

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, Editor. RICHMOND, VIRGINIA August, 1852—
Volume 2—No. 8.

ODOLOGY;

OR, THEOLOGICAL MESMERISM WITCHCRAFT REVIVED ANEW.

So much for the strongest argument for the existence of spirits separate from material bodies—an argument which with all its strength is but general debility in the presence of God's testimony, and Messrs. Karsten and Draper's experiments of the coins. Separate spirits!—mere spectral impressions on magnetic haloes!—hidden, indeed, from light-stimulated optics; but disclosed to electro-magnetically excited brains! How are the "wise" with the ignorant entrapped in their own foolishness! And the "pious" too—the "great and good divines," with their adorers—how are they taken in the craftiness of their own pietism! Oh the worth of the immortal soul, who can calculate it!—of that soul evoked from the magnetic halo of a clairvoyant's sensorium! Such is the phantom-soul, for whose salvation from Pluto's realm of fire and brimstone, the whole machinery of clerical superstition has been erected in ages past; and is now maintained at the expense of the liberty, intelligence, and wealth of the nations; and is sought to be imposed upon all semi-barbarians and savages as a means of introducing the long-looked for millennium upon earth! A mighty superstition—a great mountain filling the globe—a stupendous fabric of moonshine—a pious cheat for the salvation of a magnetic spectre! Still out of evil God educes good; for if he did not, where on earth would the good come from? Even this vast imposition on human credulity He turns to a good account. The generations of mankind having yielded themselves to their propensities; or, as the scripture expresses it, "instruments of unrighteousness to serve sin"—their intellectual and moral sense has become so darkened and unfeeling, that they cannot comprehend or appreciate the goodness of God, so that order in the absence of the divine majesty might be maintained among them by its influence over them. There is, therefore, but one of two things remaining—either the earth must be left a prey to anarchy, which would be "hell;" or, order must be established by acting upon the fears of the multitude. The existence of "hell" here would defeat the divine plans destined to eventuate in blessedness upon all nations. The world became hell before the flood. It was therefore destroyed to become heaven: therefore, order was elaborated; and "the powers that be," as they appeared from time to time from amid the storm of human passion, were controlled and ordered of God. Without approving their words, He permits them to exist as a terror to evil-doers until the appointed time arrives to punish them for their wickedness, and to set up His own kingdom in the earth which shall rule over

all, administering His will in truth and righteousness over all nations. At present the popular superstitions are an important element in "the terror" by which evil-doers are restrained. The clerico-priestly dogmata of immortal disembodied ghosts; heaven in a spirit-world; hell somewhere; and the necessity of faith in these wares as administered by an ordained ministry, or "sacred order," on pain of the soul's exclusion from the joys of the one, and eternal fiery torment in the other—are the staff of the spiritual police, which co-operating with the imperial sword, keeps the world in awe, and maintains order until the Lord comes. It is the fear of punishment, not the love of truth and hope of reward, that makes men behave with social decency and order. This is the general rule, to which doubtless there are exceptions; but they are such as to establish the rule.

Our worthy correspondent thinks that the answers obtained by the dead-seekers from the spectres before the medium's sensorium is "the strongest argument for the existence of spirits separate from matter." I grant it. It is doubtless the strongest, and but weak at that. It is the argument of a dream to prove a fact. But the argument cannot be received as valid; for the dream-answers are not always right, as he testifies in the case of the second gentleman. Answers from God are infallible. His spirit never makes mistakes; nor is it presumable that any intelligences of a true spiritual nature, in harmony with His spirit, are ever guilty of untruthful utterances. The "spirits," therefore, whatever they be, are neither of God, nor of "the just made perfect." But, may they not be the spirits of the wicked or unjust; if they be, then, the disembodied existence of spirits is as much proved as though they were the spirits of the just? Granted. If by a spirit is to be understood no more than a spectral impression on a medium's sensorium, mesmerically evoked by the thinking of the dead-seeker, I grant that such spirits do exist separately from the persons they represent, as the spectral impression of the coin exists on the halo of the mirror separately from the coin itself. All the phenomena observed belong to spirits of this class, and prove only their existence under mesmeric excitation. Before their evocation before the medium's sensorium, they exist only as images before the seeker's mind when he thinks of them. I can now see before my recollecting faculty a child of three years old, standing with a ruler in his hand with which he had just struck me over the head. This child, a little brother, has been dead over thirty years. I see his image, and if I were placed en rapport with a medium I could make him see the child's appearance; but would it be logical to conclude that he saw the child himself, or the real individual, which a spirit is supposed to be? If the spectral impressions, or spirits, seen, were real persons, and had cognisance of human affairs, they would make no mistakes in their responses; they would speak truth only, unless they were wicked persons. It is admitted that they err, and on theological subjects it is notorious that the mediums utter the most stupid nonsense; hence I conclude, that they are not of God, nor of his saints, whatever they be.

Now, it is not my business to prove that these lying spectres are not real persons. I do not undertake to prove negatives. I have shown that they may be philosophically accounted for. It is for the spirit-mongers to prove that the forms observed by their clairvoyants are realities, and therefore not appearances only; and that they were formerly embodied in human clay, and lived in the world as men, women, and children, now exist therein. The kind of proof must be different to anything they have produced yet however. The declaration of the spectres through the clairvoyants cannot be received; because in a multitude of instances they have proved themselves to be liars, and therefore unworthy of credit; besides that unsupported self-testimony is incredible. It may be true, and it may not. If, then, the spectres say they lived in human clay as its animating, thinking principle, let them give us proof from God that their assertion is true. Jesus Christ, the sinless man, did not require his unsupported testimony to be received; shall we then admit the self-testimony of the lying spectres of the wicked dead?

Perish the thought! "If," saith the Lord, "I testify concerning myself my testimony is not credible" (John 5: 31). We demand, therefore, confirmation of spectral assertions strong as Holy Writ; because assertion is no proof. They tell us, or rather mediums do, that they are the ghosts, or spirits, of dead men, and that they know a great many things, and much more than the living. But upon this point the word of God gives them the lie direct. It testifies, that "the dead know not anything;" (Ecclesiastes 9: 5) and that "there is neither knowledge nor wisdom in Sheol," (Ecclesiastes 9: 10) whither we go. Now "divines" make this word Sheol equivalent to Hades, which they say is "the place of departed spirits." Well, let us accept their definition for the present; how then reads the latter text? Even thus: "There is neither knowledge nor wisdom in the place of departed spirits," which theological mesmerists term "the spirit-world"! This is, with me, authority outweighing the testimony of all the spectres in creation, with all the opinions to boot of the 30,000 simpletons in the east, judges, lawyers, doctors, parsons, and less distinguished dupes, who vainly imagine they converse with living spirits from the vasty deep.

Our correspondent thinks, that "the whole system promulgated in our writings goes down, if the claims put forth by these spirit-mongers be established." By established he means proved to be God's truth; or else, established as true in the estimation of all men. If the latter be his meaning, the system we advocate only goes down in regard to mere human opinion. Its truth is not at all affected by mankind's opinion of it; because men who are ignorant of the true Bible-doctrine, judge according to the thinking of the flesh, which knows not the things of the spirit, because they are spiritually discerned; (1 Corinthians 2: 9-15) that is, they are discerned by the light shed upon them by the spirit in the prophetic and apostolic testimony, or writings. We advocate the system exhibited in this testimony, which went down in the estimation of their contemporaries, in whose judgment the spirit-mongers of the apostles' day established the notion, that the spectres seen by the clairvoyants in the idol temples were the disembodied immortal souls of the dead. As this notion went up, the apostolic doctrine of the immortality of the body at the resurrection went down, as at this day. It ate out the truth of immortality at resurrection only, as a gangrene; (2 Timothy 2: 15-18) and left in its place nothing but a fetid, ill-conditioned ulcer, which has reduced the patient to a gasping state. The gangrene is everything; the apostolic doctrine scarcely to be found beyond the lids of the Bible. On the other hypothesis it is doubtless true, that if the spirit-mongers' claims be proved to be God's truth, the system we advocate will be exploded. No doubt of it. It ought to be; for if their claims be true, the system we exhibit must be false, utterly and entirely false. There is no agreement between spirit-worldism and the Bible; so that if mesmerized theology be God's truth, God is not the author of the Bible; and, as we advocate the things taught in this book, which are all together at variance with the spectre-revelations of clairvoyants, we must go down with the Bible, and share with it the misfortune that peradventure might befall it. But such an hypothesis is monstrous. God can be the author of no doctrine at variance with bible teaching. This He has plainly declared in the text below (Isaiah 8: 19-20). The Bible is not to be tested by the peepings and mutterings of familiar-spirit mediums, and the table-tappings of mesmeric circles; but their utterances on the contrary, by its word, which is the truth. We stand or fall by this; and feel no apprehension of the result, though a thousand millions of spirits, a thousand times told, pronounce the reveries of the possessed, the infallible and eternal truth of God.

THE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

In conclusion, I present the following replies in brief to the questions propounded through our correspondent:

1. To question No. 1, I respond, that I have nothing to do but to believe Matthew's testimony in regard to the Transfiguration and its attendant circumstances. I have nothing to do with the claims of spirit-mongers in the case. Matthew says nothing about "forms," or "souls," or "spiritual bodies," being seen there. He says, "there appeared unto Peter, James, and John, Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus"—Matthew 17: 3. Luke testifies substantially, the same thing, saying, "There talked with him two men, who were Moses and Elijah, who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him"—Luke 9: 30-32. Now I ask any man, not crazed by spirit-worldism or "theology," when he is awake in the midst of a crowd on court days, what does he take those living things to be which he sees around him? Would he not reply, "men to be sure?" Suppose, I were to say to him, "No; they are spirit-forms, or souls, that once inhabited human bodies; they are not men, but the ghosts of men, which became "spiritual bodies" when the hearts of their old bodies ceased to beat"—would he not say I was either a madman or a fool? Or, if neither, that, on the supposition of his being a dupe, I was amusing myself at his expense? If rational, would he not argue that they must be men, because they presented to the eye all the marks by which men are ordinarily known? The apostles were matter-of-fact men, and reasonable withal. They judged of Moses and Elijah as they did of other men, and therefore called them by the right words, styling them "two men." Whatever quibble might be raised about Moses, because he died, cannot at all affect Elijah, who never died; and therefore never experienced a resolution into two parts. But we need add no more. Moses died, and must have been raised from the dead, or he could not have appeared as a man before three witnesses wide awake who called him such. There is no difficulty or mystery in the case, except with those whose minds are spoiled by "philosophy and vain deceit."

