

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 December, 1852—  
Volume 2—No. 12.

---

INQUIRIES CONCERNING THE NATURE OF MAN AND OTHER MATTERS.

Dear Sir:

I am very glad that you have given an opportunity for correspondence on the contents of your invaluable *Elpis Israel*. In common with many others, I heard your lectures in Glasgow; and although your hearers could not agree with you in all the views you expressed, I feel convinced that they universally hailed your visit to this country as an omen of better times—of times in the history of theological investigation in which common sense, instead of dogmatism, would be used in the examination of the best volumes, that is, the Bible.

For years I have been a member of a strict Baptist church in this city. But, the union of pure principles with a lax practise, as well as a growing disregard to the institutions of Jesus, found in most of the churches of this sect, have induced a few of us, of kindred sentiments on these matters, to leave that communion, and to meet on the first day of the week, that by mutual reading and examination of the scriptures, we might divest ourselves of the traditions of our fathers, and learn, and practice the faith once delivered to the saints. We feel much indebted to you for your valuable hints on many subjects in which the ‘christian world’ is confessedly astray; for your lucid exposition of the Millenarianism of the New Testament; and, generally speaking, for the third part of *Elpis Israel*. Yet we cannot, really, get over the things contained in the first. Much of it is really new and startling to your Scottish readers; yet, in our experience, as well as that of others, it must lead to good results. We have gone over the entire Hebrew scriptures, and extracted the original words translated ‘Lord God,’ &c., in our version, in order that by a comparison of the various passages, we might find out the meaning of the word, ‘Elohim’ as used by the Spirit. Judging scripture to be the best interpreter of itself, we resolved to put your opinions through their ordeal, and, if found scriptural, to adopt them. You will, I have no doubt, pardon us for this freedom of speech about your views. Indeed, as co-believers, striving for the faith, we feel that we have much in common with yourself. Believe us, brother, we have no sinister object in view in writing thus. Our simple, and undivided desire is to ‘buy the truth;’ and having found it, to practise it, in order that we may have an abundant entrance administered to us into the everlasting kingdom of our Saviour at his appearing. We have individually and collectively been much maligned since we have seen it to be our duty to leave a Baptist church for principle’s sake, by those who bear the name of Christ. We say this, not in the language of boasting, but that you may be convinced of our honesty in writing to you for a clearer exposition to our apprehension of

some parts of Elpis Israel. God knows, that in our hearts, we feel too much ignorance and prejudice, and depravity, to think of boasting in such a matter. We allude chiefly to your remarks on the nature of man.

We will, then, first reproduce here in brief a few passages from your work, as sources of information from which we gather your ideas of the constitution of man. In your view of the matter, animal life seems to be a combination of three elements: first, the body formed of clay; second, the vitalising principle, or neshemet el; and third, the ruach, or spirit, generally found in combination with the foregoing. With regard to the body, you say, on page 32:

“But, at present, we have to do with animal or natural life, which is all the life the fleshly sons of the first Adam can boast of. Enough, however, I think, has been advanced to show the Scriptural import of the text already quoted, that ‘the Lord God formed man, the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives; and man became a living soul.’ The simple, obvious, and undogmatic meaning of this, is, that the dust was first formed into ‘clay,’ which was then modelled by Jehovah Elohim into the form of the soul called ‘man,’ as a potter shapes the substance of his vessels. Thus, Elihu said to Job, ‘I also am formed out of the clay’ (Job 33:6); and again, ‘we are the clay, and Thou our potter; and we all are the work of Thy hand ‘ (Isaiah 64:8). The fashioning of the clay being accomplished in all its component parts, which in the aggregate constitute man; that is, the dust being animalised, and then organized, the next thing was to set all the parts of this exquisite mechanism into motion.

With respect to the neshemet el, you say on page 33:

“This (the setting the parts into motion) was effected by the inrush of the air through his nostrils into his lungs according to the natural laws. This phenomenon was the neshemet el, or ‘breath of God,’ breathing into him; and as it was the pabulum of life to all creatures formed from the dust, it is very expressively styled ‘the breath of lives’ in the plural number. Some imagine that Jehovah Elohim placed his mouth to the nostrils of the yet clay-cold man-soul prostrate before him, and so breathed into them. Be this at it may; of this, however, we are without doubt, that God breathes into every man at his birth the breath of lives to this day; and I see no scriptural reason why we should deny that he breathed it into Adam as he hath done into the nostrils of his posterity, namely, by the operation of the natural, or pneumatic, laws. Hitherto man, though a soul formed from the ground, had been inanimate; but as soon as he began to respire, like the embryo passing from foetal to infant life, he ‘became a living soul,’ not an everlasting, but simply nephesh chayiah, a living breathing frame.”

With regard to the ruach or spirit, on page 30, you remark:

“From these testimonies it is manifest that the ruach, or spirit is all pervading. It is in heaven, in sheol, or the dust of the deepest hollow, in the uttermost depths of the sea, in the darkness, in the light, and in all things animate, and without life. It is an universal principle in the broadest, or rather in an illimitable sense. It is the substratum of all motion, whether manifested in the diurnal and ellipsoidal revolutions of the planets, in the flux and reflux of the sea, in the storms and tempests of the expanse, or in the organism of reptiles, cattle, beasts, fish, fowls, vegetables, or men. The atmospheric expanse is charged with it; but it is not the air: plants and animals of all species breathe it; but it is not their breath: yet without it, though filled with air, they would die.”

“Thus from the centre of the earth, and extending throughout all space, in every direction, is the Ruach Elohim, the existence of which is demonstrable from the phenomena of the natural system of things. It penetrates where the neshemet el, or atmospheric air, cannot.”

Such, we think, is man generically considered by you—first, made up of dust; second, vitalised by atmospheric air, combined with which is third, the ruach or Spirit, an unknown something existing everywhere, and in which is the source of all motion. As such, then, there is no difference between him and the inferior animals, being all made of dust vitalised in the same way. Proofs of this are found every where through your first part of Elpis Israel, particularly on pages 28 & 33. But specifically there is an essential difference; in other words, you consider that specific difference is the superior phrenological development of man above the inferior animal. The following extracts clearly show this: on page 33 you remark, that

“Man differs from other creatures in having been modelled after a divine type or pattern. In form and capacity he was made like to the angels, though in nature inferior to them.”

Again, on page 34, “Seth was also ‘in Adam’s own likeness.’ While image, then, hath reference to form or shape, ‘likeness’ hath regard to mental constitution, or capacity. From the shape of his head, as compared with other creatures, it is evident that man has a mental capacity which distinguishes him above them all. Their likeness to him is faint. They can think; but their thoughts are only sensual. They have no moral sentiments, or high intellectual aspirations; but are grovelling in all their instincts, which incline only to the earth. In proportion as their heads assume the human form in the same ration do they excel each other in sagacity; and as in the monkey tribe, display a greater likeness to man. But, let the case be reversed; let the human head degenerate from the godlike perfection of the Elohim, the standard of beauty in shape and feature; let it diverge to the image of an ape’s, and the human animal no longer presents the image and likeness of the Elohim; but rather, the chattering imbecility of the creature most resembling it in form. Adam’s mental capacity enabled him to comprehend and receive spiritual ideas, which moved him to veneration, hope, conscientiousness, the expression of his views, affections, and so-forth.”

This view you further explain when speaking of the Serpent’s qualities on page 72.

“And what use,” you inquire, “should we naturally expect such a creature would make of this faculty? Such an one, certainly, as its cerebral constitution would enable it to manifest. It was an intellectual, but not a moral, creature. It had no ‘moral sentiments.’ No part of its brain was appropriated to the exercise of benevolence, veneration, conscientiousness, and so-forth. To speak phrenologically, it was destitute of these organs; having only ‘intellectual faculties’ and ‘propensities.’ Hence its cerebral mechanism, under the excitation of external phenomena, would only develop, what I would term, an animal intellectuality. Moral, or spiritual, ideas would make no impression upon its mental constitution; for it was incapable from its formation of responding to them. It would be physically impossible for it to reason in harmony with the mind of God; or with the mind of a man, whose reasoning was regulated by divinely enlightened moral sentiments. Its wisdom would be that of the untutored savage race, whose ‘sentiments’ by the desuetude of ages, had become as nothing.”

Again, on page 79, you remark that,

“The Serpent had propensities and intellect, and so had the woman; but her mental constitution differed from his in having ‘moral sentiments’ superadded to her propensities and intellect. By

the sentiments she was made a morally accountable being; capable of believing, and able to control and direct her other faculties in their application. The propensities enabled a creature to propagate its species, take care of its young, defend itself against enemies, collect food, and so forth: intellect enables it to do these things for the gratification of its sensations; but when, in addition to these, a being is endowed with the sentiments of Conscientiousness, Hope, Veneration, Benevolence, Wonder, &c., it possesses a spiritual or sentimental organization, which makes it capable of reflecting as from a mirror, the likeness and glory of God. The appropriate sphere of the propensities is on things sensual and fleshly; while that of spiritual, or sentimentalised, intellect is on ‘the things of the Spirit of God.’”

Now, thus far, we think, we understand and agree with you, at least, that man’s body, vitalised by the atmospheric air, &c., is mortal or subject to death; but we are at a loss what to say with regard to his thinking part, or what is usually called the mind. We earnestly hope that you will favour us anew with your views on this subject. We are, we confess, immaterialists; and we have ever considered that the scriptures countenance this doctrine. We are willing, however, to revise this as well as other things. We will state our difficulty as distinctly as we can.

