable like *lion-soul*, *hyena-soul*, or *fish-soul*.

And here we must enlarge a little, to make the doctrine of Moses so plain that he who runs may read. When man transgressed the Eden-law, no miracle was required in the execution of the sentence "dying thou shalt die;" neither was it necessary that any change should be operated upon his ground-nature, and that of his companion-souls, to involve him and them in the common catastrophe of "THE FALL." Ground-nature animated by breath of spirit of lives *being terminable of itself*, all that was needful was simply to let it alone; at the same time preventing man-soul from making itself an exception to ground-soul in general, by eating of fruit that would have immortalized it, being, by its planter, ordained to that end.

But, it might be very pertinently inquired here, "*Suppose man had been obedient to the*

Eden-law, would he have died, seeing that his nature was terminable of itself?" To this we reply, *Yes and No*. Yes; if Jehovah Elohim had left him *in statu quo*: and No, if he had sent him to eat of the Tree of the Two Lives, to which he denied him access because of transgression. Had he continued obedient, he would doubtless have been admitted to this tree, that in eating thereof he might have been "changed," like Enoch, "in the twinkling of an eye," though not, like him, removed from earth undefiled by sin. From the Mosaic history, then, of the transactions in Eden, it is evident:

10. That groundlings can only attain to life and incorruptibility by eating of a Tree of Lives; and

11. That, when they have so eaten, their ground-natures are no longer "living souls" incapable of existence beyond the terrestrial atmosphere; but *spirit-bodies*, which can live where no "breath of spirit of lives," but pure ether only, is found: bodies, which are not breathing frames, but incarnations of spirit, and therefore *life*, absolute and independent of all subordinate conditions. Such are Enoch, Moses, Elijah, Jesus; and such, also, will be all who shall be born of the Spirit, by transformation and resurrection from among the dead.

Such is the doctrine, not of Moses only, but of all the Prophets. They all, like Moses, by their silence, refuse to testify to the existence of an "immortal soul" in Sin's Flesh. When they speak of "soul," they testify that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die;" "He kept not back their soul from death;" "Hear, and your soul shall live," which teaches, by implication, that it was previously dead; and "That soul will I destroy from his people," which teaches its destructibility—a quality of soul the opposite to immortality, the basis of which is *indestructibility*. Of Messiah, the prophets say, "If thou, Jehovah, shalt make a trespass-offering of his soul;" "He exposed his soul to death;" "Thou wilt not leave," saith the Spirit, "my soul in the grave;" and, "God will redeem my soul from the grave." Thus the prophets speak of "soul," showing thereby that they regarded it as mortal and destructible; and in death the tenant of the grave, from which it is redeemable through resurrection alone.

In our next article upon this subject, we shall answer the inquiry, "Did Jesus and the Apostles teach the Mosaic doctrine of Immortality?" Till then we commend what we have written to the candid consideration of the reader, in hope that he will search the Scripture, and see if we have not spoken according to the oracles of God.

EDITOR.

From the Gospel Banner.

Who are the Heirs of the Kingdom of God?

The Jews, that is, Judah's and Benjamin's descendants, say they are: that the Messiah will come and set up his Kingdom, and they will be called back again to the land from whence they have been ruthlessly banished many hundreds of years, there to receive the reins of government by which to rule the world. Are they right, or rather cherishing "a strong delusion" that shall vanish away and leave them nothing but subjects of that universal kingdom? Let us see what the scriptures say upon that subject. The Prophet Isaiah in the lxx. chap. 2-16:

"I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts; a people that provoked me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick; which remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels; which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day. Behold, it is written before: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the Lord, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom. 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. And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks, and the valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in, for my people that have sought me. But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish a drink-offering unto that number. Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall

cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen : for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name : that he who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God of truth ; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth ; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes."

Now, who is this people that are so perverse and disobedient? Who? They who slew the prophets of the Lord and sacrificed unto Baal? Who cast down the ordinances of the Jehovah under their feet, and progressed in their iniquity until as a final consummation they rejected their promised Messiah and long looked-for Deliverer, and delivered him bound to the ferocious soldiery of Pagan Rome to be crucified? Who was it but the self-same Jews who said "stand by thyself, I am holier than thou,"—the proud boastful Pharisee who loved flattering salutations and greetings in the public streets? They think because they can trace their genealogy down through the ages past to the old Patriarch who was so sorely tried, and who was the great recipient of the glorious promises; because their line of descent is plainly traced down from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah and his brethren, and that the God of those Patriarchs has promised so faithfully that their descendants should inherit the land again; that they must perforce be the chosen ones in that Kingdom. Daniel says, in the vii. chap. of his prophecies and 27th verse, that "the dominion and Kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High," when Gog is judged; and where will the Israelites be then, at the coming of the Messiah? They will be where they are now, scattered abroad upon the face of the earth. Then it is evident that the Israelites as a nation are not to be the heirs of a future Kingdom. Heirs of an estate are the possessors, not the subjects of it. They have the control of its resources and finances, while the subjects of it are the producers of those resources and finances. The Jewish nation will be restored to its land, and will become mightier and more powerful than any nation that has ever existed upon the earth, but at the same time they will be the governed and not the governors.

If then, they, the "chosen people," are not to be the heirs, the question recurs who are "the saints of the Most High," of whom Daniel speaks as possessing the Kingdom? Well, let us see what says Isaiah, chap. lxxv. ver. 1: "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought

me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name;" and lxxvi. chap. 5, ver.: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." Who were those that were not called by Jehovah's name and were cast out by their brother men? Who but the Gentile nations around the Israelitish camp? The Gentile nations of modern times, although they spurn the Jews from them, and spit upon them; yet the reviled scorn their revilers, and drive them from their feasts and worship, denying that they have any right or claim upon the promises made to the Fathers.

The apostles were sent by Jesus to preach the Gospel unto the Gentiles, that from among them might be taken a people for his name. Paul, Acts xxviii. 4-6, after being rejected by his own people, went to the Gentiles. The same apostle, Rom. ix. 6, 7, 8, says, "the children of the promise are counted for the seed," and at the 20th verse says, the Gentiles have attained to the righteousness of the faith; and x. 1-3, if the Jews lost the heirship by setting up their lineal descent and self-righteousness in opposition to God's righteousness, let us be careful and watch, and be warned by their loss, lest we also come short of that great blessing. Isaiah lxxvi. 1, 2; Psalm xxxiv. 18; and li. 16, 17; Matt. v. 3, 10. All of these references show plainly who are to be the future rulers in the blessed Kingdom of our Lord, when he shall come to the earth and establish his throne upon Mount Zion. The meek in spirit are the spiritual seed of Abraham—the chosen ones of God.

Oh! what a prize to strive for; with what vigilance ought we to pursue the race from its commencement to its glorious termination. With what steadfastness ought we to fix our eyes upon the great reward, and press forward to obtain the prize of our calling. An immortal crown of living glory; a joint heirship with the great Messiah, in the everlasting Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world. Shall we be there to inherit that glorious reward, and receive the gracious commendation of "Well done, good and faithful servant?" Let us strive for it, brethren, strive faithfully and diligently, for great will be our reward if we come off conquerors; yea, more than conquerors through Him who died that we might have everlasting life.

"Well done, thou good and faithful one!"
 Methinks I hear the Saviour say;
 "Thou hast been faithful, thou hast won
 The crown of life's eternal day."

"That thou receivodst, thou didst use,
As every faithful servant ought;
Now, thy reward I'll not refuse;
Receive the boon thou long hast sought.

"For every triumph over sin
When thou didst crush the tyrant down,
Receive unto thyself, from him,
A brilliant jewel in thy crown!

"A name that's named on none beside;
A robe washed white in my own blood,
Component of the 'Mystic Bride.'
Christian! sayest thou not 'tis good?"

GENEVA, ILL.

P.

The New Heavens and New Earth.

"There is a limit to the revelations of the Bible about futurity, and it were a mental or spiritual trespass to go beyond it. The reserve which it maintains in its informations, we also ought to maintain in our inquiries—satisfied to know little on every subject, where it has communicated little, and feeling our way into regions which are at present unseen, no further than the light of Scripture will carry us.

"But while we attempt not to be 'wise above that which is written,' we *should attempt*, and that *most studiously*, to be wise, *up to that which is written*. The disclosures are very few and very partial,* which are given to us of that bright and beautiful economy, which is to survive the ruins of our present one. But still there are such disclosures—and on the principle of the things that are revealed belonging to us, we have a right to walk up and down, for the purpose of observation over the whole actual extent of them. What is made known of the details of immortality, is but small in the amount, nor are we furnished with the materials of any thing like a graphical or picturesque exhibition of its abodes of blessedness.† But still somewhat is made known, and which, too, may be addressed to a higher principle than curiosity, being like every other Scripture, 'profitable both for doctrine and for instruction in righteousness.'

"In the text before us, there are two leading points of information, which we should like successively to remark upon. The first is, that in the new economy, which is to be reared for the accommodation of the blessed, there will be MATERIALISM, not merely new heavens, but also a NEW EARTH. The second is, that as distinguished from the present, which is an abode of rebellion, it will be an abode of righteousness.

* Not so few and partial as the writer imagines.—Ed. ILL.

† Of immortal-soulism and skyanlen abodes, nothing is revealed.—Ed. ILL.

"I. We know historically that earth, that a solid material earth, may form the dwelling of sinless creatures, in full converse and friendship with the Being who made them—instead of a place of exile for outcasts, it may have a broad avenue of communication with the spiritual world, for the descent of ethereal beings from on high—that, like the member of an extended family, it may share in the regard and attention of the other members, and along with them be gladdened by the presence of Him who is the Father of them all. To inquire how this can be, were to attempt a wisdom beyond Scripture; but to assert that this *has been*, and therefore *may be*, is to keep most strictly and modestly within the limits of the record. For, we there read, that God framed an apparatus of materialism, which, on his own surveying, He pronounced to be all very good, and the leading features of which may still be recognized among the things and the substances that are around us—and that He created man with the bodily organs and senses which we now wear—and placed him under the very canopy that is over our heads—and spread around him a scenery, perhaps lovelier in its tints, and more smiling and serene in the whole aspect of it, but certainly made up, in the main, of the same objects that still compose the prospect of our visible contemplations; and there, working with his hands in a garden, and with trees on every side of him, and even with animals sporting at his feet, was this inhabitant of earth, in the midst of all those earthly and familiar accompaniments, in full possession of the best immunities of a citizen of heaven, sharing in the delight of angels, and while he gazed on the very beauties which we ourselves gaze upon, rejoicing in them most as the tokens of a present and presiding Deity. It were venturing on the region of conjecture to affirm, whether, if Adam had not fallen, the earth that we now tread would have been the everlasting abode of him and his posterity. But certain it is, that man, at the first, had for his place this world, and at the same time, for his privilege, an unclouded fellowship with God, and for his prospect an immortality, which death was neither to intercept nor put an end to. He was terrestrial in respect to condition, and yet celestial in respect both of character and enjoyment. His eye looked outwardly on a landscape of earth, while his heart breathed upwardly in the love of heaven. And though he trode the solid platform of our world, and was compassed about with its horizon, still was he within the circle of God's favored creation, and took his place among the freemen and the denizens of the great spiritual commonwealth.

"This may serve to rectify an imagina-

tion, of which we think that all must be conscious—as if the grossness of materialism was only for those who had degenerated into the grossness of sin; and that when a spiritualizing process had purged away all our corruption, then, by the stepping-stones of a death and a resurrection, we should be borne away to some ethereal region, where sense, and body, and all in the shape either of an audible sound, or of tangible substance, were unknown. And hence that strangeness of impression which is felt by you, should the supposition be offered, that in the place of eternal blessedness, there will be ground to walk upon; or scenes of luxuriance to delight the corporal senses; or the kindly intercourse of friends talking familiarly, and by articulate converse together; or, in short, anything that has the least resemblance to a local territory, filled with various accommodations, and peopled over its whole extent by creatures formed like ourselves, having bodies such as we now wear, and faculties of perception, and thought, and mutual communication, such as we now exercise. The common imagination that we have of paradise on the other side of death, is, that of a lofty aerial region, where the inmates float in ether, or are mysteriously suspended upon nothing,—where all the warm and sensible accompaniments which give such an expression of strength, and life, and coloring, to our present habitation, are attenuated into a sort of spiritual element; that is meagre and imperceptible, and utterly uninviting to the eye of mortals here below—where every vestige of materialism is done away, and nothing left but certain unearthly scenes that have no powers of allurements, and certain unearthly ecstasies, with which it is felt impossible to sympathize. The holders of this imagination forget all the while, that there is really no essential connection between materialism and sin,—that the world which we inhabit had all the amplitude and solidity of its present materialism before sin entered into it—that God, so far, on that account, from looking slightly upon it, after it had received the last touch of his creating hand, reviewed the earth, and the waters, and the firmament, and all the green herbage, with the living creatures, and the man whom he had raised in dominion over them, and He saw every thing He had made, and behold it was all very good. They forget that on the birth of materialism, when it stood out in the freshness of those glories which the great Architect of Nature had impressed upon it, and then “the Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy.” They forget the appeals that are made everywhere in the Bible to this material workmanship—and how, from the face of these visible heavens, and the gar-

niture of this earth that we tread upon, the greatness and the goodness of God are reflected on the view of His worshippers.

“No, my brethren, the object of the administration we sit under, is to expiate sin, but it is *not to sweep away materialism*. By the convulsions of the last day, it may be shaken, and broken down from its present arrangements; and thrown into such fitful agitations, as that the whole of its existing framework shall fall to pieces; and with a heat so fervent as to melt its most solid elements, it may be utterly dissolved.* And thus may the earth again become without form and void, but without one particle of its substance going into annihilation. Out of the ruins of this second chaos, may another heaven and another earth be made to arise; and a new materialism, with other aspects of magnificence and beauty, emerge from the wreck of this mighty transformation; and the world be peopled as before, with the varieties of material loveliness, and space be lighted up into a firmament of material splendour.”—*Dr. Chalmers*.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

From the Southern Literary Messenger.

The Inefficiency of the Pulpit.

WHEN we consider the vast appliances abroad in this country for the propagation of Christianity, is not every serious and reflective mind surprised and disheartened at the apparently poor and inadequate result? There are in the United States, perhaps, *forty-five thousand evangelical churches*—and adding various irregular places of worship, the number would reach *sixty-five thousand*. There are more than thirty thousand regular ministers; besides an irregular Methodist clergy of some thirteen thousand local preachers; making in all forty-three thousand preachers of the Gospel.† A very respectable proportion of these men are the best educated men in the country. The others, are, perhaps, men taken from the people, and sent out to preach, on account, it may be presumed, of their *speaking* faculties. One day in every week is appropriated to this body; it belongs exclusively to them.

* This is, fiction. Potter's words here used did not refer to the terrestrial strata.—*Ed. HER.*
 † That is, the thing the 65,000 call “Gospel,” which is not “*THE GOSPEL*,” but a heathen version of the same.—*Ed. HER.*

No busy hammers, no holiday pageants, no extra play-bills, as at Paris, no government-bands as at London, break in upon the solemn stillness of the day. All is tranquil, quiet. The sabbath bells (most dulcet sound!) peal forth with unobstructed voice from every spire in the land every seventh day in the year. Public sentiment gives its sanction to the consecrated observance. The arm of the Law restrains all secular engagements. From so many pulpits, twice or three times, on that day, proceeds one general and uncontradicted testimony. "Tidings of great joy" are proclaimed from every mountain-top and in every valley, week after week—with the grandest of themes to inspire, and the most tremendous of sanctions to enforce. This makes no reference to the innumerable week-day exercises conducted by ministers, which in the way of regular sermons, prayer-meetings, revival services, miscellaneous addresses, &c., &c., would swell the number of appeals per week on this one topic, to the number of at least *eighty thousand*. Imagine a disciplined band of thirty thousand men, (saying nothing of the irregular Methodist licentiates,) steadily enforcing one cause, week after week! Men, too, of respectability and intelligence; with an audience, by associations and education, favorably prepossessed and inclined towards the subject. Imagine an active band of thirty thousand political speakers—with *no opposition*—thus steadily haranguing through every week—a long succession of able minds having preceded them in the work—and what system could withstand them! How feeble have been the efforts of all other societies compared to such persistent, constant, methodised work as this! How poor the advocacy of any other philosophy compared to this eighteen hundred years' steady and sleepless energy! Take any one village: Sunday after Sunday we meet the same faces, sing the same hymns, hear the same appeals; and after five, ten, fifteen years, where are the results? How many intelligent, thoughtful men have been enlisted?

Think, too, how these efforts are underlaid and backed by the tremendous social influences that work to the same end. The influence of wives, of mothers, of daughters, husbands, sons; the tone of society; the sentiment of the press; the religious books, tracts, newspapers; the Sunday-schools, Christian Associations, Bible societies, missionary societies, tract societies—with their agents, colporteurs, &c., over the whole country—the efforts of individual Christians, &c., &c.; these subtracted, and *how much* remains to be set down to the account of *legitimate pulpit work*?

We presume no one, on taking this view of the matter, will doubt that the result of pulpit ministrations, taken as a whole, is enormously inadequate. No one, we think, can fail to see, that such a vast system of appliances ought to make an impression beyond what has followed from it. The press, for example, another power of the present age—clashing, diverse, multiform as it is—exercises an authority that has overshadowed every other; and why should a body, *organized*, compact, acting in concert, make itself less felt? There are fifteen hundred editors in the United States, and forty odd thousand ministers; which are the most potent? We mean *in themselves*, independent of the intrinsic authority and *prestige* of their subject matter? Certainly religion exercises in this country a very large and widely-reaching influence; but mainly this proceeds from a momentum already acquired—from an energy long ago accumulated; and the question to be considered is, how much do the existing ministry *add* to the acting force? What accession do they contribute to its velocity and volume?

What then is the explanation of these things? What will account for the obvious discrepancy between so much expenditure and such meagre returns?

We put aside, of course, at once the one *great* operating cause which contributes to obstruct and nullify the Gospel; we mean that coordinate with and inherent in the subject. Any one who apprehends at all what true religion is—as the implantation of a new vital principle, the transfusion and impregnation of a radically diverse energy—will not wonder if only here and there some one evinces the transformation. It is the doctrine of a sound philosophy, and of the obvious construction of Scripture, that nothing less than the almighty power of Deity can effect this change. In one sense, therefore, it is not to be wondered at that the world has been slow in accepting Christianity. All the activity of man is futile, all the effort of the Church is impotent, until the dry bones shall be touched with the spirit of life.* All this is true, but this is far from being the whole truth. God works by means; the ministry have been ordained to preach the Gospel, and the blessing of the Spirit has been pledged for their success. Give us an active, skillful, sanctified ministry, and the dew of heaven will be forthcoming.†

* *Spirit of Life*. "My words," saith Jesus, "are spirit and they are life."—Ed. H.R.

† The very reverse of the "clergy" who are "workmen," or tinkers rather, that "need to be ashamed," being incapable of "a right division of the word of truth."—Ed. H.R.

Putting aside, then, this question of supernatural influences, we propose to inquire why it is that the Christian ministry do not effect more than seems to result from so much labor. We confine our inquiry to this country, though it will apply also to the evangelical pulpits of England and Scotland.

A writer in the Edinburgh Review has divided the church parties of the English church into the High-church, the Low-church and the Broad-church. We would divide the churches (evangelical) of our country into the Democratic, the Conservative and the Genteel. The first will embrace the Methodist and Baptist denominations; the second, the various Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, &c., and the third the Episcopal Church. For the purpose of our inquiry, we class together, first, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, &c., Churches, and proceed to a consideration of the causes affecting their denominational development. We shall subsequently take up the Methodist and Baptist Churches with reference to the same question, premising that we regard the causes operating in the two cases to obstruct the progress of Christianity as, in most respects, essentially different.

Take the Presbyterian Church (Old and New School). Here is a body numbering say three hundred and seventy-six thousand. There are, perhaps, four thousand ministers. They are the best educated class of men in the community. In the way of general information and polite culture, unless the Congregational ministry be an exception, there is no question of it. That they are *good men* no one will have a doubt of it.* That, as a body of Christians, they are faithful, devout, laborious, will be as freely admitted. Take them generally, their piety is of a high type. They are earnest, sincere, humble Christians.† They give their lives to their work. They toil year after year on small salaries—often in trying situations—for the cause they are linked to.

* *There can be no doubt of the contrary.* Jesus said to one, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." Shall we, then, address the undoubted goodmanship of the clergy who blaspheme the truth, and live by the merchandize of souls, pretending to *cure* them for a price, but leaving their disease untouched? Do we call quacks, pretenders, empirics, "good men?" Nay, imposters rather! —Ed. Hzz.

† *Piety of a high type.* How many types of piety are there? Which the highest, which the lowest? The Bible only recognises one, "the obedience of faith," all other *pieties* are phrenological excitations merely. Presbyterian high type is pharisaic; they appear to unenlightened men to be righteous; but they who understand New Testament Christianity deny that they are "Christians," and reject their piety as spurious.—Ed. Hzz.

Here is piety, earnestness, learning, faithfulness, activity; what should there be to obstruct? What was the increase of the Presbyterian Church during the year last reported? The Old School numbered in 1854 two hundred and twenty-five thousand members; in 1855, two hundred and thirty-three thousand—an increase of eight thousand, about one to every twenty-eight. The New School numbered, in 1854, one hundred and forty-one thousand members; in 1855, one hundred and forty-three thousand—an increase of two thousand, about one in eighty. The ministers of the Old School church numbered, in 1854, two thousand two hundred; those of the New School sixteen hundred. The number of converts to each minister of the first, was three and two thirds; to each minister of the second, about one. Sixteen hundred preachers preach a whole year, and each of them has at the end of the period *one convert*.

On the other hand, take that portion of the Episcopal Church in which religion is not a mere system of posturing, of fashion, or of elegant sentiment, and where will you meet a more refined and beautiful Christianity? What church besides this could have produced that glorious and saintly minister, Henry Martyn? The modesty, the purity, the simplicity, the truthfulness, the self-denial, the delicacy, the refinement, the zeal, the culture, the sweetness of temper—was not *he* the true forthputting of the true, real, apostolical Church of England? It seems harder (as compared with other denominations) for the Episcopal Church to throw itself cordially into the great popular evangelical movement of the day, but when it *does* do so, how entire, and single-minded, and unreserved the consecration! How pure, how true, how hearty the cooperation! Then, all the graces of Christianity seem to acquire new vigor from all that is pleasing and beautiful in the politer circles of social life. Here we find a clergy that are all emphatically *gentlemen*. They are no less faithful, earnest, laborious, than those we have just spoken of. They are also men of education. What are the statistics of the Episcopal Church by the last returns? In 1853, there were one hundred and five thousand members of the Episcopal Church in the United States; in 1854, there were one hundred and seven thousand. The increase is two thousand, about one and one fourth to each minister.

One of the chief obstacles in these

* *Beautiful Episcopal Christianity!* Beauty of the whitened sepulchro type; the burning beauty, rather, of the oldest harlot daughter of its Roman mother.—Ed. Hzz.

churches to a more rapid and marked success lies, we believe, in the character of their preaching. Eleven thousand Presbyterian and Episcopal sermons are delivered every week, and how are they delivered? Accustomed as we are to good speaking in this country, let any one saunter some Sunday into (for example) a Presbyterian church. After hearing the choir sing a hymn or two, and one very short and one enormously long prayer, the preacher commences the main service of the occasion. He is boxed up in a pulpit. He would think it sacrilege if he omitted to take a text, and accordingly a text he takes, applying naturally, or in the way of conceit, to his subject. With this placarded thus in imagination above him, and which, according to his taste, he recurs to constantly as a sort of refrain, he launches out into his discourse, which will be sensible, or decorous, or fanciful, or vapid, but always formal—the sermon is written out. The speaker has come there with a discourse in his pocket, and its apothegms and its appeals he gives over to his auditors, whenever he can lay his finger on them. On their part, the congregation come to hear a sermon; yes, they come to hear a sermon; a certain amount is to be dispensed, and a general assent to be returned, and the church breaks up, and all go home. The sermon is criticised, the sentiments may be applauded, and it is considered very good advice, and there the matter ends.

No one heart has been touched, not one emotion awakened, not one resolution adopted. Not a human being, it may be, but, in a general way, has assented to or admired the sermon; not one who, especially, and with a personal application, has grappled with its thoughts in his heart.

How poor to such a listener such a speech-making as this; after listening to the fervid appeals in the forum, where every sentence strives towards a mark, or to the varied, easy familiar elocution of the stump!

Perhaps our adventurer has found his way into an Episcopal church. There is a death-like propriety. All is still as the grave. It is a "dim religious" edifice. There is stained glass, and lofty groined arches. People step about as if the ground were haunted. A genteel grave sexton moves mysteriously from pew to pew. There are solemn texts starting out from the walls. The great emblem of Christianity is there broadly prominent, and now ingeniously evolved. Fashionable ladies and gentlemen, no one knows how, gradually fill the church. A solemn form comes silently forward in a stately robe, and, amid multitudinous folds, dramatically kneels in prayer. A strain of

dream-like music breathes through the spacious aisles. And presently, "The Lord is in his Holy Temple, let all the earth keep silence before him," from a clear, chaste voice, initiates the pageant. The different parts of the service are then more or less devoutly gone through—one of the most splendid and imposing rituals that the imagination has ever conceived, and one the most calculated to touch and impress an imaginative heart. A hymn is then read from the chancel, and sung in the gallery; and then twenty-five minutes are devoted to the reading of a perfectly unexceptional and elegant production.

And that is the trumpet-call erst uttered "in the wilderness," and which was thundered at Cesarea before Felix and Drusilla, touching that "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come"!

This is the dainty method by which the tremendous import of the Gospel—like arrow-root to the dying—is communicated to the mawkish stomachs of the higher society.

How often is a true, manly, straight-forward address heard in such a pulpit?

Such are no highly colored pictures of the preaching we hear in Presbyterian and Episcopal churches. Of minor points we will not just now speak. We commenced by speaking of the sermon. Here, as we have said, lies, we believe, one of the great and main obstacles to the success of these churches. It is in the mode of the preparation, and delivery, of these sermons, that is to be found in a great measure, we think, the source of that barrenness of results which characterizes this preaching. The Sunday address is prepared in the closet as a paper to be read, or as a discourse to be declaimed from a manuscript, and the mind becomes directed rather at a certain abstract theme, than on the audience itself as a body of living men to be incited to real action.

The great question to be decided is, whether written sermons are effective? We assume, for such is the case, that the organizations in question do write their sermons. We know the vast difference of opinion that exists on this subject. We know how many of the most highly intelligent advocate it *à priori*. But our convictions are not at all the less implicitly established: we are, almost without a wavering of opinion, decisively fixed in our conclusion, that M.S. sermons are the bane of these churches—and hang upon their ministries like a pestilential vapor, when it behoves that they should be breathing the free and open air. It is like the dry and sickly temperature of a close and heated room,

when what is wanted is the pure and life-fraught warmth of the light from Heaven.

The great object of the preaching of the Gospel, is to produce a certain result. The great end is a certain practical effect. Any contrivance, however respectable; any appliance, however elegant, is utterly worthless which does not conduce to this object. We hold in all things, that the great aim should be, to be *practical*. That system of farming is best which is practical; that system of law is best which is operative; that scheme of ology is best which produces; that *method of preaching is best which convinces—and leads to action*. In the most of the ordinary affairs of life human necessities soon adjudicate how a thing is to be conducted. An individual soon finds where his efforts are to be directed, and the stern voice of hunger, or one equally as imperious, soon blows to the winds any visionary edifice. In effecting any great moral objects—the result of which does not immediately bear upon our current necessary wants—there is a wider margin left for the dreamer; and speculative systems often gasp on for centuries, before their utter futility has been universally assented to. How long any system of education may be fortuitously prosecuted, when it is utterly unprofitable! How long any political measure may be clung to with bigotry, when the evils it refers to have been wholly unmitigated! From one cause to another—perhaps mainly from indolence—it has become in some churches now almost universal to use M.S. sermons. These are read more or less strictly according to circumstances. The address may be prepared specially for the occasion—or it may, as occasion offers, be brought out by the minister from his treasures “new and old.”

The great end, we say, of preaching is to *convince*—or it may be *persuade*. The world is regarded as a ruined and fallen race—a reprobate and blighted species—and to its vast multitudes comes a missionary of the cross proclaiming a *method of safety*, and invoking the sin-enthralled victims to hearken to his message. The audience is admitted to be one the most deaf to the subject-matter addressed to them; the interests are allowed to be the most momentous that can concern a thinking intelligence. How should this message be conveyed? Will rose-colored paper and an adjustment of didactic proprieties—or a dull, sleepy dissertation in theology or ethics—re-fire such an element? Will even an *able*, sensible, well-digested dissertation, be the method of reaching *those men*? Let us suppose a case. A band of highway robbers have waylaid a gentleman on the road; they have taken his effects and are proceed-

ing to murder his family and servants; he is filled with emotion; he wishes to plead for their lives; he wishes to put forth that potent spell of human eloquence; how shall he proceed? Shall he call for pen and paper and *write out* the considerations?—or shall he loose the faculties that God has given him, and pour forth from his impassioned heart the warm and *living* current of pure and true emotion? Or let us suppose the gentleman has been captured; and some idle day in the shade—like Caleb Williams in the fiction—should undertake to appeal to the robber band on their enormities and crimes. Should he best *read* to them from a moralist in his pocket, or prepare for the occasion some well-ordered discourse; or should he speak to them *directly*—in the language of human nature—and with the absence of all effort—and in such tones as would seem appropriate?

The whole error proceeds from a radical misapprehension of what public speaking consists in. We understand all effective public speaking to mean eloquence. Now, what constitutes eloquence? What suffices to make a man eloquent? Our answer is, *that every sensible, unaffected, earnest discourse is eloquent*. Let a man be sensible; let him be natural; and let him be *in earnest*; and he will be eloquent. Whatever impresses a man is eloquent. Whatever gesture even expresses a human sympathy is eloquent. Even in conversation, every unaffected, earnest-minded man, who talks good sense, is pleasing—or, in other words, eloquent. Every such person *gets the attention*. What then has a public speaker to do? He is to address a jury. In the first place, of course, the matter must be sensible; on *his part*, all that is necessary is simplicity of manner, and seriousness of purpose. If he has no purpose, he will not be eloquent. If he is not charged with a thought, he cannot fill with that energy another intelligence. Or even if he is, he must deliver it simply—he must not do violence to nature. Such a man, if he has a story to tell, will be listened to.*

The question arises then, can these conditions, on the occasions of public speaking, be met by a written discourse? Our answer is, that as a general thing, they cannot. One of the essential elements is absent at once. We mean the *naturalness* of the pro-

* Paul says, “I came not to you with excellency of speech or of wisdom (that is, with the eloquence and wisdom of the Greeks) declaring unto you the testimony of God; my speech, and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom; but in demonstration of spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand on man’s wisdom, but in the power of God.” Such preaching as this the sermonizers cannot attain to.—*ED. HEN.*

cedure. There must be a propriety in the action. We will illustrate what we mean—the subject matter of a conversation may be very sensible, and a man may be very much impressed with the topic in question: but the very moment his discourse begins to be *formal*, it ceases to impress any second party. If he uses a manuscript, or if he converses *memoriter*, the sympathy is dissipated, and the attention is withdrawn. Indeed, *earnestness* cannot well express itself through such a medium. Earnestness modifies itself by the temperature around it. It conforms itself to the thousand fluctuating accidents of the moment. In seeking expression, it moulds its utterances to the shifting media that they encounter. The warmth of the object toward which it tends, governs the fervor with which it goes forth. Its alternations are instantaneuous, and it passes with unappreciable rapidity from one form of manifestation to another. When it may nearly have reached its object, the observation of some condition in that, may instantaneously carry it to its destination, differing entirely in the tone and movement it had in its inception. The fixed character of writing—until the hearer shall have voluntarily placed himself in the condition of the reader—is utterly at war with all this. The appearance of any effort repels at once any one who is listening to language. The taste requires a simplicity and a flexibility on the part of the speaker which can hardly be dispensed with.

Therefore, in conversation—even if a man has earnest feelings—any formality or stiffness is at once repudiated. The whole thing must be simple—the whole thing must be natural. The observations may not be *inherently* stiff or formal—but only relatively as regards the circumstances. If individuals were all very philosophical persons, and willing to place themselves at the point of the speaker, the matter might not be stiff, might not be formal, but people are not philosophers—they are not willing (and very properly) to be approached in this way. They do not place themselves at the point of view of the discourses; it is his part to draw them there. He must take them in the passive, relaxed state he finds them, and address them accordingly. To this the speaker must adapt himself. Any very formal discourse—anything savoring in any degree of labor—anything evidently *gotten up*—will at once appear incongruous, and no man who is *in earnest* could adhere to such a formula. Earnestness, therefore, as well as fidelity to nature, would inevitably be excluded from a conversation or writing*.

* Therefore James says, "Contend earnestly for the

The same considerations apply to a written speech. The audience is promiscuous. They are to be addressed according to circumstances. The feelings of the speaker, and the "environment" (to use one of Carlyle's words) of the occasion, must modify the manner and the subject-matter. There is the same appearance of formality in pulling out a manuscript. There is the same recoil from the regular set-to that is unavoidably suggested. There is the same want of flexibility in running current with the shifting modifications of thought. The directness—the simplicity—the subtle and sympathetic fluctuations of language—the impalpable and inter-penetrative refinements of intonation—the shading or re-touching of the current thought—the lowering or making room for the tone of emotion—these and a thousand unappreciable accidents cannot be met, any more in a discourse than a conversation, by the unyielding and rigid mould of a written preparation. It is almost impossible, until the moment arrives, for any one to foresee what will be precisely appropriate to the occasion. There must not be any pedantry. The speaker must exhibit the most perfect ease. No expression must ever rise higher than the tone of the audience at each precise instant, nor fall below it. The very moment this is done the speaker ceases to be natural, and excites disapprobation. A speaker should indicate the appearance of *confidence*—the appearance of *sympathy*. There should seem to be a *community* between him and his audience. He should have the absence of reserve—a *directness* in his manner—which should at once awaken fellowship. To attempt this with something formally gotten up, is unnatural on the mention of it.

We think, therefore, the same objections—at least in a very considerable degree—lie, as to this point of *naturalness*, against a written speech, as against a written colloquy. On the same reasoning employed with regard to the latter, it is equally difficult, with a manuscript address, to exhibit any *earnestness*. Earnestness, as we have said, always expresses itself *naturally*, and when it attempts to find utterance through any other medium, it is shocked and driven back. (No man can be in earnest in speaking to another, unless he meets with sympathy—unless he is understood—unless he is attended to.) And the very nature of earnestness is to adapt itself to circumstances, and to con-

sist as delivered to the Saints." Let the clergy learn "the faith," let them cordially embrace it, let them discard their sermons, and then plead for it as if they believed it, "*earnestly*;" if such a course were possible for them, the evil the writer deplores would be corrected. But the case is hopeless.—ED. HER.

form to propriety. The very moment a man gets up to speak, he must not only be charged with his subject, but he must go about expressing himself in intelligible language—the language of the multitude. He breaks down at once, the very moment he ceases thus to utter himself. He is thrown out of rapport with his audience—there is nothing in common between them. However much, then, he may have his subject at heart, his speech is no longer earnest—for he has ceased to be understood—and the language of passion is at once abated, when it meets with no sympathy. And all this, supposing that even the speaker is able to sympathise himself with what he had previously written, [to sympathise with it in the very manner he did originally when he composed it.] But the remarks already made with regard to conversation, and the reader's own reflections, (with some qualifications to be presently noted,) will amply establish this point.

We announce, therefore, this conclusion, that it is extremely difficult for a written discourse to be a good speech. This is the conclusion we would come to on an *à priori* view. The essentials of eloquence cannot be complied with. We do not mean (as we have before intimated) that the writing itself may not be eloquent. Inherently, it may be a very fine composition. But we speak of it as to the purpose in hand. We speak of it as a *speech*. We regard it as intended to be communicated orally to a mixed audience:

But one will tell us, that after all, written discourses are impressive; they are listened to: men are wrought upon by them: they are delivered in an impassioned, fervid spirit: great preachers do adopt this method of speaking. A distinction must be drawn here between the ordinary *manuscript* preaching, and the *memoriter* method of pronouncing an address. They are by no means the same. We think far more can be urged in behalf of this, than in favor of the usual half-speaking, half-reading, method which prevails. As to the instances of men having succeeded well on the manuscript plan, Samuel Davies, Dr. Chalmers, Mr. Wadsworth of Philadelphia, are eminent examples. Of the brilliant oratory that may be exhibited on the *memoriter* method, the French pulpit, and our ordinary formal orations on certain special occasions, are instances affording sufficient proof. We hear also constantly in our pulpits most impressive discourses read from the manuscript. We have only to say, that we believe such a speaker as Dr. Chalmers succeeded in spite of his method—which we regard as essentially vicious. A man may read with power, but it does not prove, that

reading is inherently as efficient as speaking. Even Dr. Chalmers is said to have been more powerful in his extemporaneous efforts. There are minds (one in a thousand, perhaps,) that can re-produce the precise course of feeling they originally experienced in the composition of a sermon, that can call up again, with the same vivid distinctness, and the same tone of emotion,—in spite of the effort to remember, or the effort to read—the very same conceptions previously experienced—and that can exercise the self-mastery to hand them over in this manner, weeks after their production, to a promiscuous company. The *memoriter* speaker may do this, and make a most effective speech: the reading speaker may have read with feeling, and moved his hearers with his written reflections; but the first will have been a most difficult and painful effort; the second will have been no speech at all, but have only evinced how much may be even accomplished by good reading. Very few persons, as we have said, can do the first, and very few can do the second. Frequently the manuscript speaker combines the two methods, reading sometimes, and speaking from memory at others. His address will be effective just in proportion as he counterfeits real speaking.

But as to any capacity of pleasing generally by reading a discourse, we do not believe in it—we mean comparatively speaking. It requires, first, the talent to write what will sound well when delivered, and, secondly, the talent to induce a mixed audience to listen to what is read to them. The *memoriter* method, we believe, is far more specious. We know that men frequently—and it is easy to conceive of it—prepare elaborate orations, and recite them on this plan in the most eloquent manner.

But in either of these cases, what a struggle must it be for the speaker (unless he reads out and out) to keep his thoughts before him—to keep their ranks unbroken! How difficult to re-produce precisely the original train of emotion! to keep up the delicate poise that is to be maintained in the audience! A speaker may work his audience up to his state of mind—but to keep them in that attitude with a rigid train of thought, that has nothing to yield on its part, and must rely altogether on sustaining its tone—is difficult exceedingly. If the discourse is from a manuscript, there are constant interruptions, from difficulties in catching the sentences. If delivered *memoriter*, the slightest jar confuses every thing instantaneously: a slip of memory, or some agitation of mind, or inattention on the part of the audience, will produce disorder throughout.

And, then, whatever may be adduced of the effects of this speaking (and we have seen something of it,) can there be the same *directness* of approach that there is where the speaker sees precisely what is wanted, and departs himself accordingly? Supposing that a very successful, eloquent oration of this sort has produced a certain general impression—does it reach down immediately to the individual conviction like a straight forward, direct, hand-to-hand appeal? When a man gets up, and speaks right off, bringing himself at once in contact with his audience—with nothing pretentious—with nothing high-flying—with nothing “philosophical”—with nothing didactic—but simple, plain, outspoken, earnest—how it reaches the heart! Plain men sit under the overshooting reverberations of that deep-throated artillery. It must be remembered, that the audience is *promiscuous*—rough, blunt men—that have a sympathy like yours, if you will approach them as a man. There is a tie between you, if you will give them your confidence. They want no finely-worked sentiments: no dainty moralities: no solemn harangues: no wire-drawn speculations: no scholastic discoursing: no attempts at fine writing, no general remonstrances: they want *direct, personal appeal*: they want to be touched at the very quick of their natures: they want to be talked with as men with a man. If you can do this in an elaborate oration, you are at liberty to write your sermons.

There is a vast amount of importance to be attached to this point: a written discourse may be equally *pleasing* with a spoken one, without being as *effective*. I may hear a very grand and a very eloquent written sermon, and may have been carried away with many passages—and even in a general way been led to serious thinkings—but this is not the thing. The difficult point lies *beyond* all this: it is that last retreat of the carnal conscience, that citadel of reserve in every human heart, which it is so difficult to carry. The main stand is made here. The outworks are often broken down. Good resolutions are constantly made. The great question is, how to carry this? The fight here must be hand to hand. Conventionalities must be thrown aside. Fine sentences effect no opening. A general firing will accomplish no advances. The only method is *an assault*. That wall must be scaled sword in hand. Your parchments and your book sentiments must be thrown to the dogs. The strong language of nature is now what is wanted—no affectation—no labor—no wordiness—no form.

It must, we say, be remembered, that the object of preaching is to persuade men to

act. To impart certain opinions: to arouse certain feelings: to communicate certain facts: this may be done in writing: but you must see a man whom you want actually to put in motion. And so again, in the matter of speaking, these opinions, these feelings, these facts, may often as well be communicated in a written discourse, as after (what is called) the *ex tempore* method: but to *induce action*, a more immediate and unembarrassed appeal is necessary. The more impassioned, the more earnest, the more deeply solicitous a man is, the more thoroughly, the more absolutely he dispenses with all forms. All the prepared appeals in the world would not suffice for a person to cry to a drowning man. If the imperilled man were stupefied or perhaps reckless, and the alarmist would excite him from his lethargy, that cry must be as piercing and as home-reaching as possible. To induce that man to strike out and swim, the movements of passion must be perfectly uncontrolled. So if there is a storm approaching, how should we attempt to get the seamen to make provision against it? Or if a country is threatened with war and there is a pressing demand for men, what sort of a speech would be apt to be most effective? Just in proportion, it is evident, as the occasion is urgent—just in proportion to the speaker's sense of any crisis in question—just in proportion as he is impressed with his subject—just in proportion as he feels its tremendous associations—just to that extent will he utter the voice of nature—will he draw from *living waters*.

It is implied in our remarks, that there are occasions on which written discourses seem to be appropriate: to which we will add this qualification, that almost universally such written discourses be delivered memoriter. Certain dissertations of a didactic character and certain formal orations are best, perhaps, delivered in this way. But the exception appears hardly to militate against what we are mainly contending for. Anything didactic or discursive, as has been said or intimated, is not intended to influence directly the action of men: it is generally addressed to meditative minds, and aims rather to instruct the understanding, or to please the imagination, than to incite to activity. There are topics which call for sermons of this character; but we are regarding preaching in the main, we have said, as directed to the one great point of a call to repentance, and as an attempt to bring the heart to an active determination toward a new course of living. In a formal oration, it is almost universal to have it written out; but, on these occasions, no active effect is aimed to be produced: certain general con-

siderations (which the very occasion makes formal) are usually presented: elegant delineations are addressed to the fancy, elegant sentiments are clothed in fine language: and the exhibition is usually denominated an "intellectual treat." Such a thing has its uses: but this is an oration: it is not public speaking. That is not the method to move masses of men. A fine poem read might have produced a similar effect; but the effect is not that aimed at by a man who wants to make a man a Christian.

But even to take the case of a didactic discourse, how much feebler in its effect upon a company of promiscuous people would a written paper be, than the same sentiments delivered in a familiar, popular way, by a man who understood how to speak!

We will not inquire how far written discourses might be admissible, supposing every audience composed of studious, intelligent men. Perhaps (some may think) such men giving their attention to anything sensible, might be readily enough reached by a philosophical paper—just as a judge is often in court. But we do not even credit this: they would listen to the logical part of the discourse, or they would give attention to its abstract discussions: but when it became a practical, *individual* matter; every one of them remonstrated with as a wicked and fallen creature, and called upon by the speaker to do a certain thing; we do not believe the written paper is the battery to use against them. Here their intellectualism would have the same torpor as among a less select circle, and they would be found to be men with like passions with others.

But leaving all these speculations to take up our original question—what practically, is the method of reaching the masses? Here is an audience on every court-green, a congregation at every street-corner, how are these men to be preached to? In our cities, in our villages, in our mountains and valleys, on our frontiers and at our wharves, a teeming population of human beings are supposed to be perishing. How shall they be cried to? Shall a man go to them with a volume of sermons, or a bundle of MSS., and undertake to fix upon them a conviction of wickedness and a resolution of amendment? Did Paul stand thus on that Athenian hill? Did Peter cry thus on that day of Pentecost? Called George Whitfield thus to those Kingswood colliers? How are these things conducted in worldly affairs? How does the representative of any secular idea promulgate it through the world?

How does the lawyer speak in the court

house? How does the public man speak to the masses? We would curiously put the question, how does it *happen* that those speakers in our country, whose business is a practical matter, all speak *ex tempore*? It cannot all be accident. It cannot be merely from the effect of a long custom. There must be a principle in it. There must be an impelling cause, which has regulated of itself how certain professional speakers were to bring themselves in communication with the people.

What would any one think of a lawyer who got up to address a jury with a manuscript speech spread out on a desk? How many jurors would listen to him? How many would go to sleep? What contortions and convolutions would his client conduct himself through, while the great facts of his case, the pregnant points in his evidence, were thus being spun away into impractical syllogizings, into impalpable fantasies! That adroit lawyer stands there, knowing what he has to do. In a difficult school he has learned himself deeply in *human nature*. He knows that that rough man, with his horse out at the fence, doesn't want any fine sentiments. He knows that any abstracted mode of reasoning—sensible as he is—would be utterly lost on him. He knows that remotely planted premises, far reverted postulates, strike no chord in that rough-hewn intellect. General considerations, compactly-built argumentations, subtly-related trains of thought, play around him innocuously. There is a certain style of communication that that man can understand. It must be the language he is accustomed to. It must be in a mould that he can appreciate. It must be strong, blunt, graphic, unconstrained. Let no one think it may not be eloquent. Let him go to the court-house, and see. Let him listen once to a really good county court speaker, and then to a "seminary" preacher. It is the language of *men*; the other is the sentiments of books. The one comes fresh and in life from nature; the other is artificial, scholastic, abstract. The advocate has a special end to produce; he has a distinct object a-head of him, and he finds no difficulty in approaching it. There is no difficulty in speaking when there is something to be said. No man feels at any great loss for words when he is pleading for mercy; no lawyer is ever embarrassed when he understands his

* A lawyer, though he preaches for pay, does so with earnestness, that he may convince the jury and defeat his opponent; that he may obtain his client a *quid pro quo*, and by zeal for the interests of his employers enlarge his practice. A clerical hireling reads sermons to occupy the time, being as well paid without convincing, as though he proselyted his tons.—ED. HERALD.

case. He sees clearly that he wants a particular thing done, and he feels a deep interest that it *should* be done, and he speaks plainly what he has to say: and he speaks naturally and earnestly. It need not be said that men can't speak *ex tempore*. They can speak *ex tempore*. It is done every day. It is done habitually by a whole class of speakers before every court. And these men speak *well*, too; they speak incomparably better than the pulpit. Their speaking produces in the aggregate a much greater effect.

Again, let us take *the stump*. Let us see how our politicians address themselves to the masses. Did any one ever see a MS. on the stump? Now here is a sort of abstract topic, if you choose, as the topics of the pulpit are sometimes called, and the practice is, for speakers universally to speak without manuscripts—and perhaps, also, universally without having committed their speeches. We ask for the explanation of this. These men speak like the lawyers. They are equally practical, equally acquainted with the people. No one will deny, that as a class their speaking is very fine. Compared with pulpit addresses, their speeches are strikingly effective. We do not mean that they often convert a partizan from one side to the other. That has its own explanation; but we mean that they make *good speeches*. How easy their manner is towards their audience! How perfectly good-fellowly and invitative of confidence! What an entire absence of all stiffness—all pedantry—all embarrassment—all effort! How *familiar* their style—and how carelessly they vary it from one key to another!

The pulpit is the only place where manuscript speeches are made. Our deliberative bodies all speak without writing. In our State legislatures, and in Congress—as in the House of Commons and the British Senate—it is almost universal to speak as it is done at the bar and before popular meetings. Does any one suppose that John Randolph ever wrote out his speeches? Or that Mr. Henry ever trusted to the fixed type of a manuscript? We suppose Mr. Clay never wrote a speech in his life. If any place would justify a written speech, it is a body like our Senate, or the House of Commons. *Ex tempore* speaking is equally practiced at our Temperance meetings—our scientific conventions—our religious anniversaries—the associations, conferences, conventions, general assemblies of our churches, &c., &c.

We think this is the duty of the pulpit, to bring itself practically in contact with the masses. A system of easy writing is not

efficient. The language of it, and the manner of it, is not the way to reach the great soul of humanity. The more direct—the more personal—the more real its vivid utterances, the more instant, the more abounding, will be its results. Every thing that tends to break down the barrier between the clergy and the people, will tend to bring the latter more in fellowship and in sympathy with their teachers. Let the preacher get up in his congregation as a man. Let him stand forth there as one of the people. Let him, as Alexander Campbell, we thought once, happily did it, address his "*fellow-citizens*."

(To be continued.)

Analeccta Epistolaria.

Approves the Best, and yet the Worst Pursues.

Dear Sir,—I recently sent some propositions to the Baptist preacher, who deals in spiritual merchandize at the Barrens, to this effect:

1. Eternal life is a matter of promise;
2. The eternal life of man is hid in the Christ who is the Prince of Life; and,
3. Eternal life is conditional.

He argued them all, and in concluding, said, "they were certainly true;" and yet he preaches immortal soulism. How absurd!

Another of their order recently at the same place, said, that to teach that Christ Jesus would reign on the earth was carnal. If so, I think that you could show that all the prophets and apostles were carnal; for they teach it unmistakably to the conviction of every ingenious student of the Bible.

Since our organization, we have been principally their theme. They do not study the prophets, and are therefore unable to bring forth things "new;" and they soon tell all they know from their school-books. Hence, the necessity of so often changing their preachers.

We shall be on the look out for your appointment for this country.

Your brother, in Israel's hope.

J. M. STONE.

HENDERSON, KENTUCKY,
March 7, 1857.

The Warfare.

DEAR SIR,—I cheerfully embrace this opportunity of forwarding my subscription for the *Herald*, which is your due, in the full

conviction that the laborer is worthy of his hire; and that the information and instruction you give through its pages are an ample equivalent for its price.

It would be a pleasure if I could obtain some subscribers for the extension of its proclamation; but the people here in general, have quite a different view, believing that man has an immortal soul which receives at death its rewards and destiny; and endorsing all the articles of their *Legion*-creeds, "for they are many:" so that the prospect of enlargement hereabouts is not flattering.

If I were to give any encouragement and admonition it would be, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might," and in all your warfare handle "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," and no man shall set on you to hurt you.

The warfare is an obstinate one in this day of darkness and superstition. If ever men loved darkness rather than light, it is in this our day; for they seem to think, that any belief different from what they hold, is heretical, no matter how plainly expressed in the Bible.

What a pedestal of sand professed "Christendom" stands on! What a destruction awaits it, when the enemy comes in upon it like a flood!! Labor on; "preach the Word;" "hold forth the Word of Life," if that by any means you may save some.

Yours, with good will,

M. P. CHAPIN.

WOOSTER, INDIANA,
March 23, 1857.

A Macedonian Call.

DR. THOMAS,—There are four persons in this vicinity intelligent in the Gospel of the Kingdom, who are desirous of being immersed by you, if we could avail ourselves of your valuable services. We have all been immersed in the days of our ignorance, and are not at ease on account of our present condition in this matter. I think a series of lectures, at this place, either by you or Brother Magruder (so I style him because I love him), would be a means of much good at this time. If you design visiting Virginia shortly could you not come here also? If not, I will try to prevail on him to come. Please let me know through the *Herald*.

Yours, in hope of an inheritance in the Kingdom and Age to come,

J. BROSIUS.

BOTETOURT SPRINGS,
ROANOKE, VIRGINIA,
March 13, 1857.

Will Brother Magruder respond to the above? If he cannot, perhaps brethren Anderson or Passmore can. At present, it is not in our power. We expect, indeed, to visit Virginia this year; but cannot now say precisely when.

EDITOR.

"He had no Faith."

BROTHER THOMAS,—I noticed in your December *Herald* that the editor of the *Expositor* had denied saying to me that *he had no faith* when he was immersed; and that you gave the name of your informant, which was just what you should have done.

When I received the *Expositor*, I found under the caption—*Valid Immersion*—Elder Marsh there saying, that he did not wish to accuse the doctor or Brother Pierce of lying, but that the statement was incorrect, or in itself untrue, &c. Now, Brother Thomas, I wish to say to you and to all that knew me, and to all that may become hereafter acquainted with me, that I love Elder Marsh; and that I love him too well to cover up his faults: and I trust that he has the same respect for me. I will not, I dare not, disguise truth, or begot the eyes of others. *What I said to you was strictly true.* Brother MacMillon (who was present at the time in Elder Marsh's office) is a man of stern integrity and ability; and a more worthy man does not exist. I wish he were better known among Christians; in short, he may be called one of the noblest works of God. But notwithstanding all this, *he is mistaken.* It was not "on a specific point of the Gospel as expounded by Dr. Thomas," as Elder Marsh has said. The facts are these. Brother MacMillan and myself had been reading over Elder Marsh's articles on "Valid Immersion," and could not realize that it came from the pen of so worthy a man, that he should be so much in the fog, I could not bear to have him "pulling at every post." We made an appointment to call on him at his office. We found him there, and I at once broached the subject. We talked with him alternately, trying to show him his error; but it seemed difficult to bring him to a point. At last I said to him, "You are aware that the Apostle Paul says in Eph. iv. 4, 5, 'that there is one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism,' and also 'one Hope of the Calling;' now the question lies here, *Did you have the one faith, and the one hope we are called to, at the time you were immersed?*" "Oh," he replied, "*we had no faith at all; we were in the school of Christ.*" But I cannot believe, that a man is in the school

of Christ where such dogmas as the following are inculcated, or when he was teaching them—namely, that all men have in them immortal souls, that these are immaterial, and constitute the man proper; and that the body is a clog to the soul, and that at death the immaterial thing leaves its prison, and passes into a kingdom above, where there is said to be neither time nor space: by which traditions the lie direct is given to Christ and the apostles, who have said that “the meek shall inherit the earth,” and that that inheritance shall be for ever, &c. Call that the school of Christ where such dogmas are taught! God forbid that I should endorse such a sentiment. Call that the school of Christ where traditions are delivered, which have neither the Bible nor common sense to sustain them! The fact is, our friend is in the fog; and consequently has nothing but fog to fight with. I have seen him, Brother Thomas, there before; and when he got out he was glad; and I was glad to be able to forgive him for calling me “a Judaizer;” and I believe, he will do the same thing again. He cannot walk in darkness long; and I must say to you, what I have said to his face (and to J. B. Cook’s likewise), they have preached so long what some people call “Gospel” (and they supposed it was such themselves), that the cross is too great to become “as little children,” and be reimmersed. Their ministerial dignity starves them in the face. They probably feel a little, as did the Pharisees of old at Jordan; they would not confess their sins to a man whose meat was locusts and wild honey; neither would they be taught by that Nazarene, notwithstanding they were confounded by him in his answers and teachings; neither would they be taught by those fishermen, although they had the argument every time.

I am glad, Brother Thomas, to see that you have patience with him. The elder is a noble man. I have lived door-neighbor to him, and know him “like a book.” I would not hear him slandered, and not defend his cause. He, I mean Marsh, means to be honest, and he is honest, long-suffering, and kind; he is easy to be entreated, *except when his path is crossed*. His honesty is seen then; for he will not pass by the doctrine or by him that teaches it, with silent scorn and contempt as many will; but he will fight himself into the belief of it, if he cannot overthrow it. I have been present in his office, and heard him most shamefully abused by little upstarts, who were not fit to unloose his shoes, and he would bear it all.

I have often heard, Brother T., of drown-

ing men catching at straws; and, I think, our friend is at that desperate pastime. I see that in his Jun. No. 1, he publishes from Elias Smith’s *New Testament Dictionary*. He was the founder of the *Christian DENOMINATION*, of which Elder Marsh was a member. The latter seems to represent that he was a true follower of Elias Smith; but that a large majority of them dissented from the doctrines their nobles laid down, in consequence of which his sojourn with them was not unfrequently marked with sore trials. Now, if that be true, our friend did apostatize, though a little after his brethren. When I moved to Rochester, which was in the fall of ‘48, and began to teach the things concerning the Kingdom, it seemed to him like a curious doctrine; and he made similar remarks to others; and in speaking of me, he often branded me with the epithet of “a Judaizer;” and was much opposed to such a doctrine. For eight years, or more, of my acquaintance with him we have had many a long conversation up on the subjects at issue between yourself and him; and *this is the first intimation that he ever believed such sentiments*; and not longer ago than last winter he told me, that at the time of his immersion *he had no faith*, but was in the school of Christ. Now, Brother Thomas, when I get all these facts into one compound, it presents to me a very singular one. May God save him (with a little sacrifice on his part) and dispel the cloud of dust stirred up by his own feet; and that we may all meet in the everlasting Kingdom, is the prayer of your brother,

JOSEPH PIERCE.

ADDENDUM.—I see that things have come to a crisis in Rochester, as I expected. That spirit of which J. B. Cook is possessed (he and others style it the Spirit of Christ), is a strange one; and one with which I wish to have nothing to do, nor much to do with him who has it. They are in their own eyes perfect; but in mine, knowing their conduct, quite the reverse; for I found them “sensual and devilish,” J. B. Cook being foremost and chief. I have been intimately acquainted with him for years. At first, I thought him one of earth’s finest (and I now think he *means* well); but I have been compelled against my wish, to change my opinion of his merits. That spirit by which he is guided makes him believe that he hath the whole truth and cannot err: though all the truth he has got is borrowed from others. I am acquainted with some obscure individuals from whom he borrowed through the week, to deal out to his congregation on Sunday. But when they differed with his spirit on the Spirit, denying the presence in

him of that Spirit which Christ our Saviour had—the Holy Spirit—which he sent on Pentecost to bear witness of Him, and to glorify Him in the signs and wonders with which he confirmed *the word of the apostles*—J. B. Cook's spirit was incensed. Guided by this spirit, by low cunning and intrigue, he will plot at midnight, and manoeuvre to expel from his church men who differ from his spirit, whose shoes he is not worthy to unloose. I witnessed the operation of that spirit at Rochester; and I observed that it converted J. B. Cook into any thing but a gentleman; much less a Christian, deporting himself less honorably than a low politician, made yet lower by the spirit of grain.

Well, what spirit can we term it but "*the spirit of error*?" By this same spirit he was very sanguine that his former Baptist faith was the truth; by this same spirit he was afterwards taught to apostatize to Millerism; by this same spirit he was moved to apostatize from Millerism to the medley he now holds to be the truth: deny the genuineness of this spirit, and it quickly shows the cloven foot. It is an evil spirit, and ruinous to the possessed. That the truth may enter in, and cast out the demon, that he may be healed, and clothed in a right mind, is the sincere desire of his well-wisher.

JOSEPH PIERCE.

MELUGEN GROVE, LEE, ILL.,

March 1857.

"School of Christ."

IN THE SCHOOL OF CHRIST WITHOUT FAITH?—

Query.

A *school*, from the Latin *schola*, is a house or place of instruction and discipline. It is also a *system of doctrine delivered* by a teacher and his assistants. If a doctrinal system be taught in that teacher's house which he repudiates, it is taught in his school in opposition to, or perversion of his school; and it is not difficult to understand, that such a state of things is tolerated only till an opportunity favors for the teacher to expel such adversaries, or Satans, from his place of instruction and discipline.

But, if the Satanic teaching be not taught in his schoolhouse, but in some other place, then the teaching is in no sense *in his school*, but in some other school, which becomes in respect of his a hostile and rival establishment.

Now, "*the Christ*," in the sense of the ANOINTING SPIRIT whose name is JEHOVAH,

has a *system of doctrine and a place*, or house, where it is delivered. The disciples or scholars, in this school, are all they of whom He who is "THE RESURRECTION" says, "I will raise them up at the last day." In fact, they are the schoolhouse as well as the scholars; for it is written of them, "Christ's house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of THE HOPE firm unto the end."—Heb. iii. 6. Now, concerning them, the Spirit in Isaiah and Jesus saith, "THEY SHALL BE ALL TAUGHT OF GOD."—John vi. 45. It is evident, then,

1. That "Christ's school" is where God is the Teacher;
2. That it is the company in the midst of which God's truth is taught;
3. That that company is composed of those who intelligently confess God's truth concerning a certain and well-defined thing styled by him in his teaching "THE ONE HOPE OF THE CALLING; and,
4. That the recognised scholars are they, who "*having heard and learned of the Father*," lay hold of the confidence and rejoicing of that Hope, and do not let go, but "*hold fast to the end*."—Heb. x. 22, 23.

The SCHOOL OF ANTICHRIST is a rival establishment. It is divided into many classes, which are designated by divers "*Names and Denominations*." Its teaching is not uniform, as it contains many Rabbis pledged to heterogeneous systems and opinions. The Spirit of the School is the spirit of "the Flesh of Sin," which inspires them with sentiments in harmony with its affections and desires. What they suppose, think, or imagine the Scriptures ought to signify, that they affirm it teaches; and what they manifestly declare contradictory of the traditions of the Antichristian Rabbis, these pronounce to be heretical; and receivable only in "a spiritual sense," that is, as importing the contrary, or something different, to what is plainly expressed.

The disciples of this school, like their teachers, are unanimous chiefly in darkening the counsel of God by words without knowledge. It is characteristic of them that they speak what they wish, and all speak different things. Confusion worse confounded, is the real principle of their "chairs." Instead of holding truth "firm to the end," they do not know when they have got truth, but are ever shifting and changing from one set of opinions to another, as in the case of our friend J. B. Cook and others. In this, their conduct is the very

opposite of the disciples of Christ's school. When these come to understand the word of the truth of the Gospel of the Kingdom, they hold fast to the end. They do not become in turns Baptists, Campbellites, Millerites, Medleyites, &c.; these are the conversions of Antichrist's school, where classes are changed to suit the occasion. A man may, indeed, pass through all these classes, and then become a disciple in the School of Christ; but then this is only effected by leaving the one school for the other, and when he gets into Christ's, there he remains, "learning of the Father," that he may be thoroughly purged of clerical foolishness, and "go on to perfection."—Heb. vi. 1.

The Father-Spirit, whom no man hath seen, nor can see" (John vi. 46; 1 Tim. vi. 16), teaches the scholars of Christ's school by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, whose doctrine is in true and perfect accord. These writings are able, and do, make wise the teachable unto salvation—2 Tim. iii. 15-17; Psalm xix. 7. They turn those, who become as little children (Matt. xviii. 3, 4), from the fables of apostate Christendom to the simplicity of Christ." They give him introduction into his school by bringing him to an enlightened obedience of the one faith. Since the day of Pentecost, a man of faith enters the school by obeying the Gospel of the Kingdom. Attending the meetings of Christ's scholars, or speculating on mysteries does not constitute a man a scholar, any more than a visitor is a university student because he attends the lectures of the institution, or talks about the subjects treated of by the professors. A man must *matriculate* before he can be recognized as a disciple of the school. A formal admission to school membership is necessary; and this formality must be according to Scripture. A man ignorant of "the Hope of the Calling" cannot possibly find admission. He must obtain "confidence" and "rejoicing" in this; and this is only obtainable through "understanding the word of the kingdom.—Matt. xiii. 20, 23. Mark that in verse 20, "hearing the word" is the cause of "receiving it with joy;" and in verse 23, the hearing and understanding, if the ground be good, of bearing fruit. "The sentiments of all Christendom" are not taught in the school of Christ; it is the law and the testimony which find an honorable and distinguished place there; but which are comparatively nothing regarded or thought of in "the Names and Denominations." Where the Spirit of prophecy reigns, heathenism has no place. Heathenism, and the "One Hope of the Calling" cannot coexist in one and

the same believing heart. The latter is as much as a "true heart" can contain. It has no room for heathenism; and immortal soulism and sky kingdomism are heathenism. These dogmata are not taught in Christ's school; but are emphatically the characteristic crudities of Doctor Antichrist's protections. Where he reigns, they triumph; and no scope is found for the truth. He is an Egyptian; and a so-called "school of Christ" where his "sentiments" find place or favor, is a school for which we have no more taste or affection than our correspondent. With him we say, Forbid it, O ye heavens, that we should endorse such a spurious concern!

EDITOR.

—————◆—————

"Spiritualism," more attractive than the Bible!

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS,—We have had meetings most of the time since you were here. Occasionally we get a hearer who will acknowledge, that the plain literal interpretation of the "word" favors our position; and yet they will go after the thing wherein they have been reared with this knowledge upon their lips. We had a lady here lecturing upon "Spiritualism," who ignored the Bible, and drew crowd. Alas for these days of darkness: When will the people learn to love the truth? When will the Bible, "the sure word of prophecy," be unto them as "a light shining in a dark place," illuminating their understanding and opening up to them a glorious immortality, by a resurrection from the dead. They are pleased with the delusion, that makes death a gate to endless joy, and bids their spirits range Elysian fields without space, and whose hours have no time. Alas, men have not forgotten the fault of our first parents, but still aspire to be gods, instead of seeking to obtain heirship in the inheritance promised to Abraham, by a better resurrection. But we must plod on, content to be accounted as heretics and the offscouring of the earth, until Jesus comes. Now is the day of the powers that be, but then will be our time. Until then, let us wait patiently, holding fast to the prize.

Yours, in the one hope,

L. Z. BAKER.

AURORA, ILLINOIS,
March 24, 1857.

When in Aurora, last year, the people were invited to come and hear what the Bible revealed of that real spirit-world wherein the rulers of its nations shall all be

spirit-men, because born of the spirit from their mother earth; but alas, few, very few, of the townspeople responded to the invitation! Since then, however, a sort of witch of Endor, having a familiar spirit, a presumptuous enemy of that great Book, to which the world is indebted for whatever of mortal excellence it contains, has visited them; and like Simon Magus, the Samaritan, has bewitched them with her sorcery! They crowded out to hear a woman ignore the Bible; and reveal to them the mysteries of a spirit-world, by the Mesmeric excitation of flesh! If this be not an evidence of extreme gullibility, then there is no credulity on earth. What a practical comment on clerical influence and teaching in Aurora! The clergy of all sects there are the formers and keepers of the Aurora conscience, which crowds the courts of the sorceress and the infidel; but cannot be induced to lend an ear to "what the Spirit saith to the churches!"

EDITOR.

Balancing Accounts.

DR. THOMAS.—In the *Herald* for March, I noticed the lines "for distribution by F. G. C.," and feeling convinced in my mind that they possess *more poetry* than truth, I have, in an off-hand manner, endeavored to *balance accounts* with him, by adding in *more truth* than poetry; and though thereby it may not read so smoothly, it tells no doubt a *truer tale*, and *truth* is what we need in this our day. So here it is:

The Clergy.

"Those holy men whom God in Christ ordained,
To promulgate the doctrine they maintained;
By whom the Gospel's banner was unfurled,
And free salvation to a ruined world
Proclaimed in Christ, the great Messiah's name;
Who sent them forth these tidings to proclaim,
Are all now numbered with the 'prostrate dead,'
Waiting the coming of their living Head,
To raise the great assembly of the blest,
To life's immortal sabbath-day rest.
'But ere' they ceas'd to breathe, and fell asleep
In Him, to whom they gave their lives to keep,
They all predicted that, in days to come,
[The evil worked o'en then and ruined some,]
'False prophets and false teachers would arise,
And turn men's stitching ears from truth to lies.
All which has come to pass as then foreseen,
Foreknown and shown by those inspired men.
'Whether by birth of high or low degree,
Their learning what, or what their gifts may be,
Is not the question. 'Tis enough to know,
(And known it is that all these things are so;)
That men there are in this enlightened age,
Who madly dare an open war to wage,
Against the throne and majesty of God,
The Prince Messiah, and His written Word.
Reckless of truth, and in assertion bold,
As were apostates in the days of old,
[Whose fables were so cunningly devised]
Their main design so artfully disguised,
And so alluring, tho' 'fat' baits they set,
'Thousands were drawn into the fatal net.'"

Yes, many follow their pernicious ways,
Causing the righteous few in these our days,
Who walk the narrow way of Scripture truth,
As did the apostles in the church's youth,
To be ill spoken of in every where,
And persecuted sorely all they dare.
The multitude by following thus to ill,
The wide gate crowd and tread the way of sin.
'Bad at the best, and waxing worse and worse,
Poets to themselves, and to the world a curse,
These dark designing men on mischief bent,
And on the ruin of men's souls intent
They preach for hire, for filthy lucre's sake,
Devouring widow's houses—no mistake.
They beg from hungry men to feed the full
And o'er the flock watch well to get the wool;
Bind burdens on mens' souls that can't be borne,
Nor yet to lighten one, a finger turn
'To speed their course' their anger is unfurled
In merchandize bazars o'er all the world.
'My reference is to' these 'and such as' these,
Who whine and flatter every way to please,
And hold men's persons in admiration,
To obtain their dear-loved aspiration.
'In whose dark brain,' the 'darker' idea rolls,
The immortality of wicked souls.
'Men who to speed, and carry out their plans,
Would wrest from God the destinies of man;
With iron horns would push to God in heaven
The sin-stained seed—the unrighteous leaven
Of disobedience. 'All of Adam's race,'
Without regard to faith or pard'ning grace.
'Deceiving still, and being still deceived,
And hoping in the end to be believed,
They would; and do, 'their minds are so perplexed
Involve in midnight gloom the sacred text.
Would by a blast blow out the holy light
That shines therefrom upon our mental sight.
Their own 'Traditions' rather than forego
Wisdom's eternal councils overthrow;
Annul the laws which God to man has given,
And 'their traditions' give us laws from heaven.
And 'would above God's own anointed Son,
Transport themselves to an eternal throne.'
In sky-kingdom's visionary realm,
On board the phantom ship without a helm.
'These heresies with which their 'faith' is stamp'd,
Are older than they say, but newer 'vampt';
For heathen Socrates and Plato too,
Believed what they believe, and say its true.
The Serpent said the same, 'Thou shalt not die.'
His clergy all still herald forth the lie.
'Voltaire, and Volney, Gibbon, Hume, and Paine,
Than these 'more honest men,' and 'quite as sane.
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1857.

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.—Archdeacon Blackburn said,—“The more any man is convinced of the immortality of the soul from the principles of Aristotle or Des Cartes, the less will he concern himself about the Gospel account of futurity.” Again he says,—“All those fine-spun notions of the immortality of the soul, and all the artificial deductions from that principle, teaching nothing but the art of blowing scholastic bubbles, which will certainly go peaceably to their rest, without the least detriment, either to sound learning or true religion.”

Let any mighty man in the Scriptures give us a “Thus saith the Lord, the soul is immortal.”

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1857.

[VOL. VII. No. 6.]

Did Jesus and the Apostles Teach the Mosaic Doctrine of Immortality ?

Yes; the doctrine of Moses and the Prophets is the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles, likewise. In other words, the Spirit teaches the same doctrine through them all. "Think not that I am come," said Jesus, "to destroy the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled"—Mat. v. 18. And in another place he says to the Jews, "If ye believe not Moses' writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—John v. 47. And to two of his disciples he said in discourse with them after his resurrection, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!"—Luke xxiv. 25. This is the condition of the professing world at this day. It is a world of slow-hearted fools, because they do not believe all that the prophets have spoken; but are mad drunk upon their traditions. "The woman Jezebel" has intoxicated them "with the wine of her fornication"—a highly rectified spirituous compound, whose most maddening element is "the immortality of the soul"—Rev. ii. 20; xvii. 2.

The apostles, like their Divine Master, taught in perfect harmony with Moses and the Prophets. They were Jews, and as such, zealous for the Oracles of God committed to their nation's care—Rom. iii. 2. "If any man speak," says Peter, "let him speak as the Oracles of God; We have," says he, "a sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as to a LIGHT shining in a dark place:" and again, "Be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets." He did not do as the blind guides of Christendom, who discourage the study of the prophets, and

lull the people into dazy acquiescence, in the shallow sophistries doled out to them at so much per annum, with donation-perquisites! No; the apostles commended their contemporaries for searching the prophets to see if the apostolic teaching were in conformity with their testimony. They declared that such were men of "noble disposition;" but to do this now—to try the doctrine of the clergy by the testimony of Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and so forth, exposes a man to their anathema and contempt! And why so? Because such a scrutiny invariably leads an honest man to abandon their traditions; and to discern in them, "false prophets, who approach men in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." These are they who call Jesus "Lord;" but do not his Father's will; and when he comes in power, are the hypocrites that will appear before him, saying, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name have we not sprinkled babies? And ministered to jail and gallows-birds the consolations of thy religion?" "And then," saith Jesus, "will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity."

Nor was Paul a whit behind Peter in his zeal for Moses and the Prophets. "I continue unto this day," saith he, "testifying both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." And when the Jews came to his lodging, we are informed that "he expounded and testified to them the Kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the Law of Moses, and out of the Prophets, from morning till evening." This is the grand feature which distinguishes the preaching of the apostles from that of their pretended "successors." They preached "the Gospel of God which he had promised before.

by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures"—Rom. i. 1; xvi. 25, 26. And they taught that the "scriptures are able to make wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Not so the miserable charlatans, who extort from the people their hard earnings for that which is not bread, and their labor for that which satisfieth not. "Without us," say the clergy, "ye can do nothing. We are called of God to cure your souls. Pay us our tithes, stipends, and dues, and we will obtain you an abundant entrance into the skyanian mansions of eternal bliss! The channels of grace are we. Build churches, decorate them elegantly, and see us well, and heaven shall be yours!" Every one knows how little use the Bible is of in the kingdom of the clergy. The prophets are a positive nuisance to them. The piety of their proselytes begins without it, is maintained without it, and consummated without it. "Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress," "Doddridge's Rise of Religion in the Soul," and "Baxter's Saints' Everlasting Rest," are the pious substitutes of the clergy for the teaching of God in the Scriptures of truth.

Jesus and the Apostles did not teach the Devil's doctrine, that is, the traditions of the clergy, concerning immortality. If the reader desire to know the parentage of the logmas of the divinity-grinders of "Christendom" he need not humble himself to study the Scriptures to discover it. Let him consult the summary we have presented him, in No. 4 of the Herald, condensed by Rollin from the writings of the pagan Cicero. In this extract he will find the theology of the pious sons of Balaam the son of Bosor, worthy children of that prince of hirelings, who preach Nicolaitanism for filthy lucre's sake; "which things," saith the Lord the Spirit, "I detest"—Rev. ii. 15.

The following points will show the identity of the speculations of the clergy with those of their heathen predecessors; and, for the sake of emphasis, we shall present them distinctly under the caption of the

HEATHEN ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CLERGY.

1. The Heathen Divines could not define the nature of the "Soul" in which they believed; neither can the pulpit-heathens of the nineteenth century.

2. The "orthodox" heathen assumed the immortality of a thing, of the nature of which they were confessedly ignorant; this is true also of the heathen orthodox of our day.

3. The heathens supposed it was "a breath" or else "a fire;" our reverend heathens of the pulpit suppose the same thing, terming "the breath of life" the "immortal

soul;" and, in their anthems of fleshly rapture, styling it "a heavenly flame;" in proof, read their "Dying Christian."

4. The heathens considered spirit to be the opposite of matter; and therefore termed it *immateriality*. Because it was not matter, they regarded it as *life-essence*; and therefore, from the necessity of things, *immortality in essence*. Hence, they said, *the soul is spirit*; and consequently, immaterial; and because it is immaterial, therefore it is immortal. The heathen theologists of our schools and colleges have made no improvement upon this. Being naturally of a Cretan cast of mind (Tit. i. 2) they have been able to make no advance in "metaphysics" beyond their pagan masters; with whose works they are infinitely better acquainted than with the Bible. They have, therefore, humbly and reverently adopted the speculations elaborated for them by the brighter or livelier imaginations of the Greeks. One of their fellow-craftsmen, Taylor Lewis, LL.D., in his preface to "*Plato against the Atheists*," says, "Our object (in editing the book) is to recommend Plato to the student or reader by every means through which attention could be drawn to our favorite author; believing that in no other way could we render a better service to the cause of true philosophy and religion. Some may say, that in our great partiality, Plato is made to talk too much like a Christian." What "religion" but heathenism can be so well served by the writings of a pagan, ignorant, as Plato was, of the wisdom of God? As we said of Cicero, so we may say of Plato, that he would pass current in these times for a very good Christian, if we take the clerical standard for the measure of the goodness. Between Dr. Lewis's Plato and a clerical Christian, there is no essential difference—they are both heathens, only of a different "Name and Denomination." "We believe," says the doctor, "that in this age there is a peculiar call for a deeper knowledge of Plato;" in other words, for a profounder acquaintance with heathen philosophy. That is, our heathen clergy are only smatterers in the heathenism they teach! "We speak with confidence on this point," says he. "The young man who is an enthusiastic student of Plato can never be a sciolist in regard to education, a quack in literature, a demagogue in politics, or an infidel in religion! Our main object, then, is to recommend this noble philosopher to the present generation of educated young men, especially to our theologians." Hence, according to this Gentile Rabbi, an enthusiastic disciple of Plato can never be an infidel in religion—that religion, of course, approved by the New York City University

in which he is professor of Greek; and which is generally known as Protestantism! Are we not, then, correct in saying that Protestantism is Heathenism? Plato is a proselyter of his disciples to Dr. Lewis' religion; surely that religion must be heathenism. Plato's writings never made a Christian; but they have Platonized many Christians, and made them apostates and heathens, whose religion is college-religion, clerical-religion, mere vanity and lies, and altogether at variance with and subversive of the truth. The religion the apostles preached has no use for Plato, his disciples the clergy, nor of any of their "philosophy or vain deceit." Let them call things by their right names. They preach Plato's dogmas; let them, then, be candid knaves, and call their religion Platonism; and cease to beset mankind in palming upon them the speculations of the Greeks under pretence of teaching them the doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

5. According to the Stoics, by an ultimate revolution, the whole world is to become only fire; this is also the dogma of the Stoics of "Christendom," who burn up the earth and all the promises in "the conflagration of the last day."

6. From the separation of the "immortal soul" to the general burning, the heathen taught that the souls of good men inhabited the upper region, where they would have nothing to do but to philosophize at their ease, supremely happy in the clear vision of the universe. The heathen theologians of the churches teach substantially the same thing. Their "upper region" is Skyana; where they "bathe their weary souls in seas of heavenly rest." If they do not philosophize, it may be for want of a turn that way; but as a substitute, they have recourse to song; and sing in everlasting strains, the dreamy joys of phantom bliss!

7. Plato, Socrates, and other pagans, taught that the "immortal souls" of wicked men were consigned to a place of torments as soon as they left their bodies at the death of these; and that they were tormented there by the Furies eternally. The clergy also teach this article of the Heathen superstition. Pluto, god of hell, they call the Devil. Hell and the Devil in the mouth of the clergy, are the power by which they proselyte mankind to the religion of their schools and colleges. Without hell and their Devil they could do nothing: Hence, in trying to cure souls their prescriptions always smell strongly of sulphur. Being "ministers of Satan," as Paul styles them, it is natural enough that they should vomit forth brimstone and flaming blue!

8. When an infant child of heathen par-

ents died, their tiny immortalities were supposed to cross the great gulf to the haven of celestial bliss and glory, and there to join their deified ghostly predecessors. Expressive of this article of heathen superstition, was the custom (as illustrated in Barker's account of the idols recently discovered at Tarsus in Cilicia) of making images of the departed arrayed in the symbols of deity. Mr. Barker describes a number of "deified little ones," some of them with radiated heads and mounted on dolphins. As an example he cites, "a fragment representing a child with wings, and in close drapery; the hair of the head is knotted on the top." "A memorial," says Mr. Abingdon, "of a deceased and deified child."

Here is the heathen dogma of the apotheosis, or deification of the "immortal souls" of infants. It was not possible for the clergy to permit so romantic and "poetical" a speculation to remain an alien from their creed. They have, therefore, adopted it with the rest of their appropriations from "the wisdom" of the heathen Greeks! When babies come into the world they call them "little immortals," whose souls must be *rhantismally* regenerated with "subvenient" or "prevenient grace," lest, dying *unsprinkled* with holy water, their "immortal souls" should go to torment. And when their little immortalities evacuate their bodies, they say that the "angels lend their wings" for them to "mount and fly;" that is, the angels become, as it were, the winged dolphins to transport them across the ethereal sea to glory—there they are deified, being little gods, or "winged angels," in the kingdom of heaven! The clerical hirelings of the apostacy are very zealous for this article of their superstition, and say all sorts of hard things of those who deny the *deification of infant ghosts*. It is a tradition that greatly enriches them, being a source to them of fees for lustrations, and burials, and funeral sermons; and, through the philoprogenitiveness of the mothers of the little deities, greatly strengthening their hold upon the favor of the world.

Such is the heathenism of the clergy of all the names and denominations of blasphemy of which the nations are full. Between it and the doctrine of the Bible there is no affinity. John the Baptizer, Jesus and the apostles, taught nothing like it, but the very reverse in all particulars.

As we have seen, they endorsed the doctrine of Moses and the prophets in every jot and tittle, and their teaching, consequently, in regard to immortality. Thus, John affirms the absolute mortality of man in saying, "He that is disobedient to the Son shall not see life." In other words, they

only shall partake in the life of his Aion who believe *into* him; as it is written, "He that believes *into* (*ὁ πιστευων εις*) the son hath aionian life."—Jno. iii. 36. These sayings make immortality dependent on "the obedience of faith;" for to "believe into the Son" is to obey him; and Paul says, that "being made perfect, he became the author of aionian salvation (the salvation pertaining to his Aion), *to all that obey him.*"—Heb. v. 9. Suppose, then, that no soul of man of all Adam's race were obedient, what would be their condition in view of these sayings? There is but one logical answer that can be given—*not a soul of man's race would see life after its decease*; consequently, the doctrine of Jesus and Paul is in harmony with Moses and the prophets, who taught, as we have seen, the unqualified and absolute mortality of man.

Again, Jesus declares in plain terms that the soul is destructible: "Fear him," says he, "who is able to *destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.*" Now if soul were absolutely immortal, it could not be destroyed in Gehenna or elsewhere. It is a contradiction in terms to talk of that which is essentially incorruptible and deathless, dying or being destroyed. But a heathen, or believer in "the immortality of the soul," which we have seen is the same thing, objects, and says, "soul must be something apart from body, capable of existing after the body is dead, for Jesus said (and they want to make him as much a heathen as themselves) that man, who could kill the body, '*could not kill the soul.*'" It by no means follows. Jesus was speaking of destruction of *both* soul and body in *Gehenna*. Here was a body and soul destruction, in which the power of man has no place. They can kill the bodies of his disciples as they killed his, "*but after that have no more that they can do.*"—Luke xii. 4. They are, therefore, mere body-killers of the saints; but they cannot prevent those "mortal bodies" (Rom. viii. 2; Isai. xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2) coming to life again, and standing before the tribunal of the Anointing Spirit, or Christ, when *knees shall bow, and tongues shall confess to God.*—Rom. xiv. 10-12; 2 Cor. v. 10. The resurrected disciples of Jesus, with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets and faithful under the Lord, will stand before that tribunal *bodily*, that "IN BODY" they may receive for the good or evil that they have done. See the text quoted from Corinthians, and leave out the *italic* words, which are not in the original. There is no reward or punishment for incorporealities. Bodies, living bodies, are the subjects of both. Resurrected disciples are bodies and souls, or living bodies, as Jesus was when he came

out of the sepulchre, and was mistaken for the gardener. Now, it is in this state that the resurrected appear at Christ's tribunal to receive according to the evil they have incurred by their misdeeds. Resurrection, or the act of coming out of the ground, does not make them spirit-bodies, or immortal; it only restores them to the "*as you were,*" before they died. If they came out of the ground incorruptible as well as living, being immortal, they could not receive *evil in body*—an evil which, in some cases, is to result in the destruction of soul and body in *Gehenna* by the Spirit; for, as Paul says, "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption," a reaping which occurs at the "season" of the Son of Man's apocalypse in power, to reward every one according to his works.—Mat. xvi. 27.

"Soul," which cannot be killed by man, is life manifested in resurrected bodies—*life rekindled in mortal flesh*. Man can now put out the light of life in killing the body, but they cannot extinguish it finally, therefore, they are not to be feared. God, however, can not only put it out as they can, but he can do more: he can build up again the body they have killed from its dust and ashes, give it life, make it exactly the same living soul, or creature, it was before, arraign it at his bar, as he did the first "living soul," exclude it from the Tree of Life, and send it back into the ground out of which it was taken, with all the terrible accompaniments of *Gehenna*-destruction. "Fear him," saith Jesus, "who, together with the killing (*μετα το αποκτειναι*), hath ability to cast into *Gehenna*;" yea, I say unto you, fear him."

"My soul," said he, "is exceedingly sorrowful unto death." In this he affirmed death of that which was capable of grieving, and if of grieving, therefore of thinking; so that, in this saying, he affirmed the mortality of his soul, and, consequently, of all other souls. Isaiah had long before testified that his soul was to die, but, also, that afterwards Jehovah would "apportion to him with many, even with mighty ones, he shall divide the spoil;" and the reason given is, "Because he hath exposed his soul to death." But, before he could inherit conjointly with his many brethren "the mighty," that is, the saints, the spoil of the enemy, he must have been raised from the dead. Hence, the Spirit, presciently contemplating Messiah's soul as dead and buried, says in David, the representative of his Son and Lord, "My flesh shall dwell in confidence, for thou wilt not leave my soul to the grave, nor permit thine Holy One to see corruption."—Psalm xvi. 10. Here "flesh," "soul," and "Holy One," all refer to the same thing, and are the flesh, soul, or Holy One through which JEHOVAH, the

Spirit, manifested himself to Judah in the days of Tiberius Cæsar and his procurator, Pontius Pilate. They were, therefore, the Spirit's flesh, the Spirit's soul, and the Spirit's *Holy One*, so that the Spirit in David styles them his, saying, "My flesh," and "my soul." Now, Paul, speaking of God the Spirit, says that "He only hath immortality;" that is, that God is essentially LIFE. God the Spirit (and Jesus says, *πνευμα ὁ θεός* God is spirit), is designated by various titles expressive of his relations to the sons of men. Among these he is styled THE WORD, as it is written, *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* "God was the Word." Now, of this it is testified, *ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν*, "in him was life." In God, therefore, there is no death principle, and God the Spirit is the only existence of whom this can be affirmed. All other existences in his universe are created mortal, that is, with natures which, if left to their natural wear and tear, would, in process of time, return to the crude material of which they were originally composed. This is implied in the oracle, "God only hath immortality," all other immortalities are derived from him; but he derives his from no predecessor, being himself absolutely and independently life, and the fountain of life and motion to all created things.

Abraham's nature, that is, the ground-soul nature taken by *ΓΕΝΟΥΑΙ ΤΗ ΣΠΙΡΙΤ*, was a union of flesh and spirit—*ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*—"THE WORD became flesh." It became mortal flesh, for if spirit had become immortal flesh, that flesh would not have been sin's flesh, or the nature of Abraham's seed, and sin could not have been condemned in it, for there would have been none there, and it could not have been slain by crucifixion. Adam the first, and all other living creatures, were "Spirit made flesh." All that is called "matter," is spirit made material, that is, spirit manifested with all the qualities technically styled "the properties of matter," the enumeration of which, as far as known, is the nearest approximation philosophy can make to the definition of matter, or the statement of what it is.

Spirit, in that form called "mortal flesh," was, in the case of Jesus, enveloped, or buried deeply, so to speak, in an unmeasured quantity of "free spirit"—"Uphold me with free spirit," and "Take not thy holy spirit from me."—Ps. li. 11, 12. Speaking of spirit made mortal flesh, termed "the Son," Jesus says, "God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him." This measureless impartation was primarily at his immersion in the Jordan, and constituted his sealing of the Father, so that the anointed Jesus was consequently God in mortal flesh prior to his crucifixion. But while hanging on the

accursed tree the spirit was withdrawn, upon which Jesus cried with a loud voice, in the words of Psalm xxii., "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" The spirit of the Father had departed, and left the mortal flesh still living, a weak and helpless man, upon the cross. He did not die for some time after the spirit of God forsook him. He was there, a living soul about to die—the second Adam, as mortal as the first in the article of death. Again he cried with a loud voice, and ceased to breathe, or expired, *ἐξεπνευσε*.

Such was the living mortal soul, apart from the Spirit, or Father, termed, "Jesus, the Son of Man and Son of God," the latter a title shared by him with Adam the first.—Luke iii. 38. Having expired, the soul, Jesus, was dead, and deposited in a tomb. But, "because he had done no violence, neither was there deceit in his mouth," the spirit's soul was not permitted to remain dead, nor to see corruption; therefore, the Spirit of the Father returned to it, entered into it, pervaded all its atoms, transformed them into incorruptible atoms, endowed them with mobility, and so restored his soul to life. The dead soul now became really and truly an immortal soul, a deathless soul, a living and incorruptible body, styled by Paul *πνευμα ἁγιωσύνης*, spirit of holiness; that is, HOLY SPIRIT NATURE, for, says Jesus, "that which is born of the spirit is spirit."

From these testimonies and reasonings, the reader may discern the New Testament doctrine of immortality. Man, in the present state, born into it of flesh and blood, and of the will of man, is sin's flesh, earthy and mortal—he is a mortal soul; but a righteous man, born of the grave by the Spirit, and afterwards transformed, "is spirit," that is, is a living, incorruptible body, or man, so that, if the phrase "immortal soul," be at all admissible, it may be defined by its equivalent, a deathless man.