2. The sudden appearance and disappearance of the Lord's body, or the Lord rather, for the Lord and his body are one and the same, was the result, not of any change upon him, but of an effect produced by him upon the eyes of his disciples. "Their eyes were holden that they should not know him," until he thought proper to release their sight from the restraint. Mary saw Jesus but did not know him for the same reason. (Luke 24:16; John 20:14; 21:4) The eyes of the disciples going to Emmaus were holden. The meaning of this is given in the words, "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him." Hence to hold the eyes is to shut the sight, so that though the lids be unclosed, certain objects shall be invisible. I have performed an experiment similar to this upon the eyes of a person now in this city in the presence of many witnesses. I first mesmerized him by looking at him steadily in the eye. By this process the lids were closed so that he could not open them. I allowed him to remain in this state for some time, and then brought him out of it by a wave of the hand upwards and backwards. He could now see, and converse with anyone. I told him to look at my finger which I held before him, and about six inches above the level of his eyes. While he was doing this I carried it obliquely upwards and forwards as far as I could conveniently reach, and then suddenly withdrew it from the line of vision. This left him staring with the eyes wide open upon vacancy, with a countenance as blank and inexpressive as a corpse. He was now in the state of ecstasy. His eyes "were holden" completely; for he could see nothing. In proof of this a lighted candle was passed almost near enough to singe the lashes, but without causing a wink. Everything in the room vanished from his view with the jerk of my finger from the line of vision; and appeared

again as suddenly as I waved my hand upwards before his eyes, which "opened them" to the objects by which he was surrounded. The Lord Jesus, who understood man's physique better than all the living, operated upon the disciples more skilfully. He could close their sight upon some objects at once, while he left them capable of discerning others. In this way he made himself invisible to them, and entered with them unseen into their room, where he continued to hold their eyes until they shut the doors for fear of the Jews, when he opened them and was discovered standing in their midst to their no little amazement, as may be supposed. When he parted with the disciples at Emmaus, he did not vanish as a figure from a magic lantern; but as the margin of the text reads, "he ceased to be seen of them;" that is, he took his departure. Just men, made perfect at the resurrection, will doubtless have the same power over mortals to make themselves visible or invisible as they please, by holding or opening their eyes; for of them, it is testified, "they shall be like him." He was never seen so as to be recognized by others than his disciples, because it was contrary to God's plan that he should be seen by any others. He was only to be seen by witnesses, that his resurrection might be a matter of testimony and faith, that believers might walk by faith and not by sight; therefore, the eyes of all men were holden except "the witnesses chosen of God," (Acts 10: 40-41) and the Roman guard.

3. Elisha's servant saw on the mountain near Dothan "horses and chariots of fire," such as Elijah ascended to heaven in. They descended to Elisha, and at his instance, in obedience to Jehovah's command, their riders smote the Syrian host with blindness. The servant's eyes were made more open, and the Syrians' were closed by the same spirit. The patriarchs and prophets saw angels as they saw men, by their natural sight. When men do not see them, it is either because there are no angels present to be seen; or because their natural sight is holden that they may not see.

4. Paul was not removed from earth when he saw Paradise. When he is writing about the Third Heaven and Paradise, he tells us he is treating of "Visions and Revelations of the Lord;" that is, of things represented and communicated to him by the Lord, as they were of old time to the prophets, and afterwards to John in Patmos. He was so absorbed in the contemplation of what he saw and heard, that he was altogether unconscious of his present existence. He had a Vision of Paradise, or a Vision of the Third Heaven, in which he heard things not communicated for utterance. He did not see Paradise or the Third Heaven, but a representation of them as they will be when the Kingdom is established by the God of heaven in the land promised to Abraham, and shall be in continuance after the thousand years shall have passed away. The "heaven of angels" is their abode in some of the stars. Hence they are styled "the Morning Stars;" but which of the heavenly bodies is not testified; therefore I cannot tell. Paul's body could have been taken any where God pleased; but, as I have said, it, that is, he never left the earth. He was wrapt in vision unconscious of where he was.

5. In his argument with the Sadducees, Jesus meant to prove the resurrection of the dead from Moses' writings; and he did prove it triumphantly. He does not even hint, much less affirm, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "are already risen." He said, "that the dead are raised even Moses has shewn at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, etc.;" that is to say, "that there is to be a resurrection of the dead, Moses teaches in calling Jehovah Abraham's God." How so? Because Jehovah is not a God of dead men. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead men; therefore, for Jehovah to become their God they must become living men; for Jehovah is a God of the living, not of the dead. Hence their resurrection is necessitated, as that is the only way in which the dead can become living. This being so, He is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while they are actually dead, "because they all

live to him" in the sense of rising from the dead to live; for "God who makes alive the dead, calls ta me onta things not existing as though they were" (Romans 4:17). The Lord of glory dealt not in "catches" nor "dishonesty;" these are the weapons of spirit-mongers, and of those who have more respect for the foolishness of men, than the words of the living God.

EDITOR.

* * *

QUERY.

Jehovah, by the prophet Ezekiel, declares that the kingdom of Israel shall be an overturned kingdom until He (Christ) receives it whose right it is. It is evident, therefore, that the kingdom promised to David's Son and Lord is a kingdom once existent, but afterwards in ruins. But the sky-kingdomers say, that Christ is now in possession of the promised kingdom. Will they be kind enough to inform us, if it was an overturned kingdom till the epoch of Christ's assumption? We wait for a reply, but "guess" we shall wait in vain! —EDITOR.

* * *

CRITICISM.

"LORD, WILT THOU AT THIS TIME RESTORE AGAIN THE KINGDOM TO ISRAEL."

Edinburgh, Scotland, June 11th, 1852.

Dr. Thomas:

Dear Sir—I have been requested to extract the following from Dunbar's Greek and English Lexicon, to be sent for your consideration. He says in his preface, "I need offer no apology for endeavouring to explain several passages in the Greek Testament. I have taken a different view of them from our translators, and all the commentators that I have had an opportunity of consulting. Some of them submitted to distinguished scholars have met with their approbation. I would particularly refer to the observations on Acts 1: 6, and James 2: 1." His observations on the former passage are the following: "The verb apokathistano occurs in Acts 1: 6, "Kyrie, ei en to chrono touto apokathistancis teen basileian to Israel?"—"Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" as if apokathistaneis were the future of the verb. Dr. Bloomfield, in a note on the passage says, "Some explain ei by num; others by anon. The former may be considered a more accurate version. The idea seems to have arisen from the blending the oratio directa with the indirecta. I have great doubts if ei in an interrogative sentence ever signifies either num or anon. The interrogative particle ee may be so rendered, but not ei. I apprehend the meaning of the passage is generally misunderstood. It is evident that the Apostles were still looking forward to a temporal sovereignty to be established by our Lord; and that they expected to receive from him offices of power and authority in it. This, I think, is evident from the answer returned by our Saviour: the first part of which has reference to the time when the Kingdom of Israel was to be restored, which, he says, "the Father retained in his own power;" the other to the kind of power which they should receive. Their aspiring thoughts after temporal power had been formerly checked, and their views directed to a heavenly kingdom. These thoughts had again revived after his resurrection from the dead. Still, however, they were fearful of putting the question in a

direct manner, but had recourse to a supposition evidently implying, in their own minds the certainty of the event, leaving it to be understood what was their real aim. There is, therefore, an apostopesis in the expression, which our Lord perfectly understood. Supposing this to be the case, the words may be thus translated, “Lord, if at this time thou art engaged in restoring the kingdom to Israel?” The object they had in view, but which they were afraid to name openly, may be thus expressed, tina dynamin en autee leep sometha? What power shall we have in it? Our Lord replied, “alla leepsesthe dynamin epelthontos tou hagion pneumatos eph’ hymas.” There is a similar apostopeesis in a conditional statement with ei in Philippians 1: 22. See Dr. Bloomfield’s Note on the verse.”

“Dunbar’s definition of apostopeesis is “a keeping silence; also a figure of rhetoric, by which the meaning is to be gathered from the context.”

I remain, in haste, yours,

J. CAMERON, Junr.

* * *

SOMETHING ANNIHILATED BY NOTHING.

“God hath chosen things that are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence.”—PAUL.

I am much obliged to Mr. Cameron for the above copy; and as the best acknowledgment I can make for the trouble he has taken, I will offer a few remarks upon its contents.

No doubt there is ample scope for views of passages in the Greek New Testament different from any yet presented by translators and commentators, the most highly esteemed in the theological world. But whether Mr. Dunbar has juster ideas than they off the true import of those passages, I am not prepared to admit, if Dr. Bloomfield’s criticism on Acts 1: 6, be endorsed by him as a specimen of his own. Dr. Bloomfield ranks as a distinguished scholar, profoundly skilled in Greek; but, deep though he be in human lore, his apostopesian critique proves him to be, like all other State-Bishops, a very shallow divine. If Mr. Dunbar approve the criticism, I can make no exception in his favour; but am strengthened in the conclusion to which I have been led by observation, that no philologist, however skilled in Hebrew and Greek, is competent to render a critical and accurate version of the scriptures, who is ignorant of the true import off the sure word of prophecy. This is illustrated by the case before us. Dr. Bloomfield is a spiritualist; and therefore infidel of what his class terms, the “temporal,” which is the only kingdom of God promised to Jesus and his brethren. Spiritualists use the word temporal in contradistinction to spiritual. A temporal kingdom with them is a veritable kingdom on earth, existing in time, as Victoria’s, or Otho’s, exists; while by a spiritual kingdom they understand a reign of evangelical principles in the hearts of men. Hence, they style the existing church of Christ as defined by them, his spiritual kingdom, and the only one he will ever have on earth; his everlasting and glorious kingdom being the receptacle of disembodied spirits among the stars. The apostles, as Dr. Bloomfield admits, looked forward with certainty to the establishment of a veritable kingdom in the Holy Land, even the kingdom which had once been possessed by Israel. The Bishop assumes that the apostles were altogether mistaken. Mr. Dunbar also, by invoking the

doctor's criticism, seems to participate with him in this assumption. But there is nothing in the text or context, nor in the Old or New, Testaments, to justify it. They can adduce no testimony to convict the apostles of error; therefore, as the only resource, they rack their ingenuity in the treatment of Greek particles and tenses, to fetch out such "a supposition" as will give their spiritualism the benefit of a doubt in its assumption and implication against the "temporal sovereignty" in which the apostles so firmly believed. If the critics understood and believed the prophets, we should have heard nothing off their apostopesis; but being ignorant of "the gospel of the kingdom" testified by them, Messrs. Bloomfield and Dunbar have entertained us with an hypothesis upon ei; which, we were almost tempted to add, "is all my eye," and so forth.

Mr. Dunbar takes exception to the rendering of apokathistaneis by the future sign of the verb; as thou wilt restore again. It is true that apokathistaneis is of the present tense active; and should be, independently of position, thou restorest, or dost restore again. Suppressing the note of interrogation, and rejecting the ei, the question proposed affirmed the conviction of the apostles' minds; as "Lord, in this time thou dost restore again the Kingdom to Israel." From this it is clear, that they regarded the restoration as a future event; and that when it should come to pass, Jesus, the Lord, would be the Restorer. This, it is admitted by Dr. Bloomfield, was their certain conviction. Hence, though the verb is in the present, the facts of the case and the conviction of the inquirers, convert the present into the future, and fully justify the king's translators in rendering apokathistaneis by the words thou wilt restore again—thou dost restore again, and, thou wilt restore again, are evidently equivalent, especially under the circumstances of the case.