To proceed then. The three elements which have been already referred to, are called by you ‘the Flesh.’ Now when on page 114 you say that the flesh thinks, we are at a loss to know to which of the three elements you allude, since one of them must do so, seeing they are essentially different. Again, on page 80, you quote Paul’s phrase *to phronema tes sarkos*, ‘The thinking of the flesh,’ as proof that the brain thinks, or is the thinking substance if we are to take this expression absolutely, there is an end to all reasoning in the matter. The brain truly is flesh or matter. Doubtless, then, the matter of the body thinks. But motion at least takes place in thinking. Now in treating of the *ruach* (which is certainly not the brain) you say, on page 30, that it is ‘the substratum of all motion’ whether in animate or inanimate creations. Now we are anxious to know, how these two statements can be reconciled. Besides we would like to know also, what you would make of the next clause of the same verse, *to phronema ton pneumatos*, ‘the thinking of the Spirit.’ If the apostle’s *sarx*, or flesh, be a substance, so must his *pneuma*, or spirit, be; for they are contrasted as causes of certain results. Here then are two thinking substances in man. We apprehend, however, that the apostle is here speaking, not so much of the thinking substance, as of the channels or media through which thoughts are effected. His idea may be paraphrased thus;—just as water takes its qualities from the bed it flows over, so are the affections and thoughts tinged by the fleshly or by the spiritual medium through which they must proceed before they are represented by the action, which action always depends for its moral nature on the state of the affections, &c. in another place—Matthew 6: 22, it is said, *ho luchnos tou soomatos estin ophthalmos*, ‘the light of the body is the eye.’ Is not this a passage of similar construction to the one you quote? If so, does it prove any thing else than that the eye is the medium through which we see? But, must not your next clause on page 80, modify your absolute expression ‘the brain thinks.’ The brain, you say, is termed by Paul, the fleshly tablet of the heart. So indeed it is. We know, however, that the tablets to which Paul referred, served the same purpose as our slates, or sheets of paper, do now. It was on them that the ancients wrote. In the same way the heart’s tablet is written upon by the heart, and therefore cannot be the heart itself; but only the medium through which the heart acts.

But again, we are at a loss to know why you fix upon the brain in particular as a corresponding expression for the apostle’s *sarx*, or flesh. The only proof you allege, as far as we can see, is that contained on page 114, where you say, quoting the same language, to wit, “The apostle says that the flesh thinks, *to phronema tes sarkos*, that is, the brain thinks, as all who think are well assured from their own consciousness.” Now we would inquire, Is not this abandoning

your own principles of reasoning, and resorting to the wooden swords of the schools, against the use of which you caution your reviewers? Assuredly I am conscious of thinking; but I am far from being conscious of the thinking of my brain. Besides, we would like to know if there be not in the New Testament a corresponding expression for the Old Testament word ruach? One would think that if 'life and immortality were brought to light' in the New Testament, some discoveries might be made there in things which are mysterious in the Old. Are the ruach and the pneuma not identical? They are certainly both similarly translated, and for any thing that we can see, they are synonymous in their meaning. Thus in 2 Kings 3: 17, and in Jonah 4: 8, the word ruach is translated 'wind.' Now, I need not quote the passages in the New Testament where pneuma is thus rendered. From testimonies of this kind are we not intitled to say, that they both denote the same agent? We must confess that we do not like your definition of the word spirit. You appear to us to confound it with spiritual body. The Swedenborgians pursue an opposite course, and with the most unblushing effrontery, declare that the immaterial part of man is what Paul means by 'spiritual body!' Does the truth not lie between you? I must, however, acknowledge that your notions of the ruach have shed a flood of light on many passages of the scriptures, which hitherto were an enigma. Yet, I think you will see cause to modify them. In such passages as 'Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.' What are we to make of the Spirit's individuality?

Your views, too, of the Elohim are worthy of all praise. There is only one passage on which we would like to hear your opinion—Deuteronomy 6: 4. Is the word Elohim dual or plural? We certainly can see no objection to translate the phrase Jehovah Elohim by the corresponding one in English Lord of the Rulers, understanding by the rulers, the angels or spirits into whose hands are committed the affairs of this present world during the current ages.

By-the-bye, one good christian brother is much displeas'd because you say on page 114 that 'the body of Jesus was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for.' He cannot see how the texts you quote as proof have any connexion with the body of Jesus, namely John 3: 6, and particularly, Psalm 51: 5. Perhaps you would drop a hint on this matter.

The same brother requests me to ask you if any reviewers of Elpis Israel have made their appearance; and what magazines they may be found in?

And now for the present we say, adieu. When this evil age is passed away, we trust we may have an opportunity of conversing about these matters, if not before. In the mean time, it is ours to fight the good fight of faith, laying hold of eternal life. Then we shall have rest. We wish you more and more success in your present enterprise; and hoping that you are well, we unaffectedly subscribe ourselves, yours in the hope of eternal life.

GAVIN GREENLEES.

3 Greenhill Street, Anderston, Glasgow,  
N. B., March 14, 1850.

\* \* \*

“ELEMENTS”—“SOUL”—“VITALISING PRINCIPLE”—“IMMATERIALISM”—  
“THE THINKING OF THE FLESH” “THE THINKING OF THE SPIRIT”—HOW IT  
WRITES UPON THE HEART.

Although the foregoing epistle is three years old in March '53, the matter it contains is as fresh and timely as when originally conceived. Other affairs, which wholly occupied me,

left me no leisure for a reply as early as desired. I therefore put it aside for a more convenient season. Since then, however, I had lost sight of it, until looking over some old letters recently, it unexpectedly turned up; and, on being re-read, seemed to merit a respectful and serious attention.

The writer, who speaks for others as well as himself, has very fairly stated what he and his friends conceive to be the views set forth in Elpis Israel on the constitution of man. He speaks of his being regarded there as a compound of three elements. I should allow this to pass as admitted, if I did not apprehend that the reader might misconstrue the sense in which I admitted the use of the word element as expressive of the views I hold. I do not admit the use of the word in its chemical sense. I do not mean by element that which cannot be reduced to any thing more simple than itself. I admit that the ruach is strictly elementary—a principle that, however it may be diluted, or modified in its manifestations, cannot be resolved by analysis into more simple or elementary matter. But this cannot be said of the body of man, and the neshemet el. The apostle styles the former ‘vile body,’ which is strictly true; and this villainousness is attributable to its non-elementary, or composite nature; its constituents being incompatible when the combining influence of the ruach is withdrawn. The neshemet el, or atmospheric air, styled in scripture ‘the breath of God,’ is also compound, consisting of oxygen, nitrogen, and some carbon. It is evident, therefore, that a living man cannot be scientifically said to be compounded of three elements; nor can animal life be said to result from a combination of only three. Elements, then, must be taken with grains of allowance. The subject is animal life, or the life of an animal. Without the animal, of course, there can be no animal life. In this sense, therefore, we may admit that the animal is a constituent or element of the life, or existence. But drain from it its blood, and though the body remain undecomposed, there will be no life, though neshemet el, or air, and ruach or spirit, may abound. Blood, air, and spirit are the elements, or constituents, by whose affinities alone motion is produced in the organs of the body, through their operation upon the nervous system, which is composed of the brain, spinal chord, and sympathetic, and other nerves. This motion is so subtle as to be almost imperceptible, perhaps quite so in the matter of thought where no lesion exists; at other times very obvious. Motion is the effect of the operation of two forces. It is therefore a duodynamic effect, and in common parlance, called life; which, more strictly speaking, should be applied to the forces, or to that which develops or sets the forces free, than to the ordinary phenomena so styled. Nephesh havbahsahr baddahm hiv, ‘the soul of the body (is) in the blood itself.’ Nephesh is the Hebrew word for soul: dahm is blood, and bad-dahm, in the blood. There can be no mistake, therefore, about the above rendering. Theologians may speculate about the body’s soul till they lose themselves in immaterialism beyond the skies; we believe Moses, who was God’s interpreter of truth, that the soul of man is in his blood. Jehovah, speaking to him, is very explicit upon the subject—nephesh, says he, kol-bahsahr dahmo be-naphsho hoo, ‘the soul of all flesh (is) its blood for the soul thereof.’ And again in the same verse, nephesh kol-bahsahr dahmo hiv, ‘the soul of all flesh (is) its blood itself.’ It is soul makes atonement for soul; hence, it is written in the law, haddahm hoo bannephesh yekaphpair, ‘the blood it expiates for the soul’—Leviticus 17: 11-14. When, therefore, the blood of Jesus was poured out from his cross-suspended bahsahr, or body of flesh, the words of the prophet were fulfilled, he-erah lammahveth naphsho, ‘he poured out his soul unto death; and again, im-tahsim ahshahm naphsho, ‘verily, his soul thou shalt cause to made an expiation’—Isaiah 53: 10, 12. Soul is sometimes used for body or flesh as well as the sense above written; as, lo-thaazov naphshi le-sheol, ‘thou wilt not leave my soul in the grave’—Psalm 16: 10. But to return.

It is manifest that the corporeal element of animal life is blood; and that consequently it may be received as an axiom in psychology that where there is no blood there is no living soul. This compound fluid it is, which, acted upon by the air and electricity of our atmosphere, and permeating the minutest tissues, and diffusing itself every where throughout the body, is the divinely appointed source of human life. It matters not how much 'immortal soul' may be imagined to exist in the body—yea, it may be saturated with it—yet, unless the brain be duly supplied with arterial blood, there can be no 'thinking of the flesh,' nor can any thing be inscribed on the tablet of the heart; and if withheld a sufficient length of time, motion would cease in all the organs, which would be death. Blood, air, and electricity, then, are the matters from which life is kindled in 'all flesh.' They are necessary to constitute life; hence they are the elements of life, and in this sense I am willing to tolerate the word in the statement of what I am supposed to teach is revealed in the scriptures concerning the constitution of man.

I am supposed to say that the neshemet el, or air, is 'the vitalising principle.' This is not an exact representation of my view of the matter. I regard no one natural simple element as the principle of life. Oxygen alone, diluted or undiluted with nitrogen; nor ruach or pure spirit; nor blood, separately considered, is the principle of life. It requires all three to vitalise flesh such as sin's body is composed of. Chemical decomposition is the beginning of life, as observed in the phenomena of digestion. By this process, added to respiration, living blood is generated; and becomes the soul or life of the heart, liver, lungs, brain, and all other parts of the body, which are collectively styled 'sin's flesh,' and sometimes simply 'flesh.' It is the immortal-soul theory that vitalises the body by a single principle—a physiology well befitting the science of old Egypt, but worthy of no respect since many have run to and fro, and knowledge has been increased—Daniel 12: 4. A child lives by the life-development of its maternal flesh; an existence which is continued after birth, not by being born with an immortal vital principle hereditarily derived, or by the inrush of an immortal spirit with its first breath, but by the same process that continues in being 'the soul of all flesh,' from man to a mouse. Let the reader take the following remarkable phenomenon as an illustration of creature-formation, and animal life, the result of a due combination of principles according to some unknown existing law to which matter has been subjected in the wisdom of God. I extract the notice from the Tribune, where it appeared recently under the caption of

#### MR. CROSSE'S INSECTS.

"A great deal of discussion has lately taken place in the scientific world in reference to certain experiments of Mr. Crosse, an amateur philosopher of Somersetshire, England, who was said to have created insects called the *Acarus Crossei*. It was a mistake, however, to suppose that Mr. Crosse claimed the creation of the insects, for he only alleges that he has been enabled to develop insects under the most singular circumstances. Our Consul at Liverpool, Mr. F. F. Ogden, has recently visited the house of the philosopher, and, in a letter to *The National Intelligencer*, gives this account of what he saw:

"I own to utter incredulity until I had the opportunity of a thorough examination of the process and a full explanation of the means. No room was left for doubt. No delusion, no self-deception, no favourite hypothesis to be carried out, had any influence in the result. On first witnessing the result, Mr. Crosse would not believe his own senses. He locked up his laboratory and took a long walk in the open air to assure himself that he was not labouring under some illusion. On his return he beheld the actual living insect in various stages of its

formation. The apparatus was prepared for the purpose of producing crystals from the silicate of potash.