Here, then, are two races—the mortal race of man and the immortal race of man. The former, according to the testimony of the Spirit by David and Paul, was created "a little lower than the angels," but the latter, according to Jesus, "shall be equal to the angels." Now these races are not absolutely and entirely independent of each other. They sustain a similar relation to that of the corn planted to the corn reaped. If there be no seed planted there can be none to reap. This law of vegetable reproduction is adduced by the Lord Jesus as an illustration of the production of spirit-man. "Except a corn of wheat," saith he, "fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." So, also, saith the apostle, in answer to the

question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" "Fool," said he to the man asking such a question, "that which thou sowest is not vivified except it die; and that which thou sowest is not that body which shall be, but thou sowest naked grain, it may be of wheat or of some one of the other grains; but God gives to it a body, according as he hath pleased, and to each of the seeds its own body." There is diversity of flesh as well as diversity of seeds. All seeds are not the same, neither is all flesh the same. Beast-flesh will not produce bird-flesh, nor man-flesh fish. The "fool" the apostle was reasoning with was doubtless an immortal-soulist, who believed in metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls; that is, he imagined that when a man died, the "immortal soul" he supposed to be in him, migrated into a beast, bird, fish, sun, moon, or stars, and became the demon or genius of the thing possessed! This was as absurd as to suppose that wheat sown would produce barley or Indian corn. On the contrary, according to what is sown is that which is produced. If a beast were buried it would not rise up in the form of a man, nor if a man were buried would he rise up in the form of a beast, bird or fish. "With what body do the dead come?"—a question which implies that the inquirer supposed they might come with other bodies than the human body, with which they were buried. Paul might well say to such a querist, "Thou fool."

Now, the doctrine taught by Jesus and Paul through these illustrations is, that the "living soul" is to the *everlasting soul* as a grain of corn planted is to the fruit-bearing corn plant in the field. The "living soul" is the "naked grain" planted in its burial. It remains in the ground and takes root there. In process of time the earth cracks open, and a stem puts forth and bears fruit, and in that fruit is found the principle of identity. There is no sameness of form perceptible in a grain of Indian corn and the plant produced from it standing in the field in the month of June. Place them side by side, and one unacquainted with the grain and the plant, and the relation of grains to plants, would see no resemblance; but in September, when the fruit is perfect in the ear, he will know, by comparing the naked grain of a former year with the grains upon the new plant, that this is the product of a similar grain. "So, also, the resurrection of the dead saints." The living soul dies, and "is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption, it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory, it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power, it is sown a *psychical* body, it is raised a *pneumatical* body."

Here we have two kinds of body, but related in so far that the one is produced from the other. The *psychical* body is the "naked grain," from which comes the *pneumatical* body. We have designated the bodies by the adjectives we find in the Greek text, where the bodies are treated of. *Psychical* comes from *psyche*, the Greek word for "soul," and *pneumatical* comes from *pneuma*, the Greek word for "spirit." If, then, we use the words *soul* and *spirit* adjectively, the one body may be correctly styled *soul-body*, and the other *spirit-body*.

Now, of the *soul-body*, Paul says, it is corruptible, dishonorable and weak, and of the *spirit-body*, that it is incorruptible, glorious, and powerful; and he also informs us that between the soul-body and the spirit-body is placed resurrection and transformation. The one is turned into the other in the twinkling of an eye. If the *soul-body* die and turn into dust four thousand years before resurrection, its dust must be formed into soul-body again, for it is soul-body, not dust, that is to be turned into spirit-body. "This *corruptible* must put on incorruption, and this *mortal* must put on immortality." Dust is neither corruptible nor mortal, but the *detritus* resulting from corruption when the process is finished. The subjects of resurrection come out of their graves *soul-bodies*, and beyond that many will not advance. Many resurrected soul-bodies will never be transformed into spirit-bodies, not being permitted to eat of the Tree of Life, which is then in the midst of the paradise of God"—Rev. ii. 7—on account of not having overcome the world by faith.—1 Jno. v. 4. Resurrected spirit-bodies, who have not walked worthy of their high vocation, but devoted themselves to the things of time and sense after baptism, will be expelled like the first Adam from the garden, that they may not eat and live in the Aion, while others of an opposite character, called "the blessed of the Father," will be transformed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, like Enoch and Elijah, by "the energy that subdues all things," that is, by the Spirit, whose action upon soul-bodies, in transforming them into spirit-bodies, is represented in the symbolical expression, "eating of the Tree of Life."—Phil. iii. 21.

This corruptible, dishonorable and weak body, termed by Paul a soul-body, is the "living soul" described by Moses in Genesis. "There is," says Paul, "a *psychical*, or soul, body, and there is a *pneumatical*, or spirit, body." In the Common Version, *psychical* is rendered "natural," and *pneumatical* is expressed by "spiritual." But *natural* does not define *psychical*, being the translation of *φυσικον*, *physical*, and not of *ψυχικον*,

psychical, which imports that which exists by breathing. This is Paul's soul-body—a body that exists by breathing. Now, says he, "There is such a body." He states this as a proposition to be proved by Scripture, and by the only Scriptures of appeal at that time—the Scriptures of the Prophets. Being asked, then, for the proof of such a body's existence, he replies by reference to Moses, saying, "And so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made into a living soul." This is his scripture proof that there is a soul-body, which is equivalent to saying that "living soul" and "soul-body" are the same.

Pneumatical body"—a spirit-body. He then points to the last Adam as an example of it, saying, "The last Adam was made into a life imparting spirit." Here are Adam the first and Adam the second, the former the figure of the latter; the one an example of a soul-body, the other, being resurrected, the pattern of a spirit-body. These two are as the naked grain and the plant, and in the divine arrangement, it is as necessary that the soul-body precede the spirit-body as that seed should be sown before a crop can be produced. The earthy breathing body first, then the body which results from the soul-body being changed into spirit by the spirit from heaven. Thus, "the second man is the Lord from, or out of, heaven;" that is, Jehovah, the Spirit from heaven, changed the resurrected Jesus into spirit-body, and he became "the heavenly," in contrast to "the earthy," who, instead of being changed into spirit, returned into the dust whence he came. "Like the earthy man," says Paul, "so are earthy men, and like the heavenly man so also heavenly men. And as we have borne the image of the earthy man, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly man."

"The last Adam was made into a life-imparting spirit." This fact is Paul's proof that there is a pneumatical, or spirit-body. Such a conversion of the resurrected soul-body of Jesus was just as necessary to the future development of incorruptible or deathless souls, or spirit-bodies, as the conversion of dust into soul-body, by the Spirit becoming flesh in the formation of the first Adam, was to the development of mortal souls. The principle of soul-development and the principle of spirit-development are diverse, but the maker is the same. "The maker of all things is God." Human soul-bodies all come from the substance of the first Adam by procreative agency, while spirit-bodies come from the substance of the second Adam, "the Lord, the Spirit," by creation, that same second-Adam spirit commingling with the mortal dust of the saints, and creat-

ing, or forming, it into spirit-bodies in his own image and in his own likeness; so that, as soul-bodies, they are "his brethren," all having borne the image of their earthly father; and as spirit-bodies, they are "the children which God has given him."—Ps. xxii. 22, 25; Isa. viii. 18; Heb. ii. 12-18; "being all members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones;" first by faith, and afterwards by creation of the Spirit through him.—Eph. v. 30; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Rom. viii. 11.

It will be seen, then, from this, that the species of soul styled "man," stands related to two images, and to two only—first, to the *living-soul image*, and afterwards to the *spirit-body image*. There is no third or intermediate image between these two, any more than there is an intermediate something between a seed-corn in the ground and the corn-plant in the field. The order is not first seed-corn in the ground, next ghost of seed-corn in the air, and, afterwards reunited seed-corn ghost with seed-corn body for the manifestation of seed-corn plant in the field. Such a theory as this would split all farming sides with agricultural laughter! But it is no more absurd than the heathen dogma of the clergy that between the earthy image of the first Adam, and the heavenly image of the second, there is an *intermediate image*, styled by the "wisdom of the world," an *incorporeal immortal soul*! But though all the heathen of the beast's names of blasphemy are deeply enamored of this *no-body image*, and rarely speak of it apart from a holy drawl, not easy to express in type, Paul makes not the least allusion to it. We never find him writing about the image of the *immortal soul*! This holy guttural, so constantly drawled forth from throats of clerical grimace, receives not the least attention from the apostle in his disquisition upon mortal and immortal images, in his letter to the immersed image-bearers in Corinth and elsewhere. He does not say to them, "As we have borne the image of the earthy man, we shall also bear the image of the ghost man, and then the image of the heavenly man." The earthy and the heavenly man he knew; but who is this *tertium quid*, this man between the earthy and the heavenly? Who has ever seen him? The earthy and heavenly men have each a history, but where is the history of

THE GHOST-MAN?

READ Plato, read Cicero, read the Mythology of the Greeks, read the saviourology of Rome, and read the demonology and psychology of Protestant colleges and divinity schools; and in all these readings you will find all that is knowable of the Ghost-Man, whose image is borne by deceivers and de-

ceived! He is the fictitious Jesus of the Apostacy; the "*other Jesus*," the clergy then just coming into existence, preached contrary to the Jesus preached of Paul—a Jesus, that has thrown the Lord Jesus Christ for the present, totally into the shade.—2 Cor. xi. 4. This is the kind of allusion we find in the New Testament to the Ghost-Man of Christendom; an allusion, too, which repudiates him.

We repeat, this Ghost-Man is the clerical Jesus, to which all their disciples expect to be conformed. Their doctrine concerning him may be resolved into the following points; they affirm,

1. That "when Jesus assumed our nature, he was made flesh. *This, however, was not sinful flesh*; it was nothing more than the likeness of sinful flesh; and therefore, of course, some other flesh; it was essentially and immaculately pure and undefiled;

2. That he was not capable of sinning;

3. That in dying on the cross, he did not offer up a sacrifice for himself;

4. That he suffered as a substitute for the ungodly; and that in suffering, the hate and wrath of God against sinners, fell upon him.

5. That when buried, his body was in the tomb till the third day; and that during the interval between death and resurrection, his "*immortal soul*," which was the real Jesus, went to Paradise, and also into Hell, where he preached the Gospel to "spirits in prison!!!"

6. That his body in the tomb was essentially incorruptible;

7. That he will never come to the Holy Land, there to reside among the Jews; and sitting upon David's throne, to reign king over them and all other nations; but that, on the contrary, he will come to earth, at what they call "the last day," and in one general conflagration, sublimate the globe and all upon it, into gaseous invisibility.

These seven particulars define the Ghost-Man of Christendom, whom the clergy worship as *their Lord and Christ*, and preach as the redeemer of the "*immortal souls*" of all men, women, and children, babes and sucklings, who submit, and are submitted to, the influences of the sort of Christianity by which they have their wealth and honor in and from the world. They teach their most credulous disciples, that as they have borne the image of the earthy man, they shall, at their decease, bear the image of the Immortal Ghost, that went with the thief to Paradise, and preached to spirits in hell-prison, before resurrection. How rare it is to hear the clergy urge upon the

people's attention post-resurrectional realities. Old wives' fables about incorporeal immortal souls of mothers revelling in extatic joys with their deified little ones represented on pictures as winged heads, and similar foolishness, is the burden of their prophesyings. Skyana is their kingdom of heaven; and this they people with a heterogeneous cloud of ghosts, which have no real existence beyond the horizon of the fleshly imagination of the ghostly soul-traders of the world.

But, the Second Adam was never a ghost. He was once a living soul, or soul-body, as we; but such no longer: he is now, says Paul, a spirit-body, or life-imparting spirit. "I am," said Jesus, speaking by the Spirit, "the Way, the Truth, the Resurrection, and the Life." "He brought life and incorruptibility to light through the Gospel;" and that Gospel he and his apostles preached, says nothing about immortalsoulism. On the contrary, he taught that the way to God's kingdom and glory, is to follow in the steps of his faith and obedience; to believe the truth as it is in him; to be resurrected by him; and to live by him. When he preached the Gospel of life and incorruptibility he used to say, "He who believes into the Son hath aionian life," in the sense of "*having a right to it*."—Rev. xxii. 14; Jno. iii. 36. And again, "He that understands my word, and believes him that sent me, hath aionian life, and comes not into condemnation, but hath passed out of death unto life." "Verily the hour comes, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." "They shall come forth from their graves; they that have practised good things, for a resurrection of life; but they who have committed evil deeds, for a resurrection of judgement."—Jno. v. 24–29. This doctrine indicates, that a right must first be obtained to the life of Messiah's Aion; that it is obtainable by the obedience of an enlightened faith; that in obeying, a constitutional transfer of the believer ensues, by which he comes under a sentence to life; that the practice in the present life of what God shall deem good things, will entitle to the realization of the acquired right; that the dead are in no sense alive till they hear the Son's voice calling them; for "they that hear shall live;" that the dead who are then to live, whether good or bad, are not to come from the skies, but from their graves; and that reward for good, and punishment for evil, is after resurrection.

Now, according to the Gospel of life and incorruptibility Jesus preached, it is not for every soul-body of Adam's race that immortality is provided; but only for an election therefrom. Jesus teaches this in saying,

that "This is the Father's will who hath sent me, that *all that he hath given to me*, I should not lose of it, but should raise it up at the last day. And this is the will of him who sent me, that *every one comprehending the Son, and believing into him*, may have the life of the Aion; and I will raise him up at the last day." And, "No one is able to come to me unless the Father who sent me, draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the propiets, And *they (who shall be raised up) shall be all taught of God*. Every one, therefore, having heard from the Father, and learned, comes to me." "I am the living bread which descended out of the heaven; if any one eat of this bread, he shall live in the Aion; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Verily I say to you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, *ye have not life in yourselves*. He eating of me the flesh, and drinking of me the blood, has the life of the Aion; and I will raise him up at the last day. He eating of me the flesh, and drinking of me the blood, *dwells in me and I in him*;" that is, "by faith."—Eph. iii. 17. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live through the Father; he also eating me, even he shall live through me. He that eateth this bread shall live in the Aion."—John vi.

Such doctrine as this is utterly subversive of the dogma which assigns to every son of Adam an immortal soul as an hereditary element of his nature. Jesus taught his contemporaries that "they had not life in them;" and that to obtain it, they must feed upon him. But had our clerics been present, they would have denied it; and have said, "Rabbi," thou teachest not the truth; for all by nature have immortality in them; so that whether they feed on you or not, they will live for ever!" Jesus would, probably, have replied to them, "No other thing than a denial of my words is to be expected from you, the children of the serpent, and not of God. Ye speak the sentiment of your father, who said, 'Ye shall not surely die.' But I say unto you, he that is of God heareth God's words; but ye regard them not; because ye are not of God. Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto *them* the life of the Aion, and they shall not perish in the Aion."

"But, Rabbi," they would have replied, "thou must be mistaken. Immortality in the Aion thou speakest of, cannot possibly be dependent upon an understanding and belief of the words of God as thou expoundest them; for multitudes of pious souls

whom we have cured, are now in glory, singing God's praise with cherubim and seraphim before the throne; who, before they left the church below, mounting and flying as vital sparks of heavenly flame, and soaring on angel's wings to the church triumphant above, knew nothing at all of God's words and thine expositions. We believe, that 'the divine Plato,' and his preceptor Socrates, with many sincere heathens, who were lovers of their wisdom, are now in heaven among the blest; and they had no acquaintance with the words of God, and never ate thy flesh nor drank thy blood, without which thou sayest, *no man* has life in him, or can see the life of thine Aion."

To this Jesus would, doubtless, have replied, "It is true of you, that ye draw nigh to God with your profane mouths, and honor him with your treacherous lips; but your heart is far from him: but in vain do ye worship him, ye clergy, teaching for doctrines the precepts and traditions of the heathen. I am from God, and speak his words even the Gospel of life and incorruptibility in the kingdom of the Aion. I declare th: 'he who believeth not into the Son *shc not see life*.' 'The words that I speak at spirit, and are life;' and to obtain glory, honor, life, and incorruptibility in my kingdom, they must be intelligently believed and obeyed. But, as I told you before, ye are not of my sheep, and therefore cannot believe. Ye are of the flesh, and think and speak according to its suggestions. But I tell you, that 'the flesh profits nothing.' I give the life of the Aion to my sheep, because they believe my words and do my Father's will. But ye do neither; and shall therefore have your portion with the heathen, whose foolishness is your delight."

Here, then, is a great truth. *They who attain to the life and incorruptibility of Messiah's Aion, are those who are taught of God*. This is the doctrine of the Spirit by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Jesus.—Isa. liv. 11-13; Jer. xxxi. 33; John vi. 44, 45. The converse of this is that, *They who are not taught of God shall not attain to the life and incorruptibility of Messiah's Day*. If either of these propositions be admitted, the other is necessarily true. How important, then, to know assuredly what it is to be taught of God, that we may place ourselves under the teaching; that we may learn of the Father the words of Aionian Life, that we may understand, believe, and do, and live in Messiah's Aion, and in that beyond. "Men are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them."—Eph. iv. 18. What a damning thing, then, is ignorance of the words of life and incorruptibility. It consigns men to death and corruption.

Let us, therefore, eschew ignorance; and the teaching of all pretenders to godliness, who would keep us in ignorance of God's teaching; or who would discourage the broadest and fullest investigation of the Scriptures of truth. Of all serpents, beware of that poisonous viper who would turn you aside from Moses and the Prophets; for the New Testament writers highly commend them; and exhort us to "be mindful of the words spoken by them; and when we speak, to speak according to them."—1 Pet. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 2. He that would turn us aside from them is a Satan, and seeks to turn us from the light.

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." These are the words of the apostle of the circumcision. When Peter uttered them those oracles were to be found only in Moses and the prophets. They were the exhortation of the spirit through him, who had also highly commended those writings through Jesus, who came to "magnify the law and make it honorable."—Isai. xlii. 21. The application, then, of these words to the subject before us, is this "When thou, O man, undertakest to speak of immortality, or of the Gospel of life and incorruptibility, see that thou speakest according to the testimony of Moses and the prophets." We have seen that Jesus, the greatest of all teachers, and his apostles did so, why then shouldst not thou? They all magnified the law and made it honorable; and when they put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, they confounded them out of the law.

Take an example: Jesus and the Sadducees for instance. Both parties admitted the authority of the law; Jesus only that of the prophets. In any dispute between them he must therefore confine himself to the testimony of the law. The Sadducees denied that there was "any" resurrection; which was consequently a denial of the doctrine of Jesus, who taught it, and declared that the resurrection power was in himself. In order, therefore, to put them to silence, he undertook to prove that Moses taught the restoration of life to the dead by resurrection. "That the dead are raised up," saith he, "Moses disclosed at the bush when he saith, 'Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob.'"—Exod. iii. 15. Luke quotes this statement of Jesus in the words of the Septuagint; which, however, he did not use, as the Jews to whom he preached did not understand Greek. He would quote the words of Moses in a tongue intelligible to his audience—the then modern Hebrew. He would say to them according to what is written in the ancient Hebrew—"WHO WAS, IS, SHALL BE, Gods of Abraham, Gods of

Isaac, and Gods of Jacob." The Angel of the Bush did not say, purely and simply, in behalf of Jehovah the Spirit, "I am the God of Abraham," etc.; but "I shall be the Gods." To have said "I am now" would have been to affirm that He is the God, or strength of the dead, who have no strength; but to say "I shall be" was to declare that the God-relation would be established with them at a future period when they would be living by him.

Both Moses and Jesus show, that the spirit did not mean to be understood that he was Abraham's God at the time of the Angel's interview with Moses at the bush. This is evident in regard to Moses, from the words זְכוֹר לְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֶיךָ *zeh-shēme lē-olām, this is my name for the Aion*; that is, "When the age exists my relation to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will be expressed by my name יְהוָה *Y' ho-ah*. אֵל *ah*, "was;" הוּא *ho* "is; and אֶעֱשֶׂה *ah-eh* "shall be." It was therefore a prophetic name, which required for its accomplishment the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from the dead. It taught that they were to be raised at the last day—at the Aion, Olam, or Cycle, to which the name belonged. Then, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, would be in the Kingdom of God with all the prophets; and the spirit, who styled himself אֱלֹהִים *EL-ŠHADDAI*, the strength of the Mighty Ones, 430 years before the exodus of Israel, would manifest himself in ELOHIM, or *Strong Ones*, that is, Gods who should be spirit, because born of the spirit. The "ONE SPIRIT," in plural manifestation, being aggregately "the Sons of God."—Rom. viii. 19. So that the Elohim or Gods of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in that day will be, "their seed," even Jesus and the saints.

"*Y' ho-ha-ah*, or *Yah*, is my name for the Age." So Moses testifies; and so Jesus expounded the name. "Θεός *is not of the dead ones*," said he—Θεός οὐκ ἐστὶ νεκρῶν. Here Θεός answers to אֱלֹהִים, *elohim*. Christ's proposition is that *Theos*, or *elohim*, being spirit or corporeal manifestation, they cannot be affirmed of names which have no living embodiment. Men die for want of spirit; as it is written, "If God gather to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust"—Job xxxiv. 17: and "Thou takest away their spirit, they die, and return to dust. Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created."—Psal. civ. 29. Now *theos* is affirmed of the spirit, which is life. John styles τὸ πνεῦμα *spirit* by whom all things were made, *THE LOGOS*; and "in the Logos was life;" hence in *theos* is life; because it is spirit. Therefore it is absurd to call the spirit, whose name is *Y' ho-ah*, "*Theos nek-*

rōn," God, or life-strength, of dead ones. It is a contradiction in terms—death and weakness being the negation of life and strength. "Theos" said Jesus, "is of living ones;" it is manifest, therefore, that as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are dead ones, and as *theos* is affirmable only of living ones, that these fathers must become living ones by resurrection that *theos* may be affirmed of them.

Such was the argument of Jesus in concert with the testimony of the faithful Moses by which he so triumphantly confounded the Sadducees, that he extorted the approbation of his enemies, some of whom were compelled to exclaim, "Master, thou hast spoken well!"

EDITOR.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS UNDER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

The Rebuilding of Babylon, and the Reign of the Latter-Day Assyrian therein, affirmed from the Prophets.

Isa. xiv. 1—4. "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob; and the people shall take them, and bring them to their place: and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and handmaids: and they shall take them captives whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors. And it shall come to pass in the day when the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from thy hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!"

This testimony proves that the overthrow of the king of Babylon and the destruction of his city, are events intimately connected with the future deliverance of Israel from all her enemies, and especially from her great oppressor, the Assyrian of the *latter days*. In the day Jehovah shall give the house of Israel rest, they are to take up this proverb, or, as the margin reads, "this taunting speech," and say, "How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" Now these triumphant exclamations of Israel must have reference to a King of Babylon and his city, both of whom had just then been overthrown. Therefore, before this prophecy can be accomplished, Babylon,

which hath so long been desolate, must be rebuilt, and a king reign therein who will fulfill what is written concerning the great latter-day enemy and oppressor of Israel.

But some one may say the prophet refers to some other city than Babylon, and the king prophesied of, although styled "King of Babylon," and "the Assyrian," cannot be *literally* either one or the other: the Prince of Rosh spoken of by Ezekiel, *reigning in Constantinople* with dominion over Assyria, is the King of Babylon, or Assyrian, of the latter days.

Now to my mind, this view of the Assyrian and his city, is not satisfactory; to me it savors too much of those figurative interpretations of prophecy which apply to the Church what is spoken of Zion, and to a Jerusalem in heaven what is to be accomplished in Jerusalem restored. Isaiah, and other prophets, speak of a yet future Assyrian King, the King of Babylon; now all the kings of Babylon of which the Bible or history make mention, reigned in Babylon for example, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus and Alexander: why, then, should we suppose that the *future* King of Babylon would be an exception? Is it because Babylonia is waste and desolate, and very unlikely to become the seat of such a vast and mighty dominion as the latter-day Assyrian's? Surely to those who expect that Jerusalem will yet be the metropolis of the world notwithstanding appearances are so much against this ever being the case, any argument based upon the improbability of Babylon being rebuilt and made the throne of the Assyrian's empire, can be but little regarded.

Probably what has led most students of prophecy astray in regard to the Assyrian being other than a literal king of Babylon, is the general belief that the prophecies containing the burden of Babylon have been fully accomplished, and that "she is now lying under an irrevocable doom of perpetual desolation."

Jeremiah was commanded to take a stone with his prophecy against Babylon attached to it, and to cast it into the midst of the Euphrates, and to say, "Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her."—Jer. li. The word of Jehovah spoken by Jeremiah, dooms Babylon to be desolate for ever, and precludes any possibility of her rising again from the evil to be brought upon her. But the desolation and evil which overtook Babylon no more fulfilled all that Isaiah and Jeremiah spoke against her, than the destruction of Sennacherib's army fulfilled what was spoken concerning the yet future treading

under foot of the Assyrian upon the mountains of Israel. In many particulars the word of Jehovah against Babylon has not yet been fully accomplished, and therefore must be accomplished in the future. In several places the *sudden*, as well as the complete destruction of Babylon is foretold; whereas history shows that her present state of desolation came *gradually* upon her. The sinking of a stone in the Euphrates was a symbol of her sudden and entire destruction. "Thus shall Babylon sink." "These two things shall come to thee in a moment, in one day, the loss of children and widowhood. . . Desolation shall come upon thee suddenly."—Isa. xlviii. 9, 11. "Babylon is suddenly fallen and destroyed."—Jer. Now, as I have said, history shows that no such sudden desolation and destruction have thus far overtaken Babylon. Dr. Keith says, "A succession of ages brought it gradually to the dust; . . . its greatness did not depart, nor was its glory obscured in a day. Cyrus was not its destroyer, but he sought by wise institutions to perpetuate its preeminence among the nations. He left it to his successor in all its strength and magnificence. Alexander the Great attempted to restore it to its former glory, and designed to make it the metropolis of a universal empire. . . . About the beginning of the Christian era, a small portion of it was inhabited, and the greater part was cultivated. It diminished as Seleucia increased, and the latter became the greater city. In the second century nothing but the walls remained. It became gradually a great desert."

These extracts from Dr. Keith prove that Babylon's desolation came upon her the very reverse of suddenly; therefore, in order that the word of Jehovah may be fulfilled, Babylon must be rebuilt.

That Babylon is to be the headquarters and stronghold of the latter-day Assyrian, is evident from Micah's prophecy, (v. 5, 6.) "And this man (the Bethlehem-born king of Israel) shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land: and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him seven shepherds and eight principal men. And they shall waste the land of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrance thereof: thus shall he deliver us from the Assyrian, when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our borders."

This testimony identifies the Assyrian with Assyria and Babylon, the deliverance of Israel from the Assyrian is to be effected by laying waste the land of Assyria, and the land of Nimrod, the beginning of whose kingdom was Babylon. See Gen. x. 10. If

the power of the enemy were not centered there—if Assyria was not the great stronghold of the oppressor, how could the laying waste of Assyria effect the deliverance of Israel? If Assyria were not the enemy's country, why lay it waste?

Again, does not the fact that it is then to be made waste necessitate its previous restoration? Lastly, if Constantinople is to be the throne of the Assyrian, and Assyria a comparatively unimportant part of his dominions, why in the deliverance of Israel is special vengeance wreaked upon the land of Assyria? It appears to me that if Assyria were not the guilty land, and the seat of the Assyrian's empire, it would not be singled out by Jehovah, and in so special a manner made to feel the effects of his wrath.

There can be no doubt that Isaiah and Micah refer to the same Assyrian, the same deliverance of Israel, and the same destruction of Israel's oppressor and his city. The proof then, I think, is complete, that when Israel, in fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy, shall say, "How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" they will have referred to the overthrow of the King of Babylon, and the sudden and complete destruction of his golden city, which shall have been accomplished in the laying waste of the land of Assyria, as foretold by Micah.

But there is further proof of Assyria being the seat of the King of Babylon, at the time of Israel's deliverance, inasmuch as the prophets speak of the Assyrian as the chief prison-house from whence Israel shall be delivered. Isa. xi. 11, 16, "And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, . . . and there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria and from Egypt." Isa. xxvii. 13. "And it shall come to pass in that day that the great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount of Jerusalem."

Hosea xi. 10, 11. "They (Israel) shall walk after the Lord: he shall roar like a lion: when he shall roar, then the children shall tremble from the west. They shall tremble as a bird out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria." Zech. x. 10, 11. "I will bring them again also out of the land of Egypt, and gather them out of Assyria; and I will bring them into the land of Gilead and Lebanon; and place shall not be found for them, and he shall

pass through the sea with affliction, and shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up; and the pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away."

All these passages are prophetic of the future deliverance of Israel from Assyria and Egypt, in effecting which "the pride of Assyria" is to be brought down. Is there not evidence here of the proud position Assyria has yet to occupy, as well as of the part she has to act in connection with Egypt—then part of the Assyrian's dominion, as the spoiler, oppressor, prison-house, and would-be exterminator of Israel in the latter day?

The reader cannot have failed to remark, how, in the above passages, Egypt is coupled with Assyria: from these and various other Scriptures, it appears that Egypt as well as Assyria will hold in captivity God's people; it is distinctly foretold (Deut. xxviii. 68; Hosca viii. 13; ix. 3), that Israel shall return to Egypt, and as Egypt is to be subjugated by the Assyrian, "the king of the north, (Dan. xi. 42,) the same spirit of bitter hostility to Israel will rule in both countries.

Then Isaiah's words (xlii. 22) will be descriptive of Jacob, "This is a people robbed and spoiled; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison-houses:" (in Assyria and Egypt, ready to perish) "they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore." In the next chapter, however, they are comforted with assurances of Jehovah's regard for them, and promises of his interference in their behalf. xliii. 6. "I will say to the north (Assyria) give up; and to the south (Egypt) keep not back." And farther on we read of the wonders Jehovah shall work in effecting their deliverance: and then Babylon comes in for her final judgement—see chapter 47—and "the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible (king of Babylon) delivered.—xlix. 25.

That the latter-day Assyrian should be a king of literal Babylon, seems necessary when we consider that Nebuchadnezzar's image is the symbol of his empire in its fullness. No empire can be the fulfillment of that symbol whose throne or head is not in Babylon—for it symbolizes a strictly Babylonish dominion. Nebuchadnezzar, the head of gold, reigned in and over Babylon: Cyrus added Media and Persia—the silver breast and arms—and reigned in Babylon; and is so styled in Scripture (Ezra v. 13; vi. 2) king of Babylon and king of Assyria: Alexander added the brazen belly and thighs,

and reigned in Babylon as the head of gold, ruling over the silver breast and arms and the brazen belly and thighs; but no king has yet appeared to add the kingdoms symbolized by the iron and clay of the image to Alexander's empire, and, like his predecessors, seat himself in Babylon. This the fourth king will do, and so earn for himself the title of the king of Babylon, and fulfil all that is written of the latter-day Assyrian, the king of the north, of the time of the end, the antichrist, that wicked, man of sin, and son of perdition.

Lastly, in the 4th chapter of Zechariah, there is a very remarkable prophecy of the concentration, as it were, of the wickedness of the earth, in the shape of a woman sitting in the midst of an ephah upon the mouth of which a talent of lead is cast, after which it is borne away by two women with wings like a stork, and the wind in their wings, to build it an house in the land of Shinar; where it is to be established, and set there upon her own base. The only interpretation I have seen of this prophecy is by a Mr. Strange, author of *The Light of Prophecy*—a work to which I am indebted for most of the ideas and arguments contained in this article. He regards it as a prophecy of the rebuilding of Babylon. I will give a brief sketch of his interpretation. An "ephah" (he says) is a Jewish measure. The woman who sat therein is the personification of wickedness. "This is wickedness," it is said of her. And she embodies the evil of the whole earth. "This is her resemblance," it is declared, "through all the earth." Here are exactly the characteristics of the great whore, "having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication," out of which "the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk;" "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

This figure is carried to the land of Shinar, the very site of Babylon, and there she has an habitation built for her upon a spot described as "her own base." The city, then, is to be reconstructed upon foundations that are *her own*, and here the mounds, the ruins of her former grandeur, afford the means for the accomplishment of the fact predicted of her. She may be built upon them. Mr. Layard shows that the mounds of Assyria are thus very commonly built upon. The woman in the ephah being the type of a nation, the two women who bear the ephah, it may be concluded, must likewise indicate nations. We are to be led then to expect that there will be a combination of two powers who will undertake together to build the city. They will do it with celerity, as is indicated by their having the

wings of a stork (a bird of swift flight), and the wind in their wings. They further bear the ephah between the earth and the heaven. Considering that it is wickedness that is to be set up, and this in the renovation of the doomed and desolate Babylon, their action, we may conclude, will be with a settled purpose of opposition to the will and workings of God; and this corresponds with that of the first builders of Babylon, who wished to construct a city with a tower whose top might reach unto heaven,—a fitting habitation for him who is to say in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. . . . I will ascend above the heights of the clouds: I will be like the Most High." Isa. xiv. 13, 14. The elevation of the ephah above the earth may betoken this fixture of impiousness. Were any powerful civilized nations to coalesce together for the restoration of Babylon, and the realization of her abounding means of wealth, the results would doubtless be rapid and astonishing.

The prophecy, as has been pointed out, indicates that it will be by foreign interposition that she will be reestablished upon her own base in the land of Shinar; and that with celerity, when the action is once commenced. Once so encouraged and assisted *Babylon might soon become a vast emporium of eastern trade*, and concentrate within herself the wealth and the power of the adjacent countries, and thus be brought to occupy the position from which prophecy demonstrates she is in the latter days, to be thrown down.

Mr. Strange's work was published in 1852: since then how much has happened to confirm his views. In the *Expositor* of Jan. 15th, there is an article on Palestine, which contains the following most striking passage: alluding to the *railroad* about being constructed from a port on the Mediterranean to the river Euphrates, the writer remarks, "In this age of steam and telegraphs the construction of a road of a few hundred miles in extent does not create any surprise, scarcely a passing remark; but the idea of a *snorting locomotive darting by the ruins of Babylon*, of the shrill whistle being heard among the oldest monuments of antiquity, and *ticket stations erected on the plains of Shinar*, give a peculiar interest to this enterprise, apart from its importance as a new avenue for commercial industry and the spread of Christian civilization."

Viewing this enterprise in connection with the prophecies concerning Babylon and Assyria, it certainly is of surpassing interest. That railroad is evidently destined to become the highway of the commerce and

travel of the East; as a natural result of which cities and towns will quickly arise at the points on the Mediterranean and Euphrates at which it terminates; and as the site of ancient Babylon is admirably situated for commercial purposes, and the elements of her former greatness—her climate, her soil, and her waters—still exist, according to the accounts of recent travelers; in a very few years may Babylon reappear in all its ancient glory and magnificence. If Nebuchadnezzar could say, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built"—what may not be accomplished in the same way by an individual possessed of the power, ambition, and resources of antichrist, its future king, and would-be-God of the whole earth?

J. R. LITHGOW.

Halifax, N. S.

Remarks on the Above.

1. We transfer the above from the pages of "*The Expositor*" at Bro. Lithgow's request.

2. We agree with him, that Isaiah's and Jeremiah's prophecies concerning "the King of Babylon and his city" were not fully accomplished on the dethronement of Belshazzar, and the superinduction of the existing desolation of the seat of his government. Nevertheless, we cannot admit his conclusion that, "therefore Babylon which has been so long desolate, must be rebuilt."

3. "Assyrian King" and "King of Babylon," he uses synonymously; as evinced by the words "Isaiah and other prophets speak of a yet future Assyrian King, the King of Babylon." To this we do not object. But he continues, "now all the kings of Babylon, of which the Bible or history make mention, reigned in Babylon." This we cannot admit. It is, however, a main pillar, if not the Jachin of his argument; for, he inquires, "Why, then, should we suppose that the *future King of Babylon* would be an exception." See No. 7.

4. We agree with him, that no argument against the fulfillment of a plain declaration of Scripture based upon improbabilities deduced from present conditions, is worthy of any regard.

5. We admit that the existing desolation of the *collection of houses, termed Babylon*, was not "suddenly," "in a moment, in one day," but the work of ages after Belshazzar's fall. But, we cannot admit, that because a sudden catastrophe was predicted, Babylon must reappear in architectural being, splendor, or proportions. If "Babylon" be used prophetically in the sense only of an enclosure of houses on the banks of the Euphra-

tes, (which, however, is not the case, nor even historically, Ezra vii. 16; Dan., iv. 29, where it stands for "province" and kingdom,) the argument would assume the aspect given to it by our highly esteemed correspondent. But this has not been shown; therefore to us the conclusion is inadmissible.

6. We admit that Assyria Propria, and also the land of Shinar, will be included in the latter day dominions of Israel's and Judah's enemy, and that Babylon, but not Babylon alone, but "Erech, and Accad, and Calneh" also, were "the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom:" we do not, however, therefore conclude, that Erech, Accad, and Calneh, will be rebuilt. If this rebuilding be not contained in the premises based on Micah v. 5, 6, we do not see how that of Babylon can be discovered there.

7. The territorial dimensions of Britain compared with its empire are very insignificant; yet it supplies the name of the dominion; as, the British empire unshadowed by a setting sun. We admit that Assyria proper is as dimensionally "unimportant;" but this is no reason for restricting the term "Assyria" to the province. The name designates a dominion also, which in the time of Darius ("King of Assyria" and "King of Persia," two titles of one and the same monarch, who, as his successors, reigned not in Babylon, but in Shushan in the province of Elam by Ulai, (and see Ezra iv. 24; vi. 22; Neh., i. 1; ii. 1: Dan. viii. 2.) extended "from India to Ethiopia, a hundred and twenty-seven provinces"—Esther i., 1.

8. "Land," as representative of Power upon the land, is guilty of violence against the Israel and Judah of antiquity. This is unquestionable. But we do not agree that it is "singled out." The countries of the Ten Horns of the Latter Day Beast are all contemporarily visited in vengeance with the Assyrian, as the Toes of his dominion. The old Assyrian oppressed and destroyed the Kingdom of David; his Toes of the West in all their history, the Heirs of that kingdom to be restored.

9. If, as our brother saith, "Assyria be the seat of the King of Babylon," then the Babylon in which Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar lived and died, will not be his throne; and need not consequently to be rebuilt for that purpose. The collection of houses, called Babylon was in "the land of Shinar," and not in Assyria Proper; for of Nimrod it is said, בְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ הָיְתָא אֲסַבּוּר, min-häärétz hähi yätza Assbur, "out of that land (Shinar) he went (to) Assyria," and builded Nineveh. If then, the future king of Babylon's seat be Assyria, we might expect rather Nineveh to be rebuilt than Baby-

lon; and Mr. Layard might pass for his fore-runner and pioncer. But we know our valued correspondent is far from such romance as that.

10. Assyria and Egypt proper are antagonists in part of the Latter Days; but the latter is conquered by the former just before Messiah appears. See Dan. xi. 42, 43. The Jews in Egypt, because of its subjugation by the Assyrian King of the North, are "the outcasts in the land of Egypt" oppressed by that power in common with their brethren "ready to perish in the land of Assyria." Previous to the conquest they are protected in Egypt, as at this day.

11. We admit that "no empire can be the fulfillment of the Nebuchadnezzar-Image symbol, whose throne or head is not in Babylon;" but then, there is a very important question to be answered before we can admit the conclusion, "therefore Babylon must be rebuilt upon the banks of Euphrates." It is this: must the throne be in Babylon-city, Babylon-province, or in Babylon-dominion? We reply, in the last; our worth correspondent says "No; in the first"—t which we cannot agree.

12. To interpret symbolical prophecy literally, as Mr. Strange has done with the woman in the ephah, is to reduce it to an absurdity. The woman in the ephah is "the wisdom of God in a mystery;" which mystery is expounded in the Seventh trumpet and the things pertaining to it—Rev. x. 7.; 1 Cor. ii. 7. The exposition of "the mystery," or "enigma" (1 Cor. xiii. 12, βλεπομεν αρτι δι' εσοπτρου εν αινιγματι "we see at present by a mirror in an enigma") does not consist in converting its terms into identical propositions. This expounds nothing; but occupies time and space uselessly in affirming that Aleph is Alpha; and Alpha is A; and A is Aleph; and therefore, A is Alpha; which all amounts to this, that A is A, or the thing is what it is! The woman, the ephah, the land of Shinar, &c., are *symbolical* things; that is, things representing something *analogous*, but *not identical* with themselves. "The land of Shinar" is representative of something having resemblance to it, in some of its historical conditions. This resemblance is the mystery, or enigma, to be solved, which Mr. Strange has yet to get an iukling of.

April 30, 1857.

EDITOR.

"I fill heaven and Earth, saith I SHALL BE." Jer. xxiii. 24.

Theopolitical.

A Curious Occurrence.

"I WILL REMEMBER THE LAND." *Lev. xxvi. 42*

The Ottoman Government has issued an important decree relative to the colonization of the waste lands in Turkey, by which decree foreigners are to be enabled to acquire property in those lands.

In reference to this the *London Leader* says, "To turn from the West to the Easternmost part of Europe we have a very curious occurrence—the issue of a notification by the Turkish Government, of conditions on which European foreigners shall be allowed to colonize the provinces of the Ottoman Empire, more especially Roumelia. The conditions are advantageous. The emigrant will require a capital of nearly £60; but with that he will have many of the advantages of a new country with the opportunity of an old. What a seed to sow in that Mussulman-Christian Empire!"

Indirectly, this decree invites the Jews to colonize the Holy Land; for multitudes of them are European; and Palestine is pre-eminently a Turkish province, abounding in waste lands. Will they not avail themselves of it; and settle themselves there to some extent, forming "unwalled villages," dwelling confidently, and abounding in cattle and goods in the midst of the land? We believe they will; and that this emigration-movement eastward is the inauguration of a prosperity which will be of rapid growth, but brief in its continuance. It will be perfected by the time that the Prince of the Rosh has become the "Gog of the land of Magog." This is Russia's mission before her final move against the East. We may now see why Turkey has been providentially sustained by the Anglo-French alliance. Had Russia devoured her in the first stage of the Eastern Question, the country would have been closed against the commercial and agricultural enterprise of the West; and the work of "bringing back the land from the sword, and gathering out of many people," (*Ezek. xxxviii. 9.*) would have been prevented. But Jehovah hath said in effect to Gog, "Stand off till I colonize my land. I will people it, and prosper it; and then thou shalt rush and overflow the empire; and stand upon my mountains, where thou shalt fall and be broken to pieces!" Turkish policy, inspired by British enterprise, is working out the result demanded by prophecy too plainly to be mistaken by him who is observant of the times. Emigration to the waste lands of Turkey is restoration for Palestine. Is that no sign of the times, in

view of Jehovah's declaration, "I will remember the land!" Let the reader "search and see!"

May, 1, 1857.

EDITOR.

Analecra Epistolaria.

Thoughts of the Flesh.

*Dear Father:**—I have been intending to write to you for some time, but find very little leisure, and so procrastinate. This is a brisk business place, and I think very pleasant. I am teaching in the Com. College here, besides my own pupils, &c., which keeps me pretty busy. We have been rather short of reading matter of late, when we had time for reading (which is not often); but meeting with the debate between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Watt, last Sunday, we read it and were much interested.

I wish, (with much diffidence, having read so little) to suggest a few ideas which have seemed very much to conflict with Dr. Thomas' views, as well as with those of all the churches. What I was going to say was about this: 1st. God is omniscient, he sees the end from the beginning. 2nd. He is omnipotent, has everything according to his own will, for surely nothing can be contrary thereto. 3d. "He hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked."

The creation, a work so vast, so glorious, so beyond all human comprehension, *great*, (and by himself pronounced "*good*") must have had an object, which object must have been *commensurate* with the work and *consistent* with the Creator's attributes—some glorious consummation worthy of so vast a plan. Did he then create a man and pronounce him good which man he knew would be tempted, and *would yield to the very first temptation*, (than which not the most depraved offspring of the most depraved parents could possibly do more or worse), knowing, also, that the inevitable result would be the "*death*" of almost (comparatively speaking) all the human race, millions of millions utterly destroyed: what a melancholy spectacle for a Being who hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked, who is all love, who has created man as he is. And in what respect was the *man*—the full grown intellect, of sound judgement, and enjoying the privilege of communion with his Maker, to be considered *good*, if he yields to the *first temptation*, a *single* one; for the exhibition of a much less degree of frailty in a little inexperienced child, we hear them

* Written to Bro. Christian, of St Charles Ill., by his son-in-law, and forwarded to us for publication and remark.—EDITOR.

pronounced "naturally depraved." Now all this transpired according to God's will, or it did not transpire at all. The Creator must have had a plan, and in that plan no details were omitted; our own bodies are sufficient evidence of that, if everything else did not testify to the same thing. This dreadful event, then, and the state of things consequent upon it, were a part of the plan, or we are altogether deluded in believing that the result is so fatal. If, on the contrary, the plan were the glorious one of a race created for eternal life and happiness, such a plan, conceived by such a being could not be frustrated. This may be sophistry, but if so I cannot distinguish: and furthermore, I wish to be understood rather as asking than asserting about these things. I feel that these things must be worthy of attention, and have always felt so, but have neglected for months and years to write to you as I meant always to do soon. When I did write, I never had time for anything but immediate affairs, and so postponed other subjects.

With much respect to all, I remain

Yours, Sincerely,

W. H. PRATT.

Barr's Commercial College,
DAVENPORT, IOWA, March, 1857.

Flesh of itself Incompetent to Think aright on things Divine.

When "the flesh," having read very little, as remarked by Mr. Pratt, and therefore unenlightened on the ideas and purposes of God, undertakes to speculate upon His character, attributes, and plans, it is sure to think contrary to Scripture and to the truth. If, of itself, the flesh could think aright on divine things, Revelation would have been unnecessary, and the Bible a work of supererogation. But as "to err is" essentially "human," a revelation from God was indispensable, if it were deemed desirable for man to know the origin, reason, and ultimate, of his surroundings; as well as God, the beginning and end of all things.

The "thinking of the Flesh" and the "thinking of the Spirit," are thinkings as diametrically opposite as light and darkness, truth and error. The thinking of the flesh is illustrated by the dogmas of Confucius, Zoroaster, Plato, the Jewish Rabbis, Mohammed, and the founders and clergies of the Catholic and Protestant sects of Christendom; while to these has ever been opposed the thinking of the Spirit, whose mind hath been by himself made known through the instruction and testimony of the Scriptures. The flesh loves its own thoughts, as most people love their own bantlings;

therefore it is, that disciples in the School of the Flesh (styled by its patrons, curiously enough, "the School of Christ") are zealous for those who teach them. Referring to certain Doctors of Divinity in the School of the Flesh the apostle saith, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; they are of the World: therefore they speak from the world; and the world heareth them:" in other words, the world, constituted of flesh, without understanding of the Scriptures, is error incarnate; doctors or teachers of divinity, who are of that world, speak under the inspiration of error; and, as "the world loves its own," therefore it hears them; and has consequently, no ears to hear what the Spirit saith to the Ecclesias." "The voice of the people is the voice of God;" and "what everybody says is true, must be true," are the world's maxims; but as false as the world itself. Try the times of Noah, Abraham, Moses, the Prophets, Jesus and of the Apostles, by these rules, and their falseness is strikingly apparent; for those witnesses, of "whom the world was not worthy," all testify that its "everybody" is corrupt, lying, apostate, and the enemy of God.

The World! What is the value of the world's opinions on divine things? Literally nothing; yea, worse than nothing—they are positively pestilential; and sedulously to be avoided by all who would attain to the knowledge of the truth. What can a man know of mathematics or chemistry who has not studied the principles of those sciences? Should such a person by any possibility be found in the seat of Euclid, Newton, Davy, Dalton, or Faraday, would he not be the scorn and derision of all intelligent and skilful mathematicians and chemists? Such is the world for wisdom in the things of God, in the estimation of "scribes instructed for the kingdom of the heavens." Mankind are condemned to dig for knowledge as for hid treasure if they would acquire it. This is a law to which there are only rare exceptions, as it may please God. Even his own prophets had to dig in the fields of one another for treasure not specially, or personally, revealed by the Spirit. Witness the case of Daniel's study of Jeremiah, Dan. ix. 2. The world's history shows this to be a law in all departments of its literature, science, and philosophy. All its "great lights" have been "hard students." None of them have become such by the wishing-process. A man's wishing that he were wise, though an admission that he is a fool, and therefore a first step to wisdom, never made a wise man yet. *Ex nihilo nihil fit.* Nothing comes from nothing, not even from wishing unaccompanied by intellectual

or corporeal activity. How absurd then, to regard the opinions of the world concerning God and his truth as any thing more than mere folly and conceit! The only depository of knowledge respecting these (excepting His *αἰδιος* eternal power and Deity, which are manifest from his works) is the Scripture; and into that mine mankind do not dig. *Ἐρευνητε τας γραφας* — "Search the Scriptures," Jesus; or, "Ye do search the Scriptures" — for the Greek will admit of either rendering. Either way he both commands and approves the practice; and condemns men as "fools" who do not believe "all" they teach. Now the Scriptures to which he referred were those alone extant when he uttered the words — namely, Moses and the Prophets — Jno. v. 39-44; Luke xxiv. 25-27, 32, 44. How much does the world — nay, how much do "the Churches" and their clergy, the Synagogues and their Rabbis even — for they are "of the world," study these writings? It is notorious, that the understanding of Moses and the Prophets is deemed unnecessary as a qualification for membership in church or synagogue; or for the "sacred desk" of either. Men whose heads are as empty of their testimonies as the shell of a rotten nut, are the wise and godly men of Rabbinical and Gentile "orthodoxy." But Jesus denounces them as "fools;" because he laid it down as a first principle of genuine faith in him, that a man believe their writings, saying, "If ye do not give credence to the writings of Moses, how can ye believe my words!" The priests, scribes, and lawyers of his day did search the Scriptures, "because they thought by them to obtain life in the Age;" but they did not give credence to what Moses and the Prophets say *apart from the gloss they put on their sayings by their traditions*. This was one of the sins that ruined that generation — a making void of the word of God by their traditions. Jesus charged this home upon them, and they could not, and dared not, deny it. They "erred, not knowing the Scriptures" of Moses and the Prophets; a source of error and ruin to every people against whom the same accusation can be proved.

Men, then, whether we call them individuals or the world, cannot know what the Scriptures teach *unless they study them apart from tradition*. This is contrary to their practice. Their custom is, to indoctrinate the human mind with tradition from the cradle to maturity. This is called "training up a child in the way he should go, that when he is old he may not depart from it." It ought to be styled, *the putting the mind in chains stronger than iron*. After they have handcuffed and riveted the intellect, they put the Bible into their hands with eulogy,

and saying, "Read it, for the Bible is our religion!" They all tell their disciples this, whether clergyman or rabbi; and as their scholars are trained in a sort of awful reverence for the men of sanctimony and the "holy tone," they are too much the creatures of implicit faith, to dispute the fact. Believing "as they happen to be led," the one a Rabbinist, the other a papist; the third an Episcopalian-Trinitarian, the fourth a Congregational-Unitarian; the fifth a Baby-Sprinkler, the sixth, a Trine-Immersionist; and the seventh, ignoring almost everything but "the light within," a broad brim, and the holy drab — each disciple of these contradictory "faiths" professes to find his own particular creed there, whatever may become of the rest! Were this really the case, what an absurd and ridiculous book the Bible would be! But according to the present system, there is no alternative between the belief of folly or absolute infidelity. So long as Tradition rules the mind of man, the Bible will be a nose of wax, pinched and twisted into every form the most agreeable to him that wears it. A captive in the chains of tradition, in reading the Bible, sees nothing but his slave-driver there. If he discern a free ranging thought in the book forming no link of his own chain, he accounts it as nothing, or as having a spiritual import in harmony with the notions he entertains. But the truth is, Bible is not the religion of such; nor do they believe it *apart from their traditions*, with which it wages destructible and uncompromising war. It ignores them all, except as "damnable heresies," "blasphemies," and perversions of the truth. It does not teach the sentiments of Christendom, with which it has as little sympathy, as Moses and the Prophets have with Modern Judaism; which is as fleshly or heathen in its origin as the Gentilisms to which it is nationally opposed.

The doctrine of Scripture, then, approved by enlightened reason, is this, that in relation to divine things, *all men are fools, who are ignorant of the teaching of the sacred writings; and still fools, if knowing what they teach, they do not believe it all*. Hence the ancient world, whose "wisdom" was the philosophy of the Greeks, and the tradition of the "wise men" and "scribes" of Judah, was a world of fools. That branch of it in which the Sanhedrists rejoiced caused their disciples to draw near to Jehovah with their mouth, and to honor him with their lips, while their heart was removed far from him; for "their fear towards him is taught by the precept of men" — Isai. xxix. 13. But it was a false wisdom, as false as that of the Greeks. So that in the next verse of the prophet we find a prediction declarative of its overthrow —

"The wisdom of the wise ones shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent ones shall be hid." Nothing is more evident than the accomplishment of this since the manifestation of the "*marvelous work and the wonder*" of which the New Testament is the record. By that "work and wonder" God converted their wisdom into folly, and took them in their own craftiness. If nothing more can be said for the Jewish element of the world's wisdom, what can be said for the Greek? The apostles proclaimed it all to be mere foolishness. "Let no man deceive himself," said they; "if any one among you think that he is wise in this Aion, let him become a fool, that he may become wise: for the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written in the Psalms, 'Jehovah knows the thoughts of the wise are vain.'" Therefore let no one glory in men. That world by its wisdom knew not God, nor the voices of the prophets, nor the wisdom of God in the mystery, ordained before the times of the Aions, and revealed in the apostolic preaching in strict accordance with the prophetic scriptures. Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. i. 18.—ii: iii. 18-23.

Yet in the days of that world, contemporary with the apostles there was more knowledge of God, and of his wisdom, than in the world of the present time. If man knew the scripture revelation of God and His wisdom, this declaration would be self-evident. But it doth not; therefore darkness it calls light, and evil good. Its wisdom is the old heathenism with the gods and goddesses converted into saints and saintesses; and that "other Jesus," of whom Paul speaks in 2 Cor. xi. 4, and his "Immaculate Mother," enthroned in skyana, as the Jupiter and Juno of the system. Protestantism, Mohammedanism and Modern Judaism are to this, what the skepticism of the philosophers in the persons of Socrates, Plato, and Cicero, used to be to the cruder superstition of the image-worshippers; for a Mohammedan, Protestant, and Jew, liberalized by the literature, science and philosophy of our century, ignore all mysteries, confess one God, reject images, and proclaim the immortality of the soul from natural principles; and sing,

"For forms of faith, let senseless bigots fight,
He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."

Are such the persons to guide the world in knowledge, to expound the reasons of things, and to exhibit the true wisdom; or, shall we turn to the idolaters of Rome, or to their mystic offspring of Oxford, or Geneva? Away from them all; for their thoughts are not the thoughts of God; but thoughts of flesh, subversive and opposed to his. Their "wisdom is earthly, sensual, and

devilish;" and cannot rise above the perishable: but of His, he saith, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." These thoughts are the thinking of the Spirit, and constitute "the wisdom that is from above." No man knows this instinctively. He must study God's book of wisdom, the Bible, to find it out. Ignorant of this he is not competent to utter a respectable opinion on the true. Does one man understand the mind of another, or his views, before he makes them known; or before he obtains information of what they are? Let the reader then be rational; let him read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the word of truth; and then deliver his conclusion from the premises, and his opinions will be entitled to a respectful attention from his contemporaries. But let him not say, "I have read but little, nevertheless, my ideas are thus and so." He that has read but little of Scripture, and consequently thought but little to the purpose, unless he be inspired, has no ideas on divine things worth listening to. The above epistle is well written, and diffidently expressed; but there is no instruction in it; for its ideas are only "fleshly reasonings." Still they are suggestive of difficulties common to many minds; and as such, we shall make a few remarks in putting them aside.

1. God, doubtless, knows all things; and sees the end of all things from the beginning. This is scriptural, being the substance of what James says with his quotation from Amos—"Known to God are all his works from the beginning of the Aion." This was said in relation to a certain purpose not yet accomplished; but quoted by the apostle in justification of the admission of believers from among the Gentiles, to fellow-citizenship with the saints of the Commonwealth of Israel; upon the principle of "calling upon the Name of the Lord," without the observance of ordinances peculiar to the Jews. Amos ix. 11, 12; Acts xv. 18; Eph. ii. 19.

2. God is certainly omnipotent, as his works declare; and therefore "cau," if he please, put down everything that rebels against him. But this ability to subdue, is no evidence that he approves of the great transgression. The Israelites rebelled against him ten times, till his patience was almost exhausted. Did he approve of their rebellion because he had the power to crush it in an instant? By no means. He is longsuffering, as in the days of Noah; being willing that all men be saved, and come to exact knowledge of truth. So say Paul and Peter; and so speaks a greater than they, who was the exact representation of the cha-

acter of God; "who," says Jesus, "so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son that every one believing into him might not perish, but have Age-Life." And another reason why he permits what he does not approve, is, that "He has appointed a day in which he intends to judge the Habitable in righteousness, by a Man whom he hath ordained, offering assurance to all, having raised him from among the dead." This is the scriptural reason why sin is not punished as soon as committed. Jehovah is silent now as a part of his arrangements. Isaiah predicted that it would be as the history of the past eighteen hundred years has exhibited it; and that Jehovah's silence would continue until the time arrived for him to overthrow the kingdoms of the nations, and to rebuild the tabernacle of David in the restoration of the tribes of Israel. "Jehovah shall go forth," saith he, "as a Mighty Man; he shall stir up jealousy like a man of war: He shall shout, yea, roar; he shall prevail against his enemies; I HAVE LONG TIME, HELD MY PEACE; I have been still, and refrained myself; but now I will cry as a travailing woman; I will destroy and devour at once. I will make waste mountains (empires) and hills (kingdoms) and dry up all their herbs (nobles and chief men) and I will make the rivers dry deserts, and I will dry up their pools. And I will bring the blind (the tribes of Israel) by a way they knew not; I will lead them in paths they have not known; I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do for them, and not forsake them."—Isa. xlii. 13.

God wills the unsuppressed triumph of sin, until the arrival of this great and terrible day; in which the vengeance he hath also willed, will convince sinners, that the still voice of the written word, though neglected and despised in this day of his silence, is as dear to him as his life and honor; and that all that do not venerate it, and obey, shall then reap as they have sown.

3. True, "He hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked." This, however, is only a part of the truth, which is made whole by the rest of the verse, "but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Jesus taught that there was joy in heaven over the repentance of such. But, when the wicked will not turn and live, he hath pleasure in their death: for it hath pleased him to appoint them to execution in the day of vengeance.

4. Unquestionably God had *an object* in view when he created the mundane system; and a *plan* also according to which he deter-

mined to accomplish it. Do parents forbear to generate because of the evil they know assuredly will befall their offspring? Why, then, should God have abstained from the genesis of the world, because he knew that in attaining to the full development of his purpose, according to the moral basis he laid down, it would in its ages and generations pass through a sore and terrible probation? But, after all that can be said of the evil, even if it were ten times worse than it is, the life and happiness of the world that is to inhabit the Earth eternally, will surpass ten million fold, nay, illimitably, the evil of its mortal period of seven thousand years. The citizen of that world when he looks back upon these years, more especially on the small proportion of the evil he personally experienced, will behold in it but "a momentary light affliction," that "worketh out a more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Men err by comparing the good and evil of the present state as though it were permanent and final. The present is only temporary—a transient system of means to a glorious end.

5. "God is love;" but not "all love." He is also "light," "jealous," "a Man of war," "a Consuming Fire," &c.

6. Man was "very good" in a physical, not a moral, sense. He was "very good" as lions, tigers, serpents, doves, &c., were very good; for it is written, "God saw all that he had made, and behold, it was very good." If Mr. P. would read the Scriptures critically, and apart from the tradition of his earlier years, there are some thoughts of his brain, he would have forborne to pen. When man breathed the breath of lives for the first time, he was simply innocent. He had done neither good nor evil. He had no character; but as a new born child, capable of its development in the future of its career. If man had been formed incapable of sin, which is the transgression of law, there would have been no scope for the formation of character. He would have been a mere automaton, and the law and transactions of Eden a farce.

7. Mr. P. presuming that "God is all love," and confounding what God permits with what he wills and approves; and being unacquainted with his purpose and plan; and supposing also that the present is a finality—jumps to the conclusion, that God has been overreached, as it were, or frustrated. But, he says, his reasoning "may be sophistry." Doubtless, it is, for the reasonings of the flesh in ignorance of the system of truth the Bible teaches, are always sophistic; for right reason is only that which brings the mind to conclusions in harmony with the written testimony of God. "To the law and

the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isai. viii. 20. This is as true of logicians, as it is of all the "Spirituals," whether they be clergymen, or the rapping-ghosts and hobgoblins of "the Spirit-world."

May 1, 1857.

EDITOR.

No Loitering on the Way.

839 Grange Road, London,

11th April, 1857.

MY DEAR FRIEND :

I was glad to perceive by the third number of the "Herald" that you revived the notice respecting "Anatolia," as no demand whatever has been lately made on me for that work, probably, as a truce has been made with "the chief Prince of Meshech and Tubal." Sectarian bigotry may brand the work a obsolete; and be assured that whatever difficulty you may encounter in proclaiming the "Gospel of the Kingdom," on your side of the Atlantic, there is no less beligerent opposition in this once highly-favored island, now become enslaved in "gross darkness," and ripening, under political corruption, abominable priestcraft, and moral depravity, for sure destruction. The obstinate bearing of Mr. Orvis, in his controversy with Mr. Magruder, is a specimen of the *spiritualizing* mania which infects religionists here, yea, "The priests and the prophets, and all the inhabitants, are filled with drunkenness," by "the Mother of Harlots."

I fully coincide with you, that it is incumbent on those who are authorized to proclaim "the Gospel of the Kingdom," "earnestly to contend for the Faith, once (finally) delivered to the Saints," and "whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear," those commissioned servants are nevertheless bound to struggle against the glaring errors and infidelity of the evil generation to which they belong, and being enlisted under the banner of their great Captain, who has waged a sanguinary warfare against "the accuser of the brethren," they may not quit the battle-field, until enabled to reverberate the mighty proclamation, "The Kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Anointed One." Yes, my dear friend, and, however "hard to be understood," may be the divine assurance. I boldly affirm it that such faithful servants, "though now dead," yet shall they renew their mortal clothing, and live; and soon, ah very soon, the glorious day will dawn. When thus living, they shall "never die;" having put on immortality. The heavenly bridegroom has "called" them to "the marriage Supper," nor dare they loiter in "the

narrow way," for even now may be heard in the distance the voices of the assembling guests, saying, "Let us be glad and rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." Loiter! did I say? in "in filthy garments" of mortality, then verily would they arrive at the door in time only to hear the irrevocable decree, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still." May it, however, be our happy privilege, to press zealously onward, and finally obtain the inestimable prize of endless life, heedless of the foul abomination that ascribes a mere fraction of that prize, as being inherent to our fallen condition, and destined to soar in the skies, or, that the predicted destruction of Satan is merely equivalent to rendering him a *useless* fiend engulfed in endless flame, thereby perpetuating the deed of sin, no; neither can we listen to the "lying spirits," syren song, that "the king of kings," under whose banner we have sworn allegiance, has ever consented to reign cotancous with "the Prince," and his accursed subjects of "this present evil world." But, that we may be found walking "worthy of God, who hath called us unto his kingdom, and glory," "striving together for the faith of the Gospel," and eschewing all modes of human faith, until privileged to take down our harps from the willows, and attune them to "the new song" of redemption, which shall resound o'er the hills of Zion from that immortal throng, the "called, chosen, and faithful," is the fervent prayer of

Your faithful friend and fellow-servant in the Lord, "waiting for the kingdom of God."

RICHARD ROBERTSON.

We will attend to our friend's suggestions concerning Elpis Israel and the work in contemplation. The latter, the subject of which is the Apocalypse, is in preparation; that is, we are writing it, as we can find opportunity. At present, we get on slowly, having much else on hand, and time rapidly on the wing. We shall give due notice when we shall be ready for the press.

May, 1857.

EDITOR.

"Jupiter Tonans."

DEAR SIR :

The repose of this region was disturbed on Thursday last, by the Harbinger of A. Campbell, which announced, Prepare ye the way of your god. Messengers were sent through all the region "round about" and the proclamation was made "the feast is

ready," prepare the bride for the coming of her lord. I confess that I was interested as well as amused. The supreme glory that revelled in the faces of the initiated, foretold a high expectation of a jubilee. The time (Sunday) arrived, and lo! your humble servant occupied a seat in the synagogue, with materials to take notes of what *Jupiter Tonans* should say. They are before me, and from them I will give you some hints of his particular points. 1st. He showed the importance of understanding the circumstances, feelings, mannerism, and idiom of a writer, or speaker. 2nd. Of the mannerism of Jesus at Cæsarea Philippi, which brought him to the text, (i. e.) "Thou art the Christ, &c." He said the dove sunk down into *Him* (Jesus) and He was anointed the "King of the Universe." He made this the radiating point of Christianity. Upon this he spent his time; now condemning all "creeds," and the "five points," and then applauding the Bible as his only creed, and then speaking of the authority of Christ over the *universe*; and towards the close he spoke of his *coming* to judge the world! And wound up his rare lecture by stating that no man of common sense and common education could believe in the annihilation of human beings. I drew my breath with the mental ejaculation, "How are the mighty fallen!" Day before yesterday I received a request from a lady friend to come and hear Mr. Campbell preach at night on the Second Advent of Christ. I immediately repaired to the place, and quietly took a seat. Mr. C. read from Revelation the account of the small and great standing before God, from which he spoke about an hour and a half, and the only mention he made of the second coming was incidental. He exhorted the brethren to be ready to meet the Lord in the air; and told them of the judgment, and the different books, &c.; and made this singular remark, that when the Saviour would welcome the righteous to the Kingdom "they would be unconscious of having done any service to him." Does not this prove that they have been asleep?*

* It proves that those Mr. Campbell styles "righteous," being then unconscious of previous service, will awake to the consciousness that they were never the servants of Christ, and consequently not entitled to any share in his rewards: for the sentence is, "Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord." A *servant* is one who renders service to another called *master*, into whose employment he has formally entered. Such a one who is "unconscious of having done any service to him," must be a very worthless servant. A plantation of such servants must be in a very ruinous condition. He errs "not understanding the word of the kingdom." They will be perfectly conscious of having rendered service, but under an overwhelming sense of the magnitude of their obligation to their master, "after they have done all," they will regard their doings as comparatively trifles, light as air.—EDITOR.

He delivered a lecture on education (on Monday) at which I was more astonished than I am wont to be; for I then heard for the first time that a horse had a soul as well as "A. Campbell." He said Paul was his polar star, and Paul had asserted that man had three entities—body, soul, and spirit. Every one knew what the body was. The soul—from *psuche* Greek—meant the *animal* of man—that faculty which enabled the birds to find their way from place to place, and the brute to discriminate between good and bad. After saying that these words were never used the one for the other he said, "Solomon says the *soul* of man goes upward, and the *soul* of the beast goes downwards into the earth."* "But," said he "man *alone* has spirit—the moral faculty which God breathed into him when he breathed into him the breath of lives." From this learned lecture, I learned much, particularly that in all other institutions (except Bethany College) wherever religion was taught at all, it was taught by Catechisms but at Bethany, there was no sectarianism; It was the only college in the union where the education of the whole man—physically, intellectually and morally was completed. If the thing was in the man or boy, Bethany alone could *educate*—bring it out of him. All were called on to subscribe, and then *ex-cun! omnes*.

The whole affair resembled a dance without a fiddle. It certainly was the saddest effort to speak against convictions I ever saw. The whole affair has strengthened me in my convictions that your interpretation of the sacred volume is the best: and since I have perceived your willingness to answer Truth Seeker's inquiry, I want to ask an explanation of a passage, John xii. 24.†

Truly yours,

PETER TANNER.

Cheneyville, Louisiana.

A Bubbling "Fountain" of Romance.

HENDERSON, Ky., April 25, 1857.

Bro. Thomas:

Fountain E. Potts, of Nashville, a celebrated minister of the Methodist church, recently visited this city and delivered two lectures on the Fulfillment of Prophecy; and, as I am informed that he left a challenge

* Mr. Campbell ought to know better than this. Solomon does not say "soul" or נֶפֶשׁ *nephesh*. He says, בְּנֵי אָדָם מִי יוֹדֵאֵם הַרוּחַ בְּנֵי אָדָם, *mi yodaiu ruakhdenai ha adam?* "Who knows the spirit of the sons of Adam?" of the grounding? Mr. Campbell says that "man *alone* has spirit!" This is like many other of his sayings—directly opposed to scripture. In the passage before us, Eccles. iii. 19-21. Solomon contradicts him point blank, saying, רִשְׁתָּם אֶתְּרוּ לַבָּל *rudkhe had la kol*, there is "one spirit for all."—EDITOR.
† John xii. 24 is explained in 1 Cor. xv. 36. Ed.

for you, if you ever visit this place again, I have concluded to give you a synopsis of his lectures, as near as I can, and hope that you will make it convenient to come and meet this Goliath, some time during the summer. If you conclude to do so, and will let us know at what time you will be here, we will inform his friends of it, so that he may be on hand. I think it probable some good may result from such a discussion.

He commenced by stating that prophecies touching the nations, down to the fall of Jerusalem, were but a literal history of Syria, Edom, Moab, Egypt, and Judea; but from the destruction of the Jewish capital down to a certain period, called "the time of the end," a veil was on the prophets, and no interpretation of the sublime visions during that interdicted age could possibly be correct; for God had repeated the announcement to Daniel, the prophet, that "the words were closed up, and the vision was sealed to the time of the end." That this was not the end of the world was evident; for, in the time of the end, "many should run to and fro, and knowledge be increased;" that then "the wise should understand, but the wicked should not understand." Not only was the vision itself sealed, but the time or end of these wonders, and especially the theatre of these wonders, or the land of their realization, should be unknown till God was prepared for their accomplishment. That "the time of the end," an age of great intellectual energy, adventure, and locomotion, was the age in which a great nationality would arise; that the United States arose at the end of 1290 symbolic days from the destruction of Jerusalem; that Daniel's 70 weeks being equal to 603 years and 214 days of solar time, according to the eclipses of the sun, gave an infallible rule to determine symbolic time; so that, if 70 symbolic weeks equaled 603 years and 214 days, 1290 symbolic days reached from the burning of the temple, on the 187th day of the year 68, A.D. to the 4th day of July, 1776; and that, making the starting point at the occasion of the daily sacrifice, which happened, according to astronomy, at sunrise, three minutes past five o'clock, a.m., on the day the temple was burnt, the 1290 days run out at a quarter to 3 o'clock, p.m., on the 4th day of July, 1776; and, from the best sources of information, the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed at that hour on the fourth. That the United States was the fifth government represented by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands. The image of Nebuchadnezzar represented the successive kingdoms of Assyria, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, and Rome; that the iron and clay in the feet and toes of the image

symbolized the union of church and state under Constantine, June 13, 325, A.D.; that the antagonism of the stone to the image, smiting it on the feet, symbolized the genius of our great nation in its opposition to the union of church and state; that while the stone kingdom or government were not Christianity, the mountain out of which the stone was cut was Christianity. That the winged woman of the wilderness was an emblem of Christianity, and her man-child, to whom was given "a rod to rule," was an emblem of our government, arising from a pure religion; that this man-child, being caught up to heaven in the clouds, showed the Providential protection of our infant republic. That our nationality which was to come was Israel restored. That God would constitute such a nationality out of people who would acknowledge his Son, Jesus Christ, and not of the Jews, who, from the beginning, have denounced Christ. That perfect coincidence being perfect fulfillment, our nation and no other on earth answered the picture. That the nationality to arise was to be gathered out of the nations. That they were to go to the westward. That the country they were to inhabit was a land between the eastern and the great western seas. That the land was one "that had always been waste." That it was to be located in thirteen distinct states. That these states should be bounded on the east by the eastern sea, and on the west by the great western sea. That the people gathered out of the nations should "build and dwell safely in unwall'd villages and cities, having neither gates nor bars," "a land of broad rivers and streams;" a republic where the people "should appoint for themselves one head," and their rulers and governors "should be from among themselves." That the United States were "the isles that should wait" for God, and that the ships of Tarshish or Old Spain should be first to open emigration. That our country was "the land shadowing with wings" which was beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, which from Judea beyond the Nile was the United States, and no other country. That our great country was divinely protected in its beginning, and, answering the predictions precisely of the nationality that is to come, is the "nation born to God in a day"—born on Independence Day. That the U. S. arose in the providence of God as the model political government, and that its great mission was the "overthrow of monarchy, and the utter destruction of political and ecclesiastical despotism.

His subject the next evening related more especially to "the last great battle (which he says will be) between civil and religious

liberty on the one hand, and political and ecclesiastical despotism on the other." That the U. S. would be invaded by monarchy; that Russia would be the leading power, and England and all the autocracy of the world would be allied with Russia against the U. S. except France; that France would be with us in the end, as she was in the beginning. That an armament, such as the world never saw, composed of millions, would invade the country. That the battle-field was the valley of the Mississippi (here he referred to Ezekiel, 38 and 39). That Heaven would be upon our side. But, in this last dreadful fray, there would be trouble such as never was. That the U.S., being the exponent and representative of republicanism, extending its borders from sea to sea, and from the lakes to the gulf, arose as the formidable defiance of autocracy; and that Russia, embracing an area of one seventh of the globe, and arising in dreadful grandeur, must, in self-defence, attempt the extinction of popular freedom; and that these two formidable powers, lowering and culminating to the heavens like dreadful clouds surcharged with the elements of ruin, would shock the world with their collision and drench the earth with blood. That monarchy would be overthrown for ever, and republicanism everywhere prevail, and nations learn war no more, for a thousand years.

I have written more than I anticipated, and will conclude. Accept my best wishes for your health, happiness, and prosperity, through a long life of usefulness.

Yours, in hope of immortality,

P. A. BLACKWELL.

The Truth in Norfolk, Va.

27th April, 1857.

Dear Brother Thomas:

The following is substantially, and almost verbatim, a copy of a communication from a gentleman in Norfolk, Va.

NORFOLK, March 27th, 1857.

MR. A. ANDERSON:

Dear Sir: In view of the day that God has appointed, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that Man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead, a few seekers here after truth, prompted by a desire to know more of the exceeding great and precious promises by which we are made partakers of the divine nature, and thus be prepared for his name, that we may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city—believing you to be competent to the task, we have sent up this petition, in the hope of realizing a visit from you at your

earliest opportunity. Yours, in hope of a resurrection unto eternal life. *

In compliance with this "petition," having sent an appointment, I arrived safely in Norfolk on the day before the second Lord's day in April, and found it arranged for me to lecture Sunday nights, upon the Abrahamic covenant. Notwithstanding unfavorable weather, I was enabled to deliver six lectures. In the commencement, passages of Holy Scripture in the 12th, 13th, 15th, 17th, and 22nd chapters of Genesis were read, as a *platform* or *foundation*, deep and broad, on which to base the lectures. After an explanation of the term covenant, and some preliminary remarks, the attention of the audience was called first to the *promise*, that Jehovah would bless *all nations* in Abraham and his seed. The seed was identified with the Christ, upon the authority of Paul in Galatians, identified with him of whom we read as the *son of man*, Son of God, Jesus of Nazareth, &c. It was argued that, to bless *nations*, would be, to bestow upon them a *good* government, administered in righteousness. Thus, the Gospel, preached to Abraham, was the gospel of a *desirable* government. This was confirmed as the lecturer proceeded to consider the testimonies in relation to David and David's throne, and residence, and kingdom, as promised to his seed, the Christ. Other testimonies in relation to the same seed presented under other and richly-varied expressions, such as Jehovah's Son (as in the 2nd Psalm), unto us, a child is born, a Son is given, &c., &c., made the argument still stronger, and more interesting. The subject was manifest as expanding, while prosecuted through the abounding testimonies of both Prophets and the Apostles. The Seed being identified with Jesus by reference to the 1st of Matthew and 3d of Luke, it followed that, whatever is affirmed of Jesus in the Sacred Word, the same is true of the Seed. In a word, the latter-day glory of Israel, and of the Gentiles, was all suspended upon the promises, as centering in him. The last lecture was upon the apocalypse as developing Jesus in the character of a *mighty warrior* and a *glorious conqueror*.

I had reason to believe, that the effort was highly satisfactory, to the audience, and especially to the seekers after truth, for which I am *humbly* thankful.

I send this brief account, as an inducement for you to visit Norfolk. I can truly say, there are some there who are very interesting, on account of their extensive researches after Bible truth. I was requested to invite you to Norfolk. You can easily take it in your way to Richmond.

ALBERT ANDERSON.

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, JULY, 1857.

[VOL. VII. No. 7.

"Not Able to Kill the Soul"

ETERNAL LIFE is a promise, not to all mankind, but to certain styled "*heirs*."

Paul terms "*eternal life*" ζωης της εν Χριστω 'Ιησου, *life which is in Christ Jesus*; therefore, in another place, he styles Jesus in relation to the saints, "*the Christ our life*;" which life, he says, "*is hid with Christ in God*." Hence, it follows, that the life of the saints being in Christ and hid with him in God, the life or soul they are to have eternally is not in themselves.

The life or soul possessed by all mankind in the present state is *not hid*. Its operations are manifest; for, wherever there is *motion* in the system, there is life. In the tissues of a dead man there is no motion, therefore, no life; and, consequently, no vital manifestations. Hence, the dead neither know, think nor do—"the dead know not anything," as Solomon declares.

Yet, in a certain sense, the man believing into the Son has life αιωνος 'Ο πιστευων εις τον αιον, *χει ζωην αιωνιον* He has it now in the sense of Christ dwelling in his heart by faith.—Eph. iii., 17; Jno. iii., 36. If this faith have led him into Christ by being immersed into his name, Christ dwells in him and he in Christ, and he has the *life aionian* in the sense of having a right to it. "Blessed are they who do his commandments, *that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city*."—Rev. xxii. 14. To have a *right to a thing, and to possess that thing, are distinct ideas. People may have rights, but be for a long time debarred from those rights; while others may possess things and have no right to them; while others again may have both right and possession. All in whose hearts Christ dwells by a faith which has led them into him, have acquired rights to the Tree of Life and the City; but for a*

time they are debarred from the possession of them both; but when sinners, who now possess "all things" to which they have no *aionian right*, shall be deprived of their usurpations and robberies, the dead, in whose hearts Christ dwelt by the One Faith an One Hope of the calling, "when they were alive; and the living, in whom he dwells in like manner, shall have *right and possession aionian*. The saints walk by faith; sinners, by sight: the former have *aionian life* by believing unto "justification of life;" the latter, not believing into Christ, "*shall not see life*, but the wrath of God abides upon them."

This *life*, to which those sanctified by the Abrahamic Covenant dedicated by the blood of Jesus, obtain a right thereby, is styled *aionian*; in the Common Version, "eternal" and "everlasting," because it belongs to the *αιων αιον*, or DISPENSATION to be founded by Messiah. The life of Messiah's cycle is the life promised to the saints. Because *αιωνιος αιωνιος*, is added to God, life, punishment, times, fire, doors, people, the dead, servant, joy, laws, &c., it does not, therefore, follow that all these things are *eternal* in the ordinary acceptation of the word, that is, *without end*. "The *terminus ad quem*, as it is called, is to be determined from the nature of the subject;" and we may add, as that subject and its nature are, for the most part, defined, not by Gentile theology, but by the testimony of God. In the case before us, the duration of the life is defined by the compass of Messiah's cycle, which is indicated by the saying, "His name shall endure לעולם לעולם, *εις τον αιωνα*, for the course;" the duration of which course of things, or *αιων* is 1000 years, but being succeeded by another *αιον*, the continuance is illustrated by the sentence immediately following, saying, "His name shall be continued as long as the sun."—Ps. lxxii., 17. Now, as the sun is

to exist always, *the cycles of Messiah's name* will never be closed; so that the life of his *αἰών* will be *aionian* in the sense of being *without end*.

Let not the reader, however, jump to the conclusion that, because *αἰώνιος* signifies *without end* in the case before us, that eternal or everlasting are its meaning when it stands absolutely or alone; and that whenever added to a substantive it imparts the idea of eternity thereto. The Mosaic law declared that the servant who would not accept of his discharge from his master, should be his *aionian servant*—עֶבֶד עוֹלָם *ēved olām*—that is, *as long as he lived*. Hence, it is manifest, from the nature of things, that *aionian* does not mean absolutely duration without end; but limited duration as well as unlimited, as the case may be. No man is doomed to eternal servitude; though it might be so argued with as much propriety from *aionian servants*, as that the wicked will be subject to *unending torment*, because their "punishment" is styled *aionian kolasis*.

The life of Messiah's cycles, which will never close, is a *matter of promise*, and therefore of *hope*.

Paul says he was "an apostle according to the *promise of life* which is in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. i. 1. In another place, he says that he was "an apostle separated unto the *Gospel of God* which he had *promised* before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures."—Rom. i. 1. He preached the *good news of life and incorruptibility in the kingdom of God restored again to Israel*, FOR ALL WHO BELIEVED the things covenanted to Abraham and David, and the things concerning the Name of Jesus Christ, and were baptized into the name of the Holy. This prospective abolition of death, and bringing to light of life and incorruptibility through the gospel of the kingdom, was a novelty introduced to the Jewish nation by Jesus, and by his command proclaimed to the Gentiles by the apostles. The proclamation set up *incorruptible life the gift of God to obedient believers of his promises*, in opposition to the wisdom of the world, which taught that "Death is the separation of an immortal, or deathless, spirit from the body, whose immortality and essence were originally breathed into man from the Divine Substance, and hereditarily diffused through every individual of the race without exception." Thus, in the first century of our era, two theories of immortality divided the attention of mankind—the one from God; the other from the Serpent. God promised immortality of body to his friends at their resurrection; the Serpent denied it, saying, that the body was of no account. The spirit, or soul, was essentially and here-

ditarily immortal. That immortality, consequently, was independent of faith and obedience, so that they should not die, but be the subject simply of a separation of spirit from the body, which was all the death that would ever happen. But we reject the philosophy of the Serpent and his seed, and accept the words of God. He says, "he will render *aionian life* to them who, by patient continuance in well doing, *seek for glory*, and honor, and incorruptibility."—Rom. ii. 7. Men only "*seek for*" things they have not got; and seeking, they *hope* to attain the things sought. But "*hope* that is seen is not hope;" seeing, therefore, that we do not now possess incorruptible life, "*we with patience wait for it.*"—Rom. viii. 24, 25.

Incorruptible life, with glory and honor in the kingdom of God restored again to Israel at the resurrection of the just, is the hope set before us in the gospel, "THE ONE HOPE OF THE CALLING." Being promised in "the Covenants of Promise," those who obtain a right to the promise, in obtaining that right become "*heirs*" of this inestimable gift. Hence the phrase, "*heirs* together of the grace of life."—1 Pet. iii. 7. An heir is one *who hopes to possess*; and, at the same time, his hope is according to law, or he is not a lawful heir, however earnestly he may hope. An heir of immortality, the kingdom, &c., is not a present possessor of these things, but one who has obtained a scriptural right to the Tree of Life and the City.

Our proposition, then, is a great truth, namely, that *Eternal life is a thing promised to certain styled heirs*. This being irrefutable, it follows infallibly, that all mankind, not being lovers of God, and consequently not "*heirs of God*," have no right to eternal life, and therefore "*shall not see life*." Now, a man that hath no right to a thing, and shall not see, or be the subject of, that thing, in no sense possesses that thing. It is therefore certain that immortality in no sense is the attribute of mankind in general; and being a matter of conditional promise, it is only a *thing of the future, attainable by those who fulfill the conditions*. Hence, in relation to the present possession of immortality as a thing physically connected with the human organization, the words of Solomon are a divine oracle, that "*mankind hath no preeminence over a beast; they all have one spirit; all go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.*" This is very humiliating to the proud and pharisaic, and to those who regard men "*as gods, knowing good and evil;*" but it is the nature of God's doctrine to humble "*the proud in the imagination of their hearts;*" and to bring the high thoughts of

men into subjection to his. "The spirit of man is immortal, because it is spirit," say the wise of this world. Be it so. Then the spirit of the beast is immortal, too; for, says the scripture, *man and beast have all one spirit!* At death, saith the Gentile philosopher, the spirit of man goes to heaven, because it is written, "the spirit of man goeth upward." Be it so. It is not unusual for the Devil to quote scripture. But it is also written, that man and beast have all one spirit, and all go to one place, so that if one goes to heaven, the other goes there also! That cannot be, saith the philosopher; for, it is written again, "the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth." Be it so. It therefore follows, that Solomon was not speaking of "going to heaven at death," but of something else, which our contemporaries no more than his, understand; for he inquires, "*who knoweth the spirit that goeth upward, &c., and the spirit that goeth downward, &c.?*" The philosophers do not. They do not perceive that Solomon speaks, not of a physical principle, but of disposition. "The spirit of the sons of Adam," which once prompted them to reach heaven by a tower, and the spirit of beasts, which is prone to the earth, having no ambition for "above." "All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." The "spirit" and "breath" of men and of beasts are God's, which he lends them for the purposes of their organized dust, which constitutes the man and the beast, according to its form. They, that is, their organisms, are formed of the dust of the ground, and their dusty forms are animated by the spirit and breath of God. While they possess these, men and beasts live and move, and have their being in God; and thus, as Moses says, "Jehovah is the God of the spirits of all flesh;" so that, as Elihu says in Job, "if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to his dust."—Chap. xxxiv., 14, 15.

What rational man, unprepossessed with Gentile traditions, and unperverted by their college sophistry, miscalled "logic," can fail to see from God's testimony, that constitutionally, man has no immortality of body, soul, or spirit, and that the immortality promised of God is deathlessness of transformed animal bodies, or of reorganized dust; that this corporeal immortality is limited to God's friends, who are defined to be those "who do whatsoever he commands;" that a right to it is all that can be attained now; and that the thing itself cannot be attained until the resurrection, and the appearing of Christ in his kingdom, that is, in the Holy

Land? Of the rest of mankind, characterized by a "*stumbling at the word*, being disobedient," (1 Pet. ii., 8), God plainly and positively declares, "they shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them."

But, concerning those of whom this is spoken, it is written, "they shall come forth from their graves to the resurrection of judgement." They will, therefore, see a life after death and resurrection; but it will not be the life of Messiah's cycles, which never close. In their present life-time, "they sow to their flesh;" therefore, saith Paul, "of the flesh they shall in due (or the appointed) season reap corruption." They rise from the dead, then, at the time appointed for their resurrection, as *dust reorganized on a corruptible basis*; so that the life they again temporarily possess is a destructible life, being developed through corruptible flesh—or soul and body which God will destroy in hell, or more properly, in "Gehenna." This destruction, or "of the flesh reaping corruption," is "the wrath of God that abides upon them;" it abides upon them as a sentence of "Death ending in death." *θανατο εις θανατον*, 2 Cor. ii. 16—"death, into death;" which is the scriptural form of the phrase, "the extinction of being;" for what "being" can be more perfectly, completely, or totally extinguished, than the being, the sinning and sinful being, whose death "*ends in*" death, as President Campbell, after MacKnight, renders it? The gospel Paul preached was an odor of this "in them that perish," so that his idea of perish, destroy, reaping corruption, &c., was for that which sinned to die after resurrection, and to continue dead unendingly—*death ending in death*.

Immortal soulists admit that it is the soul that sins; it is the soul, then, that must die; and this death of the soul must "*end in death*." "The soul that sinneth, shall die," saith the Scripture. Now, is it not folly to tell us that such a soul, whose death ends in death, is immortal, or deathless? Yet such is the wisdom of the world; the adored nonsense of colleges and schools, in whose service their babes and sucklings chop their "logic" for the confusion of "heretics" and the salvation of souls!

"THE SOUL, WHOSE DEATH ENDS IN DEATH, IS IMMORTAL."

Hear it ye worldly wise! This is really the proposition ye affirm. Surely ye are learned dunces all.

He, then, that stumbles at the word, being disobedient, shall not see life—shall not become immortal, or deathless. He shall rise to judgement, to "be tormented with fire

and brimstone in the presence of the holy messengers, and in the presence of the Lamb, and the smoke of his torment, shall ascend to aions of aions," or to the commencement of the thousand years reign (Rev. xiv. 10); and being tormented in this, the Great Day of God Almighty, his torment shall be unto death ending in death, which, as a whole, the torment and its consequences, is the aionian punishment—the *κολασις αιωνιος* into which the wicked, with the Devil-Power and its Angels—are cast at the apocalypse of Christ.

If one man, or a thousand men, be proved to be constitutionally and essentially mortal, it is satisfactory proof to all but theological sophists (who, being intoxicated with the wine of Babylon, cannot be regarded as *compos mentis*) that human nature, as a whole, individually and racially, is hereditarily mortal also. If, on the contrary, the race were essentially immortal; that is, that every individual of it possessed within him an immortal "vital principle," which carried on all the functions of the body, and lived disembodiedly after death and in death, as the proper man, then no man should be subject to a death ending in death, or to exclusion from resurrection. But the testimony of God reveals that there are some of Adam's sons, who, being dead, shall remain dead without resurrection to life of any sort, whether to terminate in corruption, or to be interminable in incorruption.

The reader will find the proof of this in Isaiah xxvi., which contains a song to be sung by the Jews in the Holy Land after they shall have been restored, and delivered finally from the power of the governments that now oppress them. In this song, two classes of the dead are treated of—the one comprehending the past and present Gentile lords, or Babylonian oppressors of Israel; the other, Jehovah's dead ones, who constitute his Body mystical, at present within the gates of the invisible, and styled in verse 19, "thy dead, my dead body." Of the former class, it says, in verse 14, "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish. They are not to rise from the dead, and not to live. This is affirmed absolutely—they shall not live in any sense. For the dead not to live, is for them to be the subject of death ending in death; and as these dead are not to rise, their death ending in death, begins at the ordinary death of man, which is pre-resurrectional. Had the testimony simply declared that they should not live, without adding, "they shall not rise," it would have taught us

that, rising from the dead, they should not partake in the life of Messiah's cycle, but should die a second time, from which time their death should end in death, or be eternal.

