

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. NEW YORK, March, 1854—
Volume 4—No. 3

“THE HOUSE OF TOGARMAH OF THE NORTH PARTS, AND ALL HIS HOSTS.”
BY THE EDITOR.

In the thirty-eighth chapter of Ezekiel is the celebrated prophecy of the Invisible One against the Great Power of the Latter Days, styled Gog, erez ham-Mahgog, nesi Rosh Meshech, we-Thuvahl; that is, Gog of the land of the Magog, Prince of Russia, Muscovy and Siberia. Having designated the Power by this title, repeating it—Ezekiel 38: 3—with the omission of erez ham-Mahgog to show that Gog is not the name of the land of the Magogians, or European Scythians, but indicative of the Agag * who shall be the Prince of all the Russias, particularised in the title contemporary with “the latter days”—the Spirit goes on to advertise the reader of the several races or peoples that shall compose his army and fight against Israel under his ensigns. They are ranged under certain principals, as “Persia, Khush, and Phut; Gomer and all his hosts; the House of Togarmah, parts of the north, and all his hosts.” Persia, Khush, and Phut, belong to the gold and silver parts of Nebuchadnezzar’s image; Gomer and his hosts to the iron and brass; and Magog, Rosh, Meshech, Thubal and Togarmah to the clay, and destined ere long to be commingled with Gomer and his hosts by a brittle union, soon to be preternaturally dissolved, after the illustration of iron not being permanently miscible with miry clay.

* AGAG I suspect is the ancient form of Gog, a word of the same class as Pharaoh, Shah, Czar, Emperor, Sultan, Autocrat, Khan, etc.; not the family name of a man, but the national title of him who is for the time being the enthroned chief of the state. Agag was the greatest of the powers of the time of Israel’s exode from Egypt, and their most inveterate enemy. He was related to them much as Gog will be at the crisis of their future exodus from the “Spiritual Egypt,” and their fate will be the same—utter obliteration from under heaven. Balaam’s prediction will then be fulfilled, saying of Israel, “His king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted.”—Numbers 24: 7.

Togarmah was son of Gomer, grandson of Japheth, and great grandson of Noah. There is but little said in the Scriptures about him or his descendants. The prophecy which was written in Babylon says, that his “house” occupies “parts of the north.” In a northerly direction, then, from the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, we must look for the territory occupied by Togarmah’s house. This bearing points us to all that country lying between the Caspian, Persia, Afghanistan, and the Chinese Empire, with Russian Siberia on the north, as the dwelling-place of Togarmah’s hosts. This region is called Tartaria, or Independent

Tartary; a human hive, from which have issued immense swarms of cavalry in ages past, that have swept over Asia to the gates of Constantinople and Vienna, like tornadoes from the east. Togarmah's country has always been celebrated for its numerous herds of horses and for its horsemen. In the days of Tyre's commercial prosperity, they of the house of Togarmah traded in its fairs with horses, and horsemen, and mules. Bochara, Khiva, Samarcand, etc., are principal cities of this Mongolian and Kirgesian region, or "Scythia within the Imaus," as the ancients used to style it. These are the tribes of the buckler, of the shield, of the bow, of the arrow, of the javelin, of the spear, the horse and the sword, so that these Tartar auxiliaries, added to the forces of the west, would constitute an army such as that described by Ezekiel, being "equipped with all sorts of armour," whose overthrow on the mountains of Israel would leave the land strewn with "the shields and the bucklers, the bows and the arrows, and the javelins and the spears"—Ezekiel 38: 4; 39: 9.

Having enumerated the races that are to be confederated under Gog as the clay-element of the Latter-day Image dominion, Adoni Jehovah addresses the Prince of all the Scythians, saying: "Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou and all thy multitude assembled unto thee, and be thou to them for a mishmahr, or guardian." It is evident from this, that before the invasion of the land of Israel by this power, the Dynastic Chief will pursue such a policy as will, in its full manifestation, bring these races to submit to him as their shepherd or sovereign director. The period during which he is working out this policy is the period of preparation indicated in the prophecy—a period thus foretold by the prophet Joel, saying, "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: beat your ploughshares into swords and your scythes into spears; let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves and come, all ye nations, and gather yourselves together round about." This is the war preparation preceding the actual invasion of Palestine and final investment of Jerusalem by the confederated hosts of the Autocrat, who is the waker-up of the nations to the war of the great day of God the Almighty.

The nations of the prophetic earth have evidently entered this period of preparation. As I have shown many years ago from the prophets, so it has come to pass, namely, that in the latter-day gathering of the hosts of the nations for their last struggle preceding the advent of Christ, Persia would side with Russia, British counsels losing all their influence there. Now, behold the verification of the interpretation, ye that say prophecy cannot be understood till after it be fulfilled. The news by the "Baltic," which sailed from England December 29, 1853, states that "accounts had been received from Vienna, that the Persians and Russians had opened a direct communication, and that the Russian General Yermiloff is to command the Persian forces. The overland Indian mail brings confirmation that the Shah of Persia had left Teheran with an army numbering 30,000 horsemen, with 1000 pieces of cannon, and 3000 camel-loads of ammunition, to cooperate with Russia. At latest accounts the army had passed Tabreez. The Shah had also sent an envoy to Dost Mahommed to point out the advantages of his siding with Persia and the Russians."