“A tubulated retort, with its long end plunged in a glass dish of mercury, has a platina wire passing through it, connected with a negative pole of a weak galvanic battery. Through a neck in the retort, hermetically sealed, another platina wire, immersed in the caustic solution, communicates with the positive pole. The bulb of the retort is two-thirds filled with a most carefully prepared caustic solution of silex and potash. Pure black flints and caustic soda, after being subjected to a white heat, are pulverised and melted into a glass, which is soluble in distilled water. In this solution no animal life can possibly exist, nor can there in mercury. The whole was then placed upon a shelf for constant inspection. A gelatinous substance was first observed to have formed around the bottom of the positive wire. Then No. 1 made its appearance, gradually expanding into Nos. 2 and 3, when flexible filaments were observed. No. 4 began to show animal life, and, after one hundred and forty days’ watching through all its changes, the perfect living insect crawled up the wire! —not singly, but in sufficient numbers to dispel all doubt, if any could have existed, and prepared for another stage of life. Like our mosquitoes, that merge from the element in which they are produced, and are drowned in it if they return, any unfortunate straggler that missed his hold immediately perished. The *Acarus Crossei* is now known as a distinct species.”

Here is the formation of living animals from materials in which animal life could have by no possibility previously existed. A great outcry was raised against Mr. Crosse by the religious when the phenomenon was first announced in the British journals. He was denounced for an atheist for revealing the fact that a physical law existed by which living creatures were produced by galvanism. Mr. Crosse did not affirm that galvanism was the creator; nor did he claim to be the contriver of the law, but simply the discoverer of its existence. But superstition and fanaticism are without reason as they are regardless of scripture. Mr. Crosse has doubtless stumbled on the verge of a great fact—on the principle according to which Jehovah Elohim form living souls from the dust, and waters of the sea. The ruach, like the galvanism in the above process, directed by superhuman intelligence, is formative and life-enkindling, no matter what the substance operated upon may be; so that, as John observed, ‘God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.’ He employs means in all he does by himself and others. These means are laws to a vast extent completely hidden from his creatures. The law of soul-creation from the dust is known only to Jesus of all the sons of men. The law exists though hidden; and awaits its application by him for the resurrection of the dead. Jesus, as God’s representative, will re-create their souls from their original dust by God’s spirit—2 Corinthians 4: 14. ‘God,’ says Paul, ‘shall make alive your mortal bodies by his ruach,’ pneuma, or spirit—Romans 8: 11. He will not require the mechanical contrivance used by Mr. Crosse to bring the formative ruach or spirit into formative and life-enkindling contact with their dust. His spirit-directing finger, is enough for this. He wills it, and it is done; not without law, or contrary thereto, but in harmony with latent physical principles whose modus operandi is known only to Him that appointed them, and is prepared and authorised to apply them. The formation of a living soul from dust, called Adam; and the reproduction of everliving souls from mortal dust, by resurrection, is demonstrated to the infidel to be possible by Mr. Crosse’s insects. He admits the formation of these by the positive and negative forces of galvanism applied to a solution of calcined silicate of potash and soda in condensed steam, or distilled water. —This is wonderful; and the resurrection of the dead is but a similar wonder on a grander scale. That the dead will rise is a matter of testimony; that they can be raised, is demonstration; and how? no one is

stumbled at who can trace the 'worm Jacob' to his manhood, the *Acarus Crossei* from animal nonentity, and believes that 'all things are possible with God.'

Our intelligent correspondent confesses that he and his brethren are 'Immaterialists,' and believes that immaterialism is taught, or countenanced by the scriptures. But they are not like immaterialists in general; for they mix candour and teachableness of mind with their immaterialism, 'being willing to revise it as well as other things.' They do not assume that they are infallibly right, and that all who do not assent to their system are mere disciples of French materialism, which recognises neither God, a future state, nor rewards and punishments to come. This is the antipodes of their theory, though it recognises all these things, 'the truth of the gospel' has no affinity with either.

This will appear when we consider what the nonentity is, if I may so speak, that passes current under the term 'immaterialism.' As defined by Webster, it signifies 'the doctrine of the existence or state of immaterial substances or spiritual beings.' Now if any one can comprehend this, it is more than I can. "Immaterial" is defined to signify, 'not consisting of matter;' and 'substance,' 'something material, real, solid, 'body, corporeal nature or matter.' 'Immaterial substance,' therefore, must be a phrase signifying no matter matter, unsolid solid, incorporeal body, &c. Now, this is a fair specimen of 'words without knowledge,' or positive absurdity. And such 'immaterial substances' form the idea entertained by immaterialism of 'spiritual beings!' It beggars all speech to give expression to immaterialistic conceptions. 'Beings!'—What sort of beings are immaterial substances? Nonentical entities! And these are the spirits of immateriality! The immortal souls of metaphysics! From this the reader will perceive that it is only necessary to define the terms of the hypothesis to show what absolute nothingness is wrapped up in conceit. Most assuredly, the scriptures countenance nothing so palpably absurd; and I doubt not, that, if so sensible a writer as our correspondent were to reconsider the matter, he would hasten to disclaim all affinity with an hypothesis whose vocables are so indefinite, and manifestly foolish.

I come now to the difficulty of our friends the Immaterialists. They assume that I call 'the three elements' the flesh: and that as I affirm that Paul says the flesh thinks (which is indeed evident to all) they want to know to which of the three elements I allude as the thinking principle of the flesh—whether to the brain, the *neshemet el*, or to the *ruach*. This difficulty would very naturally arise in the mind of an Immaterialist, whose hypothesis regards life and mind as a single principle capable of incorporeal existence and intellectual operations. A difficulty of this sort, however, would not occur to one unperverted by the notion. He would answer, that abstractly considered neither of them thinks—neither the brain alone, nor the *neshemet*, nor *ruach* at all, alone or combined, with the brain or without it. Brain or flesh alone is mere dead matter. Neither Paul, nor I after him, ever hinted that inanimate flesh thinks. To say this would be like saying that a locomotive is self moving independently of fire and steam. The brain-flesh is the machinery of thought, the thinking apparatus, the intellectual locomotive, which 'goes ahead' only under the forces generated by the mutual affinities of blood, air, and electricity. Man has formed the railway locomotive from crude unsightly iron ore, that it can move forward or backward, with the slowness of the ox, or the velocity of the wind. Show an ancient man of a thousand years ago a mass of ore, and tell him that a moving machine could be constructed from it capable of running at the rate of sixty miles an hour with a burden two hundred horses could not move on a common road, and he would conclude you were either in jest, practising on his credulity, or beside yourself. —'What! That iron ore move itself at sixty miles an hour!' This would be as astonishing to him as it is to immaterialists to say that God has constructed a thinking machine from the dust

of the ground. —‘What!’ they exclaim, ‘tell us that matter thinks!’—that the dust which the wind can blow away with a puff can compose the Principia, Milton’s Paradise Lost, or Shakespeare’s plays!’ And why not? —Is that more surprising than the raising up of children to Abraham from stones; or the production of living animals by the galvanic forces from calcined silicate of soda and potash dissolved in distilled water? ‘All things are possible with God.’ It is much more reasonable that solid matter should think, than that neshemet el, or air, or ruach, electrical spirit, should. —But unorganised matter is as incapable of thought as unorganised iron ore is of moving sixty miles an hour. When Paul speaks of ‘the thinking of the flesh,’ it is of organised matter in living action he affirms the thinking. And so do I. When I use the phrase ‘the flesh,’ in speaking of mind, I mean the brain, the thinking apparatus, set in motion by the vital forces. The brain does not originate its own power to think, any more than the railway locomotive its own power to move; but they are both so formed that under an appropriate stimulus, the one can think, and the other run sixty miles an hour. The locomotive, however, cannot regulate its own movements. It requires a hand directed by intelligence. Once started, and it would run till its forces were exhausted, or it was arrested by an obstacle it could not overcome. So the brain requires guidance in right thinking by some other influence than the vital forces. Under the mere impulse of these its thinking is instinctive, in other words, the actions of the creature are generated by physical impulses spontaneously arising in the organs of the brain. Brain, whose fibres vibrate only under the excitation of natural forces, is incapable of right thinking. Worked after this manner it is brutish. Its thinking is wrong, and without the admixture of a single spiritual idea; and manifested in the actions of the creature, exhibits to view man in the savage state. This is ‘the thinking of the flesh’ in genuine physical manifestation. Left to itself, it runs like the unguided locomotive, into headlong excess. This is seen in the savage varieties of our race, among whom Paul’s *phronema tou pneumatos*, or thinking of the spirit, cannot be found. The spirit referred to in that phrase does not exist in them in the sense in which it is so used. —If by ‘the spirit’ we are to understand ‘the immortal soul,’ which immaterialism plants in all human beings, then there would be no savage, or semi-barbarous, or unenlightened, ungodly, people on earth; for under that hypothesis, the thoughts of all men, women, and children would be ‘the thinking of the Spirit,’ which Paul says ‘is life and peace,’ as opposed to ‘the thinking of the flesh,’ which is ‘enmity against God.’ Immaterialism teaches that what it terms ‘the immortal soul’ is ‘a particle of the divine essence,’ and the originator of human thoughts and actions; for with this ism it is the thinking principle, and principle of life! Hence, it elevates every man, Indian, Hottentot, New Hollander, and Thug, into an incarnation of the deity, which is mere God-blaspheming Pantheism. The phrase ‘immortal soul’ imports a deathless soul. Now, for a soul to be deathless it must be incorruptible; and the living thing that is incorruptible is essentially pure, holy, and undefiled. Does the reader imagine that such a soul or ‘Spirit’ in savage, semi-barbarian, or civilised man, presiding over his thoughts and actions, could coexist in them with the characters they are known to possess? Their diabolism triumphantly refutes the immaterialistic notion of men being in any sense immortality incarnate. —No; the principle in his flesh is not a deathless one, but mortal sin; and hence all the enmity against God, and wickedness in the world from ‘the thinking of the flesh.’