This text of Isaiah shows us in what sense the Spirit uses "destroyed" when speaking of the dead. It is for them *neither to live nor rise again*. A man who is dead and shall not live, is destroyed. If he be dead, and shall rise again to die a death ending in death, destruction rests upon him—"the wrath of God abideth upon him;" but if a man be dead, and rise again to live for ever, he is not destroyed, though he be in death five thousand years. To put a man to death is all that men of power can do. If he be a righteous man, they cannot prevent him rising from the dead; and when so risen, they cannot put him to death again, so that when they have killed his animal body there is no more that they can do—they cannot "kill the soul" or life. Not so, however, with God; he can "destroy both soul and body in Gehenna."

"All they that are taught of God," saith Jesus, "will I raise up at the last day."—Jno. vi., 44, 45. These are they who come to Jesus by the drawing of the Father, and are they whom the Father has given him. They are therefore styled "Christ's;" and being Christ's, "heirs according to the promise." In the song referred to, the Spirit addressing Jehovah, afterwards manifested in the flesh as Jesus, says concerning Christ's, "They dead shall live;" and, as the manifestation was by the same Spirit, the Spirit claims them also as his, and continues by Isaiah, saying, "My dead body they shall arise." This is the antithesis to verse 14; as, Judah's oppressors when dead shall not live, but Jehovah's dead, many of whom they have slain, shall live: Judah's deceased oppressors shall not rise; but the "One Body," all the generations of which, except the one presently extant, are "dwelling in the dust," and barred within the earth by the gates of the invisible or the grave—the "One Dead Body," which the Spirit styles "my dead body," shall arise—"the Gates of the Invisible shall not prevail against it."—Mat. xvi. 18. In view, therefore, of the victory Jehovah's dead are to obtain through Jesus Christ (1 Cor. xv. 57), the Spirit in the 19th verse addresses them through Isaiah, saying, "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust!" This will be a glorious time for Abraham, and all the holy apostles and prophets, and saints at large. Till the resurrection, they are all asleep, and dwelling, not in "kingdoms beyond the skies," but in closer contiguity to the scene of their future glory—

in the dust of the earth. Daniel, referring to this event, says, "Many that sleep in the dust of the ground shall awake, some to the life of the age, and some to the shame and contempt of the age;" though returned to dust, and therefore without organism, they are said to "sleep," because their unconsciousness, or know-nothing condition, is to terminate in a state in which they will be wide awake. "The dead know not anything," say the scriptures; "their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished;

* * * for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest."—Ecc. ix., 5, 6, 10. Now, *thou* is the second person of *I*, which the sophists say is the thinking principle, and immortal because it thinks! This *I*, then, when spoken to, becomes *thou*, and consequently, obnoxious to all the things affirmed. The *I*, then, goes to the grave in which it knows nothing, and consequently thinks not at all. Now, if it be immortal because it thinks, what is it when it cannot think? Must it not be mortal? The beasts think. Is their *thinking I* immortal because it thinks? It is a bad rule that only works one way.

Jehovah's dead, then, are unconscious dust and ashes imprisoned in the ground, and said to be asleep because their unconsciousness is not final. They are to awake and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, saying, "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of nations. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? because thou only art adorable: for all the nations shall come, and do homage before thee, because thy judgements are made manifest.—Rev. xv., 3, 4. And in view of this gathering of the nations to Jesus as their King, they also sing in their new song—"Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation; and dost make us for our God, kings and priests, and we shall reign upon the earth."—Rev. v., 9, 10. This is a song which they sing before the throne, and which no man can learn but they whose condition it describes.—Rev. xiv. 3. To sing this song as a celebration of accomplished facts is the purpose for which they awake from the sleep of death; for they cannot sing it till the deeds are done.

The awakening of Jehovah's dead, who come forth as dew of herbs from the womb of the morning (Psal., cx. 3.), is at the time of "THE INDIGNATION." Daniel styles it, "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation to that same time"—a

time of trouble, characterized by distress of nations in perplexity, and the deliverance of the Twelve Tribes. To spiritual, or adopted, and native-born Israelites then living, the Spirit saith by Isaiah, "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were, for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, Jehovah cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; the earth also shall disclose her bloods (*τας ψυχας, the souls των εσφαγμενων* of them that were slain, in Rev. vi. 9), and shall no more cover her slain.—xxvi., 20, 21.

Now, if these things be understood, but not otherwise, the reader will find no difficulty with such texts as, "Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."—Mat. x. 28. This should be read in connection with verse 39, as follows, "For he that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Thus, if a man fear the body-killers instead of the soul and body-killer, he finds his present life, but loses his future life; but if he disregard them, and fears the soul-and-body destroyer, he loses his present life, but finds his future one.

Now, in this there is no difficulty till we begin to reason from the English Version, which renders the original words of the two verses by different English ones. But the sophist will contend for the translation as it stands in the verse 28, because there is the word "*soul*," which is so theologically indefinite as to leave him ample scope for disputation. It occurs there twice, and professes to be a translation of *ψυχη, psuchē*; well, we have no objection to leave it so, provided that the same word *ψυχη* which occurs in verse 39, four times expressed and understood, be rendered by "*soul*" also. This granted it would read, "He that findeth his soul shall lose it; and he that loseth his soul for my sake shall find it." In view of this, we might ask, in what sense could a man, or an immortal soul, in losing his immortal soul for Christ's sake, find his immortal soul? and in what sense could an immortal soul be lost for Christ's sake? The translators perceived the absurdities consequent upon such a rendering of *psuchē* in verse 39; they therefore split the difference, and rendered the word *soul* in verse 28, and *life* in verse 39.

But we contend for uniformity in translation in both verses; and that if *life* be good for verse 39, it is doubtless equally so for verse 28; therefore, satisfied of this, we prefer to read the two verses as it follows:

"Be ye not in fear from them who put to death the body, but have not power to abolish the life; but rather be ye in fear of him who has power to destroy both life and body in geëna. * * * He that finds his life shall lose it; and he that loses his life for my sake shall find it."

Now, let this be compared with Luke xii., 4, 5: "Be not in fear from them who put to death the body, and *with this having no more that they can do*. But I will forewarn you whom ye should fear; be ye in fear of him who with the putting to death hath power to cast into geëna; yea, I say to you, be ye in fear of this, *τουτου*." In this text, Luke renders Matthew's phrase, "have not power to abolish the life" by "having no more that they can do." This is strictly in accordance with fact. Human power can do no more than to put the animal body to death. They may burn it to ashes and scatter them to the four winds, but they cannot prevent the living reëmbodiment of those identical ashes. They cannot "kill the soul," as the Common Version has it. The soul, or life, of the incorruptible body does not reside in the present body; it is, therefore, beyond the reach of human vengeance. The Spirit of God will be the life of the Saints' incorruptible flesh. They will find this life in glory should they be called upon to sacrifice their blood, in which is the life of the present body, for the sake of Jesus. But if in this emergency, they should prefer to preserve their animal body in life, then there is nothing before them but the looking for of judgement, which shall devour the adversaries; and to participate in which they will be raised with soul, or life, which God will extinguish in Geëna.

Life, or soul, which God destroys in Geëna, is not "*the life*" or soul which Jesus said men could not destroy or abolish. The latter is his own Spirit—the vital and motive power of incorruptibility; the former, life, such as belongs to living corruptibility. We have such a life, or soul now, which Jesus says is destructible; for, says he, there is one who can destroy it in Geëna.

The destruction in Geëna is not of disembodied life or soul, but of life and body. Living bodies are the subjects of Geëna-destruction. It does not read, "Be in fear of him who hath power to destroy the soul in Geëna," as if it were the soul alone to be destroyed there, but, "Be ye in fear of him who hath power to destroy *both* soul and body in Geëna;" or, as Luke expresses it, "who, with the putting to death, hath power to cast into Geëna;" the casting into Geëna, being the means of execution in the case.

The destructibility of soul by the power

of God is an argument with some against its immortality. The soul cannot be immortal because God is able to destroy it. This, however, is more specious than solid. Nothing is essentially indestructible but God. All other indestructibilities in his universe are created indestructible by him; they are therefore only relative indestructibilities, not absolutely so. The dusty elements of the saints are to be raised to indestructibility by the Spirit; but can it be maintained that their indestructible bodies could not again be reduced to dust by the same Spirit? By no means. The power that creates can also destroy. But while they are not absolutely indestructible, they are relatively so. In relation to every agency but that of the creating power, they will be indestructible. Immortal-soulists base the indestructibility of what they call "the soul," on the assumption that it is a particle of the Divine Essence—a part of God himself. It is therefore indestructible, because God cannot destroy himself. Here is the weak point of their argument. It is admitted that God cannot destroy himself; but he says, that he is able to destroy soul as well as body in Geëna, which is certainly not hotter than Nebuchadnezzar's furnace; but is not enough for destruction of soul: the soul, therefore, that Geëna-fire can destroy is more destructible than the bodies and hair of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, which assuredly were not as indestructible as God's own substance. It is evident, therefore, that the soul God is able to destroy in Geëna is not a part of his own essence or substance, nor is it of necessity absolutely immortal. If God had put into man at his creation a principle endowed with eternal vitality, God's declaration of ability to destroy it would not prove it to be mortal; it would only prove that he could undo what he had done. It would still be immortal, notwithstanding his declaration; for it would live so long as he forbore to exercise his destroying power; and if he had said he would never put that power into force, it would be absolutely immortal with reference to every other agency. But here is the impossibility for the sophists; they cannot show from God's testimony that he has put such a principle into man; neither can they adduce a revelation from him that if there be, he will never exercise his power to destroy it. But, the sophists of the schools err, in assuming that soul, or life, is a self-existing principle. This is in no case true, except in respect to God. "In him is life," absolute and underived. It is therefore written, "With thee is the fountain of life."—Ps. xxxvi., 9; "The Father hath life in himself"—Jno. v. 26; and, "The Spirit is life"—Rom. viii. 10. Hence, the Spirit of God

generated within, and emanating from, his substance, is the vital principle of the universe; issuing forth as "a river of water of life" from him as "the fountain of living waters"—Rev. xxii. 1; Jer. ii. 13. This Spirit-life is organizing, or formative, producing from the dust the forms termed beasts and men. So long as it remains with them, their organs continue to play, and to develop their several functions, which organic concert of action constitutes the life, or soul, of the creature in a physical sense. The forms are organized only for temporary continuance; some, however, enduring longer than others, according to the law of their organization, which defines the life of the being according to its species. At the expiration of the appointed time, God's Spirit withdraws from the forms of beasts and men, their machinery stops, and its elements, unrestrained by the Spirit's action any longer, ferment until the forms are obliterated, and resolved into their original hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and earth. Thus in gathering to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh perishes together, and man returns to yis dust, which would not be the case, if an immortal vital principal were planted in it; for this would counteract the tendency to decomposition, and maintain the dust in form and life forever. But we must forbear for the present and leave the sophists till a more convenient season.

EDITOR.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

[Extracted by Bro. Lithgow, from "The Light of Prophecy," by Thomas Lunnsen Strange, London, 1852, and published in the *Herald* at his request.]

The Rebuilding of Babylon.

"THEN the angel that talked with me went forth and said unto me, Lift up now thine eyes, and see what is this that goeth forth. And I said, What is it? And he said, This is an ephah that goeth forth. He said, moreover, This is their resemblance throughout the earth. And, behold, there was lifted up a talent of lead: and this is a woman that sitteth in the midst of the ephah; and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold there came out two women, and the wind was in their wings, for they had wings like the wings of a stork; and they lifted up the ephah between the earth and the heaven. Then said I to the angel that talked with me, *Whither do these*

bear the ephah? And he said unto me, *To build it an house in the land of Shinar, and it shall be established and set there upon her own base!*—Zech. v. 5-11.

"An ephah is a Jewish measure. The woman who sat therein is the personification of wickedness. 'This is wickedness,' it is said of her, and she embodies the evil of the whole earth. 'This is her resemblance,' it is declared, 'through all the earth.' Here are exactly the characteristics, and the very figure of the great whore, 'having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication,' out of which 'the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk,' 'the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.' (The author had previously been endeavoring to identify the Babylon of Isaiah and Jeremiah with the Babylon of John: and to show that their prophecies relate to the same city—Babylon; the capital of Chaldea—when it shall be, as I think he clearly proves, the throne of that vast empire which is symbolised by Nebuchadnezzar's image.)

"This figure is carried to the land of Shinar, the very site of Babylon (Gen. x. 10; xi. 2), and there she has an habitation built for her upon a spot described as 'her own base.' The city, then, is to be reconstructed upon foundations that are *her own*; that have already belonged to her; and here the seven hills, the ruins of her former grandeur, afford the means for the accomplishment of the fact predicted of her. She may be built upon them.

"The woman in the ephah being the type of a nation, the two women who bear the ephah, it may be concluded, must, likewise, indicate nations. We are to be led, then, to expect that there will be a combination of two powers, who will undertake, together, to rebuild the city. They will do it with celerity, as is indicated by their having the wings of a stork (a bird of swift flight) and the wind in their wings. They further bear the ephah between the earth and the heaven. Considering that it is wickedness that is to be so set up, and this in the renovation of the doomed and desolate Babylon, their action, we may conclude, will be with a settled purpose of opposition to the will and workings of God; and this corresponds with that of the first builders of Babylon, who wished to construct a city with a tower whose top might reach unto heaven—a fitting habitation for him who is to say in his heart, 'I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High.—Isa. xiv., 13, 14.

"The above prophecy of the reconstruc-

tion of Babylon appears to have been given about twenty years after the capture of the city by Cyrus, when the predicted downfall of the place might have seemed to be in process of accomplishment. 'If,' as Dr. Keith remarks, 'while in the plenitude of its power, and according to the most accurate chronologers, 160 years before the foot of an enemy had entered it, the voice of prophecy pronounced the doom of the mighty and unconquered Babylon,' men were called upon to look for the desolation of a city so rich in resources and so established in prosperity, why may it not be that a trial of faith in another way is given to us, and that we are required to believe that a spot so waste and judgement-stricken as the site of Babylon, shall one day be occupied by a great city, and, as is described in the book of Revelation, ruling over the kings of the earth, and concentrating in herself the riches and the commerce of the world.

"The elements of the former greatness of Babylon still exist—her climate, her soil, and her waters; and the operations of these may be multiplied with facility to any required extent. All that is wanted is the energy of man to put these means into action.

"The following extracts will prove how great are the resources of this land :

"The immense fertility of Chaldea correspondeth, if that of any country could vie with the greatness of Babylon. It was the most fertile region of the whole east.' Babylonia was one vast plain, adorned and enriched by the Euphrates and the Tigris, from which, and from the numerous canals that intersected the country from the one river to the other, water was distributed over the fields by manual labor and by hydraulic machines, giving rise, in that warm climate, and rich, exhaustless soil, to an exuberance of produce without a known parallel, over so extensive a region, either in ancient or modern times. Herodotus states that he knew not how to speak of its wonderful fertility, which none but eye-witnesses would credit. In his estimation, as well as that of Strabo and Pliny (the three best ancient authorities that can be given), Babylonia was, of all countries, the most fertile in corn, the soil never producing less, as he relates, than two hundred fold, an amount, in our colder regions, scarcely credible, though Strabo, the first of ancient geographers, agrees with the 'father of history,' in recording that it reaches even to three hundred, the grain, too, being of a prodigious size. To this day 'there cannot be a doubt (the quotation being from a writer in the Bombay Philosophical Transactions) that, if proper means

were taken, the country would, with ease, be brought into a high state of cultivation.'—Keith, pp. 397, 398, 400.

"The air of the modern town of Hillah, on the site of Babylon, is salubrious, and the soil extremely fertile, producing great quantities of rice, dates, and grain of different kinds, though it is not cultivated to above half the degree of which it is susceptible. When at its height, the Euphrates overflows the surrounding country, fills the canals dug for its reception, without the slightest exertion of labor, and facilitates agriculture in a surprising degree. In such a soil as that of Babylon, it appears surprising how long some of the canals have remained. The Nahor Malcha, a work of the Babylonian monarchs, might still be effectually repaired, and it is probable that many of the canals now seen on the site of Babylon may have been in existence when it was a flourishing city.—Rich's Memoir, pp. 12, 13, 16, 17.

"In the volume of the Family Library upon the 'Ruins of Ancient Cities,' the possibility of the future renovation of the place is speculated upon; and this is the more remarkable, since the grounds of the anticipation are derived wholly from the natural resources of the country, and the probabilities of prosperity that these still afford.

"The writer's own observations enable him to add his testimony to its requiring nothing but water and culture to make Babylonia what it was in ancient times—the richest grain country in the world. The soil is alluvial mould, formed by deposits from the Euphrates and Tigris, and wherever water reaches it, most productive.

"The facilities for building are also very great. The whole soil affords clay for bricks, which the heat of the sun would soon bake into hardness, and cement is abundant, in the shape of bitumen, lime, and clay, as shown, also, by Mr. Rich.

"With such abundant materials close at hand, and with a command of labor, either at order, or for a very trifling rate of hire, and with extensive water-carriage to facilitate operations, a city could be raised upon the site of Babylon in an incredibly short period of time.

"Were any powerful civilized nations to coalesce together for the restoration of Babylon, and the realization of her abounding means of wealth, the results would doubtless be rapid and astonishing. The prophecy, as has been pointed out, indicates that it will be thus by foreign interposition that she will be reestablished 'upon her own base' in the land of Shinar, and that with celerity, when the action is once commenced upon. At present, such agency is to be looked for only

from Europe, and it is very observable how much, in recent years, the attention and ambition of the leading states of this division of the world have been turned to the east. Mutual jealousy, and the necessity of maintaining the balance of power among them, would operate to prevent any one of them occupying the territory of Babylonia for herself, but it might suit them, at any time, to take the pent-up and neglected resources of the country out of the hands of the ignorant and apathetic Turks, and have them developed for the general advantage. Once so encouraged and assisted, Babylon might soon become a vast emporium of eastern trade, and concentrate within herself the wealth and power of the adjacent countries, and thus be brought to occupy the position from which the prophecy demonstrates she is, in the latter days, to be thrown down.

"THE DESTRUCTION OF BABYLON IS SHOWN IN THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH AND JEREMIAH TO BE CLOSELY LINKED WITH THE FUTURE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO THEIR OWN LAND.

"Babylon stands forth as embodying the predominant sins of the whole world; as incorporating in herself the root and the head of its offences. It is very fitting that her judgement should take place as a climax, at the end of this dispensation; and that on the grapes of the vine of the earth becoming fully ripe, this spot that has borne them the earliest and most abundantly, should meet with signal retribution at the time of the treading of the great wine-press of the wrath of God.

"Babylon, as has already been observed, was the first city built upon earth subsequently to the deluge. The design of her builders in constructing her, eminently displayed their spirit of worldliness and opposition to God. Their wish to raise a tower whose top might reach unto heaven, and to make to themselves a name upon earth, was in prosecution of their own honor, which they sought to establish by terrestrial and human means; and in procuring this to themselves, they were ready to defy God, and exalt themselves to the place of his abode. Their first monarch was Nimrod, the grandson of Ham—one accursed for the exhibition of a most depraved and carnal mind. Nimrod himself was a mighty hunter, given over to an occupation typical of warfare, and the capture and subjection of prey. For all these features the Babylonians have been notorious throughout their whole history. From 'her youth' the city was addicted to sorceries and idolatries, and to the debasing sensuality which accompanies these sins.—Rom. i., 18, 32. She has

been also invariably, a merciless invader and oppressor of other nations, carrying off multitudes as a prey into bondage and slavery. Her pursuit of worldly wealth and renown was incessant, and in this she was successful above every rival. 'Is not this,' said one of her kings, 'great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?' Dan. iv. 30. She was styled 'the golden city,' 'the lady,' and 'the glory of kingdoms.' She said in her heart, 'I am, and none else beside me.' She has also openly carried out to its worst extreme, the idea of exalting her head to the place of the Most High. One of her monarchs, for example, made a decree that no one should ask a petition of any God or man for the space of thirty days, save of himself (Dan. vi., 7-9), thus mentally dethroning Jehovah and every idol, and making himself, for a time, the sole arbiter of the wants and the destinies of his people.

"In the Babylon described in the book of Revelation, we see those very same characteristics prominently brought to view. She is marked for idolatries, sorceries, oppressions, worldliness, luxury, boastings, and the blasphemous sins of the Antichrist himself—making to herself, as at the very beginning of her existence, a name upon earth, and exalting her head unto heaven. It is the same Babylon throughout, that has been known in Chaldea; and her spirit is that manifested in all ages by the whole world—the seeking exclusively their own, and the being at enmity with God.—Phil. ii. 21; Rom. viii. 5-7. 'In the last days,' these features will be more and more displayed, and perilous times shall come.—2 Tim. iii., 1-5. Babylon, in the end, will be the concentration, as she has been the great propagator of these evil dispositions; and she will be visited as such with a judgement which the whole world shall feel, as poured out upon the great corrupter of the race—the root and the capital of their wickedness.

"Against the spirit of the world, Israel were called out to testify. They were to be a nation separate from all other nations—a peculiar and a holy people, who were to be witnesses for God against the evils that had spread over the whole of the earth. Through the weakness of the flesh, the natural descendants of Abraham have failed to realize the object of their election, but the Lord will establish His purposes in the latter days, by an Israel who shall be doubly the children of Abraham; by affinity according to the spirit, as well as according to the flesh.

"In effecting this, in restoring the true Israel to the position they are to occupy

upon earth, Babylon, the great opponent of God, of His ways, and of His people, is most fittingly brought under final judgement.

"The two parties are spoken of correlatively in the following passages, in which the overthrow of the one and the establishment of the other are shown to be events closely associated together.—Isa. xliii., 1, 4-15; xlv., 1-11.

"After this comes the prophetic announcement of Cyrus as the restorer of Israel and the overthrower of Babylon, foreshadowing the final reestablishment of the one and destruction of the other, which latter events are thus proclaimed:

"They shall be ashamed, and also confounded, all of them: they shall go to confusion together that are makers of idols; but Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, world without end. Isa. xlv, 16, 17.

"The contrast is again renewed:

"In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory. Bel boweth down; Nebo stoopeth.' Isa. xlv., 25; xlvii., 1, 12-14; xlviii., 1, 4; and xlviii. 12-14.

"The dependence of the salvation of the one upon the destruction of the other is repeatedly, and still more forcibly marked.—Jer. i., 1-11, 17-24.

"And it shall come to pass in the day that the Lord shall give thee (Israel) rest from thy sorrow and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the OPPRESSOR CEASED! THE GOLDEN CITY CEASED! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the scepter of the rulers. He who smote the people in wrath with a continual stroke, he that ruled the nations in anger, is persecuted, and none hindereth. How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!—Isa. xiv. 3-6, 12.

"The voice of them that flee and escape out of the land of Babylon, to declare in Zion the vengeance of the Lord our God, the vengeance of his temple.—Jer. i. 28.

"Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth; say ye, The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob.—Isa. xlviii. 20.

"It is clear, from the foregoing scriptures, that whenever the time comes for the restoration of the ancient people of God to their own land, then, and not till then, are the

judgements foretold against Babylon to be finally and fully executed upon her. * *

"Thus Babylon, the source and realization of all the wickedness for which the world is noted; its pursuit of earthly things; its desire to be independent of the Creator; its idolatries, in spirit and in action; its hatred of God, and oppression of his people, and its adoption of all that is anti-christian, and finally of the Anti-christ himself, is to be found in the latter days, established 'upon her own base,' filled to satiety with every thing that her heart has been set upon, and carrying out to their utmost extreme all her iniquitous principles and rebellious will. She is to sit yet again as the lady and the glory of kingdoms—the center of their power and wealth, as she has been the originator and the head of all their corruptions; and it is as such, as the capital, moral and physical, of a world lying in the wicked one, that she meets with her final condemnation at the time that the whole earth is judged, and brought under the dominion of the only true and righteous King.

"At present, the mark of condemnation is visibly stamped upon her, as a standing warning to those who ask these things for which she has been noted; but the fullness of wrath has yet to be displayed towards her, and before that day she will rise from her posture of desolation, and prove how righteous that wrath, by displaying again the depths and the unchangeableness of her wickedness.

"Just so it was with her great parallel, Egypt. On the night of the passover, the stamp of judgement was visibly put upon the Egyptians. Death was inflicted in every house, and there was a great cry of lamentation throughout the whole land. But from the sense of this desolation they recovered, and they set themselves once more openly in array against the Lord of hosts. Then, at length, they met with irrevocable destruction, and at that same time, salvation was wrought for Israel, whom they had persecuted. 'Thou didst divide the sea before them, so that they went through the midst of the sea on the dry land; and their persecutors thou throwest into the deep, as a stone into the mighty waters.'—Neh. ix. 11.

"And a similar fate still awaits Babylon. She will be reestablished as wickedness itself—the woman seated in the ephah; and as wickedness is to be put down with the strong hand throughout all the earth, when the Lord comes to take up His great power and reign, so will Babylon, the root and centre of the offences of the earth, as a stone cast into the sea, be then 'thrown down with violence, and be found no more at all.' "

(To be continued.)

The Political.

[Translated for the New York Herald from *La Patrie*, of Paris, of April 2, 1857.]

The Rivalry Existing Between England and Russia in Asia.

THE barriers which nature and political jealousy have interposed between the civilized nations of the West and the richest countries of the world in the East are daily seen to be gradually falling down. The Pacific Ocean is at the present day become a rendezvous and point of meeting for all nations. The Japanese, of their own accord, begin to relax the severity of their exclusive policy; China, too, will soon be obliged to make similar concessions to Western commerce, by dint of force, while the wandering populations of Central Asia, the tribes which lead a pastoral and unsettled life are being gradually disciplined and civilized by Russia. Thus it is that Europe seems in the present age to be directing all her energies and activity towards the Eastern world. It may, therefore, very possibly happen, that two at least of the great powers of Europe will begin again in Asia the fierce struggle which was terminated for a time in Europe by the treaty of Paris. The question arises, whether England has any reason to fear for her Indian possessions? Whether any danger from Russia is to be apprehended on her part? Will the opposing forces of England and Russia ever meet together in hostile array on the plains of the East? These are questions into which we will inquire, and for the purpose of aiding us in their solution we shall avail ourselves of the information derived from Mons. Ferrier, a French officer, the first who has ever traveled through these countries of Asia, by which the English and Russian possessions are separated from each other.

The continent of India forms an immense triangle, two sides of which are watered by the ocean, while the base of the triangle is formed by the mountains of Thibet, in an insurmountable chain. Thus it will be perceived that nature has provided for the defence of India by means of the strongest barriers. There is only one point at which this vast region may be said to be vulnerable, and that is the northwest point of the triangle. There it is that a succession of plains called steppes, placed one above the other successively, rise like a gigantic staircase, each stair being a vast plain of country, extending from the shores of the Gulf of Persia as far as the Himalaya mountain. Here, the great river Indus, receiving in its course all the streams by which Central Asia

is watered, rushes into the ocean with a power and rapidity exceeding that of all other rivers. Ever since the time of Alexander the Great this has always been the corner at which foreign people have penetrated into India with their invading forces. The Indus, notwithstanding its great breadth, and the rapidity of its current, has never interposed a barrier adequate to arrest the invading hordes of Central Asia.

The English, who are the only people who have conquered India by an invasion made on the side of the sea, have never entertained any serious fears of the Hindoo population of this country. These people, enervated by the climate, and weakened as to national unity by the system of castes, could not be excited to revolt against their conquerors, even by their religion. While such is the case with the Hindoo population, it is quite different with the Mussulman race inhabiting India, who are chiefly settled in the northwest region of the country, and are the descendants of the ancient Mahometan conquerors of Hindostan. These men, who are much stronger and more warlike than the Hindoos, hate the English, whom they regard both as the spoilers of their inheritance and as the enemies of their religion. In them the English have always found rebellious subjects, and doubtful allies. Besides all this, these Mussulman tribes, living as they do at the foot of the Himalayas and on both banks of the Indus, hold, as it were, in their hands, the keys of the country, and could at any time deliver them up to an invader. Now, let it be supposed that there should suddenly arise in Central Asia a power such as that of the Tartars or of the Mongols, or suppose that Persia was to have a revival of the days of Nadir Shah—then, in either case, if any conqueror, unfurling the flag of Islam, should appear on the banks of the Indus and proclaim a holy war, a war of religion, he would behold millions of Mussulmans flocking to his standard, and would make the empire of the English totter to its foundation. The immense difficulties which the conquest of Scinde and of the Punjab presented to the English within the last few years, is proof enough how much more terrible the struggle would have been if there had been some invader in the country who had rallied round him, against the English, the Mussulman population, uniting them together into one band. It has ever been the policy of England, from the commencement of the present century, to guard against a danger of the kind we have here intimated.

In accordance with such a policy, separate treaties of peace and amity have been made with Persia, and with the Afghans, by the

British, at a great cost, without any stint whatever in the distribution of gold for the purpose. These two nations have been played against each other. If the Affghans invaded India, then Persia was bound by treaty to invade Affghanistan, and thus to make a diversion in favor of the English. On the other hand, if Persia invaded India, the Affghans were bound by treaty to bar the passage to that power. But if the two powers should happen to quarrel and make war against each other, in that case, England was not bound to meddle, but leave them alone mutually to destroy each other.

This system answered the purpose very well, and was a two-fold security to England against the invasion of India, until lately, when Persia fell under the power of Russia, and was first conquered and then dismembered by her. Henceforth, Persia was to be feared, as being likely to become a tool in the hands of Russia. Now it was that the former power, having lost so much on its northern frontier, was seen making an effort to compensate itself by new acquisitions on its southern. Persia now desired to extend her empire over Affghanistan, in order to make up for the territory which she had ceded to Russia. The Suddozy family, which formerly reigned over the whole country, had no other possession than Herat. A new family, the Barukizy, ruled over all the other parts of the land. Dost Mohammed, belonging to this family, reigned over Caboul; and Jellalabad Kohen-di-Khan, his half brother, reigned over Caudahar; while other brothers of this family were lords over the other secondary cities and places of the country. Persia made an offer to all these princes to guarantee to them their several states and sovereignties, provided they would acknowledge her as the nominal sovereign power. At the same time she offered to drive out the Suddozy family from Herat as being the common enemy of the princes of the Barukizy family. In conformity with these propositions on the part of Persia, a secret treaty was concluded between Kohen-di-Khan and Persia, under the special guarantee of the Russian Ambassador, the condition of which orders that Kohen-di-Khan should do homage to the Shah of Persia as his vassal, and that in return the Shah should give him the possession of Herat. It was in the execution of this treaty that the Persian army marched upon Herat in the year 1838, and laid siege to that city.

But this intermeddling on the part of Persia in the family affairs of the princes and rulers of Affghanistan completely upset all the plans of the English East India Company and the policy handed down to it by its

predecessors. This policy was to oppose the Persians to the Affghans and the Affghans to the Persians reciprocally. The English naturally reasoned thus: If Russian intrigue succeeds in uniting Persia and Affghanistan, and in constituting the latter vassals of the Persian empire, what is to hinder Russia, in process of time, from bringing all the Mahometan states of the northwest of India into a similar alliance with Persia, thus forming a mighty Mussulman confederation, embracing all the countries situated between the Caspian Sea and the Banks of the Indus and the Sutledj? It was foreseen that the day might come when an army of two hundred thousand Mussulmans, officered by Europeans, might show itself on the banks of the Indus. Such being the view of the case, fear seized upon the English government of India, and drove it into the adoption of the most disastrous measures. Sir Alexander Barnes, however, who was at that time in Affghanistan, was far from participating in these fears. This gentleman possessed such a perfect knowledge of the country, and such just and sensible political views, that he was fully capable of forming a correct judgement upon the matter in question. He knew that Dost Mahommed, the sovereign of Caboul, who was the most intelligent as well as the most powerful of the Barukizy family, was altogether opposed to the new Persian alliance.

The principal motive which induced the other individuals of this family to enter into such an alliance was the strong desire which each had of being separately confirmed in the possession of the province he had seized upon. Now, then, the proper course for the English to pursue would have been to fall in with this desire of these princes—to guarantee to each one of them the possession of his territory—and by the liberal offer of subsidies in the event of any war with Persia, to draw all of them into an English alliance. If they should only be made sure of keeping their own States, severally each one for himself, all further motive for placing the independence of their country at the feet of Persia would be at once removed; then also the religious sectarian differences which divide the Affghans from the Persians would have regained all their force, and the covetousness for which the Affghans are so notorious would have bound them for ever to the English. Such would have been the proper course; the wisdom of such a policy has since been fully acknowledged. But its extreme simplicity caused it to be rejected as not efficacious or operative enough. Hence the negotiations entered into by Sir A. Barnes with the princes of Affghanistan did

not receive the sanction of the authorities at Calcutta. These men were resolved not to modify in the least degree whatever the traditional course and old policy of the East India Company. They, therefore, persisted in the purpose of making Afghanistan a single power, to act as such as a counterpoise to Persia. For this reason, while a fleet was despatched up the Persian Gulf to intimidate the Shah by a demonstration made in the very heart of his kingdom, and then to oblige him to abandon the siege of Herat, the company determined at the same time to send an army into Afghanistan, in order to establish there the sole legitimate authority of the hereditary Shah, who was named Soojah, over all the provinces of this vast country. The unfortunate results of this famous expedition against Caboul are too well known, as also what tremendous efforts it cost the English subsequently to revenge the destruction of their army. After all, the English could not succeed in attaining the object they aimed at, namely, to form Afghanistan into a single empire. They were obliged to content themselves with merely raising the siege of Herat. They afterwards made separate treaties with the Afghan princes, whom they had sought to divest of their powers. Dost Mohammed retained his dominion in Caboul, and Kohendi-khan continued to reign in Candahar, subject only to the condition of engaging to relieve Herat if Persia should again attempt to obtain possession of that place.

At the same time, however, that an English army was destroyed by the Afghans in Caboul, an expedition made by the Russians against Khiva met with the same fate. This counter defeat gave new spirits and fresh courage to the English. It seemed now to be proved by terrible facts and disasters that these two European Powers could never succeed when they attempted to go beyond the limits assigned by nature. Tartary seemed to be a certain and unavoidable grave for the Russians, and Afghanistan for the English. Between these two countries, moreover, a vast region of country extended, nearly a thousand miles in length and about five hundred miles in breadth, over which no European foot had ever passed. All accounts concurred in representing this vast region as consisting only of sandy deserts and uninhabitable plains, which even the few hordes of wandering Tartars scarcely ever ventured to traverse. Between the Afghans on the one side, and the people of Bukaria on the other side of these vast deserts, there never had existed any relations of commerce or of any kind whatever, which was taken to be a manifest proof of the barrenness of all the

countries situated between Herat and the Sea of Aral. Thus then it seemed as if nature herself had undertaken to plant large and impassable barriers between the several possessions of the English and Russians in Asia, rendering any hostile collision between these two great European powers impossible in Asia. Such being the case, England had no cause to entertain fear of any power whatsoever except Persia, and to secure her against Persia all that was necessary was to watch over and preserve the independence of Afghanistan. England felt still more confident in her security after the conquest of Scinde and of the kingdom of Lahore. The river Indus was not a secure line of defence. It was not quite certain that an enemy could be prevented from crossing at some point or another a river the whole length of which was nearly five hundred miles. Even the presence of an enemy on the left bank of the Indus would of itself alone be sufficient to make the world call in question the high pretensions and character of the English power, and a single battle lost would place the whole northern part of the Indian peninsula in the power of the invaders. We may be convinced of this when we remember the effect produced throughout Hindostan by the defeat of Sir Henry Gough at Chillianwallah, by the Sikhs. The conquest, therefore, of Scinde and of the kingdom of Lahore, while it made the English masters of the whole course of the Indus, from its rise in India to its mouths in the Gulf of Persia, enabled them to advance their line of defence forward beyond the river, behind which they could safely retire and reorganize their troops in case of a defeat. Parallel with the Indus from Hindoo Koush to the Gulf of Persia there extends a long chain of mountains, forming the boundary of Afghanistan. This long mountain range can only be crossed at two places, one on the north, opposite the country of Caboul, at the place where the Indus leaves Thibet and enters India; the other at the south of Afghanistan, opposite Candahar, which are called the passes of Bolon. It is at the last mentioned point that the armies of England twice penetrated into the country of the Afghans. At both these passes where they open into the opposite territory, the English have erected powerful fortresses, viz: Peshawer, opposite Hindoo Koush, and Thikarpore, opposite the passes of Bolon. Behind these forts are bridges erected over the Indus; one at Atloki, where the river Caboul falls into the Indus, the other at Baruk, on the lower Indus. In case of any reverse the English are thus enabled to fall back upon the left bank, while they also have by these bridges the means of pouring troops at any time into the coun-

try from the right bank of the river. It is therefore not to be denied that the recent conquests of the English have been the means of giving to their empire a much stronger frontier than it previously possessed, while at the same time their system of defence, organized on the plan it is at present, presents insurmountable obstacles in the way of any Asiatic army. Would it be so, however, if they had a European army to contend with? And first of all, let us ask, could a Russian army ever penetrate into the country so far as the river Indus? Ever since the expedition against Caboul, the opinion has prevailed almost universally that the very idea of the advance of a Russian army across Central Asia is to be regarded as an absolute chimera. Such has been the general opinion; it is, however, a deception which a more perfect knowledge of the progress already made by Russia will dissipate. We shall now proceed to prove satisfactorily how unfounded this opinion is.

We have shown where the vulnerable points of the Anglo-Indian empire are to be found, and also what are the defensive resources of the English on that continent. Let us now inquire into and ascertain the means of aggression which are in the power of Russia.

Within the course of the last fifteen years Russia has become sole and sovereign master of the whole Caspian Sea. The pirates, by whom it was previously infested, have been wholly exterminated; the freedom of navigation on its waters has been taken entirely away from Persia; a large fleet of ships of war and transport ships has been constructed, and, lastly, a great military and commercial port has been created by Russia on the southern extremity of this ocean at Ashounadeh, opposite Asterabad. Every time Russia has a quarrel with Persia she always threatens to seize upon the latter fortress and occupy it as a pledge of good behavior. This fort commands the celebrated Caspian ports, and Russia has frequently endeavored by negotiation to obtain the cession of it whenever that power, whether by fair means or by foul, shall become master of Asterabad. The independence of Persia will thenceforth no longer be possible. Russia will then be able to penetrate into the heart of Persia by Asterabad, and march against Teheran on two sides at one and the same time. This she could do, inasmuch as the south is already open to her invasion by her Caucasian provinces. Let us now then inquire into the possibility of the march of a Russian army to the Indus. First, let us suppose it to be under the shadow of an offensive and defensive alliance with Persia, and, next,

which is, however, a very doubtful contingency on the supposition of her respecting the neutrality of Persia in a war with England, in which the former power would remain neutral, let it be supposed that a Russian army is collected at Moscow or at Kesar; that it is embarked upon the Volga, which it will descend in eight or ten days and arrive at Astracan. At the latter place a fleet is in waiting to receive the army on board. After five days sailing this army will be landed at Ashibournadeh. Thus then a Russian army could be concentrated at Asterabad and be ported into Khorasan within fifteen days after leaving Moscow. If it should be a small army it would be able to follow the highway of the caravans as far as Meshed, then turning suddenly southward it could ascend the Heri-rood as far as Herat. This road passes through a fertile country, in which are rich and populous cities. The caravan with which Mons. Ferrier traveled, and which went at the rate of ten or fifteen miles a day, completed the journey along this highway in twenty days. But if, on the other hand, it happened to be a very large army, and it was wished not altogether to exhaust the country through which it passed, it would be easy to march it in three columns, each taking a different route. The first column might, on leaving Asterabad, follow the course of the river Goughan, by that route which was explored by Mons. Mowranax. In its march it would cross over the territory inhabited by the Kurdes, and would strike the river Heri-rood at the place where it is lost in the sands. From this point the columns would ascend the river to Herat. The second column might pursue the Meshed route; and the third, marching more to the right, might proceed in a straight direction to Herat, through Tourshiz Kaff and Gourian. There would be no necessity for such an army to bring the artillery required for a siege all the way from Europe, for there are in the arsenal at Teheran 500 pieces of artillery of the largest caliber, which have been cast and mounted by European engineers, and also there are abundant means of transport. As respects the victualing of such an army, the immense plain of Khorasan would supply abundantly every kind of provision, notwithstanding it has been represented by Burnes and Kinneard as being nothing but a desert. The Shah of Persia has repeatedly marched armies of 30,000 or 40,000 men across the plains of Khorasan, without taking any provisions with his army or providing magazines. In these cases, the armies have never suffered for want of provisions, although, at their approach, the population whom they plundered without mercy, always fled away,

and carried off with them all that they could remove. In 1838, during all the nine months that the siege of Herat lasted, the Persian army, according to the account of Sir John McNeill, subsisted almost entirely upon the resources supplied from the neighborhood of Herat and Gourian, without having recourse to the neighboring districts of Furrak and Subzar, which are far more productive. A Russian army, which would pay for what it required to consume, would be sure to see the whole population of the surrounding country flocking in crowds to dispose of their provisions, allured by the prospect of the smallest gain.

While one division of the army might be left to carry on the siege of Herat, the remainder of the Russian forces, continuing their march, would arrive under the walls of Candahar, where they would not be long detained, this city not being in a condition to maintain a siege. From Candahar to the Indus the army would follow the road which the English took when they invaded Afghanistan, with this difference, that instead of having to climb up the heights of the Pass of Bolan, which the English had to do, they will have the more easy task of descending those mountain heights. Sir John McNeill, though he has been treated as a Pessimist and an alarmist, was perfectly justified in writing to Lord Palmerston, after the events of 1838, as follows :

“The country comprised between the frontiers of Persia and the Indus is much richer and more fertile than I had any idea of. I can assure your lordship that neither the configuration of the soil nor the lack of subsistence would be found to present any obstacles whatever to the march of a large army from the borders of Georgia as far as Candahar, nor even, according to my view of the case, as far as the Indus. So far indeed from the nature of the various countries which an invading army would have to pass through presenting any guarantee for the security of India against invasion, I am of opinion that, on the contrary, it would be remarkably favorable to such an undertaking. I feel myself more especially called upon to express this opinion in the most decided and positive terms, inasmuch as it is a contradiction of what I formerly considered to be the case, and is contrary to the opinion I more than once expressed, at a time when I formed my judgement upon information which I have since discovered to be inaccurate.”

Now, this very route which Sir John McNeill considered practicable for an army, has been traveled over by Mons. Ferrier in its whole extent, from the borders of the Caspian Sea to the walls of Candahar.

What he says therefore on the subject has all the weight and authority of an eye witness, and is perfectly in accordance with the opinion of Sir John.

Let us now go upon the supposition of the neutrality of Persia in a war between the English and Russians. Let us inquire in this view of the matter whether a meeting of the hostile armies on the Indus would in this case be impossible.

That which caused the failure of the first Russian expedition against Khiva, fifteen years ago, was the fact that the Russians ventured into the desert without a sufficient number of troops, and without having a sustaining place, or *point d'appui*. But they have learned wisdom by experience, and have fixed upon the Sea of Aral as the basis of their line of operations. Having already for some time had a considerable establishment at the mouth of the Ourel, on the Caspian Sea, viz., Gowrief, they have now established another at the mouth of the Embah, which is the most considerable of the streams by which the country lying between the Caspian Sea and the Sea of Aral is watered. They now navigate the Embah to a considerable extent from its mouth. From the point at which the Embah is no longer navigable, they have dug a series of wells, reaching to the northern extremity of the Sea of Aral. They have settled here in this country military colonies of Cossacks, whose business it is to take charge of those wells of water. These colonists have also been required to cultivate the ground in the neighborhood, and having done so, it has been found that the land is more productive and fertile than it had been before imagined. It is therefore evident that a Russian army would be able to march from the mouth of the Embah on the Caspian to the Sea of Aral without suffering for want of water or provisions. On the Sea of Aral a flotilla has been constructed, and every island of the sea has been taken possession of, so that this flotilla can disembark and land a Russian *corps d'armée* at the mouth of the Oxus, a few days' journey from Khiva, having all necessary provisions and supplies at its command.

But the Russians have not remained contented with doing all this. On the Caspian Sea, 150 miles south of the Embah, they have founded a new city called Alexandrof, and from this city to the southern extremity of the Sea of Aral they have established another line of wells of water, under the care of other military colonists. Ten whole years were spent, and an entire *corps d'armée* was employed in the execution of this great work, by which Russia has secured to herself the possession of all that part of Tartary com-

prised between the Caspian Sea and the Sea of Aral.

By means of this work she can now make herself master of Khiva whenever she pleases. Furthermore, since the year 1853, the Khan of Khiva has been a mere vassal of the Czar of Russia. For, whatever power holds in its hands the mouths of the Oxus, that power has all the Tartars at his feet, the Oxus being the great artery of the whole of Tartary—indeed it may be said to be the only one.

It is evident, therefore, that a Russian army, starting from Astracan, may be disembarked at Alexandrof, and in a week's time may be transported to the mouths of the Oxus. It would then be able to ascend this great river, followed by the flotilla of the Sea of Aral, carrying its artillery and all the necessary supplies. The Oxus is navigable as far up as Balkh and Khulm, that is to say, into the very heart of the ancient Bactriana. On arriving at the confluence of the Oxus with the river Khulm, the army would be at the foot of the chain of mountains called by the ancients Paropamisus, and by the moderns, Hindou-Koush. The army would then cross these mountains at the gorge or opening of Bamian, when it would arrive at Caboul. After this all it would have to do would be to follow the course of the river of Caboul, which falls into the Indus, in order to arrive on the banks of the latter river. This is the route by which Alexander the Great arrived on the Indus. By this same road Nadir Shah, a century ago, penetrated into India and advanced as far as Delhi.

No serious obstacle, therefore, would be able to arrest the march of a Russian army from the mouth of the Oxus to the banks of the upper Indus, unless it should happen that the English, instead of waiting for him under the walls of Peshawer, should go to meet the approaching enemy, and prepare against his approach by occupying Caboul and its territory.*

* The course indicated by Mons. Ferrier would most likely be adopted by Russia if the Tarshish-Merchant Company of India were to wait at home for the arrival of the Muscovites. But this they would not do. They would certainly send forth their "young lions" to meet them in the way. The world's destiny, however, is not to be determined in India nor in the valley of the Mississippi. Jehovah's controversy is about Zion, and his victory is to be inaugurated on the mountains of Israel. The manifest policy, though not the destiny of Russia, is to acquire universal dominion; and the continued existence of the Indian empire necessitates the policy of British opposition of the deadliest character. These two policies are two forces actively working in the political heavens, which can neither of them be carried out purely and simply. Their mutual antagonism will mark out a course for England and Russia which neither of them contemplates at present. That course is delineated in the prophets, and indicates "between the seas to the glorious holy mountain," and the region of Botzrah, as the grave of these two rivals for the scepter of the East.—*Editor Herald.*

But the Russians would not confine themselves to demonstrations threatening the upper Indus; they would follow the example given them by the conquering Tartars. We have before stated that the chain of the Afghanistan mountains runs parallel with the course of the Indus. Now there is a long line of fortresses and fortified cities which extend parallel with this chain of mountains, and command the whole plain or plateau of Central Asia. Commencing with them from the north, and proceeding southward, their names are in that order as follows:—Khulm, Balkh, Shibberghan, Meimana, Kalenough, Herat, Subzar and Furrah. Military force, or more probably and more effectively, gold, would soon open the gates of any one of these fortified places to the Russians. There they would find ample stores and provisions, and the means of re-equipping their cavalry, and repairing their carriages and wagons. Once masters of Herat, they would be in a condition to march against Candahar and the lower Indus. This road to the Indus, by way of Herat and Candahar, and across the mountain pass of Bolan, has this great advantage: that it leads straight to the Indus below the point where that river receives into its streams the waters of its last tributary; whereas, the road by the gorge and passes of Bamran and Caboul only leads to the Punjab, and in order to penetrate into India by this way, the five large rivers which water the country of the Sikhs have first to be crossed in succession. If we suppose, therefore, that the Russians made their principal demonstrations to the south, by way of Herat, still it would be of advantage for them to occupy the more northern route, if it were for no other purpose than that of making a diversion, and of preventing any division of the English army from marching out upon Caboul, and thereby placing themselves in the rear of the Russian line of operations. Military and scientific men will take great pleasure in examining into all these details, which will be found in the work of Mons. Ferrier, in relation to the different roads an army might take to go from Herat to Caboul, or to Candahar; how such an army would have to be supplied with provisions and forage; how artillery, &c., would be transported, &c., &c., but we abstain from entering upon them in this article. It is the first time that the topography of Central Asia has been studied in a military point of view. Mons. Ferrier has done more; he is the first European who has penetrated into the country of the Emaks, of the Hazaraks, of the Taimouns, tribes of Tartar descent, who are in continual warfare with the Afghans. The latter never

traverse the territory of these people, but take long circuits to avoid them, certain as they are to meet either with death or captivity if caught among them. These tribes would be sure to join any conqueror who would subject the Affghans by force or oblige them to submit by negotiation.

We leave it to those who are fond of conjectures to guess what would be the effect which the appearance of an army of 30,000 Russians and 50,000 Persians on the banks of the Indus would have upon the rulers and people of Hindostan, and to endeavor to make out on which side the chances of success would preponderate. The English East India Company would, it strikes us, have great difficulty to bring together an army of more than twenty thousand English and forty or fifty thousand Sepoys. They could not assemble a larger force without weakening too much the garrisons of the fortified places. Hence the forces on both sides would be pretty equally balanced. It is quite sufficient for us, without seeking to penetrate into the secrets of futurity, to have proved by the new light which we possess at the present day upon the geography of Central Asia, that the idea of a Russian army going some day or other to knock at the gates of India is not a dream nor a chimera, as some of the wisest men have hitherto thought that it was.

Another conclusion also naturally flows from what has preceded, and it is this: If Caboul and Herat command the two several routes which lead from Central Asia to India—the one on the north and the other on the south of Affghanistan—it is manifestly most essential for the safety and security of the Anglo-Indian empire that both these strong places should be held by those who are faithful and firm friends of the English. Perhaps there are some persons who may be inclined to go a little further, and who will be of the opinion that it is for the interest of the English to possess and occupy themselves the only two points by which an entrance can be made into their empire. They may think that the English ought to keep the keys of their own house themselves, founding such a conclusion upon the principle that it is always better to meet a danger half way and in advance, rather than to wait till it comes home to one's doors.

From the *Jeffersonian*.

The Inefficiency of "The Church."

MR. EDITOR—The *Jeffersonian*, though chiefly secular in its character, sometimes takes pote of ecclesiastical affairs, and keeps your readers posted as to movements in the

religious world. On this account, I ask a little space to inquire into the objects and purpose of the new organization in our community, whose title stands at the head of your column. Is it to afford an occasion or inducement for "Christian young men" to assemble or "associate" together to promote religious intercourse among them, to engage their energies in personal holiness or benevolent efforts for the spiritual good of others? If so, is not *the Church*, with all its hallowing influences, with its divine organization, the ministry, the word, the spirit, the ordinances, the prayers and the praise, designed by its Great Author to effect these very objects? And shall we turn from the Heavenly Plan of doing good, from the Divine Wisdom, to follow our own inventions, "after the doctrines and traditions of men, and not after Christ?" Is not *the Church* the Christian Association for young men and old, the Temperance Society, the Missionary, Bible, Tract, Charitable, Benevolent Institution which God has ordained for the improvement, instruction and ransom of our race?

Of the Great Head of the Church, it is written to Christians in Scripture, "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are complete in Him, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Do Christians believe this when, by inventing new means of effecting that which Divine wisdom has devised a way to accomplish, they presume to exalt their wisdom above God's, and practically repudiate and reject his plans?

What would be thought of a new mode of dispensing justice, of upholding the laws, and inflicting punishment on the guilty, in civil society? Would it not be a deliberate attack on the dignity, authority and wisdom of the courts of justice and the established organized institutions of society? Mob law, vigilance committees, lynching, etc., are all vindicated on the plea of the feebleness or inefficiency of the lawful tribunals; and it is because men despise and denounce them that they resort to other expedients to secure protection and make justice sure. So in religion; complaining of the "inefficiency of the pulpit," of the powerlessness of the Church, they take the law into their own hands, and go about to found "Christian Associations," etc., like California Vigilance Committees, to do the work which *the Church* is too feeble or too corrupt to effect! Now, the remedy in either case is plain. It is not to supersede and practically set aside the courts in the one case, or the Church in the other. It is to set about the work of reform, and make each what it

ought to be. To do this, we have no need of these new contrivances. There is no society designed to help out the lame performances of the Church which is not founded on a practical usurpation of the rights of the great author and founder of the Christian faith. Make the fountain pure, and the stream will be pure. God is a jealous God, and will he not say hereafter, in reference to all such human schemes, "Who hath required this at your hands?"

Charlottesville, Va.

CHRISTIANOS.

Analecta Epistolaria.

The "Ecclesia" in Halifax, England.

BELOVED BROTHER:

It is with extreme pleasure that I correspond for the first time with you, whom I might with truth acknowledge as my Father in the Faith. I have longed to write to you before, but opportunities have seldom occurred. I herewith send a copy of a circular letter addressed to the churches in this district. The adoption of a similar plan where there are churches near together might be beneficial to them. Will you please to insert it in the May No. of *Herald*, if it can be done conveniently. We will acquaint you with results. The brethren here are going to deliver the enclosed list of discourses, and have an idea of opening a campaign in some of the surrounding towns. The want of some good tracts on the chief principles of our Faith, calculated to open men's eyes thereto, is much felt, and we may probably publish some before long.

Perhaps a few particulars respecting the "Ecclesia" in Halifax, England, may not be altogether uninteresting; for, as Solomon says, "news from a far country is like sweet waters to a thirsty soul." But I must be brief, as trespass is already being committed upon your space, time and patience; so must furnish more at another time.

Through the instrumentality of my excellent relations in this place, by means of letters, *Elpis Israel*, and the *Gospel Banner*, which all found their way to Halifax, myself and brother J. Whitehead became convinced of the truth of Israel's hope. Indeed, his attention was drawn to it during his visit to this place in 1852, and he brought *Elpis* on his return. By its means we became acquainted with the prophetic declarations and indications of their fulfillment in these last days, so that we have taken the keenest interest therein ever since, down from the time of *Menschikoff's* mission till now; and have

frequently pointed the attention of our audiences to the splendid accomplishment of prophecy now transpiring. For a while appearances seemed to favor our affirmations, and men seemed half inclined to believe; but when repeated reverses attended the Russian arms, especially the evacuation of the Danubian Principalities, and the fall of Sevastopol, they begun, like thousands more, who walk by sight only, to pour contempt upon our expositions. Nevertheless, the brethren stand firm to a man, convinced that the end will be even as it is written, and that before long; indeed, the movements of the Prince of Rosh since the conclusion of the war, and the increasing strength he is manifesting, is stronger evidence than before. But more of this anon.

At first, our minds were somewhat held on the Soul question, but the reading of *J. Panton Ham's* works set us completely at rest, that the dead are unconscious, and that Eternal Life only through Christ is the doctrine of the Bible.

For a few months we pursued our investigations, whilst in communion with the Sects; but on the 18th of March, 1854, six of us immersed one another into the name of Jesus, making a solemn confession of Faith and renunciation of former things. We had all previously withdrawn from Babylon's daughters. One is since dead, and self and another removed, but we feel to be present with them still. They have since increased to 16, having had one immersion recently, and more expected. Of our present number, 3 are from the General Baptists, 1 from the Episcopalians, 1 from the Unitarians, 2 from the Campbellites (who have become extinct there), 6 from the Wesleyans, and 4 who were not connected anywhere, and 6 of our number have been reimmersed. They are scripturally organized as a church, with 2 Elders, 2 Deacons, and a Scribe, and have adopted no name, but that of the Master's, nor do they intend doing. This has sorely puzzled the people who have labored hard to put some sectarian cognomen upon us, but all in vain, as they hit upon any save the right one. They meet in a room in the Temperance Hall, Albion Street, capable of holding about 120 persons, and which has several times been filled; but the audience varies much, sometimes upwards of 60, but often below 30. We have given many public discourses, and the good work is still going on.

You are at liberty to publish this letter, or such extracts as you deem meet, and the circular also. It is rather lengthy, but we shall not often trouble you with such. - Wishing you health, prosperity, and every other

blessing till immortalization comes, I remain

Yours, in Israel's hope,

GEORGE DEAN WILSON.

Geneva, Illinois, April 23, 1857.

A Remarkable Question.

DR. THOMAS :

DEAR SIR,—I am engaged in a correspondence at present with a *small* Baptist preacher, but I very much doubt the probability of being able to benefit him. You know the difficulty of discussing a proposition with an individual who has not information enough to understand an argument. In his first communication he admits that Eternal Life is a matter of promise—the Eternal Life of Man is deposited or hid in Jesus the Prince of Life—Eternal Life is conditional; and yet in his last communication he says, Man is in possession of an immortal principle "we call soul."

In it is this remarkable question, "Do you mean to say that Man's physical powers will ever be unending? if so, I call for the proof." Now what could you do with a man with no more biblical information?

There is no news with us; we meet regularly; we are not able to make our meetings interesting to spectators, but they are very interesting to us.

I should be glad to hear how you are progressing with your Book.

Yours, in hope,

J. M. STONE.

Henderson, Kentucky, April 17, 1857.

A Hungry Time.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS :

AFTER my arrival at this place, I went occasionally to hear the Campbellites' preacher, but he was sick, and his sheep were compelled to seek for pasture under the guidance of shepherds from elsewhere; but they were not able to obtain a leading into green pastures all the time, so that, on one particular occasion, they found themselves in a desert with nothing to graze. This was a hungry time. They licked their lips, and *bah-h'd*, in hope of some stray spears of grass that one might pick from his neighbor's lips; but no blade was adherent there. The shepherd's dog barked, but this brought no provender, and an end had come to all grazing. What was to be done? Must the flock hunger and thirst, and perchance die in the desert? The dog barked again, and asked the goats if they had no sympathy

for sheep in such an extremity? Would they not give them a little milk, that they might grow thereby and not perish? Upon this general appeal to the audience, and after waiting some time to note its effect, I concluded, as the goats seemed deaf to the barking, that, having some excellent fodder near by, I would give them a little upon which to chew. I therefore began to strew it about, directing their attention to the promises made to the fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. They seemed to listen with a good deal of interest, and when I had finished, invited me to return the following Sunday. But their shepherd, ever watchful of his own crook, which he had left in the care of his dog, *President*, hearing that a stranger had been supplying his flock with fodder of singular relish, commanded his sickness to depart for the present, while he went to see what was to do. He came to see me at my place of business, when, after a short conversation, I found myself defending the goodness of the pasture with the product of which I had been feeding his starvelings. According to promise, I was on the ground again with feed in plentiful supply. But, to the astonishment of the sheep themselves, who supposed their shepherd was diligently tending his own ailments, he appeared among them for shearing purposes! I, of course, saved my provender for better times; for the heavens began to gather blackness, lightnings zig-zag and forked darted forth, and thunders rolled with rattling and crashing fury against your devoted head as leader, or prince, among the devils. But, though the storm has subsided, the sun does not shine. I have had no further opportunity of leading the flock to grass, for the shepherd has not yet found it convenient to be sick. I see some of the sheep, however, occasionally; and give them a nibble as time and circumstances will permit.

Wishing you health and happiness, I remain,

Your brother in the one hope,

W. S.

Paineville, Lake, Ohio, Feb. 14, 1857.

Plan for a more efficient Working and Organization of the Churches in this District of Illinois.

BELOVED BRETHREN IN THE COMMON FAITH :

Grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. Your brethren in this place, partakers of the same hope and calling, send to you greeting. Having been convinced of the paramount necessity of a *more earnest course of action*,

and the desirability of a stronger bond of union amongst us than any which now exists, have resolved to memorialize all our brethren in this locality on these important subjects. The matter stands thus—first let us state our wants :

1. We need a more perfect and Scriptural organization, such as, for instance, the appointment of elders, deacons, secretaries, &c., where such officers do not exist; both for the purpose of proper self-government, and also for the more effective carrying out of evangelical labors. Various improvements are also needed in worship, discipline, and other matters pertaining to church arrangements.

2. Besides these improvements in each separate Church, we need drawing more closely together in the bonds of reciprocal brotherly love in a collective combination. At present, we pursue a too isolated policy—seldom or never see each other, and comparatively little friendly intercourse is kept up between our sister churches. This ought not to be the case among brethren. The consequence is, that much spiritual good is lost, which might accrue from an interchange of speakers and other gifted brethren, less vitality and interest is felt, and our means of usefulness restricted to a narrow circle, which, by mutual assistance, might be greatly increased. Surely we can have this without degenerating into a sect, or giving rise to priestly domination.

3. It has also been proposed to commence, as soon as opportunity affords, some active evangelical labors in neighboring places. Towns and villages are springing up populously around us, in which it is very desirable that the Gospel trumpet should be sounded. There are earnest men among our number, who are both willing and able to engage in the glorious work of proclaiming the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God to their perishing fellow-men; but, unfortunately, many of them could not, in justice to themselves and their families, afford to leave their business for a few days, without some assistance, to enter upon the work in a manner commensurate with their wishes. But if our brethren would combine, funds might easily be raised to pay their occasional expenses, for it is not proposed to maintain any Evangelists permanently in the field at present, but only to assist such as may wish occasionally to go out and preach. Until more extensive measures could be taken, much good may be done on a smaller scale in our respective localities; and then, as our means increase, launch out on a larger. Already are some openings beginning to present themselves. Much good has

resulted from the pursuit of a similar plan by our brethren in Scotland. *The Gospel must be preached*; and woe to those who have the means and use them not in the work of the Lord! But it sometimes happens that while one church possesses more talent, more gifted brethren, it may lack the funds, while another may possess more wealth than talent. What then should be done? One church should say to another, "you have the men; we have got more of the money; send them forth and we will help you." Come, beloved brethren, let us make-up to this important matter! and devote more of our time, talent, and substance to our blessed Saviour's cause, than we have yet done, and there is no telling what blessings may follow. This is no time for folding our arms in supineness and indolence, when there is so much to be done; when the judgments of God are descending upon the nations, and the coming of the Lord approaches very nigh. Let us not begin to excuse ourselves that men will not hearken. If they don't in one place, they will in another.

4. One of the chief methods of spreading the Truth, would be the publication of some sterling Tracts on the Gospel, Baptism, and other subjects, to scatter broadcast over the land. This would be almost too heavy a task for one church to bear alone; but if other churches would assist and organize to support such exertions, it should easily be done. Persons could be found to write them, and these little messengers of Truth could be scattered far and wide, where our personal presence cannot reach.

These are a few brief statements of some of the wants that have been felt. We will give a few suggestions as to the plan of operations by which the end proposed may be attained :

1. There are churches established in Aurora, Geneva, St. Charles, and Northfield, besides a few isolated brethren in this section of country. *Let these associate in a union*, not to form a Sect, but for mutually strengthening each other, and for spreading the Truth. There need be no surrender by each church of its own proper right of self-government—each assembly of brethren having the liberty of choosing its own elders, deacons, and other officers—but let each appoint a scribe (or secretary) for keeping up a regular correspondence with the sister churches.

2. *Let conferences be held* at regular periods of the year, at such times as may be deemed most convenient, in which all the churches may be represented by delegates or letters, to report progress, and also to delib-

erate on measures for the general good, open new fields of usefulness, and infuse a livelier feeling of earnestness into us all.

3. *Let frequent exchanges* of friendly intercourse be made, so that we may become better acquainted with each other, and especially of those who preach the Word, that we may be nourished by their teaching and counsel, and let each church receiving the benefit of such visit, reward those who confer it out of grateful hearts, and with such manifestations of Christian kindness and liberality as are enjoined in the New Testament. It is our duty to entertain hospitably, and reward those from whom we receive spiritual good; not to let them travel at their own expense, and then put up at a hotel, as is the case with many; and especially if a brother is not well able to leave his business for a few days, and travel at his own cost, it is unkind, nay, more, it is decidedly wrong, to do so. If he is able, and choose to spend some of his wealth in such self-denying labors, it is a different case, but even that would not release us from showing tokens of gratitude. We mention this, because it is a common practice among many churches in this country, and we would not that any of our brethren should fall into this mean and contemptible spirit. Let us therefore ascertain who among us are able to preach the Word, and make arrangements for their visiting the churches, and building them up "in their most holy Faith."—Rom. ch. xii., 3-9; 1 Cor. xv., 58; ch. xvi., 13; Col. ii., 5, 6, 7; ch. iii., 16; Eph. v., 15, 16; Gal. vi., 6; 2 Tim. iv., 2, 3; 1 Thess. v., 11, 12, 13; 1 Pet. iv., 10, 11; 1 Tim. v., 17, 18; Heb. iii., 12, 13; ch. x., 24, 25.

4. *Let us get some good Tracts issued* on the leading subjects of the Faith, such as Immortality, the Gospel, the Promises, the Kingdom, the Way of Salvation, &c., and let every brother and sister assist in the good work both of publishing and disseminating them.

5. *Let a report of progress be sent* from time to time, for insertion in the *Herald of the Kingdom*, by the Secretary of the United Churches.

6. *To carry out these plans, of course some funds will be needed, though not to any large amount.* To meet this, let us all contribute liberally at our weekly collections, and so raise a surplus for a general fund, to be devoted to the above objects. Let us not be influenced by the detestable spirit of sordid avarice, but according to the ability God has given, let us cheerfully give him something in return. Act with true Christian zeal and generosity. Let not the cold shade of parsimony come over you. Partake

not of the covetous spirit of this nation and age. *We have a purer faith*; let us show nobler deeds. Awake to action, ye soldiers of Christ! Your Master will soon appear to reckon with his servants for the talents he has given them; then, happy will it be for those who have used them well. 1 Cor. xvi., 1, 2; 2 Cor. viii., 2, 5, 12, 13, 14; ch. ix.; Matt. x., 7; Acts v., 32, 34, 35; Phil. iv., 10, 14, 19

Brethren, we now leave the matter with you. We have stated but a few of the principal things we need. But these alone, if carried out, would prove of great good to us all, by quickening to greater zeal and earnestness in the cause of Christ. We need such an awakening. We are sinking too much into that spirit of lethargy and supineness which is the crying sin of the present day. This state of things will never do. The sublime and awful scenes of the Second Advent of Jesus will soon burst upon the astonished nations, together with the outpourings of God's wrath; and shall we leave men unwarned thereof? Nay! rather let us put forth ten-fold greater energy to make known the gospel's joyful tidings, and rescue all we can from the coming wrath; lest God require their blood from his watchmen's hands.—Ezek. xxxiii. 1-9. O, brethren, preach the word! and, constrained by the love of Christ, seek to lead men to a knowledge of his precious name! Our own safety depends on it also; for if we allow ourselves to sink into listless apathy, and idle security, we endanger our own salvation thereby, and may be found, when the Master comes, like the unprepared and foolish virgins in the parable.—Matt. xxv. 1, etc. It is only by action that our swords can be kept bright. Look at the perilous nature of the times, brethren, and see if they do not call for more zeal and self-denial on the part of God's people; see if they are not calculated to excite our fears lest any of us "should fail of the grace of God." Let all our past forgetfulness of duty, all tardiness in the work of God, all roots of bitterness (where there have been any) be now forever put away; and let us join like the heart of one man, in an earnest, determined effort to bring about a better state of things in our brotherhood—Hearken to the solemn charge of Jesus concerning the times in which we live: "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life; and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all those things that shall come to pass, and to stand before

the Son of Man."—Luke xxi., 34, 35, 36. Listen to this heavenly voice!

Brethren, if these proposals meet with your approbation, let us know; and if you can suggest any improvement, do so; that we may adopt the best course. If you accept them, well and good, we shall be glad—for more can be accomplished, since "union is strength." But should you decline to cooperate, we shall leave it between yourselves and God, and pursue them alone, on our own responsibility, to the extent of our limited power, but regretting the loss of a larger amount of good that might have accrued through your united and hearty assistance.

Copies of this have been sent to all the churches, and a reply is awaited as soon as possible, stating your views on each point. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

Signed,

In behalf of the Church at Geneva, Ill.,

GEORGE DEAN WILSON,

April 23d, 1857.

Secretary.

N. B. Our worthy and esteemed brethren, Messrs. Wilson and Cockroft, propose to supply a need the want of which has long been felt—viz., a faithful translation of the New Testament, copies of which have been sent round. This work promises, from the specimens we have seen, to be far superior to that of the American Bible Union. We wish you, brethren, to assist them liberally, either by taking a number of copies individually, or taking a share for a quantity. There will be no risk, and there is no doubt that when the work is but once fairly started that it will succeed, and a boon of immense value will be conferred; at least we wish you to make it a common cause, espouse it with zeal, and send in subscribers' names at once, if you wish to see it pushed through. It would be a pity to see it fail, when a little extra exertion would bring it to a successful issue. We regret to say that names, as yet, come in slowly.

**Protest of the Dutch Catholic Bishops
against the Doctrine of the Im-
maculate Conception.**

PASTORAL INSTRUCTIONS OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF UTRECHT AND THE BISHOPS OF HAARLEM AND DEVENTER ON THE SUBJECT OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

WHEN we heard of the great preparations that were being made for deliberating on the point of the Conception at Rome in December, 1854, we found, and with good reason, that these preparations would all be found eventually to have been little more

than an outward form; but we nevertheless hoped that the prayers of many good men, so earnestly solicited by the Holy Father, for the light of the Holy Spirit, would be so heard as to succeed in turning the counsels of Abithophel into foolishness. The unsearchable judgments of Divine Providence have otherwise ordered. Pius, alas! the weak Pius, having once thrown himself into the arms of the Jesuits, has now again lent his name and his influence to accomplish a deed deeply grieving all good men, and causing new scandal in the Church.

The encyclical letter of the 8th of December, 1854, threatens the wrath of Almighty God, etc., to all who should dare to speak against, or even not to accept, the decision therein announced respecting the conception of the Virgin.

How great soever may be our respect for his Holiness as head of the church and the center of Catholic unity, we should dread still more the displeasure of the Almighty if we blindly accepted such decision.

St. Paul did not threaten the people of Berea with the displeasure of Almighty God when they searched the Scriptures to see if the things which were brought before them "were so;" and St. Luke even confers upon them special honor—"These were more noble than those of Thessalonica," because they did so search. If this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception can be so thoroughly proved to be a doctrine of the Catholic Church, as in such apostolic letter it is declared to be, there need no fear arise from such search; yea, rather ought an appeal to go forth inviting such a search, that it may be patent to the whole world that we are indebted to the care and zeal of Pius IX for this discovery.

Inasmuch as we have no conviction that Pius has spoken an infallible word when he declared the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin to be a revealed truth of the Catholic faith, we feel it to be our duty to examine the grounds upon which such declaration rests.

These grounds are said by him to be five:

1. Holy Scripture.
2. Sacred tradition.
3. The continuous feeling of the church.
4. The wonderful unanimity of Catholic pastors and of the faithful.
5. The illustrious acts and constitutions of his predecessors in the Papal chair.

After combating the above grounds, they say, in reference to the fourth, "Where is this wonderful unanimity to be found?"

Naturally in the answers given by the bishops to the encyclical letter addressed to them from Gacta in 1849. The analysis justifies no such unanimity. The whole dogma of the Immaculate Conception being thus entirely new, there need be no wonder that the mode of announcing it was entirely new. Never before were such utterances heard from a Pope's lips. Formerly it was the congregated fathers who, after previous deliberations, etc., judged and determined. But it was on this occasion no church council, although, for the eye of the world, such a coloring was attempted to be given to it. The bishops were merely mute attestators of what was proposed by Pope Pius IX., and with too great reason may the words of the prophet be applied to them, "Blind watchmen! they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs; they cannot bark."—Isaiah, lvi. 10.

Oh! how did those teachers in Israel belie their character! and how was their character trampled on by the first in rank amongst them! An open contumely and spot of shame is thus thrown on the episcopal character and office, those functionaries having nullified their very position and work as judges of the faith.

When the successor of St. Peter gave utterance to the lie that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had been revealed by God, was there no Paul to withstand and gainsay him to the face? On the contrary, they winked in the lowest cajolery when one of the French bishops looked his Holiness in the face and said, "Holy father! thou hast not only decided the Immaculate Conception; thou hast decided thine own infallibility."

Under the fifth head of the pastoral instruction, reference is made to Gregory the Great, Innocent III. and Innocent V., Clement VI., etc., to show that for fourteen centuries a doctrine was held in entire contradiction to that promulgated by Pius IX., and it is then said:

We leave it to every unprejudiced person to decide whether we have good ground for the strictures we have made, and whether we have proved or not that the apostolic letter issued by Pius IX., on the 8th of December, 1854, is simply a tissue (*zamenweefsel*) of untruths, wherein the name of Scripture and sacred traditions are shamefully misapplied to exalt into a matter of faith a mere matter of feeling or subjective impression, not even based on the lowest grade of probability.

In conclusion, we solemnly declare before the whole world that the maxim "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*"

reaches neither in teaching nor in acceptance to this dogma of the Immaculate Conception; and we say to all Catholics, "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set."—Proverbs xxii. 28. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."—Gal. i. 8. "Remember how thou hast received and heard; and hold fast."—Rev. iii. 3.

† JOHN, Archbishop of Utrecht.

† HENRY JOHN, Bishop of Haarlem.

† HERMAN, Bishop of Deventer.

Calvin and Servetus.

CALVIN denounced the doctrines of Servetus, called in the temporal arm of the Genevese magistracy to extirpate the heretic and his creed, and only paused to ask a commutation of his sentence when his victim was about to be bound at the stake. "We endeavored to alter the mode of his death but in vain," observes Calvin in a letter to Farrel. The account we have of the unfortunate Servetus, given us in another letter addressed to his friend Sulzer, exhibits in painful colors the ferocity of the times, and the unmitigated severity of the lean Cassius-like reformer. "As Michael Servetus, twenty years ago, infected the Christian world with his virulent and pestilent opinion, I should suppose his name is not unknown to you. It was he whom that faithful minister of Christ, Master Bacon, of holy memory, in other respects of a mild disposition, declared from the pulpit to be worthy of having his bowels pulled out and torn to pieces. While he has not permitted any of his poison to go abroad since that time, he has lately, however, brought out a larger volume printed secretly at Vienna, but patched up from the same errors. To be sure, as soon as the thing became known, he was cast into prison. He escaped from it some way or other, and wandered in Italy for nearly four months. He at length, in an evil hour, came to this place, when, at my instigation, one of the Syndics ordered him to be conducted to prison; for I could not disguise it that I considered it my duty to put a check upon this most obstinate and ungovernable man." Such was Calvin—a persecutor arrogating to himself infallibility in Geneva. As the man, so is the spirit of his creed—dark, cruel, and revengeful. Like its Roman Mother, the blind propensities blindly led by the sentiments with intellect dethroned.

"Blasphemies."

Baltimore, 10th April, 1857.

DEAR BRO. THOMAS:

I have read the April Herald with great pleasure. The article on "Blasphemies" is unanswerable according to the scriptures, and of fearful import to those whose faith is formed in ignorance of the scriptures, which are the power of God for salvation, a power they repudiate in rejecting the promises with which they abound. They don't belong to those described by Paul as being built on the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone. I thank you, my dear brother; very cordially for this truly lucid article. I think it would be well to put it forth in pamphlet form.

The excellent letter of our brother Edwards gave me great satisfaction, its spirit and matter is of the best.

Yours most truly,

W. M. P. LEMMON.

New Translation of the Bible.

THE subject uppermost in men's minds just now is the proposed new translation of the Bible. For some time the question of the propriety of obtaining a new, free and official translation of the Holy Scriptures was confined to a small circle of religious people. It is now cast forth for public discussion in the newspapers and private circles, and will doubtless produce the usual fruits of a religious controversy. Dr. Cumming, a man of world-wide fame, has entered a protest against touching the present version. His reasons may be shortly summed up by saying that he contends that this is not the time when the attempt could be safely made; and in this he finds many to agree with him. The division, so long deplored, which is known to exist in our "Established" Church—the difficulty of finding forty or fifty men competent to the work, of thoroughly sound views, unbiassed by sectarianism—the danger at all times found in meddling with anything the bulk of the people have been long accustomed to look upon as sacred—serve to render men cautious how they give their sanction to this movement; and although little time has yet elapsed since the question was seriously mooted, discussion is now getting earnest, and those opposed to the carrying out of the project are becoming anxious and nervous. I have, conceiving the subject to be one of immense importance, and one that should not be lightly handled, taken some pains to inquire, from gentlemen of various persuasions, their wishes as to the re-translation, and, strange to say, Baptists,

Independents, Wesleyans and moderate churchmen have all answered me in one universal exclamation of dissent, with the accompanying wish, that we should "let well alone." However, I do not give you this popular expression of opinion as the one which should represent the wishes of the intellectual and deep-thinking men of this country. There is a strong desire among men of the highest attainments that the errors known to exist in the present version of the Bible should be corrected, and that the world should be furnished with such a translation as could be produced by the united talents of men of learning of the present advanced age, but (these buts are sometimes troublesome) then comes the arguments of such men as Cumming, and the conviction fastens itself upon their minds that there is truth in this man's declaration, that this is not the time to begin the work, but that the attempt would benefit the Church's enemies rather than gratify its friends.

The religious movement I have here alluded to has not escaped the keen eyes of the publishers, for just in the nick of time I find the "American Bible Union" advertising a "Revised English Version of the Holy Scriptures."

An Ancient Tombstone.

AN ancient tombstone at Bolton bears the following inscription:

"John Askew, the servant of God, was born in London in the year 1608, came into this town 1629, married Mary, the daughter of James Crompton, of Brightmet, 1635, with whom he lived comfortably twenty years, and begat four sons and six daughters. Since then he lived sole till the day of his death. In his time there were many great changes and terrible alterations; eighteen years civil wars in England, besides many dreadful sea fights; the crown or command of England changed eight times, Episcopacy laid aside fourteen years, London burned by Papists, and more stately built again, Germany wasted 300 miles, 200,000 Protestants murdered in Ireland by the Papists, this town thrice stormed, once taken and plundered. He went through many terrible and diverse conditions, found rest, joy, and happiness only in holiness, the faith, feare, and love of God in Jesus Christ. He died the 29th April, and lieth here buried.

1 6 8 4

"Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

"HOLINESS IS MAN'S HAPPINESS."

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never perish, and a dominion that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1857.

[VOL. VII. No. 8.

The Gospel in Macedonia.

"The Jaffor and other untaught Gentiles heard, believed, and obeyed the Gospel in the short time of an hour. Therefore, a correct understanding of the Gospel must have been obtained by them in that brief space of time."—*Prop. Expositor*, p. 104.

LUKE informs us in Acts xvi. that in a vision Paul had, there stood before him a man of Macedonia, who entreated him to come over to that country, and help them. This was regarded by Paul and his companions as a vision from the Lord, calling upon them to announce the glad tidings (*εὐαγγελισασθαι euaggelisasthai*) in Macedonia. They had essayed to "preach the Word" to the idolaters in the provinces of Anatolia, called Asia and Bithynia, but had been forbidden by the Holy Spirit. The cause of this interdict is not stated. The province of Asia contained the seven apocalyptic churches which were, doubtless, already existing there;* and Bithynia, also, was not destitute of the truth. But the time and circumstances were not yet quite appropriate for the annunciation of "The Fellowship of the Mystery" among them; importing "that the Gentiles (or pagans) should be fellow heirs (of the kingdom with the saints of Israel), and of the same body (that is, of the 'One Body'), and partakers of God's promise concerning the Anointed (*εν τῷ Χριστῷ, en tō Christō*) through the glad tidings." Having proclaimed the christian fellowship of Jew and Gentile in the Syrian Antioch, Seleucia, Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Attalia, they were directed to visit the country west of Constantinople, and north of the Ægean Sea, where, it is probable, Christian-Jewish prejudices were not so strong as in Asia and Bithynia.

In the region of country indicated, and not far from the sea, stood the City of Phil-

ippi, so called after Philip, King of Macedon, and father of Alexander the Great, "the great horn of the rough goat" of Dan. viii. 21. This region was *Macedonia Prima*, and Philippi was a Roman colony; so that the Philippians, though Macedonian born, were Roman citizens as they declared.—*Verse 21.*

In his letter to the Philippians, Paul styles his labors among them, at this time, "the beginning of the Gospel" (*ch. iv., 15*), that is, that the glad tidings of the Fellowship began to be proclaimed to the "untaught Gentiles" of Macedonia when he responded to the prayer, "Come over to Macedonia and help us!" Now, Macedonia contained many cities, among which were Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berca. All these Paul visited as well as Philippi, announcing in one the same glad tidings as in all the rest. No one, we presume, will dispute this. Thus, when he visited Thessalonica, he gave them to understand that he was the bearer of an invitation to them from the living and true God of Israel, who had commanded him to invite them to his kingdom and glory.* Many of the idolatrous Macedonians there accepted the invitation joyfully † when they discovered that it was genuine—that it was no fiction, but a word sent to them from heaven, and therefore styled "the Word of God," in deed and in truth, being confirmed by the power of God. ‡ This created in them a hope which was the "one hope of the calling," or invitation; so that he could address them as he could not address their idolatrous friends, saying, "be not as the others, who have no hope."

The hope formed in them by the apostle's preaching looked forward to the coming of the day of the Lord in which Jesus should re-

* Acts II. 9.

• 1 Thess. II. 12.

† 1 Thess. I. 6.

‡ 1 Thess. I. 5.

"Blasphemies."

Baltimore, 10th April, 1857.

DEAR BRO. THOMAS :

I have read the April Herald with great pleasure. The article on "Blasphemies" is unanswerable according to the scriptures, and of fearful import to those whose faith is formed in ignorance of the scriptures, which are the power of God for salvation, a power they repudiate in rejecting the promises with which they abound. They don't belong to those described by Paul as being built on the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone. I thank you, my dear brother, very cordially for this truly lucid article. I think it would be well to put it forth in pamphlet form.

The excellent letter of our brother Edwards gave me great satisfaction, its spirit and matter is of the best.

Yours most truly,

WM. P. LEMMOX.

New Translation of the Bible.

THE subject uppermost in men's minds just now is the proposed new translation of the Bible. For some time the question of the propriety of obtaining a new, free and official translation of the Holy Scriptures was confined to a small circle of religious people. It is now cast forth for public discussion in the newspapers and private circles, and will doubtless produce the usual fruits of a religious controversy. Dr. Cumming, a man of world-wide fame, has entered a protest against touching the present version. His reasons may be shortly summed up by saying that he contends that this is not the time when the attempt could be safely made; and in this he finds many to agree with him. The division, so long deplored, which is known to exist in our "Established" Church—the difficulty of finding forty or fifty men competent to the work, of thoroughly sound views, unbiassed by sectarianism—the danger at all times found in meddling with anything the bulk of the people have been long accustomed to look upon as sacred—serve to render men cautious how they give their sanction to this movement; and although little time has yet elapsed since the question was seriously mooted, discussion is now getting earnest, and those opposed to the carrying out of the project are becoming anxious and nervous. I have, conceiving the subject to be one of immense importance, and one that should not be lightly handled, taken some pains to inquire, from gentlemen of various persuasions, their wishes as to the re-translation, and, strange to say, Baptists,

Independents, Wesleyans and moderate churchmen have all answered me in one universal exclamation of dissent, with the accompanying wish, that we should "let well alone." However, I do not give you this popular expression of opinion as the one which should represent the wishes of the intellectual and deep-thinking men of this country. There is a strong desire among men of the highest attainments that the errors known to exist in the present version of the Bible should be corrected, and that the world should be furnished with such a translation as could be produced by the united talents of men of learning of the present advanced age, but (these buts are sometimes troublesome) then comes the arguments of such men as Cumming, and the conviction fastens itself upon their minds that there is truth in this man's declaration, that this is not the time to begin the work, but that the attempt would benefit the Church's enemies rather than gratify its friends.

The religious movement I have here alluded to has not escaped the keen eyes of the publishers, for just in the nick of time I find the "American Bible Union" advertising a "Revised English Version of the Holy Scriptures."

An Ancient Tombstone.

AN ancient tombstone at Bolton bears the following inscription :

"John Askew, the servant of God, was born in London in the year 1608, came into this towne 1629, married Mary, the daughter of James Crompton, of Brightmet, 1635, with whom he lived comfortably twenty years, and begat four sons and six daughters. Since then he lived sole till the day of his death. In his time there were many great changes and terrible alterations; eighteen years civil wars in England, besides many dreadful sea fights; the crown or command of England changed eight times, Episcopacy laid aside fourteen years, London burned by Papists, and more stately built again, Germany wasted 300 miles, 200,000 Protestants murdered in Ireland by the Papists, this towne thrice stormed, once taken and plundered. He went through many terrible and diverse conditions, found rest, joy, and happiness only in holiness, the faith, feare, and love of God in Jesus Christ. He died the 29th April, and lieth here buried.

1 6 8 4

"Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

"HOLINESS IS MAN'S HAPPINESS."

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.]

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1857.

[Vol. VII. No. 8.

The Gospel in Macedonia.

"The Jailor and other untaught Gentiles heard, believed, and obeyed the Gospel in the short time of an hour. Therefore, a correct understanding of the Gospel must have been obtained by them in that brief space of time."—*Proph. Expositor*, p. 104.

LUKE informs us in Acts xvi. that in a vision Paul had, there stood before him a man of Macedonia, who entreated him to come over to that country, and help them. This was regarded by Paul and his companions as a vision from the Lord, calling upon them to announce the glad tidings (*ευαγγελισσθαι euaggelissasthai*) in Macedonia. They had essayed to "preach the Word" to the idolaters in the provinces of Anatolia, called Asia and Bithynia, but had been forbidden by the Holy Spirit. The cause of this interdict is not stated. The province of Asia contained the seven apocalyptic churches which were, doubtless, already existing there;* and Bithynia, also, was not destitute of the truth. But the time and circumstances were not yet quite appropriate for the annunciation of "The Fellowship of the Mystery" among them; importing "that the Gentiles (or pagans) should be fellow heirs (of the kingdom with the saints of Israel), and of the same body (that is, of the 'One Body'), and partakers of God's promise concerning the Anointed (*εν τῷ Χριστῷ, en tō Christō*) through the glad tidings." Having proclaimed the Christian fellowship of Jew and Gentile in the Syrian Antioch, Seleucia, Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Attalia, they were directed to visit the country west of Constantinople, and north of the Ægean Sea, where, it is probable, Christian-Jewish prejudices were not so strong as in Asia and Bithynia.

In the region of country indicated, and not far from the sea, stood the City of Phil-

ippi, so called after Philip, King of Macedon, and father of Alexander the Great, "the great horn of the rough goat" of Dan. viii. 21. This region was Macedonia Prima, and Philippi was a Roman colony; so that the Philippians, though Macedonian born, were Roman citizens as they declared.—Verse 21.

In his letter to the Philippians, Paul styles his labors among them, at this time, "the beginning of the Gospel" (ch. iv., 15), that is, that the glad tidings of the Fellowship began to be proclaimed to the "untaught Gentiles" of Macedonia when he responded to the prayer, "Come over to Macedonia and help us!" Now, Macedonia contained many cities, among which were Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berea. All these Paul visited as well as Philippi, announcing in one the same glad tidings as in all the rest. No one, we presume, will dispute this. Thus, when he visited Thessalonica, he gave them to understand that he was the bearer of an invitation to them from the living and true God of Israel, who had commanded him to invite them to his kingdom and glory.* Many of the idolatrous Macedonians there accepted the invitation joyfully † when they discovered that it was genuine—that it was no fiction, but a word sent to them from heaven, and therefore styled "the Word of God," in deed and in truth, being confirmed by the power of God. ‡ This created in them a hope which was the "one hope of the calling," or invitation; so that he could address them as he could not address their idolatrous friends, saying, "be not as the others, who have no hope."

The hope formed in them by the apostle's preaching looked forward to the coming of the day of the Lord in which Jesus should re-

* 1 Thess. ii. 12.

† 1 Thess. i. 6.

‡ 1 Thess. i. 5.

* Acts ii. 9.

appear upon the earth. But so well had he instructed them, that they did not expect that day to arrive until there had first been an APOSTASY FROM THE FAITH, acuminating in a power styled "the Man of Sin," whose revelation would be preceded by the removal of the power then existing. "Remember ye not," says he, "that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? and what withholds now for his being revealed in his appointed time, ye know." Yea, so conspicuous a place had these things in his preaching, that an outcry was soon raised against him, accusing him, in the city of the Philippian jailer, of "teaching precepts which were not lawful for them to receive, neither to observe, being Romans;" and in Thessalonica, of "doing contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying there is another king—one Jesus."