In relation to the tribes of Togarmah's house as confederates of the Czar, the same steamer brings the following information, which may be accepted as a sign of the times: "According to the Kolnische Zeitung, curious developments are coming to light which indicate that Russia has long been preparing for the present crisis. A large expedition has been secretly organising under pretence of a campaign against the Khan of Khiva. For fifteen years past, Russian agents have been busied in organising the Mongolian and Kirghesian hordes, supplying them with money and arms, and teaching them to act in concert. From this source it is asserted that Russia may obtain the aid of 200,000 irregulars, mostly horsemen, so that if

war does break out in earnest between Russia and the Western Powers, the war will rage along the entire line of Europe and Asia.”

The plot evidently thickens. The Autocrat is very successfully fulfilling his mission, and will ere long falsify all the vaticinations of that particular school of political prophets of which the London Peace Society and the Stock Exchange Moneycrats of all nations are the most far-seeing, “wise and prudent” examples! The Autocrat must fulfil the destiny marked out for him; and where he would seem unequal to an emergency, the blundering diplomacy of those who would keep him in check will be sure to help him. He is Gulliver in Lilliput, a perfect whale among the minnows. Habakkuk’s description of him is to the life. “He is a proud man,” says the prophet, “keeping not at home, who enlargeth his soul as the grave and as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all the nations, and heapeth unto him all the peoples: shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him, and say, ‘Ho to him that increaseth that which is not his! How long? to him that ladeth himself with thick clay!’” The “nations” and “peoples” are the “thick clay” with which he loads himself; and now is the time that this proud Lucifer has left his own home, or proper dominion, to begin the work of “the End” in loading himself with the guardianship of many Asiatic and European races. He has left his own home, and broken into the Sultan’s, like a robber. But this is only the beginning of his depredations; and the prophet says, “He cannot be satisfied.” The powers that be have therefore fearful times before them. A gigantic burglar has appeared among them, who is taking measures to break into their houses, and to spoil them of the populations by the sweat of whose faces they have their wealth. As a whirlwind from the north, he is preparing to sweep over many countries of the Gomerian race, and to overthrow them. In these conquests he will mix up the iron and the clay, and mould them into the Feet and Toes of the Image-dominion of the Latter-days. The Assyrian Colossus being complete, and being within forty years of the terminus of its existence, which terminus will be the end of the seven times, or 2520 years, destined to pass over the Assyrian Tree, it will march its forces into “the Glorious Land,” and plant its royal encampment between the seas before the holy mountain of glory. Behold it there, like Rabshakeh defying Israel at the wall of the Holy City, whose confidence will then be in the power possessed of Egypt, that is, the British. They may take up a parable and a taunting proverb against him, saying “How long?” etc.; but Anglo-Egypt cannot save them, for “the land of Egypt shall not escape” him. The Holy City with its shrines, which now stir up the fanaticism and covetousness of the Czar, will fall into his hands, and the vengeance of his fury will scatter death and violence in the land and city. Will not Israel then cry to heaven, saying, “How long, Lord? Wilt thou hide thyself for ever? Shall thy wrath burn like fire?” But Israel knoweth not the voices of their own prophets. They know not the oracle of the Lord addressed to their Assyrian spoiler of the latter days, indicating from whence his destruction and their deliverance shall proceed. Our “bones are dried and our hope is lost,” say they, “and we are cut off from our parts”—Ezekiel 37: 11. But help comes to them from “the right hand of power,” and from the dust of earth; for, says the prophet, addressing the Power laden with thick clay, or in other words, the thickly-laden clay power, “Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite thee, and awake that shall vex thee, and thou shalt be for booties unto them? Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee; because of men’s blood, and the violence of the Land, of the City and of all that dwell therein.” Christ from heaven and the resurrected saints shall be their deliverers.

* * *

REPENTANCE.

The following criticism is from the pen of our worthy friend, Silas E. Shepard, who I perceive, is advertised in the list of "Baptist Churches" in this city, published in the New York Chronicle of December 31, 1853, from which I copy it, as "Pastor," that is, Shepherd, of the "Disciples," which name being in the possessive case, signifies The Disciples' Baptist Church. Thus, the Campbellite church formerly of Green Street, but now of Seventeenth Street, is officially recognised as an orthodox Baptist church, and Dr. Shepard, being its pastor, as a feeder of sheep in a good and wholesome pasture, sufficiently well watered, and free from all noxious weeds that would be likely to endanger the flock or any sheep of other pastures that might happen to stray in thither.

Our friend has two articles in this number of The Chronicle, one on "Repentance," and the other on "Hades." I like that on Repentance better than the criticism on Hades. Yet I cannot accept all he says about repentance. He objects rightly enough to the theological definition of metanoia, which makes it "a godly sorrow for sin;" because Paul says, that "godly sorrow produces repentance," and cannot therefore be repentance itself.