Our correspondent says truly, ‘If we are to take this expression absolutely, there is an end to all reasoning in the matter.’ By ‘absolutely’ he means without limitation; that is, if we are to interpret the phrase, ‘the thinking of the flesh,’ as meaning simply what it says. And why should we not? Because, says Mr. Greenlees, in thinking there is motion; and you say that the ruach, or spirit, is the substratum of all motion: therefore, as the ruach produces the motion, it must do the thinking. This seems to be his argument as deduced from what he says. —The ruach doing the thinking through the flesh, is the immaterialist interpretation of ‘the

thinking of the flesh;’ but if so, then what do they mean by ‘the thinking of the spirit?’ These two thinkings are antithetic; but immaterialism makes them the same; therefore their results must be identical, which according to Paul, is not the fact. Immaterialism has no taste for absolute significations; because they leave no scope for speculation, or ‘thinking of the flesh;’ I am, however, particularly partial to them, because in the thinkings of the Spirit of God they remarkably abound.

I have indeed said that ‘the ruach is the substratum of all motion.’ But by ‘substratum’ is meant ‘that which supplies the basis in which are inherent the qualities from which motion results under certain conditions. But without the blood and the air, the ruach would not cause a single fibre of the brain to vibrate a thought; nor would the blood and the air without the ruach. The substratum of motion in flesh is, indeed, made up of these three; and under the influence of their resultant the liver secretes bile, the stomach gastric juice, and the brain thinks. The resultant does not perform the thinking any more than it does the secreting of bile and gastric juice; yet without it all three operations would cease. From this it will be seen that there are no diversities of statement to reconsider.

‘The thinking of the spirit’ is a divine superaddition to the ‘thinking of the flesh.’ The latter is common to all men and beasts, in a greater or less degree of perfection; while the former is peculiar to the prophets and apostles; and the saints of the living God. This is the reason why there is so much diversity between true believers and the world. The world’s mind is the unenlightened thinking of Sin’s flesh, the propensities being ascendant; while that of the true believer is thinking which results from the understanding and earnest belief of the things of the Spirit of God. In this case, the intellect is enlightened, the sentiments elevated, and God’s truth enthroned. The thinking is then in harmony with that truth; and as the truth is the Spirit’s, the thinking is the Spirit’s likewise. This explanation, I hope, will remove Mr. Greenlees’ supposition, that I teach that there are two thinking substances in man, unless by substance we are to understand the truth as well as the brain. The apostle is certainly not speaking of channels of thought, but of the sources of thought in the believer, on the one hand, and in the unenlightened man subject to his propensities, on the other. The Spirit-truth is the light, the eye of the brain body in things divine, as the eye is the light of the same organ in regard to things without. —When a man is indoctrinated with it, it is the true light within which restrains him from running off into wild excess of thought, word, and deed; and conforms his thinking to the mind of God.

Mr. Greenlees is manifestly mistaken in saying, that ‘the heart’s tablet is written upon by the heart; and therefore cannot be the heart itself; but only the medium through which the heart acts.’ Paul speaks of two kinds of tablets—stone tablets, and fleshly tables of the heart. On the former, the Mosaic law was written; on the latter ‘the epistle of Christ.’ It is worthy of remark here, that the scripture divides heart-tablets into two kinds—stony heart tablets, and fleshy heart tables. The former are like the tables of the law, hard and insensible; the latter, soft and sensible as flesh. Israel now, and of old time, seeking a justification by the law, is an illustration of the old stony heart in the flesh; being unbelieving, perverse, and stiffnecked—‘uncircumcised of heart, and ears.’ The Gentiles are like them. God, however, has promised to give Israel ‘a new heart,’ which he styles ‘a heart of flesh’—Ezekiel 36: 26, upon which he will write his law—Jeremiah 31: 33, that they may fear him forever—Jeremiah 32: 39. This new heart was given to the apostles, and to those, both Jews and Gentiles, who believe the gospel of the kingdom, and in Jesus ass the king, through their word. —There was a congregation of these new hearts of flesh in Corinth. In the second letter which the apostle wrote to them, he tells them they ‘are the epistle of Christ written with the Spirit of the living

God on fleshy tables of the heart'—2 Corinthians 3: 3. It was not the heart, then, of each disciple that wrote upon his fleshy table, as our ingenuous correspondent supposes; but the Spirit of the living God that inscribed upon it 'the law of the spirit of life'—Romans 8: 2. Does the reader inquire, How did the Spirit write the epistle of Christ upon the Corinthian heart? Paul says, he did it by him and Timothy. They were the Spirit's amanuenses or secretaries. 'Ye are the epistle of Christ,' says he, 'ministered by us.' The way they wrote the letter at the dictation of the Spirit is set forth in the narrative of the introduction of the gospel of the kingdom into Corinth. 'He reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.' He went to them 'declaring the testimony of God,' 'teaching His word among them,' and 'testifying that Jesus is the Christ' (or king)—Acts 18: 4 'in demonstration of Spirit and of power'—Acts 18: 11, 5. He did not bring them to the acknowledgment of a theory by eloquence or a display of worldly wisdom. Their reception of the truth was the work of the Spirit through him and Timothy. The testimony was God's, the power was God's, and the demonstration his Spirit's; the reasoning alone was the apostle's, who testified also that he had seen Jesus and conversed with him, since his crucifixion, and that consequently he was indeed risen from the dead—1 Corinthians 2: 1-4. 'Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptised.' Their heart tablet, stony before, became fleshy, and inscribed so notably with Spirit-truth, that they were known and read of all men as Christ's in whose hearts he dwelt by faith.

When a man thinks, and at the same time his brain is in an aching state, he is conscious of thinking with that organ. —Observation also proves that the brain is the thinking substance of the body; for pressure upon it suspends all thought and sensation.

The scriptures do not say that 'life and immortality are brought to light in the New Testament;' but that Jesus Christ has brought them to light 'through the Gospel;' which, the same apostle whose words these are, says, 'God promised before by his prophets in the holy scriptures.'

Strange that any one should say that I confound 'spirit' with 'spiritual body.' Spirit has many meanings in the scriptures, and one of these meanings is spiritual body; as *apokyriou pneumatou*, 'from the Lord the Spirit,' and 'that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit;' and again, 'the last Adam was made into a life-imparting Spirit.' But these texts are not immaterialistic; hence confusion arises in the minds of immaterialists, whose idea of spirit is mere incorporeal invisibility. —Swedenborgianism is mere mesmerism bewitched—a contemptible crotchet, unworthy of a scripturally-wise man's consideration for five minutes. It is as absurd for them to style 'the immaterial part of man' the spiritual body, as it is for immaterialists to affirm that there is any part of man that is immaterial! The only difference I can see is that they synonymise nothing with something, while the others leave something out of their system altogether. I find the word spirit used in the Bible for what science styles electricity, galvanism, magnetism, &c.; for mind, natural courage, natural force, life, instinct, ambition, apparition, demon, breath, disposition, a disease, words of truth, God, teaching-unction, angels, the gospel, conscience, &c. any one may see that spirit is not to be rendered by one meaning in all the texts where it occurs. Its signification must be determined by the subject in text and context. This is the rule I work by; and by its aid I find no difficulty in making sense of all the passages where it is found.

'What are we to make of the Spirit's individuality?' Why, just what the Bible makes of it. It is as inseparable from God himself as his wisdom, knowledge, life, and power. It is the medium of connection between Him and all his works; so that by it he is everywhere

present, though corporeally a million of years removed from some parts of his universe. By it He is cognisant of the fall of a sparrow upon earth, and at the same instant, of events in the stars billions of leagues remote. 'There is nothing hid from him.' No man hath seen God at any time; but by his spirit he makes himself known, as to his 'holy men' of ancient time.

Elohainoo in the sentence, 'Shema yisrah-ail Yehowah Elohainoo Yehowah echahd, 'Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Being,' is neither dual nor plural. —Elohah is singular with the plural pronoun ainoo, our, affixed—'our God,' not our gods, two or more. The plural would have a Yod between ai and noo. Yehowah ail elohim, Jehovah, God of gods, is the God of Israel; not God of idols, but of angels, the provisional superintendents of human affairs.

The 'christian brother' is unnecessarily 'displeased.' Paul says the body of Jesus was 'the nature of Abraham's seed.' I have said no more. Was this clean or unclean? Jesus was 'born of the flesh,' and was therefore flesh, whatever that may be. This is the connexion of John 3: 6 with his body. Psalm 51: 5 is prophetic of his being so born.

I am not aware of any reviews of Elpis Israel having appeared. There have been occasional notices showing that it is a book the reviewers don't like to meddle with. Prudence is sometimes the better part of valour.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

THE ADVENT HARBINGER'S "REMARKS" ON OUR "REPLY."  
(See Herald page 195.)

We have delayed publishing this reply, hoping to find time to give that attention to it which the magnitude of the questions under investigation demands; but in this we have been disappointed, and as our time will be all taken up in making necessary preparations for our eastern tour, and as we desire to have our readers see the article, all we can do now is to give it to them with the following brief remarks:

1. We very highly prize the spirit of christian kindness manifested in this 'reply.' It is a rare grace among religious disputants in these degenerate times: may it more and more abound in us and our worthy friend of the Herald, so that we may be enabled to 'keep the unity of the Spirit,' though on some minor points we may differ in sentiment.
2. We profess to be 'grounded and settled' in the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity, for they are plainly taught in the inspired Word; we therefore expect to make no essential changes in reference to them. But relative to unfulfilled prophecy, we freely confess that we are a learner, and as a matter of course are not perfect in knowledge in this respect—and should be willing to be taught more perfectly by any one; and we are happy to be assured that the editor of the Herald possesses this teachable disposition; and we would that we could say the same of the editors of other Heralds. Were they willing to learn of Christ, they would become wiser and much better qualified to teach others than they now are.
3. Bro. Thomas is mistaken in saying that we hold that the 'Twelve Tribes will be restored to the land promised to their fathers . . . immediately subsequent to the battle of Armageddon,' for we have supposed they would be gathered previous to that battle. We have viewed the order of events thus, 1. The personal advent of Christ and the

- resurrection of the saints, &c. 2. The gathering of Israel to their Messiah at Jerusalem, (whom they would not know at first, any more than Joseph's brethren at first knew him.) 3. The kings of the earth, or Gog and his confederates, make war with the Lamb, or the battle of Armageddon is fought, on the mountains of Israel, and the Lord and his people are victorious. 4. Christ, or the anti-typical Joseph, then reveals himself to his brethren according to the flesh, and they mourn, &c.
4. Bro. Thomas agrees with us that the general gathering of Israel, &c., will not be perfected until after the advent, but thinks it will be sufficiently commenced previous to that event, to have a colony of Israelites in Jerusalem and Palestine when the Lord shall come; 'two-thirds' of which (the people in the country) will be cut off—and the city will be taken, &c., by the invading army of Russia, and at this time of sore trouble of the Jewish colony, the Lord will come to their deliverance, and to the destruction of the army of Gog. At this crisis Gentile times will terminate, and the 'times of restitution' begin.