Referring to "the beginning of the Gospel," the apostle says to the Thessalonians, "God hath from the beginning chosen you for deliverance by a separation of spirit and belief of truth; for which (εἰς ὅ, sc. σωτηριον, salvation) he called you through our glad tidings for the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ."* In this he tells them, that by a separation of spirit and faith, that is, by a holy disposition created in them through the truth believed,† they had been chosen of God for deliverance from the wrath to come upon those who now not God, and hearken not to the glad tidings of the Lord Jesus Christ, and for sharing with him in the things covered by the phrase, "his kingdom and glory." They were separated or sanctified by faith, and "called," or invited, to their high destiny through the glad tidings they believed. The sanctification of spirit, or heart-purification, referred to by Paul, was "righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Spirit," resulting from belief of the glad tidings of the kingdom; wherefore he saith, that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink," that is, the doctrine concerning it does not teach believers to concern themselves about distinctions of meats and drinks, saying, "touch not, taste not, handle not;" but it inculcates and develops in them who embrace it with honest and good hearts, righteousness, and peace, and joy in a Holy Spirit. This fruit of faith is the "Divine Nature," and essentially diverse from the nature common to pagans and all others ignorant of the truth. It is only producible by "the exceeding great and precious promises believed." Belief that Jesus is the Son of God, in the modern Gentile sense, neither

hath nor will produce it. The fruit of this believed is not righteousness, peace, and joy in a holy spirit; but, on the contrary, resistance to the righteousness of God, doubts and fears, and despondency in a faithless, perverse, and sordid spirit. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Having indoctrinated the Macedonians in Thessalonica with the glad tidings he announced to them, in writing to them he informs the reader, that they "received the word with joy of a holy spirit;" and that in consequence they "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from the heavens, whom he raised from among the dead, even Jesus delivering us from the wrath to come." Before Paul went over to help them, they knew nothing about the God, and the Son of the God, and the kingdom and glory of that God, whom Paul preached; they knew not that there was any wrath to come upon the world, nor of any deliverance from it through a resurrected man, coming from the heavens; nor did they know that those delivered from it would share in the glory and dominion of the Deliverer. Will any reasonable man, then, pretend to impose upon us the notion, that all that was submitted to these "untaught Gentiles," to turn them from their vanities, was that a certain Jew, who had been crucified as a malefactor about 1100 miles off, was the son of the God of the Jews, and raised from the dead by his power? What moral power is there in such a statement as this to cause a Macedonian idolator to cast his idols to the moles and the bats? None. It had no more power to produce this result than it now has to cause papists to turn from their image worship, and the adoration of dead men's bones; or sectarian devotees to renounce the systems of foolishness and impiety they profess. It is evident from the nature of the case, that the first thing Paul essayed to do was to reason the Macedonians out of their idolatry, as he did the Athenians; then to acquaint them with the living and true God; after that to announce to them the purpose of God, or "secret of his will which he had purposed in himself according to his own good pleasure;" then, that "one Jesus" was he by whom he intended to execute that purpose, whereof he had given assurance in raising him from the dead; that he was to return from the heavens to perform the work assigned him; and lastly, that whosoever believed these things, and became obedient, should receive repentance and forgiveness of sins, and a right to eternal glory in the kingdom, "through His name." To instruct them in these things, was for Paul to fulfill his mission, which was, "to open their

* 2 Thess. II. 18, 14.
† Col. III. 10.

eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them (of Judah) who are sanctified by faith that leads into Jesus," *εις εμε*. The Macedonians were in darkness, and in Satan's power, and unable to help themselves. They were "Gentiles in the flesh," whose moral destitution is well described by the apostle who went over to help them. "At that time," says he, "ye were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope, and atheists (*αθεοι, atheoi*) in the world;"—"walking in the vanity of your mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that was in you, because of the blindness of your heart." But from this state they were happily delivered by Paul's preaching; so that he could say to them, "Ye who were formerly afar off are now in the anointed Jesus, made nigh by the blood of the anointed one." They were "made nigh" by the blood of the anointed one; that is, instead of being "aliens from Israel's commonwealth, and strangers from the covenants of the promise," they had become "fellow-citizens of the saints (of Israel), and of the household of God;" instead of "having no hope," they hoped in the kingdom and glory of God, of which they were invited to become "inheritors" by the preaching of Paul; and instead of being "without Christ," and "atheists," they were "in the anointed Jesus," and worshippers of his Father, the God of the Jews; for the return of whose Son from the heavens they were patiently waiting.* These originally "untaught," but now instructed, "Gentiles" had become "light in the Lord;" "the sons of God without rebuke, shining as lights in the world;" "children of light and of the day," and "not of the night, nor of darkness;"† invested with "the armor of light;" so that, "the eyes of their understanding being enlightened," the apostle could now say to them, "Ye are all the sons of God in the anointed Jesus through the faith: because as many as are baptized into the Anointed have put on the Anointed: and if ye be the Anointed's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

What soul-stirring tidings must they have been which constituted the subject matter of Paul's preaching, and that could have effected so wonderful a change on the understandings, affections, and conduct of the idolators of Macedonia Prima, and of "un-

taught Gentiles" in sundry other places! In what did the power of his preaching consist? In the teaching of God, called "the truth in Jesus"—"the light of the glad tidings of the glory of the Anointed, who is the image of God"—*εναγγελιου της δοξης του Χριστου*. "Of his own will," says James, "the Father of lights begat us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures," of whom it is written in the prophets, "They shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father," says Jesus, "cometh unto me." Paul, as God's messenger, taught the word of God, which he did not handle deceitfully; "but, by manifestation of the truth, commended himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God."‡ This was the secret of his power—his doctrine was God's teaching, confirmed by God's power, through the mighty deeds with which he astonished the world. Who need wonder at the results with such an instrumentality? "We," said Paul, "are ambassadors in the Anointed's stead (*υπερ Χριστου*), as if God did invite you by us;" which invitation was expressed in the glad tidings of the kingdom and glory he preached. The joyous character of the tidings miraculously confirmed, commended them to the hearts of the people, and kindled a joyousness in them, that energized them to accept the divine invitation in the face of ruin, imprisonment, torture, and death; so that, in writing to the Macedonians, he says, "Ye became followers of us and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction with joy of a holy spirit."

But, in opening the eyes of Macedonian Jews his method was somewhat different. He had not to turn them from idols, nor to bring them to wait for the Son of Israel's God; nor yet to instruct them in the purpose of God to rule the habitable in righteousness by him, for they were not idolators; and they were waiting for the appearing of the Son promised them in Isaiah ix. 6, 7; and were fully in the belief of his sitting upon the throne of his father David, and reigning over Israel and the nations for ever. All that was necessary in their case was to convince them that Jesus was that Son of David and of God, Jehovah had covenanted to resurrect for them in the house of David.† Thus, in his preaching to "the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews;" in other words, "to them that are

* 2 Thess. iii. 5.
† 1 Thess. v. 5.

* 3 Cor. iv. 2-4. † 2 Chron. xvii. 11-14; Acts ii 30, 1 Cor. iii. 4, 5; 1 Epl. i. 5.

under the law, he became as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law." If he had gone to the Macedonian idolators "as a Jew," he would not have gained them; he therefore went to them as a Roman, which is evident from his reply to the magistrates at Philippi, saying, "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison, and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Now, Romans were not under the Law of Moses; so that in relation to that law they were "without law;" therefore in approaching the Romans as a Roman citizen, he says, that "to them without law, he became as without law, that he might gain them that are without law." He addressed the Greeks, Romans and barbarians, as an ambassador, sent to them direct from a God whom they knew not, but who had made the universe, and continued to uphold all things by his power. It was not necessary for such a person to do more before such an audience, ignorant of all things pertaining to the God, prophets, and hope, of the Jews, than to state the truth confirmed by divine power, and to persuade them to receive it. Thus as he says, "My word and my preaching was by inimitable proof of Spirit and power, and your faith might not stand in men's wisdom, but in God's power." And again, "Our glad tidings came not to you in word only, but also in power, and in holy spirit, and in much assurance." This course, however, would not answer with believers in the prophets. He could not approach Jews as a Gentile citizen of Rome, and expect them to believe on authority without appeal to the prophets. Idolators might be built upon apostles, but a Jew required to be built upon the prophets; for they would receive no testimony of apostles, though confirmed by miracle, unless it could be shown to be in accordance with the Oracles of God, read in their synagogues every sabbath day. When, therefore, idolators built upon the apostles, testifying the same things as the prophets, and Jews built upon the prophets illustrated by the apostles, came together into the "one body," Paul could say to them, "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus the Anointed himself being the chief corner stone." They were all, both Jews and Gentiles, brought to acquiesce joyously in the "One Faith;" the method only of bringing them to that acquiescence so as to prepare them for the "One Baptism," differed.

The reader, then, will readily perceive that the apostolic preaching was very much sim-

plified in regard to the Jews. All that was necessary was to show them what their prophets taught, and then to prove that to a certain extent their predictions were accomplished in Jesus, as an earnest, that what remained would be fulfilled in and by him likewise. This was the course pursued by Paul in Thessalonica. He went into their synagogue, and reasoned with them out of the Scriptures of the prophets, opening and alleging, *firstly*, that the Messiah they were looking for must needs have suffered, and *secondly*, that he must needs stand up from among the dead. These were among the *first things* (*εν πρωτοις*, 1 Cor. xv 3), he delivered to the Jews; how that their Messiah was to die for their sins, according to the prophets; be buried, or "make his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," and arise on the third day, according to the scriptures. If he could convince them of these things, their minds were then prepared for his *third* proposition, which was, "that this is the Messiah, even Jesus, whom I announce to you."

They err greatly who imagine that one method of preaching "the glad tidings of the glory of Christ," would have been suitable for idol-worshippers, and the members of the synagogue. The proposition, that "Jesus is the Anointed, the Son of the living God," would have been meaningless and unintelligible to idolators. To have comprehended it they must have been made previously acquainted with the existence of that living God, and with the doctrine concerning the Anointed One. And this the apostle set himself to do in laying before them the glad tidings of the kingdom, as exhibited in the revelation of his will, which God had purposed to himself. When they came to understand this part of the subject, they would very naturally desire to know, *Who should be the King by whom the world should be ruled in righteousness, when the appointed time for the manifestation of the divine purpose should arrive?* Paul told them that it was a certain Jew, named Jesus, who was dead, but came to life again, and is alive for evermore, who is to be king of the whole earth. This answer to the question very naturally prompted another, namely, "If the Jesus he proclaimed were to be king of all nations, what would become of Casar's throne?" Nor did Paul hesitate to answer this inquiry, as we have seen in the second epistle to the Macedonians of Thessalonica. "He shall be taken out of the way," and then a power, embodying the Mystery of Iniquity already working, shall take his place, which shall also be utterly abolished by the manifestation of the Lord's presence from the heavens." Such questions and answers as these created

a great stir among the multitude, many of whom renounced their idols, and declared themselves, not only willing, but earnestly desirous, to become heirs of that kingdom and glory, that they might reign with Jesus when he should receive the dominion, glory, and kingdom at his return from the right hand of power. But the Jews who rejected the claims of Jesus to the Davidian throne of universal empire on earth, were moved with envy at this revolution in the pagan mind, and determined to put a stop to it, if possible. They excited the lowest of the people against Paul and his friends, both in Thessalonica and Berea. As Paul was preaching politics, which had been forbidden by the emperor, they assailed him as a transgressor of the imperial decrees, saying, that *there is another king than Casar, one Jesus*. The same outcry was raised in Philippi with the same result—proclaiming principles unlawful for loyal Romans to receive and do, and thereby exceedingly troubling the cities of Macedonia Prima.

Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, &c., were thrown into an uproar by Paul's preaching the glad tidings of the glory and kingdom of God. Let not this fact be overlooked. Was it done by a sixty minutes' discourse, the burden of which was that Jesus, whom perhaps no Macedonian pagan had ever heard of before, was the Son of the unknown God of the despised Jews, and sacrificed for sin? What would they have thought of the doctrine that the blood of a murdered Jew, in some mysterious way, was to save them from wrath to come, of which they knew nothing? Instead of such preaching as this (of which the world has a surfeit in these superficial times) exceedingly troubling cities, and turning the community upside down, the apostles would not have obtained a second hearing. No; they might have preached the divine sonship of Jesus in the modern Gentile sense of it, not for an hour only, but until this day, and have never made a Christian, or agitated a single family, that Jesus is the Son of the God of Israel, and not the Son of Mary's husband, is most true, and a very important truth in its proper place; it is a genealogical truth upon which all his claims are founded; but in the Gentile sense of it, there is no good news in it. His blood cleansed from all sin; true, but what then? If that be all it leaves without hope, and the future is a blank. Such a Gospel never came from heaven to Jew, Macedonian, or Italian, or to any other Gentile family of man.

Paul's preaching was the same in all the cities of Macedonia. It planted the same hope in the hearts of the people at Philippi, as at Thessalonica. Here it taught them

to turn from idols to serve the God of Israel, and to wait for his Son from the heavens, when they should receive the kingdom of God, for which they suffered persecution;* there, it taught them to be like-minded with the apostle in pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God by the anointed Jesus.* This "mark" was the resurrection that Paul desired by any means to attain to, because the prize could not be obtained until that mark were reached. The prize was the subject of the glad tidings he preached to them. It was for the obtaining of this prize that they entered the lists by being baptized, that they might from that time start in the race, and press onward to the goal. *Did they begin to run without knowing what they were running for?* No indeed. When men, as in Paul's day, entered upon a race which exposed to torment, imprisonment, and death, they were very careful to know what they were to gain by the risks they encountered. "I so run, not so uncertainly," saith the apostle, "so run, that ye may obtain;" obtain what? That which God sent Jesus to invite men to in the glad tidings of the kingdom which he preached, and therefore styled "the high calling of God by the anointed Jesus." An everlasting kingdom is the prize set before us as "untaught Gentiles," connected with which are glory, honor, riches, and life eternal. Hence, James says to them who are taught of God, "he has chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, as heirs of the kingdom which he has promised to them that love him;" and Jesus saith, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," and when they that love him stand in his presence after rising from the dead, he saith to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the State." Were these blessed ones baptized in ignorance of the kingdom and glory they were called to? In darkness plunged into water, not dreaming that the God of Israel purposed to set up a glorious kingdom in Palestine for Jesus and his brethren, which was to rule over all? Was their faith so meager, so death-stricken in its birth, that it could only faintly whisper an assent to a leading question about the genealogy of Jesus, before they descended into water? Were their eyes so blind that they could see nothing in the future? No, no; before they were baptized they took care to know what they were baptized for. *They were baptized that they might become Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise, which they understood*

* 2 Thess. 1, 5.

and believed with joyous and faithful hearts. Hence, the apostle could write to the Roman citizens of Philippi, who believed, and the jailor and his house among their number, saying, "Brethren, be followers together of me and mark them who walk, so as ye have, Paul and Timotheus, servants of Jesus Christ, for an example, for our citizenship begins in the heavens; out of which also we earnestly expect the Saviour, the anointed Lord Jesus; who shall transform the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, through the power whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself." And afterwards he adds, "Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen with me, do." This covered the whole ground of his teaching, which was effective to their illumination as lights in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation.

EDITOR.

Sept. 1, 1855.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

"The Four Great Kings of Babylon."

[Abridged by J. R. Lithgow, from the "Light of Prophecy," by Thomas Lumsden Strange, London, 1832.]

"THE visions recorded in the book of Daniel of the great image exhibited to Nebuchadnezzar, and of the four great beasts shown to the prophet, have evident relation to one and the same subject. The image was composed of four parts, each figuring a kingdom; and the beasts also were four in number, and were significant of four kings; and both the image and the beasts were seen to come to a common end. The image was broken to pieces, and ground to dust, by a stone cut out without hands, and which 'became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth,' denoting, as we are told, 'a kingdom' which 'the God of heaven' should 'set up,' and which should 'never be destroyed,' but should 'stand for ever.' This stone, and the dominion thereof, none can doubt, mark the reign of Jesus and of his saints. . . . The beasts of the other vision, in like manner, in fine, have 'their dominion taken away,' and in lieu thereof, 'one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, . . . and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,' &c.

"The visions are thus in each instance of four kingships, which are to be overthrown by Jesus, when he takes to himself his great power and reigns; and as they relate in this

manner to similar objects coming to a similar termination at one and the same time, and, by the same agency, their identity, one with the other, is made manifest. . . .

"The four parts of the visions are designated, indifferently, kings or kingdoms. 'Thou, O King,' it is said of one of them, 'art a king of kings. . . . Thou art this head of gold.' And then the transition is made to kingdoms. 'And after thee' (the individual monarch then addressed) shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.' So also in the vision of the beasts. 'These great beasts' it is said, 'which are four, are four kings.' And, again, of 'the fourth beast' it is declared, that it shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth.

"The exigency of the language then requires that there should be four kings, and each with his kingdom; and those, we are told, were to be 'diverse one from another.'

"But we learn also that there was to be a unity and indivisibility belonging to them. In the vision of the image, the four parts are built up into one object, which is seen standing in its completeness, thus composed, from the head down to the feet. Each is necessary to the other to form the figure which they all together represent. The head alone could not have constituted it; neither the breast and arms; nor the belly and thighs; nor the legs and feet. The presence of all the members was requisite, at one and the same time, to make up the embodied image; and all are in existence together when the blow is struck by the stone cut out without hands; for by that blow, they all fall together. 'Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors.'

"The kings could not be amalgamated together. Their individuality must ever, in the nature of things, remain distinct. Their kingdoms, however, could be conjoined together, and the one be made to combine with the other, and the whole might be consolidated into one; and this without forfeiting the distinctiveness, or 'diverseness' of the several portions.

"The vision of the image manifestly calls for such a solution. The component parts whereof are diverse, both as to shape and substance. One is the head, and of gold, another is the breast and the arms, and of silver; a third is the belly and thighs, and of brass; and a fourth is the legs and the feet, and of iron and clay. Each, however, fits on to the other, and in common

they constitute, and belong to, one individual image.

"The current view taken of the four portions of the visions, is that they represent four distinct and successive empires—the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman; and convey thus an account, in outline, of the supremacy exercised on the earth from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to the coming of the Lord Jesus.

"To this there are important objections:

"1st. Though the requirement of the prophecy as to these portions of the visions being four kingdoms would be thereby met, the equally strong one that there should be 'four kings,' and no more than four, would be nullified, in the bringing in of four dynasties, embracing an indefinite number of kings.

"2d. The successional order of the kingdoms would be provided, as called for in the prophecy, but the amalgamation and coexistence of the parts, the one with the other, would be wanting. Empires set up, each upon the ruin of that which preceded it, and standing in antagonistic posture without any common center or object upon which to converge, would represent the very opposite of the image of the vision, seen as it is, consolidated and composed of the various parts, all requisite to constitute its whole; and if the one portion had to give way, and to disappear before the other was brought upon the second, the grinding of the whole to dust, by a single crowning act of judgement, in the manner we find the fabric is to be brought to an end, would be impossible. When the feet are struck, the head, and the breast and arms, and the belly and thighs, are all to be present, so that all may fall simultaneously and be crushed and annihilated together; and in like manner, according to the undoubted exigency of the prophecy, the BABYLONIAN, the Persian, and the Grecian empires should not have passed away, but be subsisting, in their full integrity, at the time when the blow of destruction is struck upon the Roman empire, so that all might be brought down with it in one common overthrow together.

* * * * *

"Four kings are then to be sought for, and the possessor of a kingdom, and yet partakers of one common empire, which each, in his order, serves to construct; so that, in the end, the last monarch may stand as ruler of all that his predecessors may have severally, in turn, produced and added to the common stock. These kings would bring in thus the various materials—the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron and clay, of which the image is composed, each in his place having

served to build it up, and all being in that sense in common headship together.

"Such kings and kingdoms, in effect, there have been, to the extent of three, and the characteristics of the fourth, and the most important one of the whole, are given with an amplitude and plainness that place him also with distinctness before us:

"1. *The head of the image, or the first beast.*

"In regard to the first king and his kingdom, there can be no room for mistake, as the Scripture has revealed to us that Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, was the man. 'Thou,' it was told him, 'art this head of gold.' A dynasty was not wanting; but here was no question of one. The individual king, then addressed, supplied in full the first portion of the vision. The long succession of monarchs of the Assyrian line, who had preceded him, from the time of Nimrod onwards, and the four—Evil Merodach, Neriglossor, Laborosoarchad, and Belshazzar, who followed him, had no position in this section of the vision. Nebuchadnezzar singly, and not the Assyrian dynasty, was the sole object thereof. *The head was entire in him.*

"The subject being an individual personage, individual features, belonging specially to him, and indicative of him, may be expected to characterize it; and such are given.

"'Thou,' it was said to him, 'O King, art a King of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory; and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven, hath he given into thine hand, and made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold.'

"The symbol of the head of gold is thus found to be significant of the power and glory of Nebuchadnezzar's kingship, exercised over all around him as a king of kings. The metal used in the figure specially indicated the wealth and splendor that attached to his throne. For these, Babylon, the seat thereof, has been celebrated, so as to have been called 'the golden city,' and 'the lady of kingdoms' (Isa. xiv. 4; xlvii. 5); and to Nebuchadnezzar, it appears, she was indebted for her magnificence. 'Is not this,' he could say of her, 'great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?'—Dan. iv. 30.

"The Scripture uses these figures to bespeak pride of power, and fierceness and swiftness in casting it.—Prov. xix. 12; Amos iii. 8; Ps. vii. 2; Obad. iv. It is as an eagle, 'a great eagle with great wings,

long-winged, and full of feathers' (Ezek. xvii., 3), that Nebuchadnezzar is adverted to in reference to his descent upon Judea. 'Behold, he shall come up like a lion from the swelling of Jordan, against the habitation of the strong. Behold, he shall come up, and fly as the eagle, and spread his wings over Bozrah,' &c.—(Jer. xlix., 19, 22).

"Nebuchadnezzar, to fulfill the figure, had so to act. He had to fly swiftly on his prey and to rend so that none should deliver; but, nevertheless, though so powerful to destroy, it was necessary to the position assigned him of 'king of kings,' that he should not remove from their thrones the monarchs over whom he exercised his arms, but should maintain them in their sovereignties, he holding supremacy over them.

"This was just the character of his conquests. He covered the surrounding nations, but did not deprive them of their kings, nor add their countries to his own; but when they rebelled against his authority, he rushed upon them with the swiftness of the eagle, and the power of the lion, and compelled their submission, at times rending them with ungovernable fury.

"It is not now exactly known to what limits the sway of this sovereign extended, save that Judea, Tyre, and Egypt, it is certain, felt the force of his arms, while Nineveh had been destroyed, and Media humbled, in the time of his predecessor, the first who bore his name. These were the surrounding nations, and the greatest of the then known earth, and he held his rule among them in headship, as king of kings, receiving for his individual territories *no more than Babylonia*, the land of his forefathers. On several occasions he had to put forth his strength to keep their neighbor nations in subjection to him, but he exerted it no further than for the assertion of his empire over them as king of kings, and at no time with the greed of conquest, so as to add their dominions to his own.

* * * * *

"But the power and the pride of Nebuchadnezzar had to meet with a reverse. Mighty as he was, he had to learn that there was one more mighty than himself. Among men, he was placed as king of kings, and no rival mortal was to be exalted over him; but there was the supremacy of the God of heaven, which he had overlooked; and under this he had to be brought to bend. 'When his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him: and he was driven from the sons of men, and his heart was made like the

beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses: they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till he knew that the Most High God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will.'—Dan. v. 20, 21. And after he had received this lesson, thus painfully, the same power that degraded him, restored him to his kingdom. 'At the same time,' as he himself chronicles, 'my reason returned unto me; and for the glory of my kingdom, mine honor and brightness returned unto me; and my counsellors and my lords sought unto me; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent majesty was added unto me.'—Dan. iv., 36).

"There was a remarkable event in the history of this monarch; and it appears to be shadowed out in the figure of the vision. 'I beheld,' the prophet says, 'till the wings thereof were plucked, and' (or perhaps, 'wherewith'—see marginal reading) 'it was lifted up from the earth, and made to stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.' The eagle wings, spread out to carry terror and destruction over the world, and which had led him to exalt himself above what was of the earth, were taken from him, and he was made at length to feel his standing as a mere man—the heart of a man—that he might apprehend that such was his condition, being, in this sense, doubtless given to him.

"The vision is thus marked throughout with strictly personal features, belonging to the individual sovereign to whom the scriptural interpretation confines it. There is the headship over the surrounding kings retained by him (so singularly for a conqueror) upon their thrones, in order that he might be acknowledged by them as king of kings; there is the fierce exertion of his power, put forth like that of the eagle and the lion, crushing and devouring all who ventured to dispute his rule; there is the brilliant magnificence, gathered by him round the seat of his throne, making his a golden headship; and there is his full, and the striking lesson that this conveyed to him.

"To none other of his line do these particulars belong. Up to the time of Sennacherib, Nineveh was the dominant power, and the rulers of Babylon were in subjection to the Assyrians, and far from being kings of kings. Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib, united the two kingdoms into one. He was replaced by his son Nebuchadnezzar the 1st, and during his time the Medians twice invaded the empire, and though they met with repulses on both occasions, the mere act of their aggressions shows that the form

and the yoke of the line of Babylon was not yet upon them. Saracus, the son of Nebuchadnezzar the 1st, succeeded to the throne, but was destroyed by Nabopollasar, one of his father's generals, who usurped his kingdom. Nabopollasar turned his arms against Nineveh, and destroyed the city, but it appears that he lacked the strength to accomplish this of himself, and was indebted to the support of Cyaxares, king of Media, who joined him in the expedition; and after this Nabopollasar was himself defeated by the Egyptians, for 'Pharaoh-nechoh, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates' (2 Kings xxiii. 29), and gained a victory over him. But at this time the subject of the vision, Nebuchadnezzar the 2d, who was the son of Nabopollasar, appears upon the scene, and the strength of the line becomes immediately manifest, 'and the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt' (2d Kings, xxiv. 1, 7); wresting from him thus what he had torn from the crown of Babylon. On the demise of this king of the vision, his son Evil Merodach succeeded him, but after a short reign of two years was put to death by his subjects. Neriglissor, one of those who had conspired against him, then took the throne, but he held it for no more than four years, when he was slain in battle by Cyrus. His son, Laborosoarchad, followed him, and in nine months he was killed by his subjects. Then came Belshazzar, the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, and the last of the line, who fell when the city was taken by Cyrus. Not one of these was a 'king of kings;' nor furnished with the wings of conquest; neither did any of them undergo the fall, and reap the lesson, which was brought upon the beast of the visions, when the heart of a man was effectually given unto it. This portion of the vision was, in truth, *complete in Nebuchadnezzar*. 'Thou,' he was told, 'art this head of gold;' and to him alone, of all his stock, was the figure, in its details, applicable. The dynasty had no part therein.

"The Scripture affords a solution as to the subjects of the vision, only in respect of the first of the four members thereof. The succeeding portions we are left to make application of by other means than that of direct revelation. The nature of the interpretation, as regards the first portion, must obviously be intended to guide us as to the nature of the interpretation to be resorted to in respect of the others. They are all constituents of the same image exhibited in

the vision, and the members must have also analogy to the head. They are all likewise represented as beasts, and the one beast must partake of the nature of the others. The first member, or beast, cannot be a man, and the others, systems or dynasties, or chains of rulers. They, too, must be men, if he be one. Things dissimilar in nature could not be built up together to form an incorporate whole. The co-relativeness of the several portions of the visions, and the revealed interpretation given us of the first of these portions, would afford no instruction, and give no aid towards the discovery of the meanings of the succeeding portions, unless the declared constitution of the one should be taken as indicative of the others.

"But we are not left to the consideration of one solitary action of the vision for the ascertainment of a principle of interpretation. This is what may be deemed a *fifth* subject of the vision, of which it is clear, as of the first, that the application is to an *individual personage*. This is 'the stone cut out without hands,' which grinds the image into dust, and which the Scripture undeniably shows us in 'the Son of Man,' the Lord Jesus, who overthrows the empire of the beasts, and consigns them to judgement.

"What is thus true of the nature and constitution of the first and the fifth portions of the vision, must be true also of the nature and the constitution of the three portions that intervene between them. The Scripture interpretations furnished of the two, would serve only to perplex and mislead in respect to the others, for which no interpretations are supplied, if these pointed to one description of objects, and those to another.

"There is, however, in truth, an interpretation as regards all the portions of the visions, so far as that it is told us that all are kings. 'These great beasts,' it is explicitly said, '*which are four, are four kings.*' Travel out of the number of the kings, and we travel out of the number of the beasts. The first beast, or king, we see was an individual monarch. He, by whom they are all to be overthrown, will, in like manner, beyond all room for question, be an individual monarch. The three beasts, for which application has to be sought, must hence be *three individual kings*. There is an eud of restriction to that which is *written*, and an opening for indulgence, without limit, in human ingenuity, unless such be the case. We are to accept, then, most assuredly, the Scripture revelation that the three intermediate subjects are kings, equally with the

first who precedes them, and the last who supplants their dominion. The only question to be determined is, who are these kings?

"But beyond the circumstance that individual monarchs make up the several portions of the vision, there is the amalgamation of their kingdoms, the one with the other, so as that one aggregate whole should be formed by them, as taught by the vision of the great image consisting of four distinctive parts, of which the figure is built up, and which thus constitute together one incorporate body. The kings, to whom the visions have reference, must accordingly be such as have acted in this way, and have proved to have been associated with an empire in which all have had a common standing, and which each in turn has served to construct; the one supplying the head, the other the breast and arms, the other the belly and thighs, and the last the legs and the feet.

The Scripture has made it apparent that *the empire to which these kings belong is that of Babylon.* There was the place of the throne of the first number of the vision, and if the others are to have part with him in a common sovereignty, *there also should they reign.* The kings to be sought for must 'hus all be kings of Babylon.

"The deductions then to be made, from that the revealed interpretation as to the first number of the visions has put before us, are, that the other beasts are each individual kings; that there are personal features belonging to them, shadowed out in the visions, which seem to show who they are; that *Babylon is the seat of their empire*; and that each has a diversity attaching to him, and also an extent of sovereignty differing from that of the others. And this distinctive territory doubtless it is that each brings in as a contribution to the common empire, which all these have to build up, until it attains the fullness represented by the entire figure of the image, thus made up of its various parts.

"In seeking for the remaining personages of the visions, it is clear that the possession of individual attributes, and not the occurrence of a successional descent, constitutes the title of each to be admitted to a place in the vision; that the Spirit, in effect, has not put forth these visions with the view of giving us an outline of general history, but in order to indicate an especial end, selecting from among the actors on the stage of the universe those fitted to embody that end, and none others. For example, Babylon is the theme of the visions: and objects unassociated with Babylon, have no place therein. But, more than this, Babylon, at cer-

tain stages of the construction of the empire, is what is in question, and so a consecutive history of Babylon, and of her kings, is not to be looked for. We may expect, then, lapses between these kings, one being adopted, and others passed over unnoticed, and another king again being stretched, according to the particular purpose of the visions.

"The book of Daniel abounds in instances of such discriminative selections, proving that throughout it, whatever pages of history may have been unfolded therein, it has not been the object of the Spirit to provide us with any thing like an outline of all that was to befall the world, or any region of it.

"For instance, the degradation and restoration of Nebuchadnezzar are recounted, but not his death—the fact of his reformation being followed by a description of Belshazzar's feast, and the intermediate kings, who reigned in the interval, namely, Evil Merodach, Neriglissor, and Laborsarchod, being passed by unmentioned.

"The remaining members of the visions may consequently be introduced in succession to the first, after the occurrence of lapses, more or less lengthly, without at all violating the order and the method observable in the relations of the prophet. We cannot seek for their antitypes in the immediate descendants of Nebuchadnezzar. These, we see, were altogether insignificant as rulers, and in no way embodied the power and grandeur which it is shown, manifestly, are essential to the subjects of the vision. We must look beyond them, and Cyrus then inevitably arrests the attention; and he, it will in truth be found, fulfills accurately and completely, all the requirements called for in the second number of the visions.

"2. *The breast and the arms of silver, or the second beast.*

"Cyrus has been commonly accounted a king of Persia; but though he truly was such in one sense, *in Persia he never sat up his throne*, and events show that *Babylon was his seat of empire*, and that he is to be looked upon strictly as a king of Babylon. Cyrus was a Persian; and in behalf of his uncle Darius (Cyaxarus the 2d), who was king of Media, he besieged and took Babylon, killing Belshazzar. The kingdom of Babylon was not extinguished thereby, but simply changed hands. 'Darius the Median took the kingdom' (chap. v. 31)—of course the kingdom of Babylon. The Median became king of Babylon; and there, in effect, he had his throne. Cyrus succeeded to him, and, as Darius had done, adopted Babylon as his capital; and there, and there alone, was his kingly state displayed, until he ended his days; for there also he died.

Previously, he had been in the field in the capacity of a general, but in *Babylon he ruled as king*. He is called, consequently, in the Scripture, 'the king of Babylon,' in the same breath that Nebuchadnezzar is referred to under the like appellation (*Ezra* v. 12, 13); proving thus that the kingdom of the first portion of the vision had not been obliterated, but that it remained entire in him who may be seen to be the second.

"The material of the first member of the great image was gold. That of the second is silver, making an inferiority thereto; as it is said, 'and after thee shall arise another kingdom, inferior to thee.'

"This inferiority is not said to have been in respect of extent of dominion and power, and Cyrus, in effect, owned a wider border than Nebuchadnezzar, his territories extending beyond Media to the further confines of Persia; and of him it was declared, equally as of Nebuchadnezzar, that 'the Lord God of heaven had given him all the kingdoms of the earth' (*Ezra* 1, 2). The gold of the first member of the image, denoted, as we have seen, the wealth and the regal splendor of the monarch who was figured thereby. The adoption of silver, as emblematical of infirmity in the second member of the image, must then be in respect of the pomp of royalty being less displayed with him than with his predecessor in the vision. Such was eminently true with regard to Cyrus. Simplicity of habits, and abstemiousness, marked him above all other potentates; and it was not till he had accomplished the part he had in the vision, and taken up his place in membership in the great image as half of Babylon, that he at all indulged in luxury or regal show.

"In the visions of the beasts, a bear is the figure assigned to the number now under contemplation.

"In common with the others made use of in the vision, this animal has ferocity, but it is distinguished from the rest by its powers of endurance, and slow deliberate method of procedure, and also by its facilities for excavation; and the lengthy, patient, siege of Babylon by Cyrus, who invested it for two years, and then effected an entry by trenching and draining the river, through the channel of which he passed in, makes the selection of the form of the bear whereby to designate him, a peculiarly appropriate one.

"Of the bear, it is said that 'it raised up itself on one side.'

"Persia was the ancestral kingdom of Cyrus, and Media he inherited from his un-

cle Darius. The conjoint kingdoms are afterwards typified under the figure of a ram with two horns, of which it is mentioned that 'one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last.'—*Chap. viii., 3, 20*. This just corresponds with the action of the bear, which raises itself up on one side—elevating the one above the other—and is descriptive of Cyrus, by whom Persia, the last of the two to become a kingdom, was exalted above Media. The bear is seen to raise itself up thus, its procedure is noted while in process of completion, and this renders the application of the figure to Cyrus absolute. He alone can have been seen to effect the exaltation of one portion of his dominions over the other. His successors inherited the kingdom after this had been brought about, but the act of the raising of the one side above the other was his, and so none but he can be the bear who is observed to go through this action.

"The bear, furthermore, 'had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it and they said thus unto it, arise, devour much flesh.'

"As human relations, and not such concern the beasts of the earth, are what a in question—the bear standing for one of the human race—the flesh devoured is doubtless the flesh of men, and signifies their destruction. There were to be three instances wherein the bear in this way, was to 'devour much flesh,' it being apparent that it was in reference to the three ribs in his mouth that the word was spoken that he was to devour the flesh. By Cyrus this feature in the vision was also accurately realized. He fought three great battles in which multitudes were slain, and in them subdued three kings, who may stand specially for the three ribs in the bear's mouth. The first was with the joint forces of Cræsus, king of Lydia, and Neriglissor, king of Babylon, who are said to have brought upwards of 400,000 men into the field. These were defeated by Cyrus with great slaughter, and Neriglissor himself was killed. Cræsus gathered another host, whom Cyrus engaged and overthrew a Thymbra, and Cræsus then fell into his hands, and was led out for death, but eventually had his life spared to him. This was the second instance of slaughter. The third was at the taking of Babylon, when Belshazzar was slain.

"In point of diversity, both as to himself and as to his kingdom, from the first member of the vision, and his kingdom, Cyrus likewise fulfills the exigency of the prophecy. Nebuchadnezzar was an Assyrian, and Cyrus a Persian, and so of a diverse stock; and whereas Babylonia formed the sum of

the possessions of the former, the rule of the latter stretched also over Media and Persia, making the kingdom thus essentially a different one. Cyrus brought in these additional provinces, adding them on to Babylonia, where he set up his throne, and thus he took his place in the stately image, contributing his quota to the materials towards its completion.

"In all these details, personal characteristics are seen to have been exhibited, such as could not belong to a dynasty, or chain of kings, but only to a single individual; and he in whom they are all found to have been realized, must be the man. The abstinence from bravery and stately show, the bear-like qualities in the field, the raising the one side of the kingdom above the other, the three great instances of slaughter affording the three ribs between the teeth, and the diverse stock and differing kingdom, even when the seat of empire was the same, came true of Cyrus, and of none but him, and as Nebuchadnezzar fulfilled, absolutely, in himself, the first portion of the visions, without room being left to conjoin with him in it any of his line, so also has Cyrus, in his person, embodied all that belongs to the second portion of the visions, without there being a possibility that any of his line can have had part therein.

"3. The belly and the thighs of the image or the third beast.

"Among the line of kings having connection with Babylon after the time of Cyrus, none stands so prominent as Alexander the Great. Elsewhere, in this book of Daniel, under the type of the he-goat—the king of Grecia—by whom the empire of Media and Persia was to be overthrown—he has been made the subject of prophecy in a way too plain to be mistaken. He is the next of a diverse stock from Cyrus who came upon the scene of the visions, and it will be found, on judging of the details now to be considered, that the exigencies of the third portion of the visions have been fulfilled in him, as completely, and as accurately, as those of the prior portions have been shown to have been in Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus.

"Just as in the inherited standing of Cyrus as 'King of Persia,' the position he finally acquired as 'King of Babylon' has been hitherto overlooked, so has it been with regard to Alexander, whose title has been given him from his ancestral dominions, to the exclusion of that which he earned and made his own by force of arms. The careers of those two monarchs were similar. They went forth as warriors, and subdued all with whom they came in contact, and when their course of warfare had been run, and

the time of fruition of their conquests came, they sat down in Babylon, making her the place of their throne, and the capital of their possessions. No where else did they exhibit their kingly state, and there too they severally terminated their course and died.

"Cyrus, as we have seen, has two titles accorded him, in the Scriptures, the one founded on his patrimonial right, the other on his personal and acquired one. The case of Alexander being precisely a parallel one, he also should have his personal and appropriate title of King of Babylon, independently of his ancestral one of King of Greece. The Scripture warrant in the instance of Cyrus would of itself suffice to establish this position, but the word contains further indication that it is a true and a maintainable one. We find him called therein, 'the King of Grecia,' and also 'the first king.'—Dan. viii., 21. It was not of Grecia that he could be accounted the first king, for on the throne of Macedon, which was his peculiar possession, there a long line of more than twenty kings had preceded him, and on that of the united empire of Greece, his father Philip, who had acquired it, sat before him. He must have been styled the first king in reference to some other kingdom, and it can only have been that which his arms achieved for him. He was, in effect, 'the first (Grecian) king' of Babylon, and to this, undoubtedly, it is that the Scripture points. * * *

"The likeness given of the king we have now before us is that of a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl."

"The Scripture shows that this symbol denotes celerity.—Hab. i., 8. Rapidity of movement was the special characteristic of Alexander's operations, for in twelve years he fought countless battles, and overran and subdued every nation from Greece to the borders of India. The quality of celerity, as attaching to him, is doubtless, what is also signified of him in the symbol of the he-goat, where it is said that he came 'on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground.'—(Dan. viii., 5),—flying, as it were, like a winged animal, over it, in the speed of his course.

"The beast had also, it is said of it, 'four heads;' and dominion was given to it.

"The ordinary interpretation of this portion of the vision is, that the four heads relate to the four divisions of Alexander's empire, into which it was divided.

"This event has, however, been distinctly foretold elsewhere in the book of Daniel, (chap. xi., 4); and it is to be looked for that it should appear in repetition in the

course of the same chain of prophecies. Neither will the tenor of the language of the prophecy now under consideration support this application thereof. The beast was presented to the eyes of Daniel in its entirety. There was what denoted the rapidity of its movements; there were also there its four heads; and there was finally the dominion given to it. *All these features were seen to coexist together, and to form in the aggregate the object portrayed.* The rapidity that characterized it, and the dominion conferred upon it, could not belong to one state of its existence, and when they had passed away, the four heads to another. *All*, to convey the impression of the beast as it rose up to Daniel's sight, *must necessarily subsist together*; and, under any circumstances, it could not be that the crowning feature—the dominion given to the beast—was to disappear before the preceding clause of the four heads that belonged to it had been brought in. On the contrary, the language of the description couple up all together, and hangs on one feature of the image to the other, showing that the whole were linked together, and stood as parts one of the other, in the composition of the object they served to represent. The beast had its four wings, and also its four heads, and, *after this*, dominion was given unto it.

"Neither was the dominion spoken of that which attached to the successors of Alexander. Of him it was declared that he should be a mighty king, and that he should 'rule with great dominion'; but weakness of power, and not strength of rule, was what was to characterize his successors in their divided empire; for of them it was said, that they were to stand up, 'but not in his power'—nor according to his dominion which he ruled.—Chap. viii., 22; xi., 3, 4. It cannot be that in the parallel representation of the kingdom of brass, of which it was foretold that it was to 'bear rule over all the earth,' the dominion said to be given to it relates, not to the mighty monarchy of the unrivaled founder of the dynasty, but to the enfeebled and petty sway of those who came after him, when this monarchy had been broken up and parted among them. The dominion that was given to the beast with four heads cannot assuredly be this insignificant and divided rule, and so the four heads of the beast which came in antecedently to the bestowal of the dominion upon it, must necessarily relate to the empire in the time of its integrity and its strength, and not to what it was when it was disjointed and shorn of its power.

"The four heads, then, are to be taken as

belonging to the empire of Alexander the Great. In what sense they are to be viewed will be best understood by bearing in mind that as a member of the great image, he had to bring in his contribution towards its formation. Nebuchadnezzar furnished the capital, with its attendant territory, and though with the means of incorporating other countries with his possessions, he added none thereto. He left them although prostrate at his feet, their nationalities and their kings, contenting himself with an acknowledgement of his supremacy over them as king of kings. Unity therefore, characterizes his kingdom, and the single head of gold appropriately designated it. To Cyrus duality attached, shown by the advergence to the two sides of the bear, and, in the other vision relating to his kingdom, to the two horns of the ram. What already belonged to the image was not to be counted in estimating the proportion thereof which he supplied. Babylonia was there, before his day and the vision, as it respected him, notice therefore only the two-fold contribution which he supplied—Media and Persia. He might have added other provinces to the empire; but he did not do so. On the defeat of Cræsus, Lydia was in his hands, but, according to Rollin, he continued to Cræsus the possession of his sovereignty, 'suffering him to enjoy both the title and authority of king.' Syria was overrun by him, but there is no room to believe that he retained a greater sway there than was held by Nebuchadnezzar; and one important place thereof—Tyre—we find indubitably maintaining its independence till the time of Alexander, who overthrew it. Egypt also felt the force of his arms, but was not deprived of her kings, for one of these, Parnenitus, was engaged in warfare after his death with his son and successor Cambyses. The vision required from Nebuchadnezzar but one province for the empire, and from Cyrus but two, and both obeyed the exigency thereof, and appropriated no more. The third member was, however, to bring in a larger contribution. He was to add four provinces, or kingdoms, to three already existing in the image, as indicated by his four heads. This Alexander exactly fulfilled; for Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, owned his sceptre when he came into membership with the great image, and took up his seat upon the throne of Babylon. More he would have acquired, but when he passed the utmost confines of the Persian Empire, and proceeded to wage war beyond them in India, his soldiers, who had hitherto yielded him implicit obedience, and had followed him in his conquests with a zeal only outrivaled by his own, refused to advance, and he had to

retrace his footsteps, and to content himself with the specific portion assigned him in the vision."

Notes on the Above.

1. The reader will bear in mind that ours is not "the current view" of Daniel's predictions; and that consequently we are under no obligation to defend it. We have often shown, that the Four Beasts are representative of Four Systems of Powers *historically or successively developed; and contemporaneously existing in combination, as the elements of Nebuchadnezzar's Image, in the time of the end;* that the Fourth System of Powers is to be utterly destroyed by Messiah and the Saints, while the other three will continue to exist, but without dominion of their own, for "a season and a time," or 1,000 years. Mr. Strange's objections have no bearings against this position.

2. The Fourth Beast is currently styled "*Roman*," as though it were purely and simply a *Latin* or *Italian* dominion. This is an important error. Its "nails of brass" show that it is connected with the dominion of the "brazen-coated Greeks," as they styled themselves; but "*iron*," which has been taken to signify the Latin element exclusively, is nowhere so used in Scripture. The iron element is banded round the stump of the Babylonian tree, and identified with the legs, feet, and toes of the Image, and therefore with the ten horns of the Fourth Beast, and with its teeth, to *indicate the strength, not the racial characteristics*, of the symbols. This appears from the words of the text, "And a fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron; because that iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all; and, as iron, for the breaking of all these, it shall break in pieces and divide. * * * The kingdom shall be divided; and the strength of iron is to be in it." So it reads in the Chaldee of Dan., ii. 40, 42. That is, there was to be power in the fourth system of states for the breaking, or subduing, or incorporation of the first three; and for dividing without itself falling to pieces, and for continuing to the end.

Now this iron strength of the "fourth kingdom" has been developed through different races, of which the Latin or Italian is but one of several; and at the present time any thing but the iron of the fourth kingdom for strength. The horns, seven of which are iron, are Teutonic, and conquerors of the Romans. The term "*Roman*," however, is admissible in connection with the beast, if in the use of it, we do not exclude other elements from it which have imparted strength to it, though not racially Roman. We may term it the Roman Beast on the

ground that the history of the Roman Empire, "pagan" and "holy," constitutes a large proportion of the history of the beast. But in the prophecy, it is nameless. We have there the lion, the bear, and the Leopard; but that which appeared last is simply termed "*the fourth*." Its history thus far connects it with Greeks, Italians, Goths, Franks, Germans, Turks, &c., as its racial rulers; and before it shall have been destroyed by the Stone Power, Muscovites will flourish in their day, as an element of its political constitution.

All the oppressors of Israel until the end of the oppressing powers, were styled "a yoke of iron."—Deut. xxviii., 48. "Iron shall break the northern iron and the steel."—Jer. xv., 12. That is, the Stone Power with a rod of iron shall break the kingdom strong as iron in the day of Israel's redemption. And in Mic. iv., 13, concerning Zion, it is said, "I will make thine horn iron, and thy hoofs brass; and thou shalt beat in pieces many people; and I will consecrate their gain unto Jehovah, and their substance to the Lord of all the earth."

3. The fallacy, as a worm at the root of Mr. Strange's logical tree, is the mistaking an *individual man* for an *individual power*. The prophecy has to do with *powers*, not with *men*, as such. Thus, "Thou, O King, art a King of Kings!" Why? The answer was *not* "because thou art the man Nebuchadnezzar," but "because the God of Heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, strength, and glory." This was why he was "the Head of Gold." Strip him of the kingdom, power, strength, and glory, and though living, he ceases to be "the Head." Not perceiving this, Mr. Strange has elaborated an ingenious piece of sophistry which need not be followed in detail. The foundation being removed, the superstructure is in ruins.

4. The Scripture does not define "the Stone" in the prophecy by "individual personage," but by the phrase, "a kingdom." What smote the Image in the vision? "A stone." What breaks in pieces and consumes the toe-kingdoms? *A kingdom*.—See Dan. ii., 34, 44. The image is an aggregation of the Babylonian *Powers* of the time of the end; and the stone is the aggregation of Israel the Saints, and Messiah, constituting the kingdom" which the God of Heaven develops as the image-breaker of the crisis. Messiah is the stone of Israel; but, as an individual, or single person, he is not "the stone" of the prophecy. In the seventh chapter, judgement is given to the Saints (of whom Messiah is one) and to their people (see vers. 18, 22, 26, 27); and thus they become *the stone of Judgement*.

5. In the first year of Darius the Mede, he was confirmed and strengthened as king by the angel-companion of Israel's prince. After him, and before Xerxes, three kings were to stand up. "There shall stand up yet three kings *in Persia*." Cyrus was the first of these *three*; yet Mr. Strange says, "*in Persia*, Cyrus never set up his throne."—Dan. xi., 2. A king reigning in Persia—standing up in Persia—is certainly equivalent to his throne being there. They were Medo-Persian monarchs and Kings of Babylon, but did not restrict the seat of government to the conquered city.

May 10, 1857.

EDITOR.

A Candid Mind.

NORRIS sheds so fine a light upon the human mind as candor. It was called whiteness by the ancients, for its purity; and it has always won the esteem due to the most admirable of the virtues. However sought for or practiced, all felt the power and charm of its influence. The man whose opinions make the deepest mark upon his fellow-man, whose influence is the most lasting and efficient, whose friendship is instinctively sought where all others have proved faithless, is not the man of brilliant parts, or flattering tongue, or splendid genius, or commanding power; but he whose lucid candor and ingenuous truth transmit the heart's real feelings, pure and without refraction. There are other qualities which are more showy, and other traits that have a higher place in the world's code of honor; but none wear better, or gather less tarnish by use, or claim a deeper homage in that silent reverence which the mind must pay to truth.

Inefficiency of the Pulpit.

From the Southern Literary Messenger.

(CONTINUED FROM THE MAY NO.)

PEOPLE regard the clergy as an isolated caste; they are looked on as quiet, inoffensive, holy recluses, who have nothing to do but in a ghostly way. They are not esteemed as members of society, or as having any concern in sublunary affairs. There is a great wall between them and the people, and any cordial inter-communication is not looked for on the part of one class toward the other. Ministers are considered as so exquisitely sanctified, that all familiar intercourse with them would be out of the question. They themselves, contribute (by their manners) no little to create the impression. They are expected to discharge a certain class of duties which are not binding on other Christians. To look solemn and to pray, are thought to

be their only legitimate employment. To shun their society, and regard them with a sort of diffident terror, becomes universal. Who is to blame for this? We say the clergy, in no small degree. *No barrier ought to be kept up between the clergy and the people.* They ought to mingle with them, to concern themselves in their interests, sympathise with their affairs, identify themselves with what affects them. It is towards this end, that we say, let the preacher present himself in this attitude as a speaker. Let him, as the politician, address himself to people of whom he is one, and communicate with them familiarly and plainly. Do not let him fence himself in from those he is speaking to, and, with a professional neck-cloth, read them a lecture as ghostly as he is.

Does any one suppose that some profane vagabond in the congregation feels any sympathy with *such* a man?

All formality in the pulpit tends to add to that idea of mystical holiness with which the popular mind is disposed to invest the clerical order—or rather, we should say, tends to transform the *clerical* idea into the *priestly* one, and to create the impression of the superior sanctity of the ministers of religion. It is, therefore, more the duty of a speaker on religious subjects to avoid all pretension before his audience, than it is even as regards those whose topics are secular.

Turning from the political rostrum and the bar, what in reality (as to its efficiency) do we witness in the pulpit—we mean where written sermons prevail? However untenable our reasonings with regard to the matter may have appeared—and however feasible, to some minds, manuscript speaking, or the *memoriter* method, may present itself—what *in fact* do we witness in such pulpits? We do not ask, how does some great and exceptional case manage to speak in spite of his manuscript. Not how Dr. Chalmers used to speak; or how Dr. Mason preached; or how such and such a gentleman or gentlemen may now be preaching with the use of the notes. But we ask, how do the clergy of these denominations, as a class, speak? How A, B, C, D, E, F, &c.—the great body of the clergy—succeed in their pulpit ministries? Some way back, we attempted to show that even those who had succeeded so eminently with the manuscript might have done better without it—or we attempted to account for the success on certain occasions of manuscript or memoriter speeches; but this we are not called upon to do; the question is a broader one: it does not refer to a few special individuals; but it embraces the *general preaching of the great mass of the clergy.* What

then are the facts with reference to our inquiries? How do the whole body of the clergy (in question) succeed as a class of speakers? Our experience is, that, as a mass, these ministers are dull: their sermons to us are lifeless: their speaking is idle. We would be careful of our expressions; but such is our conviction. They do not interest their congregations. We are told not to criticize the sermon; but it is hard to maintain silence. Such a writer of sermons falls almost inevitably into a plodding, mechanical train, which deviates entirely from the idea of speaking. Blair's Sermons are perfect models in this way—barren proprieties—which never yet thrilled with a vital emotion. Scholastic disquisitions—dogmatical theses—meditative essays—constitute the staple in general of such discourses. Where the method of composition does not vitiate the matter, the procedure is rendered inefficient by the manner of the delivery. It is almost impossible for us to stand both ordeals. An *ex tempore* speaker, of any taste or sense, is almost compelled to address to his audience matter that is suited to them. He cannot wander off on something out of character and keeping with the occasion. A sense of propriety not only extorts from him unconstrained and natural and *appropos* remarks; but the same discriminating faculty—excited into action—suggests to him the manner and the tone with which he should express himself. We do not see why Addison was not right when he rebuked, in his little *Moralist*, the clergy of his day for presuming to compose their own sermons. There were great repositories, he told them, of pulpit eloquence among the great divines of England; and he did not see how any clergyman, of proper modesty, should venture to lay before his congregation any of his own inferior efforts, when, by selecting from these models, every parish in the kingdom might hear, every Sunday, from Barrow, or Tillotson, or Taylor, or South. The operation is this: a pious, sensible minister feels deeply impressed with the importance of his office; he has a realising sense of the great magnitude of the issues involved in his calling; he sees multitudes of his fellow-creatures perishing around him; and under a deep sensibility of the responsibility upon him, he preaches to the congregation before him the topics which he has so nearly at heart. He tells them, with the eloquence of simplicity and true feeling, of the great peril which besets them. But suppose, now, the same pious, sensible man gets to *writing* about religion, what will be the manifestations of his pulpit ministrations? They will almost infallibly get to be *disquisitions*: he will get to dividing his subject into so many heads:

he will produce very dull orthodox lucubrations; and the congregation will have about as much sympathy with what is afforded them, as a man has ordinarily when somebody reads to him for about an hour from some grave book. We challenge the comparison between the bar and the pulpit. One is like a living body—the other *torpid, barren, dry*. That is breathing, active, vital; this does not throb with a human pulsation. How the tide of passion uninterruptedly—spontaneously—flows in those channels: how it stagnates and deadens in this sluggish current!

It is time, perhaps, that we should have remarked what we mean by an *ex tempore* speech. We do not mean, of course, anything involving less labor than is rendered necessary by a written preparation. It will not occur to any one that we propose for any speaker to get up and address a congregation without previous meditation. No man of sense would ever offer such an insult to an assembly. We believe at temperance meetings, &c., such a procedure is frequently attempted, but no one who does it can possess modesty or judgement. It is impossible for a man off-hand to throw off a speech which shall be valuable. *To make a good speech, a man must understand his subject.* We have no faith, indeed, in *impromptus* of any sort. Unless Theodore Hook were an exception, we do not know of any well-authenticated case on record. We believe every really fine effort of the human mind requires *labor*. We do not believe that Byron wrote *impromptus*; and we believe that the best portions of Shakspeare were carefully elaborated. Neither do we believe that Patrick Henry was “spontaneous” in the sense we are speaking of. The preparation required for *ex tempore* speaking (so-called) is *much greater* than that requisite for manuscript speeches. To master the subject thoroughly—to get all the necessary facts and the necessary illustrations—to arrange them in the memory—to comprehend well the principles they involve—and to *ingrain* the whole so deeply in the mind that it becomes appropriated with it like a natural growth—this is no easy task. When it is once done (and habit greatly facilitates the process) the speech then lives: it is masked from the sense; but it will break forth into manifestation when the spirit sweeps over it. To carry two such sermons for every Sunday in the head, is a very different process from committing them, *currente calamo*, to a manuscript. The writing process also fastens up that sermon for ever for the future: the other method leaves it liable to be lost in the general current of thought. We stated, therefore, at the outset, that we believed one

great cause of the prevalence of written sermons was the saving of labor. It is not a serious business for a man accustomed to the process to write a sermon, and then throw it off, in a declamatory way, with the manuscript before him. It is a serious thing to digest a subject well, and from the depth of mental travail, to produce a living picture that shall stand out vividly to the apprehension of every listener. Thinking is a far more serious thing than reading, and it is also a far more serious thing than writing. And an *ex tempore* speaker must think, while a practiced writer of sermons often expends no more labor than he would in writing a letter. There is also this essential difference, that the first speaker must, *ex necessitate*, from the very constitution of his mind, direct his attention in a *practical direction*, while the second is lured off by the accomplishment of a treatise, whether pertinent or not, and the point aimed at is very apt to escape him. The one has to bear down with his invention on a certain definite purpose; the other sits down to write a sermon; it will probably be some abstract dissertation. * *

There is certainly something in free, natural, spontaneous speech, which engages the attention in a very different manner from anything presented at second-hand as the result of another's, or of one's own previous labor. That subtle principle in the human bosom which inevitably interests every man in his fellow, seems involuntarily to be awakened by every natural expression of feeling. Every spontaneous utterance strikes upon a chord in every other breast. And so long as one speaks freely, without effort, simply, the language of the heart, there is a sympathy elicited from every human soul, which secures and detains the attention of the hearer. The sound of the human voice, when it goes forth *truthfully*, has something irresistibly attractive to every member of the human family. Even if the speaker is of little importance, even if the subject matter is not very profound, as long as there is the simple expression of genuine feeling, a sympathy is awakened, and an attention bestowed. This seems to be the secret of *ex tempore* speaking. There is no suspicion of deception. There is no impression that anything may be false. As long as the speaker is really interested in what he is saying, he is uttering sentiments that are necessarily *human*. On the other hand, in the case of a manuscript, it is presumed to be done as a matter of business. The appearance of labor seems to cast a suspicion on the sincerity of the sentiments—that is, as specially entertained at the moment in question. Those feelings may have been experienced—but are they felt *now*? Is there an emotion—a living

feeling—for with the past we have nothing to do—struggling there now? It is with human emotion that this matter has to do; and if that emotion was another's, or if it is dead, it has no spell to lay upon others, except in so far as it can be resuscitated or successfully counterfeited.

On the stage we see this attempted. A fine actor who can reproduce the real feelings of Hamlet by *appearing to have them himself*, elicits rounds of applause. Just so far as he approaches nature, is he successful. So any *memoriter* speaker, just in so far as he can really revive, or appear to revive, his original feelings, will his address be eloquent, and his appeals be effective. And so with a MS. speaker; his success will be exactly proportioned to the felicity with which he counterfeits actual and real speaking. And let this be well pondered: that even successful MS. speaking owes its success to the approaches it makes to the speaking called *ex tempore*. * * * *

How did they preach in the early church? How did Apollos and Stephen and Paul speak? We do not suppose they wrote anything. Coleman, in his delineation of the early church practices, referring to the sermons or homilies of the earlier Christian, says: "It was the usual custom to speak *ex tempore*." Notes were sometimes used; but "it was the prevailing mode to dispense with them." To the same purport, we find the following testimony in the recent elaborate work, by the Rev. Henry C. Fish, entitled the "Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence," giving specimens from the most eminent divines of all nations: "The discourses of the fathers were also *fre*, and *familiar*. The word by which they are designated among the Greeks (*ὁμιλία* homilia, from *homileo*, to converse in company,) seems to imply this. Whether this be so, or whether the word implied no more than the usual Latin appellations, *tractatus*, *sermo*, or *allocutio*, (a name applied by Tertullian.)—which mean, substantially, any exposition or handling of Scripture—it is apparent, upon the least observation, that the early preachers had little regard for exact method, and made no show of great learning or argumentative skill in their ordinary discourses. With very few exceptions, there is an entire absence of the divisions, and formal propositions, so common in our own day; and little of labored interpretation and close discussion. There is more of careful exegesis and strong reasoning in the homilies of Chrysostom than in those of any other father; and yet he is far more noted for force of eloquence than for just criticism and sober demonstration. Even where the preacher gave to his sermon the form of an

extended address upon some particular text, it appears to have been, nevertheless, discursive, and, if rich in thought, was yet without unity or argument, or the skillful arrangement of the several parts. To this remark there were some exceptions, yet in the main it holds true of all the fathers. Discourses were sometimes previously composed and committed to memory; in rare instances read from the manuscript; but commonly, either delivered after a plan prepared beforehand, or altogether from the suggestions of the moment. Those that have come down to us were not, in the main, preserved by the original manuscripts of the preachers, but by means of short-hand writers, who attained to great perfection in the art, and took down entire discourses at the time of delivery." Thus, we presume, spoke Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome. Thus, we know, spoke the two great patterns of the Greek and Latin pulpits—Chrysostom and Augustine. Those preachers, who, in three centuries, had completed the overthrow of Paganism—and that mainly through preaching—could have been no ordinary speakers. Their speaking must have been effective—must have been like that which was connected with the great awakening under Luther and Whitfield.

John de Wickliffe—born a century and a half before Luther—was the author of the first great revival of primitive Christianity.* He was indeed—as he has been called—the Father of the Reformation. There seems no doubt that he was a great preacher. "The number of his disciples," says Knighton, canon of Leicester, "is so great, that a man can scarcely meet two people on the same road but one of them is a disciple of Wickliffe." His method of preaching, says the account of him in the volumes of Mr. Fish, above quoted, "was *pastillating*, in distinction from *declaring*; that is taking up the various parts of a passage and briefly expounding them, in succession," etc.

"Owing to this fact, the sermons of Wickliffe which have come down to us, are exceedingly brief and imperfect," etc. It is manifest we think, from this, that Wickliffe must have spoken in an *ex tempore* manner, and may, therefore, be numbered with those already referred to as illustrating this subject. See to the same effect the life of

* This is a great mistake. Wickliffe, Luther, Huss, etc., were merely protestors against popish excesses, not revivers of "primitive Christianity," of which they were as ignorant as the clergy of our day. Origen, Cyprian, and the rest above named, were perverters of the primitive faith—the members of the firm of BALAAM, JEZEBEL & Co., which has now the monopoly of the soul-trading of "Christendom"—ecclesiastical politicians, eloquent against the gods in the interest of their own delinquency.—*Ed. Her.*

Wickliffe in the "Lives of the British Reformers," published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Does any one doubt that the stirring appeals of Peter the Hermit—or of the great Florentine Reformer, Girolamo Savonarola—were the impassioned, fervid utterances of extemporaneous feeling?

But with here and there a solitary exception, the preaching in the middle ages amounted to nothing. The first great revival of the sort took place at the Reformation. Few greater preachers can have ever appeared, than Luther. There can be no doubt that he was an extemporaneous speaker. "Daily, and often several times in a day, he was wont to attract crowds by his public discourses; and of his sermons it was said, 'Each word was a thunderbolt.'" In the course of twenty-nine years, also, he published seven hundred and fifteen volumes—or one in a fortnight of his public life—many of which were taken down from his lips by his friends.

For ages the pulpit exercises of the Scotch church were all *ex tempore*. The rude and overwhelming eloquence of Knox was, it may be safely assumed, of this character; and he was doubtless a speaker of the most extraordinary abilities.

Calvin, we know, was an *ex tempore* speaker.

What was the method of the early English Reformers we are not prepared to say; but we should infer from the familiarity, the anecdotes, the rude allusions in his sermons, and from the fact that he traversed the country as a kind of itinerant, that Latimer at least spoke without a manuscript, or having memorized his language. Excepting a few names, the pulpit oratory of Scotland is hardly worth noticing between the period we have noticed and the impulse it received from the example of Chalmers.

The latter part of the 17th century, in England, was signalized by the powerful writings and preaching of the great Non-conformist Divines—Baxter, Bunyan, Howe, Bates, Owen, Flavel, Charnock. We can only say in general, that although, perhaps, many of them used notes, still their exhortations from the pulpit must have possessed, in a very great degree, the characteristics of *ex tempore* preaching. "They were accustomed," says a writer in the Princeton Review, "to the effusion of thought and feeling in language suggested at the moment of delivery." "Baxter," who was in the habit of using notes, "was great," says Mr. Sylvester, "at extemporaneous preaching."

It was among the established clergy that the purely written sermon, during this period, was used in England. Tillotson, Barrow, South, Taylor,—then Atterbury, Bull, Waterland—these are the great names that must be marshalled in behalf of the memoriter or manuscript method of preaching in its most rigid form. Their merits are well known. The pure English of Tillotson—the noble passages of Barrow—the caustic wit of South—the many-tinted glory of Taylor—the courtly splendors of Atterbury—have given the Anglican *Sermon* a place in her noble literature not inferior to that occupied by any other species of writing. But these men were not “great preachers.” They are not preachers in the sense that Chalmers was, or Davies, or Mason.

Coming down later, the two greatest names in the English pulpit are undoubtedly those of George Whitfield and Robert Hall. Whitfield, in the great element we are now mainly concerned with—in *results*, in *power*—has certainly never had his equal in these ages. Both of these men were *ex tempore* preachers. Whitfield’s history is well known. He literally, indeed, “turned the world upside down.”* With his great cotemporary, John Wesley—himself also one of the first preachers, and an *ex tempore* preacher—he has left, in a hundred years, the most powerful religious organization now existing in the world (we refer to any pure form of religion).† With respect to Hall, all of those splendid orations of his, which have caused him to be spoken of as combining the characteristics of Chatham, of Burke, of Sheridan, of Fox, of Pitt, were delivered *ex tempore*. * * * * *

We will now dismiss the consideration of this point, so elaborately treated, and hastily enumerate some others in which we conceive there is something requiring a change in the policy or genius of these churches.

We have incidentally spoken of the fact, that these communions *fail to reach the masses*. This came up naturally in considering their preaching. But the fact lies more broadly. Out of their pulpits, there is no sympathy between an Episcopalian clergyman and a brakeman on a railroad car. The petty shop-keepers, the sewing-women, the timmer, the blacksmith, the overseer’s wife, never

think of joining the Presbyterian church. In a congregation of either of these churches, how many persons in the inferior grades of society can be found? Of course, there is a great difference between an Episcopal and a Presbyterian congregation; but, even in the latter, how few mechanics of the humbler sort—how few poor people are met with! May not this be rectified? Should not Presbyterianism strike down to those to whom “the Gospel was preached?” Should not Episcopacy send out its voice also to that clattering dray that is thundering over that rough pavement, as well as to those mettlesome bays that are standing beneath those elegant windows? Will one say, “our church suits such people, and that church is adapted to people of that sort?” This is often said; but it is wrong. Has your church no peculiarity but that it is suited to a certain class, and to a certain manifestation of merely the social life? Is this the genius of Christianity—that there is to be in reference to a common Savior, a line of *social demarcation* between Christians? Is this that feeling which was enforced upon Philemon, with reference to Onesimus, that he was to “receive him”—“not now as a servant, but as a brother beloved?”—or consistent with that spirit, that “God hath chosen the base things of the world, and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence?” or with the fact, that Jesus, and Paul, and Peter, consorted with the very humblest and poorest of the community? *A church which is only adapted to the rich, is essentially wrong.* A church merely suited for the humbler class of people, is somewhat defective. If a bishop is essential to a church, why should not a poor man’s minister receive consecration at his hands? If Calvinism is important as a doctrine, why should not the shoemaker study the ninth of Romans?

It is, we repeat it, the imperative duty of these churches to come in contact with the masses. Perhaps all of your educated, seminary preachers, are insufficient to meet the demands already made upon them. Then ordain uneducated preachers. Go among the people. Reach them somehow. Organize special efforts for the “groundlings.” Throw off your gentility, if necessary. “To the poor the Gospel is preached:” do you do it? * The clergy must bring themselves,

* The Apostles were said to have done the same thing. The down side they turned up was the side that ought to have remained up to this day. But Whitfield and others such as he, are also said since then to have turned the world upside down! It therefore follows that they must have reversed the labors of the apostles! The side of the world now up is consequently not apostolic, but antichristian and apostate. —*Editor Herald.*

† Wesleyanism, in the light of the Bible, “a puro form of religion,” is a self evident absurdity. —*Ed. Her.*

* To require the clergy to preach the Gospel that their pulpit may become efficient, is really cruel! You might as well hold a pistol to the head of an uneducated Anglo-Saxon, and threaten to blow out his brains if he did not speak Greek. Poor fellows! How can they preach in ignorance of “Tux Woad?” Set them to preach *dicinylisms*, and they are your men!

and they must teach their people, to bring themselves in contact with the people. This is one of the duties of this age—among such churches. We tell the Episcopal church, that a well-bred young man, with a prayer-book and a surplice, is not going to get to the hearts of the rude million. The well-trained young presbyter, who has just gotten through "Charnock on the Attributes"—we tell Presbyterianism is not a tribune for the people. The teachers of the people must come from the people. The mass must be leavened from within itself. The *impulse* may originate from above.

There is too little social intercourse between the Christians in different circles. *That was not the genius of Primitive Christianity.* It is a high Christian duty to sympathize with the poorer members of the society; and for this purpose, they should be visited—not condescendingly, but—fraternally by the rich. Their affairs, their wants, their interests, should be known. The influence would then develop itself into the whole circle of their acquaintances. How little do the rich know of the poor—of their way of thinking—their sorrows—their struggles. Their inner life is no more understood by those who employ them, than the manners and habits of a distant people. And this we take to be the great blessing of the colporteur system—that these humble laborers visit the poor in their homes, and sit by their fires, and become acquainted with their sympathies.

Connected with this duty, which we conceive to be neglected by these churches, is the want in their establishments of something like the system of Methodist *Itinerancy*. They want missionaries for the home population. In the way of supplying the respectable districts in towns, and the settled portions of the country, with pastors, the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches have done their duty.* But what have they done for the frontier? or for the abodes of wretchedness and poverty in the cities? All their churches move "up town" as systematically as the theatres. They want a band of *Gospel circuit riders*. They are the true pioneers of Christianity—and they, as in a Five Points' mission, go to the very dens of wickedness.† There is no proposi-

tion more obvious than that it is *not* necessary to give every preacher an elaborate education. When Peter left his nets, what did he know of theology? How much do these humble colporteurs know? To go into the mountains—to penetrate our back settlements—to thread the dark alleys of our towns—to stand on our wharves—a well-brushed coat and a white cravat are not necessary. Let these churches then organize a new body of men—an itinerant missionary corps, and let them profit by what they see in the Methodist and Baptist churches. There is a vast amount of material lying perfectly idle in these denominations, that could thus be made available in the most decided manner.

We have intimated that these clergy *must throw off their sacerdotal manners*. They must mix with society. They must make themselves accessible to all. They must learn, that, perhaps more can be done in the *social circle*, than from the pulpit. If any man should court popularity*—if any one should habitually electioneer—it is the minister.

Clearly all professional peculiarities should be avoided—a clerical dress—a *derical whine*. There is something perfectly intolerable to us in that solemn nasal cant so common in the pulpit.

Young theological students should here also be cautioned against an offence against good taste, to which they seem specially liable. A very large proportion of them are *conceited*.†

Lastly, there is something wrong in the prevailing mode in these churches of preparing young men for the ministry. They learn books; but they know nothing of *men*. They are students. They know nothing of the great world. Of the currents of society—of the habits of men at large—of the ideas, the opinions, the prejudices of the depraved masses—they are perfectly ignorant. The Methodist preacher learns all this: knocked about from pillar to post, he acquires that rough learning that is given only by experience—that "reading and writing that come by nature." The colporteur also learns this. But at Alexandria or Princeton, those young men are reading Church History, and they come forth into society as an isolated class—only mingling with the

But, in the name of peace and charity, never ask a clergyman—"Do you preach the Gospel to the poor?" They have as little to do with the Gospel, as the groundlings have for them.—*Ed. Her.*

* Truly; and because from them are attainable "the loaves and fishes."—*Ed. Her.*

† "Dens of wickedness," are common to Fifth Avenue, Bond Street, &c., as well as to the Five Points. Grace church at the head of Broadway, is a den of wickedness in purple and fine linen—Five Points, of wickedness in rags and ladders. The difference is therefore a question principally of dry goods and millinery!—*Ed. Her.*

* In manners, but not in doctrine, as they are wont to do. "If I yet pleased men," says Paul, "I should not be the servant of Christ." Gal. 1. 10.—*Ed. Her.*

† It is evident that the writer hath not the fear of clergy before his eyes! The clergy, young and old, claim to be "the ambassadors of Christ," sent by him, and "called of God, as Aaron was;" and yet he presumes to style these heavenly dignitaries "Conceited!" Either he is a very impudent scribe, or they are very self-important knaves to indulge in such conceit!—*Ed. Herald.*

world through pastoral visits. We really think a year or two spent in the labors of colportage would be fully as advantageous as the same period spent in the seminary. For the purposes of speculation or scholarship, the habitues of the closet are wanted, but for influencing the masses of society what is needed is practical men.

So much for what we regard as among the causes of the "inefficiency of the pulpit," among the more cultivated and conservative denominations. They proceed essentially from the very so-called conservatism existing among them. Their whole system wants opening—wants loosening. Its movement is slow, and dropping behind the age.

(To be continued.)

Theopolitical.

Situation of Europe.

THE following is from *Blackwood*. Though some of the incidents mentioned have been superseded by others, the situation of Europe is not less threatening. The article is worthy of note.—*Editor*.

To any one who really sees Europe as it actually is at this hour, the spectacle is a sad one. To him who forgets that God rules all, from evil still evoking good, it is a hopeless one. Are we really at the close of war, or only at the beginning of one still greater? Take up the newspapers—those Arguses whose eyes travel to and fro on the face of the earth—and what do we read of?

First, come voices of trouble from the East. Troubles in Arabia—50,000 rebels at Mecca swearing that the Sultan has forsworn the Prophet; troubles in Syria—wild men at Nablous rising because there is no one to keep them down; troubles in Bagdad, smouldering troubles in Smyrna and other places in Anatolia, where the charter we wrung from the Porte is only settling Turk and Christian the faster by the cars; perfect anarchy in Greece—neither men nor goods safe beyond three miles from the coast, where French troops patrol—and the people fiercer than ever against the Ottomans, and more than ever frantic to kiss the feet of the Czar, and subject themselves to an iron despotism which is probably marked out by Providence as the sole effectual cure of Hellenic madness. So much for Turkey, which, our rulers tell us, we have rescued and made strong. Is there a single whole place in it from head to foot?

But "we have checked the southward progress of Russia."

For a moment. But why those cries for help from the Caucasus, that marshaling

of Chrucliff's host, those plans now preparing in the bureaux of St. Petersburg for new forts on the east side of the Black Sea, and a war-navy on the Caspian?

Turkey disintegrating, and Russia adhering to her "hereditary policy"—this is but one scene of the diorama. Take another phase of the troubles. Were there ever before so many "armies of occupation" in Europe? Austrians in the Principalities, British and French in Turkey and Greece, French and Austrians in Italy, all most generously keeping the peace in other peoples' territories—the wrong men in the right place!

The sight of those various white, blue, and red-coated soldiers in alien countries, is a significant proof of the disjointed state of affairs. It is like the sight of dragoons in a mob, telling of troubles. Italy is especially the seat of troubles and the object of apprehensions. Geologically the most volcanic of European countries, she is so now also politically. The damp dungeons of Naples teem with victims, and King Bomba overawes his people by means of brigands and lazzaroni. French bayonets around the Vatican alone ward off a new Roman Republic and a second flight of the Pope to Gaeta. Austria, overpassing her own frontiers, has corps of occupation, alike in Parma and the Legations, where they rule like demons—and in her own Italian territories there prevails only a milder form of the same reign of terror.

Radetzky writes to Vienna that either his master must say No at once to the Remonstrances of the Western Powers and Sardinia, or he will resign. Indeed, in the present combustible state of the peninsula, can Austria recede without evoking the flames? It is a duel between Austria and Sardinia, contesting the supremacy of Italy. Sardinia demands—publicly in the face of Europe demands—that the cords which bind Italy shall be slackened. If Austria yield, the Star of Piedmont rises higher on the horizon, and all eyes turn to it. The light of hope will grow stronger all over the peninsula, and the slackening of her cords will only make galled Italy pant more furiously to be free.

But what a spectacle for modern Europe! Italy and Greece, the heirs of the classic empires, the descendants of the ancient world—both mad and miserable—raving and chafing with a fury unintelligible to northern races! Why, the very soldiers of our Italian Legion at Malta are growing delirious—have been shouting and stabbing "for liberty" in a place where there is nothing but batteries and oranges—and would

doubtless throw themselves into the sea to swim for Sicily, if they could carry their arms with them.

Is this peace? Cross the Alps and look northward. Poland groaning, and at times hoping, but securely manacled, and perhaps about to be offered by her master a political sop. Hungary, bleeding at the heart, but with no hope on the earth, save in the utter crumbling of the Hapsburg throne, which would only bring a Muscovite, instead of an Austrian bondage. These we count not at present. They figure largely in the speculations of superficial observers, but it is not by them that the troubled sleep of Europe will first be broken; indeed, it seems to us their day cannot come at all, until Germany and Italy have first gone through the fire, and come out greatly changed. But Germany is troubled, and will probably be into the furnace sooner than most people imagine.

Destitute of the mad impulses of the South, less demonstrative even than the French, the Germans do not give tongue much before they act—but there are symptoms that the tranquillity of Central Europe is anything but secure. The policy of the governments towards the people has become most reactionary—in many respects there is less freedom now, than there was before 1848—and even in the free republic of Hamburg, the most cruel measures of oppression are put in force against the press.

The Germans are a slow moving race, and if they had even a promise of better things coming, they would wait on, smoking their pipes, and drinking their beer, with true Teutonic phlegm, for another generation. But at present they have not even a promise of better things—the nobility, worse than the throne, seem only bent upon pushing things backward toward feudalism; and the consequence is, that were revolution

to commence in serious form, either at Paris, or in Italy, Germany would speedily catch the flame.

In France itself tranquillity is only secure so long as the firm hand of Napoleon III holds the reins. While he lives France will not throw its rider. But his death would resolve all into chaos; and Bourbonists, Republicans, and Socialists, would be struggling together in the dread maelstrom. For such a convulsion there can be but one issue. Order must be reestablished; but around whom is the nation to rally?

Suppose Napoleon III gone, what Saul is there overtopping all the rest by head and shoulders? What name is there but one that is known beyond the limits of Paris and a few leading towus?

Such, it appears to us, is the essential condition of the leading states of the Continent. Troubled they are, all of them. Never was the political state of Europe so full of quicksands. "Distress of nations and perplexity"—such is the exact aspect of the times. One cannot take a bold step any way without plunging into abysses which the future only can fathom. Not to speak of the evidently transition state of the Spanish peninsula, Turkey is disintegrating. Italy is on the eve of exploding; even Germany is not safe; and a crisis in any one of these quarters may set Europe by the ears. Liberalism and Despotism are for the moment strangely interwoven. France threatens the press of Belgium.—Austria similarly threatens Sardinia, and crushes Italy. Sardinia menaces despotic Austria.—England sympathizes with freedom everywhere, but does not act. France dreads an outbreak in Italy, and stands balancing between Austria and Sardinia, yet, at the same time, is not disinclined to intervene to check Espartero and democracy in Spain.

Table of Contemporaries.

The following table will show how easy it was to hand down the story of the Creation and Fall, by tradition, from Adam to Isaac. Adam was contemporary with Methuselah, and Methuselah with Shem, and Shem with Isaac; hence it required but two persons intermediate between Adam

and Isaac to recount to the fathers of Israel the history of the world to their own time. Isaac could tell his grandson Levi, and Levi his grandson Moses, and the latter has delivered it unto us, having been guided into all the truth by the Spirit of God.

ADAM		NOAH		SHEM	
was contemporary with		was contemporary with		was contemporary with	
	yrs.		yrs.		yrs.
Lamech,	56	Lamech,	595	Lamech,	93
Methuselah,	243	Methuselah,	600	Methuselah,	98
Jared,	470	Jared,	366	Noah,	448
Mahalaleel,	535	Mahalaleel,	234	and after flood with	
Cainan,	605	Cainan,	179	Abraham,	150
Enos,	695	Enos,	84	Isaac,	50

—Selected.

The Jews.

An intelligent writer in the North American Review, supposes that no class of immigrants has increased more rapidly in this country than the Hebrew.

"Hidden away, as it were, behind the great mass of our Christian inhabitants, there is a very large population of Jews; people shut up almost in themselves, preserving their own customs, practicing their own religion, and keeping up quietly, but faithfully, the ceremonies and traditions that have come down to them from their forefathers. Observing their Sabbath when all the rest of our population is busily engaged in traffic and business, the Jews have but few Christians as visitors to their places of worship; and the synagogues remaining closed upon Sunday, when people, so disposed, generally investigate the religious ceremonies of their neighbors, but a small portion of our citizens, comparatively, know anything about the very interesting Jewish ceremonial law and practices.

"The number of Jews in the United States exceeds a quarter of a million, and in the State of New York, there are about forty thousand, of whom nearly seven eighths reside in the Empire City. This estimate is arrived at not by any census—the taking of which is forbidden by the Jewish law—but by the amount of unleavened bread consumed at the season of the Passover. At that time, for one week, no Jew is permitted to eat leavened bread. The Passover bread is baked in large public ovens, and dealt out to all applying families, at the rate of five pounds for every man, woman and child. By the law they are obliged to eat it, and we understand that but very few—perhaps not five hundred in the whole country—neglect to fulfill their obligations in this particular. Therefore, by the amount of Passover bread consumed, it is very easy to compute the number of the faithful children of Israel in the country."

In 1850 a man might count upon his fingers all the synagogues in the land; now there are, at least, a quarter of a million Jews, from eighty to ninety synagogues, and a multitude of smaller communities where a nucleus exists which will soon grow into a synagogue. The city of New York alone has twenty synagogues, and thirty thousand Jews—about one twentieth part of the population being such. There are synagogues in all the chief cities of the seaboard; two in Boston, five in Baltimore, three in New Orleans, two in Charleston, and four in Cincinnati, &c.

It may not be inappropriate to add to

the above statement respecting the progress of the "ancient people" in our country, the annexed historical and statistical particulars from an article in Blackwood's Magazine.

Vast as is the period, and singular as are the changes of European history since the Christian era, Judea still continues to be the most interesting portion of the world. Among other purposes it may be for the purpose of fixing the general eye upon this extraordinary land, that it has been periodically visited by a more striking succession of great public calamities than perhaps any other region. With less to attract an invader than any other conspicuous land of the East, it has been constantly exposed to invasion. Its ruin by the Romans in the first century, did not prevent its being assailed by almost every barbarian, who, in turn assumed the precarious sovereignty of the neighboring Asia. After ages of obscure misery, a new terror came in the Saracen invasion, which, under Amrou, on the conquest of Damascus, rolled on to Palestine. A siege of four months, which we may well conceive to have abounded in horrors, gave Jerusalem into the hands of the Caliph Omar. On the death of Omar, who died by the usual fate of Eastern princes—the dagger, the country was left to the still heavier misgovernment of the Moslem viceroys—a race of men essentially barbarian, and commuting for their crimes by their zeal in proselytism. The people, of course, were doubly tormented.

A new scourge fell upon them, in the invasion of the Crusaders, at the beginning of the twelfth century, followed by a long succession of bitter hostilities and public weakness. After almost a century of this wretchedness, another invasion from the Desert put Jerusalem into the hands of its old oppressor, the Saracen; and in 1187, the famous Saladin, expelling the last of the Christian sovereigns, took possession of Palestine. After another century of tumult and severe suffering, occasioned by the disputes of the Saracen princes, it was visited by a still more formidable evil in the shape of the Turks, then wholly uncivilized—a nation in all the rudeness and violence of mountaineer life, and spreading blood and fire through Western Asia. From this date (1317) it remained under the dominion of the Ottoman until its conquest, a few years ago, by that most extraordinary of all Mussulmans, the Pacha of Egypt—a dreary period of 500 years, under the most desolating government in the world. *It is equally impossible to read the Scriptural references to the future condition of Palestine, without discovering a*

crowd of the plainest and most powerful indications that it shall yet exhibit a totally different aspect from that of its present state. Enthusiasm, or even the natural interest which we feel in this memorable nation, may color the future to us too brightly; but unless language of the most solemn kind, uttered on the most solemn occasions, and by men divinely commissioned for its utterance, is wholly unmeaning, we must yet look to some powerful, unquestionable, and splendid display of Providence in favor of the people of Israel.

The remarkable determination of European politics toward Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt within these few years; the not less unexpected change of manners and customs which seemed to defy all change; and the new life infused into the stagnant Governments of Asia, even by their being flung into the whirl of European interests, look *not unlike signs of the times*. It may be no dream to imagine in these phenomena the proof of some memorable change in the interior of things—some preparatives for that great Providential Restoration of which Jerusalem will yet be the scene, if not the center, and the Israelite himself *the especial agent* of those high transactions which shall make Christianity the religion of all lands, restore the dismantled beauty of all earth, and make man what he was created to be, only “a little lower than the angels.”

The statistics of the Jewish population are among the most singular circumstances of this most singular of all people. Under all their calamities and dispersions, they seem to have remained at nearly the same amount as in the days of David and Solomon—never much more in prosperity, very much less after ages of suffering. Nothing like this has occurred in the history of any other race; Europe in general having doubled its population within the last hundred years, and England nearly tripled hers within the last half century; the proportion of America being still more rapid, and the world crowding in a constantly increasing ratio. Yet the Jews seem to stand still in this vast and general movement. The population of Judea, in its most palmy days, probably did not exceed, if it reached, four millions. The numbers who entered Palestine from the wilder-

ness were evidently not much more than three; and their census, according to the German statisticians, who were generally considered to be exact, is now nearly the same as that of the people under Moses—about three millions. They are thus distributed:

In Europe, 1,916,000, of which about 668,000 are in Poland and Russia, and 453,000 are in Austria.

In Asia, 738,000 are in Asiatic Turkey,

In Africa, 504,000 are in Morocco.

In America, North and South, 57,000.

If we add to these about 15,000 Samaritans, the calculation in round numbers will be about 3,180,000.

This was the report in 1825; the numbers probably remain the same. This extraordinary fixedness in the midst of almost universal increase, is doubtless not without a reason, if we are even to look for it among the mysterious operations which have preserved Israel a separate race through eighteen hundred years. May we not naturally conceive that a people thus preserved without advance or retrocession; dispersed, yet combined; broken, yet firm; without a country, yet dwellers in all; everywhere influential; without a nation, yet united as no nation ever was before or since, has not been appointed to offer this extraordinary contradiction to the common laws of society, and even the common progress of nature, without a cause, and that cause one of final benevolence, universal good, and divine grandeur?

In noticing the preceding statistics, the late Major Noah remarked;

“We apprehend there is some error in the above statistics, and that the number of Jews throughout the world may be estimated at nearer six millions than three. There are more than a million in Poland and Russia; in all Asia there are full two millions; half a million in Austria; in the Barbary States and Africa a million; in all Europe, two millions and a half. We do not think, during the most splendid period of Jewish history, that they ever exceeded four millions; but then their colonies and countries, held tributary in Europe and Asia, amounted to many millions more.”

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.] Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y. Sept. 1857. [VOL. VII. No. 9.

"Christianity the True Judaism."

In the early part of this year meetings were commenced at a Hall, 106 Centre street, New York City, by certain בני ישראל *benai Ye-raail*, styling themselves "Christian Jews." With one exception, however, *Gentilized Jews* would be a truer designation of the agents in the affair. They were Jews after the flesh, who, as far as known to us, had abandoned the Talmud for Congregationalism. Methodism and Lutheranism. An incarnation of Congregationalism was the principal operator, announcing himself as "The Challenger," throwing down the gauntlet of "*Christianity the True Judaism*." He invited all the Jews under these heavens to pick it up and to come and discuss that question at 106 Centre Street, which had been granted by the holders for the purpose. Gentiles and Jews were all invited; and discussion declared free for all.

We were not present at the first meeting, but were informed that a goodly number of Jews and Gentiles were convened. The genuineness and authenticity of the *New Testament* was the point of departure. This was Congregationalism's mode of introducing "Christianity" into the Jewish mind; and as might have been expected, resulted only in "beating the air." The conduct of the argument emboldened a non-christian Jewish gentleman to take the floor against "the challenger," and to deny all his premises and conclusions. In short, we were impressed with the idea from the reports that reached us, that the challenger had "caught a Tartar" who was in a fair way to demolish him.

But before the second meeting, Congregationalism, accompanied by a Jewish friend of ours who had obeyed the gospel of the Kingdom, made a special visit to us at Mott Haven. He had once listened to us at our place of meeting in the City, on which occa-

sion his nervous system had experienced shocks and vibrations of an intense and thrilling character. As a Jew, his soul was moved to admiration; but as a Congregationalist, or as a Gentile in effect, he was filled with wrath and indignation. He could not endure to hear the besom of destruction making a fell swoop of the clergy and their traditions; which, as our readers know, we do not hesitate to aver are pure and simple heathenism, rhanitized with "holy water." Having been theo-gentilized at Andover, Mass. he was exceedingly zealous for the craft by which his order "had their wealth;" and though a Jew, out-gentilized the Gentiles in his zeal. "Do you believe," said we, "in the immortality of the soul?" "Yes." "That, then, is heathenism! Do you not practice sprinkling the faces of babies in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" "Yes," said he, "and circumcise them too." Baby-sprinkling, we remarked, "is not to be found in the Bible; but is heathenish and a blasphemy. Is it not the religion of 'Christendom' for the salvation of what they term 'the immortal soul' from eternal punishment in 'hell'?" "Yes." "That also," said we, "is heathenism." Of course, he was horrified at these sentiments: and, in opposition to what we said about searching the Scriptures of the old and new volumes to get at the truth, remarked, that "religion could be got in an instant!" Such were the notions substantially avowed by this "converted Jew," who challenged the Israelitish World of New York City to accept the Christianity he proclaimed as the "true Judaism;" or to acknowledge themselves infidels, hypocrites, or any thing but Jews!!

But, notwithstanding our bold and unqualified rejection of "the sentiments of all Christendom" as heathenish and blasphemous, he visited us with our friend to invite us to their meetings for discussion with the Jews.

They had caught a Tartar, who bade fair to prostrate in wreck and ruin all Andover Christianities. Congregationalism was prepared to defend as the Judaism of Moses and Jesus: D. E. de Lara, LL.D. was bold and defiant of the Gentilisms to which "converted Jews" sought to turn their fellow Israelites. He challenged them to a regular and formal debate; and undertook to demolish their whole fabric, whether he might succeed in establishing Modern Judaism as the truth or not.