He dissents also from the Campbells, who define repentance as reformation, because it is not in accordance with John, the supposed founder of the Baptist denomination, who said, "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance;" so that reformation, which is made up of the "fruits meet for," cannot be metanoia, or repentance.

Rejecting the orthodox and Campbellite views, he reveals his agreement with the Greek Lexicon, which defines metanoia as "a change of mind and purpose." Hence, he renders the saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," by "Change your minds, because the kingdom of the heavens is at hand."

Now, as the result of what had gone before concerning godly sorrow, repentance, and reformation, he tells the reader that "the metaphysical consanguinity of these words is this:—Godly sorrow is the parent of repentance, and repentance is the parent of reformation." Thus, repentance with Dr. Shepard is something between "godly sorrow" and "reformation." Therefore he asks, "What is this which lies between godly sorrow and reformation?" He then answers the question, saying, "It is an item of 'Christian experience'—a DETERMINATION to forsake sin and obey God. Repentance, or metanoia, has reference to the state of the mind or heart; and more particularly to the mind with regard to purpose or determination." All of which is quite in accordance with the Lexicon.

But Dr. Shepard's metaphysics do not satisfy my mind upon this subject. Godly sorrow, change of mind and purpose, and reformation-fruits, are all effects produced by some CAUSE operating upon the intellect and affections. That cause, which is one, the Doctor does not reveal to us. He says, indeed, that "John the Baptist had but one gospel for the righteous and the wicked, and that gospel required them all to change their minds." This makes John's preaching the commander of a change of mind, but not the cause of "godly sorrow" which works out metanoia, or change of mind and purpose; for John preached to the righteous, who needed not to be made the subjects of godly sorrow by the preaching. It is evident that my friend's "metaphysical consanguinity" is a metaphysical impossibility. He makes godly sorrow the parent of change of mind, instead of change of mind the parent of godly sorrow. It is contrary to the constitution of the human mind for a man to have sorrow of any kind unless his mind have been previously so affected as to change its view of things. So

long as a man believes he has done well, he has no sorrow; but convince him that his well-doing is really evil in God's sight—this change of mind, or view, it is that makes him sorry after a godly sort. Hence, my friend's consanguinities must suffer reverse, and he must acknowledge that he has mistaken a father for the son. His proposition, then, should be, Change of mind, or of views and feelings, begets godly sorrow, and godly sorrow begets repentance.

Incontrovertibly true. But what is the begetter of the whole family? Let Paul answer the question. Paul, then, what sayest thou? I say that "The goodness of God leadeth thee into repentance"—Romans 2: 4. But where is that goodness set forth? "In the word which is nigh thee—the word of faith which we preach." There can be no godly sorrow without faith in that word, for "without faith it is impossible to please God." The goodness of God, understood and believed Abrahamically, leads men into repentance. This is tantamount to saying that the understanding of the gospel, or word, of the kingdom—Matthew 13: 19, 23—leads men to repentance in the name of Jesus Christ—Acts 2: 38; that is, to a change of views and feelings, which results in their being immersed in his name, that being in him, their correct view of the truth may be counted to them for remission of sins, and their Abrahamic feelings, or disposition, be granted—Acts 11: 18—to them for repentance. When such a changed, or renewed, sinner is baptised into Christ, he is baptised "into repentance;" because repentance, as well as remission of sins, was to be preached "in his name"—Luke 24: 47.

Dr. Shepard says that the gospel John preached required all men to change their minds, as if it were in the power of men to change their minds in obedience to a command! You may as well tell a man to go and love a woman who has no attractions, or is positively disagreeable to him, and expect obedience, as to command a man to repent by virtue of that command. The feelings are not to be captivated in that way. All who come to God are drawn of him; for of his children it is testified, "They shall be all taught of God." "No man can come unto me," said Jesus, "except the Father who hath sent me draw him." It is by teaching that the Father draws men to Jesus; so that "every man that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Jesus"—John 6: 44-45. These principles reveal to us the truth, that it is God who "gives repentance" by leading men into it; as it is written, "Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth;" and every one that is begotten of him by that word comes to be baptised into Jesus for repentance in his name.

There is no gospel-repentance out of Christ. Repentance in his name is "repentance unto life;" while repentance out of his name is the sorrow of the world (the professing world) which works death. There is no repentance out of Christ, no remission of sins or justification out of Christ, no immortality out of Christ, there is nothing worth having out of him; and the only way of getting into him, is to believe with the heart the gospel of the kingdom unto righteousness, and to confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus unto salvation, and to be baptised into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. He that hath done this is "complete in him."

The order then of the "metaphysical consanguinities," as our friend styles them, presented to us in the Word, is, first, the Father, who is "THE WORD," by whom all things were made—John 1:1, 3; secondly, the Word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom which proceeds from Him, and is submitted to the human mind in the Bible; thirdly, the mind enlightened by its testimonies, and as a consequence its views and feelings changed or transformed into a harmony with the mind of God; fourthly, union to the name of Christ by immersion, in the act of which, styled by Peter "in the obeying of the truth," the views and

feelings assuredly believed and felt are counted to the sinner for repentance and remission of sins, or justification; fifthly, the fruits meet for or evidential of repentance, or of the dwelling of Christ in the heart by faith that works by love. There is no other order than this, harmonising, as it does, both with the Bible and the human mind, as God, the author of the Bible, has constituted it.