We will, when we shall have time to do so, compare these views more thoroughly if possible, than we hitherto have done, with the sure word of prophecy, and endeavour to follow its light wherever it may lead us, for every other way is dark, and ends in disappointment. We would not be too sanguine on these great matters, which are yet in the future. We may be mistaken, and Bro. Thomas in the right, on certain points, and vice versa; or both may be incorrect in some respects, and the truth may lie between us. The order of events may stand thus:

1. The advent of Christ into the atmospheric heavens.
2. The resurrection of the righteous, who with the living saints, will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air.
3. The gathering of Israel to their own land, &c.
4. The indignation of the Lord, or vials of wrath on his enemies, while his saints are secure with the Lord in their 'chambers.'
5. The gathering of the army of Gog on the mountains of Israel, by which Jerusalem will be taken, sacked, &c., two-thirds of the inhabitants of the land be cut off, as predicted in Zechariah 13 & 14.
6. At this time of trouble of Israel, the Lord with all his saints, (who were caught up to meet him in the air, at his first manifestation) will descend to Mount Olivet, destroy the hosts of Gog and deliver Israel, who will then acknowledge him to be their Messiah, and mourn on account of their sins, &c.

Let us candidly compare these different views with the revealed word, with a child like disposition, willing to receive the truth, however much it may cross our most dearly cherished opinions, and the true light on these important matters will so shine upon the eye of our understanding as to enable us, beyond all doubt, to decide which is the right way.'

#### COMMENTS.

It will be seen from the above that our friend of the A. H. does not expect the battle of Armageddon to be fought at the appearing of the Lord of Hosts; but subsequently to that event, and 'the gathering of Israel to their Messiah at Jerusalem.' His difficulty in the case, I think, may be referred to his regarding the phrase 'the battle of Armageddon' as a single fight, instead of a series of bloody campaigns. The apocalyptic words are *eis ton polemon tes heemeras ekeines tes megalees ton Theou tou pantokratoros*, that is, 'unto the war of that great day of the almighty God'—Revelation 16: 14, 10. The kings of the Roman territory are

gathered by the agency of the Frog like spirits, not to a mached or pitched battle, but to a polemos or war; and this war is styled 'the war of Armageddon,' because the symbolic angel of the sixth vial through the Frog-Spirits 'gathers them into the place (or country) called Hebraistically Armageddon.' The Armageddon war begins with the striking of Nebuchadnezzar's image on the clayey feet at the appearing of Christ; it continues during the comminuting of its fragments to dust; and ends with the utter destruction of the Powers which now rule the goat-nations of the earth. A war precedes the Armageddon war which is being prepared for the world by the ambition of Napoleon. This Napoleon war will ultimate in the gathering of all the goat-nations' armies against Jerusalem under the Russo-Assyrian Gog, who will take possession of the city, as predicted by Zechariah—Zechariah 14: 1-2. Thus the crisis is formed which necessitates the coming of Michael, or Jesus, to deliver Daniel's countrymen and their city, which deliverance of the city begins the Armageddon war, which is Christ's and his Saints' war against Israel's foes. During this war the work of Israel's restoration under Elijah as Christ's forerunner to the Ten Tribes, progresses to its consummation—a work which will have been accomplished when peace is granted to the world.

The sacking of Jerusalem after the Lord's appearing in the air, the fifth thing in the order of our friend's theory, cannot by any means be admitted. The enemy will be in the possession of the city when the Lord appears. He comes to drive him out. But to permit him to sack the city in his very presence, would be to inflict a discomfiture on Israel's king, which would fill the hearts of his followers with dismay.

In reasoning upon all these events it must not be forgotten, that Jesus is to be 'a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to both the Houses of Israel'—Isaiah 8: 14. This has been fulfilled in relation to the House of Judah; but as yet he has never been so to the Ten Tribes. Scope must therefore be afforded for this work; so that any theory that leaves it unprovided for must be defective in some important element of interpretation.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

#### REMOVAL TO NEW YORK CITY.

This number closes our engagement with our subscribers for 1852; yet renewable, we trust, from year to year until the king of Israel comes to his own in power and great glory; when the instruction and warning of the press will be required of us no more; and we shall exchange the pen for the two edged sword of judgment—Psalm 149: 6; Daniel 7: 22, when 'judgment shall be given to the Saints of the Most High.'

Circumstances beyond our control, (through which, we take it, God gives expression to his providence concerning us) render it expedient that we transfer the publication of the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come from Richmond to New York City. Whether the move will be for the better, we cannot say. We are not hypersanguine, seeing that the fortunes off the truth will not be materially benefited until 'the time comes for the Saints to possess the kingdom.' There will be there, however, more ample scope for our well meant endeavours. In Richmond, we have been long convinced, there is none; and have therefore ceased for years to make it other than a place of publication, our post office, and a sort of caravanserai abode. We spend, however, necessarily many Lord's days in the year in one place, being detained there writing, and superintending the Herald. These days require to be more profitably employed

than they can be here in the nature of things. We have advised with our friends in Eastern Virginia and elsewhere on this subject; and though they express regret at our removal farther off, yet considering the cheap and rapid facilities for locomotion, they say they doubt not the change will be for the better in every respect. We hope it will. Here there are only 16,000 whites out of a population of 32,000 to operate upon. These are subdivided into papists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, universalists, Campbellites, politicians indifferent to all sects and principles, and 'the baser sort,' styled by Jesus, 'dogs and swine.' In New York there are all these in proportionately greater numbers; but then there are more abounding 'odds and ends,' who believe that truth is more precious than gold and popularity, and who are willing in a Berean spirit to 'search and see.'—The population of New York and its suburbs is over half a million, with great facilities for divergence to all points of the compass. The Jews also are concentrated there in considerable numbers; and printing is cheaper than in this city. The field presenting these attractions is not to be neglected. Its cultivation is worth a trial, we have therefore concluded to go, and sow 'the word of the Kingdom' in hope of some fruit springing up to everlasting life. By this change, however, expenses will be considerably increased. We trust, therefore, that the friends of the Herald, both in America and Britain, who profess themselves to be under great obligation to Elpis Israel, for the knowledge they have obtained of the 'great salvation,' will redouble their diligence in its behalf; and remember that the press cannot be kept in operation without money to pay the expenses of the work. The friends of truth are few, and fewer still the friends who believe and love 'the truth.' It is necessary therefore for them to do more, to devise more liberal things, and that spontaneously as cheerful contributors, than if their numbers were of a large amount. —We are reproached by the Adversary because we are few, as if that were an evidence against the truth of the things we plead! We accept the reproach, and follow Jesus, who is 'the truth,' without the camp forsaken of all his friends. He died for that truth, and maintained it by his single testimony. We are not yet reduced to one; but are hundreds. Will it not be to our eternal disgrace, if we allow our public testimony in the face of the scoffing world to be suppressed for the want of funds, seeing that many of us have enough and plenty to spare? Let not this be our reproach, whatever else may come. Let us all put our shoulder to the wheel with cheerfulness. The truth has nothing to fear from the enemy. Let its friends be true, and it defies the world.

To New York, then, we remove after the issue of the present number. Our correspondents after its receipt are therefore respectfully requested to direct their letters and papers for us to the care of Mr. Stacy, 234 Wooster Street, N. Y., until further notice. The January number will be issued thence; and when received will be a hint, tendered in the most respectful manner possible, that the season has returned for sending on subscriptions in advance according to the usual terms.

EDITOR.

Subscribers in Britain and the Provinces will receive their papers for 1853, when their names are forwarded to us by Mr. R. Robertson, 89 Grange Road, Bermondsey, London; and by our other agents, according to our 'Timely Notice' on page 215.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## “THE LOVER OF ZION.”

The Lover of Zion is the title of a paper just issued at Hartford, Connecticut, by Henry Heyes, at 50 cents per 12 numbers, payable in advance. The word ‘Zion’ in the above title is not used by the editor in the sectarian sense, for a gentile denomination of religionists who fancy themselves to be the church of God; but in its genuine import as the name of ‘the city where David dwelt,’ and where Jehovah has decreed—Psalm 2: 6-9—the Son of David shall reign as his King over Israel and the Nations for a thousand years.

The number before us, which is the first number, abounds in intelligence from the Holy Land, and goes to establish the fact, that that highly interesting country is being colonised; an event which no one can be indifferent to who believes ‘the Gospel of the Kingdom.’ The way is preparing for the return of the kings of the east to the land promised to Abraham and Christ for an everlasting possession. The Lover of Zion, we presume, will glean all the information available upon this subject, that his readers may see how events are striding onwards to the political resurrection of the great nation of the east; which, under the Lord of hosts and his associate kings, as his sharp two-edged sword will smite the nations, and overturn the kingdoms of the world. But we will let the editor state his object in his own words:

‘Our object in publishing the lover of Zion is—to exhibit the true hope of the Christian Church; to maintain the literal principle of Bible interpretation; to set forth the bearing of passing events upon the near crisis of nations, and the certain and speedy advent of Messiah to take the throne of his father David, and to rule the world in righteousness; to urge the disciple of Christ by every meet consideration, to take heed that the day come not upon him unawares; to warn against the dangers of the present hour, especially the rapping spirit delusions, ‘clairvoyance’ and the soul-poisoning instructions often conveyed through ‘Phrenological’ lectures and publications; to expose and rebuke the sins of the age: in short, to testify to the Truth, according to our ability, wholly and thoroughly.’

The Lover of Zion is to be issued monthly. All remittances of money, letters and communications must be directed post-paid to Henry Heyes, Hartford, Connecticut.

We wish the editor all possible success in the accomplishment of the object proposed.  
EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## “CONTRAST BETWEEN PROTESTANTISM AND THE GOSPEL.”