This was a tight squeeze for our Jewish champion of all the Christianities, or "Names and Denominations," except the Mother of the Harlots and Abominations. In this extremity, as we have said, he invited us to attend. But knowing we could not defend the sort of Christianity he believed in, and unwilling to be an occasion of difficulty in their meetings, we excused ourself on the ground that our health was then inconveniently disturbed, and that we should not be able to get home till midnight. But at the solicitation of our Christian friend, also a Jew by birth and education, but who having believed "the gospel of the Kingdom," and thereupon been immersed, not a Gentile like "the challenger"—at his solicitation and for his sake, and for the sake of the truth, which we determined should be heard until so hampered that it could not be spoken at 106 Centre Street, we at length consented to entertain the idea, and if possible to attend.

On the following Sunday several of our brethren who had attended the first meeting expressed their anxiety for us to be at the discussion. Many Jews were in attendance, and it would be a fine opportunity, they thought, for introducing the Christianity of the New Testament to their notice. Our Christian Jewish brother also renewed his request; so that we concluded to go at the hazard of being obliged to leave the meeting under the urgency of alvine irritation, which usually attacked us about 8 P. M.

We accordingly attended on several Sunday evenings, but did not make a note of the meetings in particular. Our statement of things will therefore be general. We proceed, then, to say that the Russian Jew "converted" to Protestantism, and indoctrinated at Andover into the mysteries of Congregationalism, and who invited us there, on the first night we were present, occupied a considerable portion of time in reading extracts from a book written by one McIlvaine, a bishop of the Anglo-American Episcopal descendant of the Mother of Harlots. The title of the book we do not remember, but the extracts read amounted to this; *that quotations from all the writings constituting the*

volume termed the New Testament, are found in the works of "the Fathers" from the beginning of the Second Century; and that consequently the New Testament scriptures must have been in existence during the First Century; and therefore written by persons contemporary with the transactions they narrate. This reading was "the challenger's" argument for "the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament." He did not submit to the audience any definitions. If he defined what was to be understood by said "genuineness" and "authenticity," we did not hear him. A good logician will always define his terms, that his hearers may know in what sense he uses the words he utters; and that in speaking he may feel that he is not "beating the air." But it is not the forte of clergy and their disciples to be too particular, or precise; for being sophists, and not reasoners, they honor definition in the breach rather than the observance.

Genuineness signifies "freedom from anything counterfeit, freedom from adulteration;" and Authenticity signifies authority; from authentic, "that which has every thing requisite to give it authority." Hence, the proposition before the meeting was, that the New Testament was absolutely free from the least particle of interpolation or departure from the original manuscript; and has in itself, apart from all other writings, every thing requisite to give it authority in matters of faith and practice. This proposition defining the problem before the meeting, and "the challenger" affirming that he had solved it by the reading from McIlvaine's book, he proclaimed himself victorious, if the extracts he had read were not disproved by Jews or Gentiles present. His syllogism in effect amounted to this:

a. The extracts from McIlvaine prove that the New Testament existed in the first century;

b. That which exists contemporary with the transactions it treats of must be genuine and authentic;

c. Ergo, the New Testament must be absolutely free from every particle of adulteration; and of independent authority in faith and practice.

This was "the challenger's" position, which, however, it was manifest he did not perceive. The premise "a" is doubtless true; but the premise "b" is self evidently absurd. To affirm it is equivalent to saying that all histories of transactions written by scribes contemporary therewith are genuine and reliable! This is contrary to experience and fact. The second premise of his syllogistic position was therefore false; and consequently his conclusion "c" was not proved.

Dr. de Lara, a non-Christian Jew, saw this ; and planting himself right in the breach, opened his battery upon the false premise, taking no cognizance of the first, and with a whole broadside raked and swept the deck of “the challenger’s” conclusion.

It is necessary in this place that we should impart to the reader the information we possess concerning the Tartar “caught” by “the challenger” in his onset ; but who not only refused to “come along,” but shouldered his captor, and threw him to the dogs, or Gentiles. Dr. de Lara in all we have observed conducted himself with all due decorum and respect ; though a Jew, he did not brand “the challenger” as “an apostate,” and “a renegade,” or “an impostor ;” though he had abandoned the traditions of his people for Gentilism, and in so doing had become a Gentile, he uttered no word of reproach, but confined himself to the points at issue between Gentiles and Jews. He is a member of the Literary and Philosophical Society, Liverpool ; and of the Institute of Physical and Experimental Science, Manchester. During thirteen years he was Professor of Continental Literature, and Lecturer on Education in the Royal and the Mechanics’ Institutes, the Literary and Scientific Institution, and the High School, at Liverpool, England. He is now living in the city of New York, where he occupies himself as “Translator of Literary Productions, Scientific Papers, Commercial and Legal Documents from or into the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, German and Dutch Languages ;” in which, also he gives instruction. It is presumable, therefore, that such a man is capable of rendering a reason, and as cogent reason as can be adduced by “a philosophical Jew,” for his rejection of the Christianities of the Gentiles, and of discerning the logical position of all “converted” challengers, who present themselves as champions of the piebald and motley Christianity of “the religious world.” But let us turn from biography to a sketch in brief of the incidents occurrent at the meetings. It was evident that most of the Jews who presented themselves were there in the spirit of fun. Non-Christian Jews have an intense and supreme contempt for “converted Jews” who become hirelings of the Gentiles for what they regard as the perversion of needy and ignorant Israelites. We are sorry to say, and we know honest Christian Jews who say so too, that this contempt is merited to a great extent. For ourselves we have no confidence in Jews converted to Methodism, and kindred Gentilisms. If they are honest they must be profoundly ignorant ; if enlightened, grossly hypocritical : for the Chris-

tianities of the Gentiles are a burlesque upon the Christianity of Moses and the Prophet like to him.

“Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah?” demanded a Jew of “the challenger.” “I do,” said he. “I don’t believe you!” cried the other. “You are hypocrites,” exclaimed “the challenger,” on another occasion, “if you do not believe that Jesus is the Christ.” Upon this upstarted our friend acting as chairman, and calling him to order, said, “No, brother, they are not hypocrites ; they are ignorant.” “Oh, very well, you are ignorant. You are not Jews. We are the true Jews. You are ignorant !” “Thank you,” said they with a laugh.

Another Jew arose, and telling the audience that he was a lawyer, proclaimed “the challenger” a renegade. This very much excited him, “I’m not. Sit down, Sir.” But the lawyer’s face was brass, and his nerves iron ; so that he heeded not. “Sit down I say, Sir ; sit down !” At length he resumed his seat ; and the storm subsided in the challenger’s apostrophic murmur o “Call me an apostate !”

Another Jew stood up and said, he arose to pour oil upon the waves. But this being deemed as “not speaking to the point,” he also was ordered to sit down. He supplicated, however, with humble intonation to be allowed to “speak out his seven minutes anyhow !” But this being refused he subsided, doubtless in despair of blessedness in making peace.

“My friendsh, Gentlemens and Ladies,” said a benign and venerable, but somewhat arch looking gentleman, sparkling in brilliants, and stepping upon the platform, “I am a Jew. My father was a Jew ; but my mother was not. She was a Jewess.” Having indulged in much rambling discourse after the same style, the amount of which was that all would find themselves right in the end if they only acted honestly according to the light they had ; and that all should continue in the religion in which they were born ; he turned to the chairman and “the challenger” and said, “I have several houses in such a street, and if you will convert me I will give you one of them.” This produced a scene. “We don’t want your house !” “I’ll give it to the church then if you will convert me !” “We can’t convert you. God only can convert you ! We don’t want your house !” He seemed to think that the object of the meeting was conversion of the Jews for the sake of gain.

Another rose and said, he had a few questions to put, which he could not see into ;

but if they could answer them to his satisfaction, he would join their church. They were most of them frivolous and foolish; but among them were two not to be slightly passed over in conducting a controversy respecting the "true Judaism." One was concerning the miraculous conception of Jesus; the other, his occupancy of David's throne. "The challenger" made some attempt to explain the last; but his effort was only a darkening of counsel by words without knowledge. Upon orthodox Gentile principles the difficulty cannot be explained so as to satisfy the Jewish or any other mind, that the prophetic testimony does not militate against the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship. "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel; neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually"—Jer. xxxiii. 17. *If Jesus be the Son covenanted to David why is he not sitting upon David's throne in Hebron or Jerusalem? And why are not the Levites doing perpetual sacrifice there before Jehovah?* This is a question Andover and other Gentile divinites cannot answer. It was not answered by "the challenger;" and the querist did not join his church!

Such were the materials, with the respectable exception of Dr. de Lara, with which "the challenger" occupied his time. His work seemed to consist in arbitrarily commanding them to "keep to the point," which in truth he did not himself perceive; or to sit down. Altercations, reproaches, and assertions unproved, as far as our observation went, made up the discussions about "the true Judaism" as far as "the challenger" and his turbulent and sun-loving opponents were concerned. These evidently did not attend in the spirit of earnest inquiry after truth; for when the truth was submitted to them from another quarter they had not a word to say concerning it. Their demonstrations were against Jews turned Gentiles, with whom they felt they were sufficiently strong successfully to contend. Indeed, it is clearly to be seen that Christianity is a lost case with Israel in the hands of "converted Jews." We use this phrase in the sense ordinarily attached to it. We mean by it, Jews turned Methodists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Episcopians, etc.; Jews converted to the Names and Denominations of the Gentiles, whether Latin, Greek, or Protestant. Such are Jews turned Gentiles. They are Gentiles in every particular except the accident of birth, over which they had no control; even as Europeans and Asiatics are Americans by adop-

tion. The conversion of Jews to "the Names" is their adoption, by which their Judaism is merged into Gentilism, and the "old clothes" of the Synagogue exchanged for "the purple and fine linen," and every day sumptuousness of fare, of the temples of the heathen. Our experience is that, with very rare exceptions, there would be no such "converted Jews" if it were not for the loaves and fishes. There were multitudes of such in the days of Jesus of Nazareth, who called him "Rabbi," and sought his company, to whom, however, he said, "Verily, I say to you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles (proving that I am that prophet that should come into the world—John. vi. 14.) but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled. Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which endureth unto Aionian Life (the life of his Aion) which the Son of Man shall give to you: for this (man) the Father hath sealed God"—*ταυτων γαρ ο πατηρ εσφραγισεν, ο Θεος* John vi. 26, 27. We say, this is our experience; for we have met with many "converted Jews" who privately express their delight with the doctrine we teach, and confess that it is true; but nevertheless, turn their backs upon us, and seek the fellowship and fishes of the heathen whose dogmas they despise! If Jews really believe that Jesus is the Messiah of Jehovah foretold by Moses and the Prophets, let them also believe the gospel of the kingdom he preached, and obey it as he commanded. Let them thus believe and do, and starve as others have done before them, if need be; let them "provide things honest in the sight of all," and if they are able to state, illustrate, and prove "the faith" to the conviction of their contemporaries in Israel, let them do it without fee or recompense, and the contempt bestowed on "converted Jews" by Israelites will not fall upon them. Let them have nothing to do with the churches of the heathen; but let them "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the Saints" before those "churches" had a being—the New Testament christianity interpreted in rigid conformity with the Scriptures of Moses and the Prophets. If they do this they will save themselves at least. They will acquire an honorable reputation with all who venerate truth; and wield an influence that will command the respect of, though they may fail to convince, their "brethren according to the flesh."

While the sun loving Jews played off their jokes upon "the challenger" as we have shown, Dr. de Lara was evidently in earnest. He challenged "the challenger" to a regular and formal debate, in which each party

should occupy alternate half hours, until the issue was settled one way or other. But "the challenger," whose stronghold was in McIlvaine, had no taste for such a formidable encounter as this. He insisted that his "proofs" of "the genuineness and authenticity" should be replied to on the spot. Dr. de Lara said that at the next meeting, if he might be permitted to occupy the platform, he would adduce abundant evidence from Christian and other authors against "the genuineness." This was agreed to. In the meantime he spoke many things, and among them delivered himself substantially as follows.

"When I open a geography or other elementary work of science, the first thing that salutes my eye is a definition of the subject treated of in the book. Now, here am I, a poor ignorant Jew, obnoxious to damnation in the flames of hell for ever in the opinion of the orthodox faith, unless I become converted to Christianity! Suppose then that it be granted that the New Testament is all that is claimed for it by its friends; still, seeing that there are so many different faiths in the world, and all claiming to be truly Christian and taught in the New Testament, what am I to do when I am called upon to turn Christian or be lost? WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY? Give me a distinct and intelligible definition, that I may know what the thing is I am called upon to embrace! If I say that I believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, that would not be accepted as sufficient to constitute me a Christian. The Romanist tells me that I must believe in transubstantiation—that a mortal priest can make his God and eat him—

At this point, the doctor was interrupted by the chairman with the remark, that "they had nothing to do with Romanism."

"But, as an unconverted Jew I have to do with Romanism. This system is the form which Christianity assumes in large and populous countries; and is recognized by multitudes of Protestants as a true church, only containing many great corruptions—a church which notwithstanding these, receives many converts from among the clerical orders of Protestantism. This church tells me, that though I believe in Jesus, I should be damned if I died out of its pale.

On the other hand, pious Christians of divers denominations tell me that damnation awaits me in Romanism, which is idolatry. Protestant Christians even condemn one another to perdition. The "Orthodox" tell me to beware of the Unitarians. They declare that they deny the Lord, and are not

Christians; while the Unitarians warn me against Trinitarianism as absurd! The Unitarian tells me that Christianity teaches but one God; Trinitarians, that it teaches three; and, if 1 John v, 7 be genuine, it seems very much like it. I find it written there, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

Here we suggested that it did not read as quoted. It stands thus, "The Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit." The doctor thanked us and adopted the correction.

He proceeded: "Now, here am I, a Jew, inquiring after the truth, in the midst of confusion, asking a definition of Christianity, and can get no satisfactory reply! Again I ask, what is Christianity? You say, believe in Jesus! But you are not content with this belief. You require me to believe that he is Son of God; that he was crucified for the sins of the world; that he rose from the dead; that he ascended to heaven; that he is God! But if I believe all this, yet am I not a Christian; for I may thus believe, and be damned by Romanism; or if Romanist accept me, for that very reason be turned over to Satan by the pious of Protestant sects."

While Dr. de Lara was speaking, we inquired of "the challenger," in a whisper, "Shall I answer his question?" At first he replied, "Yes," but the word was scarcely out of his mouth before he recalled it, and said "No." We inquired, "Why?" "I have," said he, "a particular reason." We apprehended that the particular reason was that he knew from what he had heard from us at Jefferson Assembly Room, where our congregation met, that we would not endorse the Christianity embraced by "converted Jews" like himself, and approved by the heathen or Gentiles who patronized him. We said no more to him, but resumed our seat, with the determination to be on our feet the instant Dr. de Lara prepared to sit. The present was not an opportunity to be lost for introducing New Testament Christianity to the notice of the Jews, and for giving it a distinct position, apart from all the foolishness which so embarrassed the question in the estimation of Israelites.

Having secured the floor, we remarked, that, "the question asked by Dr. de Lara was of primary importance, and was quite in place and to the point on the part of a Jew whose conversion from Modern Judaism to Christianity was desired. It was a question that should be answered in the terms of the New Testament itself. It was not a difficult one; still it was one that could not be answered by "the Names and Denominations:"

of which the nations were full—*γεμον ονοματων βλασφημιας*.—Rev. xviii, 3.

"They would, perhaps, admit that Paul taught the true Christianity, if there be any such; that he fully understood it; and was quite competent to define the Christianity he taught. This granted, we should then ask Paul, What is the Christianity you preached? We should not go to the Pope, to Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, &c., or to any of their followers or approvers, to ask, What is Christianity? We might go to them to ask, What is Romanism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Wesleyanism, and so forth? They could answer these questions satisfactorily enough; but to ask them, What is the Christianity taught by Jesus and his apostles? and to expect a scriptural and rational definition, is preposterous in the extreme! Now, in order to get Paul's answer, we must go directly to his writings and speeches, and extract the information thence. I pray you, then, to mark attentively what he says in 1st Cor. ii, in answer to the question, *What did you make known in Corinth to the synagogue of the Jews there when you first introduced the Nazarene Christianity to their notice?* Now hear him:

"I came," says he, "declaring the testimony of God; or of the Christ."—v, 1; i, 6.

"*Inquirers.*—'But in declaring that testimony, what did you and your colaborers speak as the subject matter of it?'

"*Paul.*—'We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the hidden, which God ordained before the ages—*προ των αιωνων*—for our glory.'—ii, 7. 'Even the Mystery that hath been hid from the ages and from the generations, but now is made manifest to his saints; to whom among the Gentiles God would make known what is the richness of the glory of this Mystery; which (*richness ο πλουτος, ος*) is Christ in you, the hope of glory.'—Col. i, 26, 27.

"This is Paul's general answer to the question, What is Christianity? as that geography is a description of the earth, is a general reply to the question, What is geography? *The particulars* of the science must be learned by the study of the geography—of the book containing the principles and details of the subject. So also, if we would know the principles and details that in systematic combination constitute the Nazarene Christianity as a whole, we must diligently and dispassionately study 'the testimony of God,' which is contained in Moses and the prophets; and, as the friends of Jesus believe, also in his doctrine and the writings of the scribes which Jesus sent.—Mat. xxiii, 34. These writings constitute

the volume ordinarily styled, 'THE NEW TESTAMENT,' or *The Revelation and Interpretation of the Mystery*, hidden both from angels and prophets in the times and ages of the Mosaic dispensation or Aion—1st Pet. i, 10-12—and absolutely inscrutable to Jews and Gentiles, who do not understand the Old Testament, and are content with the traditions of the synagogue, and with those of the schools, colleges, and pulpits of 'the Church.'

"Whether the New Testament be regarded as true or false, it is certainly of authority in all questions of the Nazarene interpretation of Old Testament Christianity. The facts reproduced in the extracts from McIlvaing prove that it belongs to the age of the Apostles, and is the most ancient Nazarene record extant. Reason, therefore, if not prejudice, readily accepts it as the symbol or compendium of Christianity; as it accepts the Koran as the authentic symbol of Mahomedanism. Thus, if you wished to know if modern Islamism were the original doctrine taught by Mahommed, you would not spend time in discussing the genuineness and authenticity of the Koran; but you would at once study the Koran, or Mahomedan Bible, to know what it teaches. Having learned its doctrine, you would then proceed to try its verity. Mahomedanism and Christianity are existing facts. They are in the world. How came they here? And what do they teach? Reject the New Testament as a history of the transactions and teaching of certain men called Jesus and his Apostles, &c., and these questions cannot be answered. Reject the Koran, and we know not what was the doctrine of the Arabian prophet. Reject the New Testament and Koran, and the world finds in it two religions of great power and influence, and nothing certain is known about them. Our conclusion, then, is, that the New Testament and Koran are, by the consent of unprejudiced reason, endorsed by veritable history, the original books of the two faiths; and the only authentic records, or sources of information concerning the sayings and doings of Jesus and the apostles, and of the dogmas of Mahomet.

"But the question of all-absorbing interest to us ought to be, *What does the New Testament teach; and is that teaching true?* I sympathize with the tantalizing and unhappy position of Israelites in this matter. Societies are instituted, and efforts made, for their conversion by the clergy of the Gentiles; yet can they not obtain from the sea- and land proselyters a scriptural definition of New Testament Christianity 'Believe!' they say, 'believe, or you will be damned!' 'How can I believe,' exclaims the Jew.

'except I hear, and what I hear is proved to be the truth?' And here they are met with a dry and vapid disquisition upon the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament!

"We have, in general terms, stated what is taught—a teaching that occupied Paul from morn till eve in earnest discourse with the elders of the synagogue in Rome, in unfolding its details for their belief—Acts xxviii, 23. We have not scope in the few minutes allotted to us here to follow his example. But we will state a rule by which we work in ascertaining the truth of the facts and teaching of the New Testament. It is this: *If the facts and teachings of the book be in accordance with the Mosaic pattern of things in the law, and with the predictions of the prophets, then we admit that the facts and teachings are true; otherwise not.* Our experience satisfies us that this rule places the Nazarene interpretation of Old Testament Christianity beyond a doubt. The rule is not mine. It is the rule of interpretation presented by Jesus and Paul. 'I am not come,' said the former, 'to destroy the law and the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill, for verily I say to you, until the heaven may have passed away, and the earth, one iota, or one point, may in no wise have passed from the law until that every thing be accomplished.' And of Paul, it is written that he said, 'I testify both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come;' and when at Rome he worked by this rule, 'expounding and testifying the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.' In this way he 'declared the testimony of God' concerning the Christ; and that he be whom he might, he must be a crucified person.

"We remarked that a very considerable part of the New Testament consisted of Paul's writing. It is a relevant question, therefore, to ask, Was Paul a reliable witness? We answer, Yes; he was the best kind of a witness. He was a bitter, murderous, ignorant rabbinist, doing all he could to suppress and exterminate the Nazarenes and their doctrine. This is the account he gives of himself while an unbeliever. He was exceedingly mad against all Christians, and conscientiously thought to do God service in destroying them. The loaves and fishes, too, were all on the side of unbelief. Honor, riches, and power were all against the Nazarenes. If such a man had suddenly ceased his animosity and become an advocate of their doctrine, *but remained among their enemies*, you might say he was not to be relied on;

that he was a hypocrite or a coward, or afraid of losing his social position or his living, or all of these; but when he not only declared that he had seen Jesus after his resurrection, and that he believed he was indeed the Christ of God, but was immersed into him by Ananias, and *exposed himself to persecution, imprisonment, and death* in the work of planting the faith he had sought to destroy, such a man is a most reliable witness, and at least equal, if not superior, to any that can be produced.

"Furthermore, we maintain that he was not only a true witness, but a man inspired by the Spirit of God, by which he could teach without mistake. If it be admitted that he is reliable, then this is true; for he testifies that his speech and preaching were in demonstration of spirit and power; that the faith of his hearers might stand, or be based upon, the power of God—1st Cor. ii, 4-5. But apart from his own testimony to the fact, his writings prove that he was inspired by God. We require no stronger evidence of his inspiration than the existence of those very things against which Dr. de Lara has been objecting, and which we protest against as earnestly as he. The 'Names and Denominations' which constitute 'the church' against whose 'Christianity' Israelites object with so much force, are nothing more nor less than THE APOSTACY Paul predicted would arise in later times. His words are, 'The Spirit speaketh expressly that in later times some *will apostatize from the faith (αποστησονται)* giving heed to seducing spirits, and to teachings of Divines*; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their own conscience cauterized; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats.'—1st Tim. iv, 1. Here is the prediction; look abroad into the 'religious world,' and behold the fact. There are the Divines or Doctors of Divinity, 'seducing spirits' of all orders of the clergy 'speaking lies in hypocrisy under the profitable sanction of the Names and Denominations to which they belong. When the Spirit spoke expressly by Paul these things did not exist, yet he declared with certainty that they would. 'The time *will come*,' said he, '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 shall be turned to fables.'—2d Tim. iv, 3, 4. This is Christendom to the life; and the 'fables' are its

* So we render δαιμονίων in this place. "Every demon," says Plato, "is a middle being between a god and a mortal." Hence a *divine*. An ecclesiastical daimonion is a clergyman, who officiates as the middle man between the clerical god and the people.

Christianities from which our Israelitish friends are at a loss which to select as the true! Our advice is, have nothing to do with any of them, but study the Old and New Testaments for yourselves; they will not deceive you. They speak the same thing. They will seduce you only from error and sin. The New Testament doctrine is attested by the law and the prophets, for whose testimonies all its writers were zealous to imprisonment and death."

At the ensuing meeting Dr. de Lara appeared prepared to show cause why he demurred to the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament. He read from a manuscript he had prepared for about three quarters of an hour; but as he had not then finished, it was agreed that he should have the rostrum on the following Sunday night to do so. The reading was substantially a more methodical statement in detail of the subject-matter of his speech already noticed.

After he left the stand. I rose, as no one else seemed ready to do so. Nevertheless, I remarked that, as I had spoken several times, and did not wish to force myself upon their attention, I would resume my seat if any other person would proceed. I was, however requested to go on. In doing so, I showed them from the prophets—

1. That the Messiah's name was to be called *Jehovah*, with the adjunct *Tzidkaimu*, יְהוָה צְדִיקָה which is expressed in Greek by the word *Ἰη-σοῦς*, *Jesus*; and in English by *I shall be—the Saviour*; which is equivalent to "*JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS*"—Jer. xxiii., 6. "I, I Jehovah; and beside me there is no Saviour.—Isaiah xliii., 2.

2. That Messiah was to be named *Jesus* while he was in the womb of his mother. *Isai.* xlix, 1.

3. That *Jehovah* was to give him that name.—*Ibidem*.

4. That Messiah was to be *Jehovah's* servant.—*Isai.* xlix, 5, 6; xlii, 1, lii, 13; liii, 2, 3-11.

5. That the service appointed for Messiah to do, is the political and moral regeneration of the twelve tribes of Israel; the transformation of Palestine into Paradise; the enlightenment of the nations, and the salvation of them all from the evils they endure in all the earth.—*Isai.* xlix, 5, 6, 8; xli, 18, 19; li, 3; *Ezek.* xxxvi, 35.

6. That Messiah was to fail in the performance of the required service for a time; but that he would not despair of final success. *Isai.* xlix, 4.

7. That during the period, of failure he would, nevertheless, be glorious in *Jehovah's* sight; and that the period of failure would

be characterized by the continued dispersion of Israel.—*Isai.* xlix, 5.

8. That Messiah would be abhorred by his own nation, and be a servant of its rulers—*Isai.* xlix, 7.

9. That Messiah would be a בְּרִית *berith*, or covenant; and therefore, from the nature of the thing, a sacrifice.—*Isai.* xlix, 8; xlii, 6; *Gen.* xvii, 13; xv, 17, 18; *Zech.* xi, 10; ix, 11: *berith*, "covenant," from בְּרָה to cut asunder; to eat.

Having shown that these items were revealed concerning Messiah many centuries before the time of Jesus of Nazareth, we remarked that they had all found their accomplishment in him; and that consequently he was the Messiah. He had indeed failed to restore the Kingdom again to Israel, and Israel was still dispersed; nevertheless, he is at the right hand of power, and glorious in the sight of him who raised him from the dead. But because "*the Son of Jehovah's handmaid*," (see *Ps.* lxxxvi, 16; cxvi 16.) has "labored in vain, and spent his strength for nought," as was predicted of him, will he therefore never accomplish the service indicated in our fifth item? If the traditions of the schools and colleges of "the Denominations" prophecy the truth, he never will. They tell us that Jesus is to come and escort the reëmbodied elect to trans-solar regions beyond the bounds of time and space; and to reduce the residue of the world, and the great globe itself, to ashes! This is the mission of the Jesus they preach; a Jesus, styled by Paul, "another Jesus, whom he had not preached"—2 Cor. xi, 4. How can Israel honestly receive such a Jesus as that? Only by denying the testimonies of Moses and the Prophets, in whom was the Spirit of Christ. We say to Jews, reject the clerical Jesus, the world-burning destroyer of the Law and the Prophets; and heartily embrace the crucified son of David's daughter, who came not to destroy, but to fulfill them. Let him be your hope; for he has declared, that he will return, and build again the tabernacle of David, and set up its ruins, that it may be as in the days of old; that he will come in power and great glory, and establish the Kingdom he has promised to his friends.

Having concluded for the time, the audience, as on a former occasion, expressed its opinion of the argument in what is technically styled "a round of applause"—a roll of sound by the feet. This effect sadly disturbed the temper of "the challenger." He rebuked them sharply for their presumption, and commanded them henceforth to abstain from all expression of feeling in the meetings which were "religious!" The fact was, that he could not endure to hear the

claims of the New Testament Jesus and the New Testament Christianity vindicated, and approved, at the expense of Andover Divinity, and of other kindred forms of clerical heathenism. Was it not "his meeting?" Was not he "the challenger?" Had he not studied divinity at Andover? Had he not read extracts from Mellvaine, which nobody had taken any notice of? Had he not done all the quarreling with opponents, stigmatizing, insulting, and apologizing, by turns? Did he not try hard to keep speakers to the point, to confine them to seven minutes, to stave off inconvenient questions? Had he not talked himself dry in this service and in returning men to their seats, and had these onerous labors in behalf of "the true Judaism" elicited the first inkling of applause from the audience? The contrast was too marked to be tolerated. When God's testimony was set forth, and its points and conclusions reasoned out, all was profound attention and without disturbance, except when we had our coat pulled from behind and the watch intruded as a hint to stop; but when he moved in matters, confusion was pretty sure to result. It was not difficult, therefore, to discern the cause of his indignation when the testimonies and arguments were audibly and generally approved.

His notion about the meeting being "a religious meeting" was perfectly ridiculous. The meeting was an assembly of "converted Jews," Protestants, Romanists, unbelieving Jews, Gentile infidels, and a few Christians of the New Testament faith. Such a crowd could practice no acceptable worship in common; for they that worship God must worship him *in Spirit and in truth*; for such only doth the Father seek to worship him—*John iv, 23, 24*. Not only were they destitute of the right spirit, but what a strange "truth" must that be that could have been squared to such incompatibles in the worship of "him in whom there is no darkness at all!" Alas for Christianity when it falls into the hands of such incapables!

On the following Sunday evening Dr. de Lara took the stand again to finish what he had to say against the genuineness of the New Testament. Before advancing in his argument, he occupied himself in recapitulating, by which he of necessity repeated some things he had read before: upon this, a stranger and afterwards "the challenger," broke in upon him on the old plea of his not keeping to the point. An altercation ensued in which "the challenger" spoke of persons coming there and bringing their friends with them to applaud their speeches! Dr. de Lara supposing that this was meant for him, indignantly repelled the charge, and

termed it "a vile insinuation;" at the same time declaring, that he would not condescend to have any more to do with such a person. As to the point, he had not deviated from it. He had shown by numerous quotations from Christian writers that there were interpolations and errors innumerable, and that consequently the New Testament was not genuine. Show him that these authorities were not to be respected, and that the book was genuine and really written by the men whose names sanctioned its several parts, and there would be an end of all dispute. "I will do it!" cried "the challenger," coming forward with self-important air, which augured greater things than had yet appeared. The mountain labored, expectation rose; but when he augustly laid his hand upon the book, and proclaimed, "I say it is, and that's enough," or "I say it is genuine, and therefore it is so!"—the ridiculous little mouse was seen: and Dr. De Lara, putting up his papers, seized his hat and mantle, and precipitately withdrew!

This was vexatious. The Jewish gentleman in brilliants, who offered a house if they would convert him, rebuked "the challenger;" and himself took the stand, where he soon got into an altercation with him. All "points" were lost sight of in the twaddle of the one and the impetuosity of the other. A philosophical Jew in the audience below said, the question had been asked, what was Christianity? He wanted to hear that answered; and as the first step to it, he considered that it should be shown that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. He would like to hear that proved, if it were possible.

"The challenger," remarked that *whosoever believed that Jesus was the Christ, and the Savior of sinners, was a Christian!* Therefore, we may respond, all "the devils" were Christians; for they believed the same. *Mark i, 24!*

After he had delivered himself of this definition, we arose and offered to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, if the audience wished it? This seeming to be general, we proceeded to the platform, were the gentleman in brilliants was still standing. In passing by him, he inquired, "*what do you mean by the Christ?*" We replied, that if he would take his seat, and lend us his ears, we would show him. But, before we reached the desk, we overheard the unhappy "challenger" call to some one near him "Stop him! Stop him!" But finding this impracticable, he would have "absquatulated" to parts unknown to the writer, but for the persuasion of his better half. Here, then, was a "converted Jew" in wrath and indignation, and seeking to close the mouth of one, who was

ready, and, as he believed, able to prove the Messiahship of Jesus. "That which you speak," says he in a letter, "I adore and love as the truth of God;" but in public the demeanor declares the opposite. If he adored our speech as God's truth, why edge on others to close our mouth? Such an adoration may be very convenient and politic, but it strikingly lacks the incense of sincerity which ever burns in the censers of the saints.

But no one attempting to enforce "the challenger's" demand, we proceeded to show the etymological and scriptural import of the phrase "the Christ." We remarked, that it was a Greek word anglicized by the cutting off of the last syllable. The Greek before mutilation is *χριστος*, from *χρωω*, to anoint to consecrate: hence *christos* signifies anointed. A christ is an anointed one. All kings and priests, therefore, who are made such by *χρισμα*, or that with which the anointing is performed, are *christs*. They are, however not therefore Jehovah's christs. They only are his, who are anointed by his appointment; for his purposes. All others are the christs of the Devil Power, and styled "His Angels."

The *chrism*, or anointing matter, may be oil or spirit. The kings and priests of the houses of David and Aaron, and the prophets of the Hebrew nation, were anointed with oil, or "an oil of holy ointment." They were, therefore, all of them, irrespective of moral considerations, Jehovah's christs. Abraham, Moses, Joshua, and the prophets, were anointed with holy spirit. This was the *chrism* which dwelt in them; and is referred to by Peter when he said "the Spirit of Christ was in them" (1 Epist. i, 11)—the same Spirit that quickened the son of Heli's daughter when he rose from the dead (1 Epist. iii, 18) and styled by Nehemiah in his prayer to Jehovah "thy spirit in thy prophets" (ix, 30.)

Christ, or Anointed, are represented in the Hebrew by *משׁיח* *Mesiah*, commonly written *Messiah*.

To affirm, then, that A, B, and C, are Jehovah's christs, is to declare that they have been anointed with oil or spirit as his prophets, priests, and kings. To say to A, "thou art a christ," might be to declare a truth; but to say, "thou art the Christ" implies that A is some particular christ, who had somewhere been the subject of special discourse.

Now this we find to have been the case when we read, mark, and inwardly digest those ancient writings current under the style of "Moses and the Prophets." Moses taught that a prophet was to arise in Israel

like unto him (Deut. xviii. 14) to whom they were to hearken; that the Jehovah-spirit would put his words into his mouth; and that whosoever would not hearken unto those words, it should be required of him. He taught that this prophet was to speak in the name of Jehovah: that is, he was to be the medium through whom the Spirit would discourse to the Hebrew nation; and that when the spirit should so speak, the spirit would be the person or manifestation to whom he referred when he said to Moses "I will be who I shall be"—*אֲהִי־אֲשֶׁר אֲהִי־אֶהְיֶה* *Ehyeh asier ehyeh*—"This is my name, and this is my memorial (or remembrancer) for the Aion, and for a generation's generation."—Exod. iii, 15. Hence Moses taught that this prophet should bear "the glory" of the Spirit, which is "the name" he proclaimed to Moses—Exod. xxxiii, 18, 19; xxxiv, 5-7—"the august and glorious name *אֲהִי־אֲשֶׁר אֲהִי־אֶהְיֶה* *atli Jehovah Elohakah, the I shall be thy Mighty Ones.*" Deut. xxviii. 56.

Here, then, the nation was taught to expect the appearance in its midst of a person, who should be at once an Israelite and the Eternal Spirit—two beings in combination; the Spirit manifested in and through flesh. Moses also taught that this Spirit-manifestation, or Prophet, whom he styles *שׁוֹלֵחַ* *Shuloh* (Gen. xlix, 10) should be a scepter in Judah; and though Judah's seed, yet in a peculiar sense, "the seed of the Woman"—Gen. iii, 15—the destroyer of the serpent-power. Moses had such faith in this personage of whom he wrote (John v, 46) that "he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer evil with the people of God (who had the same hope) than to have the enjoyment of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of the Christ greater wealth than the treasures in Egypt."—Heb. xi, 24-26.

The prophets are copious in their references to this spirit-anointed seed of Abraham. Even Balaam the son of Bosor had a glimpse of him in his regal and military glory. Balaam, who was compelled to bless Israel against his will, discerned a time in the then far-distant future, which he styled "the latter days," when he should himself have been raised from the dead, that he should "behold him but not nigh." For "a Star," said he, shall come out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall arise out of Israel, and shall smite the princes of Moab, and he shall destroy all the sons of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession. Seir also, his enemies, shall be a possession: and Israel shall do valiantly. And from Jacob shall he descend; and he shall cause

to destroy the remnant from the city."—*Numb. xxv, 17.*

Samuel, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, &c., all testify of the Christ, "the pleasant (theme) of Israel's songs"—נעים זמירות ישראל *nēim zēmirot Yisra'el*. Samuel tells us that he should be Son of God and Sou of David; that he should bow down, being chastened by the scepter of men; but that he should rise up to sit upon the throne of David's kingdom during the Aion subsequently to David's resurrection; for, "thy kingdom," says the spirit, "shall be established before thy face"—לפניך *lēphānekah*, in thy presence.—2 *Sam. vii, 12-16.*

David says, in his last words, that the accomplishment of the promises covenanted to him concerning the Christ was "all his salvation and all his desire." He sings of his crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, conquests, sovereignty, &c., and proclaims the joyful sound in spirit-inspired verse. To speak in detail would be to quote nearly all that he has penned. Isaiah, Jehovah's prophet to the House of David, describes his kingdom and glory in glowing terms—"the joy set before him," as recompense of suffering and obedience unto death. He styles him the son of a virgin, who should name him "God with us," ch. vii, 13, 14; says that he should be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel; a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, viii, 14; that the government of Israel should be on his shoulders, as the mighty God of the whole earth and founder of the Aion and reign of peace, ix, 6; liv, 5. Jeremiah testifies that he shall execute judgment and righteousness in Palestine; and that in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, xxiii, 5, 6; xxxiii, 14-18; and Daniel, that he shall destroy all the powers of the Gentiles, civil and ecclesiastical: and transfer the government of the world to himself and friends throughout all the earth.

Now the issue that has been formed and debated between Jews and Christians during the past eighteen hundred years is this, *Is Jesus of Nazareth that personage of whom Moses and the prophets speak, or is some other individual he?* This question may be affirmed *traditionally* or *Scripturally*, and the opposite. The multitude affirms it traditionally; a few affirm that Jesus is that person; because having examined the Christianity of Moses and the prophets, they are convinced that it is *germinantly inaugurated* in Jesus, but not yet fully developed in him. A Jew intelligent in Moses and the prophets is not content to receive Jesus as the Christ as he is traditionally confessed. We do not blame him for this. Indeed we do not see

how such a Jew can honestly confess the Messiahship of the character styled Jesus by the Pope, the kings, the clergy, and the people of "Christendom." An ignorant Jew or a Gentile ignoramus can confess anything and not excite our surprise, but not so an intelligent and honest-hearted Jew. He says, and we also say, to the Methodist or other sectarian, you affirm that "God has cast Israel away; that Jesus has nothing to do with them in the future but to punish them in the flames of hell for rejecting him, and that he will only return to the earth to withdraw his elect and then to reduce it to ashes in a final conflagration!" If that be true, then Jesus is not that Christ who is styled in Isaiah "Jehovah's servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the desolations of Israel;" a covenant of the people to raise up the land and to cause it to inherit the desolate estates;" "a Christ who has no good things for Israel; who is not the Repairer of their breaches, and the Restorer of the paths to dwell in, Isai. lviii, 12, is not the Christ for Israel; neither is he the Christ of Moses and the prophets, nor of the New Testament. The New Testament Jesus is to return hither and to do all that is written concerning Christ which may not have been already fulfilled in him. Read Acts xv, 13-18, in connection with Amos ix, 11-15, and you will see that the crucified Nazarene is to "return" and set up David's kingdom as it was in David's time; and to possess himself of all the enemies of Israel; and to plant the Jews in Palestine, from which they shall thenceforth be "pulled up no more."

But in our addresses at this place we could not elaborate sufficiently for want of time. An endeavor from behind was tried to cut us short, but it was met by a voice from the meeting—"Go on till morning!" We proceeded till half past nine, and then, of necessity, ended without finishing as usual. It was gratifying to learn that many were deeply interested. After one of our arguments a Jew came up to us and said, "Why, sir, if all the Jews and infidels could hear you, they would all believe! Why, you could convert the universe!" Alas! thought we, how little thou knowest of that universe! If Jesus and his apostles could not convert Judah, our efforts are as nothing in the scale. He continued to speak in high terms of Jesus, waiving the question of his divinity, and condemned in unqualified terms the High Priest and rulers who compassed his death. He predicted, however, that we spoke too much truth for 106 Centre street; and that it would not be long ere our voice would cease to be heard there. We had no doubt of this, but were determined to im-

prove the opportunity while there was an open door. Even the clergy heard us with interest, for we were informed by the chairman that they had said, "They could have sat all night to hear us."

But this was the very thing that was likely to arrest our progress here. There was too much satisfaction in hearing us. It was the "challenger's" meeting, and he could not endure that the truth should be glorified apart from him. He had driven off Dr. de Lara by a speech he had aimed at us. When the doctor rushed out with indignation, we called to him to remain, but he either did not hear or heed. We wanted to say to him, that we were sure the "challenger" did not refer to him in saying that "persons brought their friends there to applaud their speeches," but to us. We concluded to let the matter pass for that evening, being unwilling for more precious time to be wasted in complaint and altercation, but determined also that the "challenger" should eat his words or prove them; and in default of either, that we would withdraw and continue a meeting elsewhere, where we should be free from the semblance of coöperation with Gentilized Jews, who say that they are the true Jews, Rev. ii, 9; iii, 9; that "he is a Christian who believes that Jesus is the Christ and the Savior of sinners;" "that religion can be got in an instant;" and that tell sinners to go into their closets and pray for it! They doubtless desired to get quit of us. This was too palpable to be mistaken; and as they seemed to have no taste for Jesus without the loaves and fishes, the time had come to withdraw from them.

During the week the "challenger" carried a written declaration to Dr. de Lara, stating that he did not refer to him, and requesting him to withdraw his expressions at the meeting under the erroneous supposition that he did. This the doctor did in a letter which, with the "challenger's," was to be read at the next meeting. We arrived while they were being read. We had read the "challenger's" before, so that we lost none of its contents. When he had finished, we rose and said: That in his letter he had stated the truth and nothing but the truth; he had not, however, stated the whole truth. It was certainly true that he did not mean to say that Dr. de Lara had brought his friends there to applaud his speeches. He meant that Dr. Thomas had done this, and that as he had now finished with Dr. de Lara, we adopted Dr. de Lara's words that it was "a vile insinuation," and we repelled it with contempt. His remarks about "ap-
plause" were occasioned by the public ex-

pression which followed our addresses, and he could mean no other person. He knew that we attended these meetings reluctantly and at his request, yet when we last rose to speak he had cried out "Stop him!" and insinuated that we had come there with our friends for them to applaud us! This was utterly false, and he knew it; and as he had apologized to Dr. de Lara, we demanded that he should also apologize to us or prove the words.

To this he made no reply. Some fifteen minutes after, we inquired if he had no reply to what we had said. He said "He would think of it." "Give him time," said the chairman. "O, certainly, all the evening, if he will!"

The meeting proceeded, but with indications of a new policy. The "challenger" monopolized the platform, acting as chairman, while "the chairman" stood at the melodeon below and read some remarks. This indicated that no one was to be admitted to the desk as before. It was also announced that if an address or speaking were not finished by nine o'clock, the gas would be put out; and thirdly, the time was frittered away in trifling till about a quarter to nine, when, of course, no one would think of entering upon the discussion of so great a subject in such a niche of time. This situation of affairs revealed the real character of these meetings for the conversion of the Jews. New Testament Christianity, as the true Judaism, might go to Jericho. Jesus in the midst of twelve baskets of fragments, and the "challenger" a specimen of a true Jew Gentilized in an instant of time, the true Judaism. The baskets are the twelve apostles of the system, without which "conversion," we suspect, will stagnate in the way.

Having a presentiment, as it were, that we had spoken for the last time in Centre street, the brethren in this city hired the hall at 187 Bowery for night meetings. The "challenger" having dismissed the meeting without a word of explanation, we could speak no more there under the stigma he had affixed to our motives. We had afforded him a fair opportunity of declaring that he did not mean us, or of proving the offence; but doing neither, no alternative was left but to withdraw and leave the concern to its own inherent sterility and death.

EDITOR.

Aug. 1857.

Paul and the Jailor of Philippi.

"The jailor and other untaught Gentiles heard, believed, and obeyed the Gospel in the short time of an hour. Therefore a correct understanding of the Gospel must have been obtained by them in that brief space of time."—*Proph., Expos.*, p. 104, 1855.

After Paul and his companions arrived at Philippi, they abode there certain days. How long exactly is not stated, but sufficiently long to set the whole city in a ferment with his doctrine. They began their work in the suburbs with the enlightening of Lydia and her household. Before Paul met her she was a worshiper of God, and frequented a house of prayer on the Sabbath day. She was a proselyte to Judaism, and therefore an eligible subject to begin with. Paul spoke certain "things" to her which she attended to. The things are not particularized, but as the consequence of faith in them, she and her household were baptized.

What Paul had done in Philippi had now become notorious; and to make it more so, he was beset for "many days" by a damsel possessed of a Pythonic spirit, who brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. She directed public attention to him by proclaiming that he and his companions were the servants of the Most High God, who taught the way of salvation. Paul was grieved at this, as it tended to identify him with the disreputable, who gloried in their shame. He therefore commanded the departure of the spirit from the girl in the name of Jesus Christ. And it came out forthwith. But though relieved of her annoyance, the indignation of her masters fell upon him, because they could no longer make profit of her. They therefore arrested Paul and Silas, and took them before the magistrates, to whose establishment the jailor belonged. The accusation preferred against them was, that "being Jews, they exceedingly troubled the city, and taught precepts which were not lawful for Philippians to receive and practice, being Romans." This stirred up the mob against them, and caused them to be beaten, and delivered over to the jailor, who thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks.

At midnight the attention of the prison inmates was drawn to Paul and Silas, who prayed and sang. This was not done in a low tone; for, it is written, that "the prisoners heard them." They prayed and sang the truth; but what they said is not determinable by the prayers and songs of "disciples" or "pastors" among us. It was no doubt instructive to the hearers as well as edifying to themselves and appro-

priate to the emergency of their case. The answer of God to them while they were yet speaking was doubtless as astonishing to the prisoners as it was gratifying to Paul and Silas, and alarming to the jailor. There was suddenly a great earthquake, which shook the prison to the foundation, opened all its doors, and loosed the fetters of all. This was therefore not an ordinary earthquake; for when did an earthquake ever loose the chains of malefactors and enemies of the gods? The songs and prayers of these two Jews to a God unknown to Macedonians, followed or interrupted by an earthquake, and their liberation from bonds, was a notable testimony to the truth of their mission, that "the Lord had called them to announce the glad tidings to the Macedonians." Suddenly aroused from a sound sleep, (for though the prisoners heard the prayers and songs of the brethren, the jailor did not,) he was seized with panic when he found that all the doors of the stronghold were open. The darkness of the place concealed the prisoners from view. We are not told what he said, but what he was about to do, and the reason of it.

He had not uttered his fears and intention he would have killed himself before any would have thought of giving him assurance that all his prisoners were there. His utterances showed that he supposed they had escaped; a result that would have been visited upon him with death, as in the case of the jailors who were executed by Herod on Peter's escape from their custody. Death, then, was a certainty; and to save himself from the ignominy of a public execution, he determined to inflict punishment upon himself as the less evil of the two. He had drawn his sword, and was about to sheathe it in his own carcass, when Paul cried out aloud, "Do thyself no harm; for we are all here!" Hearing this, he called for a light, and trembling with the terror of the hour, he bounded into the presence of Paul and Silas, and fell down before them. The man's mind must have been highly excited, just awaked out of a sleep and therefore not quite master of himself; a building over his head shaking to its foundations; its doors open and the prisoners probably fled; his responsibility under pain of public execution; the ruin of his household; the state of mind peculiar to a suicide; and all these terrors heightened by the darkness of midnight, which to the terrified imagination of a pagan, was full of demons and alarms; all these things considered, will enable the reader easily to discern the import of the idolatrous jailor's question. "Sirs, what must I do that I may be saved?"

But, whatever may have been his peculiar

meaning, Paul and Silas replied to his question in their own sense of it. Instead of giving him advice as to how he should proceed in securing the liberated prisoners and so escape the consequences he apprehended (for it would be no easy matter for one man to put fetters upon a number by lamp-light, with all the prison doors open; if they were all there, when they found how things were, they would not be likely to remain long)—Paul and Silas directed his attention to a salvation of a higher and more important character. "Believe on the Lord Jesus the Anointed," said they, "and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house;" and it is added, "They spake to him *the word of the Lord*, and to all that were in his house."

Now in this testimony it will be perceived that the exhortation was first given to believe; and then the subject-matter for faith was presented. Hence, *for these idol-worshippers to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ was to believe the word of the Lord Paul and Silas spake.* The word they spoke is styled the Lord's word, *because God sent it by the Lord Jesus to the children of Israel;** so that it is both "the word of God" and "the word of the Lord," or "the doctrine of the Lord," i. e. "the faith," "*the word of this salvation sent to the children of the stock of Abraham.*" The pagans of the prison were invited to believe on the Lord Jesus in believing his teaching which he had sent to them by Paul and Silas. There was no such thing in those days recognized as believing on the Lord Jesus where his teaching was not known, or not believed. Believing that Jesus is God's Son, and Apostle, benefited no one, but rather aggravated their guilt, who did not receive his words. The demons believed that he was the anointed son of God, and trembled; but that did not make them saints; and so did the centurion who superintended his crucifixion; but that did not make him a Christian. The Lord's word that Paul spake to the idolators of the jail was the glad tidings of the kingdom that Jesus said should be announced in all the habitable for a teaching to all the nations thereof;† and concerning which word he has emphatically said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath that which judgeth him: **THE WORD THAT I HAVE SPOKEN, THE SAME SHALL JUDGE HIM IN THE LAST DAY.** For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father *who sent me* gave me commandment *what I should say and what I should speak*: and I know that his command-

ment is life everlasting: whatsoever, therefore, I speak, even as the Father says to me, so I speak."* Hence the words of Jesus are "the words of eternal life."

In these words of the Lord concerning the word he preached, we learn that a man is condemnable on two counts; *first*, for rejecting him as the anointed Son and Apostle of God, whom he has ordained to rule Israel and the Nations in righteousness; and *Secondly*, for not receiving **THE WORD HE PREACHED BEFORE HE WAS CRUCIFIED**, which his witnesses testify he styled, "the Kingdom of God," "the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God," "the Word of the Kingdom," and oftentimes simply "the glad tidings," or in Saxon English, "the Gospel." A man is condemnable on either, or both of these counts. If he do not reject the personal claims of Jesus to an equality with God in saying that he is Son of God; yet if he do not receive the Word of the Kingdom he preached, "*he shall be condemned.*" So also on the other hand, if he receive "the Word of the Kingdom," but deny the Lord Jesus (as the Jews did) saying that he is not the Anointed of Jehovah; and consequently, if not, is not the person promised in Isaiah, ix, 6, 7, and covenanted to David 1 Chron. xvii, 11-14—"he shall be condemned or judged in the last day." The truth is that *salvation is promised only to those who accept Jesus and believe his words.* It is utterly unscriptural to suppose that a man has "the faith," who affirms that Jesus is the Son of God, but is ignorant, or infidel, of the glad tidings of his kingdom and glory. The teaching of the Lord and his Apostles made no such believers as these. They "opened the eyes of the people, and turned them from darkness to light, and the power of Satan to God," first; and then baptized them in water for "forgiveness of sins and inheritance among the sanctified," who were "rich in faith" and "heirs of the promised kingdom."

When, therefore, Luke says, that Paul and Silas spake to the pagan jailor the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house, it is equivalent to his saying, that they spake to them the glad tidings of the kingdom and glory of God. They were sent to Macedonia for this purpose, as we have seen; namely, to invite the idolators to his kingdom and glory; so that when they spoke to the jailor and his house they were trying to persuade them to become "heirs" thereof with eternal life. This is incontrovertible, and no sophistry can make it other-

* John xii. 48-50.
 Luke iv. 48.
 Mat iv 23.
 Mat. xiii. 10.
 Mark xvi. 15, 16.

* Acts x. 36, 37. Acts xiii. 5, 7, 8, 13, 26, 32, 44, 46.
 † Refer to these texts.
 * Mat. xxiv. 14; xxviii. 10, 20.

wise. Paul's discourse would come to those that heard him as the word of him who shook the prison and loosed the prisoners. He pronounced against idolatry, and they obeyed his voice in turning from their idols. This was "repentance towards God," which did not require long to effect. He announced his purpose of setting up a kingdom in Israel's land which should rule all nations righteously; he declared that he had ordained a certain Jew, named Jesus, who was his Son whom he had begotten from among the dead, to sit on his throne of the dominion; whom he would send from the heavens to establish it; and they believed it. This was believing God and having faith in the Lord Jesus as his Anointed King. He then invited them to become his sons, that with Jesus their Elder Brother, he might give them all things pertaining to the kingdom and glory. They accepted the invitation, and "were baptized, he and all his, straightway."

Luke does not say that "the jailor and other untaught Gentiles heard, believed, and obeyed the Gospel in the short time of an hour:" but that "the jailor took Paul and Silas the same hour of the night and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Washing the stripes and baptism occupied the hour, not the teaching, if by "hour" is to be understood a space of sixty minutes. The word *ώρα*, *hōra*, rendered "hour" in this text, signifies *time, season*, as well as *the twelfth part of an artificial day*, or of the time that the sun is above the horizon. The text does not limit us to this twelfth part of a Jewish, or to the twenty-fourth part of a Gentile, day. The events of the night covered the interval from midnight to day; for the earthquake occurred at midnight, and the order for Silas and Paul's release arrived "when it was day." Several of our sixty-minute periods are included in this interval, which were doubtless all occupied in the business of the night. It does not say how long they were engaged in speaking the word of the Lord to these pagans. It was, however, long enough to plant in their hearts love for Paul and Silas, and a joyous belief in God, *as well as* in the Lord Jesus: for having washed their stripes, and brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, *believing in God* with all his house. Thus they renounced idolatry, and became saints.

But because these results were accomplished between midnight and day, doth any one in this century imagine he could turn an idolator into a Christian in an hour? Nay, could he in that time bring one who says that Jesus is Son of God, to the obedience God prescribes? If the very words that Paul

spoke to the jailor were now repeated to such a one the time would not suffice for the work. And for what reason? Because first, men are too pious in their own conceit to be saved *by the truth*; because secondly, their hearts are unsubdued to the authority of Scripture; because thirdly, they have a natural repulsion to obedience; because fourthly, they are educationally perverted; because fifthly, God does not confirm the word spoken by men now as he did Paul's; and because sixthly, it would be interpreted "spiritually," and be condemned as "ultra" and "too exclusive." The events of the "many days" preceding Paul's imprisonment were not unknown to the jailor and his house; for the city was exceedingly troubled. It would be strange, indeed, if they had been living in the heart of such a city, and continued ignorant of what had become a common talk with the multitude. The "new doctrine" was as much a matter of inquiry at Philippi as at Athens; and the gossip of the city created by it predisposed men's minds to an investigation favorable to the reception of the word.

Such was the Gospel and the circumstance attending its introduction into Macedonia by Paul and Silas. The people were blind, in darkness, and under the power of Satan. They knew nothing about God, or Christianity; and there was no sectarianism among them to pervert their minds concerning it; which was an advantage that unhappily society is destitute of in this age of the world. They believed in thirty thousand deities, to be propitiated by sacrifices; in heaven among the stars; and in the physical immortality of the spirit within them. The experience of eighteen hundred years has proved that men cannot be exorcised of these "vain imaginations," which constitute "the wisdom of the world," by scripture and reason "in the short time of an hour." The word of the Lord taught by inspired men, and confirmed to the hearer by the attestation of God in signs and worders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his will,^{*} can do it; but even that powerful agency is inefficient to subdue the incredulity and perverseness of the multitude; so that after all said and done in the work of calling the many, only few are chosen to salvation on account of holiness of spirit, and belief in the truth—*εν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, και πιστει ἀληθείας* †—and without this "no man can see the Lord."

In its relation to the truth the world is now in worse condition than in the days of Paul. A large section of it most compla-

* Heb. ii. 4.

† 2 Thess. ii. 13; Mat. vii. 13, 14; xx. 16.

cently styles itself "Christendom," or *the Dominion of Christ*, in the sense of his actually reigning over it; the Pope and all orders of clergy, Romish and Protestant, being the saints who reign with him!!! It is a principle universally confessed by the supporters of this system of abomination, that *Jesus is the Son of God, died for sins, was buried, rose again from the dead, and now sits at the right hand of God*. This they call the Gospel, and themselves therefore believers of it! They "believe" it, because they so happened to be led. Had they been born in Turkey under Mohammedan influences, they would have been Ulemas and Dervishes, and have confessed "there is one God, and Mahomet is his prophet!" For they attain to the belief of what they call Gospel by educational constraint. This "Gospel," mantled over with the phrenological affiations of veneration and conscientiousness, called "piety," is obeyed in the heart when the cloak of their fleshly piety is thrown over their profession. According to their theological jargon, they then "experience conversion," are "born again," "regenerated," or have "got religion!" This theological "obedience" is common to "the Mother of Harlots," her Daughters, and to "all the abominations of the earth," that have exhaled from their corruption. If they have been sprinkled in their infancy these penitent obedient (!) are admitted to "the *eucharist*" by episcopal confirmation, if they can tell their names, and can repeat the Lord's prayer, Ten Commandments, and Apostles' Creed; if not sprinkled and crossed, this ceremony is added. Others who obey in the heart prefer to obtain access to "the *sacrament*" by being dipped in water; others eat the sacrament in the heart, and are baptized in the heart, without material bread or water at all!! All these, though filled with zeal, oftentimes of a very ardent type, against each other, have of late years tacitly compromised their enmities upon the understanding, that they are all Christians; and their churches useful divisions of the great Christian church, or Body of Christ—in what they deem essentials, one; in "non-essentials," liberty. This they think is a very fine and holy state of things; and highly approved of God! All admitting the Christianity of each provided none call in question their neighbor's! And thus they wrap it up; and Christ, who is "the truth," is crucified as pestilent!

Such is Christendom, British, Continental, and American; a magnitudinous APOSTACY FROM THE FAITH. Paul foretold its development from "the *Mystery of Iniquity*" secretly working in his day, in his teaching at Thessalonica. It is a monument to his inspiration until the Lord come to destroy it. Its in-

fluence is, as he said it would be, that of "a strong delusion." His words are "Because they receive not *the love of the truth* for their salvation; God shall permit a power of imposture to go to them unto their giving credit to a lie; that they all might be condemned *who believe not the truth*." The power of this imposture which pervades "Christendom" is enormous; and reigns in all names, denominations, sects, and parties. It is "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," who substitute sacrifice and the fat of rams for obeying the voice of the Lord.* There is nothing to antagonize this power but the divisions of its own imposture; but for this division of the house against itself, the *Herald of the Kingdom* would be silenced in death. But it lives, and while God permits it to live, if it stand alone till the Lord come, it will contend against this power wherever it appear.

Such are the two worlds, and the powers that possess them in absolute dominion. The Roman idolatry, or "*power of Satan*," chained the world of nations to which the apostles were sent; while the "*power of imposture*," or a spurious christianity, hoodwinks and binds modern society in its thrall. "The truth," stated, and enforced by Bible testimony and reason, is all that can be brought against it, in a Bible-neglecting, unreasoning, and perverse generation. The voice of truth is therefore now but a dying whisper in the ears of men, heard by a very few. It declares God's teachings to them, and proves that the "gospel" and "obedience" sanctified by Christendom, are not the word spoken by Jesus, nor the obedience, that are to acquit or judge them in the last day; and though they cannot confute it, they cry out against it for "in saying this thou condemnest us also!"

The preaching sanctified by Christendom aims at a different result from Paul's. It aims to induce educational believers: in "the Apostles' Creed," as it is called, to become "pious" and join in a church that at death they may escape hell-fire, and go to heaven; while Paul's was to turn men from idols to the God of Israel, to belief of his promises, to faith in Jesus, to baptism in his name, and to wait for him from the heavens, in the hope of then attaining to the resurrection of life, and a share in his kingdom and glory, as the reward for holiness of spirit and belief of the truth from the heart obeyed. What a godlike difference! The one, mere foolishness, the other, the wisdom and power of God. It is the foolishness the Critics believe as "disciples" before they are dipped; and

* Sam. xv. 22.

preach as "pastors" when theologically imbued.

It was the wisdom and power of God, and not the foolishness, that was preached to the Macedonians. Had the foolishness been preached to them, it would probably have run like wildfire; because foolishness is more congenial to the human mind, than the wisdom of God: and assimilates closely to paganism *in its hope*. If the idolators would have said they believed in one God, and that Jesus was his Son, they would have baptized them, and taught them their peculiarities after. They would not have troubled their minds about Jewish matters, and the kingdom, and the covenants, and the promises. Certainly not; these are only for graduates in the truth; profound and recondite affairs, patent only to Eleusinian doctors!! It is easy to convert men to foolishness, as every "revival" and camp meeting prove; and in a very short time too; yea, in less than the twenty-fourth part of a day. But it is not so with respect to the wisdom of God in the absence of his attestation by miracle and sign. It requires much testimony and close reasoning to cast out the demons of foolishness, that the truth may find an entrance. You have to convince Christians in their own conceit, that they are not Christians in the judgment of Scripture. This was a difficulty the apostles had not to contend with. They had no spurious, or counterfeit gospels to combat in Macedonia; for there were then but "one faith, one baptism, and one hope of the calling," and these were set forth in their preaching alone. They had but to state them endorsed by the attestation of God; and they were received with a faith that rested upon his power, and not upon the word, wisdom, or persuasive eloquence of men. Thus, their work was comparatively short and easy, where the truth they stated fell into honest and good hearts. But it is not so now. In our experience we have met with men of sincere and good intentions, the Crito family for instance, "who have read the Bible for thirty years with as much impartiality as any man living, but for the life of them they cannot see" what was visible to any novice in the days of Paul, that for dipping in water to be the "One Baptism," the subject thereof must be enlightened by the "one faith," or dipping cannot be "the obedience of faith." They are filled with zeal against this self-evident proposition, not because they can shew the contrary, but because it pulverizes their foundation, makes them "naked," and exposes them to "shame;" for the pride of opinion is so strong and inflexible even in the well-disposed, that they cannot endure that they

should have been "disciples," and "pastors," and "guides of the blind, lights of them which are in darkness, instructors of the foolish, and teachers of babes," for thirty years, (Rom. ii, 19,) and have yet "need that one teach them what be the elements of the beginning of the oracles of God," (Heb. v, 11-14.) This is mortifying and intolerable to the pride of Christendom. Paul himself would be rejected if he came to them with the glad tidings that so exceedingly troubled Philippi. They would tell him, that his teaching was "an iron bedstead," and "poorly adapted to the liberal spirit of the gospel," being "new and diverse from the sentiments of all Christendom." The liberal spirit of the gospel!! As if Paul's gospel were the gospel of modern liberalism! The spirit of his gospel was liberal indeed; for it offered men, without money and without price, an everlasting kingdom with inexhaustible riches, unlimited power, divine honors, and eternal life and glory. This was a gospel of a liberal spirit; and offered man a *covenant-right* to all these good things upon the easy conditions of believing the exceeding great and precious promises of God, faith in Jesus and baptism in his name; but our impartial readers of the Bible for thirty years are displeased with it; because it does not grant this *right* to their Christendom upon its own terms! Their gospels are more liberal; for they offer the babes they teach *rights* without regard to faith in the promises at all! Ye natural borns of Christendom, educationally credulous of its dogmas, only be pious, and your gaseous immortalities shall "have the stars" in spirit-land! This is a liberal spirited gospel truly! Nay, it is more liberal than even this, for it gives *rights* to glory among the stars to infants of the flesh without faith, or hope, or thought, or any thing, but the instincts of their being! And shall they glorify them in heaven, and send "the pious" to eternal flames; or give them no interest in the future world, because they did not believe in the Kingdom and the things pertaining to it, which Paul preached to the Macedonians?" "Perish the thought!" say they. Away with such "a system of theological ultraism!" "The ground is extreme, and utterly untenable when explored in the light of facts and apostolic precedent!" These "sentiments of all Christendom" are sacred in the eyes of pious liberalism, which is *pious disbelief of all God's promises unpalatable to the thinking of the flesh*. Pious liberalism and pious bigotry are the two extremes of Christendom, which, though fierce antagonists, meet in sweet accord upon this common ground. Their pieties are mere exhalations of the flesh, which join heart and soul in justifying

themselves upon principles which, though "highly esteemed among men, are abomination in the sight of God" (Luke xvi, 15; Gal. i, 10.)

We conclude, then, "in the light of the facts and apostolic precedent" shining forth from Philippi and Thessalonica, that men were enlightened in "the things of the kingdom of God, and name of Jesus Christ," by Paul's preaching before they were baptized; we know from an understanding of "the sentiments of all Christendom," that the pious are not so enlightened, even though they may have been readers of the Bible for thirty years, and may profess that the Bible is their religion and only creed: we conclude, therefore, that they ought to be so enlightened before they are immersed; and that in default of the same, their immersion is not "obeying the truth," "the obedience of faith," nor the "one baptism;" and that consequently, they have acquired no covenant right to the kingdom and glory of God. All of which is benevolently and respectfully submitted to our well-beloved friends in all the world, in hope that they will candidly look into the things written, without burdening their troubled spirits with affairs in this city which don't concern them; or with the motives and "infallibility" of the writer, to which he lays no claim. The truth of the matter need be our sole concern.

Sept. 1, 1855.

EDITOR.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Food for Profitable Thinking.

BY WILLIAM PASSMORE, M.D.

THE following letter was written to our self-denying, exemplary, and earnest brother, Albert Anderson of Caroline Co., Virginia, who, in forwarding it to us for publication, says, "Possibly the love I cherish for the writer may, to some extent, disqualify me in judging of his productions, but I think his letters very profitable to me, and they may be so to others. You can judge better of this than I, on account of the circumstances of our relations to him." We insert the letter with much pleasure. It shows that he is not satisfied with simply believing the gospel of the kingdom, and being immersed, that his past offences might be pardoned, but that he is diligent also to acquire "glory, honor, incorruptibility and life," in the Aionian Kingdom of Jehovah and of his Anointed, or Christ, by increasing in knowledge and faith, as evinced in devotion to heavenly things. Brother Passmore's "obedience to the faith" is comparatively recent,

but his comprehension of it and self-denial of "ungodliness and worldly lusts" are a pungent rebuke of many by whose conduct the truth is crucified in the house of its professed friends. To such the Spirit saith, "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, but art dead. Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die, for I have not found *thy works* perfect before God. Remember, therefore, how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If, therefore, thou wilt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee."—Rev. iii. 1-3. We grieve over the conduct of such, but how to remedy it is the difficulty. If they will not heed the words of the spirit, is it conceivable that they will attend to us? Oh, that the Lord would come and vindicate his truth! Amen.—Editor.

THE LETTER.

"*Dear Bro. Anderson:* I thank you very sincerely for your kind communication. I have read your letters again and again, and find no language adequate to express how much pleasure they have given me. They are sweet to the taste of the inner, the hidden, the intellectual man. They regale the mind with beautiful representations of that wonderful day immediately impending, and which 'is big with the' destiny of the whole race of man; the glorious day in which 'all kings shall fall down before him' who is 'the man of God's right hand, the son of man whom Jehovah has made strong for himself.' The day in the which God will judge the nations righteously, by Jesus the Christ, and the kingdoms of the earth shall sing unto God; and God shall save Zion, making it beautiful in the eyes of all nations, and shall build the cities of Judah, and his son shall reign for ever; and 'all nations shall serve him,' and all God's works shall praise him, and 'all nations' shall join with his saints, and call him blessed. Then 'the Lord shall rejoice in his works,' because they shall praise him and call him blessed. Oh! glorious day of happiness! when wilt thou unfold thy tranquilizing energies upon our fallen and disordered race, promoting peace on earth and good will among men? Never until the Man at God's right hand returns and restores all things; not until 'he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth;' when he shall speak peace to the nations, and destroy 'the people who delight in war.' Not until the glory of Jehovah shall cover the earth, and the saints shall have received their 'eternal weight of glory.' Then, and not before, will 'tranquillity and order' be re-

stored among 'the bewildered race of Adam.' How powerfully calculated are such ideas and energizing impressions to expand the range of mental vision, enlarge the bounds of thought, and bring the intellect to the investigation of the great problems of time as well as eternity. And, O! how much are they intensified when we consider that they compose the pabulum of our eternal existence! They develop, to use the glowing language of Lamartine, 'that grand and inward improvement of the thought, by the exercise of thought itself.' Now all things in the universe are the products of thought, the offspring of eternal mind, the earth on which we dwell, the entire solar system, the universe of wonders. The new creature is the product of thought; we are made the image of God by knowledge. This knowledge, which professes the wonderful power of moulding the views and feelings of the man, destroying all old things, and producing a new creature, with all things new, is the truth as it is in Jesus. This powerful system Jesus came into our world to establish, as it is written, 'for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness of the Truth.' Because he confirmed it by the attestations of heaven, it is emphatically styled, 'the Truth in him.' This truth is 'the promise confirmed to Isaac for a law,' 'written upon the hearts of those who understand righteousness.' It supersedes the law of Moses, being the substance; not, however, by destroying, but by fulfilling it. They who are 'of the truth' have been 'redeemed from the curse of the law.' Therefore, Jesus says, 'Every one who is of the truth hears my voice.' This system, styled, 'the truth in Jesus,' is not shrouded in incomprehensiveness, but is the 'strong meat belonging to them who are full of age, even those who, by reason of use, have their faculties exercised to discern' the elements of which it is composed. They are 'not children in understanding but in malice' only. They have been 'made free' by 'the truth,' and shall, therefore, remain 'in the house' with 'the son forever.' The complicated and beautiful structure, 'fearfully and wonderfully made, once exhibited the image of God, and had dominion; it again can have that image re-stamped upon it, by receiving the truth, and becoming obedient to law. Wearing this image, he shall have dominion, and shall enjoy, in the ages to come, uninterrupted felicity. What are the diversified works of Jehovah, the plurality of worlds, the sublimities of creation, the earth filled with riches, the mysteries of life, the beauties of the universe, but manifestations, vast exhibitions of the eternal mind, whose conception gave birth to them all?

"The greatness and achievements of such men as Johnson, Chatham, Burke, Newton, &c., the most impassioned and beautiful productions of the poets; the masculine vigor of Dryden, the wit of Congreve, the pathos of Otway, the glowing inspiration of Shakspeare, the Roman Empire of Gibbon, the essays of Bacon, the *Elia* of Lamb, the Spectator and Tattler of Addison and Steele, the Rome of Arnold, the Notes on Books, Friends in Council, the Statesman of Taylor, the *Elpis Israel* and *Anatolia* of Dr. Thomas, in which thoughts and suggestions of thoughts move in such solid phalanx, that every line is a study; all, all were the products of thought.

"Letter-writing is the telegraphic medium by which mind is immediately connected with mind; the medium through which intelligence and emotion, love and truth, friendship and sympathy are conducted, as soothing zephyrs to the mind. Many able men are coming to our standard, contending for that which has been so long inscribed thereon, in blazing capitals.

"'Pisgah Views of the Promised Inheritance,' by Cross, a preacher among the Methodists, is a charming production. In advocating the literal interpretation, he says, 'proceeding upon this rule (and who will presume to pronounce it either unsound or unsafe?) I found it impossible to reconcile the popular doctrine with the voice of prophecy on the subjects of which I have discussed.' These subjects are, the new dispensation, the glorious parousia, the first resurrection, the millennial kingdom, the day of judgment, &c., &c., all which do not agree with the popular doctrine, when viewed in the light of prophecy.

"I agree with you, dear brother, in thinking it an unspeakable privilege to be permitted to meditate on the Word of God; but, alas, alas! how few, even among those who have professed to have become 'new creatures in Christ,' think and act as if they deemed it such. Christians, indeed, 'look not at the things which are seen,' that is, 'earthly things;' forgetting such, they are seen 'reaching forth unto those things which are before,' 'denying' themselves of all 'worldly lusts,' they 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 shall, at his appearing in his kingdom, change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his own glorious body. All who have this hope purify themselves, even as Christ is pure. They are diligent in every good word and work. Diligence, it has been well said, is the philosopher's

stone, that turns everything to gold. By 'diligence' alone our calling and election are secured. 'What a lesson,' then, 'the word diligence contains! How profitable it is for every one of us to be reminded, as we are reminded when we make ourselves aware of its derivation from *diligo* (to love). The only secret of true industry in our work, is *love of that work!*'

"I have been reading 'Whately's Future State.' In lecture 7th, on the restoration of the Jews, and the millennium, he says, 'Christ coming in bodily person upon earth, recalling the Jews after the flesh to Judea, rebuilding Jerusalem, and there reigning in worldly (he should have said heavenly and visible) splendor, with his saints . . . there is no ground for expecting.' Again, he says, 'Nothing can be more at variance with this (that is, the general tenor of the Scriptures) than a literal reign of Christ in bodily person for a thousand years at Jerusalem, a literal restoration of the Jews to their country, and all the other circumstances of a literal and carnal (he should rather have said spiritual) Millennium.'" The angels said, 'this same Jesus . . . shall so 'come' in like manner," for God will 'send Jesus whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things.' 'The 'diadem' and 'crown' taken from 'the profane and wicked prince' of Israel, will be given him whose 'right it is' to reign. These are the words of Him who 'cannot deny himself,' and who says, 'the Scripture cannot be broken.' Having received 'the throne of his father David, he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.' 'All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him.' Have these Scriptures been fulfilled? No, verily. 'His own received him *not*. They would acknowledge 'no king but Caesar.' 'The world knew him *not*.' This was his condition who, in the time appointed, 'shall be king over all the earth.' He was 'despised and rejected of men,' who 'shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off,' when he shall reign in Zion, his chosen habitation. 'I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Basban, and his soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Ephraim and Gilcad. Then 'Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem, as the throne of the Lord, from generation to generation.' All, all of which 'is to be interpreted spiritually,' that is, according to the principle which resolves everything into mystic vaguery !!

"'Is it not plain,' he continues, 'that the course of the divine dispensation would be *going back* instead of advancing, if a worldly kingdom of God were to succeed a spiritual

one?' This certainly would be very strange, if he means by 'worldly kingdom of God,' the kingdom which God once had upon the earth, namely, the kingdom of Israel, under the Mosaic constitution. The kingdom to supersede this is the one of which Jesus is the king, to be 'set up by the God of heaven, comprehending all nations, and languages, and peoples, and tongues, under the whole heaven, and is an everlasting kingdom. Now if this were succeeded by the Mosaic kingdom, the divine dispensation would be *going back* instead of advancing. but he does not use the word 'spiritual' in this sense, but in the sense of invisibleness, 'refined from external things.' He understands by spiritual kingdom, the church and Jesus reigning over it in the heavens. Now I cannot see, if we take this view of the subject—which is utterly inconsistent with the Scriptures—that the dispensation would be *going back* instead of advancing, if Jesus were to come and reign on the earth; his location only would be changed. But if he were to come and immortalize the saints, introduce his law among all nations, and they have his name called upon; and in their midst is seen 'the sapphire-colored throne and Him that sits thereon,' with the crown of all the earth, the earth decorated with garlands of imperishable verdure and beauty. This, I think, Whately himself would be compelled to admit, is advancing rather than *going back*.

"God's kingdom of old was a kingdom of this world, but Christ's kingdom is not of this world;' 'and surely,' he continues, 'it would be going back to the carnal dispensation (which the Gospel set aside) to look for the establishment of a splendid and prosperous earthly kingdom at Jerusalem for the saints, for whom 'some better thing has been provided' (Heb. ii, 40). The kingdom of Christ is not of this world, but heaven, both in its principles and origin. Christ was not of the earth, but above, still his mission was on the earth, and on the earth he again must come to reign. Jesus said, 'New' is my kingdom, not from hence.' Instead of its being of this world, it was of the heavens—'the kingdom of heaven.'

"The quotation from Heb. xi, 40 does not teach, as Whately would have us believe, that they who have formed a good character by faith, because they have not received the promise, therefore never will, but the contrary. that they, as well as we, shall receive it together, namely, at the time when all are 'made perfect.' The saints, for whom this 'better thing' has been provided, are also to receive the promise, as well as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to whom it was made. 'If ye are

Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and, therefore, heirs according to the promise.' Here we learn that Christ is the better thing through whom we obtain perfection, and hence the promise. Hence Jesus is to him 'the finisher of his faith,' whose blood is 'the blood of the everlasting covenant,' with which we are 'made perfect,' by 'the blood of sprinkling, that speaks 'better things' than that of Abel.'

"Adieu, my dear friend, believe me to be your most affectionate brother,

WM. PASSMORE.

"LUNENBURG, Va., Nov. 28, 1856."

No Reign of Righteousness before Christ Appears.

I CANNOT gather from any portion of the word of God that a universal reign of righteousness (the Millennium) will precede the personal appearing of Christ, when he comes "to be glorified in his saints," and to take "vengeance on them that know not God." (2 Thess. i, 8, 10.) Let those who tell us that it will be so, show us, from Scripture, the basis of their belief. I read, that "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.) and, that God is visiting the Gentiles, "to take out of them a people for his name." (Acts xv, 13-17.)

In opposition to the popular idea of a Millennium before the coming of Christ, I think I see it revealed very plainly that nothing is to be hoped for but increasing manifestations of ungodliness to the end of this age or dispensation. I find that in Paul's time the mystery of iniquity and the falling away (the apostacy or departure from the faith) had begun and would continue to work and to advance, until that wicked [One] (the man of sin—the son of perdition) be revealed, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."* And how much, with respect to the moral condition of mankind when He comes, is implied in the emphatic question of our Savior, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke

xviii, 8.) We are told also that the Tares and the Wheat are both to grow TOGETHER UNTIL THE HARVEST (explained by our Lord to be the end of the world, or age, or present dispensation).* (Matt. xiii, 30, 39.) The same truth is again taught by Christ in Matt. xxiv, 37, 38, 39, and Luke xvii, 24-30.—After describing the state of the world before the flood, and of Sodom before its destruction, he says, "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." From these and many other portions of Scripture, we learn, with the utmost clearness, the position of the world, especially of professing christendom, when the Lord Jesus comes—that it will be full of daring rebellion and impiety, and ripe for judgment.

From this view of the position of the world, we are naturally led to consider what will be the position of the true church during the growing apostacy, and in expectation of the Savior's reappearance. And in doing this we find, from the testimony of truth, that the event which will issue in awful judgment to the wicked, is revealed as the brightest hope of the church—as the time of her full salvation. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." (Titus ii, 13.) "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." * * * "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (James v, 7, 8.) "For our conversation (citizenship) begins in heavens; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. iii. 20, 21.) "Beloved, we are now the sons of God, (in reality though not manifested) 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, 2.) "And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ." (2 Thess. iii, 5.)

Wherever on earth we look, whether to the church, to the world, or to the planet we inhabit, with all the life which swarms upon it—what do we see? The consequences of the fall in Adam. Confusion, sorrow, sin, suffering. All are GROANING.

What is the portion of the true followers of the Lamb here? Even the same as was that of their blessed Lord and Master himself. "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." (John xv, 20.) "In

* In answer to those who contend for a *spiritual* "coming" of the Lord Jesus Christ in the hearts of the children of men, as being referred to in a great many of the passages where his "coming" is spoken of, it may be well to state, which I do upon the authority of those competent to decide, that the Greek words used to describe that coming "are used to express *personal, or bodily, or actual presence.*" See a Tract—"Remarks on the words 'arousia,' 'Ephpheta,' &c., &c.," which may be had at 1, Warwick Square, London.

† τῆν πίστιν the faith.—Ed. Her.

* Mosaic not "present."—Editor.

the world ye shall have tribulation." (John xvi, 33.) These, rejection and persecution, with trial, will be the abiding inheritance of the witnessing church *till the Bridegroom comes*. What does Paul say: "Ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*" (Rom. viii, 23.) "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." (Rom. viii, 18.) "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him." (2 Tim. ii, 12.) "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." (2 Tim. iii, 12.) "If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." (Rom. viii, 17.) And Peter says, "Rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings: that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." (1 Peter, iv, 13.) We find that the teachings of our Lord and his Apostles agree in this: that Christians in this age, would never cease to be strangers and pilgrims; that they, the children of the bridechamber, were to fast till the return of the bridegroom. Hence the exhortations, that we are not to be conformed to the world; and that we are neither to love it nor the things which are in it. In this world we are led ever to expect trial. This was the legacy of the Lord to his disciples. In him alone they were to have "peace." The preaching of the Cross will never cease to be foolishness and an offence to the world. The way to heaven will continue to be narrow, and few will find it; the road to destruction will continue to be broad, and many will throng it. This exhortation will continue in full force so long as the head of the church is absent. "Set your affection on things above—not on things on the earth; for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." (Col. iii, 2, 3.)

What is the present condition of the whole creation? By the introduction of sin it "was made subject to vanity" (disorganization); and it is also groaning and travailling in pain together until now; and is earnestly waiting "for the manifestation of sons of God." (Rom. viii, 19, 20, 22.) And at that glorious period it shall share in the redemption purchased by Jesus for his people; for "itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the (then manifested) children of God." (Rom. viii, 21.) Then, "instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree." Then, "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall

eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat; they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." (Isaiah lxxv, 25.) "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox: and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain: FOR THE EARTH SHALL BE FULL OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LORD, AS THE WATERS COVER THE SEA." (Isaiah xi, 6-9.) Then also shall the vision of John be realized, "AND EVERY CREATURE which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and ALL that are in them (*every thing in creation which has breath*), heard I saying, Blessing and honor, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." (Rev. v, 13.)

What is the present condition of the world? *Groaning* beneath the consequences of its own impiety. Distress of nations with perplexity; deceiving and being deceived; glorying in their shame; minding earthly things; rejecting Christ, either boldly or practically, or resting in a mere carnal knowledge of him; lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, unthankful, unholy, despisers of those that are good, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying the power. (2 Tim. iii.) What a fearful picture! Many are scoffing and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? They are WILLFULLY ignorant of this, that because the Lord appears to be slack concerning his promise (as some men count slackness), it is because he is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. All this wickedness and apostacy will continue to increase and abound till the end of this age, as I have before shown; and Paul says, that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." (2 Tim. iii, 13.) And what have the ungodly world to expect when He comes whose right it is to reign? Jesus is now *waiting* till his enemies shall be made his footstool. And when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe; he will also come "in flaming fire, taking vengeance upon them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. i, 8.)

The dispensation in which we now live is the day of God's grace and long-suffering—the day of his merciful visitation. "To-day if ye will hear his voice." "Now is the day of salvation." God is now, "in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Now is dispensed the word of reconciliation—the proclamation of the gospel of the grace of God. The long-suffering of God is now manifested to sinners; and God is now, by the foolishness of preaching, calling one here and another there to himself. This day is now nearly two thousand years old; how much longer it will continue God only knoweth; but the state of the world and the professing church proclaim the "Day of the Lord" to be drawing nigh. Jesus ushered in this day by his advent in humiliation. He appeared as an infant of days; as the lowly one; as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. He was despised and rejected of men. And he is so still; and his people are now, or should be, the representatives of his earthly rejection, just as he is now appearing in the presence of God for them: he in them, and they in him. The heavens have received the heir of all things until the times of restitution of all things—when he shall come to take possession of his kingdom; "and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."

The next dispensation—the "dispensation of the fullness of times"—will be the "DAY OF THE LORD,"—the "last day,"—the "perfect day"—to the saints, the "day of redemption"—the redemption of the already purchased possession. To the wicked, it will be the "day of wrath;" and the "day of vengeance of our God." Whether this day will be as long as the day of his grace has now been, we have no means of correctly ascertaining. The "Day of the Lord," like the day of calling in sinners, will likewise be ushered in by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. But it will be in a very different manner, and for a very different purpose. He will come in the clouds of heaven, with ten thousand of his saints, with power and great glory; and every eye shall see him. He will then appear, not as the lowly Nazarene, but as the Lion of the tribe of Judah. He will "put on the garments of vengeance for clothing," and will be "clad with zeal as a cloak." (Isaiah lix, 17.) He will come to take vengeance on his enemies, and to be glorified and admired in his saints. "He will descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." The "dead in Christ" will be raised incorruptible; and those who are "alive and remain" shall be changed in

the "twinkling of an eye;" and, together, they shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall they ever be with the Lord.

His saints now share his rejection; but they will then share with him in his glory: having suffered with him, they will also reign with him: they "shall be priests of God and of Christ; and shall reign with him a thousand years." Then that "new song" of prospective triumph, if not then sung, will at least be realized: "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." (Rev. v, 9, 10.) Now the world "knoweth us not because it knew him not;" then "the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning." Now Satan is the god of this world; but then he will be bound; and the "great voices in heaven" will be raised in joyous acclamation, saying, "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever." Now every thing in the whole visible creation is a manifest witness of the curse of and by sin; all groan, being in bondage. Then redemption will be applied to all that now groans; and every creature will join in the universal song of joy and praise. Now the Jews are blinded, and scattered, and are a "by-word among all nations." Then they shall be established in blessing and honor in their own land. Now the Lord Jesus Christ rules in his church by his word and by his Spirit. Then the "Kedeemer shall come to Zion;" then "out of Sion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: 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." (Isaiah ii, 3, 4.)

In the evening, so to speak, of this glorious day, when the "thousand years" of reigning and blessedness are past, we are taught that Satan will be loosed from his confinement; that he will go forth and succeed in deceiving the nations; these nations will go to war against the beloved city; that God will "devour" them with fire from heaven; that Satan will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone; and then follows the resurrection and judgment of the "rest of the dead." (Rev. xx.) Then "we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth." "And," says John, immediately after detailing the judgment of the wicked, "I saw a new heaven and a new

earth; for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away." (Rev. xxi, 1.) "Then cometh the end, when he (Jesus) shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall put down all rule and all authority and power." * * * And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv, 24, 28.)

Lancaster, England; June, 1843.

Mixing up the Isms.

THERE is a subject respecting which we often feel like inflicting a preachment on some of our editorial brethren. Almost ever since we have been in the habit of reading newspapers, we have also been in the habit of noticing, on the part of certain prominent political journals—and sometimes religious ones—a disposition to garble the language, pervert the sense, misstate the position, or misrepresent the doctrine of an opponent. This, we respectfully submit, is not exactly honest. Nor does the practice generally, in the long run, advantage the party resorting to it. It certainly can never advance the cause of truth. And it leads to endless contention, bickering, crimination and retaliation. Honesty, candor, and fairness are, we are fully persuaded, the best policy in logic and literature, as well as in the domain of traffic and exchange.

As we retrospect the history of human society, most of the disputations which have divided men into sects, subdivided sects into cliques, arrayed politicians and religionists against each other, and plunged the nations in war, have arisen more from differences in the manner of expressing ideas, than from the intrinsic differences of the ideas themselves. The quarrel has not been so much about what men do or think, as about the language with which they describe their actions or clothe their thoughts. Many a hot-blooded duelist has discovered, after an exchange of shots, that the "offensive words" were susceptible of an explanation perfectly compatible with the honor of all parties concerned. Many a time have learned philosophers quarreled over a problem which, it was afterwards ascertained, neither of them knew anything about. More than one person has been put to death for asserting what is now the general opinion of mankind. Often have religious zealots engaged in "holy wars" about a word or a sentence the meaning of which neither party had thought it necessary to explain nor been able to de-

fine. And full many a time and oft have contending nations discovered, after fighting until their resources were nearly exhausted, that there was no occasion for bloodshed, all matters of difference being adjustable by the ordinary appliances of diplomacy.

Every new idea that is started necessarily provokes controversy. Every new *ism* that is announced is met by opposition. And all the experience of our race will fully sustain the assertion that just in proportion as the proposition announced is in advance of the age, and above the grasp of the general mass of mind, will the opposition to it be bitter and the persecution of its advocate relentless.

It is all well and proper to examine carefully, sift, criticise, controvert, and oppose every new idea or *ism*. So far conservatism is useful and necessary. It is the business of those who put forward new doctrines to prove them. But they should have a fair hearing. And all who present new propositions to the world should have the right conceded to them of defining their positions; and all who enter the lists of controversy should religiously respect this right. A controversialist has no more right to pervert or misrepresent his opponent's statement or opinion than he has to girdle his cherry-tree or to steal his coat.

There are now many *isms* and *ologies* being discussed before the tribunal of public opinion, and they will of necessity become more multitudinous and complicated as society advances. We may name promiscuously as some of those which are more or less agitating different portions of the political, social, and religious world, Democracy, Republicanism, Americanism, Temperance, Abolitionism, Vegetarianism, Woman's Rights, Bloomerism, Land Reform, Fourierism, Free Love, Spiritualism, Mormonism, etc., while Protestantism, Catholicism, Calvinism, Unitarianism, Universalism, etc., with their numerous schisms, divisions, and subdivisions, are by no means out of the pale of further discussion.

All of these subjects are appreciated very differently by different persons, as the data on which they are predicated are interpreted by different standards. Some of them may be the expressions of great truths, others contain, perhaps, the germs of true principles not yet fully developed, or not yet clothed in that dress of language which can commend them to our judgment. And others are, we presume, the mere vagaries of perverted intellects or diseased propensities.—*Life Illustrated.*

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never perish, and a dominion that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.] Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y. Oct. 1857. [VOL. VII. No. 9.

Visit to Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

ABOUT the middle of June last we opened a new furrow with the plow of the kingdom of God; in other words, we made an excursion into Massachusetts and Rhode Island—both of them new ground—to speak to their citizens of "the wonderful works of God."

At Lawrence, Mass., a manufacturing town of 20,000 inhabitants, nine miles below Lowell, on the Merrimack river, and about 23 from Boston, there have been recently manifested a few believers of the gospel of the kingdom, in yielding to it the obedience it demands. At their request, we visited Lawrence for their benefit, and incidentally for that of the public. We found what had been, nine years ago, a sandy desert, now a thriving and populous place. The largest cotton mills in the world are said to be here. We have seen the mills in Manchester, Preston, Bolton, &c., and think it probable that they are excelled in magnitude by the Pacific Corporation and Atlantic Mills in Lawrence. The latter are decidedly superior to them in the beauty, and even elegance, of their surroundings. The neatness, cleanliness, and amplitude of their vicinity is not exceeded by Buckingham House or Windsor Castle. The mills are palatial, and their contiguous streets a standing rebuke to the largest and wealthiest city of the Union. Perhaps we were more struck with admiration at their cleanliness because of the perpetual disgust associated with the streets of the Empire City, in the midst of which we are condemned to pick our way in going to and fro.