The representation of the present tense by the future is a notable occurrence in the Hebrew; and will excite no astonishment when it is understood, that Hebrew verbs have only past and future tenses. They have no present tense to their moods. Thou restorest again, though represented by the present of the Greek verb, is obviously a future action; and therefore, Hebraistically, in the future tense; so that, had the question been written in Hebrew, it would either have been expressed by the past, converted into the future by way conversive, or by the future absolute. Mr. Dunbar, then, is welcome to all he can make out of the discovery, that apokathistaneis is of the present, and not the future, of the Greek verb. It does not strengthen the spiritualist assumption an iota.

Messrs. Bloomfield and Dunbar admit that apokathistaneis occurs interrogatively. I would ask then, what word in the sentence converts it into an interrogative? There is but one, and that is this same particle ei. And yet Dr. Bloomfield says, "I have great doubts if ei in an interrogative sentence, ever signifies either num or anon." For the English reader it may be remarked, that num is a Latin adverb, generally used in interrogations to which a negative answer is expected. If ei were rendered by num the question would be, "Lord, what? Dost thou in this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" The inquiry put in this form would imply incredulous astonishment; as if the apostles should have said, "Lord, is it possible that you are going to restore the kingdom to Israel now: surely not?" Ei cannot be taken in this sense, certainly; for the admitted mentality of the apostles forbids it. The idea of restoration did not astonish them; and believing that the time thereof was come, they sought confirmation of their conviction from the declaration of the Lord. But though ei may not signify num in the sense of an expected negation, it may still be regarded as an untranslatable interrogative particle; that is, a particle introduced into the sentence to transform it from an affirmative into a simple interrogative, just as it stands in the Common Version, untranslated except by the note of interrogation. I do not doubt that ei represented to the ear in speech, what "?"

represents to the eye. In this sense, it is fairly expressed by anon, or an; as abiit, he is gone; an abiit, is he gone? So apokathistaneis, thou dost restore; ei apokathistaneis, dost thou restore? Dr. Bloomfield does not consider ei an interrogative particle at all; but merely a particle “in an interrogative sentence;” and therefore not representable by num and anon, which are interrogative particles; though in opposition to ei, he patronises ee, which he says is interrogative. His words are, “the interrogative ee may be so rendered (by num or anon) but not ei.” In the sentence before this, he says, he has “great doubts” about ei; and immediately after he has no doubts at all, asserting positively that ei may not be rendered interrogatively.

But the translators of the Common Version say, that ei is an interrogative particle, and is to be rendered as such; for they treat it after this view. If the question had been taken out of the verse where it exists, and, deprived of the note of interrogation, presented to them, they would have known it to be a question, because of the interrogative particle ei; but Dr. Bloomfield would not, not knowing the nature of it. He only knows the sentence to be interrogative from the words, “they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou, &c.” His opinion about ei is therefore mere speculation. But for the context he would not know if ei were in an interrogative sentence, or not. But with all his doubts, he thinks num a more accurate version of ei than anon; because num is more favourable to the apostrophe he seeks to establish from a context of his own fabrication.

Having got rid of ei as an interrogative particle to his own satisfaction, if not to ours, he then proceeds to lay the foundation of a theory which is intended to afford aid and comfort to spiritualism, by reducing the apostolic question to nonsense.

He begins the work by intimating that “the meaning of the passage is generally misunderstood.” This general misunderstanding is, that the apostles meant what is obviously expressed in their question; an idea he attributes to “the blending of the oratio directa with the indirecta.” The transition from what is styled the oratio indirecta to the oratio directa occurs in the fourth verse. Thus, the indirect discourse is supposed to refer to the Kingdom of God, about which Jesus had been conversing with his apostles for forty days after his resurrection; and the direct to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But the reverse is the fact; for the fourth and fifth verses come in incidentally between the third and sixth. The oratio directa is,

“Jesus being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?”

But Jesus not prepared to satisfy them on the subject, turns their attention to the work they had soon to engage in when they should be duly qualified. In doing this, he finished his conferences with them about the kingdom with the oratio indirecta about the gift of the spirit, introduced by Luke in the place referred to. They do not seem to have expected that the Lord would be taken from them; but concluded that, as they were to be endued with power from on high, it was for the purpose of cooperating with him at that time in the restoration of the kingdom Israel had once possessed. Hence the reason why they put the question to him. Dr. Bloomfield admits that the apostles were looking for the establishment of this temporal sovereignty, under which they should be promoted to power and authority; but extracts from the Lord’s reply, that the kingdom was a heavenly one, in the spiritualist sense; and the power to be received the gift of the Holy Spirit. But Jesus said nothing about “a heavenly kingdom.” He declined to tell them the time when the kingdom should be restored to Israel; and made no

allusion to “the kind of power” they should receive under its sovereignty; neither did they ask concerning it.

It is amusing to hear a State-Church Bishop speaking with pious flippancy about “the aspiring thoughts of the apostles after temporal power,” which the Lord had checked on a former occasion! If it be quite compatible with the fitness of things that “Christian Bishops” should be lords, live in palaces, make laws for nations, and shine in the courts of royalty; why not for the apostles, their alleged predecessors, to reign with “the King of the Jews” as “kings and priests” over Israel and the nations? Are Jesus and his apostles to be excluded from all power, authority, glory, and honour, among nations upon earth; in other words, maltreated and tormented here, and exiled by violence of men as pestilent fellows to “the spirit-world,” as the only condition compatible with the spirituality of their doctrine: while their pretended “successors” may figure as the honourable of the earth, possessing power over the nations now, ruling them with an iron-rod; and, having waxed fat with all the good things of the present world, join the redeemed company among the stars, and rejoice in glory and honour for ever? Is this the nature, genius, and character of Christianity? Yea, verily; it is of the natural religion so styled of spiritualists: but not of the religion of Christ. Those who have power and authority under existing temporal sovereignties, will have no more of them under Christ’s reign, than Jesus and the apostles have now. The Day of Christ and the Night of Antichrist are rival and hostile periods. Antichrist’s time is now—a period in which Sin and Evil are triumphant; and during which Jesus and his brethren are excluded from their rights, and made the pious sport of learned fools. Antichrist’s is the Duo-millennial reign of Spiritualism—a sort of Fools’ Paradise, in which “the thinking of the flesh” revels in all the delights of self-deception, and devotion to its own conceits. For Jesus and his apostles to be supposed to have been anything but spiritualists—to have had a looking forward to temporalities—excites all the contempt latent in those who now possess them. Like the old Pharisees, they have a misgiving that, if Jesus and his brethren lay hold of “temporal sovereignty,” there will be no chance for them. Hence they hate the doctrine; and charge the apostles with ignorance, and unjustifiably ambition, for entertaining so unheavenly an idea! But the times will soon be changed, and the order of things reversed. The Day of Christ, when the apostles’ expectation expressed in their question will be realised, is at hand; a day of justice and intelligence, of peace and blessing, which will dawn upon the world like the rising sun, shining into oblivion all word-corrupting “suppositions,” and superstitions; and exhibiting to mankind the nakedness and shame of the “wise and prudent” who propound them.

Among these, it cannot be doubted, will be numbered the patentees of the Bloomfield apostopeesian supposition, so craftily and sophistically exhibited in the document in hand. One might imagine, from Dr. Bloomfield’s representation, that the apostles in the presence of Jesus, were like so many parish beadles in the presence of the Pope, or the lordly Archbishop of Canterbury, trembling before these sons of pride. There is not the least evidence from the passage that there was any fearfulness about the apostles at all. Forty days familiarity with the Lord after his resurrection had fully reassured them. Their timidity had all vanished when they found he was no phantasm; but “the Lord the Spirit”—a substantial, flesh-and-bones, person like themselves, only incorruptible and deathless, whom they handled, ate, drank, and conversed with as their Elder Brother. Dr. Bloomfield’s apostopesian supposition is based upon their assumed timidity. “They were fearful,” says he, “of putting the question in a direct manner, but had recourse to a supposition evidently implying, in their own minds, the certainty of the event, leaving it to be understood what was their real aim.” This is mere fiction, as any one unspoiled by a spurious criticism, may see by reading the account. The

timidity not existing, there is no scope for the conversion of ei into a suppositious “if,” as though they inclined their heads obliquely downwards, and leered archly at Jesus from the corners of their eyes, and in a subdued and timid tone, said, “Lord, if at this time thou art engaged in restoring the kingdom to Israel, wouldn’t it be nice!” Ridiculous! Why Dr. Bloomfield must think they were a set of craven-spirited bishops, fishing for court favours at the hands of royalty! Edging on the king, as it were, to an enterprise in which they would come in for a considerable share of the loaves and fishes. Removing the note of interrogation, and converting the bishop’s rendering into an affirmative declaration, because of the present tense of the verb, it reads, “Lord, thou art at this time engaged in restoring the kingdom to Israel.” This affirms an untruth. Throw in the ei, and the text is converted into the hortatory hypothesis, “Lord, suppose thou art at this time engaged in restoring the kingdom to Israel.” This was calling upon Jesus for an impossibility; for being perfectly sane and conscious, he could not suppose he was doing what he well knew he was not engaged in. But if ei be admitted to be an interrogative as well as hypothetic (which interrogative quality Dr. B. greatly doubts, and then denies) the sentence becomes interrogatively suggestive, as, “Lord! Suppose at this time thou art engaged in restoring the kingdom to Israel?” Although the sentence is very much enfeebled by Dr. B’s rendering of apokathistaneis, it is equivalent to, “Lord we expect the kingdom to be restored again to Israel, wilt thou not engage in the work at this time?” This is equivalent to the common reading. There is no figure of rhetoric in the passage. It is a plain, straightforward, common sense, question, growing out of the forty days’ converse on the kingdom of God. The figures are all in the critics’ brains, which are so full of a spurious rhetoric, that they can see nothing in its obvious and unsophistic reality. “Thou art engaged in restoring” is a very verbose rendering of apokathistaneis, which is correctly enough translated thou restorest, or thou dost restore; but the verbosity is created to make the timid indirection of the apostles more supposable.

Dr. Bloomfield says, that in putting this question as he has rendered it, “the object the apostles had in view, but which they were afraid to name openly, may be thus expressed—*tina dynamin en autee teepsometha*—What power shall we have in it?” He then represents Jesus as replying to this question in the words, “but ye shall receive power, the Holy Spirit coming upon you!” What a wonderful thing is an apostopesis! Surely it is a sort of philosopher’s stone in its way, turning O into X, though in the nature of things having not the least resemblance to each other. “Lord, restorest thou at this time the kingdom to Israel?”—means, according to Dr. B., “Lord, what power shall we have in the kingdom?!” Dr. B., as “a Right Reverend Bishop,” and communicator of the Holy Spirit to college candidates for “Holy Orders,” ought to know, that the apostles knew what power and authority they were to have in the kingdom; and therefore needed not to seek any information of the kind. They had inquired through Peter, what was to be their reward for forsaking all they possessed on earth, and following Him. Jesus told them without any apostopesis, that they should have power and authority as immortal kings over Israel when the kingdom should be palingenized, or renewed; as it is written,

“In the new-birth day (of the nation) when the Son of Man may have sat upon the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, ruling the Twelve tribes of Israel * * * and shall inherit eternal life”—Matthew 19: 28-29.