The “godly sorrow” which figures in theological systems, springs up like mushrooms after a shower of rain, as the result of pulpit excitation, which every one intelligent in the Word knows has little more to do with the Scriptures than the quotation of the text. God has no hand in producing it; for he leads sinners to repentance by a scriptural exhibition of his goodness, of that promised blessedness in store for the world through Abraham and his seed, and of what he hath already done through his Son Jesus as the earnest of the certainty of the fulfilment of what remains. The “repentance” excited by a camp-meeting or revival furore, or by exhibition of fabulous scenes in heaven, earth, or hell, has no affinity with that repentance which John and Jesus and the apostles were empowered to preach to sinners. They exhorted the people to come to the baptism of repentance, because the majesty of the heavens was nigh. They preached the gospel of the kingdom for seven years before the death of Jesus, to move them to a compliance with this exhortation. Judgment was denounced against the incorrigible, not to bring them to repentance, but because they put the gospel of the kingdom, and the claims of Jesus to its throne, away from them. “Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest: take my yoke upon you, for my yoke is easy, and my burden light.” This was the style of preaching to bring men to repentance, and the Lord’s sheep among the people responded to it; for he said, “My sheep hear my voice;” and again, “Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.” That voice, alas, is but little heard, and less heeded, now-a-days; and therefore, very few come to repentance because the kingdom or the majesty of the heavens is at the door.

But I have been farther led into this subject than I intended at this time. The subject, however, is very important, and but little understood. I hope the Doctor will look deeper into it than I perceive he has yet done. I cannot but think that he will consent to rearrange the “metaphysical consanguinities,” and favour the New York Chronicle public with a genealogy of a diviner nature, by which his theological protégés, “godly sorrow, repentance, and reformation,” may appear to have some relationship to the covenants of promise which pertain to Abraham and his seed. May repentance unto life be to the Doctor through a timely obedience to the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus. We would “crowd” him upon this point; for without it no man can see the Lord.

EDITOR.

* * *

OUR VISIT TO PRUSSIA AND GERMANY.

Precisely as the double-towered church of Arnheim struck six on Thursday morning, September 11, 1850, the Graf de Paris put on her steam, and we left the Dampfschiffahrt for the Upper Rhine. The river was low, so that we could not obtain as satisfactory a view of the country as if our deck had been on a level with the top of the banks. Enough, however, was visible to certify us that from Arnheim to Duisbourg, where we left the river for a time, (others say to Dusseldorp, 32 miles below Cologne,) the natural scenery is uninteresting and monotonous. Nothing strictly modern appears but the steamers. The towns on the lower Rhine

are old and apparently ruinous, and belong to an order of things shaking to its foundation, and soon to pass away, to paralyse the energies, and to mar the happiness of mankind, no more.

The Rhine is a river of great political importance. It rises on the east side of Mount St. Gothard, in the canton of Grisons, and forms the boundary between Switzerland, the Roman Helvetia, and Tyrol, the ancient Rhoetia, Vindelicia and Noricum in part. Afterwards it flows through the Lake of Constance, and divides a portion of Bavaria, the two Alsatian departments of France, and the Rhenish province of Prussia, from Germany. It then flows through the Netherlands, called the Pays Bas, where it divides into several branches, called Waal, Yssel, Lech, and Old Rhine, by which it empties itself into the German Ocean. For the student of prophecy it is interesting and important to know, that the Rhine was the north-east boundary between the Pagan Roman empire and Germany. Hence, as the Ten Toe-kingdoms were to be divisions of the Fourth Dominion represented to Daniel, which is the Roman, they must be sought for as existing in the latter days upon its territory. I say, in the latter days, or “time of the end,” because they belong to the Assyrian Image, which was representative of what shall be in the latter days—Daniel 2: 28; and because when Jehovah Shua (He who is powerful, i.e., JESUS) shall come, their kings will make war upon Him to their own destruction—Revelation 17: 14. A line running north-east from the right angle formed by the Rhine below the Lake of Constance, to Ratisbon, the Regina of the Romans, and Regensburg of the Bavarians; and from thence along the Danube to Carnuntum, called Altenburg, brings us to the south-west angle of the Roman province of Dacia, which comprehended Hungary, the Turkish principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, and the Russian province of Bessarabia to the Tyras or Dniester. This Dacia, but imperfectly subdued by the Romans, was divided from Sarmatia, or European Russia, by a part of the Carpathian Mountains, and the Dniester, which falls into the Black Sea. Thus the Rhine, the Danube, Carpathians, and the Dniester, divided the Roman nations in Europe from the Germanian and Sarmatian tribes of the land of Magog, comprehending the “Rosh, Mosc, and Tohl,” i.e., “all the Russias.”