The print works are next the river, which is backed up with a strong and massive dam, extending across it. In front of these are the spinning and weaving departments, in a

building six stories above the level of the ground. Immediately in front the area is laid out in flower beds and walks, enclosed by iron palisades. Before this is a railway from the mills to the freight depot of the Lawrence station. Next comes a canal, beginning above the dam, about 150 feet wide and 15 deep, and terminating in the river below the mills, at the mouth of a creek called the Spiggot. The canal is crossed by several tastily constructed bridges, at the ends of the streets leading into the town, and along its whole length is a promenade, adorned with trees, and a road of wide dimensions. Then a broad pavement and blocks of dwelling-houses, three or four stories high, belonging to the establishment. These are constructed with reference to the comfort, health and convenience of the tenants, and would form good models for tenement houses nearer home.

By favor of one of the brethren connected with the mills, we went all over them, and saw the working of them, from the carding of the raw material to the folding of the printed fabrics for home consumption and exportation. The works of man show him to be "the likeness of the Elohim;" for in all his works of art and industry the genius and skill he manifests are evidently the result of an organism after the model of theirs. Such works as these have the impress of deity upon them; not that the architects and builders are gods, far from it, but that an intelligent First Cause, and not blind chance, must have created him, "after his own image and after his own likeness," as the Bible says. How wonderful and wise must that Being be who created from the dust a creature so skillful and ingenious as man! No other animal, however sagacious, can equal him. His works alone are godlike, but too often, also, "devilish."

Great and ingenious are the works, but

their fabrics are flimsy, printed buckram, more fit for show than use. The cotton warp and wool filling literally pass through fire and water before they arrive at the consumer. In one place there are rows of flaming gas jets, over which the fabric passes, to be singed, so as to give it a finer appearance. In another place it is gummed and starched, to stiffen it, and to enable it to hold together, until it gets out of the factory. When the wearer sends the stuff to the wash-tub, the stiffening vanishes and the colors fly, and the fabric soon finds the rag-bag, to which it constitutionally belongs.

The engraving and printing processes are interesting. The patterns are cut into steel cylinders or rollers, and then transferred by pressure to copper rollers of the width of the fabric to be printed. The coloring matter is laid on these, so that when the fabric comes in contact with them they imprint the pattern there.

But we did not go to Lawrence to inspect mills and machinery. This was only incidental to our visit, which had a higher and nobler object in view. We went to call off the attention of their operatives and others to things of more enduring substance—to persuade them, or some of them, if possible, that "man shall live not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," and that, therefore, they ought not to devote all the days of their vanity to the present life, which is a vain show, but as much thereof as possible to the study of the divine word, by which alone man can live in the coming Aion, for "the just shall live by faith."

Before our arrival there, the brethren had placarded the town with a hundred posters, about three feet long, of which the following is a copy :

FREE LECTURES !

"Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."—*Paul*.

THEY WHO HAVE THE TRUTH ASK NO OTHER FAVOR THAN THAT OF BEING HEARD.

The public of Lawrence are respectfully invited to attend a Course of Lectures to be delivered in Lawrence Hall, by JOHN THOMAS, &c., of New York, commencing on the evening of June 20.

SUBJECTS OF THE LECTURES.

The Christ—What ?

The Mission of the Christ.

The Mosaic and Nazarene teaching concerning God.

Christ the Son of God and Son of Man.

Christ a Priest.

Christ a Sacrifice.

Christ a Man of War.

Dr. Thomas' exhibition of scripture teaching is entirely at variance with the popular theology of the present time.

The clergy are respectfully invited to attend, as an opportunity for discussion will be afforded them at the close of each lecture.

The result of these was the bringing together an audience of moderate dimensions, and after the likeness of a mixed multitude. None of the clergy, we believe, accepted the invitation to attend; but were, nevertheless, not indifferent altogether, inasmuch as they warned their worshippers to keep away from the Circus and Lawrence Hall! Knowing the instability and blindness of their flocks, they are afraid to trust them out of their sight. Ignorance being the parent of vice and church piety, they can only preserve them from the former, and perpetuate the latter, by authority. Instead of planting the truth in their hearts to reign there as "the law of the spirit of life," they rule them by authority; and that authority they know would soon be shaken to its foundation if they permitted them to be instructed in the scripture by those who call in question their daimonianism or divinity. Hence they commanded them not to go and hear, and thus forbade them to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." Read the subjects of the lectures, and remember that the clergy of Lawrence forbid their people going to hear them! What could have been their motive, but a fear that their members would come to discover that there were truths taught in the Bible which never came to light in their pulpit ministrations, and of which, in fact, "divines" are entirely ignorant? To enlighten the people on these topics would be to ruin the craft by which they have their hire and position. They and their flocks are ignorant of the scriptures. They got their religion and maintain their piety without them; and they are happy, shouting, "glory, hallelujah!" Why, then, disturb them? for

"Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

We spoke five times to congregations of people who had not the fear of the clergy before their eyes. Among them were some who, in rejecting the clergy, had cast off their traditions and authority without embracing the truth. Their idols were reason and what they call "philosophy." One of these, catechismally educated an English Papist, but now a "Secularist," stood up against us after one of our lectures. He

admitted that we had proved our positions, and that they were strictly scriptural; but, then, he denied the authority of the Bible, and consequently rejected the doctrine we had demonstrated. He said, he preferred one sentiment of Combe's Constitution of Man, Greeley and Fowler's Writings, Comte's Positive Philosophy, &c., to the whole of it. We folded our arms, and rested upon the desk, with the most determined patience. We allowed him to pour out all the bitterness of his soul without interruption. Having emptied his vessel to his entire satisfaction, he sat down. We thought the time was now appropriate to put a question, which we did, saying, "Allow me very respectfully to inquire if you understand the Bible you have so unmeasuredly condemned?" Upon this he rose, under considerable excitement, and retorted, "Do you understand it?" With studied calmness and blandness of speech, we remarked that that was interrogating us. If we said "Yes," or "No," our question to him would still be awaiting a reply. We had respectfully asked him if he understood the Bible; we did not ask him to inquire of us if we understood it. He would not say that he did, so that we were induced to say that it was very evident that he had been condemning what he did not understand; a practice which was very reprehensible in one who avowed himself a disciple of reason and philosophy! Do you believe that an immortal soul exists in man? "No; but I was taught to believe it in the catechism when a Catholic." Does the Bible teach that dogma? "No." Then you and the Bible appear to be on the same side of that important question. I should advise you to study it without prejudice, and you will find that the better you understand it, if sincere, the more you will admire and truly appreciate it.

Another secularist, not satisfied with the position of affairs, stood up and denounced Moses for a fillibuster, and Solomon for a Brigham Young! He admitted that Solomon was the wisest of men; but he had no respect for a book, a considerable portion of which was written by such fellows. He did not see how any man in his senses could accept it as a revelation from heaven. Reason and philosophy were enough for him, and both of these condemned it. Only think of a man giving an account of his own death after he was buried, as Moses appears to do! So of Joshua! He was willing to debate these matters with us for a week. If we would agree to do so, the Secularists would hire a hall for the purpose, and there the matter could be fully and freely discussed.

To this we replied that he might safely challenge us to a week's debate, as he might

know that the day after the morrow we had a series of appointments in Rhode Island. In relation to Moses, we were sorry to perceive that he was not as just and fair towards him as he would be to other authors. If in an autobiography he found an account of the author's death, he would immediately explain it by saying that the editor of the work had appended it. This was true of Deuteronomy and Joshua. The Oracles were committed to the Hebrew nation, whose authorities edited them, and added to them events as they came to pass, for the information of posterity, in obedience to the Mosaic law. The Bible was a volume composed of public and national records, requiring the political life of the nation for its development; and the nation being a peculiar people, the book is peculiar, and necessarily different from all other books. Its historiographers, who were also its priests and prophets, compiled its archives, communicating of their own knowledge what was necessary to its general comprehension.

In regard to Solomon, the Bible did not justify his excessive polygamy, but rather condemned it. But we will assume that his morals were bad—that a believer in revelation, and the writer of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, was corrupt in practice—we put it to our opponent whether such a man could not speak truth, without that truth being responsible for his evil deeds? We knew nothing at all of our opponent—he might be a very virtuous, and quite an immaculate man, or he might not. We could not tell which. He boasted, however, of reason and philosophy as superior to revelation in its principles and conduct. Would he, as a rationalist and a philosopher, cast a stone at Solomon upon the principle of being without offence? If he could not, it was hypocrisy, mere *ad captandum vulgus*, to be raising an issue against revelation because some of the officials of the Hebrew monarchy acted contrary to the precepts of the decalogue! Is philosophy false because philosophers lie, steal, and commit adultery? Is reason an imposition because they are irrational?

Here our secularist seemed to be in a tight place. He did not mean to say that he was clear of what was called sin; upon which he rambled off into a speculation about sin, in which he confounded sin and evil, between which he saw no difference, and therefore made God the author of both, on Bible principles, because he did not prevent it. We cut this short by remarking that he did not understand what he was talking about. The Bible declared that God was the author of evil, and human lust, of sin;

for "sin is the transgression of law" to which man is tempted when he is drawn away and enticed of his own lust—James i, 14; while evil is that with which God punishes sin.

As for reason and philosophy, they were but a broken reed upon which, in the absence of revelation, no stress could be laid. What had they done for the world during four thousand years, or for thirty-four centuries from the Flood to the appearance of Jesus and the Apostles? They had free scope, certainly, during that long period, but all they could do was to reason the world into the belief of idolatry and immortal soulism. They could not find out God, nor the constitution of man. Philosophy was as mutable as the wind; always changing with the fashion of the time, and assuming all sorts of colors according to the intellect that dabbled in it. Not so with revelation. It was steadfast and unchangeable, like the God that gave it. Smatterers were always prating about reason and philosophy, while the best minds the race could boast of were on the side of revelation. Our opponent admitted that Solomon was the wisest of men. He was, therefore, wiser than Combe, Greeley, and Comté, or even himself. Solomon was wiser than all philosophers. He approved the Bible and they rejected it. Sir Isaac Newton also believed it, and wrote in its favor. Likewise Lord Bacon, Milton, and many others of renown. For our part, we preferred their company, however few, to that of philosophers who are so irrational and blind as to condemn a book before they have come to a knowledge of its contents.

Lawrence abounds with this class of persons. Philosophy and vain deceit have cut them loose from the clergy and their communions without introducing them to the light. They hate the Bible, and openly avow it; the clergy pretend to love it, but pervert it to the ruin of all who trust them. The secularists, though more openly profane, are certainly more honest than the "seducing spirits" or divines. They have brought the Bible into contempt by their traditions and contradictions, which the secularists have mistaken for the teaching of the Bible itself. They have not sense enough to discern between the two; but very irrationally make the Bible responsible for clerical interpretation, which is foolishness. Secularism is a cesspool into which sinners of a freethinking disposition are driven by the blasphemies of clerical names and denominations. It is a profane antagonism to clerical hypocrisy and word-destroying tradition. The "Churches" profess to believe the Bible, while in truth they are as ignorant of its teaching, and as infidel of its contents, as the secularists; the

real difference being a question of fleshly piety and of open profanity. Both parties are blasphemous; that is, both bring the Bible into contempt and disuse by their principles and practice, only the clerical communities are piously infidel, while the secularists are impiously so! Thus it is that the extremes meet together and embrace each other—both are working ruin to themselves and the people, only in a different way.

From Lawrence we journeyed to Bristol, Rhode Island, *via* Boston and Providence. The latter was founded by Roger Williams, an English Baptist, who withdrew from a neighboring town to avoid the persecution of the Congregational or Baby-sprinkling clergy. These men are renowned in New England story for hauging Quakers and Baptists, and the burning of spiritualists, styled "witches," in those palmy days of clerical ascendancy. It is doubtless to secularism in the hearts of politicians that we are indebted for the restraint that binds the clergy now. The Lord makes devil fight devil for the punishment of devil, and for the safety of his "little flock"; for "the wicked are Jehovah's sword." Thus "the Earth helps the Woman," and commands the clergy to cease imprisoning, hanging, and burning the creatures of God who reject their authority and traditions. It is not that the present clerical generation is more enlightened and humane than its "fathers," in whom it rejoices, building their monuments, as the pious murderers of God's Son did those of the prophets whom their fathers slew—a wicked and adulterous generation both of them: but the clergy of our day are more infidel in heart, and feeling the restraint of their brethren the political secularists, they devote themselves to guarding the vested interests transmitted to them by their fathers, into whose labors they have entered abundantly. Let them alone, and they will let you alone; but if you will not let them rest, knowing their own weakness, they will still leave you unopposed, but direct all their influence upon their own worshipers to prevent them, if possible, from hearing anything that might cause a ripple upon the dead sea of their dominion. Their policy is now to keep things quiet. They care not that the people should be intelligent in the great principles of the truth; for if one of their flock gains light by studying the word, they mark him as a trouble in their Zion, and a disturber of its grave-like peace. So long as he will be content to echo their sentiments, and to "think with the court," they grant him ample liberty of speech; but as soon as he thinks with the Bible in question of the court's wisdom, his liberty is threatened, and

excommunication glares upon him with an eye of terrific wrath. They profess to love souls, whose worth is incalculable, and to be moved in all their doings by the love of them; but let an invaluable immortal soul embrace the promises of the Bible, and confess the faith of Jesus—let him become obedient thereto and contend earnestly for it, as he is commanded to do, and their hypocrisy becomes apparent. Instead of leaving the ninety and nine and seeking the recovery of the strayed soul of their flock out of what they suppose to be the snare of the devil, they turn their back upon him, and have no curse too bitter for his denunciation, or treat him with absolute indifference and silent contempt. Their affection is love for party's sake; and when he is no longer of any use to the party the clergy have no use for him, and abandon his "immortal soul" of "infinite preciousness" to the flames of hell for ever! This is the experience of many we know of in divers parts, and that of Roger Williams in particular, who fled to the Narragansett country, and there founded Providence as an asylum for those who were oppressed by clerical intolerance and fanaticism.

We arrived at Bristol on Thursday afternoon, June 25th. We found it a quiet, wealthy, and retired place, of some 6000 inhabitants, situated between two bays, styled Mount Hope and Narragansett. The country around is exceedingly beautiful, being diversified with hill and dale, land and water, islands and the main. Two things, however, detract from Bristol as a residence—winter cold, and carrion fish. It is the practice of the farmers to manure their onion fields with a fish called *Manhaden*, which frequents the waters in myriads styled "schools." These are strewn in cart-loads upon the land, where they are allowed to putrefy. On passing from the station to the friend's house where we were to encamp, we passed one of these fields, from which the stench arose so pungently as almost to cause sneezing. It infected us on the spot. Next morning we were drowsy and bilious, and were seized with diarrhoea, which did not leave us until our return to the dirty city of New York, where it was stopped by the bitter principle in Burton ale—an English ale made in America. We knew a gentleman in Matthews county, Virginia, who manured his land with fish in a certain year. The wind carried the effluvia to his house, where several of his family were infected. Typhus came on, and several died. If animal matter be used for manure, it ought to be buried, and not left to infect the atmosphere by rotting on the top of the soil. It would be more trouble; but that is nothing in compe-

tion with the public health. Bristol would be as healthy as it is beautiful but for this fish abomination.

The town of Bristol now includes a place called Pankunnawkut by the Indians, where Massasoit, chief of the Wampanoags in 1684, and grandfather of the celebrated King Philip, resided. While in these parts, we visited Mount Hope, which is notable in Indian story. The height, by measurement, is about 200 feet above the bay, and is well observed from Fall River, a town in Massachusetts, distant some four miles. There is a solitary tree now standing on the top. The view is very beautiful, being panoramic of the whole surrounding country. Mount Hope was known among the Narragansetts by the name Pokanoket, which signified in their language *the wood or land on the other side of the water*; and to the Wampanoags by the name *Lowwams*. This was the last retreat of King Philip, who became chief sachem in 1662. The English, for a long time, had endeavored to kill him, but could not find him off his guard, for he was always the first who was apprized of their approach. He having put to death one of his own men for advising him to make peace, the man's brother, whose name was Alderman, fearing the same fate, deserted him, and gave Captain Church an account of his situation, and offered to lead him to his camp, near Mount Hope. Arrived at the swamp where it was pitched, the English rushed in, and Philip, but just waked up and nearly naked, fled with all his might. Coming directly upon an Englishman and an Indian, the gun of the former missed fire, but Alderman, whose musket was loaded with two balls, "sent one through his heart and another not above two inches from it. He fell upon his face in the mud and water, and his gun under him,"

"Cold, with the beast he slew, he sleeps;
O'er him no illal spirit weeps.

Even that he lived, is for his conqueror's tongue;
By foes alone his death song must be sung;
No chronicles but theirs shall tell
His mournful doom to future times;
May these upon his virtues dwell,
And in his fate forget his crimes."

Captain Church ordered his body to be pulled out of the mire on to the upland; upon which some of the captain's Indians took hold of him by the stockings and some by his small clothes, being otherwise naked, and drew him through the mud to the upland. The captain then said, "Forasmuch as he has caused many an Englishman's body to lie unburied and rot above ground, not one of his bones shall be buried."

Having visited the memorable retreat of the Wampanoag sachems, we may inform the reader that there is a natural angular exca-

vation in an almost perpendicular rock, about six or eight feet from its base, called the chair, seat, or throne of King Philip, where it is said he and some of his chief men were surpris'd on the morning of August 12, 1676. This high rock is situated at the north part of Mount Hope, and is variously estimated from thirty to fifty feet high. From the seat is opened a fine view of the bay; and near the foot of the rock is a fine spring of water, at present much in need of cleaning, known to this day by the name of Philip's spring.

A Mr. Alden, the collector of curious epitaphs, says that Lieutenant-Governor Bradford, who died at Bristol 1808, in early life knew an aged squaw who was one of Philip's tribe, and well acquainted with him in her youthful days, and had often been in his wigwam. According to her, it was a few steps south of DeWolfe's summer-house, now in ruins, near the brow of a hill. The eastern side of this hill is very steep. When Church's men were about to rush upon Philip, he is said to have evaded them by springing from his wigwam as they were entering it, and rolling, like a hogshhead, down the precipice, which looks toward the bay. Having reached the lower part of this 'rightful ledge of rocks, without breaking his bones, he got upon his feet, and ran along the shore in a north-eastern direction, about a hundred rods, and endeavoured to screen himself in a swamp, then a quagmire, but now firm ground. Such is the tradition of the place, part of which is doubtless apocryphal. His rolling down like a hogshhead, and instead of all his bones being broken, starting up and running for his life, requires more credulity than we possess to receive it.

The death of Philip, and the consequent deportation of his "immortal soul" to hell, was a matter of great joy and thanksgiving to the clergy of the day. "During the bloody contest," says a writer, "the pious fathers wrestled long and often in prayer that God would prosper their arms, and deliver their enemies into their hands; and when upon stated days of prayer, the Indians gained advantage, it was looked upon as a rebuke of Providence, and animated them to greater sincerity and fervor; and, on the contrary, when their arms prevailed on such days, it was viewed as an immediate interposition in their favor." The philosophic mind will be shocked at the expressions of some very eminent in that day for piety and excellence of moral life. Dr. Increase Mather, in speaking of the efficacy of prayer in bringing about the destruction of the Indians, says, "Nor could they (the English) cease crying to the Lord against Philip until they had

prayed the bullet into his heart." And in speaking of the slaughter of Philip's people at Narragansett, he says, "We have heard of two, and twenty Indian captains slain all of them, and brought down to hell in one day." Again, in speaking of a chief who had sneered at the English religion, and who had "withal added a most hideous blasphemy, immediately upon which a bullet took him in the head, and dashed out his brains, sending his cursed soul in a moment amongst the devils and blasphemers in hell for ever."

The Increase Mather religion is still the ascendant piety at the old encampment of the Wampanoag sachem. It is the piety of African corsairs, whose posterity and wealth are the strength and respectability of the churches in Bristol. We addressed some of our contemporary Wampanoags on five several occasions at the Congregationalist temple there. It is the oldest "church" in the place, but not now in use; the congregation owning it having erected one more suited to the showiness and extravagance of the times. Some of the clergy here are of a more noble disposition than their brethren in Lawrence; for they not only did not warn the people not to hear, but came themselves to hear what we had to say. One congratulated us upon the testimony we had borne for the kingdom of God; another admitted that we understood ourselves, and adhered closely to scripture. We came to discover that the former was an old reader of our paper while we resided in Richmond and he in Trenton, N. J. He is now the pastor of a congregation calling itself "Christian Baptist," in contradistinction, we suppose, to Baptist congregations which are not Christian, of which there are a multitude in the land. He offered to subscribe for the Herald, but we had to decline his name, our copies being exhausted for this year.

We were escorted to this settlement of the Wampanoags by a friend who had formerly been obfuscated by the Millerite hallucination. There is a congregation of them at Bristol, but with many of the old crotchets purged out. They profess to be inquirers after truth, and have among them some candid and sincere men. We visited some of them with our friend, and were much pleased with the disposition they manifested. Our friend has pretty well freed himself from the thrall of Gentilism, which he clearly perceives to be mere heathenism, sprinkled with "holy water." We hope yet to hear of the word bearing fruit in Bristol. Paul may plant, Apollos water, but God only gives the increase when the fruit is to eternal life; for concerning all that attain to this, it is written, "They shall be all taught

of God ;" but to be taught of him, men must abandon the clergy, and become students of his word, for this is his teaching.

We left Bristol on Tuesday afternoon for Fall River, where we took the steamer Empire City, for New York. We left at 7 P.M., and arrived at the city by 6 A.M., and in two hours more arrived at home to breakfast. Here we have remained about twelve days, and are now about to start again in another direction ; and expect before our return to have visited Henderson, Ky., Memphis, Tenn., and De Soto county, Mississippi.

EDITOR.

July 13, 1857.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS UNDER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

"The Four Great Kings of Babylon,"

Continued from "The Light of Prophecy,"
by THOMAS LUNZDEN STRANGE. 1852.

(Concluded from page 152.)

4. The legs and the feet of the image, or the fourth beast.

BABYLON, as we have seen, stands forth as the great corrupter of the earth, and opponent of God, and her final and yet future judgement comes upon her at the time of the crisis of all things, when the Lord Jesus takes unto himself his great power and reigns. It is at this time, and under similar circumstances, that the image of the vision meets its doom. It is seen standing in all its strength and grandeur at the period when the kingdom of the stone cut out without hands is brought in ; and then, as being antagonistic to that kingdom, it is crushed to dust, and scattered to the wind. There is thus a close correspondence both as to position and fate, between the image and Babylon.

The three first members of the vision, who have appeared and passed away, have proved to have been three kings of Babylon. The thing in common among them, whereinto they were consolidated as parts of one and the same great image, was just this empire of Babylon. The fourth must then hold place in the same object, and be a king of Babylon, and he must be found at the time of the end ranged in open hostility to the Lord Jesus, when he comes to his Kingdom, and at his hands must perish. None other, it is evident, can fill this place but the Antichrist, that wicked one "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of

his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (2 Thessa. ii, 8.) He, then, must be the fourth member of the visions.

The object of the visions has been much misconceived, when it has been thought that they have been given in order to the exhibition to us of political changes, which were to take place upon the earth, as occurring in a succession of empires, the one arising from the overthrow of the other, and ruling each in its turn in supremacy. Consolidation, and not disruption, is the marked feature of the great image, and the true end thereof is to put before us that centralization of human power which stands in opposition to the dominion of the Lord Jesus, and which is to be cast down and demolished when he comes to his right and reigns. It shows, in fact, the working of that self-will, and self-glorification, acting in enmity against God, common to our rebellious race, which are to be headed up in him who will be the embodiment of all iniquity, and of all hatred to God, and who is known, therefore, supereminently, as "the Antichrist—the man of sin."

Throughout the several points of the vision, there should, then, be features in common to all the subjects thereof, of a nature to identify them with this personage, in whom they meet with a common end, and such as may serve, furthermore, to display them in marked contrast to the Lord Jesus, against whom they stand, and by whom they are to be put down. Such will be found to exist ; and the close correspondence in those distinguishing points between the three first members of the visions, known of, and gone by, and the Antichrist, is the fourth, who has yet to come, will serve to add to the proof that he it is who takes up this last place on the legs and the feet of the image, and the fourth beast.

1. The members of the vision are all individual personages.

That the first of them was an individual man—Nebuchadnezzar—and not a system or dynasty, in which many were to have part, is undeniable, since the Scripture passes by the whole of his predecessors and successors, declaring that in him this portion of the image stood complete in all its fullness. The actions attributed to the second member of the visions, which could be true but of one, and were realized by Cyrus, demonstrated that he fulfilled this portion, and that none of his line had part with him in it. The third member, Alexander, necessarily stands single as to his kingdom, for he was the founder thereof, and its sole possessor, none who followed him having retained his empire. The individuality of the

fourth member will the better appear when the details that concern him are gone into. Then it may be assumed to attach to him, as he is spoken of in the vision in the self same terms as the other three, and stands in membership with them in the same image. The Antichrist who is held to be this fourth member, will undoubtedly be an individual. If, by what is said of him, a system or a class of beings, had been intended, the terms "that man of sin—the son of perdition," and the designation of "the Antichrist," could not have been used; for these all speak of individuality, and that of a special sort, distinguishing the one referred to, as before observed, preëminently above all others.

The stone cut out without hands, by which the great image is to be destroyed, is also an individual, being universally known and acknowledged to be the Lord Jesus, to whom the same figure is more than once applied in Scripture.

The objects of which the image are composed, are thus in each instance alike. The first being an individual king, as all must be constrained to allow; the second is not a line of kings; and the third at one time a consolidated empire, and at another four divided and conflicting kingdoms; and the fourth, as system—so or many have taught. The incorporated image is not made up of such discordant materials, but every particular portion partakes of the same nature as its fellow portion, so that each can appropriately enter into the constitution of the other, and all form together one consistent whole.

2. *They are all kings of Babylon.*

Nebuchadnezzar was such, beyond room for question, and it was in Babylon that the thrones of Cyrus and Alexander were set up at the conclusion of their conquests. Cyrus is hence, as we have seen, definitively called in Scripture, a "king of Babylon," and Alexander, whose title to the appellation rests upon the very same grounds, constructively so, as the "first king;" that is, the first of his line who ruled there. That the Antichrist will also be a king of Babylon, the Scriptures plainly disclose. Among the horns on the head of the fourth beast of the vision, there arises a "little horn," who is a personage intimately associated with the Antichrist, and hereafter to be spoken of. As the beast is otherwise matured in form when he appears upon him, this little horn can but spring up from some place which is a portion of the dominion of the beast. We learn, in effect, that he has his origin in one of the divisions of Alexander's empire, all of which, according to the rule of consolidation belonging to the image, should here-

after appertain to the Antichrist. "Therefore," we are told, "the he goat (Alexander) waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and from it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great." After this the Antichrist is himself spoken of as also in alliance with this empire. "And the rough goat is the king of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now, that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And in the latter time of their kingdom,* when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up, and his power shall be mighty. (Dan. viii, 8, 9, 21, 24.) The Antichrist, and with him the little horn, are thus connected with the dominion of their predecessor, the third member of the visions,

Further on, we learn in which of the four divisions of the empire it is that the throne of Antichrist is to subsist. In the eleventh chapter of Daniel, there is an account of the kings of the South and of the North, who are rulers of two of these divisions; namely Egypt, as is specifically signified in verse 8, which was the southernmost division; and Syria, which lay directly north thereto. From verse 5 to verse 12 the operations of the kings of Egypt are detailed; and from verse 13 to verse 20, those of the kings of Syria; and after mention of one of them, who was to be known as a raiser of taxes, it goes on to say, "and in his estate shall stand up a vile person," whose history occupies the remainder of the chapter.

This "vile person," now under consideration, is, we thus find, to be in existence "at the time of the end," (ver. 40.) and is to "prosper till the indignation be accomplished;" (ver. 36;) and "at that time" is to be the period of Jacob's "trouble," out of which he is to be "delivered;" connected wherewith a resurrection of the dead is then spoken of. (Chap. xii, 1, 2.) The one who prospers up to the time of this crisis, is indubitably the Antichrist, and he, consequently, must be this "vile person;" and hence, as succeeding to the "raiser of taxes" in whose estate he stands up, the Syrian division of the empire of Alexander, it is clear, is to be the place of his dominion; and in that division was Babylon.

* This affords no room for the intervention of any kingdom, as being indicated in these prophecies, between that of the successors of Alexander, and that of the Antichrist. Place for the Roman Empire, to which the fourth part of the vision is so universally applied, is thus not to be found in these prophecies.

But the Scripture brings us still closer to the region of his power, and shows us that it will be centered in Assyria, and more definitely still, in Babylon.

The connection between the overthrow of Babylon, and the redemption of Israel, has been seen, as also that the time of the deliverance of Israel is to be preceded by the period of their greatest trouble. The Antichrist will be the instrument of this their last tribulation, and as they are brought out of it, he will be consigned to destruction. The "vile person" has just this career. He aggresses upon Israel, and then meets his doom, and this at the close of their final trial. "And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas (the Mediterranean and the Red Sea) in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and then shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." (Dan. xi, 45; xii, 1.)

Now it is as the Assyrian that he thus acts towards Israel, and hence his connection with Babylon, the capital of Assyria, is the more evidently manifested. "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in thine hand is my indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so," (he has no thought of serving God's purposes in this,) "but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. . . . Wherefore it shall come to pass, that when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem," (when the time of all her tribulation is accomplished,) "I will punish the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks. . . . Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Hosts, O my people that dwelleth in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian; he shall smite thee with a rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction. And the Lord of Hosts shall stir up a scourge for him. . . . And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing" (when Israel is

made holiness to the Lord.) . . . And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. . . . With righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips" (see 2 Thess. ii, 8,) "shall he slay the wicked." (Isa. x, 5-33; xi, 1-4.) "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land. . . . and they shall rule over their oppressors. And it shall come to pass in the day that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the scepter of the rulers. He who smote the people in wrath with a continual stroke, he that ruleth the nations in anger, is persecuted, and none hindereth. . . . The Lord of Hosts hath sworn, saying, "Surely, as I had thought so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand: that I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under foot; then shall his yoke depart from off them, and his burden depart from off their shoulders." (Isa. xiv, 1-6, 24-26.) "Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up his breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound. . . . And the Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard, and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering and tempest, and hailstones. "For through the voice of the Lord" (see again, 2 Thess. ii, 8,) "shall the Assyrian be beaten down which smote with a rod. . . . For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the King" (this king of Assyria—see Rev. xix, 20,) "it is prepared: he hath made it deep, and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it." (Isa. xxx, 26-33.) "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: whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. . . . And this man shall be the peace when the Assyrian shall come into our land: and when he shall tread in our palaces, then shall we raise against him seven shepherds and eight principal men. And they shall waste the land

of Assyria with the sword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof: thus shall he deliver us from the Assyrian, when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our borders. And the remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men. And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who, if he go through, both treadeth down and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver." (Mic. v, 2-8.)

The testimony is thus complete that the Antichrist, the instrument of the last and greatest of the tribulations of Israel, will be an Assyrian, and the king of Babylon.

3. They are builders together of the empire of Babylon.

Nebuchadnezzar founded the glory of the capital, saying of it, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of my kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?" And in his hands the state first became dominant among surrounding nations. Cyrus brought in the kingdoms of Media and Persia, adjoining them to the dominions of Babylon. Alexander still farther increased the empire, contributing thereto the territories of Greece, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt. Thus the image grew under their hands as each took his place in it, supplying the substance thereof, and adding to its proportions. The part that the Antichrist performs as a constructor of the empire, must be considered hereafter, when the particulars of the vision connected with him are treated of.

The Lord Jesus, on his side, is the founder of the kingdom which he has to set up, but unlike what springs from man. His dominion is not to be confined in its comprehensiveness by shape or size as is the image, which, reaching from the head to the feet, is incapable of further extension. The stone cut out without hands, and thus unrestricted in figure or dimensions, is a type of this. "Of the increase of his government . . . there shall be no end." (Isa. ix, 7,) and he is without coadjutors in the work of raising it up, but is the Alpha and the Omega, the author and finisher of the whole.

4. They are all kings aspiring to universal rule.

Nebuchadnezzar, the first member, was a "king of kings, . . . and wheresoever the children of men dwelt," they had been "given into his hand," and he was made the "ruler over them all." Upon Cyrus also,

the second member, had been conferred "all the kingdoms of the earth;" (Ezra i, 2,) that is, all which he came in contact with. Alexander, the third member, had even more extended sway, and in his contest with Darius, which was one for universal empire, is reported to have said, "that as the heavens could not bear two suns, neither could the earth suffer two kings." The Antichrist is to be a still mightier potentate than any of his predecessors in the image. Satan, who is "the prince of this world," will give him "his power, and his seat, and great authority," and "all the world" will "wonder after him, and he will have power over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him." (Rev. xiii, 2-8.) Babylon, the place of the thrones of these rulers, is thus "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

5. They all act in self-will, and so usurp the proper attribute of God.

Of Nebuchadnezzar it is said that all "people, nations, and languages, trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive, and whom he would he set up, and whom he would he put down. But," it is added, "when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him," (Dan. v, 19, 20,) "and he learned to know that all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing" before the Most High, and that it is *He* that "doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (chap. iv, 35.) Of Cyrus also, under the figure of the ram, it is said that "he did according to his will," (chap. viii, 4,) and so also of Alexander, that he should "do also according to his will," (chap. xi, 13.) The same has likewise been predicted of the Antichrist as the vile person. "The king," it is said, "shall do according to his will." (Chap. xi, 36.)

The characteristic of the Lord Jesus was the very reverse of this, for he came "not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him." (John vi, 38.)

6. They are all addicted to idolatry, honoring thus other than the true God.

Nebuchadnezzar, besides doubtless carrying on habitually the idolatrous worship of Babylon, set up a golden image in the plain of Dura, and caused all under his authority to fall down and worship it. (Chap. iii, 1-6.) Cyrus viewed the earth and the sun as gods, and worshipped them, and, when

dying, rejoiced in the thought of reposing in the bosom of the earth, as in that of a deity. Alexander was so earnest an idolater, that he sacrificed to the gods of every country which he visited in his course of conquest. The Antichrist will also be a promoter of idolatry. He is to honor "the god of forces, and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory." (Chap. xi, 38, 39.) This strange god, unknown to any who had gone before, is probably his own image which is to be set up for adoration, (Rev. xiii, 14,) for his act of honoring it is introduced by the declaration that he shall not regard "the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, (the Lord Jesus,) nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all." (Dan. xi, 37.)

7. Lastly, they assume the very place and powers of the Divinity.

Nebuchadnezzar openly defied the living God, saying to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, when they refused to do homage to the image which he had set up, "Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" arrogating thus to himself a superiority above God. Cyrus received public adoration as a god when he appeared in procession before a countless host after the capture of Babylon. Alexander assumed to be the son of Jupiter Ammon, and thus of divine origin, heading all his letters and orders as such; and when he conquered Darius, he caused himself to be worshiped as a god. The Antichrist will go beyond all his predecessors in this daring attempt to dethrone Jehovah, and to magnify himself to his seat. He will do this in a determinate way, choosing the very temple of God for the exhibition of himself in His room. He "opposeth and exalted himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped: so that he, as god, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii, 4.)

The first member of the vision was as a lion, the second as a bear, and the third as a leopard. The fourth is said to be "dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly," but his form is not given. In the description of the Antichrist in the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation, we have it, and it is found to be made up of the figures of the other three. "And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion."

The association of the Antichrist with the

three first beasts of the vision, is here very evident, and his part in the fourth, the most important and formidable of them all, cannot be doubted. Its features are here undicated, simply because he is himself that fourth.

The incorporation and oneness of the members of the visions, becomes thus as perfect in the visions of the beasts, as in that of the great image, and the whole are found to center and be represented in the last that appears upon the scene—the Antichrist.

The three first members of the vision, it has been seen, were severally constructors of the empire of Babylon, as typified by the great image. Each brought in his contributions, and the successive portions were added on, the one to the other; nothing, up to that period, being lost of what had gone before. But from the time that Alexander, the third member, passed away, this condition of the empire ceased to be. The work of disruption began; the provinces of the state were disjointed and severed; Babylon herself, the place of the throne, became a utter ruin; and the strength, the glory, and the very proportion of the great image, disappeared.

But in the latter day, as we said, this image is to be found standing in all its brightness and terribleness, and in the full dimensions of its stature. Nothing that the earlier members brought in will then be wanting. The head of gold, the breast and the arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, will all be there, together with the legs of iron, and the feet of iron and clay.

The Antichrist, to take his place in the image, must be a constructor thereof, equally with his predecessors, and as the whole of their labors has come to nought, and the image perfected by them to its lower limbs, has been dismembered, and no more exists, upon him it must devolve to reproduce it in all its parts, and to restore it as it was.

Notes on the Above.

1. "A king of Babylon must be found at the time of the end, ranged in hostility to the Lord Jesus." Of this there can be no doubt. But, although king of Babylon, it does not, therefore, follow that the old town called Babylon must be rebuilt; for *Babylon*, we have shown, is used in scripture in more senses than one, being the name of a town on the Euphrates, a province, an empire, and a mystical city. A man may be king of Babylon, and in Babylon, and yet the old aggregation of houses so called have no existence.

2. Before Mr. Strange published the

speculations before us, we had abundantly proved that "the objects of Daniel's vision had been much misconceived;" and that their principal design was to exhibit the crisis of the latter days in the subversion of the kingdom of men, termed *Babylon*, by the kingdom of God, styled *the stone*; and that the image of Nebuchadnezzar, representative of the kingdom of men in full manifestation, had yet to attain to the perfect stature of a Man in Satan, antagonistic to the Man in Christ, the mystical stone. Mr. Strange, therefore, agrees with us when he says, that "consolidation, and not disruption, is the marked future of the great image, and the true end thereof is to put before us that *centralization of human power* which stands in opposition to the dominion of the Lord Jesus, and which is to be cast down and demolished when he comes to his right, and reigns."

3. "The members of the vision are all individual personages." The erroneusness of this will appear by reference to No. 3 of our notes on page 182, col. 2. The second member of the visions, that is, the silver of the image, the bear of the four beasts, and the ram of Dan. viii, he says, "referred only to one man, and he, Cyrus the Persian, with whom none of his line had any part. But this notion is overturned by Daniel telling Nebuchadnezzar that the silver of the image represented "a kingdom," not a man, "inferior to" him, or to the kingdom of which he was the executive chief. "After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron." According to Mr. Strange's strange theory, Daniel should have said, "After thee, Nebuchadnezzar, shall arise another king, one Cyrus, a man inferior to thee, and another third king of brass, one Alexander; and the fourth king, Antichrist, shall be strong as iron." But, as we have said before, Mr. Strange errs in mistaking *powers* for individual men. Cyrus was prophesied of by name, indeed, but not as part of the visions of Daniel; but as a representative man, in Isaiah, typifying Messiah as the subverter of Babylon, restorer of Israel, and rebuildier of the temple. The Plymouth brotherist principle of interpretation is too *personal*, not enough *potential*, to elaborate the truth.

4. The Antichrist is a combination of persons and power, not a single man. There will, doubtless, be a last man of the power, through whom that power will find expression; but it does not, therefore, follow that the Antichrist power does not exist till that

last man is enthroned. Spirit precedes matter. The spirit of the thing exists as the germ thereof previous to its manifestation. Hence, the *spirit* of Antichrist worked in the apostolic age, in which there were many Antichrists—1 Jno., ii, 18; and by which it was then known that it was "the last hour" of the Mosaic dispensation. The spirit of Antichrist was the *denial that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh*, that is, that he had immaculate flesh, a holier flesh than falls to the common lot of man—1 John iv, 3. This spirit has become material or corporate in "the church" termed "Christendom," but properly *Antichristendom*, or the Dominion of Antichrist, and has inspired the late decree affirming the Immaculate Conception of the mother of Jesus, that a clean nature, or something else than "the flesh" might be born of her! We see, then, that Antichrist exists, for the co-apostolic spirit thereof is in vigorous and corporate activity in "the powers that be." Antichrist, however, we admit readily, has not attained to his full manifestation. His power awaits its consolidation in the giving of the power and strength of the ten-horn kingdoms to the eighth head of the beast (Rev. xvii, 13-17) which will be the development of "the devil and his angels" in full. This is a future event, and must, of course, occur under the sovereignty of some one man who may then happen to be enthroned. This one man is not the Antichrist, but the representative, for the time being, of *the power* which already exists, and has existed for ages, in the world.

5. The little horn of the goat, in Dan. viii, is neither racial nor personal, but potential. It is the symbol of human power consolidated against Israel in the east, and which magnified itself against Jesus, the Prince of the host; took away the daily sacrifice; cast down Jerusalem, the place of its sanctuary; leveled the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law (Rom. ii, 20); and cast down of the host and the stars of Judah to the ground, and stamped upon them; destroyed the people of the holy ones, and is yet to stand up against the Prince of Princes at the epoch of its fall, to rise no more for a thousand years. And yet Mr. Strange tells us, in effect, that the little horn is a personal Antichrist, and affords no scope in its symbol for the Roman element of power.

6. Mr. Strange directs the reader's attention to Dan. xi, 21, where he finds mention made of "a vile person," which, without a shadow of proof, he declares is Antichrist, "whose history occupies the remainder of the chapter!!" Having swept out of his

way nineteen verses of difficulties, he falls upon verse 40, where he finds the phrase, "at the time of the end;" and assuming that the "vile person" and "the king" of verse 36 are the same, he makes this verse testify that the vile person is to "prosper till the indignation be accomplished." "We thus find," says he, "this vile person to be in existence at the time of the end!" Upon the same unprincipled interpretation he might have found Alexander the Great to have existence at the time of the end; for if assertion be proof, anything may be proved. But we deny that this "vile person" is Antichrist, that he is identical with "the king," and that his history occupies the remainder of the chapter. We have shown in Anatolia and Elpis Israel the interpretation of this whole chapter of Daniel, which no writer, great or small, has attempted to impugn or invalidate. For ourselves, we believe it to be invulnerable. We have there shown to what this chapter refers from verse 21 to the end, and need not repeat it here. We will only quote our paraphrase of verse 21, to show who the vile person was: "*And in his, Seleucus Philopator's, place shall stand up Heliodorus, a vile person, being both a poisoner and usurper, to whom they, the authorities of the nation, shall not give the honor of the kingdom; but Antiochus Epiphanes shall come in peaceably and obtain the kingdom by flatteries bestowed on the party of Heliodorus.*" The italics are the text, the Roman type the interpretation. Shall not Antichrist obtain the honor of the kingdom obtained by flatteries? This is certainly not the kingdom of God. The vile person cannot possibly be Antichrist, for even Mr. Strange admits that Antichrist is to be great above all, even in the temple of God.

7. We are told by this writer, that Christ is without coadjutors in the work of raising up his government! Yet Micah tells us that, in delivering Israel from the Assyrian, which is part of the work of raising up the new government, there are to be seven shepherds and eight princes of men—Micah v, 5; and the spirit of Christ in John testifies that the undefiled follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes; and that he has with him in the war against the kings of Europe "the called, the faithful, and the chosen" and Daniel says that the fourth beast system of powers is destroyed by the saints. Yet Mr. Strange strangely affirms that Messiah has no coadjutors in the work!

8. Having assumed that the old town Babylon is to be rebuilt, and that because it was once the locality of the throne of the Babylonian kings, it must be so to the end,

he assumes also that Satan gives his throne to Antichrist, and that in so doing he will give him the mounds of Euphrates overspread with palaces. These things assumed, he concludes: "Babylon, the place of the thrones of these rulers, is thus 'that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.'—Rev. xvii, 18."

Put a few testimonies into Mr. Strange's crucible, and he can bring out any "thus" to suit himself. He doubtless calculated widely on the credulity of his readers, for he writes like one who has no fear of being asked for proof. When John peened the words quoted, the Euphratean town was in ruins, and had no dominion. John spoke of a great city, reigning while he wrote—*ἡ εχουσα βασιλειαν επι*—having dominion over the rulers of the earth; that city was the Tiburean Babylon, the then present inheritor of the sovereignty of the kingdom of men, which had passed from Nineveh to Babylon, and thence to Rome.

9. The "strange god" of Dan. xi, 39, Mr. Strange tells us, "is probably Antichrist's own image, which is to be set up for adoration!" This is absurd. The "desire of women," if the parenthesis be in the right place, is the Lord Jesus! This is absurder; and Antichrist is to be in the temple of God, which is the absurdest of all. The absurdity in the positive and comparative degree is sufficiently manifested in Anatolia, p. 45, and Elpis Israel, p. 362. We may, therefore, here simply refer to them. A word or so may, however, be added concerning the absurdity in its superlative degree.

It is a common notion, founded upon the English version of 2 Thess. ii, 3, that "the Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition," is to be found in "the temple of God," in the sense of that temple being "the church of God." But the Man of Sin belongs not to the temple, but to "the court which is without the temple, which is given unto the Gentiles."—Rev. xi, 2. An amended translation will put Paul's words in a true and intelligible light. Thus, "*The Man of Sin, the Son of Perdition, opposeth and exulteth himself above every one called a god, or august; so that he sits as a god in the temple of the god, exhibiting himself because he is a god.*" Let the reader compare this with Dan. xi, 37, and he will doubtless perceive that one and the same god is referred to by Daniel and Paul. The strange god of the former, "who regards not the desire of wives, nor respects any god, for he magnifies himself above all," is clearly identical with the Man of Sin power, which exalts himself above every one, "forbids to marry, and commands to abstain from meats."—1st Tim. iv. 3. It is "in the

estate of the king who doth according to his will," and not in the temple of the living and true God, that this ambitious god is found. That king's estate belongs to the court without the temple of God; in which court the temple of the god is seen. There, as upon a stage, the papal puppet, the image of the Beast, exhibits himself as a god, and is worshiped by the fools that bow to him the knee, and kiss his toe. He is a god strange or foreign to the worship of the Pagan Cæsars, who knew him not, for it remained for their besotted successors in the Roman purple to set him up in their estate. Mr. Strange is, therefore, far wide of the mark in teaching that Antichrist will yet exhibit himself in "the very temple of God." This is mere fal-lal, being without the shadow of a foundation in the scriptures of truth. EDITOR.

August 25, 1857.

Theopolitical.

An Editorial Offset.

"Dr. Thomas has published that the recent Russian war would not terminate till the Lord should come, and destroy Gog and his army on the mountains of Israel. The war has terminated in a general peace; he Lord has not come; Gog has been turned back and consequently has not been on the mountains of Israel."—*Expositor*, p. 662. A. D. 1857.

Our friend of *The Expositor* seems to think, that what he terms "the recent Russian war," is over, having terminated in "a general peace," as he considers the present suspension of arms among the belligerents. We have said that the antagonism between Russia and Britain, aided by whatever allies she may be able to diplomatize in her interest, will not terminate until the Lord comes and punishes Leviathan, the crooked and piercing serpent, the dragon of the sea, (Isaiah xxvii, 1,) upon the mountains of Israel. Our contemporary thinks that we have made a mistake in this matter. Now, we never have pretended to infallibility, or an exemption from error, especially in our views of the details of the future. As to the general outlines, we have "full assurance of faith," and "full assurance of hope," and cannot be shaken with respect to them. We are certain that the kingdom of God will be set up, or restored, in the Holy Land; that the twelve tribes of Israel will be planted there by Jesus Christ; and that he will conquer Leviathan on the mountains of his kingdom. We can make no mistake about this while we retain the faculty of reading the English Bible, where these points stand out in such bold relief, that a child may read and understand. Upon all these points, with a multitude of

others equally plain and obvious, our respected friend has been infidel and dogmatically deniant, while professing to be a true believer and a christian. These arc errors that cannot be offset, or transmuted into harmless mistakes, by publishing mistaken notions of Dr. Thomas' views or opinions of unrevealed details strongly expressed. We have not been trained in the expression of our views and convictions in the "Circumlocution Office." We have neither time, space, nor taste, for circumlocution; and in expressing strong convictions, we use our own language in our own sense of its terms. We say, then, that the Russian war has not ended, and that the present is not "a general peace," but a temporary truce, or suspension of arms. We have, over and over again, declared our conviction, that the Russian war, or antagonism, in the great Eastern Question, is resolvable into four stages: and that the independence of Turkey and the integrity of its territory, cannot be maintained, though all the world should decree the same. The events of the past two years demonstrate the truth of this position. We do not walk by sight. We do not form our views of the future by present temporary incidents. Because Sebastopol has fallen, and a truce exists, we do not admit that the Russian war is over. The French war was not over because there was a general pacification of Europe in 1802, which lasted till May 1803. The interval afforded scope for modifying the course of events. This is the character of the present interval between the treaty of Paris, and the future renewal of blood. We walk by faith, and are fully assured that the policy of Britain and France will be circumvented, and that Russia will triumph; and that her triumph can only be converted into irremediable disaster and defeat by the King of the Jews, at his advent, in power and great glory. "Gog has" not yet "been turned back," as our respected friend of *The Expositor* supposes; for he has never yet "pitched the tent of his entrenched camp between the seas" upon the mountains of Israel—Dan. xi. 45; and it is from thence that he is to be turned, and not from the frontier formed by the Pruth. When turned back only a sixth part of Gog will survive, which was not the fact at the fall of Sebastopol.—Ezek. xxxix, 2.

Our friend says, we have "observed" profound silence as to, what he terms, our "miscalculations." We hope he will let his readers know, in the republishing of these remarks *verbatim*, that the silence is at length broken; and that we have neither time, space, nor disposition, to reply to all the misrepresentations of our views, that,

from divers causes, find their way into print. We can afford to be silent, knowing that time will rectify misapprehensions, and justify us in our position. The *first stage* of the Russian war has terminated; and the *transition period*, between the first and second stages, is present with us. "There is no peace for the wicked," saith Jehovah; yet are the wicked not always slaying and killing one another with the edge of the sword. The Little Horn was to make war upon the saints, until the Ancient of Days come. The war still continues, though the saints no longer continue to fall by sword, and imprisonment, and torture; for they continue to contend by their testimony, and the Ancient of Days has not yet come.—Dan. vii, 21, 22. Can our friend not now understand how that blood may cease to flow in battle, and yet war continue till the controversy be finally assuaged? The Russian war is in continuance, only, for the present, diplomatically waged. The subject of diplomatic strife is the same as when Sebastopol was besieged, *the independence and integrity of Turkey*. The following article from the *New York Times*, will show the reader the point at which that matter of debate has arrived. We submit it to him without further comment, leaving our friend of *The Expositor* to his own reflections on the premises.

Aug. 25th, 1857.

EDITOR.

Turkish Independence.

"The last mails bring news of rather a serious political complication at Constantinople, arising out of differences between the French Ambassador, and Redschid Pasha, touching the union of the two Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. As far as we know at present, the influence of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, hitherto paramount in the councils of the Porte, seems to be on the wane, and that of the French minister to be in the ascendant. Ups and downs of this sort in the fortunes of Turkish ministers have, however, been so very common for the last seven years, that it would be absurd to pretend to see in them any indications that can guide us in judging of the future of the Ottoman Empire.

"In one point of view, however, the few lines of the dispatch which tells us that the French Ambassador made the resignation of the Sultan's ministry the only condition on which he would consent to maintain diplomatic intercourse, are pregnant with meaning. No one who followed the history of the late war, however carelessly, can forget with what warmth all the 'notes' of

all the great lights of diplomacy insisted upon the necessity of extricating the Ottoman Government, from its position of degrading dependence upon foreign influence. According to Nesselrode, Russia went to war wholly and solely to secure to the Sultan the free and untrammelled exercise of his sovereign rights. Drouyn de L'Huys, on behalf of France, and Clarendon, on behalf of England, were equally ardent in declaring that they, too, had fully made up their minds that the time was come for making the Padishah a member of the great European confederacy, and guaranteeing to him, as to all such powers, complete liberty of action inside his own dominions, reserving to themselves, however, the privilege of 'remonstrating' in favor of religious toleration. To estimate these declarations at their full value, we must remember that ever since the beginning of this century, ever since, in short, Turkey became weak and disorganized, the actual ruler of the Ottoman Empire, has been, not the Sultan or the Grand Medjliss, but whichever the foreign ambassadors, for the time being happened to be the greatest bully, or in the fiercest mood, or in possession of the most determined will, he was the actual sovereign of the country. The Sultan occupied very much the position of the princes of the Merovingian dynasty in France, and the foreign plenipotentiaries were the Mayors of his palace. Each of them had his favorite among the Turkish pachas, and fought and snarled and threatened to procure his advent to power, with as much ferocity as Stamboul dogs over the bones of an old horse. The natural result was to crush out every spark of nationality amongst the Turks, and to convince every aspirant for office that his only chance of success lay, not in deserving well of his country, but in pandering to the whims and caprices of foreign emissaries. What was done *en grand* in the Capitol, was done *en petit* in the provinces. Every pashalik had its Russian, French, and British Consul, who bullied its Governor, and fought over his prostrate carcase; reported him, and called for his removal, after the manner of their superiors in the metropolis. The brunt of these battles, of course, mainly fell on the representatives of Russia and England. The one was able to threaten Turkey by land, and the other by sea. One could throw 100,000 men ashore in Bulgaria, the other to anchor a dozen line of battle ships in the Golden Horn. The Sultan was a shuttlecock between them, and they battered him about till he became the laughing stock of the world.

"At the close of the last war, we were

told we were to have had an end of this. Turkey was to be placed in such a position, that a Russian Minister would no more think of calling for the dismissal of Red-schid Pasha, than of requesting Lord Palmerston to retire into private life; and the British Minister would as soon insist upon appointing the Grand Vizier, as upon nominating a candidate for the American Presidency. Russian influence once overthrown, by the capture of Sebastopol, and the destruction of the Black sea fleet, the halcyon days of Turkey were to begin. The Ministers were to be the Sultan's, the police the Sultan's, and in short the country was to belong to the Turkish Government.

"The controversy about the Principalities, which has now been dragging its slow length along for two weary years, and the foreign intrigues which have been hatched in rapid succession in the seraglio ever since the treaty was signed, and this last Ministerial crisis which has resulted in the overthrow of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's favorite, all prove, that as far as Turkey herself is concerned, the war has simply given her a master the more. Instead of receiving all her kicks and smiles and insults from Russia and England alone, she now gets a few from France as well, and is hobbling along on the old beaten track of foreign dependence, and will, in our opinion, hobble along it to the end, which cannot be very far distant. The spasmodic attempts at reform, of which we hear but the faint echo, are but the struggles preceding dissolution. These diplomatic conflicts waged by the dragomans, in the halls of the Porte, are but heralds of sterner controversy which the three great powers of Europe will yet wage, and at no very remote period, over the remains of the extinguished empire."

Analecta Epistolaria.

The Truth in Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 25, 1857.

BRO. THOMAS.—Baptism, without the Abrahamic faith, is once more rejected and cast to the moles and bats. On the evening of the 20th we proceeded to the water, in company with four candidates for immersion, viz.: two members of the Baptist church, one a Methodist, and another who had been baptized into Campbellism and Millerism, having been of the class spoken of by the prophet, in the 107 Ps. 23 v. I must say to you this is, in maritime language, a main-top-sail haul, having been performed in the presence of the preacher. They rejected that baptism that is called by the baptist preach-

ers "a divine command," and with the next breath they denounce it as "non-essential." They rejected the teachings of men, and fled for refuge to the promises of God made to the fathers of Israel, of which promises says Paul, Heb. 6: 17 v., "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his council, confirmed it with an oath, that by two immutable things in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor to the soul." They can now say, in the language of Paul when arraigned before the Sanhedrim, Acts 23 ch. 6 v., "of the hope and resurrection we are condemned by the world," even that hope which Paul so nobly contends for before King Agrippa, Acts 26, when he exclaims, "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes hope to come, and for which hope's sake I am accused," for preaching the Gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus; and it is for this hope they can say with us, we are denounced by the clergy. Let them reject the promises of God, and teach the doctrines of men, it is but vanity; for they may see their position and doom in the end in the language of Paul, Eph. 2 ch. 11 and 12 v., that they are gentiles, and are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world.

Having arrived at the water, Brother Campbell opened the Scriptures, and taught the people the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, in contrast with the teaching of the clergy, to which they listened in silence and attention. Having concluded his discourse, I informed the audience that if they would close around the candidates they could hear the Gospel in a nutshell, by hearing the confession they were in the act of making.

They came near, and I proceeded as follows: "Do you believe in the covenants of promise made of God unto the fathers of Israel, and in the personal reign of Jesus the Messiah upon the throne of his father David in Jerusalem, over the Jews restored, and the nations, in virtue of these covenants of promise made to Abraham and David and brought into force by the resurrection of Christ from the dead?" They answered: "We do believe." What the audience thought of such a confession of faith I do not know, for they were very silent. I then informed them that this is the only Gospel revealed to us in the Bible, and before any

man can become a Christian he must believe this Gospel, and make the good confession which Paul says, 1 Tim. 6 ch. 13 v. Jesus witnessed before Pontius Pilate, 15 v., who, in his times he shall show who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality. When arraigned before Pilate (John 18 ch. 37 v.) Jesus exclaimed, "Thou savest it; I am king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." This is the reason why "he has commanded all men every where to repent, (Acts 17 ch. 30 and 31 v.) because he has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, and hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead."

I can scarcely believe the clergy to be ignorant of these great truths of the Gospel, for they must know from the teaching of the Scripture, that Christ must come again, as it is written, Heb. 9 ch, 28 v., "Unto those who look for him shall he appear a second time;" Acts 3 ch. 20, 21 v., "For he shall send Jesus, which was before preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of his prophets since the world began." Then the seventh trump sounds, and there are voices in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever, he takes to himself his power and reigns;" the nations become angry at his wrath, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints and them that fear thy name, and to destroy the wicked. Well, teaching such doctrine as this, does not suit the clergy in Washington, so the disputers of the world spoken of by Paul, 1 Cor. 1 ch., 2 Pet. 2 ch., call it "perfect humbuggery." Such language as this from the wise should make us content to be fools; but truly such language is like wisdom in a balloon, they being ignorant of the teachings of Moses, the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles; they are of necessity also ignorant of that which we believe and teach; therefore let us (1 Tim. 6 ch. 12 v.) fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life whereunto we are called; Rom. 5 ch. 2 v., rejoicing in hope of the glory of God at his appearing and kingdom.

Your brother in the hope of Israel,

R. A. BOARDMAN.

The Gospel of the Kingdom progressing in Canada.

TORONTO, 1st August, 1857.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS,—As you favored the readers of the "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come" with a sketch of your journey through Canada West last summer, I know that a short account of "the cause" in this province will be acceptable to all friends of truth whose lot is cast in the "dark and cloudy day." Brother Williams, of whose arrival in this country you had heard from the church at Plymouth, has been instant in season and out of season ever since he came amongst us, and you will be rejoiced to hear that three in this city have become "obedient to the Truth," through the earnest, heart-searching discourses of our respected brother on the inexorable necessity of a belief at once enlightened and sincere, in "the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ," as enjoined in the Scripture of truth; and here was furnished a most delightful proof of the moral power of "the word," when received into honest hearts"—a proof full of comfort to the believer, and at the same time with scathing, withering rebuke to the sapient cavillers of our time, at what they suppose the ultraism of our views. Here, then, were two honest, earnest hearts, already faithful of the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ, and with very considerable knowledge of the coming kingdom, prompting them to pray with fervor that it might speedily come, yet, in the good providence of God, through the preaching of Brother W., convinced that they possessed not the one hope of the calling, viz., to God's kingdom and glory, by becoming joint heirs with the Christ, their Elder Brother, in the age to come, as rulers over the mortal nations then existent on the earth, (this being the specific point of the Gospel or glad tidings, of which they were ignorant, and of necessity, therefore, faithless) they at once casting aside the sincere ignorance of a pious immersion, submitted themselves to the righteousness of God, were forthwith baptized into the name of "the Holy Ones," and can now, with full assurance of faith, look forward with grateful joy to the high vocation whereunto they have been called; convinced, from the testimony of the living God, that no amount of intensity of sincere ignorance can stand in lieu of the truth, heartily believed and lovingly obeyed. Would that many now holding a position similar to that of our respected friends, could be induced to enter in by the door, and renounce, at once and for ever, all their puny efforts at either improving upon, or virtually ignoring, the all-surpassing

excellency of God's way of righteousness.

We are in good hope of having others yet added to our number here. I know that some are seeking "what they must do to be saved;" and were the fogs of a life-long tradition once dispelled (as dispelling they are) by the rising beams of the Sun of Truth, they would soon bask in the life-giving rays of his light, love, and joy. A Mr. Blain, of Buffalo, New York, has been lately here lecturing to the people, and distributing tracts on the Life and Death question, though utterly void of *Life* to perishing men (inasmuch as he virtually ignores the testimony of Moses and the Prophets.) The addresses and tracts of Jacob Blain may not be valueless in calling the attention of some to the false pretensions of the orthodox to that much abused name, while claiming for themselves and all mankind a right to that existence which is promised to the righteous alone, as a part of their reward for belief in, and obedience to, things at which the superstitious rail and scoff. Once convinced of being without *Life* in themselves, men, if sincere for life eternal, will soon ask *how* they can obtain that of which they are destitute.

From Hamilton Brother Somerville writes—"that there was a small meeting of inquirers there, to which he had been invited" some time ago; they had pretty correct views of the things of the Kingdom, "but having been brought up among Presbyterians, had incorrect views about baptism." Since he commenced meeting with them, three had been baptized, and he hopes the whole will soon come round. Prior to his visit among them, I do not know that they had been more than investigation meetings. I trust, however, they will be enabled to form a church ere long. From Queensville Brother Deeger writes, under recent date, *inter alia*, as follows: "Are you aware whether Dr. Thomas is likely to visit Canada again soon? Could he be prevailed on to do so. I will pay his fare from New York to Canada on condition of his giving some lectures in our part. I think some might fully embrace the truth could they hear the doctor's reasoning on the same. I am endeavoring, with the little ability I have, to let the light shine; and although I am still alone for the hope of the Kingdom, yet there is some prospect in future of others embracing the faith. We cannot expect much in these days, seeing there are so many "forms of Godliness," yet without the power, and "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." Nevertheless, dear friend, let us continue "steadfast in the faith, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

Brother Williams, at the urgent request of our friend, intends visiting Queensville (D. V.) next week, when the Christians in that quarter will have certain strange things brought to their ears." In Paris, Brother Scott having been denounced as infidel by the respectable orthodoxy of the place for assisting in the distribution of certain tracts intending to show the people the Bible doctrine of Immortality, has, by public hand-bill, openly challenged any of his calumniators (lay or clerical) to meet him in public debate and prove him in error. So far, however, they have preserved a silence highly ominous of a consciousness of their weakness. If they but study their *own* vested interests, that silence will remain unbroken. Our brother of Paris has received an invitation to go down to Cayuga on the Grand River, and speak to some inquirers after truth—a call which it is needless to say, he will most joyfully and gratefully obey. Many inquiries have been made of late by the readers of your works here respecting the promised book on Revelation. How soon are your Apocalyptic labors likely to close? All the brethren in Christ send their grateful remembrances. I remain, dear Brother, yours in Israel's hope,

J. COOMBE.

Grateful Acknowledgement.

BELOVED BROTHER THOMAS, — I return you my sincere thanks for the honor you have done me, in taking the pains you have in answering my letter; and must say that I am highly satisfied, and gratified too, with your explanation, and think that you have greatly honored me in being so explicit; and believe that you have not only removed a great mist from my eyes, but by your plainness, criticism, and profound knowledge in the meaning of the original Scriptures, have, and are doing, mighty things in this perverse and serpent generation.

I had prepared another letter for you, but need not trouble you with it, being greatly satisfied with what you have already written upon the subject. Yet I thought it but just to acknowledge thus my gratitude, and to thank you for the trouble you have taken. Go on in the good cause you have embarked in, and may God bless, strengthen, and comfort you, is the prayer of your affectionate brother in Israel's Hope.

CHARLES FISH.

The "Seeker after Truth.*"

Nottingham, England,
June 24, 1857.

* See page 60 of this volume.—*Editor.*

Humanisms Abandoned for the Truth.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS.—Having a few moments' leisure, I have concluded to write you a few lines. Our beloved Brother Anderson has been among us. He has been speaking with great power. His discourses were, I think, more eloquent and powerful than common. His purity of character and high intellectual qualities commanded for him the warmest respect and praise. May, dear brother, we all be like minded, having the same love, not seeking our own, but the things which are Jesus Christ's. Let us study to be approved of God, to make acquisition of "the doctrine which is according to godliness," for it is "profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." I admire your article in the June number, "Did Jesus and the Apostles teach the Mosaic Doctrine of Immortality?" It contains, I think, a vast deal of accurate and valuable knowledge. Such investigation cannot be otherwise than laudable, and I think it at present altogether wisely directed. There are many to whom your writings are detestable; they think you are making war with the earnest convictions of serious persons, but, in fact, it is offensive collision with popular creeds, bigoted opinions, strong prejudices, and narrow views, all of which combine to maintain the ascendancy of error, and falsify the truth. Many think your views vague, incomprehensible, and extravagant; but they are always of that number who manifest great unwillingness to look closely at the system, investigate the foundations on which it rests, and the conclusions to which it leads. As to your incomprehensibility, it is well known that your views have, for a number of years, been deliberately shaping themselves, expressing themselves in language the most lucid and forcible, displaying a superiority over every other system of vagueness and mysticism which the language of men has been made to give utterance to, and all for the purpose of being thoroughly understood. The mind attains health and perfection only when it attains clear, systematic, and independent expression—expression not of the false, the current common of our day, but of sound wisdom and discretion. How clearly, lucidly, and forcibly are the transcendental mystics of the ingenious Platonic school described to us! so clear, and intelligent, and demonstrative in its utterance, that few, I should think, of Adam's race would be denied the luxury of possessing its knowledge. They may deny the truth, style it preposterous, absurd, and pernicious, but they cannot overturn it, cannot exhibit it as logically, scripturally, really false. "The foundation of God standeth sure: the Lord knoweth

them who are his." Therefore, the Lord's doctrine cannot be denied or set aside; and, therefore, the opposer has no other work than calumny and misrepresentation. Let us, then, continue to search the Scriptures. A great deal of important knowledge has been the result of this active investigation. All minds are not susceptible of receiving great truths even when they are discovered for them. Truth, which is above all price, giving the highest hope to prosperity—softening, soothing, and cheering the heart even in the darkest hours of adversity—can be obtained only by perseverance, labor, and research.

There are some here, dear brother, seeking for it—some have surveyed, and obeyed it. A few days ago I had the pleasure of baptizing two very intelligent persons into the hope of the Gospel; and, a short time before that, a gentleman of comprehensive scriptural knowledge demanded baptism. A month before that, two gentlemen, understanding the truth, renounced their erroneous views, and cheerfully obeyed the truth. Another, having discovered the truth, has abandoned the false, and desires to obey from the heart the truth as it is in Jesus, at her earliest opportunity. These facts throw a lively interest over the welfare of our little band. All had been immersed before into the systems of error—five into Campbellism, and one into Baptistism.

We are expecting you here soon. When shall we expect you? I desire much to see you, and hear you speak.

I am, affectionately, your friend and brother, in hope of the first resurrection,

W. M. PASSMORE.

Lunenburg, Va., June 12, 1857.

Visit to Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee.

In July, ult., we repeated our visit to Henderson, Ky., arriving there about the 19th. We found the brethren united in brotherly affection and love of the truth, and desirous of knowing all about it that is knowable, having no sectarian horizon limiting their view.

We remained with them till the following Monday week, speaking every day of our sojourn, and on one occasion twice. Week-day meetings, even with the "Names and Denominations" which enjoy the favor of the world, are very scantily attended by the Hendersonians; it was not to be expected, therefore, that our meetings, whom the world neither loves nor favors, would be numerously patronized. We found, however, an increased attendance compared with last year,

and larger audiences than, we were informed, attend the ministrations of the world's divines. On Lord's Day, the multitude turned out, as a matter of course, the impression being that "there would be a crowd," and such an opportunity of seeing and being seen is not to be lost, "down in the country side."

Our auditors had all ears, as far as we know. It is presumable they had, as the ear-cropping era for offences against the opinions and rules of society does not at present obtain. Perhaps it is well for the safety of our own and our brethren's ears that it does not, as we might be minus those useful appendices ourselves. Be this as it may, whether our auditors had "ears to hear what the Spirit saith to the Ecclesiast," is beyond our faculty to testify. Our fears are that, generally speaking, they had not; and we say this, because, after a couple of hours' declaration of God's testimony, and the reasoning out of its points, the levity of demeanor and frivolity of the wordiness we overheard around us, demonstrated that what we had proved to be the saying of the Spirit, found no respect with the majority.

All, however, were not of this light and shallow cast of mind. On the contrary, they heard with gravity, and seemed interested in what they heard; and we have the satisfaction of knowing that several are diligently studying the Scriptures, and with an interest in the Bible they had not felt until they were made acquainted with the matter of our teaching. A lady, forty years ago immersed into Baptistism, and afterwards received into the Campbellite kingdom by an evangelist right hand of fellowship, voluntarily presented herself for an intelligent immersion into the One Faith and Hope of the calling. This was the result of some two years' examination of the Word, assisted by our writings. She publicly renounced her sectarian baptism, and intelligently confessed the faith before many witnesses.

While in these parts, the Pitt-fountain of romance (see p. 142) was on a mission, pouring out waters sweet and bitter. We affirm this, however, only hypothetically, for James inquires, "Doth a fountain send forth at the same spout sweet water and bitter?" He did not believe it could, nor do we. But Mr. Fountain E. Pitts seems to have been trying the experiment in Henderson County. The "reverend" gentleman had descended thither from Nashville on a gospello-railroading adventure! The reader may have never heard of the like, even in this "progressive age." We will define it, then, for his especial benefit. *Gospello-railroading* is a preaching which begins in discoursing Wesley-Metho-

distie gospelism, and ends in a "railroad speech." Mr. Pitts, or some person in communication with him, issued bills, announcing that he would preach at certain places, and after the sermon a railroad speech would be delivered. We had something else to do than to attend the preaching, but we understand that he taught, or rather rehearsed, the foolishness lately published in a Methodist book styled "Armageddon," which declares the valley of the Mississippi to be the field of Armageddon, and the United States the stone cut out of the mountain without hands! He is said to forestall the applause of his auditory by telling them how he was magnified by the world's great ones at Washington, D. C. He there undertook to prophesy, before the conscript fathers of the nation, the foreign ambassadors, and the people in the capital (I think), and in his prophesyings of the destiny of the United States, to declare that, as France was with the original colonies in the establishing of their independence, so she will be with this Union when it crushes Nebuchadnezzar's image in the valley of the Mississippi!!! While vaticinating after this fashion, which none but a *daimonion*, or "divine," or theologian of the apostacy could be blind enough to do, a pointing of innumerable fingers turned his attention to a portrait behind him, which on beholding he discovered to be that of La Fayette! The effect was dramatic, and the laurel descended on his brow! O, ye Hendersonians, half horse half alligator men, could you presume to withhold applause after such an example at the capital? Dare ye exercise common sense in view of such romance? Was it love of liberty and democracy that caused France to aid the colonies, or hatred of England? And will France so abandon the love of glory, its national vanity, and become so disinterestedly unselfish as to devote herself to the exaltation of the United States above all dominions, not excepting her beloved self? Alas! how blind must the people be with whom such babbling can pass for a logical exposition of the sure prophetic word! With such trash the railroading divine is said to begin his proclamation, not forgetting to lug in the prophet Nahum, and casting him into the crucible of theological alchemy, and compelling him to prophesy of railroads, and, by consequence, of that which is sought to be from Nashville to Henderson city. This brings him to the railroad element of his divine mission. He labors to persuade the Hendersonians to tax themselves for the completion of the Tennessee and Ohio Railroad through their country. This was the great question of the day while we were there, and Mr. P. was its apostle! This is

the divine," the Methodist deity (for all "divines" are the deities of "the names and denominations") who is said to have left a challenge for us if ever we should visit the country again! But we did not meet his reverence, though we heard of him within two or three miles of our locality, nor did the alleged challenge arrive. But if it had it would have been all the same, for our time is of too much value to waste it in discussion with men so grossly ignorant of the first principles of the oracles of God. The place for them is on the form, the lowest form, in the class of A B C. To admit them to the arena of debate as principals in a discussion of the matters we teach, is a conception too magnitudinous to be entertained. If Methodism, or some other kindred "name of blasphemy," were the subject matter of debate, the case would be altered. "Divines" are tolerably proficient in these, and can legitimately take their positions as principals, affirming, illustrating, and attempting to prove their systems, by their own authorities and feelings. We understand their sectarian principles, at least as well as they, and, therefore, claim the arena as their equals in discussing them. But this we cannot grant to them. Confessedly, they do not understand the prophets, an admission which declares their disqualification to explain the apostolic writings. Now, the prophets and the apostles are our especial study, the very writings they know least about. Their systems preached do not require intelligence therein, either for salvation or proclamation. One might, therefore, as properly challenge an A. B. C. scholar to debate the principles of classical English, as a titled *daimonion* of the apostacy, the Christianity of Moses, and the "prophet like unto him." We are ready and willing to teach them this with all possible long suffering and patience, but to admit them to the coequality of debate is a condescension too sublimely ridiculous to be momentarily entertained.

Having stayed as long as was compatible with other engagements, we returned to Henderson city, from whence we purposed to board a steamer for Memphis. But it is easier, at least such is our experience, to arrive at Henderson than to depart from it. Our quarters being at the end of the town, we were too far off from the landing-place to reach it between the blowing of a steamer's whistle, notifying its approach, and the departure of the vessel. We were obliged, therefore, to keep watch upon the wharf-boat, and to return to our meals, at the risk of a steamer passing while away. This was a tedious look out upon the waters, for looking for a boat was like looking for land from the ark of Noah, none appearing for the right

direction for a day and a half. The brother who accompanied us suggested Peter's excursion, and we went a fishing to kill time, certainly not to kill fish, for of all the sport I could boast, "a glorious nibble" was "the sum total of the whole!" On the second day he hooked two respectable looking fish, but for me, the nibble was the sole reward.

At length the St. Louis packet, *Highflyer*, rounded to the wharf, and we were soon after in full steam for Cairo, not in Egypt, but at the junction of the Ohio with the Mississippi. We arrived here about 8 A.M. As our course was down the Mississippi, and the steamer's up, we had to part company at this place. We were now at our late employ again, on an Ohio wharf-boat, waiting for a boat. One other was in the same case, and as the prospect of departure was particularly dreary, being armed with hook and line, he betook himself to killing fish. This he did literally; for though at Henderson he caught nothing, at Cairo he drew from the water four or five cat fish, from ten to twenty pounds each.

The Illinois Central Railroad has made this Cairo an important place. In itself, is without attraction, and will never be sought for as a site where wealth and refinement may enjoy *otium cum dignitate*. The leisure or inactivity it affords is masterly, but undignified—an inactivity compelled and compelling, by an utter disregard to the convenience of the river-traveling public. In 1832, the site of the present town was six feet under water, but it is now leveled by an embankment, the top of which is eighteen feet above the streets. A good deal of business of some sort seems so be going on, especially when the river is too low for the largest steamers to ascend. Smaller boats bring cargoes to Cairo, which are there transferred to Mississippi craft of larger size. This work detained us twelve hours at the wharf. The City of Memphis arrived there from St. Louis about an hour after the *Highflyer* had departed. We boarded her, and on the assurance that she was about to start almost forthwith, we entered our name as a passenger to Memphis. But lying seems to belong to steamboating, as an ordinary official attribute. Instead of starting forthwith, they had no intention of leaving until night, but had to make sure of our fare, that we might not go by an earlier boat. This was exceedingly vexatious, as we were striving to reach Memphis, a distance of 240 miles, by Friday night or Saturday morning at latest. "We shall start when we have done coaling," this was the first assignable cause of delay. It was reasonable, however, that fuel should be stored, for without it her

paddles would give no sign. Yet that coal-
ing was a damper on all haste, for two enor-
mous flats had to be emptied, a full three
hours' work for thirty hands.

While this was in progress, we exercised
the eye in beholding the pursuits of the sons
of earth. The tumbling of a platform with
twenty bags of coffee into the river, and the
getting of them out by the semi-immersed
stevedores, though a source of vexation to
the commission merchant, was something to
amuse the bystanders, who had nothing to do
but to kill time. There was a study in the
incidents of the hour. Half a dozen men
fishing bags of coffee from the deep, and
thirty others shoveling coal under a broiling
sun, could not fail of exciting profound grate-
tude in the heart of a spectator, that the
lines had fallen to him in better places, and
that one of these was even the shadow of the
City of Memphis, waiting for a start. There
are few miseries in ordinary life which are
not greatly diminished by comparison. It is
a less evil to be imposed upon by a steam-
boat official, than to be sunstricken shoveling
coal. Thus we kept our humor good, the
cheerfulness of which increased as we per-
ceived the coal-*ing* drawing to a close. Now,
thought we, we shall soon be off! And so
we were, for round went the wheels, and we
steamed from the wharf, but not for Mem-
phis; in ten minutes we were moored higher
up the river opposite the mills, from which
several hundred barrels of flour were to be
rolled into our hold. This occupied the crew
about two hours. When all were on board,
"now we shall soon be under weigh." This
was the general impression; but we all
"reckoned" without the skipper. We had
to put back to our former moorings to take
in some more flour. While engaged in this,
a freight steamer hove to, which had passed
us while fishing from the Henderson wharf-
boat, called the *Arkansas Traveler*. To our
dismay, we were soon apprized that her cargo
was to be transferred to the City of Memphis.
This was a finisher to all our hopes, and we
abandoned ourselves to despair of loosing
from this Cairo till midnight. Fortunately
the Mississippi was too low to float us
with a full cargo, or we might have been
detained to tranship the lading of another
boat. We do not blame skippers for getting
all the freight they can, but we do despise
their meanness in making passengers the
sport of their mendacity for the sake of their
fare. To charge a man ten dollars from
Cairo to Memphis, and to compel him to
lose a whole day, and sometimes three days,
besides, is downright robbery. The govern-
ment ought to protect passengers from this
imposition on their time and patience, for
conscientiousness has no place upon the

waters of the West. The morality of that
world is perfectly antediluvian, and ripening
fast for a like catastrophe.

At length, the coal being all in, the flour
stowed away, and the *Arkansas Traveler*
completely emptied, steam was got up, and
we bid adieu to Cairo at 8 P.M. We were
soon on the broad waste of the Mississippi,
coursing our way amidst its shoals to the
"Bluff City." From the mouth of the Ohio
to Memphis, it is as uninteresting a river as
can be found on earth. Low alluvial banks,
mostly covered with cotton wood trees, and
where open, unadorned with anything at-
tractive. We shall never travel this route
again if we can help it. Nothing but mono-
tony on every side. The Mississippi region
is evidently a portion of the earth not yet
finished. An earthquake, raising the banks
some fifty feet, would be quite an improve-
ment, confining the wild waters to a respect-
able channel, and affording beautiful "villa
sites." A good, deep channel to the Gulf
of Mexico would very much enhance the
Valley of the Mississippi; but with all its
transmuting influences, would never convert
its undulations into "the mountains of
Israel." It requires a Methodist "divine"
to do this, by theological legerdemain!
What a country for an Armageddon! What
a military encampment for the armies of
Nebuchadnezzar's image! Truly will the
United States break them to pieces there
when they shall have befooled them into the
untamed forests of this watery wild! Alas
for Mr. Pitts, into what a pit of absurdity
has he fallen!

About 10 P.M. of Saturday, we landed
at Memphis, Tennessee. The time of our
arrival being uncertain, there was no one to
meet us. We had written to a brother some
forty miles distant, that we should leave
Henderson about July 30, and he had writ-
ten to another, twenty-five miles off in another
direction, giving him the same information;
but, owing to the uncertainty of the route,
as the reader will have perceived, exactness
as to departure and arrival, was out of the
question. Being, then, a stranger, fifteen
hundred miles from home, we had to follow
the example of strangers, and shift for our-
selves as we best could. We accordingly
surrendered self and baggage into the hands
of a 'bussman, who, getting no other fare,
drove us at his leisure to the Commercial
Hotel, which we had ascertained beforehand
was a safe and reputable place, where
travelers were taken in and respectably done
for at two dollars and a half a day. The
price was imperial, but not the appointments.
New York prices, but not New York splen-
dor is found in Memphis. We get the

prices, which are long, but the commons are short enough—short of cleanliness, short of good cookery, and, in many instances, abundantly short. However, as we are not a gourmand, we can get along with anything that is eatable, without certain emesis; still, when we are charged Empire City fees, we feel entitled to Empire City fare. We don't expect it, however, for experience has cured us of such foolishness. This is not an age and generation whose principle is an equivalent for value received. "All things," they say, "are fair in trade," and "anything will do for travelers." These are preëminently the principles of hotels and refreshment rooms, as we found them in a circuit of three thousand miles. No matter how inferior the stuff, the full pay is sure to be extorted. Such is the reciprocity of hostelry.

On Sunday morning, Aug. 2, we arose with the intention of leaving Memphis by the Mississippi Central. This was the wrong route, as we fortunately discovered. We were aiming for De Soto County, Mississippi, but did not know at what station we were to stop. We ascertained this, however, that it was the Mississippi and Tennessee Railroad, and not the Mississippi Central, that ran through De Soto. We took the omnibus for this, and at the depot were much relieved at learning that our friend's residence, to which we were tending, was seven miles east of Senatobia station.

While sitting at the door of the Commercial, we overheard a gentleman talking about the best mode of using cold water. We concluded from his discourse that he was some Memphian hydropathist commending his wares to a prospective patient. But we afterwards learned our mistake, for in a few days he appeared at our meetings in Mississippi, and there revealed himself as our old friend of Goochland County, Virginia, Matthew Webber, now of Fisherville, Shelby, Tennessee. He had come twenty-five miles to Memphis, on Saturday, to meet us, supposing that we should arrive about that time, and had lodged in the same hotel as we. He remembered seeing us on the pavement, but "thought that could not be Dr. Thomas, because of the whiteness of his beard." About twenty years had elapsed since we met in Virginia, during which Old Time has laid hands upon us both. He had changed as well as we, or we should not have mistaken him for a water doctor of the city. After we had left, he found our name in the register of the hotel. He remained that day in the city, and preached in the Reformers' House, and on the next day returned home, to make arrangements there for his absence in Mississippi, where he proposed to attend our meetings.

We arrived at Senatobia between 10 and 11 A.M. On inquiring concerning our friend's abode, we were told that he lived ten miles east, and that we could hire a horse and buggy at the livery stables in the rear with a driver to take us there. We were glad to hear this, for we were apprehensive that we should have to pedestrianize the way. The truth was not told us as to the distance. It was seven, not ten, miles, but the three were probably added to secure the hire of the conveyance. Be this as it may, while the horse was being harnessed, our friend appeared, having arrived at the station with several in company to take the return train for Memphis, expecting to meet us there. The meeting was opportune. We surrendered the horse and buggy to a gentleman, who was regretting that we had secured before him the only one to be obtained, and entering our friend's, proceeded with him *en retour* to Looxohama.

(To be continued.)

What Nation will Rank the Highest in Future Years?

HERE is a political question, which it will puzzle politicians to answer. Some, on reading it, will at once claim the honor for America, others for Britain, and others look to the Russian colossus as the one which shall tower high above all. If we trust to the imaginings of the fleshly mind, unenlightened by the word of Prophecy, we may spend all our days in speculating on the Future, and yet be very far from the truth.

The nations and governments of earth, as at present constituted, are unstable as water, and liable to mightiest changes. Instance the powerful nations of Assyria, Greece, Rome, or Egypt. Where are the magnificent cities of Nineveh and Babylon? They are all come to nought, and are brought down to the dust. Their glory has departed, and is lost in the past. Seeing, then, those once prosperous nations and mighty empires have been removed and are lost, how presumptuous it is for vain man, in this late day, to undertake the task of diving into Futurity, to bring therefrom the history of nations now existing, unless aided by the uerring light of Revelation! By bringing this luminary to bear upon our subjected reason, we can at once decide the question before us.

All Bible readers are aware, that at one period of our world's history there was a powerful nation existed, which sprang from a man chosen of God, viz., Abraham. This nation (Israel) was under God's especial care, and he wrought mighty wonders and miracles in their midst, such as were never witnessed

by any other people; but, notwithstanding these, they were a stiffnecked and rebellious people, choosing to serve dumb idols rather than the ever-living and true God. Consequent on their disobedience they were punished many times; but this failing to bring them into subjection, God determined to cast them off for a time, and he suffered the great powers and enemies of Israel, then existing, to carry them captive into all nations, and thus they have remained to this day.

If we were to believe the false teachings of many of the so-called enlighteners of the people, who teach for hire, and use smooth words, we should say that the nation so scattered would ever remain so; but we choose rather to receive the plain word of God, untainted by the fanciful interpretation put upon it by these hirelings.

Concerning this nation God says: "For a *small moment* have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I *gather thee*; in a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a *moment*, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee." Isa. liv, 7, 8. We see that, compared with the duration of mercy and kindness which is to be extended towards them, the season of their affliction is comparatively but a moment; yea, as though to reduce it still more, he terms it a *small moment*.

The prophet Zephaniah, in a vision of the Future, (chap. iii, 14,) calls upon Israel to shout, because, he says: "The Lord hath *taken away* thy judgments, he hath *cast out thine enemy*," and, as though this was not sufficient for Israel, he blesses them still more: "The King of Israel, even the Lord, is in the *midst of thee*; thou shalt not see evil any more." In verse 19th, he says: "I will get them *praise and fame* in every land where they have been put to shame."

Again: "The *nations* shall see and be confounded at all *their might*; they shall lay their hand upon their mouth; their ears shall be deaf; they shall lick the dust like a serpent; they shall move out of their holes like creeping things." Micah vii, 16, 17. What terror and submission! In Isa. liv, 15, we read that "Whosoever shall gather together against thee (Israel) shall fall for thy sake;" and verse 17: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper;" and in Ezek. xxxvii, 26-28, the Lord says: "Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will place them (in their own land, verse 25,) and multiply them * * * yea, I will be their God, and they

shall be my people, and the heathen (nations) shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."

From the proof adduced, (not a tithe of which has been given) we conclude—

1. That Israel are to be restored to the land from whence they were taken captive, and are to be subjects of God's everlasting mercy and kindness.
 2. That the judgments God has poured upon them for so many centuries are to be taken away, and the enemies who have served themselves of Israel are to be cast out.
 3. When reestablished in this enviable position, they will be further blessed by the residence in their midst of the King of Israel, even Christ, and with him, as their King, they shall not see evil any more; but every land where they have been put to shame shall resound with the praise and fame of Israel restored.
 4. Such a mighty power and excellence shall be granted to this once despised nation, that *all other* nations (republics included) shall be as it were struck dumb, and amazement will seize them.
 5. All nations or weapons of war brought to bear against Israel at that day cannot prosper, for God will be with them as their shield.
 6. A covenant of peace will be made between them and God, and he will cause them to increase rapidly, by reason of the peace and prosperity they will enjoy; and for evermore he will be their God and they his people.
- And now, we leave the matter between the reader and the word of God, whether the question we undertook to solve is not fairly answered? T.

Geneva, Illinois.

"The Merchants of Tarshish."

THIS commercial corporation is in great trouble just now: Their Indian Presidency of Bengal is in military insurrection. It will, doubtless, be suppressed; and lead to the extension as well as consolidation of British power in the East. We shall return to the subject when our travels for '57 are ended.

EDITOR.

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a KINGDOM which shall never perish, and a DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.] Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y. Nov. 1857. [VOL. VII. No. 11.]

The Apostasy of the First Century.

BY THE EDITOR.

WHEN the effusion of the Holy Spirit first occurred, the gospel of the kingdom was taught with power; and no sentiments which militated against it, could be supported for a moment. As through the prevalence of human corruption, the love of the truth was lessened, heresies and various abuses of the gospel appeared; and in estimating them, we may form some idea of the declension of true religion towards the end of the First Century, which was, doubtless, not confined to the churches of Judea, but appears to have affected those in other countries also.

The epistolary part of the New Testament affords but too ample proof of corruptions. Paul guards the saints in Rome against false teachers, one mark of whose character was, that "by good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple." These were the prototypes of the clergy and their flocks of our day. Corinth was full of evils of this kind. Their false apostles, by their "good words and fair speeches," transformed themselves into the appearance of real ones. Many Christians walked as enemies of the cross of Christ, "whose end was destruction, whose god was their appetites, whose glory was in their shame, who minded earthly things." So Paul tells the Philipians with tears of grief. The epistle to the Colossians proves that pretty strong symptoms of that amazing mass of austerities and superstitions by which, in after ages, the faith was so much clouded, and of that spurious piety, or self-righteousness, which surpasses men's regard to the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus, had begun to discover themselves, even in the apostles' days.

The prophecy of the Apostasy in 1 Tim. iv. 1-3, expressly intimates that the spirit of antichrist had already commenced in the ex-

cessive esteem of celibacy and abstinence from meats. The corrupt mixtures of vain philosophy had also seduced some from the faith. Peter and John have graphically described certain horrible enormities of nominal Christians, little, if at all, inferior to the most scandalous vices of the same kind in these latter ages.