Then again,

“Fear not little flock, it is the Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.”

And when he was about to suffer he repeated the promise, saying,

“Even I am covenanted for you, since my Father has himself covenanted a kingdom for me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit upon thrones ruling the Twelve Tribes of Israel”—Luke 22: 29-30.

After these plain, unfigurative, declarations before the crucifixion, the apostles were at no loss to know “the kind of power” they were to exercise in the restored kingdom. It was this very knowledge that prompted them to inquire of Jesus, whether the time had now come to fulfil his promise to them, seeing that he was now risen from the dead, and all authority (exousia) was his. He did not evade their question, but replied directly to the point. He did not give the remotest hint that the restoration was not to occur. He knew it would, and that He, being the Christ, would have to do the work; as it is written in the prophets,

“The many with thee shall build; the ancient ruins of past generations thou shalt raise up; and thou shalt be called, THE BUILDER of the breach, THE RESTORER of by-ways to rest in:” # and, “Jehovah hath formed Me from the womb to be his Servant to bring Jacob again to him * * * to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the branches of Israel” * * * to be “for a Covenant of the people to restore the land, and cause to possess the desolate estates”—Isaiah 49: 5-6, 8.

Therefore,

“In that day, I will restore (ahkim) David’s dwelling place that is fallen; and I will wall up its breaches; and I will restore its ruins, and make it a city (benithah) as in the days of old: for the purpose of possessing the survivors of Edom, and all the nations where my name was proclaimed, saith Jehovah, who doeth this”—Amos 9: 1-12.

Jesus and his apostles understood these things, and one another when they conversed upon them; which “right reverend” and “reverend” philologists do not. There was nothing reprehensible in the inquiry about the time, nor in their desiring to be put in possession of the honour and glory of the kingdom. The Lord was no doubt as gratified at the interest they took in the restoration, as he would be grieved, if now on earth, to see the apathy, indifference, and infidelity respecting it, manifested by “the pious,” who profess to be his disciples. He sent out his apostles to infuse into mankind an aspiring disposition; a high ambition, which would be satisfied with nothing short of equality with the angels, and joint-heirship with God’s own Son. He ordered them to invite men to his kingdom and glory. Aspiration after these is quite compatible with peacefulness and humility among themselves, benevolence to their enemies, and faithfulness and meekness before God.

Isaiah 58: 12. —Nethivoh lah-shahveth, by-ways for resting; that is, the country made so safe for travellers that they may, without danger, traverse the by-ways leading to resting places.

The scriptures justify us in saying, that at the time the apostles put the question, the Lord was unable to fix the time of restoration. In his rejoinder, he tells them plainly that the Father was the sole depository of the secret.

“The times and the seasons of the restitution,” says he, “the Father hath retained in his own power.”

Before the restoration of the kingdom to Israel could take place, Daniel’s prophecy of the destruction of the city and temple, and of the people off the Holy Ones, by the Lord’s army of Romans—Daniel 9: 26; 8: 24, had to be accomplished. This was the passing away of the heaven and earth constituted by the Mosaic law, in the generation contemporary with Jesus and the apostles; a dissolution and vanishment necessarily to precede the setting up of the “new heavens and earth in which dwells righteousness”—a constitution under which “Jerusalem shall be created a rejoicing, and her people a joy,” in every land where formerly they had been put to shame—2 Peter 3: 13; Isaiah 65: 17-18; Zephaniah 3: 19. Referring to this day of vengeance on Judah and Jerusalem, of which he spoke in his Olivetan prophecy, Jesus said,

“Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels who are in heaven; neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is”—Mark 13: 32-33.

Jesus knew the order of events, but he did not then know the time of them. He knew that the coming of the Son of Man to destroy and take vengeance, was to precede his appearing as King in his glory to build up Zion—Psalm 102; 16—and to redeem Israel; but the times and the seasons he did not know, as he avers; and therefore, he could only tell the apostles that they had asked him for information he could not impart.

He could inform them, however, so much as this, that whenever the restoration off the kingdom might happen they had a work to do before it could come to pass. The kingdom would require “a people” to administer its affairs righteously—a necessity, which makes it impossible, therefore, that the unrighteous can inherit it—1 Corinthians 6: 9; Ephesians 5: 5. It would be their business, therefore, to collect this people together out of Judah and the nations—Acts 15: 14—by the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom in his name, witnessing to him, that He is the man ordained of God to rule the world with them in righteousness. He knew they were unable of their own ability to make this proclamation to the nations, being ignorant of their several languages; and moreover, had they been able to speak all tongues, their proclamation would not have been regarded, as they were devoid of power to prove that they were heralds sent of God, and that the word they preached was his message to the world. Till the Day of Pentecost, then, they were powerless to execute the work of announcing the good news to every creature. “Tarry ye therefore in the city of Jerusalem,” said he, “until ye be endued with power from on high”—Luke 24: 49, by the Holy Spirit coming upon you—Acts 1: 8. They obeyed; and from the history of that notable day, we find that they became fully equipped on the reception of the Spirit, for the work of faith and labour of love before them; a faithful performance of which is to be rewarded by exaltation to the thrones in Israel, when the kingdom is restored to them in the palingenesia, or “times of restoration (apokatastaseos, a word of the same family as apokathistaneis) of all things”—Acts 3: 21, 25—pertaining to the nation.

But I need add only a few more words at present. A little scripture testimony, intelligently applied, is worth a library of spiritualism, with all its rhetoric, logic, and classic lore, to boot. These things, useful enough in their way, become in the hands of those who “grind divinity” for the multitude, the means of “darkening counsel by words without knowledge.” Dr. Bloomfield ranks as the most accomplished Greek scholar of his age. But for his skill in Greek, it is probable, he would never have been heard of. His ability to translate a Greek MS. which had foiled some “learned divines” caused his introduction to Earl Spencer, whose patronage eventually helped him to the Right Reverend Father-in-Godship of

“London’s famous town.” But of what value is his Greek for scripture criticism while ignorant of the prophets? It is positively injurious. A single testimony from these upsets his whole hypothesis. A mere professor of heathen Greek undertakes to define the apostoses of the New Testament, the idea is preposterous! There are many points there on which the apostles “keep silence;” but where the meaning cannot be gathered from the context. In this case it can only be collected from Moses and the Prophets. Let, then, a Gentile bishop or professor, with his pagan Greek, who is ignorant of the “sure word of prophecy,” undertake to interpret the apostolic silence by suppositions, and criticisms on particles, does the reader imagine he would be enlightened by the effort? Nay, it would only make darkness visible, as in the case before us. Criticism on Greek particles is no sufficient substitute for the prophetic testimony. Nothing can supply the lack of this in the interpretation of the New Testament. It is the pagan criticism off the unlearned in the prophets, that is the parent of spiritualism; and that wrests the scriptures to the destruction of the critics, and of them who heed them. There is much written at the present time, in this country, about giving the people a faithful and thorough translation of the Bible! I would like to know the man of this generation, who, being ignorant of the prophets, could do it. If he could, then he must have received spiritual gifts, as the word of knowledge, the word of wisdom, and the gift of tongues. He would then be qualified to translate by inspiration; but in default of these gifts, and a correct understanding of the prophetic word, there exists on earth no man that can accurately transfer the mind of God from Hebrew and Greek into his mother tongue. All translations, therefore, are of necessity more or less imperfect, owing not so much to ignorance of the language (though of this there is no little in the best of scholars as their controversies prove) as to stolid imbecility in the teaching of the prophets. The agitation, therefore, about a new and thorough translation of the word, is much ado about nothing; for if accomplished in the spiritualist sense, it will only be a monument of complacent foolishness, demonstrative of the presumption off the carnal mind, whose ethereal speculations are subversive of the truth of God. Let us, then, eschew the Grecian critics and their spiritualism; and take heed to the prophetic light that shines from the vernacular lamp, imperfect as it is. The light is brilliant enough to show us the divine purpose, and our interest in it; and to show us how we may obtain inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God; when they shall have seized upon the temporal sovereignties of the world; and have bestowed the spoils of the enemy upon the apostles, and on them who believe on Jesus through their teaching. In hope of a speedy fruition of this expectation, we conclude this article with the kindest feelings and best wishes for all concerned.

EDITOR.

* * *

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE TEMPTER CONSIDERED.

NO. 2

That diabolos, rendered devil in the Common Version, is SIN, appears from the expressions of Paul in various parts of his writings. He says “that having the power of death is diabolos.” The power of death is that which causes death. In a venomous serpent the tokratos, or power of death, is in its fang or sting. Remove this, and the most deadly reptile is perfectly innocuous. It has lost its power, not of locomotion, but of inflicting death. So if the power that makes death work strongly within us could be removed, we should never die. It is that power Paul styles diabolos. It is not death but the death-producing power, which is in every man, young and old, saint and sinner; therefore diabolos is in every human being.

Having ascertained, then, that the power of death resides in diabolos, if we can ascertain what is the death-power, we at the same time learn who or what diabolos is. Let us then, ask Paul a few questions. Thus, “Venerable Brother, you have said that diabolos hath the power of death, will you kindly inform us, what that power is?”—Readily. It is death’s sting; and that sting is SIN, which is strengthened in its workings by the law of God, which is contrary to it —1 Corinthians 15: 55-56. —“Why do you triumphantly inquire, “O death where is thy sting?”—Because, in speaking of the mortal and corruptible body common to all the saints, putting on incorruptibility and life, I saw that the sin in our flesh, which stings us to death, would be extracted, and the body consequently healed; and that, although we had been severely wounded in the heel, so to speak, we should recover and so cheat death of many victims. In other words, in the case of Christ’s brethren, they would get the victory over him, and verify the saying, “Death is swallowed up in victory.”—“You have said that “the body is mortal because of sin”—Romans 8: 10-11, pray how does the body get quit of this deadly principle, so as to be pronounced victorious over death?”—In two ways according to the believers acted upon; first, by dissolution into dust, and reorganisation thereof into body incapable of decay; and made to live by the creative Spirit of God in the hands of the Lord Jesus. This is resurrection. And secondly, by an instantaneous change wrought in living flesh and blood by the energy of the Spirit which will destroy the Sin-power, or sting, which gives place to that which hath the power of life, that is, the Spirit. This is transformation. —“But if the Spirit have the power of life, how is it that Jesus styles himself “the life?”—And so he is;

“For as the Father hath life in himself, so he gives also to the Son to have life in himself”—John 5: 26.

The Spirit, which “imparts life because of righteousness,” is placed at the Lord’s disposal “that he should give eternal life to as many as God has given him”—John 17: 2. The spirit-life, therefore, of the Saints is hid with Christ in God; and when he who is their life shall appear, then shall they appear with him in glory—Colossians 3: 3-4.

“Sin in the flesh,” then, and the Spirit of God, are the two antagonist principles to which human nature is amenable in the present and future states. The former hath the power of death, and is termed diabolos; the latter hath the power of life, and is styled “the Lord the Spirit”—2 Corinthians 3: 18; 1 Corinthians 15: 45.

Human nature is styled “sinful flesh”—Romans 8: 3, that is flesh full of sin; and Paul speaking of himself as sharing therein, says,

“In me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing”—Romans 7: 18.