This is the title of a pamphlet of 82 small duodecimo pages written by Mr. N. M. Catlin of Smith’s Basin, New York, and issued from the Advent Harbinger office, at Rochester, N. Y., by its editor, Mr. Joseph Marsh, who will furnish it at \$9 per hundred copies.

We have read it, and can commend it to our readers as setting forth the kingdom’s gospel in lively contrast with that incongruous affair current by the name of Protestantism—a thing which, while it protests against Popery, and is more favourable to civil and religious liberty than that hateful ‘Mystery of Iniquity,’ is equally gospel-nullifying in its traditions, and powerless for the salvation of the soul, and the redemption of the world.

In a letter accompanying the copy transmitted to us, Mr. Catlin says: 'It was your writings led me to the consideration of the subject, and which finally resulted in my totally repudiating protestant faith; in fact, so many ideas gathered from you were in my mind at the time I was writing 'The Contrast,' that I hesitated lest I might be guilty of plagiarism: and it was a query with me whether to give you credit by quotations, or otherwise. I finally determined to make my reference to the matter in the preface, and so save the cumbrance of quotations, especially as I had reason to believe you were not a sensitive man about small matters.' Our brother has well judged in this. So that the truth finds circulation we rejoice, even though stolen from our treasury without acknowledgment; still we would prefer to see it credited, that we may be able to note the result of our endeavour to illustrate it to the conviction of the public mind. —Bro. Catlin has satisfactorily acquitted himself of all discourtesy in the case in saying, 'I have been materially aided by the writings of Dr. Thomas, editor of the Herald of the Future Age.' Preface.

The author of *The Contrast* is evidently sound in the faith of the gospel, both in theory and in practice. The following extracts may afford some clue to his doctrine and position relative to the truth:

'It is evident, that to believe the gospel a man's faith must embrace the hope contained in 'the Word of the Truth of the Gospel.' In another form, he must believe the unfulfilled promises relating to the Kingdom of God; that believing he may 'wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.'

'And if a man would successfully preach the gospel, he must understand 'the things concerning the kingdom of God.'

'Now, reader, mark the contrast. Protestantism makes the belief of the doctrine of Christ crucified, and freedom from sin and perdition through his sacrifice, the standard of gospel faith. It knows nothing of the 'glad tidings' of the kingdom of which we speak, and have many things yet to say. We admit, that the man who believes the gospel, necessarily believes the things concerning the Lord Jesus; but one may believe these facts as taught by Protestantism, and yet be as ignorant of the doctrine of the kingdom of God as an uninstructed heathen, having his mind blinded by the popular belief of going up to heaven.' P. 49.

His relation to the kingdom's gospel appears from what follows:

'Let those that can afford it get along with a baptism into a false hope received before being enlightened in 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.' The writer, and many others have felt it a privilege to correct a mistake in this respect; and thus, as it were, exchange a bad title for one that reads in harmony with the divine plan. —It is right at any time to do right.' P. 82.

'Baptism into a false hope' is immersion into the hope of the soul's ascent to heaven at death there to inherit kingdoms beyond the skies. This is not only an unfounded, unscriptural, and false hope, but subversive also of the one true hope of the calling. It is 'another gospel,' for it is the hope that defines the character or nature of the gospel believed. A false hope makes a false gospel; for 'gospel' is glad tidings of or concerning a hope: if therefore the hope believed be a false hope, and therefore 'no hope,' its gospel is false, or in fact, no gospel at all. 'Baptism into a false hope' is consequently baptism

into a false gospel, which is equivalent to no baptism at all. This is Mr. Catlin's conclusion, and a perfectly logical and correct one it is. He could not afford to get along with such a baptism, and therefore corrected the mistake he made in submitting to it, by being immersed again into the 'one hope of the calling' to the kingdom and glory of God.

We are very much astonished at many good and honest people, who believe 'the gospel of the kingdom,' not being able to see into this matter. They have faith now, but they are so tenacious of the doings of their old 'piety' and sincerity, that they cannot see their insufficiency. Their cherished notion is, that belief of the truth after an immersion predicated upon ignorance of it, will amend all its defects. —This belief may not take possession of them until twenty or twenty five years after their immersion into a false hope; yet so enamoured are they of piety, sincerity, and dipping, that they will tell you that had they died in their ignorance of the kingdom's gospel they would have risen from the dead to inherit it! From this, it is clear, that 'the truth' is less esteemed by them than their piety, sincerity, and immersion into a false hope. Surely, they must possess some talisman, or charm, or open-sesame, some private interest in the king's court, by which they can gain admission into the kingdom upon other terms than those granted to the apostles and their contemporaries! Mr. Catlin cannot afford to get along through this world on such a presumption. He is wise to make his calling and election sure, and to leave nothing to a mere hypothesis. He has done right in being baptised into the true hope, and so putting off his false one. —Scripture and reason say, 'Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,' and then the addition of the 'all things' shall follow. But the fashion is to invert the king's order, and seek first God's righteousness and then his kingdom; not understanding that 'the righteousness of God' is accessible only to those who believe the word of the kingdom; and without that righteousness no flesh living can be saved. We therefore congratulate Mr. Catlin and all others who have purged out the old leaven, and become a new lump. First believe the gospel of the kingdom, and then obey it. This is the order laid down by Jehovah's king; for it is the belief of that gospel that justifies the immersed, and not immersion into piety and misbelief.

Let those, however, who have 'become obedient to the faith' remember that baptism into the one hope of the calling to the kingdom and glory promised, is but the first step to immortality. Henceforth they serve mammon at the peril of their lives. Friendship with the world places them in hostility to God. The kingdom is for those only who illustrate their faith and perfect it by their works; for while the great father of the faithful's belief of the gospel was counted to him for righteousness or remission of past sins, his faith was made perfect afterwards by his works; so that 'Ye see how that by works man is justified, and not by faith only'—James 2: 20-26. It is these postbaptismal works by which the saints are justified. Sinners are justified from all their past sins, and become heirs of God, by an intelligent belief of the gospel of the kingdom counted to them for righteousness in the act of immersion into the Holy Name. Thus they become saints, and dependent upon a patient continuance in well doing, through evil and good report, for acceptance and exaltation in the Day of Christ. The way, therefore, to the kingdom is plain, though beset with suffering, difficulties, and trials. It is a very unfrequented path; still there are a few wayfarers there. They like company, and therefore put themselves to some trouble and expense to obtain it. This is their mission in the world till Israel's king appears. The straight gate will then be closed; and the glory and honour, the incorruptibility and life, of the kingdom, will be inaccessible to the sons of man for a thousand years. Their principle is to 'work while it is called today.' It is the duty of them all to work, for 'he that will not work, shall not eat.' They must all therefore work in some way. He that can neither write nor speak in behalf of the faith must enable those to do it who can. And it must be done cheerfully too; for 'the Lord loves a cheerful giver:' and what is

done, must be done as to the Lord, and not to man. It is the Lord's truth, and the Lord's people must sustain it; or be condemned for covetousness, and consequent exclusion from his kingdom. —'Buy the truth,' then, 'and sell it not;' that is, don't part with it for any present advantage; and do your utmost to disseminate it, for by so doing, you prove that were He in your midst who has styled himself 'THE TRUTH,' you would be indeed devoted to his cause. But he who in Christ's absence leaves the truth to eke out a feeble, lingering, existence, would leave Him to pine away in a common gaol without relief.

Bro. Catlin's brochure is one of the few things issuing from the press that we can commend to the patronage of our readers. The copy sent to us is a defective one, being deficient of sixteen pages; but judging from the sixty six we have read, we feel able to trust him for the goodness of the rest. It is his testimony for the gospel of the kingdom. Let those who have the means give it a circulation; and however, extensively they may do it, after they have done all, let them say from the heart, 'O Lord, we are unprofitable servants!'

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

### THE ADVENT AND THE VIALS.

I see it stated in the Advent Harbinger of October 30, over the signature of 'J. B. C.,' that 'many fix on the event at the Fifth Vial as the Advent—I refer to Dr. Thomas and others.' If by this is to be understood that I refer the appearing of the Lord Jesus to the opening of the fifth vial, I would say that the supposition is altogether erroneous. I consider the third, fourth, and fifth vials as being poured out through the agency of the French under Napoleon 1. The throne and kingdom of the Two-Horned Beast were the Germano-Papal, which suffered so severely that for several years previous to the battle of Waterloo, this dominion, styled the Holy Roman Empire, was darkened; and its dignitaries, spiritual and temporal, the blasphemers of God and his saints, truly 'gnawed their tongues for pain,' but 'repented not for their deeds.'

Between the fifth and sixth vials was an interval of six years; that is, from Napoleon's last battle to the breaking out of the Greek revolution, which ultimated in bringing out the ninth horn of the Ten Horned Beast. This sixth vial has been emptying its contents upon the Ottoman dominion from that time to this; and will continue to do so until it is blotted out from the dynasties of nations. The Seventh Vial began to pour out in 1830, and was marked by the fall of the elder branch of the Bourbons, and the establishment of Belgium as the tenth horn of 'the Scarlet Coloured Beast.' I consider the Sixth as the vial of judgment or wrath upon the eastern Roman territory; and the Seventh, that on the western. They have been dropping upon these two divisions of the prophetic earth collaterally since 1830; and will so continue to do until the East and West coalesce into the dominion represented by Nebuchadnezzar's Image, when the Seventh vial affects the whole territory indiscriminately till the crowning victory of the Faithful and True One over 'the kings of the earth, and their armies,' by which the wrath of God is stayed against the nations.

The mission of the Frog Power headed up in the embryo emperor of the French, is to commingle the streams of these two vials that the manifestation of Nebuchadnezzar's Image may result. They are the last vial, or wrathful periods of the Seventh Trumpet, which is subdivided into seven such. That is, when the First Vial commenced, the Seventh and Last Trumpet began to sound; and when the Seventh vial shall be exhausted, the sounding of the

trumpet will cease: so that from 1793 to the conquest of the kings by Him 'who doth judge and make war in righteousness' are 'the days of the voice of the seventh angel—holan mellee salpidzein—when he shall sound (not 'begin to sound,' as in the English version) in which the mystery of God is finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.' In these days, not in the Fifth Period of them, however, nor at the beginning of the Sixth, but when the Sixth and Seventh have commingled, and Gog, the Russo-Assyrian Head of Nebuchadnezzar's Image, shall be in possession of the Holy City, will the Advent, or appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ in his kingdom, become manifest to the armies of the Goat-nations encamped upon the mountains of Israel's land. His power indicative of his presence will be manifested in the plagues of their overthrow. Only one sixth part shall escape to proclaim their, to them, unaccountable discomfiture; while the third part of the Jewish residents in the land (all that remain of the colonists now beginning to settle the country in hope of a speedy national restoration) will rejoice in the Deliverer, saying, 'Blessed be He that cometh in the name of the Lord.'