Tertullian reduces the heresies of apostolic times, as they stand contradistinguished to that faith which was once delivered to the saints, to two classes, the Docetæ and the Ebionites. The Gnostics, or Docetæ, were false teachers, so styled, from professing to enjoy higher degrees of *γνῶσις*, *gnosis*, or knowledge of divine things, than the apostles; and they regarded all those who held to a literal interpretation of the scriptures, as simple and ignorant. These were persons who professed to "understand all mysteries and all knowledge," and "had not love;" of which the apostle saith, "it envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, becometh not unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity," and so forth. These things which love doth not do, the Gnostics, or *Knowing Ones*, of the apostle's days were remarkable for doing. The knowledge they professed being unmingled with love, puffed them up, and filled them with noisy arrogance. They rejoiced not in the truth, they believed not all things, and hoped not all things; but "gave heed to fables and endless genealogies; and turned aside from unfeigned faith to vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they said, nor whereof they affirmed."—1 Tim. i. 3-7.

The apostle cautions Timothy against the Gnostics in saying, "avoid profane, vain, babblings, and opposition of *gnosis*, falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." Of these were Hy-

meneus, Philetus, Alexander, who, for the love of money, sold their consciences, and made shipwreck of the faith, and so pierced themselves through with many sorrows. Though very wise in their own conceit, they were in the true sense of the words, the real "Know Nothings" of the first century,—a religious order flourishing in great vigor to this day. Paul thus refers to them in 1 Tim. vi. 3, "If any man teacheth otherwise, (than he instructed Timothy to teach,) and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that *gain is godliness*: * * * but they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition: for *the love of money is the root of all evil*; which while some covet after they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."

In his second epistle, which, as well as the first, Paul wrote in "the last days," he speaks of the Gnostics as "Lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, covenant breakers, devils (*δαίμονες*) incontinent, fierce, despising those that are good, betrayers, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof: of which sort are they who creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as Jaunes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth; men of corrupt minds reprobate concerning the faith." He afterwards styles them "Evil men and seducers, who shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." He predicts also that their influence on the mind of the religious public would be so deleterious that "the time would come when they would not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts, they would heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and should turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables."—2 Tim. iii. 1-13; iv. 3.

When Paul was at Ephesus, he forewarned the overseers of the congregation there, that these men would appear among them, that is, in the Eldership itself. "I know this," said he, "that after my departing shall

grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."—Acts xx. 29. And when giving directions to Titus about selecting men for elders over the churches in Crete, he cautions him to be careful whom he ordains, for these men were lifting up their heads in all directions. He therefore insists on the candidates for office being ascertained to be men who hold fast the words of faith according to the teachings, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision; whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, "The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bodies." This testimony is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men that turn from the truth. They profess to know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate."

There were some of these Gnostical Know Nothings in the church at Corinth, who perceiving that they could not make merchandize of its members, so long as Paul's influence was paramount, set to work to destroy it, as the first step to the exaltation of their own. Hence, they accused him of walking after the flesh; that his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible; and that being crafty, he caught them with guile.—2 Cor. x. 2, 10; xii. 16. The last four chapters of this epistle are his defence and justification against them. He denies that he walked after the flesh; and, though his personal bearing might not be commanding, nor his discourse eloquent, he was not to be judged by these exteriors; but by the matter of his speech, the divine power where-with it was accompanied, the gratuitousness of his labors among them, the persecutions he suffered for his doctrine, and his perfect abnegation of self in all his dealings with them, that they might be presented perfect in the day of the Lord Jesus. He was not of the number of those who commended themselves, like "the fools," they seemed to "suffer gladly," but he mentioned these things that they might judge righteously by a comparison of his faith with theirs.

These "fools" boasted that they were "Hebrews," "Israelites," "the seed of Abraham," ministers and apostles of Christ; but Paul denied their claims, and charged them with being "False apostles, deceitful workers,

transforming themselves into apostles of Christ; Satan's ministers transformed as ministers of righteousness," preaching "another Jesus," "another spirit," and "another gospel." The fifteenth chapter of his first epistle was written as an antidote to the gospel they preached. They professed to believe in a future state, and in future rewards and punishments therein; but they denied Paul's doctrine, saying, "There is no resurrection of the dead;" or that "the resurrection is past already," which amounts to the same thing.—1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 18. This was equivalent to saying, that *man has an immortal soul in his mortal body, which at the instant of death goes either to heaven or hell.* If they had denied a future state, then their denial of the resurrection would have been equivalent to denying incorruptibility and life, or immortality altogether; and they would have been mere French materialists, who proclaimed that "*death is an eternal sleep to all mankind.*" It was indeed, then, that *immortal-soulism* was the foundation of Gnosticism—the *Gnosis* professed by the false teachers of the First Century. This *γνῶσις*, or "science, falsely so called," was full of "oppositions" to "THE FAITH;" which, if admitted, would consume it as a gangrene. The faith of those who admitted it was regarded as "overthrown" and "shipwrecked;" and themselves considered "reprobate;" it opposes "the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus," and taught that to believe the gospel of the kingdom and be baptized, was not enough for justification; but that they must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses also, or man could not be saved.—Acts xv. 1. It opposed the self-denial of the gospel, and taught that "gain was godliness;" it opposed the decision of "the apostles and elders, and brethren" of the Jerusalem congregation, and taught a distinction of meats and drinks; respect for holy days, new moons, and sabbaths; and beguiled them into a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels.—Col. ii. 16. "They preached Christ of envy and strife—of contention not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to the apostle's bonds."—Phil. i. 16. "They walked as the enemies of the cross of Christ, worshipping their appetites, glorying in their shame, minding earthly things."—ch. iii. 13. They were "enemies of the cross of Christ;" that is, *γνώσται*, or Knowing Ones, were opposed to the doctrine of the cross, as taught by the apostles. These taught that "God sent his Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin (*σαρκος ἁμαρτίας*) and on account of sin condemned sin in the flesh;" that "he was descended from David according to flesh;" "for as much as the children are partakers of flesh and

blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same;" "being in all things made like unto his brethren;" so that "he could bear their sins in his own body to the tree," and "be touched with the feelings of their infirmities;" being, when tried, "tempted in all points like as they, but without sin.—Rom. i. 3; viii. 3; Heb. ii. 14–17; iv. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 24. The "seducers" opposed this, and taught that "Jesus did not come in flesh;" and consequently, did not descend from David; was therefore also, not born of a Virgin; and did not really suffer on the cross; so that "sin was not condemned in the flesh; and his resurrection not real. These things flow logically from the assertion that the flesh of Jesus was not "flesh of sin," but a holy and better compound. If he came not in the flesh of Abraham's seed, he can have no right to the things covenanted to Abraham and his seed, nor to "the sure mercies of David;" for these are promised only to David and his seed. The whole gospel was therefore nullified by these two principles, namely, "the resurrection past, and the body of Jesus not flesh of sin. Well might the apostle say, that such had made shipwreck of the faith.

Ignatius, who was contemporary with Paul, and from the year 70 to A.D. 107, was one of the elders of the church at Antioch, in Syria, in a letter written from Smyrna to the Magnesians, alluding to these false teachers, says, "Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor old unprofitable fables. For if we still live according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace. For the Divine Prophets lived according to the gospel of Jesus Christ. For this they were persecuted, being inspired by his grace, (or spirit,) to assure the disobedient, that there is one God, who magnified himself by Jesus Christ his son, who is His eternal word. If then they have cast off their old principles, and are come to a new hope in Christ, let them no longer observe the Jewish Sabbath, but live according to the resurrection of the Lord,* in whose resurrection from the dead our resurrection also is ensured, by him and by his death, which some deny."

To the Philadelphians he writes, "If any interpret Judaism to you, hear him not, for it is better to hear the gospel from a circumcised person, than Judaism from an uncircumcised one. But if both speak not of Jesus Christ, they are to me pillars and sepulchres of the dead, on which are written only the names of men. The objects dear to me are Jesus Christ, his cross, his death, his resurrection, and the faith which is in him;

* κυριακὴν ἑορτήν. A manifest intimation to them to observe the Lord's Day instead of the Sabbath.

by which I desire through your prayer to be justified."

But in his letter from Troas to the congregation at Smyrna, he is exceedingly pointed against the Gnostics, against whose doctrine he warns them with great zeal. In his view, the evil of their heresy consisted in destroying the sacrifice of the body of Jesus for sin, by denying its true humanity, and the hope of resurrection. Let those who will not hear the apostles, hear Ignatius, one of "the Fathers," in whom they boast, and be instructed. "I glorify Jesus Christ our God, who *really* was of the seed of David according to the flesh, and born of a virgin *really*; who *really* suffered under Pontius Pilate. For these things he suffered for us, that we might be saved. And he *truly* suffered; as also he *truly* raised up himself; not as some infidels say that he *seemed* to suffer. I forewarn you of those beasts, who are in the shape of men; whom you ought not only not to receive, but if possible not even to meet with. Only you ought to pray for them, if they may be converted, which is a difficult case." It seemed that these heretics labored to work themselves into the good graces of Ignatius. But he saw through their designs, and says, "For what does it profit me, if any man commend me, and yet blaspheme my God, *denying him to have come in the flesh*? They separate from the giving of thanks and from prayer, because they confess not the eucharist, or thanksgiving, to be the body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who suffered for our sins. They who contradict the gift of God, die in their reasonings."

Ignatius was put to death, A.D. 107, by order of Trajan. After him arose Justin, who embraced Christianity A.D. 132, and wrote considerably between A.D. 140 and A.D. 160. In his "*Dialogue with Trypho*," he testifies against the nonresurrection of the Gnostics as pointedly as Ignatius does against their denial of the true humanity of Jesus. The Gnostics were anti-millennarians, or sky-kingdomists, having no more need for a terrestrio-millennial kingdom in their scheme than for a resurrection to enter into and possess it; seeing that their gospel was a proclamation of *soul-translation to the skies at death*. Having avowed his faith in the "*New Heavens and Earth*," of Isaiah lxx. 17, when Jerusalem and her people shall be a joy in the earth, &c., he says, "Many, even those of the race of christians who follow not godly and pure doctrine, *do not acknowledge it*. For I have demonstrated to thee that these are indeed called Christians, *but are atheists and impious heretics*, because that in all things they teach what is blasphemous, ungodly, and unsound. If therefore you fall

in with certain who are called Christians, who confess not this truth"—the gospel of the kingdom in Palestine for a thousand years—"but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, *in that they say* there is no resurrection of the dead, but that **IMMEDIATELY WHEN THEY DIE, THEIR SOULS ARE RECEIVED UP INTO HEAVEN, AVOID THEM, AND ESTEEM THEM *not christians***. But I, and whatsoever Christians are orthodox in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned, and enlarged, according to the Prophets."

(To be concluded in our next.)

Eternal Life,

JOHN xvii. 3.

DEAR SIR:—I am much obliged to you for giving, at my request, a literal translation of the passage John xvii. 3. (See December '56 number of the *Herald*.) The amended translation does not, however, clear up the uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the verse. The difficulty appears to be, to find what is the significance of the close connection, and apparent dependence one upon the other, of the age, (or eternal) life and the knowledge. Is the knowledge the *cause* or the *consequence* of the life; or is it the *object* for which the life was given? With the light of the amended translation, I conceive the meaning of the verse may be either of the two following—or perhaps both and more; for considering that the speaker spake as never man spake, it is not unreasonable to predicate a manifoldness of meaning.

1. That the life is the age life, or eternal life, of the future; and that God's object or purpose in endowing with this life is that He, and Jesus the anointed, might be known by those to whom the life was given. In this case the life is the fully-manifested life—likeness to him, "our life," Col. iii, 4,—resurrection life in the age to come; and the knowledge is perfect knowledge, when we shall see "face to face," and "know even as we are known," 1 Cor. xiii. 22. This view harmonizes with the two previous verses (John xvii. 1, 2),—that the Son's dominion over all flesh, and his bestowment of life to all that the Father had given him, glorified the Son directly, and the Father by and through the Son. It also harmonizes with Ephes. ii. 7; iii. 9-11, 17-19.

2. That the "life eternal" is "that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us"—even Jesus himself, 1 John i. 2: and that this life is a *present* (as well as a future) possession. "He that

hath the Son [of God] hath life," 1 John v. 12; "Hath everlasting life * * * is passed from death unto life," John v. 24; "That ye may know that ye have eternal life," 1 John v. 13; "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit," 1 Cor. vi. 17; "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones," Ephes. v. 30; "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," 1 John v. 11; "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things," 1 John iii. 20, 27; "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son, Jesus Christ: this is the true God and eternal life," John x. 28; "Christ in you the hope of glory," Col. i. 27;*—and that the knowledge is one of the necessary consequences of having the life. In this case the knowledge is only "in part," and the life is only manifested by its effects. Perfect likeness to the author of the life will take place at the time of the manifestations of the sons of God: sons now; likeness to the Son at his appearing, 1 John iii. 2.†

If I rightly interpret your remarks, you suppose that the knowledge is the basis of the life; which is something different to either of my conceptions.

This passage (John xvii. 3), as it appears in the common version, besides being of dubious meaning, or perhaps on account of its dubious meaning, is often used to thicken the existing darkness on the subject of life—eternal life; and that is the reason why I was so anxious to get at a correct translation as a key to the meaning. It is quite commonly quoted, even by intelligent persons, as follows: "This is life eternal—to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,"—thus making knowledge and life one thing. And the error of making life to mean anything, may have caused the kindred error of making

* In this passage (Col. i. 25, 26, 27) it appears to be stated that the indwelling of Christ in his saints, which involves union, is not only the mystery, but the riches of the glory of the mystery, which hath been hid from ages and generations, but is now made manifest to his saints. And yet the most prominent peculiarity in the mode of God's working in the salvation of men (acceptance because of union to an accepted one), and that past transaction (the union to Christ—*fact and mode*) which immersion inore especially memorializes, are ignored, or explained as meaning something quite different, by all the so-called religious parties. The great bulk of them teach that present union is nothing more than Christ and his saints thinking alike and acting alike; thus confounding cause and consequence; mistaking the effects of life for life itself.

† This view appears, to some, to conflict with eternal life, being frequently presented as a matter of hope and promise. The fact of the future far excelling the present in glory, because of now and more glorious manifestations and combinations of life, may, to such, be a solution of the apparent difficulty.

death to mean anything. And so the very plain scripture teaching about life and death is well nigh lost. In Christ—LIFE: not in Christ—DEATH. The wages of sin is death: but eternal life in Jesus our Lord is the gift of God." "Because I live, ye shall live also." "He that hath the son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*

I beg your assistance concerning the following passages:

Hebrews iii. 14. Here I want the literal rendering of the verb "are made." Boothroyd has it "shall be made." Craik has it "have been made." [In testing the correctness of translations of the New Testament Scriptures, I have only the assistance of Wigram's Englishman's Greek Concordance to the New Testament, and a Greek Lexicon; and therefore I have to be under obligation to you, or some other Greek scholar, for moods, tenses, cases, etc., in the exact translation of which much beauty and accuracy are involved.]

John xv. 2. "Taketh away." A. C. has it "lopped off." Can excision be got out of the Greek word, especially as applied to a vine? I think not; but I ask the question more especially for our mutual friend, Mr. Miles Taylor, of this place, through whose kindness I am a reader of your *Herald*. In the Lexicon I see the word contains a double action—lifting up, and sustaining in the lifted-up position. The latter may be done either by the lifter-up continuing to hold up the thing so lifted up (as was the case with the palsied man whilst walking home with his bed, where the same word is translated "take up,") or its equivalent, securing it to some support. It is not difficult to see the meaning of the word when used concerning the branch of a vine. The branch either never had a support, or had lost its hold of it and fallen to the ground—perhaps covered up by grass and weeds. In this position, we know, a vine branch cannot bear fruit. Now comes the vine-dresser and lifts it up, and fixes it in its lifted-up position, that it may get sunshine and wind, and so bear fruit. The application of this to branches in the true vine is obvious.

The Greek adjective *aiōnios*:—can you give me any directions as to when it should be translated *eternal*, and when *age* or *dispensational*. Yours respectfully,

L. W. WILLAN.

Pewanke, Wau'esha Co., Wis.

October, 1857.

* How many of those who have not life in Christ will be raised to endure the penalty of the second death, is another and a much more difficult question; and perhaps a question with which we have not to do; that is, so far as settling it is concerned. Don't you want to settle, and square, and rightly define everything too much?

Remarks by the Editor.

"The knowledge of God" is both *cause* and *consequence* of "the life of God." The "divine power," says Peter, "hath given unto us all things that pertain unto *life* and godliness, *through the knowledge of him* that has called us to glory and virtue, through which are given to us *exceeding great and precious promises*, that *through these* ye might be partakers of divine nature, 1 Ep. i. 3, 4. Here the knowledge of the exceeding great and precious promises of God is declared to be the medium through which life and godliness, or the divine nature, are attained: for without the knowledge of the truth there is no incorruptibility and life in the coming Aion.

Therefore, also, it is, that Paul saith in Ephes. iv. 18, that the ignorant are estranged from "the life of God." Speaking of the intellectually blind, he says, "darkened in the understanding, being alienated from the life of God *through the ignorance that is in them*, because of the insensibility of their heart." But to those whose ignorance is dispelled, he says, "I cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of the glory (to which the gospel invites them) may give to you spirit, and wisdom, and revelation *in knowledge of him—εν επιγνωσει αυτου*; the eyes of your understanding having been enlightened—*πεφωτισμενους*, perf. part. pass.—ye may know—*εις το ειδεναι*—what is the hope of his invitation, and what the richness of the glory of his inheritance with the saints; and what the exceeding greatness of his power in us believing, according to the energy of the power of his might, which he wrought in the Christ, raising (aor. part.) him from among the dead."

In John xvii. 3, the verb rendered by "they might know" is *γνωσκωσι*; but in the passage from Paul, it is *ειδεναι*. They are both rendered *know*, but obviously in different senses. The verb *γνωσκω* is to *know intellectually*; and is the root of the word used in the text from Peter: while *ειδεναι* is from *ειδω* to see, so as to view, or behold, in the sense of discerning and being the subject of experimentally. To know the hope, richness, and power of God in the sense of *ειδω*, is to be in the kingdom a resurrected possessor of its riches glory and power: but to know them in the sense of *γνωσκω*, is to have scriptural intelligence concerning them, which the Ephesians had causing them to be baptized that they might become heirs of them by faith.

The knowledge of God, or God's system of knowledge is "the truth," belief of which prepares a sinner for purification in the obedience of it. "Having purified your souls *in the obedience of the truth—εν τη υπακοη της αληθειας*—through spirit—1 Pet. i. 22. A soul thus purified has passed from under sentence of death, and consequently in the purified state exists under sentence of life. He has obtained "*a right*" to the life of Messiah's Aion by belief and obedience—"the obedience of faith:" hence, "Blessed are they who *do his commandments* (in some copies, "*who wash their robes*") so shall the *right* be theirs upon (*επι*) the tree of the life, and they may enter in through the gates into the city.—Rev. xxii. 14.

To know God intellectually and to know him corporeally, is to be in him and he in the believer, as he is now in Christ; being "one spirit" in the fullest import of the phrase.

The word in Heb. iii. 14, rendered in the Common Version "we are made," is *γεγοναμεν*; it is 1 pers. plur. perf. 2 ind. Boothroyd's rendering is merely theological, not discerning that true believers are now partakers with Christ, who dwells in their hearts by faith that works by love. Craik is right. "We have been made partakers," and continue partakers "if we may have held the beginning of the confidence steadfast until the end."

John xv. 2, the verb *αρει* is 3 pers. sing. pres. indic. act, and signifies to remove, take away, destroy, kill. A branch on a vine not bearing fruit, is unprofitable, and a useless consumer of sap. Its removal will be beneficial to the tree. This the Father does. He did it in the case of Judas, who was a branch that bore no fruit. He did not prune him, but lopped him off, taking him away. The word Jesus spoke did not cleanse him. He did not abide in Jesus, nor did the words of Jesus abide in him; he was therefore cast forth as a withered branch: and when he rises again, he will be cast into the fire, and be burned in the fiery stream that shall issue forth from the Ancient of Days for the destruction of Daniel's dreadful and terrible, and exceedingly strong, fourth beast.—Dan. vii. 7, 9, 10. The fate of Judas is a warning to all traitors and unprofitable professors of the gospel of the kingdom.

We shall speak of *Aion* at some future time.

November 4, 1857.

EDITOR.

Visit to Mississippi and Tennessee.

(Concluded from page 239.)

Arrived at Looxohama, De Soto, Miss., we addressed the public, hastily collected, at five P. M., in the Temperance Hall. About eighty or more assembled to hear the new doctrine, for new it is to this Bible neglecting generation.

On Monday and Tuesday, one or both days, I think on both, we spoke at the house on De Wolf creek. Here an old gentleman broke out in fuming indignation against the teaching. He was formerly king of the little world around him, in which nothing was transacted without consulting his majesty. This was in times when De Soto had been but recently redeemed from the dominion of the Red Man. But Young America has since invaded his domain, and set him at defiance; and is thoroughly convinced that Looxohama will still exist and flourish, though he should give up the ghost, and depart where De Wolfe* has gone before him! The Gospel of the Kingdom, as well as Young America, has come to disturb his peace, announcing the coming overthrow of all dominion; and the reduction of America, both "Old" and "Young," to the absolute regime of King Jesus and the Saints. The old king of the Looxohamas declared that this was nothing else but abolitionism! And, although his trembling majesty professes no particular form of faith, or rather, superstition, he loudly proclaimed himself in the woods, adjoining the Hall, perfectly satisfied with the religion handed down to him by his forefathers! Truly it is abolitionism in the largest sense; for the New Dominion will abolish abolitionists and all their spurious sentimentalism; and all the kingdoms, empires, and republics; for it is written, that all nations, peoples, languages, tribes, and dominions, shall serve the Son of Man and his Associates. Dan. vii., 13, 14, 18, 22, 26, 27.

On Wednesday and Thursday the 5th and sixth of August, we addressed full houses in the Baptist temple at Tyro, Marshall Co., Miss. Here we met with bro. Mathew W. Webber, whom we mistook in Memphis for some Memphian hydropathist, eulogizing cold water for the benefit of his antiallopathistic practice. He had come to Tyro to hear for himself concerning the great things of the Bible his attention had been fixed upon, and for which his affection had been kindled, by our writings.

On Friday, Saturday and Sunday we spoke at Thyatira, in the same county. This

* Chief of the Indians, formerly occupying the Looxohama district; and now in the hunting grounds of the dead!

is a large, and when finished, will be a comfortable place of meeting. It belongs to our former brethren, whom, for the sake of distinction, we style Campbellite Baptists, Mr. Campbell claiming to be their Supervisor, and they themselves seeking unity with the Baptists, and receiving Baptists into their "kingdom," as they term "the church," by their preacher's "right hand of fellowship." A Mr. Plattenburg, late a student of the Bethany Seminary, is their pastor, whose acquaintance we were afterwards introduced to by bro. Webber at Colliersville, Tennessee. He was not at Thyatira when the wolves broke into his fold, and overhauled the peculiarities of his sheep. The audience was ample and attentive; and had an opportunity of hearing "*wondrous things out of God's law*;" which the hearing of Campbellism, and of all the Isms, for a time and eternity, would never sound up their ears. After we had finished, bro. Webber rose, and spoke to them to the following effect. "My friends," said he, "I have been coming to teach you the truth as fast as I could learn it myself, for many years past. I have in all that time sought you, and not your own. When I first became acquainted with you, it was in your lowest estate. You were few and feeble. But you began to grow, and occupied the De Wolfe school-house. You have increased still more; and I rejoice to see you in so large and respectable a building as this. If I could afford it, I should be happy to give you \$300 to plaster its walls. In the many years that I have traveled from my own home in Shelby, Tennessee, to teach you the Word, (a distance, we believe, of fifty miles—*Editor*) I have journeyed at my own expense; and during all that time I have not received from you more than \$75, and out of that I have returned you \$25 towards the erection of this house. Now, I do not mention this by way of complaint; but to prove to you by reference to facts, that it is even as I say, that I do not seek yours, but you.

"Well, time has wore on, and I believe that I have advanced in knowledge with it. I do not believe in standing still, but in going on, and acquiring truth where'er 'tis found; on Christian or on heathen ground. Nor do I think you will blame me for this. Do you not know more of the Scriptures today than you did when you first had your attention drawn to them; and do you think you are blameworthy for acting, as you do, according to your convictions? I am sure you dont. All men should act in the fear of God according to their convictions. And this is what I have endeavored to do all the time I have been going in and out

before you; and what also I intend to do by his help as long as he continues me in being.

"But some of you in time past have called me "a Thomasite!" Well, you have heard Dr. Thomas for yourselves; and I am glad that you have heard him. Now, my conclusion is after what you have heard, that you will no more call me "a Thomasite" by way of reproach. Where he is heard, that epithet will not be used for reproach. I rather believe that you will henceforth find fault with me for not talking to you more like Thomas. You will be saying, Why does not the old man Webber speak to us as he did? Well, he would if he were as well informed in the word. My regret is that you have not had the same benefit I have in the reading of his works. They open the eyes to understand the scriptures, which ought to be the chief end of all religious writing. But, I shall do the best I can. I shall not cease to visit you; but shall come as often as possible, and endeavor to show you the truth.

"But, I must now first become obedient to it; for, although, when a boy, I was immersed, and joined the Baptist church in Virginia, though pious, I was dipped in ignorance of the gospel Paul preached. That gospel I now understand and heartily believe; and I deem it, not only necessary, but my privilege, to obey it. But, I do not wish to act selfishly. There are some among you who have been searching the scriptures to know the truth. If such are satisfied that they are the subjects of an intelligent belief of 'the things of the Kingdom of God, and of the Name of Jesus Christ,' as the Samaritans were of old,—let such, I say, come forth, and make the good confession Timothy made before many witnesses; even the same confession Jesus made at Pilate's bar at the sacrifice of his life. As for myself, I shall not be immersed to-day. I wish to obey the gospel in the presence of my family and neighbors. I shall, God willing, be baptized at home. Others, however, need not defer on this account."

Bro. Webber having concluded his remarks, four persons, two men and two women, presented themselves for baptism. Of these, one had formerly been a Campbellite; another first a Baptist, and afterwards a Campbellite; the other two, we think, were of no sect.

On Sunday evening, bro. Webber departed for Tennessee, arranging to rejoin us in Memphis on Tuesday, Aug. 11. In the meantime, we proposed to fill an appointment made at Hernando, the county seat of De Soto; and then to go on to Memphis. Accordingly, on Monday morning we left

Loxohama in company with brethren James and Robert Jeffries for Senatobia, where we were to take the cars to Hernando. We arrived at this place about midday, and expected to find one waiting for us at whose instance we had made the appointment. He had impressed bro. J. G. Jeffries with the idea that he had a strong and earnest desire to hear us if ever we came to Mississippi. He had said, that the "Christian Church," the house so called in Hernando where the Campbellites before their dispersion used to meet, would be at our service. Therefore, believing him in earnest, bro. Jeffries sent our appointment to him, to advertize it, and to make due preparation. Bro. Webber did not think any good would come of it. He has had experience of Hernando of old. He had visited them until the conduct of the Campbellites both put him to shame, and nullified his endeavors. At length, he told them he would have no more to do with them. He left them to the operation of their own iniquity which has consumed them with an irreparable dispersion. Our appointment was for 4 P. M., which he thought unfavorable, being the hour of the day in which Hernando was too somnolent to hear.

The lawyer who was to prepare the way, advertized in the local paper that there would be a meeting in the "Christian Church," which would be addressed by us. But he did not meet us at the station; so we took up our satchels, and tramped off to the Virginia Hotel. None but those who have tried them know the *emui* that reigns in such hotels. There is no comfortable, neatly furnished traveler's room, with centre table well supplied with useful and entertaining literature to wile away the time, which always hangs heavily upon the hands of a thinking creature having nothing to do. For want of comfort within, or, because there was nought but a bare floor and naked walls, positive discomfort to the eyes, and to all the organs whose windows they are, we seated ourselves in the porch, that we might see, if 'aught worthy of being seen should pass that way. While seated there the lawyer whom we had expected to see, like the priest and the Levite in the fable, passed by thrice on the other side, leaving us among the thieves dependent on that good Samaritan in the pocket, which fills travelers with all available consolation as long as his presence therein is presupposed. Though one of us three was the lawyer's client, he could not see us; for the sign was "The Virginia Hotel," and not "The Lawyer's Fee." He was not in search of a lost fee, or a coming brief, across the way; so that, not supposing that there could be any one there in search

of him, he looked straight onwards, and kept ahead.

This was more trial to the client's patience than to us, to find himself reduced to the mere value of a fee. The man of law was his business man, always obsequiously polite in business, but under existing circumstances he was ignored; and that, too, by one who had professed to believe the truth! We felt not at all disposed to trouble ourselves with the appointment; and regretted that we had come to the place at all, as we could have been better employed elsewhere. About 4 P. M. we walked to the "Christian Church," the doors of which were closed and fast. We looked through the window, and perceived it to be in picturesque confusion, being used for a school room; so that, if the house had been open, and people to hear, it would have been necessary to adjourn for want of accommodation.

We returned to the hotel. Hernando being *in susta*, we concluded to share in the dose. But, our brother the client was not to be consulted by a Mississippi lawyer. He went into the town, or city, or perhaps, village, we know not which, and laid the case before the Probate Judge, who came down to the hotel to see us; but finding us *en repose*, he returned to chambers. Nevertheless, he undertook to provide a place and congregation. He obtained the loan of the Cumberland Presbyterian temple; and circulated among the citizens urging them to attend at 8 P. M. At this hour the bell was sounded calling them together. When we arrived we found about half a dozen assembled. It was thought desirable to wait a little longer. In a quarter of an hour, much to our astonishment, an audience was assembled of about a hundred people; and among them the identical lawyer who had abandoned us to fortune, but not the judge; whose potations were supposed to have exalted him too highly for vulgar gaze. We addressed the people from Zech. ii, announcing the coming glory of Jerusalem, when Jesus shall reign there, and be the glory in her midst; and the great national regeneration that will follow. Upon this subject we spoke about two hours, and were listened to with marked interest and attention. Could we have remained another twenty-four hours in Hernando, it was thought that the people would have turned out *en masse*. Even the lawyer had become approving. He introduced himself to us in the cars *en route* for Memphis; and made more apologies and explanations for not meeting us, taking us to his house, and fixing up the church than we could, or cared to remember. We believed we saw into the true merits of the case amid all the apologies and explanations. Our visit

to Hernando was an experiment. Could a lawyer lately become rich, and desiring popularity, endure to be pointed at as the man that introduced a preacher to the citizens, of whom only half a dozen turned out to hear! But, when the crowd (and it was a crowd for Hernando in the week when Court is not in session) turned out to hear, the lawyer must not be left behind. He must be there, and among the foremost, with a veil of words signifying nothing as a covering of the past. Our company, the client, his brother, and ourself, congratulated itself that we owed Hernando nothing. We had laid before it the truth, working for nothing, and finding ourselves. All the hospitality we experienced we paid for and departed.

Next day we arrived in Memphis, twenty two miles west of Hernando. In this city, where we staid two or three days, we enjoyed the hospitality of Colonel Logan, a member of the Campbellite Baptist congregation there. Here also for the first time since we left Louisville, Kentucky, where we resided in 1843, we met an old acquaintance, and we believe we may say, friend, Dr. Barbee, who is "popularly styled, Pastor of the Christian Church." The following interesting and well written letter will afford the reader some clue to his relative position.

LETTER FROM DR. BARBEE TO THE EDITOR.

DR. JOHN THOMAS. Dear sir—I would say *Brother Thomas*, but I suppose you will hardly recognize me as such, as I am one of your friends in the "Campbellite encampment," and have not been baptized into the hope of Israel, the inheritance of the goodly land which extends from the river of Egypt to the river Euphrates.

I have read your *Elpis Israel*. I did so at the suggestion of President Fanning; and I agree with him in saying it is an able production, and the author is a good man, one that fears God, and cares not for the wisdom that is earthly, sensual and devilish.

I have also read your *Anatolia*, and several numbers of the *Herald*; and although I do not agree with you in some things, I hesitate not to say that your teaching, in the main, concerning the Kingdom of God, is scriptural.

I have some difficulties on two or three points, which I would be glad to have you remove if you can.

The prophets preceding the Messiah seem to teach very plainly the Restoration of the Jews; but it is worthy of remark, that Paul, in his letter to the Galatians, does not appear to sustain the idea of a literal return to Canaan. He says, (chap. 3—16) Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds as of many;

but as of one, and to thy seed which is CHRIST. Again, at v. 29. And if ye be CHRIST's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.

Of a similar import is his language in Romans, iv, ch. 13, 14; and then at the 16th verse of same chapter he includes both the literal Jews and the spiritual Israel—"all the seed"—both "of the law" and "of the faith." But are not those "of the law" included, upon the condition that they abide not in unbelief?

This is rather a knotty question, and I have every reason to believe that you are better prepared to solve it to my satisfaction than any man living. Give us something short, pithy, and right to the point. You have written a great deal upon it, but you know that we cannot all have access to your former essays. Explain again and again.

Another difficult matter is the conflagration of the world. How can you, according to the laws of rhetoric, explain 2d Pet., 3d ch., 5—13, to mean anything else than an actual burning of some sort? I have read the learned criticisms of venerated doctors on these passages, trying to explain away the idea of literal burning, but when I hear Peter say, the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished; but the present heavens and earth are reserved unto Fire, etc. And when I remember a law of language which directs me to consider the fire literal, inasmuch as the water of the flood was literal. I am constrained to say that we certainly must expect that "the earth and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." Now it is very easy to conceive that such an event could occur by the demolition of existing governments, and that so great will be the display of omnipotent grandeur in the overthrow of the kingdoms of the earth, when the Lord comes, with great propriety it would be likened unto a conflagration; but there stands the actual water, the destructive element in the days of Noah, and in connexion with it (Figurative Fire?!)

Please explain. Meet my difficulty. If Peter had said everything concerning the burning without making an allusion to the flood, I could construe it figuratively. As it is, candor compels me to acknowledge, contrary to my own inclinations, that the apostle teaches an actual burning. It may be a renovation by electricity, or it may be something else. I cannot tell, but certain it is that Peter calls it Fire. He uses the terms earth, air, fire and water. Without dispute, he employs three of them (earth, air and water) literally. Why not the fire in the same sense?

I am rationally inclined to adopt the view which you take, but Peter wont let me.

It will be of no use whatever to quote other passages showing that fire is used in a symbolical sense—such, for example, as Paul's declaration in Corinthians—the fire shall try every man's work, &c. &c. If fire does mean God's wrath in a thousand other texts, the question still presents itself, what does it mean in 2d Pet., 3—5, etc.

Enough for the present. More anon.

W. J. B.

Memphis, Tenn., April 11, 1857.

Of the contents of this letter in reference to the conflagration of the Saints' inheritance, called "the earth" ("the meek shall inherit the earth"—Jesus) we shall speak at large hereafter. What we have more particularly to say about our friend in "the Campbellite Encampment" is, that for the short time we passed with him in Memphis we were agreeably entertained; and, we trust, occupied to mutual profit in conversing upon the things pertaining to the truth we advocate.

As he had promised, he tried to obtain for us a hearing; though he apprehended, that a majority of his folks in Memphis would shut us out. He accordingly proposed to them to offer us their house. As he expected the proposition was not favored by many. Still there was favor enough to prevent it being summarily and finally rejected. Between the two, it was the subject of grave discussion till midnight. Some thought it might be granted if we made application for it. But they were informed that application would not be made. The proposal was to invite Dr. Thomas to speak there as there were several that wanted to hear him. The matter was at length put to the vote, when it was agreed by all with the exception of two dissentients, that the house should be offered us for use as long as we chose to use it.

Time, however, would not permit us to use it longer than two nights. On those occasions we undertook to show what the gospel was; that it was not preached for the first time on the Day of Pentecost; but that it was preached to Abraham; preached by Moses to the Hebrews in Egypt; promised in the Prophets; preached by Jesus, &c.; that it was the gospel in the revelation of its mystery that was preached for the first time on Pentecost; and that "the church" was not the kingdom; but an aggregation of the heirs thereof; and that every one knew that heirs were expectants, not actual possessors, of an inheritance. When we had finished, some regretted that we were not going to

remain longer; and hoped that we would revisit them when in those parts again.

Next day we left Memphis in company with bro. Webber for Fisherville, near to which he resides. We spoke at a meeting house hard by on the three following days. The notice was short, but effective. Very respectable congregations were convened, and the attention they paid encouraging to a speaker. On the second day bro. Webber repeated substantially what he had said at Thyatira; and added, that it was his intention to be baptized that afternoon, and invited his neighbors and friends to come to his house and witness it; for he was to be immersed in a pond on his estate. A large number accordingly attended, to whom we spoke on the use of water in connexion with the gospel; and afterwards proceeded to the water, and baptized him.

Bro. Webber though advanced in years is hale and hearty and capable of doing good service for some time to come. He was an efficient laborer among the Baptists and Campbellites, having raised up several congregations among them, and he thinks, that he may yet do something for the truth. He comes of a courageous stock. His father, as well as the father of our afflicted bro. Anthony who lives near him, was a Baptist preacher in revolutionary times. He was cast into prison by the Devil (Rev. ii. 10) who then ruled Virginia with pike and gun: and when there preached to the people through the prison-bars. The son will not be more afraid of the Devil than the father: though the Devil's policy is more to be feared now than in former times. Then he came upon you with a club and scalping knife, which were sure to excite resistance; but now he approaches you in the garb of a saint, and pretends to be a very pious gentleman. It is, nevertheless, still necessary to meet him with helm and shield. He must never be permitted to insinuate himself between the person and the shield; for then the body will be uncovered and the life exposed. The shield of faith must ever be interposed between the Devil and the Saint; for "this is the victory (*ἡ νικη* the conquering power) that overcomes the world, *our faith*," With this for a shield, and our heads helmeted with the gospel-hope, we are proof against the blandishments and seductions of the devil within and the devil without. Bro. Webber, we believe, will be seduced by neither from "the simplicity which is in Christ." He will beware of flattering approaches. If a man would be saved by the gospel he must do as he has done—obey it. There is not one gospel for our friends, and another for our enemies;

but, on the contrary, one gospel for all. Bro. Webber is a host in himself, because he has the ear and respect of the people in Memphis and the region round about. Before he saw the light distinctly he was trying to reconcile the doctrine we advocate with the theory and practice of Campbellism. But he has discovered that there is no harmony between them. Campbellism may tolerate us; but we can no more tolerate it than any other of "the names" of Christendom. Friendship and respect for all men as such; but against all their "names and denominations," war and destruction unto death, or till the Lord comes; and then we shall see what will become of them! This is our battle-gage; conquer us, or we will conquer you: we give no quarter, and crave none.

Having filled our appointment on Sunday morning, brother Webber drove us over to Colliersville, about eight miles from his abode. We spoke there at night in the Campbellite house to a congregation of considerable size. In the morning we took the cars at the station with a through ticket to Montgomery White Sulphur Springs in Virginia, which was as far as we could be put through from Memphis on our return by the way of the East Tennessee and Virginia railroad. At 7.30 we parted with brother Webber and Mr. Plattenburg, pastor of the Church at Colliersville, whose abhorrence of heresy did not prevent him from hearing us the night before; and bidding us farewell at the station.

While in Mississippi, we inquired concerning friends in that State whose names only we could remember, to wit, Messrs. J. Burch and E. J. H. White. Their direction we did not recollect. On our return to New York we found a letter awaiting us there from brother White, which, as it may be encouraging to brethren in that State, we shall produce here.

BROTHER E. J. WHITE'S LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—Will you let me know what I owe to the Herald; and I will pay you what it calls for. Its intrinsic and real value I am not able to pay. You have my sincere thanks for the service you have rendered me in throwing off the errors of early education: your reward for this you have now in my gratitude and prayers to our Heavenly Father for well-being now and for ever. There is a blessing pronounced on those who turn many to righteousness; may this blessing be yours.

I receive the Herald at this office very irregularly; some scattering numbers of last year just came to hand. In one of them I see you say you will be in Lawrence county

Miss., the beginning of this summer. If this reaches you in time, please let me know when this will be. I will meet you there. I am extremely anxious that you should be here in our county. You could be allowed to proclaim the Gospel in the house of the Campbellite brethren in Fayette; and I have no doubt you could exercise a salutary influence on them. I have mentioned to the Christian brethren here the prospect of your coming; they are highly pleased, and heartily welcome you: will do what they can, that you may incur no loss by the trip peculiarly. Brother T. do come. I say, again, come. I am sure the cause of truth will be promoted by your advocacy of it here; perhaps as much as it will be in any other place of the south. I have done all that I could for the cause. My efforts have been limited owing to my poverty; but have been able to excite an interest and a great desire to hear you. There are some twelve of us here sound in the faith; that faith which sees both into the past and future.

I subscribe myself your brother in the hope.

E. J. H. WHITE.

Fayette, Jefferson Co., Miss.;

June 15, 1857.

P. S.—Since writing this, I find that I was mistaken in your coming to this State—having taken *Mass.* for *Miss.* We have a Lawrence county in our State. My anxiety that you come here contributed to the mistake.

E. J. H. W.

We did not arrive home till 10.30 on Saturday night. The distance to be traveled was fifteen hundred miles by rail; which when accomplished completed a tour of three thousand miles, and an absence of nearly six weeks, in which we addressed the people twenty-six times. In returning we passed through Alabama, by Tuscumbia, Huntsville, and Stevenson; thence to Chattanooga; from this place we turned off to Dalton in Georgia; and thence to Knoxville, Tenn. From Knoxville we passed to the Gap. Here we had to exchange the cars for forty miles of staging, which occupied from midnight to 2 p. m. next day. This brought us to Jonesboro, whose hotel accommodations were so badly reported of that we all preferred to push on to Bristol by a freight train to staying there for the morrow's passenger cars. Fleas, bugs, with abominable cookery, and general uncleanness, at high prices, constitute an imposition that travellers will not submit to if they can be avoided. Bristol is partly in Tennessee and partly in Virginia, and supplies the desiderata unattainable at Jonesboro. At Bristol we were detained a night. We left at 5 a. m. and arrived at the Springs about

11 a. m. We preferred to stop here till 3 a. m., to being detained all night at Lynchburg till 11 next day. The Springs are two miles from the railroad, but connected with it by a private rail. The Montgomery White Sulphur Springs are a beautiful location among the mountains, and situated in what was formerly termed the Devil's Hole. We left them at 3 a. m. and resumed our route by the Tennessee and Virginia line. We arrived at Lynchburg at 10, and left the dusty place at 11 a. m. for the Junction of the Richmond and Petersburg roads. At this point we left the South Side for the Richmond, and in crossing from one to the other met brother Passmore on the platform, who was on his way to Old Point Comfort for his health which appeared to be very infirm. We parted at Richmond, agreeing to meet again at New York, through which he intended to pass on his way to Niagara Falls. At 7.30, we left Richmond for Washington by way of Alexandria; and from Washington we passed on for New York without delay. As we have said, we arrived there at 10.30, with severe headache and sickness of stomach. A little medicine and rest for a day or two enabled us to overcome it; and at once to prepare for a seven weeks' campaign in Old Virginia, for which we were to set out in three weeks, as related in our next.

EDITON.

Nov. 6, 1857.

Clerical Heroism.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—You will rejoice to hear that the "Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God" has been sounded forth in Queensville by our Brother Williams. In August last, he paid a visit to that village, remaining there upwards of a week, "teaching and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God"—speaking several times, both in the Methodist and Christian meeting houses, to large and intelligent audiences. What the result will be must be left to Him who seeth the end from the beginning. It is the intention of our respected brother to return there again in the course of the fall or winter, in the hope that some of the seed may have vegetated. Shortly after his return to Toronto, brother W. attended (in company with two sisters in the Faith) a lecture delivered in the Primitive Methodist Chapel in this city, by the Rev. Jas. Edgar, on "Thy Kingdom Come," being one of a series on the Lord's Prayer. At the conclusion of the sermon, brother Williams asked permission to put a question or two to the reverend gentleman; at once there was quite an excitement in the audience. Some of the lecturer's coadjutors who were present dep-

recated the movement, and all was surprise and confusion among them. Our brother invited discussion; but the Rev. James Edgar, heroic man, actually declined all attempt at proving his assertions, and nervously dismissed the meeting. Fearful that he might be again disturbed on the following evening, he addressed the accompanying note early the next morning to brother W.

Agnes street, August 21, 1857.

MR. WILLIAMS—DEAR SIR—I decline all controversy with you on the topic so very uncourteously introduced last evening; for the following reasons, viz: 1. You are a stranger to me, and consequently may be either a good man, or a bad one, a saint or a sinner, for aught I know. 2. You have no visible union with any of the Protestant congregations in the city—at least, so I inferred from what you stated last evening. 3. You did not come to me to inquire in relation to the Saviour's kingdom, but to force upon me your own views of the question. 4. I have no disposition of entering into arguments on controverted points where no important doctrines are involved. I leave that to ladies who have more tongue than brains, and gentlemen possessing more self-esteem than humility. 5. I have no spare time to squander in useless discussion, were there eight days in the week instead of seven, I would find work for the whole period. 6. I never found discussion profitable to my soul; however it may be to those whose religion is more in words than in spirit. 7. I have not the profound erudition, nor the logical acumen, nor the brass requisite to force myself upon the public in a discussion. 8. It is seldom or ever that discussions honor God, advance the interests of religion, convince skeptics, or increase the faith and piety of those engaged therein. Dear Sir—these are reasons which move me to prefer seclusion to being exhibited to the public in the character of a champion. I profess to be *pro bono publico*, and as such desire to keep my place.

I am, dear sir, your humble servant,
JAS. EDGAR.

It was deemed advisable, for many reasons, to reply to this letter, which was done as follows:

*Yonge street, Toronto, }
August 21, 1857. }*

REV. JAS. EDGAR—DEAR SIR:—In reply to your "very courteous" note of yesterday, I beg leave, with all due "humility," to notice as briefly as possible your eight reasons for "declining all controversy" with me on the topic at issue between us. 1. As a "stranger to you," I cannot but admire your "good-Samaritan" disposition in endeavoring

to pass me by. If a "good man" or "saint," good alone could have resulted from such saintly communion; but if a "bad man" or "sinner," your close imitation of Him who "came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" is above all praise.

2. I have yet to learn that "God is any respecter of persons," therefore, "if called of God, as Aaron was," you stand condemned by that Bible you profess to advocate in withholding from me (unless Protestant) "the word of life," of which you are an ambassador. 3. I affirm, distinctly, that "I did come to you to inquire in relation to the Saviour's kingdom; "having no wish to force" upon you "my own" views of the question, yet curious to see, I confess, how far an "ambassador for Christ" in this nineteenth century would accord with the spirit of those of the first century, when they very pertinently inquired of their Great Teacher, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" 4. Your "disposition to avoid entering into arguments where no important doctrines are involved," is sufficiently commendable; but when "the Truth as it is in Jesus" is involved, and in effect denied, the heart and tongue of all (both men and women) who have been set on fire by Moses and the prophets scripturally expounded, speak forth abundantly regardless of the humble remonstrance, "Refrain, for in thus speaking, thou condemnest us also." The graceful compliment paid to the ladies, proceeding, as it did from Christian humility and "entire sanctification" they *duly* appreciate. 5. I am right glad, sir, to find that you have no spare time for useless discussion. Eight days per week, instead of seven, would indeed, as you observe, be a happy desideratum to one so *usefully* employed. 6. I can readily believe you when you say, "you never found discussion profitable to your soul"—why? You have always avoided it. Not so. St. Paul, however, who "reasoned with the people out of the Scriptures," and disputed daily in the synagogues and markets with them that met with him." Query, Did Paul first ask them if they were "saints," or "sinners," "Protestants" or not? 7. You say "you have not the profound erudition, nor the logical acumen, nor the brass requisite to force yourself upon the public in a discussion." This also I readily believe. "To contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the saints," requires an erudition even that, "that cometh from above," a "logical acumen," even the "rightly dividing the word of Truth," and an amount of "brass" even "the breastplate of righteousness," which at once condemns its possessor in the eyes of the world, and renders him

unpopular with all the sects of so-called Christendom. 8th and lastly, I prefer the testimony of Jesus Christ and his apostles to your individual opinion as to what is, or is not, "honoring to God, convincing to skeptics, or promotive of true faith and piety." "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." If inspired men thus stand out in bold relief as controversialists, par excellence, is it not a sinful sickly sighing for "Peace," that abandons the ground in toto, without first ascertaining from "the law and the testimony" (as the Bereans did at the instance of the renowned controversialist) if we be "pure." I have thus noticed, Dear Sir, in brief, the eight objections urged in your note; if you are "bona fide" as you profess to be "pro bono publico," I invite you to meet in discussion, either public or private, and examine from the Fount of Truth itself whether you or I "contend for that Faith once for all delivered to the saints," revealed by the Eternal in that "Word which he hath magnified above all his name," all short of this is mere profession. Awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience,

I am, sir, respectfully yours,

JOHN WILLIAMS.

The reply appeared duly as follows :

Agnis street, August 25, 1857.

MR. WILLIAMS—DEAR SIR:—I have to say, once for all, no discussion shall take place between us. You may congratulate yourself from being free from the trammels of ignorance with which you think I am shackled; be it so, each of us, therefore, shall enjoy our own views. If I have done you any injury, I ask your forgiveness.

I am, dear, sir, your ob't servant,

JAS. EDGAR.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—These letters, tell their own story, without note or comment—unhappy people who are so blindly led by blinder men, shrouded in more than Egyptian darkness—be it ours, if possible to come to the rescue of such deluded ones; and at the same time use all diligence to be found worthy of that kingdom for which we hope, and for which we pray, at the near approach of Him "whose right it is." May we all be enabled to "watch." The little church here now numbers eleven members, all of whom wish to be most kindly remembered. I remain, dear sir,

Yours in hope of Eternal Life.

JOHN COOMBE.

Toronto, Can. W.; Oct. 13, 1857.

Analecta Epistolaria.

A Word of Thanksgiving.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—As I have removed to Memphis, you will confer a favor by changing the address of the Herald from Louisville, Ky., to Memphis, Tenn. And I may take the opportunity of saying, that it is with great pleasure I receive every number of it. As I consider it of far more value than all the other religious papers I have seen; and it is the only one I can read with pleasure and profit: and I hope you will be long spared in health and strength to prosecute the labors you are engaged in, of endeavoring to enlighten the dark and ignorant of this sectarian age. I feel very thankful that I have been permitted, in the providence of our Heavenly Father, to listen to your teachings, and to read your writings without the prejudice usually encumbering people's minds; and for the liberty of mind that I enjoy; and for the glorious prospect of the Future Age which the truth unfolds; of the glorious inheritance of the saints in a renovated earth under the reign and rule of the Prince of Peace: which they cannot appreciate who are expecting Kingdoms beyond the skies, of which we have no revelation. O may we be enabled to attain to the perfection of character that will secure the "Crown of Righteousness" which Paul was striving for, and which the Lord, the Righteous Judge will give to all who love his appearing.

I inclose my next year's subscription.

Yours in the Love of the Truth.

THOS. BEADMAN.

Memphis, Tenn., Oct. 22, 1857.

Letter from Tennessee.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—By this time I suppose you are resting at home from your trip to the South, and have found repose in the bosom of your little family. I was in Memphis yesterday, and heard Brother Plattenburg deliver an address on reconciliation. The last of the week a protracted meeting will commence at Thyatira, where you spoke three days. The ministers who are invited are Messrs. Barbee, Matthews, Buttler and Plattenburg, the minister in charge. I intend to go down and be in attendance. It may be I may find something to do while there. If any one believing the gospel of the kingdom wishes to be immersed, I will do that; and I may say something by the way that may be for the promotion of the truth; and if anything remarkable occurs, I will inform you.

Since you were at my house, two gentlemen who heard you inquired of me whether you could be induced to come to Macon, a small village in Fayette county, Tenn., and speak for one week. They said they thought they could raise about two hundred dollars to aid you in coming. I told them I did not expect you could come this year, but thought you would come next year if you were desired, and something to keep the wheels of your machine in motion. I have had but little opportunity of knowing what had been accomplished by your labors here, and time will be needful to determine. You have made, as far as I know, a favorable impression on some. I heard while I was in Memphis, that one of my old brethren there said he was sorry, if I wished to be baptized, I had not been so by one of our former preachers; that my course had been mortifying to many of my friends. I would have told him, and will, that they could not have baptized me into my present faith, as they were uninformed about it. I saw sister F., she had returned from Kentucky; and another sister said she thought I would have to baptize her, though she wanted to read more first. Our family are all well, except one case of measles. We shall soon be, I hope, in receipt of your paper.

Yours in the one hope,

M. W. WEBBER,

Sicklby Co., Tenn., Sept. 27, 1857,

Have Nothing to do with it.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have read with much pleasure and satisfaction your *Elpis Israel*; and I desire above all things to get your periodical. I am astonished at my ignorance concerning the Holy Scriptures. About twenty years ago I was immersed by a Free Communion Baptist, and joined their church. Latterly I left. At that time I became acquainted with John Gowans, and was immersed by him a second time for the remission of sins; but upon reflection, I could see no difference between my former baptism and this one. And so I told him. Now it appears to me they were both defective in one of the most essential points. Not one of their systems said one word about the Kingdom of the Messiah upon the earth; nor had my teachers any knowledge of what "*the hope of the Gospel*" was.

A friend in Detroit being informed that I meant to take the *Herald*, tried to dissuade me from having anything to do with it; because that wherever your works were read they did more evil than good; and worse than all, that your doctrines were not fairly drawn from Scripture. I wrote him I was sorry great and good men should differ upon

matters so essential to us; and as I wished to arrive at the truth upon the subject, I would await his reply pointing out the errors in your doctrines; he is, or was, one of the members of the church to which I belonged in Glasgow.

Though immersed, I am quite convinced that I have yet to be baptized upon the same faith as Abraham, David, and all the Prophets before the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus; and upon the same Faith as the Apostles and first Christians; who all were looking forward to the time when the Lord would be universal king over all the earth; and usher in the day of rest for the people of God, who know the joyful sound.

Wishing you health and success in your endeavors to develop "heirs" for the kingdom of God, by diffusing the knowledge of His truth among men,

I remain your affectionate friend,

B. T. S.

Caledonia, Wisc., Sept. 4, 1857.

"Who will go for us?"

DEAR SIR:—I am at a loss to know why some preacher of your persuasion has not reached this place. All other denominations (except the Mormons) have been seen or heard here. I would be glad to hear one of some ability. Any other sort could not be welcomed.

Cheneyville is a village on the thirty-first degree of north latitude, fifty miles from the mouth of Red River. A line of stages runs from the mouth through the village to Alexandria on Red River. I live three miles below Cheneyville on Bayou Boeuf. I am well known by all the sectarians for forty miles around. All that is necessary for one—whom you may send here—to do, is to order the coachman at Alexandria, or at the mouth of Red River, to leave him at Peter Tanner's; and he will be accommodated. I know it is useless to ask you to come; but you may find some one to undertake.

This region is the richest portion of Louisiana; and all opposed to your views except a few. The Episcopalians and Campbellites are the most popular denominations. If you can, send us a man whose face is iron, and his nerves brass—whose tongue is oil; whose back is broad and strong. He will need all the courage of Paul and the eloquence of Apollos to bear the conflicts which will be inevitable.

May you live long and prosper.

PETER TANNER.

Oct. 9, 1857.

Result of Our Visit to Plymouth, Eng-land.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS:—Brother Williams wished me, when writing, to say that your labors in Plymouth have not been in vain, the good seed there sown broadcast by you some years ago, has fructified in some good and honest hearts, who are now earnest defenders of that Faith once for all delivered to the Saints. The church there numbers some thirty members. They are all looking forward with great interest to your again visiting them. Our brother has not been idle since his arrival here. He has addressed the people eight or nine times on the things of the kingdom of God, and neglects no opportunity of speaking a word in season. Many listen with interest, and the Truth may yet be embraced by a goodly number in this fair city. The soil requires much preparation to fit it for germinating the seed, so long has it been overrun with the noxious weeds of tradition and sectarianism.

May we continue to ask when you are coming here again?

I remain, dear brother Thomas,

Yours in the good hope,
Toronto, C. W. JOHN COOMBE.

A Possible Coincidence.

DEAR BROTHER:—I hope this will find you in good health as this leaves me. I received your letter in reply to mine; and am sorry to learn that there are no brethren so far North with whom, as Paul remarks, I might have mutual comfort; however, the pillar of light, the lamp to our feet, (in this dark age) in it is to be found comfort in every position we may be placed in; and many parallel instances of "the sons of God" being entirely isolated from the common brotherhood. In this age is not to be found our rest; and our position is essentially one of waiting and patiently enduring until the bridegroom shall return, when those only who have on the wedding garments, their lights burning, and who look for and love his appearing, shall be the happy guests.

It verily requires a faith akin to that of Abraham to stand alone in the midst of so many professors; but blessed be the God of Abraham, that through his watchful care we have beside us the *light to our feet* and the lamp to our path—the contents of which, fully understood and heartily believed, enables one to be equal to any emergency.

In reading Joseph's history in the *Old Testament* lately, I was somewhat struck with the date of his becoming *Governor of Egypt*; viz. 1864 years B. C. In your

Elpis Israel, you make a comparison between Joseph and Jesus being separated from his brethren, &c. Now would it not be remarkable if the coming of Jesus, which by the prophecies is probably about 1864, should be the same number of years after the birth of Jesus as before his birth that Joseph was exalted in Pharaoh's court?

Wishing you every good from our Heavenly Father, I remain,

Yours truly in the Lord,

JNO. ROBERTS.

Ottawa, C. W., Oct. 29, 1857.

The "One Faith" and "Everlasting Punishment."

MY DEAR FRIEND:—At the request of some of your *inquiring* subscribers, I have briefly delivered to them my views on the "One Faith," and on "Everlasting Punishment;" those views are, doubtless, consonant with yours; as, however, owing to indisposition, they were but very briefly stated, probably you will at some future period favor them with better instruction thereon, from your abler pen, without deeming it an act of supererogation.

Religious persons generally acquire their information of the plan of human redemption, revealed in the Scriptures, from some corrupt system of theological instruction, and hence the "One Faith," is commonly interpreted to mean *belief* in the life, death, resurrection, &c., of our Lord; whereas it is distinctly defined by the Apostle Paul to be "the substance of things *hoped for*," (Heb. xi. 1.) who further shows, "without which it is *impossible* to please God." So also "Everlasting Punishment," under the like subtle priestcraft, is construed into *endless torment*; indeed, so firmly has this spurious dogma of *eternal* pain, and anguish, been established, first, by papistical craft, and subsequently by sectarian opinions, that no argument, however scriptural, appears able to dislodge it from its stronghold in the human intellect, notwithstanding there is, naturally, a tendency to hope for the contrary. I apprehend that there is no insurmountable difficulty in the doctrine itself, viewed spiritually, as also appears obvious, from some of the uninitiated in clerical chicanery, being able to perceive that its primary meaning is a total extinction of the privilege of a blissful immortality; but at the same time doubting whether it does not involve *perpetual* suffering.

Ever yours, very faithfully

"Waiting for the kingdom of God."

RICARD ROBERTSON.

89 Grange Road, Richmondsey,
London, S. E., June 30, 1857.

Is it possible for the faithful and anxious

watchman on Jerusalem's walls to scan the present state of the nations morally, politically and religiously; and not feel assured that his long-promised blissful reward is nigh?

R. R.

Our respected and highly-esteemed correspondent's request shall not be lost sight of.

EDITOR.

Sign of the Times.

The following extract from an article on "Syrian Exploration," found in the September number of the *Occident*, a Jewish periodical, published at Philadelphia, is highly interesting, and plainly shows that God is about "to remember His land" in mercy, and that the "time to favor Zion" is nigh:

* * * "England will soon need a more rapid intercourse with her eastern possessions, than the one now at her command. The revolt in the Bengal army, though it may be momentarily suppressed, must force the English ministry, no less than the East India Company, to reflect on the uncertain tenure by which they hold so many millions of men in subjection, and that a revolt ill concerted this year, may be better planned and more successfully carried out a few years hence.

Great Britain, therefore, not desiring to lose her Indian Empire, from which she derives so much importance, if even there were no pecuniary benefit to flow thence into her coffers, will have to obtain a road for reaching her eastern possessions reliable at all times, and not liable to be interrupted by storms and low water in the Red Sea, and not depend on a navigation through a country controlled by so ambitious and bold a family as that of the Pacha of Egypt. It will accordingly be no love for the Jews, or a desire for their restoration, which will compel England to build the Euphrates Valley Railroad, thus securing a highway leading directly, after a short navigation into the heart of Hindostan, through a more healthy region than by the mouths of the Ganges.

This railroad once built, and the increased commerce seeking a passage over it proving, that it may be profitable as an investment, or if not this, a stimulant to a very active and lucrative trade, shrewd merchants will apply for the privilege of building branch roads leading off in all directions, into Arabia, Persia, Syria, and Egypt, just as other distant enterprises are undertaken for the simple hope of gain. However little may be thought of benefiting the land of Israel, the great stream of commerce will naturally attract to it an active laboring population,

to do the work which will be absolutely needed. These will not be able to exist without agriculture; and thus the very necessity of the case will compel them to subject the soil to the action of the plow and spade; to sink wells; to build fences; to plant trees; and at last to rid the country of those bad neighbors who love to reap where others sow. Who is able to foresee the consequences of such a new method of tilling the soil of Palestine? Who can tell how many Jews may seek a home there, when they can live there in independence and security? Men may laugh at our enthusiasm; but more improbable things have come to pass; and this is at all events within the scope of possibility, and there is nothing which can prevent it, if once the urgency of commerce gives the impulse to farther its success."

Then referring to a report made by the New York Geographical Society, relative to information collected by them, on the feasibility of building a railroad from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, the *Occident* justly remarks:

"They of course have nothing to do with the theological question which we consider involved in the matter; but as God generally guides the course of events through human agency, it is but rational to hope, that should something grow out of the present project, the beginning of the restoration of Palestine may be thus secured. One thing is certain,—that intelligent men of various persuasions and different professions, think well of the idea of settling and improving our ancient patrimony; and we, as Jews, may freely join in this opinion, especially as the ancient fertility of the land is an undoubted fact, and as the former splendor of the cities on the coast and interior, based on commerce and agriculture, proves what the land was able to furnish, and therefore leads us to believe that the same may be again, if the same means are employed as formerly."

"HIS HORN SHALL BE EXALTED."—Continuing to ride to Banius, we toiled up steep rocky paths, where we found trees and shrubs very abundant, particularly on grassy tableland. We met people traveling—women on horseback, wearing the curious horn, which is fixed on the front of the head, and fastened behind. This *tantur*, or horn, is made of tin, silver or gold, according to the rank or wealth of the wearer. Some are a yard long, shaped like a speaking-trumpet. It rises from the forehead, and is fastened at the back of the head by a band. A large veil is thrown over it, and falls down the sides of the head and shoulders. It is usually

worn only by married women, but I believe unmarried women also occasionally wear it. There are many references to this horn in the Old Testament. It was sometimes worn by men. Job says: "I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and defiled my horn in the dust." Job xvi. 15; and David, alluding to the righteous, says, in Psalm cxii. 9: "His horn shall be exalted with honor."—*Lady Falkland's Chow-Chow.*

"Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all that he hath." Luke xii. 42-44; Matt. xxiv. 45-47; xxv. 21, 23; Luke xix. 12-19.

What are we to do for Preachers.

A very singular discussion has just sprung up in the American papers upon a very American-like subject, namely: where are the people to find Preachers, or rather who will preach in these days of temptation and money making? Elder, or Preacher Landon—we forget just now how he was described in the evidence before the Railway Committee—was found the only man who could properly "improve the occasion," when the municipalities were to be acted upon for the £145,000 for the Woodstock and Eric road. An engineer, who has seen somewhat of the railway elephant out west, assures us, that a Methodist Preacher was one of the principal contractors on the Michigan Central road. Recently we saw a paragraph going the rounds, that a Preacher made himself useful all week as a conductor, and then conducted the services in a fashionable church on Sunday. In Wisconsin, a few weeks since, the extraordinary spectacle was exhibited, of a Preacher pleading, as an excuse for theft, that he was actually driven to it to keep his family from starving. Preachers, too, have two causes very strongly operating upon them at the present time, to dissatisfy them with their calling, or to render it singularly unhappy. The first is, that they see inferior men everywhere getting rich and becoming comfortable in the world, without the application of either extraordinary judgment or unusual industry. And the second is, that whilst every necessary of life has been more than doubled in price, and every kind of labor is proportionally rewarded, the clergyman is left to his six or eight hundred dollars a year, and to take the rest of his living out in thin air. Now and then we

hear of a railway laborers' "strike," and the only benefit the poor clergymen get by the operation, is to say prayers over the wounded, or to lecture the rich on Sunday about the propriety of being more liberal, and the poor about the advisability of not narrowing the road to heaven by fighting over it. The printer, who puts in type the Parson's sermon, "strikes" for higher wages, on account of dearer provisions and house rent turned into a fable. But the poor Parson, who has supplied the soul and the eloquence for the document, cannot "strike" without producing a rather too striking prejudice against his cloth; and if his house rent is turned into a fable, he must accommodate his feelings to a less fabulous dwelling. Even the useful individual who mends soles, "strikes," and thereupon gets more for the soles he mends, but the poor Parson may mend souls all his lifetime, and it never seems to strike anybody that there is any connection between his soul and his body, or his pocket and his stomach.*

Looking at this state of affairs, *Parsondom* is likely to become depopulated in the United States. Some clerical gentlemen, as we have remarked, are turning contractors, conductors on railroads, speculators, and, in all likelihood, very expert expounders of bogus or sham undertakings there. Others again are turning merchants and traders; and one exceptional character, we should hope, turned his attention to coveting and appropriating his neighbors' goods. This, however, only applies to the present inhabitants of Parsondom. The emigrants thither, in the shape of students, and young men with a religious turn of mind, are beginning to add a little personal political economy to their other information; and are sadly given to impressions that five, six, and seven hundred dollars a year may be all very well on the score of humility, but that the figures are amazingly defective in the logic of purchasing beef at ten pence a pound, potatoes at two dollars a bushel, and paying "helps" and house rent in neighborhoods where a respectable Parson may meet his perhaps fashionable congregation. In plain English, Parsons, like other people, have to live, wear decent coats, and come out, on all proper occasions, with a "dickey" at least, if they cannot afford the continuations. They cannot go into debt either without walking out of their pulpits, or walking into them from time to time under very painful circumstances. Hence, many are forced, from sheer necessity, to abandon their callings, or to divide their duties with others of a more profitable character. Some

* The souls are so badly mended, that our opinion is, that the spiritual cobblers draw much larger compensation for their work than it is worth.

leave them from prudential motives. Others are, of course, affected by the almost universal thirst for gain. Whilst students find their religion yield before the prospect of little less than beggary, and their enthusiasm dies out before meat at ten pence a pound, house rent at four hundred dollars a year, and a salary or income of seven or eight hundred; men, in these days, are liable to take a practical view of things, and to associate their religious ideas with the comforts and respectability of their children; and they really cannot be blamed for abandoning what brings sufferings that no men should be called upon to endure, and that no men can be happy whilst enduring.*

We by no means intended saying so much on this subject when we began this little article. Indeed we meant but to introduce some pleasant and instructive observations from the *Boston Traveller* on the subject; but whilst we are upon it, we may as well add, that it is one of the least creditable features in American progress and wealth, that Parsons are so wretchedly paid. Lawyers' fees—we speak of counsel—are immensely disproportioned to what they used to be. Twenty-five pounds are now paid in cases that five pounds, ten years ago, was the usual figure for on the back of a brief. Even members of Parliament—bad as many of them are—are tolerated whilst they vote themselves six dollars a day. Infinitely better men, not very many years ago, made their contributions to the collective wisdom for a dollar a day, with the privilege, however, of eating their bread and cheese on the steps of the Parliament House. In the recent railroad disclosures, upwards of £1,400 were found to have been paid to one gentleman for railroad services *outside* of Parliament. What they were did not transpire, unless he drank large quantities of parliamentary cider, vulgarly called champaign, down in the underground branch of the legislature. Sir Allan McNab received, for services chiefly, £10,000 from the Great Western Road; and another gentleman in Parliament positively scouted the idea of being only offered five thousand pounds for his! But has it never occurred to a respectable, and we fondly hope still, an honest people, that those who take care of our road to heaven should have some little consideration, when those who

make our roads here enjoy so much? For law—and it is often a poor consideration for money—we pay liberally; for every enterprise that improves our material condition, or added to our conveniences, we pay enormously. Is it fair—nay, is it creditable to our civilization, our humanity, and our intelligence, that those who improve our morals, and teach our children truth, should be allowed to exist as a mere libel upon decent living in a sumptuous land.†

The following are the opinions of the *Traveller* to which we have alluded:

"The complaint is general; it comes up from the seminaries of every sect; that no young men will enter the ministry—that the benches of the theological schools are empty, while the law schools and the colleges of medicine are full to overflowing. But, in return, the young men ask: 'Why should we enter a profession where the average pay is less than that of a good day laborer? We will do good where we can—perhaps it may be in our power to do much good elsewhere—but how can we live on \$500 or \$600 a-year?—how can we marry—how support a family—how pay off the debt of a theological education with such miserable stipend?' True, a minister of the word of God should be content to suffer and bear all things, confident of the All hail Hereafter; but why to the necessary trials, and the inevitable sorrows, and the too sure sacrifices, of a self-immolating and devoted life—why to all this should be added the harassings of poverty, the pinching of debt, and the continual anxiety for daily bread? It is an insane and suicidal policy which brings about this state of things, and the Church of America should profit by the lessons of the past."—*From a Canadian paper.*

Immersion apart from the "One Faith" not the "One Baptism."

In reference to the remarks contained in our article, entitled "*An Editorial Offset*," we said, "We hope he (our friend of the *Expositor*) will let his readers know, in the *republishing* of these remarks *verbatim*, that the silence is at length broken, &c." We said this being apprehensive that a different policy would be pursued—that we should not be permitted so to speak for ourselves. And

* Compare the "sufferings" of these persons with the sufferings of Paul as detailed in his experience. They pretend to be "ambassadors of Christ," let them be as he, who says, "I rejoice in my sufferings for you (Colossians), and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His Body's sake, which is the Church." A genuine minister of the word "is called to suffering, even unto death, if need be: the sufferings, however, should not emanate from his own brethren; but from the enemies of the truth.—*Editor.*

† Yes, but they do not teach the children "the truth." On the contrary, their teaching closes their minds against it; so that in after years it is the most difficult thing in the world to effect an entrance for it. If they really taught the truth, the children of the truth would delight to honor and console them in their conflict with "the world, which is the enemy of God." But they live by the world, and seek to please the world, and therefore they are like the world; so that all their "sufferings" are according to their deserts.—*Editor.*

so it has come to pass. Five scraps, consisting of about nineteen lines, selected to suit, out of a hundred and twenty-six, have been transferred to *The Expositor*, and smothered in three columns of notes and comments, designed to prove, what we have never denied, that we are not infallible!—that the events of Russia's prophetic career have not transpired so early as we have seemed to expect. *Elpis Israel*, written in 1849-50, has been ransacked for evidence of mistakes, and as the result, five lines have been paraded; and besides these, seven lines from some number of the Herald, in reference to the fate of the Russian power when planted in the Holy Land. With him "war" must be without truce, or peace or intermission. If its thunder and lightning are not incessant, the intervals constitute its several roarings new wars. We do not use "war" in this sense. Among the meanings of the noun are "hostility," "a state of opposition;" and of the verb, "to be in a state of opposition." This is the present situation of Russia in relation to the Ottoman Empire, and the passed likewise since 1828; and will so continue to be till "the Sick Man" is dead.

We admit that we did not expect so abrupt a cessation of bloodshedding. The death of Nicolas, no subject of prophecy, and which changed the elements of the situation, was the cause of this. But though he has departed, Russia remains, her policy respecting the Ottoman Empire is the same, the Eastern question is further from settlement by the Powers than ever, the Allies are enfeebled, Turkey too weak to maintain order in her own territory, and the ambition of Russia unabated. The very question now at issue between the Powers diplomatically is the *integrity of Turkey*. We say, then, that war continues, and will continue between the Powers concerned in the fate of Turkey, till he who is both Jehovah and Christ come, who alone can give a quietus to the question.

But suppose we were mistaken in *all the details* of the great issue between Russia and Turkey, prefacing the final settlement of "the Controversy of Zion," is our respected contemporary therefore justified from all his past sins by faith in Christyanism; or, if justified by obeying the truth, (on the hypothesis that he did so in his immersion,) is he therefore not apostate from the truth (we disclaim all intention unnecessarily to wound) in making a bonfire of all the promises—the good thing Jehovah has promised to Israel—when, as a Millerite, he warred against "carnal Judaism," which he now professes, and doomed the earth to annihilation in flames? "Salvation is of the Jews." These are the words of Jesus. It was the salvation he preached—"the Gospel of the Kingdom,"

by which also he declares we shall be acquitted or condemned. But if there is to be no restoration of Israel; no restitution of the kingdom and throne of David; if all the nations are to be destroyed; and the earth—the inheritance of the meek—to be burned up (as taught by Millerism which our friend professed):—if these things be true, then Jesus did not preach the truth. But, he did preach the truth; *ergo*, Millerism is a lie; and "no lie is of the truth."

Our friend is solicitous to put these errors of his and Mr. Miller, on a par with our alleged errors of detail concerning the career of Russia. He says, "Such were our errors for which (though we have acknowledged and confessed them) Dr. Thomas cannot fellowship us as a Christian until we are re-baptized." All our "errors" put together do not nullify the Gospel; but the errors our friend says he has confessed reduce the gospel Jesus and the Apostles preached to a tissue of falsehood and absurdity. They make the word of God of none effect, being logically destructive of it. If our friend can prove to our satisfaction that he believed the gospel of the kingdom before he was immersed, we will readily admit that he is a Christian, and as readily agree, that a second immersion would be wrong: we could then say, "Dear Friend, you are doubtless a Christian, but have been sadly tossed about by winds of doctrine: you say you have confessed your errors, and returned to the truth; in this we truly rejoice; may the Lord forgive you, for in your case, forgiveness is with him alone, that he may be feared."

Lastly, our friend says, "We deem Dr T.'s test of baptism *unscriptural*, and if carried out to the letter is calculated to divide the flock of Christ." What our friend terms our test of baptism is really this: we say that the teaching of the New Testament inculcates *faith first* and *immersion afterwards*; and that the faith inculcated is comprehensive of "the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of the Anointed Jesus;" and that without this, the One Faith, no religion is pleasing to God. See Acts, viii. 12; Heb. xi. 6; Eph. iv. 5. Strike out the faith, and the immersion is worth nothing. "It is one God which shall justify the circumcision (those under the law before the faith came) *by faith*; and the uncircumcision (us Gentiles) *δία της πίστεως through the faith*—Rom. iii. 30. The great question with us is not about the dipping, but about the faith. Truce, we must have the faith and the baptism, on the principle that no man must put asunder what God has joined: and we want it in the order in which we find it in the book; and not baptism first, and the

faith afterwards, or not at all. All this is perfectly scriptural; but at the same time too strictly scriptural for our gospel-nullifying generation; and therefore in its estimation *unscriptural*, i. e. not according to its interpretation of the word. The test is not our's, but Christ's, who says, that the word he preached shall judge men in the last day. Ignorance of this before immersion leaves that immersion on a par with a Jewish ablation, or rather below it.

Nov. 12, 1857.

EDITOR.

Jewish Luni-Solar Years.

From a work written by Sir Isaac Newton, and probably the only copy in the United States, we select for the *Herald of the Kingdom* the following remarks on the Jewish Luni-Solar Years.

"The ancient solar years of the Eastern nations consisted of twelve months, and every month of thirty days; and hence came the division of a circle into 360 degrees. This year seems to be used by Moses in his history of the Flood, and by John in his Apocalypse, where 'a time, times and half a time,' 42 months and 1260 days, are put equipollent. But in reckoning by many of these years together, an account is to be kept of the odd days which were added to the end of these years. For the Egyptians added five days to the end of this year; and so did the Chaldeans long before the times of Daniel, as appears by the era of Nabonassar: and the Persian Magi used the same year of 355 days, till the empire of the Arabians. The ancient Greeks also used the same solar year of twelve equal months, or 360 days; but every other year added an intercalary month, consisting of 10 and 11 days alternately.

The year of the Jews, even from their coming out of Egypt, was Luni-solar. It was solar, for the harvest always followed the Passover, and the fruits of the land were always gathered before the Feast of Tabernacles, *Lev. xxii.* But the months were lunar, for the people were commanded by Moses in the beginning of every month to blow with trumpets, and offer burnt offerings with their drink offerings, *Numb. x. 10; xxviii. 11, 54;* and this solemnity was kept on the new moons, *Psal. lxxxi. 3-5; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31.* These months were called by Moses the first, second, third, fourth month, &c.; and the first month was also called *Abib*, the second *Zif*, the seventh *Ethanim*, the eighth *Bul*, *Exod. xii. 4; 1 Kings vi. 37, 38; viii. 2.* But in the Babylonian captivity the Jews used the names of the Chaldean months, and by those names understood

the months of their own year; so that the Jewish months then lost their old names and are now called by those of the Chaldeans.

The Jews began their civil year from the autumnal equinox, and their sacred year from the vernal; and the first day of the first month was on the visible new moon, which was nearest the equinox.

Whether Daniel used the Chaldean or Jewish year is not very material, the difference being but six hours in a year, and four months in 480 years. But I take his months to be Jewish; first, because Daniel was a Jew, and the Jews even by their names of the Chaldean months, understood the months of their own year; secondly, because this prophecy (of the Seventy Weeks) is grounded on Jeremiah's concerning the 70 years of captivity and therefore must be understood of the same sort of years with the seventy; and these were Jewish, since that prophecy was given Judea before the captivity and lastly, because Daniel reckons by weeks of years, which is a way of reckoning peculiar to the Jewish years. For their days ran by sevens, and the last day every seven was a Sabbath; so their year ran by sevens, and the last year of eve. seven was a Sabbathical year, and seven such weeks of years made a Jubilee."

The Subscription List.

BY CHARLES DICKENS.

It has been declared, with truth, that public charity accomplishes more in this country than in any other in the world. The inference to be deduced from this fact must be carefully drawn. Many influences swell the amount of "charitable donations;" and it is by arriving at something like an estimate of the pure charity, to be generally traced in a subscription list, that we measure the extent of public heart-benevolence. Let us take up a list at random. Here is a subscription in aid of an hospital. The first name we find is that of—

Miss Lettice Latterday, of Latterborough Hall, £10

Doubtless, this lady is sincerely desirous that the hospital thus patronised should be a couple of beds the better of her contribution; yet the conspicuous contribution of Miss Latterday's name and euphonious address at full length, betrays an anxiety that her benevolent desires, together with the

fact of her being the possessor of Lutterborough Hall, should be extensively known to the public at large. The next lines on the list are :

John Pampas, Esq. £5
Mrs. John Pampas 5

If Mr. Pampas be solely anxious to extend the usefulness of the hospital, why did he not subscribe at once without dragging in his wife? Is he pleased to see his name prominently repeated in the list; or has Mrs. Pampas insisted upon seeing herself in print? We suspect that the Pampases look upon the matter rather as a bit of cheap distinction, than as real good performed by them. Mr. Pampas, we are told, was very particular about having his name properly spelled.

This expedient for spreading a small amount of charity over a large surface of publicity is more strikingly exemplified by the next entries :

The Right Honorable Lady Bittern . . . 10s. 0d
The Honorable Blanche Bittern . . . 7 6
The Honorable Fanny Bittern . . . 5 0
The Honorable Allela Bittern . . . 2 6
The Honorable Jemima Bittern . . . 2 6
The Honorable Chas. de Brandenburg Bittern 2 6

Lady Bittern is an economist. No one knows better than her ladyship how to lay out thirty shillings in charity with profit to the reputation of her numerous family. What a miracle of precocious munificence it exhibited to those who happen to know that Charles de Brandenburg Bittern has not yet arrived at the dignity of being short-coated!

The next name worthy of note is that of our friend—

Johnson Tomlinson, Esq., of Topperton Hall £25

We happened to be present when this subscription was solicited. Tomlinson, an exemplary share-broker, had recently bought "the place" advertised above. The first question he asked the begging secretary was—not as to the object of the fund in course of formation; how it would be applied; what amount of suffering it would mitigate; how many new patients would be relieved—but, "Who have you got?" The secretary unfolded his list; "Well, sir," he began, "we have the Lord Lieutenant (fifty guineas), the High Sheriff (fifty pounds), Lord Bramble, one hundred and five pounds. You

see, sir?" continued the wily solicitor, knowing his man, and remembering his initial, "We do not make up our list *alphabetically*, but according to amounts."

"Hum!" considered Tomlinson, melting to the cause when he remembered how completely out of sight the "T's" were stuck in former advertisements; "How much has Sir Skinner Flint put down?"

"Twenty pounds, sir."

"Very well; put down twenty-five opposite to my name. You see," was Tomlinson's aside speech to us, "one must do the thing a little handsome as a new comer into this aristocratic part of the country, or one gets looked on freezingly by these people: I may say blown upon."

It is a sorry inference, then—but, alas, a true one—that Tomlinson's money was not put forth to fend off suffering from the sick poor, but as a golden shield for himself against the cold shoulder of the rich.

"Sir," said the secretary, when he called on the chief proprietor of the *Whited Sepulchre Chronicle*, "We spend twelve hundred a year in newspaper advertising; besides two hundred per annum in printing circulars. You could not have a better medium for making your excellent publication extensively known to the public. Let me say five." But does the person appealed to, know that the notification would be repeated in just as many impressions for less money, we find it stand thus:

Proprietors of the *Whited Sepulchre Chronicle* £2 2s

Could the price and day of publication have appeared, the donor candidly owned he would have been glad to give the five.

Glancing the eye over other parts of the subscription list, we do not find it wholly a record of pomps and vanities. There are a few scarcely perceptible entries almost overshadowed by the big letters of the great subscribers. They are simply initials set against small sums; the smallest, however, is greater than either of Lady Bittern's family offerings. "A Friend" occurs more than once, and ten shillings is bestowed by "an Old Patient." Such contributions speak true charity out of the fulness of genuine gratitude.

Our former instances are, we reluctantly own, not overcharged demonstrations of what goes by the name of charity, in a great many cases. A new ward is to be built in a hospital. Experience proves that to demonstrate the necessity and utility of such an addition, is but a secondary necessity. The promoters know, that to succeed, they must get the undertaking graced with the names and patronage of half a dozen peers, a sprinkling of the House of Commons, and

a judicious selection from wealthy neighbors. The list is published, and subscriptions flow in. Why do they flow in? Because the undistinguished rich—the mob of gentlemen who pay with ease—have, too often, a morbid desire to find their names ranged alongside those of "Good" Dukes, Peers, and M.P's.

The truth is, deep, sympathising, effectual benevolence does not often find its way into the subscription list at all. Neither does it go about in mysterious melodramatic disguise, on purpose to be found out and be all the more blazoned; but, with unostentatious earnestness, gives its intellect and its time, as well as its money, to the needy and suffering. It discriminates, inquires, and affords judicious help rather than unqualified alms; which though it may bless the giver, seldom blesses the receiver; unless in cases of utter helplessness.

Meek charity never thrusts her hand into her purse with the bouncing let-me-know-what-I-have-to-pay, -and -have-done-with-it, profusion of a rich "subscriber." She is a great economist; for had she millions, she could not cover and heal all the sores of poverty that cover the land. She knows that unwise profusion to one case is gross injustice to many others that must be consequently neglected.

It may be argued, that whatever be the motives of the advertisers, for their seeming charity, the result is good. They give their money and that is usefully applied.

As a general rule, we doubt this. The regular charities, of which routine advertisements are constantly appearing in the Spring, are, many of them, gigantic jobs; operating less for the excellent objects pretended in them than for the payment of large salaries to their officers and managers. Most of the subscribed capital goes to build magnificent palaces for a few children, who are supposed to be born in hovels; to pay the bills of treasurers, who manage to get elected as such because they are printers, or contractors for articles used in the institution, and enormously overcharged. The purest we believe to be medical charities; but some of these are full of abuses—abuses often occasioned by their very affluence, and which they have attained by means of a clever and constant working of THE SUBSCRIPTION LIST.

The Infidelity of the Day.

It is not Atheism I fear so much in the present times as Pantheism. It is not the system which says nothing is true, so much as the system which says every thing is true. It is not the system which says there is no

Saviour, so much as the system that says there are many saviours, and many ways to peace. It is the system which is so liberal, that it dare not say any thing is false. It is the system which is so charitable, that it will allow every thing to be true. It is the system which seems ready to honor other religions as well as that of our Lord Jesus Christ; to class them all together, and hope well of all who profess them. It is the system which will smile complacently on all creeds and systems of religion—the Bible and the Koran—the Hindoo Vedas and the Persian Zendavests—the old wives' fables of Rabbinical writers and the rubbish of Patristic traditions—the Racovian Catechism and the Thirty-nine articles—the revelations of Emanuel Swedenborg and the Book of Mormon of John Smyth; all are to be listened to; none are to be denounced as lies. It is the system which is so scrupulous about the feelings of others, that we are never to say they are wrong. It is the system which is so liberal, that it calls a man a bigot if he dares to say "I know my views are right." This is the system which I desire emphatically to testify against and denounce. What is it but a sacrificing of truth upon the altar of a caricature of charity? Beware of it, if you believe the Bible. Has the Lord God spoken to us in the Bible, or has he not? Has he shown us the way of salvation plainly in the Bible, or has he not? Has he declared to us the dangerous state of all out of that way, or has he not? Gird up the loins of your mind and look the question fairly in the face, and give them an honest answer. Tell us that there is some other inspired book besides the Bible, and then we shall know what you mean. Tell us that the whole Bible is not inspired, and then we shall know where to meet you. But grant for a moment that the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is God's truth, and then I know not in what way you can escape the conclusion that sincerity alone will not save your soul. From the liberality which says every body is right—from the charity which forbids you to say anybody is wrong—from the peace which is bought at the expense of truth, may the good Lord deliver you.—*Rev. J. C. Ryle.*

"The Great River Euphrates."

The Turkish and Persian empires bound each other from the Persian Gulf to the Black Sea. The frontier between them is marked by a line which projects from the Persian Gulf, between the 30th and 31st parallels of N. latitude, and the 48th and

49th degrees of East longitude. It continues in a very zig-zag and deeply indented course to a not far distant point west of Lake Oroomiah, where the 37th parallel of North latitude decussates the 45th degree of East longitude. Thence it runs to Mount Ararat, whence it is deflected in a very serrated north-westerly direction till it strikes the Black Sea at about the 48th degree of north latitude, and 42d of East longitude. North of this line, between the Caspian and Black Seas, lies Georgia; Persia lies on the east, and the Turkish empire west of this line; so that, the latter includes the whole of "THE GREAT RIVER EUPHRATES," the Tigris, ancient Chaldaea, Mesopotamia, the ancient Assyria and Armenia, part of Media, and all the Holy Land as defined by Moses and Ezekiel. The ancient Assyria, and part of Armenia and Media, are included in Khoordistan, styled by Xenophon in his account of the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks from Persia, Kharduchai. The Nestorians, a few years since massacred by Ceder Khan Bey, are the *Mountain Nestorians*, a people almost as fierce as the Khoords, and so styled to distinguish them from the Nestorians of the plain of Oroomiah, east of the mountains in Persia.

From this rough sketch, the reader will perceive the reason why the Spirit of God has chosen the Euphrates as the symbol of the Turkish empire, not to mention the consideration that the Turks invaded Roosh, the Greco-Roman empire, from their native country eastward of that river. The Turkish and Persian powers are so merely nominal with respect to each other, that they have ceased to appeal to arms for the settlement of disputes, as in former times; their umpires are the great powers of Europe, by their plenipotentiaries at Constantinople and Teheran. In the countries of the Tigris, Euphrates, the Jordan, and the Nile, the Ottoman supremacy is scarcely more than the shade of a once potent name. The vial of the Sixth Angel has most emphatically dried up the waters of the river Euphrates, so that no obstacle is presented now, by Turkish *ability* to withstand, the resettlement of the Lord's land from the great river to the river or stream of Egypt.

Sects and their Clergy.

It is scarcely true that "the Sects are the greatest curse that afflicts the world." As the world will not receive the truth in the absence of Christ from our planet, and as it must have a superstition of some sort for its phrenologically "moral sentiments" to act upon, it would be a *greater* curse if the world were of one uniform mammoth superstition. In such an event, there would be no civil or religious liberty on earth; and then woe to all writers that dared to show up the "Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites," of the glorious and enlightened nineteenth century in the colors they are painted with in the Scriptures of truth! The clergy are the accursed preachers of an anti-Pauline Gospel, Gal. i. 6-9; "Who run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward"—Jude ii.; and "For whom is reserved the blackness of darkness during the Aion—verse 13." So long as the peoples, and nations, and tongues of "Christendom" glorify them as "great and good, wise and spiritual," it is impossible for them to be saved. They handle the word of God deceitfully, and in pretending to cure souls, "make merchandise of them, and devour them. Instead of being "workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth," they are mere botches, and pass for skilful workmen only with those who are ignorant of the Scripture; and, therefore, know not what work is when rightly done. No; the safety of liberty in any country is in the divisions and clerical emulities of its ecclesiastics. Their "Names of Blasphemy," as their "Names and Denominations" are apocalyptically styled, being mutually antagonistic, are to them a cause of weakness; but to "THE WOMAN," and "THE EARTH," which "*helps her*," their divisions are a defence. The more sects the better till the Lord come, *provided only that the saints be united among themselves.* To these it is cause of joy to behold Satan divided against Satan; for, while fighting against himself, he is too busy in an opposite direction to molest the faithful. We pray, therefore, that the Campbellite crotchet of the "union of all Christians," as they style their brethren of "The Names," may never, as we are certain it will never, be realized; but may "sects" and their clergy be soon abolished by the apocalypse of Christ.—*Editor.*

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never perish, and a dominion that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.] Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y. Dec. 1857. [VOL. VII. No. 12.]