About 9A.M. we arrived at Emmerich, a town of the Rhenish province of Prussia, on the right bank of the river, and close by the Netherlandish frontier, with rather important manufactures, and eight thousand inhabitants. A league from this place is the mountain of Ellenberg, celebrated by the Wells of Drusus, and the fine view from the summit, which commands all the surrounding countries. When we were made fast to the wharf, the custom-house officials boarded us, having first stationed one of their number with a drawn sword to keep the gangway. Many seemed troubled in spirit at the overhauling of their affaires. Much baggage, much trouble, vexation, and delay, in European travel; but we escaped all this, having condensed our wardrobes into the smallest possible dimensions. We were detained at Emmerich about two hours. The officers having dismissed us, we continued to ascend the Rhine to Duisbourg. Rees, Zanten, and Wesel, are the principal towns of interest between Emmerich and Duisbourg. Rees, on the right bank, has three thousand seven hundred inhabitants, who are largely engaged in agricultural business. Anciently it was noted for its fortress, and now for a Gothic church. Xanten is on the left bank—has three thousand two hundred inhabitants. Its environs are rich and picturesque, and its manufactures of cloth, cassimere, &c., flourishing. It is remarkable for its Gothic collegiate church, and Roman antiquities. Wesel, on the right bank, is a strongly fortified city at the junction of the Lippe with the Rhine. It has sixteen thousand inhabitants, numerous manufactures, and considerable commerce. Having arrived at the mouth of the Ruhr, about 4 P.M., we landed, and pursued our way on foot two miles and a half to Duisbourg on the Ruhr. This city has a population of eight thousand, with a large trade in coal, and is said to construct the best steamboats that float upon the Rhine. The Bahnhof, or station, on the road from Hanover to Dusseldorf, from

which we had to take the train is here. The cars came up at six, and we were soon on the way for Deutz, via the capital of the ancient duchy of Berg. We arrived here before dark. There was no time, however, to see the city. Soldiers abounded in every direction among the crowd, an evidence that the eyes of the government were watchful of the people. The Rhine is here fifty feet deep. The city contains twenty-eight thousand inhabitants, carries on a considerable trade, especially with Holland, has a great number of various and important manufactures, and is famed for its literary and artistic institutions. The chateau and garden of the Prince of Prussia are at Dusseldorf, being at present the capital of a governmental district of the same name.

It was quite dark when we arrived at Deutz, so that we could see nothing of the place. It is situated on the right bank of the Rhine, opposite to Cologne. It contains the Hotel de Bellevue, which is said to be the grandest establishment of the kind, with a fine garden, frequented of an evening by the distinguished beau monde of Cologne. Deutz is connected to Cologne, or Coln, as it is called in German, by a bridge of boats; this we crossed, and, with a sharpened appetite, made the best of our way to the Hotel der Dom, our quarters for the night.

Cologne is one of the most famous and ancient cities on the Rhine. It forms a grand semicircle of about two leagues and a half in circumference. The segment is turned towards the Rhine on a breadth of four thousand three hundred and eighty paces. The Baienthurm is the upper point, and the Thurmchen the lower. In the days of Constantine the Great, Cologne, then called Colonia Agrippina by the Romans, became the throne of one of his bishops named Maternus; and in 745 was raised to the dignity of an archbishopric. Heribert, its ecclesiastical prince, (997-1021,) was invested with electoral privileges, and, in the course of time, considerable dominions were acquired. Since 1263 the archiepiscopal electors resided usually in Bonn, on account of altercations with Cologne, which relied upon its privileges as an imperial city, and was not willing to be unconditionally subjected to the authority of the archbishop. In the period of 1577-83, Archbishop Guebhard, of Waldburg, turned Protestant, being, not convinced of its truth, but enamoured of the fair Countess, Agnes of Mansfeld, whom he married. The city is strongly fortified, and contains ninety-five thousand inhabitants, and two hundred and twenty-seven public edifices, of which twenty-five are churches, and eight chapels. It is the spring-head of the celebrated Eau de Cologne, and gives a name to many hogs-heads of earth's water that never mingled with the Rhine. Among the monuments of Gothic architecture, the Dom, or cathedral, stands preeminent. This was hard by our hotel, from which, as it was nearly opposite, we could view it at leisure. It is styled a "sublime edifice;" but for myself, I never saw a human fabric yet, whose aspect excited in my brain the idea or feeling of sublimity. Its association with the Papal superstition, which is my abhorrence, creates such strong feelings of another kind, that all rising sense of the sublime would be speedily smothered in the smoke of my burning indignation at the cathedral-craft which has so long enchained and brutalised the minds of men.

The cathedral of Cologne was founded in 1248, and since the days of the Lutheran reform, left unfinished, though at present the work is going on, and its completion intended; but the saying is, that "the world will come to an end before the purpose is accomplished." In the middle ages Cologne was a powerful and far-renowned commercial and manufacturing city, could array thirty thousand warriors, and had a population of more than one hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants; but now it is simply the largest city of Rhenish Prussia.

The weather being very pleasant, we were desirous of availing ourselves of it, for the purpose of "viewing the beauties of the Rhine," which begin to show themselves at Bonn.