Sin in the flesh, then, is a very evil thing. It is that principle which works within us what is not good in thought and feeling; and these workings, the apostle styles “the motions of sins”—*ta pathemeta toon hamartion*—the physical and mental emotions which when yielded to work transgressions of the law of God. So that when a man is tempted, he is not tempted of God, nor of such a monster as the gentile Devil; but as the apostle says,

“Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it will bring forth sin: and sin, when it is perfected, bringeth forth death”—James 1: 14-15.

This is the philosophy of temptation, so to speak. Man is made up of certain desires. He desires what he sees, hears, feels, tastes and smells; in other words, he desires the gratification of his senses. There is nothing essentially evil in this. The evil lies in their inordinate gratification. Now, between the ordinate or regular, and inordinate or excessive, God has placed his law. He has said, you may desire, but you may not inordinately desire; or if you do, you may not gratify that desire contrary to my law, under penalty of death. Abstractly, there

was no harm in picking up sticks on Saturday; but when God said “thou shalt do no manner of work on the seventh day,” this absolute harmless thing, became a high crime against heaven; and brought forth death to him who perfected the desire to gather on that day. Thus the divine law defines what is irregular, and therefore not to be done by those who would enjoy the favour of God.

Now, if God had given no law to his people (and he has given law to none else) they would not have known what he deemed regular and what excessive, what right or what wrong. In truth, there would have been no such distinction. There would have been neither virtue nor vice; and the only course would have been for a man to follow his instincts. In this there would have been no sin; because “sin is the transgression of law;” and where there is no law there can be no transgression. Had the Lord God not forbidden to eat, there would have been no sin in Adam’s eating of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. The pleasantness of the fruit in Eve’s sight, the appreciation of its goodness for food, and a desire to be as wise as the gods or Elohim, were things in harmony with the nature God had given them and which he had pronounced “very good:” but when he said, “Ye shall not touch the tree under penalty of death,” there was a law given that made the gratification of that nature sin. Hence, it was as true of them as of the apostle, who says,

“I had not known sin, but by the law: for I have not known lust (inordinate desire) except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.”

They coveted, being enticed by their own lust, which drew them away from the Eden-law. The desire to eat was conceived within them, by the suggestion from without setting the flesh to think and reason without subjection to the given law. The thinking and reasoning in harmony with their nature alone, was sophistry; and led them to conclusions in direct opposition to the divine law: had they allowed the commandment to guide their reasoning, they would have reasoned logically; and God’s thoughts and ways would have been approved, and cheerfully acquiesced in. But the reverse of this was the fact; and sophistry led them in the way of death, as it has all their posterity ever since.

“By the law is the knowledge of sin;” therefore those who are ignorant of the law, do not know when they sin. This is the case of those “without law;” who are consequently under “times of ignorance.” Nevertheless, they sin, though they know it not; and sin and ignorance work death, and “alienation from God’s life”—Ephesians 4: 18; for “the wages of sin is death,” and renewal unto life is by knowledge—Colossians 3: 10. Thus, sin had the power of death in Adam’s case, and in that of all his descendants. There was no sin in the terrestrial system till he eat. The serpent could not sin, because no law was given to it; and where there is no law there is no sin, and can be none. Sin entered the world not by the Serpent, but by Adam; as it is written,

“Sin entered into the world by one man, and death by sin; and so death penetrated into all men, because in him all sinned”—Romans 5: 12.

Adam’s nature was animal. Very good of its kind, as was the nature of all the other creatures. These did not sin, yet they returned to the dust whence they came. So probably would Adam, if he had been left to the ordinary course of things as they were. But he would not have returned to dust if he had continued obedient. He would doubtless have been “changed in the twinkling of an eye” on eating of the Tree of Life. But, being disobedient, his sin determined his fate, and that of the creatures. It doomed them all to death according to law, and “nature” unchanged was permitted to take its course. This sin became the death-power; for had there been no sin there would have been no death. Though death could have ensued without sin, it would not have been permitted to do so; but desire being conceived

for an unlawful object, this unlawful desire enticed to a forbidden action; the enticement was yielded to, and shame and fear, the evidences of guilt, resulted. Thus a new mode of thought, the sophistry of sin, took possession of human nature, and caused it to fall. Sin reigned, and Adam obeyed it in the lusts of his body, yielding his members instruments of unrighteousness to sin. The sophistical thinking of the flesh gained strength, and became in him and his posterity the rule or law of their nature. This is termed in scripture “the law of sin;” the presence of which, within him, every man may know by the passions, or “motions of sins,” at work there to bring forth fruit unto death. Because of this, it is also styled “the law of sin and death,” to which the flesh of humanity is subject. Cain was conceived under the activity of this law of nature; hence he is said to have been, ek tou poneerou, from the evil, that is, from sin. This was his origin. Had he been begotten before that tempest arose in his parent’s nature which caused them to fall, he would not have been a murderer. But like produces like, and sin in activity produces pre-eminent sinners. The storm of passion had subsided, and a repentant mind had been established, ere Abel was conceived. When he was born, he was welcomed as “from the Lord,” and though born of sinful flesh, he did not derive his origin under the impulses of transgression, but in parental reconciliation to the divine law. Thus, these two sons were the one from the evil, the other from the good; that is, of the devil, and of the Lord.

The word sin is used in two senses; first, to represent that combination of principles within us which in excitation is manifested in passion, evil affections of the mind, diseases, death and corruption. They are called sin, because their manifestation was permitted as the consequence of transgression. And this is the second sense of the word; as it is written, “sin is the transgression of law.” Transgression was the effect of the unbridled inworking of humanity; and when the transgression was complete, or “finished,” that inworking and its result were both styled sin.

This unbridled inworking yielded to is licentiousness, and excessively deteriorating to flesh and blood. It degenerates the human organization, and produces what is observed in the barbarous, and savage races of mankind. Man left to himself can never improve; but must always get worse and worse, because his nature is subject to “the law of sin and death,” which is degenerating in its operation. The only real antagonist to this law is divine truth—“the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom.” If this can be made to take root in a man’s heart, it becomes there a rule of thought and action, incessantly antagonising “the law of sin.” This rule is termed “the law of the Spirit of life.” Between these two laws there is a deadly enmity; for “the law of the Spirit of life” is “the law of God;” and the other law, the law of sin, is rebellion against it. God’s law is from without; sin’s law is born in us. The law of God is implanted by reasoning the mind into conviction of his testimony alleged. It is the gospel transferred from the prophets and apostles to the believer’s heart; and is contrary in every particular to “the thinking of the flesh,” which is sin thinking within us. Now men the least fleshly can understand these things best. Hence Paul was well skilled in the matter. “I find,” says he, “a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man”—the “new creature” formed within him by God’s knowledge: “but I see another law in my members”—the law of sin “warring against the law of my mind”—the law of the Spirit—“and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.” A man in whom the truth has no place cannot understand this; because he is subject to only one of these laws, namely, the law of sin and death. His experience, and that of the apostle does not agree. It is only the true believer can sympathise with the apostle—he in whom the truth is most active; he can discern the evil of his nature most acutely. It is such a man can exclaim with Paul, “O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death”—from this law of sin and death to which my body is subject? There is but one

that can deliver, even Jesus Christ the Lord, who partook of flesh and blood that through death he might destroy this law of sin and death from the body, that is, diabolos. Paul fully aware of this, therefore, thanks God in prospect of it. And there he leaves it in the patience of hope, continuing “for his mind” (the mode of thinking erected within him by the truth as opposed to the unenlightened thinking of the flesh) subject to the law of God; but for the flesh to the law of sin.” This is the wretchedness of our case, that, however, approved of God for character, our flesh, because still subject to “the law of sin,” or “law of nature,” in the language of “philosophy,” is still burdened by that innate power, or diabolos, which reduces us to death, corruption, and dust.

But, how does Jesus through his own death destroy the devil? I could not answer this question if by “devil” is to be understood the Gentile Devil. But the devil Paul refers to in Hebrews is “that having the power of death,” which we have seen is Sin. The question therefore is How does Jesus through his own death destroy Sin? By making his life-blood an offering for sin, which offering is perfected by his resurrection; as it is written, “he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.” Now this sacrifice of Jesus becomes sin-destroying in every one who believes the gospel of the kingdom preached in his name; and is sprinkled with his blood in being baptised into him. All the past sins of such a believer are cancelled, or forgiven; and there is engrafted in him a principle, even the word believed, called “the law of the Spirit of life,” which in the remission has “made him free from the law of sin and death;” so that sin no longer reigns in his mortal body that he should obey it in the lusts thereof. He is “made free from sin” as the sovereign of his mind and actions; and has become the servant of God, whose will it is his study to learn and obey in all things; thus bringing forth fruit unto holiness, the end of which is everlasting life, when he shall be planted in the likeness of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Such a resurrected man is like Jesus, incorruptible and immortal. The power of death is no longer in him; but thoroughly eradicated from his nature, which is now “equal to the angels:” and as he is then, so will all the brethren of Jesus be, freed from diabolos, and therefore subject unto death no more.

But though at the resurrection of the just diabolos be destroyed to this extent, it is still strong and rampant in the rest of mankind; and consequently has then yet to be eradicated from among them: for it is Christ’s mission to destroy diabolos and the works thereof, in other words, to take away the sin of the world. This is his honour as the result of his obedience unto death. The first part of the work is to restrain sin, apocalyptically styled binding the Dragon, the old Serpent; who is designated also by the words diabolos and satanas; the former being rendered devil; and the latter left untranslated. The last part of the enterprise is to destroy sin; so that thenceforth there shall not exist upon the earth a single man having diabolos, or “that having the power of death,” in his nature; that is, that all the inhabitants of our planet, without exception, shall be incorruptible and deathless. The restraining of sin or diabolos, is to be effected a thousand years before its destruction; the destroying process consummating the work of the Millennial Reign.