The Apostasy of the First Century.

(Concluded from our last.)

IMMORTAL-SOULISM and its consequents, and the denial of the true humanity of Jesus and its consequents, were the "damnable heresies" introduced by the false teachers of the first century. As Paul predicted, so have they truly gangrenously eaten out the faith originally delivered to the saints; and it is these heresies, organized into an ecclesiastical system, that constitute the Christianity of our day. The apostles were exceedingly incensed at the planters and propagators of these abominations; and well they might be, for their work was brought to contempt and destroyed by their operations. Peter is very indignant, and bears his testimony against them, saying, "There were false prophets among the people (Israel), as there will be false teachers among you, privately introducing damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them (denying that he came in real flesh). And many will follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth will be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words MAKE MERCHANDIZE OF YOU. Presumptuous, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities (*δοξας*, glories, or those in the Church through whom the ministration of the Spirit is glory), whereas angels, who are greater in power and might, bear not reproachful opinions in respect of them before the Lord. But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things they understand not. Spots are they, and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; *beguiling unstable souls*; a heart they have exercised with *covetous practices*; cursed children, who have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, son of Bosor,

who loved the wages of unrighteousness. These are wells without water, clouds that are covered with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, and wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them that live in error; while they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption."—2 Peter, ii. These were the scoffers of the last days of the Mosaic dispensation, walking after their own lusts, who tauntingly inquired, Where is the promise of his coming? of that coming predicted in Mat. x, 23; xxiv, 27?

From the existence of such "evil men and seducers" diligently and indefatigably circumventing the doctrine of the apostles, and, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, corrupting the minds of the disciples from the simplicity that is in Christ; there appears great propriety in Jude's exhortation that they should "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." Indeed, he declares that this was the reason of his exhortation. "For," continues he, "there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to the condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ." He then reminds them of the fate of those who perished in the wilderness because of unbelief; of the disobedient angels; and of Sodom and Gomorrah; and then remarks, "Likewise also these dreamers defile the flesh, despise authority, and speak evil of dignities. They speak evil of those things they understand not, but what they understand naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perish in the contradiction of Korah. These are spots in your feast of love, when they feast with

you, feeding themselves without fear; they are clouds without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withers, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. Enoch prophesied of these murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaking great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage."

The unhappy state of things in the last thirty years of the Mosaic dispensation defined by these testimonies, was a literal accomplishment of the words of the Lord Jesus, predicting the signs indicative of the approaching destruction of the Mosaic world. Addressing his apostles, he said, "Ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another; and many false prophets will rise, and deceive many; and because iniquity will abound, the love of many will wax cold. But he that shall endure to the end shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the habitable for a testimony unto all the nations, and afterwards shall the end come." Matt. xxiv, 9, 14; Col. i, 23.

The apostle John, alluding to the fulfillment of these words, in writing to those whose "sins had been forgiven them for his name's sake," says, "Little children, it is the last hour (*ώρα*); and as ye have heard that *The Antichrist* comes, even now there are many antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last hour. They (these antichrists) went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." 1 John, ii, 18.

These antichrists professed great zeal for "divine things," claiming to be Christians of superior sanctity to the apostles themselves. Their antichristian character consisted in not consenting to their teaching concerning the Father and the Son. As we have seen, there were great numbers of them of exceedingly bad minds, nevertheless, many made a great show of piety in word and austerity of life, by which they were enabled to pass current among the simple for good saints and ministers of righteousness. They professed to have the Holy Ghost, and to speak by its impulses. Some of them, not understanding in what sense "Jesus was made a curse for us," went so far as to pronounce him accursed, which led Paul to say, "I give you, Gentiles, to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed." 1 Cor.

xii, 3. There is no doubt they were moved by a spirit to teach, even as some of our pious contemporaries profess to be; but it was not the Spirit of God. It was the spirit of those phrenological organs which, before they professed Christianity, had been defiled and perverted by rabbinical traditions and fables, philosophy and vain deceit, or by the grosser paganism of the vulgar, as they happened to be led. They had received the word of the kingdom as "way side," "stony," and "thorny ground" hearers. They received it with joy, but when tribulation and persecution arose because of the word, when worldly cares increased, the word was *choked*, they became offended and unfruitful. Unwilling to abandon Christianity entirely, they sought to popularize it by mixing up its doctrines with rabbinical and philosophical traditions, that the offense of the cross might cease, and the persecutor be appeased. But neither Jesus nor the apostles would tolerate this. They would admit of no blending of their doctrine with mere human tradition. The consequence was, that these false prophets or teachers, these cowardly and infidel pietists, pitched themselves *απρι*, against *Χριστος*, *Christ*, as taught by the apostles, and were therefore styled "antichrists," and the spirit that begat them, "the spirit of the antichrist." They did not renounce Christianity, but corrupted it. They set up "a form of godliness" which had its God, its Jesus, its Holy Spirit, its gospel, its piety, and so forth; but when these were compared with those taught by Jesus and the apostles, they were found to be destitute of the *power*. The form and the power were apostolic Christianity; the form, mutilated by superstition, theirs. The latter is the Christianity that has been traditionally and papistically handed down to us. It is the Christianity of all Christendom, state and denominational, which is as much possessed of the spirit of antichrist as were the antichrists of the first century; for it is the very antichrist itself in its ecclesiastical constitution.

The Spirit in the apostles, and the spirit in the antichrists, were rival and hostile spirits. It became very important, therefore, that some rule should be given whereby they might be distinguished. This rule the apostle supplies, in these words: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they be of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit (or teacher) that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of the *Antichrist* whereof ye have

heard that it should come, and even now already it is in the world. They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, (or according to its traditions,) and the world heareth them. We 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. This excellent rule has long since fallen into desuetude, because antichrist is now paramount. The controversy about Jesus coming in "the flesh" has been decided against the apostles; and he that affirms with them that the *body* of Jesus was no better flesh than the "flesh of sin" common to all Adam's race, is denounced for a heretic. As to ascertaining who is and who is not of God, by the hearing or not hearing what the apostles say, such a thing is scarcely thought of. The criterion now is, "*the sentiments of all Christendom.*" If you speak in accordance with these, then you are of God, and the world heareth you; if in opposition to them, then you are of the devil, and the world heareth you not! Such is the rule in the nineteenth century, which has supplanted that of the apostles in the first!

The spirit of error and the spirit of the antichrist being the same spirit, and this opposed to the doctrine of the apostles, it is not difficult to discern it; and discerning it, to detect the Antichrist. "This is the Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." John does not mean deny their existence, but deny their true nature and relationship. "Whosoever denieth the Son," says he, "the same hath not the Father." Hence the denial of the Father is made consequent on denying the Son; for not to have the Father is to deny him. He that denied that Jesus came in the flesh, in so doing denied that Jesus is the Christ, because the Christ predicted by the prophet was to descend from David according to the flesh; but if Jesus did not come in the flesh, then Jesus could not be the Christ. This explains 1 John, ii, 22, which inquires, "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This, *ὄντως*, is the Antichrist, who [in so doing] denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son has not the Father." That this is the meaning of the text appears from another definition of the Antichrist, in 2 John, v, 7, "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus is come in the flesh. This is *The Deceiver* and *The Antichrist*. Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward. Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there

come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

The Antichrist, and all that are his, are the "enemies of the cross of Christ," in denying the true sin-flesh humanity of Jesus. They talk a good deal about the blood of Christ, at the same time that they maintain that his body was not "flesh of sin," rendered in the common version, "sinful flesh." But the blood of Jesus is only sin-remitting by being the blood of flesh of sin; if it was the blood of undefiled flesh, it was not sin-atoning. Examine the traditions of Christendom; and it will be found that its orthodoxy is mere immaculate-conceptionism. "Christ the Son of God," says the Assembly's Catechism, "became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, yet without sin." It is John's characteristic of the Antichrist; and it is very remarkable that the characteristic should be made to stand out in such bold relief by the papal decree concerning the nature of the mother of the Lord Jesus, in a time when the antichristian system is rapidly approaching the crisis of its final perdition. Antichrist affirms the immaculateness of the flesh of Jesus before crucifixion! But where did it come from? Was the flesh of David's daughter the flesh of ordinary women? If so, how could the flesh of Jesus be otherwise than hers? Doctor Antichrist has not been able to solve this knotty point, so as to make it an article of faith, until his reigning "Son of Perdition," Pto Noxo, bethought him of settling the matter by a decree, which pronounces her nature immaculate as her Son's! Protestants laugh at the stupid folly of the Vatican, but fail to perceive that, in denying the true sin-flesh nature of the body born of her, they are as deep in the mud as he and his bishops are in the mire. All antichrists together they are the withering fruit of the primitive heresy, which, in affirming the superior humanity of Jesus, nullified the doctrine of the cross, and denied the Father and the Son.

The multitude of false prophets, teachers, or antichrists, which sprung up like rank weeds in the apostolic age, are distinguished by a variety of names; but, as already remarked, they are reduced to two classes by Tertullian, a Latin writer of the third century, viz., to the Doctæ or Gnostics, and the Ebionites. But the New Testament has no regard to this classification and nomenclature. In the letters to the seven congregations of Asia, the Lord Jesus refers to them as a whole, by indicating their prominent heretical characteristics, which he symbolizes by

the names of persons whose characters they resembled, and whose fate was typical of that which awaits them. He does not, therefore, style them Gnostics, which would be to recognize their pretensions to knowledge while they were ignorant of "the first principles of the oracles of God," and consequently "unskilful in the word of righteousness." Instead of this, he bestows upon them titles in strict harmony with their evil and destructive principles. The first mention he makes of them is by reference to their assumptions of apostleship, having, like the priests, clergy, and ministers of our day, no right, title, or qualifications for the office. "Thou hast tried them," saith he to the Ephesian Angelism, "who say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." Here is a direct reference to those whom Paul designates "fools," "transformed ministers of Satan," "false apostles," and "deceitful workers," beguiling the Corinthians with their subtilty as the serpent beguiled Eve. Hence, they worked death in the simple, whom they deceived. They vanquished the people by their philosophy and vain deceit, bewitching them, as in the case of the Galatians, so that they did not continue in the obedience of the truth. For this cause, the Lord Jesus styles them in the same letter, *vanquishers of the people*, or *Νικολαῖτοι, Nikolaitoi*, from *νικος, victory*, and *λαος, people*. "Nicolaitans" was therefore a more appropriate name for them than Gnostics. These heretics, whose successors are now "orthodox," so completely for the time have they gained the "*victory*," have "prevailed against the saints," and will prevail till the Lord appears. They attempted to gain the ascendancy in the Ephesian eldership, or angelism, but appear to have been foiled in their first attempt, owing probably to their recollection of the warning Paul had given them of the "grievous wolves" that would "enter in among them, not sparing the flock." They had found the "perverse things" they spake to be lies, and therefore refused to follow them. Down to the time of the Lord Jesus' letter to them, "they could not bear them which were evil;" nevertheless, their love was not as warm as at first, which was an unfavorable symptom, as it prepared the way for their being finally overcome. But thus far he could say to them, "This [redeeming quality] thou hast, that thou hatest the works of the Nicolaitans, [or, of these lying apostles,] which I also hate."

The Lord Jesus was particular to stamp his reprobation upon the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, as well as upon their works. Hence, when he ordered John to write for him to Pergamos, where the Satan's throue

and dwelling place existed at that time, he reminded the eldership there that they had those who held the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing he hated. In the preceding verse, he characterizes the doctrine by associating it with Balaam and his practices. "Thou hast them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication; in this way, οὕτως, thou hast also those holding the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate." Peter, as we have seen, had introduced "Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness," as an illustration of the false teachers who throw stumbling blocks in the way of Christians, and, having eyes full of adultery, allured them with great swelling words of vanity, through the lusts of the flesh and wantonness, to commit like evil deeds. Having been thus introduced, the Lord adopts him as a type of the same teachers who were corrupting his saints in Pergamos. Balaam's name, too, and the effect of his doctrine upon Israel, were in keeping with the other title he had bestowed upon the seducers of the church. The word בָּלַע, *bahlä*, to consume, devour, destroy, &c. Moses tells us, that the women of Moab, through the counsel of Balaam, seduced the men of Israel into idolatrous practices, &c., on account of which Jehovah destroyed twenty-four thousand of them; so that Balaam and his Moabites gained a *victory* over the *people*, or became *Nicolaitans* to them, which they could not have done had they continued faithful.

In writing to Thyatira, the Lord Jesus symbolized the "evil men and seducers" Paul wrote about, by another notorious character of antiquity, *Jezebel*, the wife of Ahab, whose history was illustrative of their practices, and her fate typical of theirs. Speaking to the eldership of the congregation there, he says, "Thou sufferest that woman Jezebel to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols." Fornication, as well as eating of the sacrifices, being both elements of idolatrous worship, are used in the Apocalypse as symbolical actions, representing a departure from the right way, by corrupt or untruthful practices, and by doing what is forbidden, which is *idolatry*; "for rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness as iniquity and idolatry." This Jezebel was a teacher of the false doctrine, or "knowledge (*γνωσις*) falsely so called," whose "oppositions" were pervertive and subversive of the doctrines of Christ, by which she seduced his servants from the simplicity of faith and

practice which are in him. She was no more an individual woman than the drunken woman who now rides the blood-dyed beast of the Gentiles—Rev. xvii. She was the "Holy Catholic Church" in her incipient ecclesiasticism; the aggregate of the false teachers, or antichrists, contemporary with the apostle John, who had then not as yet "deceived all nations by her sorceries," nor become "drunken with the blood of the saints and the witnesses of Jesus," nor received the embraces of the kings of the earth. As the Jezebel of apostolic times, she had no place in the heaven of the Roman Habitable, not having been yet allied with Ahab in the throne. She confined her operations of necessity to a humbler sphere. She was the daughter of a king, the god of the world, and destined to become the concubine of many; but in her earlier career she found scope only in increasing her partizans by seducing the servants of the Lord.

The large and rapidly increasing party of the Jezebels was the great faction in the Christian community, whose formative principles are comprehensively styled by Paul, "*The Mystery of Iniquity*," in 2 Thess., ii, 7. Jezebel was this mystery symbolized, and of whom was to be born that power termed "*The Lawless One*," *ὁ ἀνομιος*, whose presence was to be the result of "the working of the Satan in all power, and signs, and wonders of falsehood, and in all seduction of deceitfulness in them who are being lost; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved." The working of the Satan here, the Lord styles "the depth of the Satan as they speak." In these places, "Satan" is a noun of multitude, and stands for "the false prophets," or "antichrists," of the Jezebel faction, who were the *Adversary* to the servants of Jesus, whose eternal well being their subtilty, where successful, effectually destroyed. In John's day, the throne and palace of this Satan were at Pergamos, Rev. ii, 13. Jezebel's teachers and seducers of the saints were appropriately styled Satan, because they were corrupting the doctrine of Christ, by mixing up with it the principles of the existing idolatry, whose organization in church and state was represented by a "Great Red Dragon, that old serpent, surnamed the Devil and the Satan," whose throne and palace were in Rome. If the reader understand this, he will easily comprehend that part of the letter to Thyatira in the twenty-fourth verse, where the Lord says, "To as many as have not this doctrine, (of Jezebel,) and who have not known the depths of the Satan, as they speak, I will put upon you none other burden."

Paul wrote to the saints in Corinth, "I have espoused you to one husband, that I

may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Paul's fear was not groundless. When the Spirit of God formed the Bride from the side of the Second Adam, and by faith in his resurrection she became partaker of his flesh and bones, on the day of Pentecost, she was as Eve before the fall. As long as she "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, &c.," she continued "a chaste virgin." But in process of time, men of corrupt minds crept in unawares, and began to discourse to her about the principles of the gentile philosophy, and the desirableness of their commixture with the doctrine of Christ. Unfortunately, she lent but a too willing ear, and was beguiled. The result was unavoidable. She was impregnated with principles which, in a set time, attained maturity, and she gave birth to Cain, *The Lawless One*. In the period of her gestation, she was the Fallen One, Jezebel, the beguiler of her companions. "I gave her space," saith the Lord, "to repent of her fornication, and she repented not. Behold, (therefore,) I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds. And I will kill her children with death, and all the congregations shall know that I am He that searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." This was the principal cause of those terrible persecutions so frequent in the reigns of the pagan emperors. They were "judgment beginning at the house of God;" and while many of the Lord's servants no doubt suffered, ecclesiastical history justifies the conclusion that its severity fell principally on the children of Jezebel. The desire of martyrdom became a madness, and instead of fleeing from one city when persecuted, to another for safety, as the Lord advised, they sought death by the fiercest torments in expiation of their sins.

The Nicolaitan, Balaam, and Jezebel communities, which were indeed one and the same, are styled by the Lord Jesus "*a synagogue of the Satan*," *συναγωγή του Σατανα*. They called themselves Jews; but were not such in reality. The congregation in Smyria numbered such among its members, but the King of the Jews refused to recognize them as belonging to his people, styling them liars and blasphemers. Addressing that society and its sister in Philadelphia, he says, "I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie, and are of the synagogue of the adversary." Rev. ii, 9; iii, 9. Let the reader mark this well, that for a nominal Chris-

tian to claim to be a Jew, and that claim prove to be unscriptural, the Lord Jesus pronounces him to be a blasphemer, a liar, and a member of the adversary's synagogue. There are very few professors now-a-days but are more zealous to prove that they have no relationship to things Jewish than that they are Jews. They have no idea that the doctrine of Christ places them in any sort of connection with Israel, or Israel's commonwealth. They feel and speak as the enemies of Israel, and care no more for Jerusalem than for Bagdad or Samarcand. There are some, however, who claim to be Jews to the exclusion of the whole Jewish nation; appropriating all the promises of good for Israel to themselves, and all the curses of God to Jacob. They call themselves "the Israel of God," true Israelites, and the genuine seed of Abraham; while they are as blind as bats, and faithless as sectarian pietism can make them of the "salvation" which "is of the Jews."

Paul was much pestered with such "Christians" as these, who were "called Jews, and rested in the law, and made their boast of God." They were the false teachers who lifted up their horn against him in Corinth, and whom he styles "false apostles, deceitful workers, and ministers of the adversary," ὁ Σατανας. They had been commending themselves as Jews, while they walked as enemies of the cross of Christ. The apostle's indignation was much excited at this, and caused him to exclaim, "Are they Hebrews? So am I! Are they Israelites? So am I! Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I! Are they servants (διακονοι) of Christ? I speak ironically: I am more!" He then shows wherein his service exceeds theirs; an excess so remarkable, as to leave them ironical servants indeed; and declares that the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ knows that he doth not lie. These were they of whom he warned the Philippians, saying "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the *Concision!*" The concision were the false prophets or teachers who taught that *circumcision* must be practised with *baptism*, to constitute a believer of the gospel of the kingdom one of the Jews to whom the kingdom is promised with eternal life and glory. They had been circumcised and baptized, why should not believing Gentiles also? Circumcision was a mark, sign, or token of the covenant betwixt Jehovah on the one part, and Abraham and his seed on the other; and at the same time it was "a seal of the righteousness of the faith had in uncircumcision;" but they did not see that the sign of circumcision, in the thing signified, was of the heart in spirit, when that heart was sanctified by the Second

Will (the Abrahamic) through the once offering of the body of Jesus Christ: a sanctification which occurs in putting him on when buried with him in baptism, as it is written, "Ye are circumcised in him with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the sins of the flesh in the circumcision of Christ, having been buried with him (συνταφεντες) in the baptism." Being baptized into the circumcision of Christ, no other circumcision was necessary. The circumcision of the heart of the baptized was known by their faith in the promises of the Abrahamic Covenant, and the manifestation of an Abrahamic disposition or spirit. Professors destitute of these are tenacious of mere circumcision, mere sprinkling, which they say came in the room of circumcision, or mere dipping on a profession of piety. These are they who say they are Jews, and are not, but are of the synagogue of Satan. The Lord Jesus and his apostles repudiate them, and in saying that they "are not Jews," declare that they shall have no part or lot in the kingdom when it shall be restored to Israel, and he shall sit upon the throne and the apostles with him, ruling the twelve tribes thereof. The sentence is recorded against them in the letter of the King of the Jews to the congregation in Philadelphia. He says to the faithful of that society, "Behold, I will recompense them of the synagogue of the adversary, who say that they are Jews, and are not, but are liars; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." This implies a resurrection of both parties, inasmuch as this subjection of Satan's synagogue to those who are Israelites indeed, in whom there is no guile, has not yet come to pass. Satan's Synagogue is "*The Church of Christendom*," which, in part and whole, has prevailed against the truth, and will prevail until the time to begin to fulfill the things threatened against Jezebel, and all who have been seduced by her, shall arrive.

Such was the awful apostasy from the faith that manifested itself ere the apostles had retired from the contest, and the gifts of the Spirit had been withdrawn. It was modern Christendom in embryo; a field of tares sown by the enemy, now fully ripe for harvest. Not only have the saints been prevailed against, but the faith they contended for is denounced as heresy, and the real heresies, protested by the apostles, established and incorporated as the truth. These have eaten as a gangrene, so that "the things concerning the kingdom of God and name of Jesus" are as fables in the ears of the deaf. What is to be done in such a case? The evil is too great and strong for the saints in the absence of their Lord. They

cannot destroy it, and to reform evil would leave it but evil still. One thing only can be done, and that is, testify against it, and bear witness for the truth, by which we may save ourselves, and some gleanings of the field.

October 26, 1855.

EDITOR.

**"He hath a Demon, and is Mad; why
hear ye him?"**

JOHN 1. 20.

DOCT. THOMAS—*Dear Sir*—Your preaching has created some talk among the sky-kingdom believers in this place. They say you are nothing more than an old infidel; and that those who agree with you are mad. Our minds have been stirred up to a more diligent examination of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and there are others who have taken it upon themselves to do their own thinking. We hope the result will be an opening of the eyes of their understanding, that they may be renewed in the spirit of their minds, and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, and thus be prepared for his name; that they may with patience wait for the hope of righteousness which is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ. I herewith subjoin a copy of the letter I wrote to the church with which I was identified. They sat in judgment, of course, on my case; pronounced me mad, and excluded me from the sky-kingdom glory for which I have no respect.

E. H. BEAZLEY.

Letter of Withdrawal from Baptistism.

To the Free-Mason street Baptist Church.

MY DEAR BRETHREN,—You will greatly oblige me by erasing my name from your list. The reasons by which I am governed in making this request, are these. After a long and careful investigation of Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, I have come to the conclusion, that the doctrines taught by the church are at variance with the Scriptures. Hence, I am compelled to reject your teachings in order to receive theirs.

John tells us, "that which we have seen, and heard we declare unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ;" this is the highest point of fellowship to which I aspire; and thus being in fellowship with the Apostles and prophets, I have the conscious satisfaction of being in fellowship also with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.

That the God of truth may induct your minds into a patient waiting for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus who will deliver us from the wrath to come, is the sincere prayer of him whose hope and labor is to attain unto eternal life by having part in the "First Resurrection;" because it is written "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the Second Death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years" "on the earth;"—Rev. xx. 6; v. 10;—and not above it, as some affirm. Yours in hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began,

E. H. BEAZLEY.

Norfolk, Virginia;
Oct. 8, 1857.

The Editor in Virginia.

On Sept. 16th, we left New York in company with brother Passmore and our daughter, in the Roanoke steamship for Norfolk, Va., where we arrived at 10.30 p.m. on Thursday 17th. Owing to an apprehension that the steamer would miss its usual trip on account of stormy weather, the appointment for Friday night was not advertized. After our arrival notice was privately circulated, and about thirty persons were convened at the place of meeting. Among these were two Baptist preachers, who pronounced what they heard rank infidelity. If Baptistism be the truth we endorse the judgment; but if the Scriptures, and the gospel which Paul preached, be the rule or measure of faith, we retort the charge upon its preachers.

On Saturday night it was exceedingly wet. We went to the Hall at 7.30 p.m., but found it empty. After waiting about fifteen minutes, we proposed to Dr. Passmore to become his congregation if he would speak. But declining, we concluded to wait a little longer. At 8 p.m., four persons arrived, making five with brother Passmore. They must certainly have been interested or they would not have come through such inclement weather. We concluded, therefore, to speak to them the words of eternal life. They listened to us very attentively for an hour and a half. Questions were asked, and answered: and about 10 o'clock we retired to our quarters at the National.

An advertisement in the Norfolk paper convened audiences at the same place on Sunday morning and night. The weather was still unpropitious. From thirty to fifty assembled on each occasion. The ice was broken; and it is probable that some will "with joy draw water out of the wells of salvation." We know some in Norfolk that

will not rest contented in the bonds of sectarian foolishness. What remains of "the Times of the Gentiles" is short. The "Time of the End" is upon us; so that what men propose to do they should do speedily; nevertheless, intelligently withal. We hope that there will yet be many witnesses for the truth in Norfolk; for no place stands more in need of light than this dark corner of the Old Dominion. Our friend Beazley has done well; when he obeys the gospel he will do better: and in walking worthy of it, he will have cause to sing for joy.

We left Norfolk on Monday morning on the Curtis Peck for Richmond, Va., where we arrived about 4 p.m.; and found brother F. V. Sutton, Sen., with a hack waiting to convey us to his hospitable abode. We remained with him two days, when we departed east for King William county, twenty-five miles distant. We spoke there ten hours, that is, on four days, at a meeting house belonging to the brethren. From this section we went to Louisa County, thirty miles northwest of Richmond. We spoke at an old tumbledown, called Temperance, on two days. Brother Passmore also addressed the people twice at the same place. We were glad to learn that the brethren here are going to put up a comfortable octagon building after the plan suggested in Fowler's "Home for All;" which ought to be in the hands of all farmers inhabiting rocky and gravelly districts. It can be obtained from them at 308 Broadway, New York City. It will teach the people how to erect comfortable and cheap winter houses for public meetings, which are needed in no country more than in Eastern Virginia.

From Louisa we went to Lunenburg, about seventy-five miles southwest of Richmond. In this county we spoke at Ledbetter, Good Hope, and Powell's school house. The brethren have repaired their meeting house, called Good Hope, enlarging and ceiling it, so that it is now quite comfortable. There is some talk of building another on a more convenient and agreeable situation than Ledbetter. This house being held as private property, brethren do not feel at liberty in the occupation of it. They think it desirable to have a house of their own, and entirely free from all individual influence and control. What they will finally determine on we know not; but such is the tenor of their discourse upon the subject. If they can come to some conclusion that will free them from their present embarrassment, it would be very beneficial to the cause of righteousness and the truth, which seems to be in a suffering condition here. The people are willing to hear, for the house was crowded; but they see nothing congrega-

tionally, illustrative of the influence of the truth upon the hearts of those who are professedly its friends. This is a great calamity, equally afflictive to all; and pressing upon all for its removal. Branches, individually and congregationally, that do not bear fruit will be destroyed as Judas, who is the type of all such. The brethren are not their own, but the Lord's. They must not, therefore, seek to please themselves, but Him; and he expects every man of them to do his duty; and in love to serve one another. From this issue there is no appeal under penalty of the Second Death.

From Lunenburg we returned to Richmond, where we spoke thrice. Once on Sunday morning at Bethel, a meeting house on Union Hill belonging to the brethren; and at night, and the following night also, at the Universalist Church, which was liberally granted for the purpose. The attendance was good on each occasion, as the following notice which appeared in the *Richmond Whig*, testifies in part:—

"DR. JOHN THOMAS.—This learned theologian delivered a sermon, or lecture, at the Universalist Church, in this city, on Sunday evening, to a large and attentive congregation. The text of his discourse was based upon a portion of the 21st chap. of Luke, giving him as a subject of elucidation the second advent of Jesus Christ. He declared that the Redeemer would descend to earth, "in like manner as he ascended," when the "times of the Gentiles" were complete, and that he would then re-establish the Hebrew monarchy, and reign supremely upon the earth over a regenerated world, as "Prince of Peace." In support of his views, he quoted several striking passages from the Bible. Other positions in regard to the destiny of mankind were advanced and argued by the speaker with a degree of pertinacity which evinced his entire familiarity with the subject. Should Dr. Thomas again lecture in Richmond, we would advise all persons who are interested in the revelations of the Bible to give him a hearing."

There is hope even for Richmond as well as for Norfolk. The truth has had great obstacles to contend against in the former city for many years. It seemed in times past to be a principle, or sort of indispensability with the ecclesiastical conscience of Campbellism installed in Sycamore Church, to blaspheme our reputation, in reviling and persecuting us, and saying all manner of evil of us, to shut up the ears of the people against us. But the times are changed or changing. Our old traducers are dead and buried, dying, or bankrupt. God has rewarded them even now according to their deeds; while we, the object of their malig-

nity, still live to advocate and glory in the truth. The voice of malevolence, however, is not entirely stilled in this city. It has proclaimed us there "an incubus upon the truth which can never prosper till we are overthrown!" This has issued from the throat of one, who, if he had indeed believed the gospel of the kingdom as he pretends, would, but for our instrumentality, have remained ignorant of it to death, had he lived to the full age of Methuselah. But he has declared also to one, who informs us that he has avowed his intention to break up the church in Richmond. He has not succeeded in creeping into it, however; still his machinations show themselves for evil. But if the brethren are true to themselves, and to the truth they have confessed, they will be proof against his diabolism. In 3 John 9, the prototype of this troubler of the brethren will be found. Like another Alexander, the coppersmith, he has tried to do us much evil, both in New York, Richmond, and elsewhere; but happily he hath signally failed. As Paul said of Alexander, so say we of him, "The Lord reward him according to his works;" and as Paul thought it proper to write to Timothy to put him on his guard against him; so we think it right to say to the brethren in Richmond concerning him who threatens their disruption, "Of him be ye ware also." While in New York City, where religiously he was a perfect cypher when left to his own resources, he made use of one *domestically in his power*, to "inflict injustice upon us in helping to spread reports detrimental to our character." This individual who is no longer subject to his control, has come to see the enormity of his crime, and as one evidence of sincere repentance, made the following written confession, which he caused to be handed to us by brother Anderson a year ago.

Richmond, Sept. 21, 1856.

BROTHER THOMAS.—Being very desirous of the value and sympathy of your friendship, which in the past has been alienated, *not by yourself*, but by the unfortunate circumstances which transpired in New York, in which I participated; I take this opportunity of *acknowledging* to you personally that I was wrong in taking the relative position I did towards you whom I ever acknowledged as an unflinching and truthful advocate of "the Word!" *I did greatly violate my duty*; and inflicted *injustice upon you* in helping to spread reports detrimental to your character. This confession I make in ALL SINCERITY to you, as I have done to others; and believe the Lord will favor me most, as I render the most uprightness towards his faithful ones. Will you, therefore,

reciprocate this sentiment of mutual friendship, and unity of spirit?

Hoping to share with you and Christ,
Believe me truly,

The *italics* and SMALL CAPITALS in the above are as they exist in the original. We acquiesced in the request with which it concludes; and as we do not wish to extend the knowledge of the name of the writer in connection with his offence beyond its present limits, we withhold his name. He assures us that he has acted during the past year in good faith and sincerity towards us; which assurance we frankly accept, in hope that nothing may occur henceforth to impair or forfeit confidence.

We have produced the letter as States' evidence against the copperheaded would-be disrupter of the church in Richmond. Let the brethren be united, and pay no regard to any suspicions generated from that quarter. Fight such troubles by letting them alone. This policy is death to their ambition; and the only course that can conquer peace. Let traitors beat the air, and their gymnastics will exhaust themselves. If the brethren will just let the fire die out for want of fuel; cease to talk about anything but the truth; "be kindly affectioned one to another in brotherly love; in honor preferring one another;" "be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love, and peace will be with them;" and they will be more than a match for all the enemies of the truth.

From Richmond we revisited King William County, where we spoke again on two days. From thence we journeyed to King and Queen Court House, where we addressed a small congregation including two Methodist preachers, who thought we were very "ingenious;" but, of course, did not believe in our anti-demoniac views. Having partaken of the hospitality of a Baptist friend, we proceeded after dinner to the house of Dr. Bland, where we were kindly entertained till the next day. About nine o'clock we started again for brother Norman's meeting-house, where we were to speak on Saturday and Sunday, October 24th and 25th. These appointments filled, we proposed to push on to Urbanna, in Middlesex, on Monday, to take the steamer then for Baltimore. But the weather was too stormy, so we deferred it till the morrow. On Tuesday morning, brethren Anderson and Passmore bid us farewell, and returned to King William, where they were to hold meeting on the following Saturday and Sunday. Brother Anderson had accompanied with us seven days; while brother Passmore had journeyed with us in all the route from New York to this

place. These brethren are both devoted to the truth, proving by their works the sincerity and earnestness of their convictions. May they be found to praise, and honor, and glory in the day of Christ, and in concert with a great multitude, sing the song of Moses and the Lamb in the Kingdom of God.

On Tuesday we arrived in Urbanna, but no steamer came into port. We were detained here till 3 p.m. next day, when the boat appeared from Fredericksburg. Bidding adieu to brother Norman, who had patiently waited with us all the time of our detention, we embarked for Baltimore, where, after a pleasant voyage across the Chesapeake, we arrived at 7 a.m. next day.

Having been so long absent from New York, we were anxious to return, especially as November had arrived, and we had made no preparation for the Herald. Still we did not like to pass through without visiting the brethren. We were detained consequently in Baltimore till Monday night. We spoke twice on Lord's Day at China Hall, West Baltimore street, near Fremont, where the brethren usually assemble. We were informed by brother Lemmon, that five or six had been added to their little flock during the past year. The audiences we addressed were respectable in size and appearance, and remarkably attentive. We spoke to them in reply to the question, "What is the truth?" and in so doing, outlined the gospel system with as much simplicity and plainness as we could attain to.

Before we left the city we received a telegram inviting us to Washington, D. C. Had we passed through we should have halted there; but under existing circumstances we found it necessary to defer our visit there to a future time. We understand that our brethren meet in the same Hall as the Campbellite Baptists; the latter occupying it in one part of the day, and our brethren in another.

Having filled all appointments, we left Baltimore by the evening express for New York City. In ten hours and a half we arrived at Jersey City; and in two hours more returned to the place of our abode, after an absence of seven weeks, during which we had spoken eighty-four hours, at twenty-seven appointments. But "neither is he that planteth any thing, nor he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase;" and He hath testified, saying, "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto

me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing, whereto I sent it." And again, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith Jehovah of armies;" and that "spirit is the truth." Editor.

Nov. 6, 1857.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Letter from Texas.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—Except the inspired writers of the Bible, we feel under greater obligations to you than to any other man, living or dead. Nay, we esteem you as our father in Christ. It was you that prompted us to search the Scriptures—especially the venerable books of the old prophets—and gave us a start in understanding the same, in relation to the coming of Messiah, and re-assembling the remnant of Jacob, and setting up the kingdom of God upon Mount Zion, with the judgment of the living wicked, the exalted glory of the (dead) martyrs and saints, with their bodies ransomed "from the power of the grave, and made never-dying, with the same glorious *change* wrought in the mortal bodies of the saints alive at his coming; and the consummation, when "He shall rule the nations with a rod of iron." Also, in like manner, are we indebted to you, in comprehending the promise made to Abraham, and the manner in which gentiles become "heirs of the inheritance, &c., &c.

Surrounded by those who are steeped in the "darkness" that "covers the earth, and gross darkness the people," myself and family, with a few others of kindred spirit, are searching the Scriptures daily, with zeal more and more increasing, to see whether these things are so or not. Our motto is, "To the law and the testimony;" "Be sure you are right, then go ahead." We can now see more and more plainly how a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures is "to make us wise unto salvation;" and with all our might we are striving to be of the "wise" that "shall understand." Seeing that the "king of the north" has, and is again about to "come against him"—(the king of Stamboul,) that men do "run to and fro," and "knowledge" is "increased;" that the "wicked" do more and more "wickedly," and do "not understand," we can see clearly that "the time of the end" has come. That "the people of the saints will soon take the kingdom, and possess it forever even forever and ever!"

The power of the Turk, "for an hour, a day, a month and a year, for to slay the third part of men," being gone, we see that the sixth vial has just been poured out in a signal manner; hence, we may very soon

(too soon, alas! for the "Amorites" of this most abandoned age, whose cup of "iniquity" is nearly "full") expect that *last vial* to be poured out, and to hear that voice of thunder saying, "IT IS DONE!"

O, my brother, with my mind's eye, I can realize—though perhaps but faintly—the stupendous scenes about to be ushered forth upon the world's stage; when the once "man of sorrows" shall appear upon Mount Zion "with power and great glory," with that "two-edged sword" "bathed in heaven," and that bright and glorious face, and those eyes of "flaming fire," at the sight of whom the rebels "call for the rocks and mountains to fall on them, and hide them from the face of him that sitteth on the throne," preferring this dire destruction to being made the subjects of his wrath and vengeance. And in my mind I can hear asked: "Who is this that comes from Bozra, with dyed garments from Edom!" and the replies: "I will tread them in my anger, and trample them in my fury." "With their blood I will stain all my raiment." Vengeance is in my heart." "The year of my redeemed has come!" Yes, and "as he fought in the day of battle" with mighty thunderings, "great hailstones fire and brimstone" so will we break forth against the grim hosts of Gog and his confederates, who have "come like a storm" against the Holy Land, and overthrow them, leaving but "the sixth part." Thus, Mesiah doth "break them in pieces as a potter's vessel." Thus, "He treadeth the winepress of Almighty God." And thus, with the "great noise" and uproar of war, do the political "heavens pass away,"—that is they commence passing away, and are soon "fled away till no more place is found for them." But, meantime, the sons of Jacob, armed, "Ephraim as his battle-axe, and Juda as his bended bow," dash forth upon the rebel nations, and "tread down the wicked, who become ashes under the soles of their feet" overthrow and destroy Antichrist till the last dregs of the stench of spiritual fornication is removed from the earth. Nor do they cease their warfare, till the earth is made "empty," and turned "upside down;" and the last vestige of false religion, and political rule are gone, never more to appear. Then shall the Lord Messiah become "King over all the Earth," and "shall reign amongst his ancients gloriously," And the "wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament," "and they who turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever ruling and reigning "as Kings and priests," in the kingdom of "the Great King," for ever. But for want of space I desist, invoking Jehovah to shed forth his choicest blessings upon you, and make you a blessing in

the earth, in turning many to righteousness. Yours in the "One Hope,"

JOHN OATMAN, SEN.

Slano Co., Texas; Oct. 30, '57.

Thiopolitical.

The Indo-Mohammedan Rebellion; What Meaneth it?

The great military problem of the not far distant future to be solved by the coming events is that indicated in the last chapter of Zechariah, and the second verse, where it is written, "I will gather all the nations—*את-בְּנֵי-הַקָּרִים*, *eth-köl-haggoyim*—against Jerusalem to war." This is the purpose of Him of whom Moses says, *יְהוָה אֵרַשׁ בְּיָמָיו*, *Yehovah ish milkhämä*, I SHALL BE AS A MAN OF WAR—EX. xv. 3. The phrase *eth-köl-haggoyim* does not mean indefinitely, "all nations," as would seem to be intended by the Common Version; the particle *eth* is emphatic, and prefixed to *köl* signifies certain particular nations. He will gather all the nations, that is, the armies of the nations subject to "the Powers that be," which have scattered Israel, and parted or divided among themselves Jehovah's land. See Joel iii. 12: and Zech. xii. 3, in which latter place it is written, "In that day (the day when Jerusalem is besieged) will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people; *all that burden themselves with it*, shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it."

The armies of the Powers of the earth, then, which burden themselves with Jerusalem and the Holy Land, are to be gathered together for war in that region of the East. It is the last Stage of the Eastern Question which immediately precedes the apocalypse of Israel's King, styled by the Eternal Spirit in the second psalm, "My King;" who is to be placed upon Zion, the hill of the Jehovah-Spirit's holiness, though all the Powers should decree the contrary.

These powers of the Earth are the parties to the Eastern Question, the principle of which is "the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire." Of course, if this be maintained by the Powers, the Jehovah-Spirit's purpose of placing His king on Zion, can never come to pass; for that empire includes within its territorial limits, Jerusalem and the Holy Land, which Jehovah in Joel styles "his land." Hence the policy of the Powers pledging themselves to the maintenance of Ottoman independence and the present boundary of its dominion places them in a state of war with Jehovah; whose king cannot "reign on Mount Zion and in Je-

rusalem before his ancients gloriously," (Isai. xxiv. 23,) so long as the Holy Land continues a part of the Turkish, or any other Gentile, dominion.

Jehovah and his King against the Powers is the fundamental element of the current situation of human affairs. His hostility to them is the source of all their trouble, anguish, and vexation of spirit. He has taken peace from them, and will plague them in various ways until he has overwhelmed them, and made triumphant the purpose he hath decreed.

The Powers against which, as the potential rulers of the world, he has indignation, are, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Turkey, France and Great Britain. We do not mean to say that he has no indignation against the powers existing on the territories of Germany, Spain, Italy, and so forth, because we have named only the six aforesaid. He has indignation against all the powers of earth. We mention those six, because their will directs and controls all the rest, which are but the satellites of the political firmament or "air." Russia claims ascendancy at the "Holy Shrines of Jerusalem" as the head of the Greek superstition; Austria and France as rival candidates for the chieftainship of the Latin; Prussia and Great Britain have planted their standard on Mount Zion as the protesters against the Greeks and Latins; while the Ottoman Turks claim the soil as their's, acquired and governed by the sword. But they are all thieves and robbers—spoilers of Israel and the land.

Great Britain, then, to say nothing of the other powers at this time, is in an attitude of hostility to Jehovah. She has entered on a career which will lead to her overthrow at the hand of God. There are points about the British Lion that make it a more estimable and respectable beast than the Buzzards of Russia, Austria, Prussia and France. Its middle classes are, perhaps, better principled than the same classes in those countries; and liberty of speech and action, civil and religious, more ample. It is a liberal, generous, and benevolent nation; and in arts, manufactures, science, literature, and arms, hitherto unsurpassed. But with all these excellencies in which she out-distances all her rivals, Great Britain is nevertheless an enemy of Jehovah, and unevangelized by his truth. Its government has established, and maintains by law and the sword that "Name of Blasphemy" known as "the Church of England and Ireland." This it patronizes in England, Ireland, and all the dependencies of Britain. In Scotland, it enforces the supremacy of another "Name of Blasphemy" called "The Church of Scotland." In Hindoostan it discountenances what the people

term Christianity, and coquets with Paganism, and the superstition of Mecca. In Ireland, it endows Maynooth; a college for the indoctrination of serpents in the diabolism of Rome, and the fooleries of image, saint, and Mary worship! It proclaims a woman, not Mary, but Victoria, as Head of "the Church," and promotes to bishoprics of souls, hypocrites, whose easy virtue fits them for convenient tools of the minister in power, who rules them through their hopes of sharing the spoils of office with their kin.

Such are some of the delinquencies of the British government. It is antichristian, hypocritical, blasphemous, and devilish. Its colonies and dependencies are badly ruled; their administrations being filled with incompetent and spendthrift adventurers of the titled and unproductive orders of the nation. These are ignorant, inflated, licentious, and proud, knowing nor caring for the people nor their interests. By the infatuation of such rulers as these—"the rulers of the darkness of the (British) Aion, the wicked spirit in its heavenlies"—the dominion of the Guelph was broken in this region of the New World; and were "the Times of the Gentiles" to continue for another century, we doubt not but that the system which prevails in the administration of British affairs would reduce the dominion of the Lion and the Unicorn to the narrow limits of its native isle.

But history proves that governments are not for the development, but the repression of nationalities; to embarrass and restrain their peculiar ambitions. At all events, this has been their influence; and what progress the people have made in what they call "civilization," has been in spite of their repressing influence. The muddle-headed occupants of place and power are the dead weight of the system they belong to. They keep it from shattering to pieces before the time by its own expansibility and explosiveness. The dead, inert, weight, however, sometimes presses too hard in certain directions; and then, the oppressed are seized with convulsions, which are now successful and then not, by which they seek to relieve themselves of the particular irritation.

The colonial jade winced under the galling saddle of George III. Not regarding her signs, she reared and threw him. He smote her with heavy blows, which doubtless she deserved for her viciousness, but all his efforts to remount were fruitless. "The wicked," says the Scripture, "are the sword of Jehovah." He points their swords against one another for mutual punishment. King George's government and adherents were wicked, and so were the colonists. They were all in the same condemnation with re-

spect to God: he, therefore, used both parties, Whigs and Tories, to destroy one another. This is his method, and very useful in the premises.

The Indo-Mohammedan situation of affairs in the East, is no exception to the rule. East Indian society, Hindoo, Mohammedan, and European, is as Sodom and Gomorrah: and treasuring up for itself wrath against the day of wrath. Enlightened humanity shudders at its deeds, and exclaims, "the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty." All allow that the Hindoos are "sensual and devilish;" all with one voice execrate them as fiends. And so they are; and utterly unfit to breathe the breath of life. But are there no crimes to be punished by the wicked who are Jehovah's sword on the other side? If the Hindoos be wicked, are the Europeans righteous? No one that knows anything about European society in India, will answer this question affirmatively. Are the Europeans when at home, when surrounded by the pious influences of "Church and Dissent," remarkable for sobriety, for chastity, for mildness of demeanor, for all the qualities that highly adorn a man, not to name a Christian? Nay, we who have lived in Britain twenty-eight years, and know what military officers, collegiate parsons, doctors and lawyers are; what sort of education that class receives from which the rulers and residents of India are drawn—do not hesitate to say, that righteousness is the rare exception, not the rule of the masters of Hindostan. If unchristianized by home piety, what sort of conduct does the reader expect these European scapegraces would develop in the midst of Mohammedans and Pagans where there exists no restraint at all? Among the eight different influences, which, acting upon the minds of the natives, are assigned by observers in India as the causes of the tremendous explosion there, is what is mildly characterized as "the indiscrete behavior of certain Europeans towards Hindoo women." An "indiscretion" that could result in such retaliation must have been monstrous. "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge"—*Heb. xiii. 4*; "The abominable and whoremongers shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone"—*Rev. xxi. 8*. These are the true words of God, and they are not uttered in vain.

These Indo-Europeans, born into British society, which exists in absolute subjection to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, grow up under these fleshly principles which strengthen with their growth. Formed by religious and educational institutions based upon and regulated by these, they become mere incarnations of

fool-hardiness, arrogance, and conceit. The wisdom and knowledge of God taught in the Bible have no place in them. They are heathen in reality; for their education has been in heathenism, Homer, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, &c., being their favorite authors, though nominally "Christians." Thus prepared with philology, mythology, and a smattering of other things, they enter the civil and military service of the East India Company, and go forth to Hindostan "griffins," an abomination to the natives, and a desecration of the Christian name.

Now, did not Jehovah exterminate seven nations in the Holy Land by the sword of Israel for like abominations; and will he not also bring the sword upon the pampered Sodomites of British India for the same? In his judgment upon Canaan, he commanded the extermination of "man and woman, infant and suckling," without exception. Yet the Israelites were not fiends any more than Englishmen will be fiends for inflicting deserved punishment upon the Sepoys for their atrocities. The crimes of the Europeans, like those of the ancient Canaanite, are against God, whom they pretend to honor; while the crimes of the Sepoys, who know not the God of Christians, are, in the case before us, against the Europeans who have offended them. To offend against God is a higher crime than to offend against our neighbour. The Europeans call themselves "Christians," while they bring Christianity into contempt with Mohammedans and Pagans by their iniquity. No, the Israelites were not fiends; but the whole-souled executioners of Jehovah's vengeance upon the guilty. Unlike the Sepoys, they were neither sensual nor devilish in their wrath, but stern avengers of outraged humanity and of God.

But one may say, Can this Indo-Mohammedan massacre of Europeans be the sword of God upon them, seeing that holy and pious missionaries have been slain among them? Verily it may; and the more so for their slaughter. The missionaries there are not God's. Their holiness and piety are school-divinity excitations of Veneration, Marvellousness, and Conscientiousness—the natural sanctimoniousness of the flesh. They are sent to India by pietists of Exeter-Hall celebrity, to proselyte the natives to the "Names of Blasphemy," of which the scarlet-colored Beast is full.—*Rev. xvii. 3*. They are there to make them proselytes to the Queen's Church, to Congregationalism, to Baptistism, to Methodism, to Presbyterianism, and such like; none of which have any valid claim to identity with the system of righteousness taught by the Apostles, and attested by the Law and the Prophets.

Their mission is without divine authority ; and their doctrine subversive of the truth. Granted ; " they have a zeal of God ;" but as Paul said of contemporary Jews, who, like our modern missionaries, went about to establish their own righteousness, " not according to knowledge." What they do, they do ignorantly in unbelief. If they did it willfully, it would be worse for them than to be slain of Sepoys, or grilled for a nocturnal feast by Fegees. The crime of the missionaries is that they speak lies in the name of Jehovah, and wear garments of deceit. See *Zech.* xiii. 3, 4. In Messiah's Aion, this will be punished with death by the clergyman's own kin ; but now God winks at it, as done in " times of ignorance," in which priests, clergymen, and ministers, know not what they do. Still they partake of the calamities of the situation, and die the death of the wicked in the evil day.

We conclude, then, that the Indo-Mohammedan rebellion means a divine retribution upon the Europeans for their offences against God and man. But this is not all. The rebellion is a means promotive of an appointed end. It is designed, we believe, to produce a reaction, which shall tend to the preparation of Great Britain for the part she is destined to perform in connection with the events to be transacted at Jerusalem and in the Holy Land. This is the significance of the rebellion with reference to the ultimate. It has, however, we believe, a proximate signification which may be stated in the following terms.

In devising a plan for the defence of the independence of Turkey against Russian aggression, it was proposed to unite into one state the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, the latter situated between Austria and Russia, or between the Carpathian mountains and the river Pruth ; and the former, south of Moldavia, and between the Austrian empire and the Danube. This proposition was not agreeable to England, Austria, and Turkey, who wished them to be separate. It was therefore agreed to consult the wishes of the people of the provinces, who were to express their desire at the polls. This they did, and at first declared through their representatives for continued separation. To this Louis Napoleon was decidedly opposed. He desired their union, as do also Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia. He declared that the elections of the Divans were not lawfully conducted : but that coercion and terrorism were employed to secure a majority in favor of continued separation. He sent his ambassador at Constantinople orders to break off diplomatic relations with the Porte if the Moldavian elections were not declared null and void. The represen-

tatives of Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia, followed the example of the French ambassador, and all joined in demanding the annulment. The Frenchman informed the Sultan that he could no longer hold diplomatic relations with ministers who were under foreign influence, that is to say, the influence of England and Austria. This caused the Sultan to change his advisers, and to call to his council new ones. They came to the same resolution of not annulling the Moldavian elections as the previous Cabinet had arrived at. The French ambassador then struck his flag ; an example followed by Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia. On the other hand, Austria protested against annulling the elections, and threatened that in such an event she would occupy the Principalities with one hundred and fifty thousand men. Such were the complications in August last.

England with a powerful fleet in the Black Sea, and Austria with one hundred and fifty thousand men in the Turkish Principalities, to maintain the Sultan's policy, with France, Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia on the opposite side, would have been quite a new and premature phase of the Eastern Question. If England had been at liberty, she would very probably have been stubborn ; but just before news had arrived of the revolt in India. At this crisis Louis Napoleon, with his minister Count Walewski, paid a visit to Queen Victoria, at which interview Lord Palmerston was present. The latter found it convenient to be convinced of the illegality of the Moldavian elections, but to save his consistency, referred the matter to Europe, " and Europe," says an English journal, " represented in this case by Louis Napoleon, seems to have pronounced in favor of a union of the Danubian Principalities." The Emperor's decisive argument was, it is said that " the Congress of Paris was only adjourned, and had not been dissolved. Upon this point Palmerston struck his flag, and, as he says, " came to an understanding with the French Government ; and that the English Government had reason to believe that the Austrian Government was disposed to concur in the elections being held over again on properly revised lists, and in uniformity with the firmans and the interpretation given of them ; and this being so, it was hoped that the Sultan would yield."

The Sultan did yield, and annulled the elections, ordering new ones ; and Austria did not carry her threat into execution. The new elections are concluded, and the results known. The Divans have declared for " self-government of the Principalities conformably to the treaties with the Porte,

whose rights are admitted. Union of the two provinces under a prince belonging to a dynasty of the West: a representative form of government, and neutrality of the new State."

But since this declaration of the Unionists, "we find Sir Henry Bulwer, the English Commissioner for settling the affairs of the Principalities, behaving at Jassy, says the Leader, "as if England could dispose of the world—freely pledging England to maintain intact the right and dignities of the Ottoman Empire, even against her own subjects. Notwithstanding the deliberate declaration both of Moldavia and Wallachia, *union is not to be*. After the virtual protest lately made by the Porte, conveying the certainty of its refusal to accept the union of the Danubian Principalities as the solution of the question, Sir Henry Bulwer's speech at Jassy may be taken as pretty nearly conclusive: no foreign prince will be placed upon the throne of Moldo-Wallachia, for Moldo-Wallachia will not exist as a political province."

But, besides deferring the crisis created by the Moldo-Wallachian elements of the Eastern Question, the Indian revolt serves the further purpose of diverting England's attention from Continental politics, and fixing it more particularly upon her own empire in the East. Three things have to be accomplished before "all the nations" of the Powers can be marshalled in the Holy Land. The alliance between France and England must be dissolved; Russia must gain political ascendancy in Europe, so as to be able to move its armies against the East; and Great Britain must become absolute in British India, so that she may be able to meet Europe in arms in the land of Israel. We need not speculate on the cause that may break up the *entente cordiale* of France and England. Many causes are latent in Europe, and ready when the time comes to spring forth to accomplish it. The French empire subverted, and the counterpoise to Russia is removed. In the process, Rev. xvii. 12-17, will be fulfilled; and the Eighth Head of the Scarlet Beast encircled with the Ten Horn-kingdoms, will be prepared to descend like a storm upon Jehovah's land. But combined Europe would not point its cannon against Jerusalem, if there were no enemy there more potent than now garrisons its area. The scripture clearly shows that the British Lion will be there with its legions from Tarshish, Sheba, and Dedan. The reaction superinduced by the Sepoy insurrection will prepare her for action. She will subdue them, and make them obedient; and in so doing, make her native armies as movable to any country as her Europeans are from Albion to Turkey or Hindostan.

Such in brief is the significance of the Indo-Mohammedan rebellion. It is, *first*, a judgment upon the Europeans there for their abominations; *secondly*, designed by the reaction it will develop to prepare British India for a military invasion of Western Asia; *thirdly*, a present diversion of British pressure in Europe, affording Louis Napoleon more scope for a policy which will finally bring him to ruin, and open the way for the European development of Russia. And here for the present we must conclude, earnestly desiring and looking for the Day of God, when the power of the wicked shall be broken, and "the meek shall inherit the earth."

EDITOR.

Nov. 18, 1857.

Russian Annexation in Asia.

WASHINGTON, Monday, Nov. 23, 1857.

The last letter of your London correspondent contained a statement so remarkable and yet so little noticed, that I copy it, in the hopes of drawing to it the attention which it deserves. He says:

"One of the most important facts, fully authenticated, though ignored by the English papers, is the submission of the Khaika Tartars to Russia. These clans amount to four millions, and their country extends from the frontiers of the province of Irkutsk to the great Mongolian Desert. They are a tribe of warriors, and have lately learned to despise the Chinese Emperor, their former suzerain. The Russian promise of lowering their tribute, and a few judiciously-administered bribes to their chiefs, have at once extended the Russian boundaries far into Central Asia. The country thus acquired is as large as France with the climate of Southern France. It is the Italy of Siberia. Together with the recent acquisition of the country watered by the Amoor, Russia has gained in Asia as large a territory since the accession of Alexander II as France, Belgium, Holland and Germany taken together. It seems, indeed, as if China, not India, were the real object of Russia."

The Russian Embassy here know nothing of this annexation of the Khalka country, and do not credit the report. I know so well, however, the high intelligence of your London correspondent, that I cannot believe he can be mistaken in the matter. He is too experienced a statesman to make such positive assertions without authority. If the statement be correct, the fact is one of the greatest political consequences that has happened for several years. The questions of Scandinavian Union, or of Moldo-Wallachian Union, which occupy the diplomatists,

are trifling compared with it. It is the greatest step forward which Russia has made since the partition of Poland.

The Chinese Tartars, as you know, are divided into two great nations, resembling each other generally in appearance and manners, but differing in language and hostile in history—the Mantchoos and the Mongols. The Mantchoos, the present ruling race of the Empire, are of very recent historical importance, having first become powerful and conspicuous in the seventeenth century. The Mongols, on the contrary, have been famous and formidable from the remotest times. Vast swarms of them have repeatedly descended from their high table lands in the center of Asia, and have overrun the plains of India, China, Persia, Syria, Egypt and Eastern Europe, penetrating to Germany, and even to France. Under Attila, and under Jenghis Khan, they established, for a time, empires, surpassing in extent any others that the world has seen. Under Kublai Khan they conquered China in the thirteenth century, built Peking and the Great Canal, and maintained a brilliant rule for about ninety years, when they were expelled by the natives. Since the conquest of China by the Mantchoos in the seventeenth century, they have been gradually bribed and coaxed into admitting the suzerainty of the Emperor, after a fashion, he paying them annually in presents about ten times the amount which he received from them as tribute.

The Khalkas are the principal division of the Mongol nation, comprising by far the greater portion of the people, and occupying the finest territory. Their Chans, or Princes, who are four in number, are lineally descended from Jenghis the Conqueror, and have constantly been a source of uneasiness to the Mantchoo rulers of China, who have always held them by a slack and capricious allegiance, though nothing has been spared to flatter and conciliate them. Eribery and religious influence have been the means used by Emperors to preserve peaceful relations with these warlike and haughty tribes, who have not forgotten the unrivaled martial achievements of their ancestors, and whose bards still sing of the days when they were masters of the world.

Father Hue, the latest traveler in Tartary, gives a specimen of the songs he heard. It is the invocation to Timour or Tamerlane:

“When the divine Timour dwell within our tents, the Mongol nation was redoubtable and warlike; its least movement made the earth bend; its mere look froze with fear the ten thousand peoples upon whom the sun shines.

“O, divine Timour, will thy great soul soon revive?

“Return! return! we await thee, O-Timour.

“We live in our vast plains, tranquil and peaceful as sheep; yet our hearts are fervent and full of life. The memory of the glorious age of Timour is ever present to our minds. Where is the chief who is to place himself at our head and render us once more great warriors?

“O, divine Timour, will thy great soul soon revive?

“Return! return! we await thee, O Timour.”

Father Hue says of the Khalkas, that of all the Mongols,

“They are the most numerous, the most wealthy and the most celebrated in history. They occupy the entire north of Mongolia. Their country is of vast extent, including six hundred miles from north to south, and about fifteen hundred from east to west. It is divided into four great provinces, subject to four separate sovereigns. These provinces are subdivided into eighty four banners, in Chinese, called Ky, in Mongol, Beekkon. Princes of different ranks are at the head of each banner.

“The numerous principalities of which Mongolia is composed may be considered as so many feudal kingdoms, giving no obedience to their sovereign, beyond the extent of their fear or their interest; and indeed what the Mantchoo dynasty fears above all things, is the vicinity of these Tartar tribes. The Emperors are fully aware that, headed by an enterprising and bold chief, these tribes might successfully renew the terrible wars of other times, and once more obtain possession of the empire. For this reason, they use every means in their power to preserve the friendship of the Mongol princes, and to enfeeble the strength of these terrible nomads.

“The Khalkas, however, do not seem to be much affected by the imperial blandishments. They see only in the Mantchoos a rival race, in possession of a prey which they themselves have never ceased to desire. We have frequently heard the Mongol Khalkas use the most unceremonious and seditious language in speaking of the Mantchoo Emperor. These redoubtable children of Jenghis Khan still seem to be cherishing in their innocent heart schemes of conquest and invasion. They only await, they say, the command of their Grand Lama to march direct upon Peking, and to regain an empire which they believe to be theirs, for the sole reason that it was formerly theirs.

“Although Mongolia is scantily peopled in comparison with its immense extent, it

could, at a day's notice, send forth a formidable army. A high Lama—the Guison-Tribe, for instance—would have but to raise his finger, and all the Mongols from the frontiers of Siberia to the extremities of Thibet, rising as one man, would precipitate themselves, like a torrent, wherever their sainted leader might direct them. The profound peace which they have enjoyed for more than two centuries might seem to have necessarily enervated their warlike character; nevertheless, you may still observe that they have not altogether lost their taste for warlike adventures. The great campaigns of Jenghis Khan, who led them to the conquest of the world, have not escaped their memory during the long leisure of their nomadic life. They love to talk of them, and to feed their imagination with vague projects of invasion."

The territory which your London correspondent affirms the Russians to have annexed is not the whole of Mongolia, of which Father Hue gives the dimensions, but only the region between the great desert of Gobi and the Russian frontier. As well as I can calculate its area from the maps in my possession, it is about seven hundred miles in length by two hundred and fifty in breadth, comprising 175,000 square miles. It is unquestionably the finest part of Chinese Tartary, in climate and in natural advantages. It adjoins and completes the recent Russian acquisitions on the Amoor, by the upper part of which river and its branches it is chiefly watered. In extent, climate, soil and position, it may be compared to Canada—the country on the lower Amoor to Canada East, the Khalka country to Canada West.

The Jesuit travelers of the last century computed the number of the Khalkas at 600,000 families, which agrees very well with the 4,000,000 of population given by your correspondent. I have read somewhere, I think, in Du Halde's great work on China, that they can bring into the field 300,000 horsemen.

The entire commerce between Russia and China has for 170 years been carried on through the country of the Khalkas, the Town of Kiakta, in the Province of Irkutsk, serving as the entrepot of the trade. The City of Irkutsk, the capital of the Province, is the seat of Government for the whole of Eastern Siberia, Kamtschatka and Russian America. It is the commercial center of Northern Asia, and the Russian Government has taken great care to maintain and augment the political importance of the place, by the institution of seminaries for teaching the Tartar and Chinese languages, and by keeping there some of the ablest and most ex-

perienced statesmen. The German traveler, Erman, who was there in 1828, speaks of its appearance, and the mode of life of its inhabitants as in the highest degree attractive and delightful. The climate in February and March he compares to that of the finest part of May, in Germany. The officers of Government would have been distinguished in any capital in Europe for their talents and attainments. Their scientific culture particularly surprised the German, who was himself a man of science of high eminence. The present Governor-General at Irkutsk, Mourawioff, is a man of great ability. Gurowski says he is "as active, ambitious and enterprising as any man in Russia;" and ascribes to him, rather than to the Imperial Cabinet at Petersburg, the project of Russian aggrandizement on the Chinese frontier.

In the present distracted and weakened state of the Chinese Empire, if the Russians have really obtained control of the Khalkas and their country, the field is open for immense acquisitions in the same direction, and even to the conquest of China itself. Directed by Russian statesmanship and military science, the warlike and enterprising Mongols, once put in motion, would be apt instruments for the subjugation of Central and Southern Asia. The powers of Europe could not interfere to any purpose, and no Asiatic nation is in a condition to resist them. The system of administration which holds Siberia, with its vast area and multifarious population, in peaceful submission to the Czar, could easily and securely extend over at least the three or four millions of square miles of Chinese Tartary, and Russia thus brought into immediate contact with India and China Proper.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Clerical Views of the Indian Woe.

The Annual meeting of the Society for the Aid of Foreign Missions, held at Chester, England, gave occasion to the Bishop of Oxford, and Mr. Gladston, late Chancellor of the Exchequer, to look at the Indian question from a religious point of view. Both attributed the British disasters to *their having discouraged Christianity and encouraged Paganism* in their Oriental empire, and both desired that Britain should retain India, not for the augmentation of their power and glory, but as a means of carrying the Christian faith among a vast race of people, to whom, however, they would allow the liberty of following their own faith as long as they pleased.

Mr. Arthur Mills, a Member of Parliament, in addressing a meeting at Taunton, said, "the English had had a dominion given

them over 180,000,000 of people in India which had for a century been committed to their care; they had at this moment a government maintained there at an enormous expenditure, and that government is now deeply involved in debt while the multitudinous population of India, after a hundred years of British rule, are now in a condition very little removed from that in which they were under the most corrupt and cruel member of the House of Tamerlane. He did not impute the slightest blame to the existing government of India; but he blamed all for so long permitting a state of things to exist *which was a disgrace to the Christian name*. When he adverted to that subject, he did so, not in a party spirit, but in the spirit of a true patriot, and he thought it was not too strong an expression to say that the British rule in India had been used as a *screen to protect the natives from the contamination of Christianity*. He stated on the authority of the late Bishop Heber, that in one district of India, *Christians were precluded from holding office*, an order having been issued by the British government prohibiting any but Mussulmans and Hindoos from holding office.

Something in the way of self-condemnation has laid hold of the official mind in England for its conduct in Hindostan. Its sins of omission and commission are practically admitted to be great, so that while it is bathing its sword in the heavens of Delhi, and drinking deep of the miscreant blood of Moslems and Hindoos, its Royal Defendress of the Faith has commanded the people to humiliate themselves in fasting and prayer. This display of national hypocrisy came off on Wednesday, October 7, and is thus treated of in a leading weekly journal printed in London:

"Wednesday was pretty generally observed, if not as a day of 'humiliation,' as a day of abstinence from work. Labor, however, did not entirely cease, for it might be observed every here and there in obscure places; but the shops for the most part were closed, and the streets wore a sort of Good Friday look of wretchedness and gloom. An east wind increased the resemblance; so that we might have almost imagined that, as Horace Walpole said, 'Spring had set in with its usual severity.' The clouds gathered thickly, and the rain fell heavily and pertinaciously, balking the hopes of those who designed to humiliate themselves at Greenwich, or to fast (on the catable contents of heavy baskets) at Hampstead or Richmond. Great was the solitude of Piccadilly; inexpressible the dolefulness of the Strand. . . . The mass of the people not being in the

streets, we will take it for granted that they were at church; and certainly, whatever may be thought of 'humiliation' according to Royal Decree, there never was an occasion more suggestive of sad and solemn thoughts. The reporters for the daily papers say that the religious edifices were well attended; and the streets in the forenoon showed many troops of worshippers passing on to church or chapel. They also showed laborers lounging about with their hands in their pockets, and 'gents' with cigars in their mouth, chaffering for apples and nuts with itinerants, and evidently *not* going to church or chapel. Here shrill-voiced women and husky-voiced men transformed for the nonce into a species of Christian Muezzim, though calling from the muddy pavements instead of the airy altitudes of minarets, and having a truly Episcopal eye to money matters—'Mornin' and Evenin' Prayer, a penny!' There the moping policeman stalked along by himself, like one of an army of blue devils. Such, in London streets, was the outward aspect of the Fast.

"Within the churches there were, we may be sure, many devout, and no doubt many sorely stricken worshippers—many also who only went because the queen commanded them, and it was 'the thing.' The following are a few extracts from some of the sermons of the day;

"The preacher at St. Paul's Cathedral observed that 'all must recognize in the Indian calamity the chastening hand of God. They were being punished because they had shown themselves cowards in fighting the battle of God in India. They had neglected to spread the Christian religion amongst the idolatrous races of that mighty empire. . . . The British government had not evinced sufficient anxiety for the real welfare of the people. There were very few persons engaged in christianizing the heathen in India. They had not fought the battle of the Lord in that country; they had only been engaged in fighting the battle of man: and if they were sincere that day, they could not help acknowledging their short-comings in India had been visited by the national calamity they all deplored."

The preacher at Westminster Abbey attributed the existing ruin and desolation in India to "the accursed traffic in opium and other deadly poisons for the purpose of profit and revenue, a sin as deadly as that of slavery."

The preacher at the Temple Church considered that "the half-measures of the Government had been its ruin. Britain might have governed the Indians if it had left them

as it found them—an ignorant, slavish race—and the Indian government, he believed, would not have been indisposed to have left them in that state; but the feeling and sense of the country were against such a policy, and the result was that we gave the natives of India a certain amount of education and liberty, but we did not instil into them the principles of religion. Education and liberty without religion brought about the first French Revolution, and here were the same cause and effect exemplified in the case of the Indians. He did not believe that Britain could hold India without a native army. That army must, of course, be officered by Europeans, and therefore it was absolutely necessary that *we should improve the Christian character of those officers who represent our power in foreign lands.*"

The preacher at Surrey Chapel testified that "*the conduct of Englishmen had been a reproach to Christianity.*" He referred to their toleration of the burning of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands; their throwing impediments in the way of native conversion to Christianity, by sanctioning the loss of caste and property upon such conversion, and dismissing the converted Sepoy from the army; our application of a portion of the imperial funds to the maintenance of heathen temples; and in doing reverence to their false gods. They had dishonored God for the purpose of saving an empire; and by so dishonoring God that empire was endangered. It seemed to him that Englishmen were suffering manifest retribution because of their sins, which had drawn down the Divine displeasure.

The Chief Rabbi of the Jews in England, did not attribute the calamity to the sin of not Christianizing India. He said that though that day was the Feast of Tabernacle, they had made it a day of public prayer, because they wished to obey all the commands of their sovereign! This was obeying man before God. He took a cheering view of the situation, telling his hearers that "the nation had only to wait a little while, and the wrath would be over." He prophesied of the future from the past, saying that "History taught that the state of anxiety will not endure; that the people will enter into their chambers—the Chamber of Legislature—to correct past errors; and the mutiny will ultimately lead to blessings for mankind at large. "The present state of the world," said he, "is depicted by the prophet Zechariah, xiv. 7, as being night nor day, a mixture of light and darkness, of belief and superstition, of hatred and love—the East struggling with the West: but in the evening there shall be light; the living

waters shall go out from Jerusalem, and JEHOVAH SHALL BE KING OVER ALL THE EARTH. He one, and his name one." What then becomes, Rabbi Adler, of the British Power in India?

From these specimens it will be seen what was indeed the universal fact, that the version of the story of the Indian woe presented by the clerical phalanx was this: "having neglected to extend Christianity in India, having on the contrary tolerated the idolatry and the vile practices of the Hindoos, England has committed a gigantic sin, of which the revolt was the retribution." "This," says an English paper, "was the presentment of the whole clerical jury upon the offender arraigned before the sacred tribunal."

Upon this clerical verdict a few remarks may not be out of place. We agree with them all that "they have neglected," in a notable degree, to "extend Christianity in India;" yea, more than this, we agree with the Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Gladstone, that they have not only neglected to extend it, but that they have actually "*discouraged Christianity and encouraged Paganism.*" By "Christianity" here, we mean what the Bishop of Oxford and his coreligionists of "church" and "Chapel," whether of the Establishment or Dissent, understand by Christianity. Official and Middle class England, inspired by the love of money and the love of power, have greatly discouraged this species of Gentilism; and have also patronized the more ancient species of Hinduism. This is a great offence in the estimation of all devout professors of the religion of the English and Scotch, to say nothing of the Irish; many of whom, both in Ireland and America, sympathize more with the Pagan and Mahomedan revolvers, than with their "fellow Christians" of Anglo-Saxondom. But with us the offence is greatly mitigated when we reflect that the issue between Anglo-Caledonianism and Hinduism is not "THE RIGHT AT IT IS IN JESUS," but a question of morality and civilization. Is the European morality in India any better than that of the Mohammedan and Hindoo? The Europeans do not burn widows in Suttees, nor do they practice infanticide, and assassination: nevertheless, "Christianity" is evil-spoken of, and despised by the natives on account of the conduct of those who profess it. The natives lie, cheat, steal, get drunk, swear, commit whoredom, and so forth: so do the Europeans to the disgust of those who know the righteousness of God. In fact, we consider the immorality of European religionists more condemnable than the Hindoo, on the ground of Europeans *knowing better*—"Ye say ye see; therefore your sin remains." The Euro-

peans "profess to know God, but in works deny him;" so that, while the natives do not deny their gods by their works, the gods and the works being alike, Europeans are *practical atheists*, being the deniers of the God they profess to worship.

But, if the morality of Anglo-Caledonian religion be of such questionable superiority, what shall we say of its theory? Is its theory scriptural and more rational than that of the natives? The religions of Europe are not inculcated in the Bible, it is therefore no opinion, but a self-evident proposition, that *they are not Scriptural*. They are only alluded to in the Bible as "Names of Blasphemy," and "Mother of Harlots," and "Harlot Women," and "All the Abominations of the Earth"—as things defiling, and to be eschewed. To these belong the religion of Mr. Gladstone and the Bishop of Oxford, of Cardinal Wiseman, of Dr. Chalmers, and of the whole herd of the Dissenting inclosure. There is not one of them reckoned "orthodox" by "society," can establish their theory and practice from the New Testament interpreted in harmony with Moses and the Prophets. They are one and all heathenism, "christened with holy water—a heathenism or gentilism elaborated by "the thinking of the flesh"—a mere creation of the "carnal mind." In proof of this, it is only necessary to refer the man enlightened by the truth to what they do and say. Bishop of Oxford Christians believe with the Pagans in the existence of an immortal soul in mankind; one and all, they believe in "the Elysian Fields" of the heathen under a different name; they have adopted the pagan rite of sprinkling with water: concerning which Justin Martyr says, that "It was invented by demons in imitation of the true baptism signified by the prophets, that their votaries might also have their pretended purifications by water:" and the Emperor Julian, out of spite to the Christians of the fourth century, "used to order the victuals in the market to be sprinkled with holy water, on purpose either to starve, or force them to eat what by their own principles they esteemed polluted."—*Dr. Middleton*.

The Christians of those days rejected water sprinkling as hateful, heathen, and polluting—a counterfeit of the true baptism which is sprinkling of the heart with the blood of sprinkling, and washing the body with cleansing water—*Heb. x. 22*. In besprinkling baby-faces and the faces of babies in the name of God, European religionists constitute themselves not only Pagans, but blasphemers—taking the name of Jehovah Elohim in vain, which men are forbidden to do.

But the analogy between Europeanism and heathenism is far from being exhausted in these parallels, as we have shown elsewhere. But these are sufficient for the present; and in view of them we hesitate not to say, that if the British government had encouraged Oxford-Christianity, or Dissenting-Christianity, or Scotch-Christianity, or any of the Christianities peculiar to "*the court of the Gentiles*." (Rev. xi. 2,) they would have been guilty of patronizing two or more systems of heathenism instead of one. Their real offence is, that they should have patronized any. Seeing that they were the Executive Administration of an empire embracing all religionists and men of no religion at all, they ought to have proclaimed equality for all, and have interfered only to protect the lives, liberties, and properties of the people they ruled.

The British government has never yet discouraged Bible-Christianity in India; not, we suppose, that they are more favorable to it than to the denominational counterfeits, but for the simple reason that it has not yet been presented to the Hindoos under their sway. The time is approaching when they may be put to the proof on this point: at that time when they shall be called to surrender their badly administered dominion into the hands of Jehovah's King, and his Associates. Till then, Hindooism will prevail in India; and all the prayers of all the parsons of Britain will never bring the day in which the natives shall ascribe glory and honor to the God of heaven in the precepts of righteousness and truth, on their account. They will never bring it, we say, for they have no influence within the veil.—*Edron*.

November 29, 1857.

The Day of Humiliation.

THE day of "solemn fast, humiliation, and prayer" passed exactly as we expected. An additional Sunday was thrown into the middle of the week, with a subject dictated for all the sermons, the congregations being expected to make a collection. There was "prayer" varying in its fashion according to the tenets and color of the congregation, more or less sincere—more or less moral—more or less bereft of any belief in its efficacy. There was a "humiliation" with the greatest number for the two hours in which the congregation was in church; a humiliation mingled with no small sense of Sunday finery. But *where* was the "fast?" Not a single meal was omitted on that day; on the contrary, it was a Sunday dinner instead of a working-day dinner.

A strong sense of the terrible calamity in the East did impart a greater solemnity,

earnestness, and truth to the feeling of the day than is customary in these observances. We have the evidence of this feeling in the general strain of the sermons. Seldom have we gone over a mass of clerical literature so devoid of any individual "striking point," very seldom have we seen so much harmony in the universal utterance. Not indeed that the clergy, whether of the established or non-established churches, grasped the true problem which was presented to them. They were, perhaps, compelled to take it up according to professional fashion, the fashion being set in ages long past; but they did their best to reconcile the practical requirements of the present day with the contracted knowledge of past ages. Their version of the story which they had to tell was this: having neglected to extend Christianity in India, having on the contrary tolerated the idolatry and the vile practices of the Hindoos, we have committed a gigantic sin, of which the revolt was the retribution. This was the presentment of the whole clerical jury upon the offender arraigned before the sacred tribunal.

There are some flaws in the case. As one preacher pointed out, if England is the offender,* justice has strangely visited with retribution not England but India;† has inflicted the larger share of penalty not even upon the English in India, but upon the Hindoos, amongst whom the slaughter is far greater than amongst the British.‡ Some of the more timid amongst the clergy tremble lest modern knowledge should prove to be inconsistent with sacred truth; as if truth and genuine knowledge could ever be inconsistent! as if we should find out in the works of the Creator facts inconsistent with inspiration! On the occasion of the last day of solemn fast, we had much broader and more truthful explanations of our wrong-doing, and, therefore, much clearer light thrown on the method of reform. But still there were some few who could seize the truth, and set it forth even in an established church. One preacher laid down his discourse upon the established tramway. The Divine ruler of the world, he said, "accorded not to individuals the final judgment on their deeds until the close of their career, but communities of men have their probation in this world;"

* The English and Hindoos are offenders against heaven; and therefore both classes have suffered by the sword, by ruin and disaster.—*ERRON.*

† England is retributed in the large sums she is compelled to spend in putting down the revolt and repairing the damage; in the thousands she will yet have to lose by war, cholera, &c.; and in the affliction these losses will entail on families at home.—*ERRON.*

‡ This fact only affects the degree of the punishment. The sepoys are devils, less mitigated than the English; therefore the slaughter has been greater.—*ERRON.*

and in the government of the world there are moral laws as well as physical laws:

"All the physical convulsions that have agitated the world have proceeded in conformity with the natural laws assigned from the first by God. An earthquake, a volcano, an eruption, a flood, though seeming to break in on nature, does nevertheless fulfil its laws as truly as the falling stone, or the raising sparks of fire, or the ripple of the streamlet of the valley. So we may be sure that the just laws of the Moral Government are fulfilled in the most inscrutable of human events, as truly as in the ordinary tenor of human existence. There is a human probation going on beneath the Eternal Eye. *There is a moral meaning for all that happens.* We must not then suppose that when we have traced to social and natural causes the enormous crime and misery which have just afflicted our Indian Empire, we have done with them."

The *Times*, said the same preacher, "has had the courage to charge the blame of the present outbreak of heathenism in the East on the defective Christianity in the middle classes, who have abetted the Indian Government in compromising between Christianity and heathenism." Dr. IRONS did not question these statements; but he retorted that the press does but reflect the mind of the middle classes; and we may add, that in the main, if the middle class have pandered to compromise in India, the press has pandered to the middle class. But says Dr. IRONS, "this mutual shifting of the blame on one another is unworthy of a solemn hour like the present." "*We have all had our share in the low tone of religion and morals among the people.*" If England will not trust religion, God will pluck up and destroy our power." We may, perhaps, question the accuracy of some expressions here, but it is the rough assertion of a great truth.

If we, as a people, habitually mingle truth and falsehood, if we adulterate our sincerity with mere outward conformity, we undermine the strength that is in us, and render ourselves incapable of maintaining our own greatness. Strewed throughout the churches of the country on that day devoted to communing with the Divine Power was a mass of hypocrisy, of pretended belief, of acquiescence in doctrines that are no longer sincerely accepted; and in the Divine Presence the people of this country were lying. Is it possible that it can throw its heart into the work, can prevent its mind from becoming confused, or can distinguish between conscience and hypocrisy, between the work to be done and the work that ought not to be done?

As if to anatomize and expose the nature

of our religious observances before our face, a great commercial company had specially added to its museum for the day. The Crystal Palace Company had procured a *monster specimen of the genus Preacher*, and the attractions of that *zoological curiosity* drew an immense crowd of holiday congregationalists. SURGEON preached to 23,500 persons. He knew that he was expected to be "striking;" he has a voice as capable as any of filling some part of that museum church; and he has the ready knack of saying things that are not generally spoken out, in a coarse language which borrows its apology from fanaticism, and adds a spice to religious unction. In this direct language of a Walworth Peter the Hermit, he told, not home truths, but home truisms; pleased the people by loudly abusing them to their faces; and begged on behalf of the collection with a forty-parson power. The congregation laughed, almost applauded. One and all, whether High Church or Low Church, Catholic or Jew, joined, or at least appeared to join in the "prayer" of the Low Churchman; and having thus *gaily* "humiliated" themselves on that solemn day, no sooner had SURGEON ended the entertainment, than half of the congregation hurried back to town engagements, while the other half rushed to finish the "fast" in the refreshment-room. For seldom have the waiters of the Crystal Palace been so busy as on that day.

In all this great national exposure there is something that is respectable as well as painful; something sound and earnest as well as that which is hollow and ridiculous. The country *means* to do well, but *it cannot distinctly see its duty*. Being Christian, it ought not unquestionably to discourage Christianity in the East; being wise, it ought not to tolerate the most odious, silly, and even bestial idolatry. But recognizing as we do the sacred right of freedom for conscience, we must leave to Hindoos their faith, must allow them the latitude that we claim ourselves. Christians are not bound to tolerate, in any land which they govern, murder, torture, or compulsory slavery, on the assertion that it is sanctioned by the Hindoo gods. But on the other hand, if it pleases Hindoos to bow before idols, or to perform any other act which is not an aggression upon their fellow creatures, *our conscience is not so clear of follies* that we have the right to prevent them. We need not supply them with the laws to carry out their tyranny; we need not tyrannically restrain them from folly. If we enforce the broad laws of humanity against murder, rapine, and depravity, we may leave the rest to the free trade of progress; for if the

Hindoo cannot overthrow the empire of the British, neither can he resist or divert the calm, wise, and beneficent course of a Government higher than any which resides on earth.—*London Leader*.

(From the Gospel Advocate.)

Call to the Ministry.

A friend (S. G. O.) wishes to see an *expose* of the call to the ministry in the *Advocate*. He says, he heard a preacher not long since attempt to prove that he was specially called to preach as were the apostles. No sensible man acquainted with the New Testament can arrive at any such a groundless conclusion. The witnesses and ambassadors of Christ, were particularly called by name, and qualified by the Spirit, to *make known* the will of the Savior to the world—they "*brought glad tidings of good things to light*," and revealed the mind of God "*not in words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches*." These revelations were written in a book, and since the sealing up of the testimony of the apostles and prophets new developments have not been made; they have not been needed, and consequently all who have professed themselves the especially called and sent, have been, and are, impious imposters. Faithful men should be called by the church, qualified and commissioned to preach the Gospel, and this is Heaven's arrangement to convert the world. "If an angel from Heaven preach a new gospel, let him be accursed."—*Paul*.

John Locke.

The celebrated John Locke, for fourteen or fifteen years, applied himself closely to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and employed the last period of his life scarcely in any thing else. He was never weary of admiring the grand views of that sacred book, and the just relations of all its parts. He every day made some discoveries in it, which gave him fresh cause of admiration. And so earnest was he for the comfort of his friends, and the diffusion of sacred knowledge amongst them, that even the day before he died he particularly exhorted all about him to read the Holy Scriptures. His well-known recommendation to a person who asked him which was the shortest and surest way for a young gentleman to attain to the knowledge of the Christian religion, in the full and just extent of it was, "Let him study the Holy Scriptures, especially the New Testament. Therein are contained the words of eternal life. It hath God for its author; salvation for its end; and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter."—*Selected*.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VII.

"Nahum's Lightning Chariots".....	3, 25	Did Moses Teach Immortal-Soulism, or	
Visit to Canada and the West.....	9, 30	Resurrection to Immortality of Body	97
Epistle from "the Called" in Edinburgh	17	Who are the Heirs of the Kingdom of	
Reply to the Brethren in Edinburgh....	19	God?.....	103
Christ and his Brethren's Reign on Earth		The New Heavens and New Earth.....	105
Defended against Campbellism.....	21	The Inefficiency of the Pulpit.....	106, 183
A Word from the Bush.....	23	Approves the Best, and yet the Worst	
The Hope Confessed.....	24	Pursues.....	115
England, Persia, Russia.....	24	The Warfare.....	115
Rush like a Tempest with Chariots....	39	A Macedonian Call.....	116
The Right Direction for the Goguchip..	41	"He had no Faith".....	116
Encouragement from Afar.....	43	"School of Christ".....	118
The Ezekiel Law of Marriage.....	44	"Spiritualism" more Attractive than	
Job's Tempter.....	44	the Bible.....	119
"Kingdom—Believers".....	45	Balancing Accounts.....	120
An Interesting Question.....	45	The Clergy.....	120
It Signor Incognito Explains.....	46	Immortality of the Soul.....	120
The Russian Railroads.....	48	Did Jesus and the Apostles teach the	
"Salvation by Baptism".....	49	Mosaic Doctrine of Immortality?... ..	121
The Corrupt Mould of Cerinthus.....	58	The Ghost-Man.....	127
Fleshly Fabrications and Contradictions		The Rebuilding of Babylon, and the	
of Sinners.....	59	Reign of the Latter-Day Assyrian	
Original.....	60	therein, affirmed from the Proph-	
"Depart and be with Christ".....	63	ets.....	131, 151, 174, 223
"The Spirits in Prison".....	66	Romarks on the Above, by the Editor,	134,
"The Gospel Preached to the Dead"....	67		182, 227
New Holy Alliance.....	67	A Curious Occurrence.....	136
"Blasphemy and Names of Blasphemy"	73	Thinkings of the Flesh.....	136
Ecclesiastical Cravens.....	82	Flesh of Itself Incompetent to Think	
The Faith of Abraham.....	83	Aright on Things Divine.....	137
An Idolator Slain.....	87	No Loitering on the Way.....	141
Letters from Dr. Passmore....	90, 210, 235	Jupiter Tonans.....	141
The Gallows-Repentance, or Convict-Con-		A Dabbling "Fountain" of Romance...	
verts of the Clergy.....	91	The Truth in Norfolk, Va.....	141
Errata.....	92	"Not Able to Kill the Soul".....	146
The Labor of '56.....	92	The Rivalry existing between England	
Railway to Jerusalem.....	93	and Russia in Asia.....	155
Candle or No Candle.....	93	The Inefficiency of "the Church".....	161
Fashionable Religion.....	93	The "Ecclesia" in Halifax, England... ..	162
An Interesting Book.....	94	A Remarkable Question.....	163
Eternal Life.....	96	A Hungry Time.....	163
The Clergy and their "Names of Blas-		Plan for a more efficient Working and	
phemy".....	96	Organization of the Churches in the	

Protest of the Dutch Catholic Bishops against the Doctrine of the Immacu- late Conception.....	166	Remarks by the Editor.....	246
Calvin and Servetus.....	167	Clerical Heroism.....	252
"Blasphemies".....	168	A Word of Thanksgiving.....	254
New Translation of the Bible.....	168	Letter from Tennessee.....	254
An Ancient Tombstone.....	168	"Who will Go for Us?".....	255
The Gospel in Macedonia.....	169	Have Nothing to Do with It.....	255
A Candid Mind.....	183	Result of our Visit to Plymouth, Eng- land.....	256
Situation of Europe.....	189	A Possible Coincidence.....	256
Table of Contemporaries.....	190	The One Faith and Everlasting Punish- ment.....	256
The Jews.....	191	A Sign of the Times.....	257
"Christianity the True Judaism".....	193	His Horn shall be Exalted.....	257
Paul and the Jailor of Philippi.....	205	What are We to Do for Preachers?.....	258
No Reign of Righteousness before Christ appears.....	213	Immersion, apart from the One Faith, not the One Baptism.....	259
Mixing up the Isms.....	216	The Subscription List.....	261
Visit to Massachusetts and Rhode Island	217	Jewish Luni-Solar Years.....	261
An Editorial Offset.....	230	Infidelity of the Day.....	263
Turkish Independence.....	231	"The Great River Euphrates".....	263
The Truth in Washington, D. C.....	232	Sects and their Clergy.....	264
The Gospel of the Kingdom progressing in Canada West.....	233	He Hath a Demon, and is Mad.....	271
Grateful Acknowledgement.....	234	Letter of Withdrawal from Baptistism..	271
Visit to Kentucky, Mississippi, and Ten- nessee.....	235, 247	The Editor in Virginia.....	271
What Nation will Rank the Highest in Future Years?.....	239	Letter from Texas.....	274
The Merchants of Tarshish.....	240	Russian Annexation in Asia.....	275
Apostasy of the First Century.....	240, 265	The Indo-Mohammedan Rebellion.....	279
Eternal Life.....	244	Clerical View of the Indian Woe.....	281
		The Day of Humiliation.....	284
		Call to the Ministry.....	286
		John Locke.....	286

END OF THE SEVENTH VOLUME.

B. Wilson & J. Thomas Nut p. 321³³

J. Thomas lived in St. Charles 13 years before meeting B. Wilson - 1844.

Indicates church there was "Christadelphian" were not "Mellinists"

Story of six anniversary themselves in Halifax - G. Dean Wilson p. 343³⁵

Also call to organization of churches in St. Louis by Bro. Geo. Dean Wilson pg 166

Page 162

Harold K & ATC VII:2 July 1857

Letter from A. Campbell - friendly letter pg 63 VIII:3 March 1858

Robert Roberts

p. 44, 45

Marsh baptisms mentioned by Thomas - p. 46, 47

Thomas criticism of B. Wilson & Mark Allen H. V. Paul, J. Stephenson & Coffman

Brothers in the West - referring to B. Wilson pg 28, 29

p. 54, 55

J. Marsh referred to

p. 116, 117