Next morning, therefore, we left the little baggage we had in the care of our host, and without waiting for breakfast, we ticketed ourselves by rail for Bonn. Between Cologne and Bonn the Rhine is exceedingly serpentine, and presents nothing of sufficient interest to induce the traveller to incur the tediousness of the navigation. By rail we passed rapidly through a pleasant and well-cultivated country. Bonn, celebrated for its University, the former palace of the Electors of Cologne, at which Prince Albert received his education, is situated on the gentle slope of a hill, near the river, in view of superb mountains on the right bank of the “majestic Rhine.” Its population is estimated at eighteen thousand inhabitants. Its most interesting buildings are the University; the Cathedral; the new Church of St. Remi, formerly the church of the Minorites; the Hotel de Ville, commenced in 1737; the Hotel of the Direction of the Mines of Rhenish Prussia, formerly the property of the Elector, and the Theatre.

By 8 A.M. we were on board the Dampfschiff, or steamer, bound for Mayence, or Mainz, where “the beauties of the Rhine” are said to end. My attention was soon arrested by two curious-looking creatures, called “friars.” The shape of their heads indicated that they were animal and sensual; and their garb, that they were devilish. Their heads were all shaved and shorn, but the bare crown-scalp was covered by a silk skull-cap, which made up all the head-gear they rejoiced in. Their hair was coarse, like the dry, uncombed stubble of newly-fledged jail-birds. Their garb was a long black gown which covered the whole person, from the neck to the feet, encircled at the waist by a genteel imitation of a rope, a white silk tasselled cord, loosely tied in front. I do not say that this garb indicated that they were devilish, because their master, the Devil, wears such an one. Having no acquaintance with him, I cannot testify on this point. His worshippers say that he is black; in so far, then, as colour is a criterion of affinity, we may regard the relationship as established; but I do not argue the devilishness of these friars upon that ground. Their garb is a regimental of the odious Papacy, a system of knavery, superstition, falsehood, and foolery, such as the world never knew before, and never will again, after it shall have been terrifically destroyed by the enemy of all wickedness, the Mighty One from heaven. No one can wear the badge of this power as the doers of its will, and be pure of heart, and have clean hands. Men who serve a power that has risen in the world by the energy of Satan, “with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish,” can only be of devilish disposition. Their proximity was to me the nearness of serpents. Though protected from the machinations of their order by my nationality, and had therefore nothing to apprehend from them, still I felt a loathing which I could not forbear expressing to my companions in travel. But in matters ecclesiastical on the Continent, they seemed afraid of their own shadows. They declined conversing about friars even in English, so that I was left to my own reflections upon the magnitude of the evil which had cursed Europe for ages, and on the romantic chivalry of the men who, in the 16th century, confronted the whole power of the Papacy to diminish it, when to protest against it was to incur the certainty almost of imprisonment and torment, or death. How necessary it is, even where faith exists, to add to it courage! A faith without courage can never overcome the world; and they who fail in this conflict, can have no part in the kingdom of God—Revelation 21: 8.

Having partaken of a very refreshing breakfast below, we spent our time on deck, enjoying the castellated mountain scenery of the Rhine. Opposite to Bonn is the Siebengebirge. This name, signifying the Seven Hills, is bestowed upon a number of lofty peaks which extend from Honnef to Dollendorf, along the course of the river. The highest is the Loewenberg or Lion Mountain. It rises 1796 feet above the Rhine. The steepest is the Drachenfels, or Dragon-rock, which towers from the border of the river as a colossal wall,

with the ruins of an ancient burgh upon the summit. While the different charming points of view upon the seven mountains are being enjoyed, the tourist may also observe on the left bank the town of Godesberg, with the fine ruins of an old Roman fort. Above Godesberg, and half a league below Remagen, the pretty town of Unkel is situated in a picturesque country. From this a series of villages extends to the Siebengebirge. Opposite to Unkel is the famous little Unkelstein, formed by fragments of basalt, some of which being scattered in the river, render the navigation somewhat insecure. In the environs of Remagen are a great number of ancient Roman monuments; and some hundreds of paces behind the town is the mount of the Romish St. Apollinarius, whose head is said to be preserved in the ancient Gothic church. The view from the top of this mountain must be delightful.

Opposite to Linz is the embouchure of the Ahr, which crosses the highway from Coblenz to Bonn, a short distance below Sinzig, before it falls into the Rhine. The old Roman castle called Sentiacum occupied this position. The church of Sinzig is a pretty Gothic building, consisting entirely of tufa. There is a little chapel at this place, which contains a very remarkable natural mummy, which is preserved and venerated by the superstition of the town as the body of a saint named Vogt. Saints have, no doubt, been always very scarce in these parts; hence the supposed necessity of carefully conserving the head of one, and the toe of another, as “salt” to preserve them from being cast out and trodden under foot of men.