The sin-power in an individual man, uncontrolled by the law of God, is strong for evil and ferocious as a beast of prey. It converts a man, as the phrase is, “into a devil;” and permits him to stick at nothing. The works of such a man are “Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like;” the doers of which, the apostle says, “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” The Gentile Devil cannot be fabled to do worse than this. Now, if instead of one such reprobate, there are two hundred millions of the like associated together in one community, the power of the evil is increased so many

million times. The increase of the power does not alter the nature of the evil—it is still sin in the flesh having the power of death, and therefore diabolos. Now, what things that community of sinners wills, contrives, and does, are the works of Sin, termed by John, *ta erga tou diabolou*, “the works of diabolos.” These works are civil and ecclesiastical institutions, styled in the scriptures, “things in the heavens and things in the earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers.” They are political aggregations of the works of sin, or diabolos. In short, every thing that is not of the seed of truth of God is a work of sin; and destined finally to be destroyed. The institutions or polity of the two hundred millions are a fair and just representation of the character of the vast majority of them, and therefore of their nationality. The individuals being sinners, and for the most part desperate ones, the community they constitute is pre-eminently diabolos, or SIN POLITICALLY INCORPORATE. The excessive wickedness of such a Body Politic is illustrated by the Inquisition, and the popish priesthood—associations of adulterers, thieves, murderers, idolaters, and blasphemers; hypocritical pretenders to piety, but as “earthly, sensual, and devilish,” as their own “Devil” is supposed to be. Now, a community like this, with an Emperor, Pope, and Ten Kings, at the head of it, is represented apocalyptically by a Dragon with Ten Horns; and to show its sin-origin, Sin’s symbol is associated with it, and it is styled “the Dragon, the old Serpent;” and to show furthermore, its antagonism to God and his people, it is termed “diabolos and satan.” In the aggregate it is represented in Daniel by the image of a man, which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream. This man-Image is diabolos and satan in the climax of Sin’s power, glory, and wickedness; and styled by Paul, *ho anomos*, THE LAWLESS, whose manifestation is the result of the energy of the adversary, which is not fully developed till the near future. When the premillennial autocratic empire foretold by Ezekiel shall be fully organised, the SIN-MAN, perdition’s son, will stand God-defiant within the walls of Jerusalem. This Sin-Power, called the Devil and Satan in the English version, is “that having the power of death” manifested in full political and military array. And, who shall bind this strong one? There will be no power on earth equal to the enterprise. Britain, and the United States (notwithstanding their present professed adhesion to Washington’s foreign policy, too antiquated for the terrible future) will, on the principle of self-preservation, contend against him. But, their efforts will be in vain. The Binder of the Sin-Man must from heaven descend, as the apocalyptic angel, having “great power,” symbolised by “a great chain,” and “enlightening the earth with his glory.” When He appears he will strike him such a blow on the feet as to send him maimed, halt, and crippled to the west. After this blow, which is the battle of Armageddon, by which Jerusalem and Israel’s land are delivered, no more is heard in scripture of the Dragon; for, deprived of the dominion of the East, the Sin-Power can no longer be represented by “the Dragon.” What remains is diabolos and satan, the Sin-Adversary, represented by “the Beast, the False Prophet and the Kings of the Earth, with their armies;” styled in Matthew, *diabolos kai hoi angeloi autou*, *anglice*, “the Devil and his angels,” but properly the Sin-power and its messengers, or agents. These are the broken “pieces” of the Man-Image, which the Sin-Binder will have to reduce to powder subsequently to the fracture of its feet.

We see from these hints that diabolos, or “that having the power of death,” appears in divers parts of scripture in a sort of personal manifestation. The personality, however, is not that of a single individual; but the personification of a power in man, and in society antagonist to God and his people. Treating of sin in the flesh, the apostle speaks of it reigning, deceiving, and slaying its victims. While sin has the power of death, he says the strength of that power is the holy, just, and good law and commandment of God. That is, sin would have had no power to work death in a man for coveting, if the law had not said “Thou shalt not covet.” It is manifestly good not to covet any thing that is your neighbour’s; therefore the law

that forbids it is a good law. But if there had been no such law given, to be covetous would not be punishable with death and exclusion from the kingdom. Hence the apostle says, “the good law was not made death unto me; but it made sin appear sin working death in me; that Sin through the commandment might become pre-eminently A SINNER.” In the common version kath’ hyperboleen hamartoolos is rendered “exceeding sinful.” This is a version, but not a translation of the words. Hamartoolos is “one who deviates from the path of virtue, a vicious person, sinful, detestable.” It is a substantive; not an adjective, as rendered in the English version; and therefore ought to be translated as above.

Now, this exceedingly great sinner, Sin, working death in man, the scripture styles diabolos: and it may be pertinently asked, Why is it so called? The following I conceive to be the reason. The attribute most characteristic of Sin’s character is deceitfulness; as it is written,

“Exhort one another daily lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;”

“Sin taking occasion through the commandment deceived me;”

“Eve being deceived was in transgression;” and

“The Serpent beguiled her through his shrewdness.”

Eve being deceived, the Serpent’s part in the transaction was finished. He held no conference with Adam, who, the apostle says, “was not deceived.” Sin, the Seducer, approached him through Eve, whose eyes were open to evil. Sin incarnate in Eve was Adam’s tempter.

“With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him.”

She gave him of the tree, and he did eat; and eating, fell. Thus Sin caused him to fall in casting him across the law-line; and therefore it is called diabolos. For diabolos is a noun derived from the verb diaballo, which is equivalent to the Latin trajicio, to throw or cast over, or across. Diaballo is from dia and ballo, to throw, cast; and in the perfect passive, to be thrown, or cast down. Diabolos is one who casts over the line; in a scriptural sense, by misrepresentation and subtlety, which is lying. Hence, diabolos stands for “slanderer, accuser, and whatever else may be affirmed of sin. This is the proper signification of the word and intelligible to every one; its improper meaning is devil, and understood by none. Sin is the devil of our planet; which few, perhaps, will believe, being so much in love with it, and delighting in its pleasures wherever they can be found. Gentile superstition is terribly afraid of its Devil; but it loves Sin dearly, and serves it in all its ungodly lusts. The scripture saith, however, “he that committeth sin is of the devil”—he is a child of sin; “for the devil sinneth from the beginning”—sin transgresseth ever. This is the unhappy lot of all the world, composed almost exclusively of the children of sin. Therefore, the apostle saith,

“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.”

But here we must pause till our next, when we shall resume the subject from some other point of view.

EDITOR.

* * *

EPISTOLARIA.

INTERESTING FROM SCOTLAND.

Glasgow, June 11th, 1852.

My Dear Sir:

I have long intended repeating my communications, but many things have occurred to prevent it. I have been, however, noticing how you yourself have been progressing. You really deserve great credit for your perseverance and energy. It is a pity you should apparently be so poorly reciprocated with; but it is only too common for christians to applaud and commend, and decline going further. Money is one of those things so suitable for all purposes, as to make men loth to part with it. One is reminded of one of our English comic writers' idea of the land of Turveytop, a place to which he describes the inhabitants of the world as being sent after death, where they were put to school to be re-educated. It seems that one old gentleman, who while here, had followed the profession of a banker, used to annoy the poor old dominie exceedingly by always spelling the word good in a very wrong way. It seems that he never could spell it otherwise than as gold. The scholar was so dull, or pervert, that he was incapable of spelling it in any other way. So the world has generally got wrong as to what is good, and among other things has taken to spelling it as gold!

We have not been lazy here. The meeting presided over by Mr. Gilmour has become a church, and assembles in the large hall of the Mechanics' Institution, North Hanover street, a place nearly as large as a fourth of the City Hall. We had a long series of lectures and conversation meetings; the latter very successful. Some of the subjects treated of in the lectures were such as follow: —“Jerusalem the future Metropolis of God's (terrestrial) Universal Empire;” also, “Who are to be the Royalty and Aristocracy of this Universal Empire of the Heavens and Earth.” Lecture third is to be “The Battle of Armageddon.”

The interest excited by these lectures has been quite unmistakable; and many by them, and more especially by the conversation-meetings, have been induced to profess publicly their acceptance of God's truth of the Hope of Israel—God's future universal Ruler and Empire of the Heavens and earth—by being baptised. It is, indeed, no wonder that such should be the case, seeing that the earth is languishing, and the world mourning, because of man's (alias the devil's) rule or rather misrule. Truly creation travaileth and groaneth to be delivered of its burden of sin and sorrow.

The Hope of Israel, God's own righteous ruler, is thus the hope of the world; and the wonder is that intelligent men, who profess to be Bible students, and zealous for God's glory, don't see it! They see clearly that man's rule during 6000 years nearly, has been an out and out failure; and yet persevere and cling to the vain hope of man still establishing the Millennium by Gospel preaching, Free Trade, Political Unions, Peace Societies, and all numerous nostrums of the imagination apart from God.

My dear sir, we are now more than ever required to press upon men's minds the near approach of God's times, and of the near finish of men's, or the Gentiles' times.

You will, doubtless, be interested to know how the churches here now stand anent the all important query, “What is truth?” The old church (Known in America as the Campbellite

church. —Editor Herald.), I mean the one presided over by Mr. Paton, has been split into three sections; to particularise which I will for convenience name their presidents—first, the party which removed under Mr. Paton; another under Mr. Linn; and the third, which I prefer distinguishing by the name of Millennial Baptists, with which Mr. Gilmour is connected. The first two have remained very few in number; the latter have been very successful both as to attracting numbers, in influence, and efforts. They have had evening meetings, always attended by hundreds; numerous baptisms into the Hope of Israel—into God’s own king, the Seed of Abraham, David’s Lord and David’s everlasting Seed, the true royal and immortal ruler of God’s future universal Israelitish empire of the heavens and the earth. They also published, during the greater part of last year, a monthly periodical named “The Prophetic Student;” which was only discontinued for want of time to carry it on. It sold very well, and treated exclusively on the glorious subjects of prophecy. The same little representative of the interests of the sure word is intended yet to be continued, and that very soon. This little church found it necessary in May last to remove to a larger hall, the Mechanics’ Institution hall, capable of holding several hundreds; and this hall, as I have already informed you, has been filled during the evening, ever since its opening. Not a seat to spare. Our speakers have also been (in accordance with invitations received from these places) visiting Hamilton, Stirling, Paisley, Airdree, &c., and delivering lectures on the Kingdom of God in connection with all its aspects of Territory, King, Aristocracy, subjects, laws, &c., &c., and are still continuing. One of them occupies by invitation of the Rev. Mr. Lichose of Paisley, his pulpit on Sunday next, morning and evening. It would cheer your weary, though unmistakably zealous spirit, to know the interesting, and in many cases romantic, incidents attending these exertions in both preaching and writing; so true is it, that truth gives a body, a substance to religion, which overcomes the circumstances of birth, position, and every thing else, exciting in the heart grateful appreciation of God’s grace in the glorious future of, not ethereal nothings, but of divine realities.

By-the-bye, I send you a Glasgow paper containing an intimation of the purchase of the land of Canaan by M. Rothschild. If this be true, we have indeed a very marked sign; for its purchase will undoubtedly be followed by events that will affect the world. There will be the withdrawal of Jews from all parts with their means, which may politically affect very much other countries; for the riches of the Jew being generally in gold and silver, may yet necessitate Jerusalem becoming the seat and deposit of the world’s wealth—the great Bank of the World; and then the Holy City will become important both politically and commercially. And independently of these comparatively important things, there is its position in fulfilling of prophecy; for it is certain that the Jews will be in part as a nation, settled in an unconverted state in their own land at the appearing of the Lord, referred to among numerous other passages in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters of Zechariah. * * * How soon, how very near, may not the appearing of the Lord be; and if so all its accomplishments; such as, the establishment of the Nebuchadnezzar-Image empire, on the Feet of which the destroying Stone power is to fall—Daniel 2: 34-35; the resurrection of the dead; the translation of the church—1 Corinthians 15: 23; 1 Thessalonians 4: 16; and so forth. My earnest desire is, that you and I, and all who love God, and, if it were possible, all men, may be, as the apostle comforts the Thessalonians with being in reference to that time, even in rest with God.