I shall esteem it a favour if my friend of the Advent Harbinger will insert this correction in his paper. What 'others' may say of the synchronousness of the Advent and Fifth Vial, may be as brother 'J. B. C.' affirms; it is not so, however, as to my view of the matter. Though the Fifth Vial's effects are still felt, it has a long time since ceased to flow, and Christ has not yet appeared. He stands, however, 'knocking at the door,' saying to the children of light, 'Behold I come as a thief,' open unto me; 'Blessed is he that watcheth and keeps his garments.' The working of the Frog-Power is the loud-sounding reverberation of the Sixth Vial period indicative of the manifestation of Israel's King in the Seventh. 'Keep your garments,' then, if you have on the garments of salvation; if not, O Reader, delay not to divest yourself of your 'filthy rags' by not only 'believing the things of the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ,' but by obeying that kingdom's gospel, that oil may be found in your lamp when the cry is heard 'Go ye out to meet him!' Make ready, then, for 'the time is at hand.'

EDITOR.

November 8<sup>th</sup>, 1852.

\* \* \*

ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.  
CANADA ASLEEP.

Dear Sir:

Having made up a small subscription list for a dozen copies of Elpis Israel, I hasten to send it to you. The parties belong to nearly all denominations in this place.

The people of Canada generally, that is, so far as I have observed them, are very much priest-ridden. Their whole time is consumed in gathering wealth; and they seem to think that it pays them better to get their thinking done by the minister. —The ‘disciples’ are much under Bethany influence, and many of them cold as icicles—they have all much need to be aroused from their lethargy. I had some thought of sending a copy of Elpis Israel for the view to the editor of the----- ----, \* the most popular reform journal in Canada West. He is a ‘disciple,’ and professes to be very liberal; perhaps he might give it a candid reading.

Yours, very truly,  
G. L. SCOTT.

Paris, C. W., July 3, 1852.

\* We suppress the name of the paper, as ‘Bethany influence’ might be exerted upon its editor, as that of Bar-Jesus the sorcerer on Sergius Paulus, to turn him away from a candid examination of the faith; or indeed, to prevent an examination of Elpis Israel at all. —Editor.

\* \* \*

ELPIS ISRAEL A PIONEER.

Dear Brother:

I consider Elpis Israel to be the most valuable book, except the Bible, I have ever read. It has been instrumental in removing many difficulties that laid in the way of my understanding many portions of the scriptures, especially the prophecies.

It would afford me much pleasure to see you, and to have your company at my house; if you ever find it convenient, be sure and call on me. I pray that the good Lord may preserve you in body and mind unto his appearing in His kingdom and glory; and that you may be instrumental in his hand of accomplishing much good, that may redound to the glory and honour of his great name.

In hope of the Kingdom and Age to Come, I remain very respectfully yours,  
NELSON WALTON.

Louisa, Virginia.

\* \* \*

I’LL READ AND JUDGE FOR MYSELF.

Dear Brother:

When I commenced reading the Millennial Harbinger, &c., some of my Baptist brethren told me, if I wanted to be bitten with the frost of infidelity to continue reading A. Campbell’s writings. I have continued to do so to the present time, and I am inclined to believe I have been greatly benefited. I am now told that the Herald is a paper of the like kind

by brother Campbell and his friends. I mean such a paper as the Baptists used to tell me his was. When I read his, I had to read and judge for myself. I am only doing so by yours. I am now an old man, and have behaved myself tolerably well. I hope yet to be a worthy man and a christian; and so far as I may gain information, I am willing to impart it to others; and I hope you and brother Campbell will indulge me in reading what each of you write; and that so long as I behave well, you will give me credit for so doing; and if I should understand somethings different from both of you, I hope I shall not be less worthy. I have always been sorry that you and he have differed so much, and that such hard feelings have been indulged in, as it seems to me, by both of you. Now it may seem strange that while you and he love each other so little, that I should love both of you; I fear, however, sometimes lest some day I may lose the love of both of you, because I love you both. But, be it so—I want to do right; and I have no good reason for not highly esteeming you both.

I remain yours in the Redeemer,  
MATTHEW W. WEBBER.  
Shelby, Tennessee.

Our good friend was a young man when he began to read Mr. C's writings, and he has read them till he has become old. If he had read them exclusively, however, it is much to be feared, from thousands of cases extant, that he would not now in his senility have much love or esteem for us or our works. He sees that we are not what our opponents evilly represent us to be; therefore, being of an honest and good heart, he cannot hate us as they do. But, however much he may love them, he may depend upon it they entertain no real love for him after avowing his love for us. The world hated the apostles because it hated their Lord. And so it is now. Men hate the champions of the faith, and all that sympathise with them, because they hate the truth. —Mr. C. hates what we contend for, that is, 'the gospel of the kingdom,' and does all in his feebleness he can to destroy it. Because he hates the gospel of the kingdom and its principles, he hates us; and would crucify us tomorrow if he could, as the Sin-power crucified 'the truth,' when it nailed the King of Israel to the cross. —Nevertheless, our friend does well to love him, in the sense of loving his enemies. —We love him in this sense likewise; and therefore do all in our power to convince him of his errors, and to 'turn him from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.' This we conceive is the best way possible of proving our love to our greatest enemy. This love, however, he has never reciprocated; but leaves us to perish without the least effort to snatch us as a brand from the eternal burnings in which he believes! We believe that the truth is so intelligibly exhibited in the Herald, that 'the ordained to eternal life' may easily come to the comprehension of it. Not knowing whether he be of that number or not, we send it to him, that running he may read it. It is to be supposed, that he thinks the truth is more intelligibly set forth in the Millennial Harbinger than in the Herald, where he would deny that it can be found at all. But, alas for his philopsychy, he leaves our 'never dying, immortal soul' in hopeless ignorance, refusing to send his paper in exchange for ours. This editorial discourtesy of his, though a small affair in itself, shows that his spirit is not so loving towards us as ours is to him. We desire his salvation, and therefore treat him as we do. We pry not into his private affairs or relations. This is the function of lewd fellows of the baser sort; with us the domestic economies of our adversaries are tabooed. We care not, nor inquire about them and their parents, their wives, their children, their debts, and their profits. In argument, these things are no concern of ours. If they killed their parents, divorced their wives, starved their children, and cheated their creditors, the truth or falsity of their opinions would not be at all affected thereby. We inquire what is said, not who says it. We war against the thing; not against the person; but so long as the latter sticks to the thing, he becomes an Agag against the truth, and must be hewed in pieces. —There is no help for it. There is no mercy for the truth's enemies until they sue for

quarter, which will readily and lovingly be granted when they confess and yield obedience to the faith.

Our worthy friend in Shelby ought not to be sorry for the difference that has developed itself between us and Mr. C. —That difference has been the means of elaborating ‘the gospel of the kingdom,’ which could only have been brought out by the kind of warfare that has prevailed between us. ‘Hard feelings’ are inseparable from war of every kind. The war has been carried on by our opponents in a cowardly and dishonourable manner. Sin always fights in this way. We have protested against it, but to no purpose. We have felt hard while suffering Sin’s injustice and malevolence; and have done the best we could under the circumstances to show up the enemy in his true colours, and to expose the sophistry and shallowness of his pretences. We have put him to silence as far as argument and testimony go; though he still occasionally gnashes his teeth and growls in wrath against us. His feelings no doubt are hard, very hard. But we can’t help that. It is the fate of the mortally wounded. Truth and Error have had a battle, a series of combats. —Truth, though crushed to earth, and over and over again declared to be dead, has risen again; and Error is dying amidst its worshippers. Can these things be, and ‘hard feelings’ have no place? The gospel of the kingdom stands strong in the name of the Lord; while Immortal Soulism, Sky-kingdomism, and Spirit-worldism, have received a deadly wound, and their advocates cut up hip and thigh. If our beloved friend; love the combatants on both sides, what ground does he himself occupy? Suppose the controversy had to be decided by vote, and the casting vote were with him, into which urn would he put the lot? We are glad he has resolved to read and judge for himself. We always rejoice in this; because truth must by this process be the gainer in some way. We shall never quarrel with him, or any other person, for pursuing this course. —Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest, if you would rejoice in the truth. It is only Sin that is opposed to investigation; for it is by ignorance he keeps his slaves in bondage. Our friend will never lose our regard by thinking independently, and judging for himself.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

“A WILD, CRAZY, VISIONARY.”

Dear Sir:

I forget whether I paid up last year’s subscription, or not. Please inform me, for I want to keep even with my dues, if possible, though I hardly have money enough to defray the necessary expenses of my family. Yet I want your Herald, and will pay for it, if nothing prevents. —I commenced my subscription during your absence in England and the Continent, merely as a trial; thinking, very probably, you were but a wild, crazy, visionary, the depths of whose imagination I had a great desire to fathom. Hence, I have continued my subscription to the present time. But please to accept my confession. There was ‘more in your philosophy than I dreamed of’ in mine. Hence with much gratitude, and with great pleasure, I remain your subscriber still, if you will accept me; and also yours very truly in this glorious Hope,

J. J. D.

Batavia, N. Y., March 26, 1852.

We insert the above as an example of honesty, due appreciation of the truth, and nobleness of mind and disposition. Surely brother D. is, a man of ‘honest and good heart.’ Would that all who regard us as ‘wild, crazy, and visionary,’ would do likewise! They would, we doubt not, benefit themselves greatly by the effort. —They would perhaps find, as he has

done, that we are ‘not mad, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness,’ and that the wild, crazy, and visionary, mentality is on the side of our traducers. What can be more wild and visionary than immortal-soulism in all its principles and details! —What more truthful, reasonable, and demonstrative, than ‘the gospel of the kingdom,’ and all its consequents! This is ‘the wisdom of God in a mystery;’ that, the merest foolish thinking of proud, conceited, ignorance—the foolishness on which is based all the superstition of this evil world.

We thankfully accept brother D., and all like him. A paper sustained by such subscribers would have no valuable space consumed in dunning; and no cause of complaint against ‘patrons,’ who read, approve, and pay postage, but nothing more!

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

CANDOR.

Adaline, Illinois, October 25, 1852.