Fourteen miles below Coblenz we came abreast of Andernach, with its walls, and sullen and sombre towers. This very ancient town, known to very remote antiquity under the name of Antenacum, was a citadel on the Roman frontier. All its streets are narrow, angular, and gloomy; and all the houses, with few exceptions, small, sombre, low, and of a construction as ill as they are antique. Four miles above this fortress of the old Iron Monarchy, we came to Neuwied, the capital of the dependent principality or earldom of Wied. It extends itself in a smiling plain along the right bank of the Rhine. It contains about 6000 souls, and is distinguished by the great regularity of its position. The most beautiful building of this agreeable town is the chateau where the Prince resides. In the building of the pheasantry in the garden of the chateau there is a rich and interesting collection of natural objects collected by Prince Maximilian during his two years’ sojourn in Brazil. The two houses, known as the Bruder and Schwestern haus der Herrenhutter, (House of the Moravian Brothers and Sisters,) are said to deserve the attention of visitors.

Ten miles above Neuwied we arrived at the union of the “blue Moselle” with “Father Rhine.” On the triangle formed by these rivers at their junction, Coblenz is situated, fifty-four miles below Mayence. In the days of the Romans it was called Confluens, from which its present name is derived. It is a fortified city, and formerly the residence of the Elector-archbishop of Treves; and under the French it was the capital of the Department of the Rhine and Moselle. The latter is crossed by a beautiful Gothic bridge, reared in the middle of the fourteenth century, and thoroughly built of freestone; while a bridge of boats eleven hundred feet long across the Rhine connects the city with Ehrenbreitstein on the opposite bank, in the valley and at the base of the mountain of that name. Coblenz is at present the capital of the Rhenish province of Prussia. It contains 23,000 inhabitants, and is noted for various and important manufactures, considerable trade, several literary institutions, the former electoral palace, several remarkable ancient churches, and for its fortifications, among which ranks first the very strong fortress of Ehrenbreitstein, standing on a towering rock of considerable altitude. This strong place during the war of the revolution experienced all sorts of misfortunes. After the first passage of the Rhine in September, 1795, by the French, General Marceau blockaded it for a month. It experienced the same fate twice during the campaign of

1796. After the fall of Napoleon it was assigned to Prussia at the partition of Europe by the Powers. In 1816, its repair was commenced, and continued at great expenditure of means. The construction of the new works is remarkably solid, and excites the admiration of all who behold them.

Passing through a draw in the bridge of boats, we left Coblenz, which continued in sight, however, till we entered the bend of the river beyond the mouth of the Lahn. On the left of this river are seen the ruins of the ancient castle of Lahneck, reared in the beginning of the fourteenth century on the top of a mountain by the Electors of Mentz; and on the right bank near its mouth, the town of Niederlahnstein. On the left of the Lahn, and quite near the Rhine on its right bank, is Oberlahnstein, in the duchy of Nassau. Opposite to this place, or rather a little below it, is Capellen, a village leaning against a rock; and behind and above it are seen the ruins of Stolzenfels, a remarkable Gothic mountain castle, with many sculptures and Roman antiquities. Stolzenfels has been converted into a royal chateau by the King of Prussia, to whom it was presented by the city of Coblenz in 1825. It was here he entertained the Queen of England on her visit to the Rhine.

Above Oberlahnstein is the little town of Braubach in Nassau, which is noted for its strong castle of Marxburg, reared at an early period of the middle ages. It is the only fortress of that time in preservation upon the Rhine. It is in good condition, and worthy of examination as a specimen of the strongholds of a barbarous and iron age. The little town of Braubach at the foot of the mountain is very ancient, being named in a title-deed extant, dated A.D. 933. Several miles above this in Nassau is Bornhofen, having a convent considered fine. High up above a vine-plot are the ruins of Liebenstein and Sternberg Castles, or "The Brothers." Beyond these in the same duchy is Welmich, with its Gothic tower and picturesque environs. It was once overawed by the castle of Thurmberg, named also the Maus, of which only the ruins remain upon a lofty and precipitous rock. A short distance above this we came to St. Goarshausen, opposite the Prussian town of St. Goar, and twenty-seven miles west-north-west of Wiesbaden. Close by on a steep hill stands the ancient castle of Katz, which was reared in 1393, by John III, Earl of Katzenelnbogen, whose line became extinct in 1479. Below St. Goar the Rhine forms a lake surrounded by walls of rocks which contains excellent salmon. St. Goar owes its origin and its name to a hermit who, having established his cell in this place, applied himself to the instruction of the poor fishermen. St. Goar, which had already experienced great misfortunes in the Thirty Years' War, was more lately severely treated by the French. The Lutheran church, finished about 1465, contains many tombs of the Princes of Hesse, and fine paintings upon glass. The Popish church, where the image in stone of the hermit who founded it is seen, possesses some well-executed sculptures, which serve to sustain the superstition of its ignorant devotees.