I have heard that your intention is to be in Scotland soon; so soon as to be likely now upon the way. I shall be glad to know if this be your intention. If you do come, the success of your last visit would be far exceeded. Since your departure, an increasing inquiry into the glorious realities of prophecy has been widely progressing; and the signs of the times being ominous, have prepared men for at least hearing of these heavenly realities, with which their

ethereal nothings are as dross to the pure gold. The principle introduced by the devil of spiritualising, or explaining away, alias commentaryism upon God's plain sayings, is now as then the source of man's ruin. Man has now lost the power to enjoy God's truth, because he has denied his sayings by making them mean otherwise than what they obviously import, forgetting that God will be justified, not in the meanings men put upon his words, but in his sayings, that he may overcome when they are judged—Romans 3: 4.

Expecting to hear from you soon,
I remain yours sincerely,
ROBERT LATTA.

REMARKS.

The above is indeed cheering. Intelligence in the Word with earnestness can do much in arresting the attention of the public. But besides this there must be something in the Scottish mind predisposing it to the consideration of the sure prophetic word. As far as my experience has gone, the scripture testimony has a far more ready access to the Scotch, than to the English, or, people of this country. —Wealth and the pride of life have corrupted the heart of England; while in America, a “devil-may-care” indifference to everything that does not tend to money-making, or self-glorification, has made the public mind callous, and irresponsive to the truth. Religion in Scotland is a passion, in England a fashion, and in the United States a profession. Perhaps the difference in these three things may explain the reason of the truth creating greater interest in Caledonia than in any other country in the world. May it continue to have free course, and be glorified.

I have no present intention of revisiting Britain. The conducting of the Herald depends upon my personal attention; and its continuance at this crisis seems to be necessary. It teaches the truth in places to which I cannot obtain access; and discourses to a far more extensive circle than that defined by its own list. Through its means the truth is establishing itself in the hearts of many who may in other places, as at Glasgow, bestir themselves in its behalf. Scripta manent written words remain; and though preaching is good, written instruction is better. The preaching of the prophets and apostles was highly useful to their generations, but it is their writings only remain to do us good. My conviction is that people and preachers require instruction in the word, which they cannot get at meetings, colleges, and schools, and which if they could, the latter have neither time nor means to procure. I believe that the Herald supplies this instruction, which it is more important to furnish just now, than for me to be travelling about speaking to crowds who forget what is spoken almost as soon as uttered. I must, therefore, not neglect the Herald, though the difficulties to be contended with arising from the wordy, but unsubstantial, cooperation of its friends, often tempt me to leave them to instruct themselves as they best can. But for the sake of what I heartily believe to be the truth, I devote my time to the Herald as though my daily bread depended upon it. I know no one that will or can become my substitute in this matter. I cannot therefore absent myself in long tours, or journeys consuming much time. Consequently at present, or until providence raises me up a helper, I must decline the invitations I have received in Louisiana, Iowa, and so forth, and deny myself the laborious pleasure of touring it through Britain. Those in that country who care to see me again, or to know what I teach, may for the price of the Herald promote their own gratification. —The means are within their reach, and they can serve themselves. An interest in what is written, will be an earnest, of a sincere desire to see the writer, and hear his words again.

Our friends in Scotland have found that even a little original periodical requires time for its preparation; more than they could bestow. Much time, however, is not needed in conducting magazines of the common sort. A pair of scissors, plenty of exchanges, and pretty numerous communications from persons, who, though neither teachable nor competent to teach, are desirous of appearing in print; will enable an editor to make up a number in a very short time. But where the articles are mostly original, and God's mind is the subject of interpretation, time, thought, and nervous energy, are consumed to a far greater amount than is perceived by the reader. The conducting of a periodical whose function is to subserve party purposes is a light affair; but to sustain one that is to teach the Word, not to gabble about it, but to make it intelligible to minds spoiled by philosophy and vain deceit, as most are, is an onerous work, a flesh-wearying, and time-consuming, labour; and places the labourer in a position in which he can attend to little else. This is my experience with the Herald. So that when its friends are inefficient, and having no time to attend to private interests, I am in a straight betwixt two. It seems a pity that there is not some one in Britain who has the ability and information, and can devote his whole time and energy to the press. There is a fine field there for interpreting the word, and "putting to silence the ignorance of foolish men;" such as papists, puseyites, political theorists, spiritual milleniumists, and so forth. One that would enter into the strong man's house, and bind him hand and foot, or be bold enough to try, is the sort of truth-advocate demanded by the times. A milk and water scribe may suit the nervous old ladies of a party; but a warrior is needed to handle the Spirit's two-edged sword with a sword's effect. Such a person, not allowed to starve, and sustained by earnest fellow-soldiers, would produce a stirring effect in Britain; where, as far as I know, there is no unshackled, independent, and manly writer on things scriptural and ecclesiastical. But the Lord knows what is best; when the crisis needs the services of such, he will doubtless be produced.

Good news is always cheering to the believer. I trust, therefore, it will not be long ere brother Latta favours us with a like report.

EDITOR.

* * *

REVISIT TO BRITAIN.

The following is an extract from a letter July 16, 1852, just received from England, which we publish by request of the writer and other friends—"I have been spending a short time in Nottingham lately, and met in fellowship with our friends there. Some among them were "wishing Dr. Thomas would come again;" and wondering "if he were likely to revisit Britain within a year or so." I remarked that, "new manifestations on the Continent might bring him." They "hoped so;" they "should rejoice to see and hear him again." A brother then observed that, "Dr. Thomas must incur considerable expense in revisiting them; that it could not be expected that he should sustain this unaided; that he ought not to do so; that if they wished his return they should assure him against pecuniary loss when he came at much personal sacrifice to minister to their instruction and edification." These remarks led another to suggest the raising of a fund to be gradually laid up, and appropriated on Dr. T's return to the disbursement of his travelling expenses, the hire of a lecture room, &c.; the fund to consist of the surplus of the weekly contributions at communion, after the expenses of room rent, &c., were defrayed, and the wants of the poorer members supplied, and the extra voluntary donations of all who wished to see Dr. T., amongst them again, and were able to give. The proposition was approved by those present, and was afterwards formally made, submitted to the church, and carried unanimously.

“Thinking that the consideration and liberality of the Nottingham church might furnish an example worthy of imitation to other churches in this island, among whom you have laboured, and will, I trust, labour again; I proposed that it should be made known to them through the medium of the “Herald,” and offered to request you to permit us to do so. You will therefore oblige us by making this communication public. It may serve as an incentive to some of our friends in the truth, who desire to hear you once more proclaim “the Gospel of the Kingdom” among us; and will at least testify to the christian love and gratitude of the community of believers in Nottingham for and towards their beloved brother and instructor far away. I have only to add their affectionate remembrances to you.”

E. M. D.

If it is desired that my visit to Britain should be repeated this is a move in the right direction. Our friends in Nottingham take a very sensible view of the matter. Though it is my duty to “contend earnestly for the faith” without regard to profit or reward, it is the privilege of those who believe it, and their duty likewise, to do the same; and if they wish any special benefit to themselves and those of their nation, to contribute according to their ability to enable those to confer it who they think are competent so to do. — I am glad to find our friends in Nottingham so considerate. Jesus had to work a miracle to pay the tax for Peter and himself; and I have but little more of this world’s goods than they: it is evident, therefore, if my friends wish me to travel to the ends of the earth for their instruction and edification, and to try to open the eyes of their people, they must furnish me with the means to do it. I have the knowledge they approve; they the funds; I am willing to diffuse it among all classes to the end of the world; if, then, it remain with me, no one can justly impute the monopoly to my disposition to make merchandise of the truth.

If I were ever so rich it would be my duty to spend freely and be spent for the gospel’s sake; but it would still be equally the duty of the poor of their poverty liberally to contribute towards the diffusion of it. The poor should never permit the rich to monopolise the support of the truth; nor should the rich refuse to allow the poor the honour of sharing with them in its expenses. The Kingdom is for the poor, and the glory of the vindication of its doctrine against all its enemies is their’s. With these views, I have no hesitation in admitting my friends in Britain to a fellowship in the enterprise of a second visit to their country on the plan proposed; and of commending it to all who wish to see me there again.

EDITOR.

* * *

LETTER FROM TENNESSEE.

Dear Brother:

You understood my communication aright, though it was not humorous but playful. Nor do I blame you for answering it more gravely; for you are engaged in a grave and heavy business! As certain moderns have said, you are “about a great work and cannot come down.”

Now, I am not disposed to beat out my brains against any man’s castle, so I shall not try to expose the flaws, either in your platform or that of your opponents! I am for a fair fight; and whether it is ultimately proven that Heaven is to be on earth, or in the Sun, (as some

incline to think,) or away in some remote region beyond this visible diurnal sphere, I shall be content, so that it be a “goodly land,” and I am admitted there.

Your Elpis Israel is well written. I like its didactic style. You use no argument of the debating kind, but just lay down how the matter is, ex cathedra, as one having (if not authority) full knowledge of the subject; then very aptly add your proof, and then go on. This is to my mind. For I have ever thought that a proposition which, when fully stated, needs argument to support it, or a man’s character where he is known, a law suit to sustain it, were at least very doubtful, and not worth the trouble; and, what is more, were seldom made any better by it.

My wife is much pleased with your book, and is cramming it into her neighbours, hands; but there I think it will stop. It will be hard work to put it into either their hearts or heads! I have told several preachers, and (in this I am very serious) now tell you, that your works must make many adherents or deists. I am inclined to think many of both.

However, my wife has teased me into sending you \$5.00 more. She wants the worth of it, sent on in the HOPE, for distribution; or rather loaning first to one, then another. Were I sending on for myself, I should look for a great many copies, as I can buy lots of theology for that sum. But as she thinks so highly of the work, you have the game all in your own hands.

Wishing you health and success according to your merits,
I remain benevolently yours, &c.

ROBERT MACK.

Columbia, Tennessee, June 8, 1852.

REMARKS.

“Adherents or deists, many of both”—that is, believers in the Hope of Israel, or rejectors of Gentilism, many of both. I believe, and trust, this will be the result of reading Elpis Israel. If a man understand its teaching and admit that it is sustained by the scripture, he can certainly no longer adhere sincerely to the popular superstition; and if he do not embrace what he admits to be proven, he occupies a deistical position; or that of a believer in the existence of God without professing any particular faith. Thus Elpis Israel is at once, constructive and destructive. It builds up the truth in the hearts of some; and destroys sectarianism in others. In both cases the subject is benefited; for if we believe not the truth, it is bad; but if at the same time, we are burdened with falsehood, it is worse; because we have no liberty here; and none in the Age to Come.

I trust that our friend Mack’s neighbours will prove more impressible of heart than he thinks. However, we cannot but approve of Mrs. M’s resolution to see what can be done. Much greater effect might be produced on the public mind, I doubt not, if all Elpis Israel’s male friends would beg, borrow, or perhaps steal would be no harm, a little of the energy and interest she displays. But I will leave them to settle this affair with her, returning her for myself many thanks for what she and they have already done.

EDITOR.

* * *

“BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.”