Doctor Thomas,

Dear Sir: —Enclosed you will find five dollars which you will apply on my subscription to the ‘Herald.’ This is all that I have paid you with the exception of one dollar and fifty cents for the first volume of the ‘Herald of the Future Age.’ The balance due you I shall send you this winter, and sooner than the ‘Herald’ shall be discontinued, I will give at least ten dollars a year towards its support. The cause of my delinquency has not been my not being able to pay, for I am abundantly able; but the fact is, I never took much interest in the matter; I merely received your paper, paid the postage, and skimmed over the contents, and filed them away, until within the last year I began to study them a little, (I have each number of each volume since 1844.) and I begin to see, as far as I understand, that you have been advocating the truth, and that truth appears to be your whole aim; not what this man believes, or that man holds forth; but what do Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, teach. You are the only man that I know of who is devoting his whole time and energies to spread God’s truth through this benighted, bewildered, and ignorant world. I notice when you get an idea from the Scriptures you give it as your knowledge of the matter; and if any person can produce a more scriptural one, you are ready and willing to receive it. Such is not the case with your opponents; they first get an idea from Plato, Calvin, or Wesley, then bend the Scriptures in support of it.

Go on in the good cause, truth is mighty and will prevail some day.  
Your sincere friend and well-wisher,

J. A. E.

\* \* \*

EUROPEAN PROSPECT.

Dear Sir:

Your article entitled the ‘European Prospect,’ in Vol. 1 page 223 is very interesting. I expect to get it inserted in one of our principal newspapers. I fear, however, we are all here, politically, so enthusiastic in our sympathy with the leaders off the democratic portion of the European world, that it will be difficult to get the public to believe that the cause of despotism

(alias the Czar) will ultimately triumph. —However, truth will be found to outlive all error. God in the end will not only be justified in his deeds, but in his words, or ‘sayings’ also; as it is written, ‘That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.’

Glasgow, Scotland.

\* \*

#### SHALL CONSTITUTIONALISM, DEMOCRACY, OR ABSOLUTISM, PREVAIL?

The universal public will not believe, nor is it expedient that it should. If the European public believed that the democracy would be eventually and finally defeated, it would not enter into combat with the enemy. In this event the purposes of God could not be carried out according to the plan he has devised and revealed in the Bible. The blindness and perverseness of the people and their leaders is a condition that guarantees the execution of his will. Would not the Socialists rather be content with things as they are in France, imperio-republican as it is, and despotic too, than seek to unfurl the banner of Red-republicanism as the national ensign, if they understood that the temporary triumph of their policy would ultimate in the annexation of France to the Autocrat’s domain? Why then seek to enlighten mankind on the destiny that awaits them? Eis martyrion autois ‘for a testimony to them’ who believe not, and for the salvation of the ‘few’ who have ears to hear, and hearts to understand. —We have nothing to do with consequences. The pleasant duty imposed upon ‘the wise’ is to ‘contend earnestly for the faith.’ There may still be some of Christ’s sheep among the people yet to be manifested. —The truth must therefore be forced upon public attention that all the members of his flock not yet separated from the goats may hear his voice, and be saved. For this cause, it is well to attack public foolishness in all its departments, and to show its subversiveness of the ‘testimony of God’ and ‘the faith of Jesus.’ It has been customary hitherto for men to confine their disputations to mere abstractions in theology, as though ‘the faith’ had nothing to do with the politics of the world. Hence the insipidity of theological disputes, and the careless indifference of the majority to their verity or falseness. Next to the worship of Mammon, speculations in politics are most absorbingly interesting to the people. ‘What’s the news?’ is the Athenian characteristic of the Nineteenth Century; so that newspapers are vastly more interesting to mankind than the Bible, which they regard as an unintelligible mystery about souls in fire and brimstone, or singing psalms beyond the skies! Now we should avail ourselves of this condition of things as far as practicable in order to attract public attention to the Gospel of the Kingdom. It is a great political as well as religious question—a key in fact to the right understanding and solution of all the movements of the age, and the consequences that must necessarily follow. We are glad that our friend intends to get ‘the European prospect’ before the news loving public in Glasgow. If we could afford it, we would purchase the right to a column in the most extensively circulated newspaper in New York, in which we would keep the politics of God’s Kingdom as opposed to popular political theories, and the political purposes of the world’s rulers, constantly before the public. But the parsimony of professors cripples all enterprise, so that the testimony can only be declared in a very limited degree. We cannot therefore do what we would, glad are we then when we find one here and there cooperating in this direction. Truth, like murder, will out at last, and then those who have laboured and made sacrifices in its interests will have reason to rejoice.

Absolutism will certainly triumph, and the propagandism of the leaders of the democracy in both worlds, will expedite the crisis. The scribe well instructed for the kingdom of heaven will desire all speedy success to their efforts, and the as speedy subjugation of the democracy of absolutism; not however because he loves despotism, but because he loves truth and righteousness, and sighs for its permanent establishment over the nations. But, is Russian

despotism a truthful and righteous incorporation? The very reverse. In its full manifestation it is 'the Dragon, the old Serpent, the surnamed Devil and the Satan'—Revelation 20: 2—a hideous tyranny, more terrible than any that hath yet calumniated the truth and played the adversary against all righteousness. But 'the wise who understand'—Daniel 12: 10 know that 'the kingdom,' which they pray 'may come' that 'God's will may be done upon the earth as it is in heaven,' cannot be established until that despotism—the absolutism of Gogue—Ezekiel 38—shall be revealed in all its magnitude and power; and, possessing the city of Jerusalem, shall prepare to grasp the sceptre of the farther land. Upon this ground it is, and upon this alone, they say, 'Down with the Democracy and success to Absolutism for a little time.' The amputation of a limb is a severe operation, but sometimes necessary to the life of the patient; even so the trouble coming upon this generation is terrible, but it is an element in the regeneration of society, and its future blessedness in Abraham and his Seed, that cannot be dispensed with: if therefore the cure off the world's maladies be 'a consummation devoutly to be wished,' in the same ratio is it desirable that Democracy and Absolutism should come to blows, and that the latter should prevail.

EDITOR.

March 1852.

\* \* \*

#### CLERICAL WRATH AGAINST ELPIS ISRAEL.

Halifax, N. S., November 1<sup>st</sup>., 1852.

Dear Sir:

It is with mingled feelings of pleasure and admiration that I now take the liberty of addressing you, and I hope you will pardon the same. I have purchased a copy of 'Elpis Israel,' and although I have received a scriptural baptism by being immersed for the remission of sins, and I trust, a believer in the faith once delivered unto the saints, I was very much in the dark respecting some off the most important portions of the law and testimony, especially the prophecies; but since I have perused your invaluable work I have received more perfect knowledge that way. I heard you every time you lectured in our city last autumn, and I rejoice at the news that we shall soon have the pleasure of hearing you again. Our Doctors of Modern Divinity are quite alarmed at the circulation of 'Elpis Israel;' one of them has anathematised the work, forbidding it to be read by his congregation; another has declared that it contains 'damnable doctrines.' My object for addressing you is to inform you that I have reduced your advice to practice, by making a whole burnt-offering of all my books of curious theological arts, creeds, and confessions, of my former faith. When Hogan quitted the church of Rome, he committed all his creeds, and confessions of faith, to a good warm hickory fire; I have done the same with mine to a good warm coal one. 'Elpis Israel' and 'the law and testimony' alone now constitute my library. The grand reason why our Doctors of Modern Divinity are so wrathful is, they are afraid their craft is in danger, the silver shrines being much more an object with them than 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' At the opening of Salem Chapel the Rev. Mr. Geikee informed his congregation, that the Church of Christ was made up of all the sectarian parties of the day, four excepted, which he enumerated as follows, viz: Roman Catholics, Universalists, Mormons, and Adventists. These, he said, could not be saved for the following reasons, viz: Roman Catholics were priest-ridden, their clergy would prevent them from coming to a knowledge of the truth. Secondly, Universalists, because hell was too warm a climate. Thirdly, Mormons, for they resided at too great a distance to be reached. Lastly, Adventists, because they entertain wrong views of the scriptures. This pretended successor to the faith of the Apostles, denies that which was their hope, joy, and

glory, and brands all with heresy, who now advocate these views, the second appearing of Christ and the re-establishment of David's throne and kingdom. But we do not allow the Rev. Mr. Geikee to be a judge in these matters, seeing that judgment belongs to the day of Christ, which is so rapidly approaching; and as he is connected with that branch of the Apostasy, styled Congregationalists, we leave him to that day, when there will be a howling among the false shepherds of the deceived flocks. If one doctrine stands forth more prominently than another in the scriptures, it is the clearly revealed second appearing of Christ our Lord from heaven, to rule the world in righteousness, and administer justice amongst the nations of the earth. It was this grand doctrine which made our forefathers in the faith endure the loss of all things, defy the tyrants' zeal and bigots' rage, and seal the testimony with their blood. What our Lord said of the Scribes of his day is perfectly applicable to the Doctors of ours, 'ye have made my Father's house a den of thieves.' It was this great truth which animated the apostle to the Gentiles in all his labours, sustained him in all his adversity, and inspired him with the most sublime hopes, and soothed him in his expiring hour. We would advise the Rev. gentleman to study more minutely the following text. 'Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation.' May we be followers of them who, through faith and patience, will yet inherit the promises. That you may be instrumental in adding many jewels to the crown of Christ, in the day of his appearing, is the sincere prayer of your brother; and may the Lord grant us all a glorious resurrection from among the dead, or a translation from among the living, according to whatever state we shall be found in at his coming, and an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Yours in the hope of the gospel, and the Lord's appearing and kingdom,

LUCAS.

\* \* \*

#### IMMORTAL-SOULISM AN EGYPTIAN SUPERSTITION.

The Egyptians conceded immortality to souls in general—this is evident, in part, from their mythology even. As among most other heathen nations, so also among the Egyptians, Polytheism originated chiefly from the notion, that meritorious persons are gifted with a divine principle, and that their soul, after its separation from the body, actually becomes endowed with divinity. So were Osiris and Isis, according to Plutarch, \* transformed only into gods out of good spirits. Herodotus calls the Egyptians the first who recognised the human soul as immortal # Egyptian superstition the parent of the dogma! Moses was well acquainted with the idea, being learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, yet he gives not the remotest hint concerning it from Genesis to the end of Deuteronomy. He had evidently no faith in it.

EDITOR.

---

\* Plut. De Isrd. Et Osir. Cap. xxix.

# Herod. Lib. ii. C. cxxiii.