“Although,” says Mr. Campbell, “we never immersed any person in water into the name of the Father, &c., who does not confess his faith in the person, mission, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ—or what is implied in “believing that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,” they (the Episcopalians, &c.) have the reckless assurance to charge our Brotherhood with the belief of Baptismal Regeneration.”—Millennial Harbinger Volume 2 No. 7, page 404. The italicism is ours for the sake of emphasis.

Mr. Campbell’s “baptismal regeneration” is doubtless not of the same kind as that of his sectarian brethren. Their’s is the being born again of an eight day old without even the form of a birth. The subject of their theological fiction is “a chip off the old block;” that is, a piece of “sinful flesh,” called a babe, without sins, unthinking, consequently without faith, whose motions are instinctive like all new-born animals. The being born again of this faithless, repentanceless, ignorant, unthinking, instinctive subject, consists with them in the physical operation of Spirit upon it in some undefinable way, in, at, or during the sprinkling and signing of its face and forehead with church-font water in the name of the Father, &c. — The design of this God-dishonouring and ridiculous farce is the forgiveness of sins, and the ingrafting into the body of Christ. The action of the spirit or water, or of both combined, does not touch the “original sin,” for it dies and corrupts nevertheless. Besides this, it has nothing in the form of sin to be forgiven. Forgiveness of sins, therefore, is out of the question. — Perhaps the rhanthism is for the forgiveness of sins committed when its “immortal soul” tenanted some other body in a previous state—that for instance exhibited by the man who was supposed to be born blind because of his sins! —John 9: 2. I suppose a babe derives its “soul” from its parents as well as its body; perhaps, then, it is sprinkled for the remission of that proportion of sins still holding on to the compound soul-particle detached from the parents’ souls into the babe’s body. If this be not the “philosophy” of the affair, I am at a loss to explain how a babe without personal transgressions can be “baptised for remission of sins.” Perhaps “His Holiness” of Rome, or his more enlightened protestant “Grace of Canterbury;” or his father-in-godship of Exeter, can exhibit the scripturality of the thing. If they cannot, it is useless to seek for light even from the posthumous hierarchy of the spirit-world! We give it up.

The “brotherhood” of which Mr. Campbell claims to be the Supervisor, cannot certainly be charged with “the belief of” such “baptismal regeneration” as this. It would doubtless, as he says, be “reckless assurance to charge” any such thing upon them. Having been mixed up with them very intimately in former years, we can add our testimony to the truth of their innocency of so gross a stultification of the human intellect. But while people may be guiltless of perpetrating one particular absurdity, they may be justly chargeable with sins upon other points of law; so that “whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” Now Mr. C. and his brotherhood do not make a baptismal subject of a faithless babe; but, notwithstanding his plausible statement above, I know that they immerse man and women as ignorant of the mission of Christ as an eight-day old. Now I am prepared to prove from the apostles and prophets that a subject ignorant of this, though immersed a thousand times, is as unbegotten of the Spirit, and therefore unregenerate, as any rhanthised suckling. I do not deny that Mr. C. and “his brethren preach a view of the Christ’s mission, which is implied in their version of Peter’s declaration that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; but I do deny, unqualifiedly, that their view and version are “the faith” by which a subject can alone be justified. —According to them, the Christ was to be sent to accomplish in person here no more than what it is testified Jesus effected, save that at some indefinite and

remote period he will come on an escorting expedition at the end of all things. This is the Christ they preach. They ask their proselytes, by implication, if Jesus is the Christ having such a mission as this? —This is what “is implied in” their notion of “believing that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.” They immerse a subject confessing this belief, and pronounce him born of water and the spirit, and therefore, of course, “spirit,” or regenerate. —The immersion of such a subject for remission of sins, I affirm, is practically “baptismal regeneration;” for when I analyse his “faith,” as it is called, I find it an assent to a view of the Christ’s mission which is no where revealed in the scriptures of truth. If then, he be regarded as born again, he is first begotten of untruth, and then born of water, which is not the regeneration of Scripture; and therefore, in effect, as much aqueous regeneration for remission as baby-immersion: for adult-belief of untruth brings even a piously disposed subject no nearer to spiritual begettal than physical incompetence to believe at all. The adult and infant subjects, (from different causes indeed,) are both faithless of the truth, and therefore unbegotten of it; their immersions only remain—they are both born of water without faith in the Bible mission of the Christ; therefore their regenerations are both baptismal, and nothing more.

Mr. C., and his co-labourers, do not know what the mission of the Christ is. This is a grave charge against men so wise in their own conceits. But we have a graver charge against them than this; that, if it be granted that they do know it, they not only do not believe it, but are opposed to it, and persecute those that preach it. —Let us put them to the test—Do they believe that the Christ will restore the Twelve Tribes of Israel to the glorious land, and build again the dwelling place of David AS IN THE DAYS OF OLD? This is part of Messiah’s mission, as we can prove abundantly. Believing that Jesus is the Christ, this also is his mission. They ridicule the idea, and “take up an evil report against” its advocates, “and reproach their principles and character, and neither give them a hearing, nor make the amende honourable;” they are, therefore, infidels and persecutors, and mere baptismal regenerationists notwithstanding the appearance of verity in the extract before us. “Do you believe in the mission of Christ?” What is easier than to say, “yes?” But change the form of the question and say—“What is the mission of the Christ as revealed in Moses and the prophets?” Mr. Campbell himself, though the ecclesiastical chief of 300,000 people pretending to apostolicity of faith and practice, cannot begin to answer the question; it is not likely, therefore, that the proselytes he immerses would be more knowing than himself.

EDITOR.

August 10, 1852.

* * *

In his last speech at Boston, Kossuth inquires—“Does not Russia remind us of the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, standing on feet of clay?” He has derived the idea from the matter we have furnished him with. —Editor.

* * *

DR. MCGUFFEY AND THE SOUL.

When we lectured some months since at the University of Virginia, we very emphatically denied that any such doctrine was taught in the Bible as that there existed in mortal man an essence capable of an independent and incorporeal existence after death, commonly styled “the immortal soul.” We affirmed, that though man consisted of “body, soul and spirit,” yet that these were when uncombined without personal entity; but that when we declared this it was not to be supposed that we affirm that there was no immortality for

man, or that immortality was not taught in the Bible. What we maintained was this: that the scripture doctrine is incorruptibility of the body refashioned from its original dust, and thus organised, endowed with endless life—as it is written, “this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality,” or deathlessness: that this incorruptible life of body is a good thing, and an item of “the great recompense of the reward” promised only to the righteous; that it is to be sought after, and will be granted only to those who “seek for it” “by a patient continuance in well doing;” and that the righteous are those who believe the gospel of that Kingdom which the God of Heaven has promised to set up in the land covenanted to the fathers of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and who obey it.

We were pleased to hear that not long after this doctrine was propounded to the students in full audience assembled. —“The Rev. W. H. McGuffey, D. D.,” one of the professors of the University, delivered to them certain lectures on “the immortality of the soul.” What he made of the subject we have no means of judging; it is probable, however, that he “handled it with marked ability;” though of this we are certain, that he must have proved himself markedly unable to demonstrate its truth from the word of God. It is not there, and the wisest advocates of the dogma admit that it is not a scripture revelation.

The Rev. Dr. McGuffey has recently visited this city, and delivered a lecture at the Athenaeum on this subject. We would have heard him had we received intimation of time and place sufficiently early. It happened otherwise, however; therefore we must content ourselves with presenting the reader with the following notice of the lecture from “The Times and Compiler.” The reporter says: —

“The Rev. Mr. McGuffey delivered his lecture on the Immortality of the Soul, Thursday night, to a crowded auditory of ladies and gentlemen. As we took no notes, we will not do the speaker the injustice of attempting a synopsis of his remarks. It is scarcely necessary to say that the subject was handled with marked ability. But with due deference to the reverend and learned gentleman, we must be permitted to express our doubts whether the discussion of the Immortality of the Soul, on natural evidence, is likely to be productive of much good. The christian religion is the rock upon which this sublime doctrine stands, and there we think it should be permitted to rest. Why impose upon our weak and erring faculties, the task of demonstrating this dark and intricate problem, when a messenger from above has solved it for us? We cannot help regarding it as a species of grave trifling for a christian philosopher of the nineteenth century to abandon, in the discussion of the topic, the high and impregnable ground of divine revelation and to wander darkling through the metaphysical mazes which 2000 years ago perplexed the subtle disputants of the Portico and Academy.”

From this it would appear that “the reverend and learned gentleman” rested his argument in favour of the tradition “on natural evidence,” without appealing to divine revelation at all. In adopting this course the “crowded auditory of ladies and gentlemen” were enabled to mark well his ability as “a christian philosopher!” But after all the philosophy exhibited, the reporter cannot help saying that the whole affair was “a species of grave trifling.” This was doubtless the case. Only look at it! A crowded auditory gravely, perhaps proudly, listening to a reverend and learned professor of an University, and an ordained interpreter of Moses and the prophets, of Christ and his apostles, wandering darkly through the heathen mazes of 2000 years ago, to prove the existence of a nonentity! But, the wisdom of the Egyptians to the contrary nevertheless, there is no natural evidence of the verity of immortal-soulism. “The flesh profiteth nothing”—“in the flesh dwelleth no good thing.” The

reverend and learned gentlemen ought to know this; and to know also, that the immortality of man is a truth peculiar to the gospel of the kingdom, covenanted to Abraham and David, and to all who shall constitute their seed in Christ, —a truth, specially revealed and attested, unsustained by a particle of natural evidence, but shining forth abundantly from Genesis to the Apocalypse, and visible to every one that is not blinded by a spurious “christian philosophy,” college divinity, and the subtleties of the old heathens. The reporter seems not at all to like “the reverend and learned gentleman’s desertion of divine revelation for natural evidence in the case. But he should remember that learned divines know least of revelation than of any other subject. They are weak there, but think themselves strong in “philosophy”—Colossians 2: 2, 8, because this is their chief study. They are not workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. They feel conscious of this, and, therefore, deal more in philosophy, such as it is, than in the scripture. Dealing in this wise is more taking with ladies and gentlemen who are too polite and well bred to be ravished with the homeliness of scripture truth. —“The reverend and learned gentleman” (we wonder, if we may be so vulgar, whether Paul was ever so styled by his contemporaries,) is too well instructed in the rules of decorum to seek any other evidence for immortal-soulism than the natural, in the presence of a fashionable auditory. It would have created a panic to have introduced an apostle saying, that “life and incorruptibility were brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel!”—1 Timothy 1: 10. —This would have upset all the natural evidence, and the Egyptian wisdom, and the Greek subtleties, and made the learned gentleman to look foolish, and all the ladies and gentlemen to faint when they found that immortality was an affair of gospel, and not a matter of flesh, and consequently that immortally they had “no pre-eminence over the beasts!”—Ecclesiastes 3: 19. The reporter thinks it a dark and intricate problem to demonstrate, although the messenger from above has solved it! Yes, he has brought it to light, so that it is no longer “dark and intricate.” The true doctrine is easily demonstrated. It shines like the sun from the sacred page, but gives no light to him who knows not the gospel of the kingdom, and is indoctrinated with the Egyptian superstition of “the immortality of the soul.”

EDITOR.

February 21, 1852.

* * *

“Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.”—Paul.

* * *