After passing St. Goar, your attention is arrested by Lurleifelsen, a remarkable rock on the right bank. On the opposite side of the river, as tourists ascend the Rhine, they are saluted by the crack of a rifle fired for the sake of the echoes produced in this region of rocks. The shout of the passers-by is said to be repeated fifteen times by echo. The reverberations of the rifle were many, but how many I did not think to count. Tradition says, that this rock was inhabited formerly by one who by his cries allured navigators into the whirlpool. Lurleifelsen is the terminus of a very savage and imposing piece of Rhine scenery which begins below Oberwesel. Here the valley becomes narrow; the banks are uncultivated; on both sides, two walls of rocks rise up without soil or verdure from the water, and spread their dark shadows over the stream. The convulsions of nature must have been tremendous to rend a passage for the Rhine at this part of its course. A little below the Prussian town of Oberwesel are the

imposing ruins of the castle of Schonburg; and opposite to it the pretty little town of Caub in Nassau, of 1350 inhabitants, whose principal resources are the cultivation of the vine, and the navigation. The ruins upon the high mountain below Caub are those of the ancient fortress of Gutenfels. Opposite to Caub, upon an island of rocks in the Rhine nearer the left bank, is a massive structure of a somewhat singular form, called the Pfalz or Palatinate. This little castle was reared at an early period of the middle ages, and from the position near the channel, would seem to have been placed there to compel tribute of all that passed by. At a little distance it appears like a bastion having a principal tower in the midst, and at the angles several small ones. Above Bacharach on the left bank is the ruin of Stahlech. This castle was besieged in the Thirty Years' War, and taken eight times from 1620 to 1640, and at last destroyed. The Elector Charles Louis rebuilt it in 1666, but soon after in the war of Orleans it was ravaged again. On approaching the mouth of the Nahe river is a little island in the midst of the Rhine opposite to Ehrenfels, with a ruined tower upon it, well-known by the name of Mausethurm, or the Tower of Mice. A ridiculous legend relates that Hatto II., Archbishop of Mayence, was devoured there alive by mice. Before we arrived at this Mice Tower we passed the castle of Rheinstein on the left bank as you descend the river; which is the course in relation to which the banks are named "right and left." Rheinstein is a modern chateau with Gothic towers, recently built by Frederick Prince of Prussia. Above Mausethurm the Nahe river presents itself, crossed by a bridge which establishes a connection between the Rhenish province of Prussia and the Grand Duchy of Hesse Darmstadt. In the corner formed by the two rivers is situated the little town of Bingen, with 5000 inhabitants, opposite to Rudesheim, formerly fortified, and now celebrated for its excellent wine. On the right the steep mount of Rudesheim rises to the clouds, and there, where the river turns the mountain, the old castle of Ehrenfels appears projecting from the rocks. On the other side of Bingen is the Bingerloch, where the Rhine breaks upon a wall of rocks now rent asunder. It is said, and no doubt truly, from what is seen below, that the lover of the grand and picturesque will experience great delight if, conducted by a guide, he ascends the mountain called Niederwald, near to Rudesheim. On the way that winds across a forest, you arrive at first at a little round temple from which is obtained "a ravishing view upon the Rhine." In front is Bingen. The view from the temple resembles that from the height of Klopp, near Bingen; but that of Rossel is unique. Like the nest of a bird of prey, the ruins of the castle of Ehrenfels are set upon the rocks. At Rudesheim there are always to be found vehicles and donkeys for a convenient ascent to the summit of Niederwald. The forester who resides near the chateau has for several years past established a good restaurant, where all sorts of refreshments may be obtained—a very important consideration for all who in the flesh would ascend so high towards heaven.

Next above Rudesheim is Gersenheim, and then Lange Winkel, from whence the ascent of Johannisberg is commenced. The Johannisberg is very celebrated for the good wine and beautiful chateau of Prince Metternich, one of the most unpopular men in the world, because in high repute with the dynastic conspirators against the liberty and enlightenment of mankind. The magnificent castle of Johannisberg became his property in 1816. From Winkel to Bieberich there are about half a dozen towns and villages, all prettily situated on the right bank. This district along the Rhine, of which Eltville was the capital, is known as the Rheingau. From Rudesheim to Castel a little beyond Bieberich there are about twenty islands, which produce a picturesque effect. Everywhere from Bonn to Castel the cultivation of the vine seems to be the favourite pursuit. Opposite to Bingen the sides of the mountain are terraced with rock to increase its surface and to prevent the washing away of the soil. On these mountain terraces the vine is planted from base to summit. Great labour must have been expended upon these works. They are solid, and no doubt a source of great profit to the

growers of Rhenish wines. I could not but think, on viewing the natural sterility of the rocks, that German agriculturalists grow rich where Americans would starve.

Bieberich is the summer residence of the Duke of Nassau. Fronting upon the Rhine is a fine chateau in a beautiful garden, the property of the Duke. Bieberich is a market town, and contains 3,100 inhabitants. At this landing those of our fellow-voyagers bound for Wiesbaden, three and a half miles distant, (the capital of the duchy, highly renowned and very much frequented as a watering-place,) left us to take the rail which connects here by a short track with the Castel and Wiesbaden road. We proceeded about three miles farther up the river to Castel, a strongly-fortified town at the embouchure of the Mayne, and opposite to Mainz, with which it is connected by a bridge of boats 1666 feet long. Here we left the steamer before dark, after a very pleasant and interesting trip of ninety-seven miles from Bonn to Castel. At Castel we ticketed ourselves for "The Free City of Frankfurt," situated towards the centre of Germany, on the Mayne, about eighteen miles from its junction with the Rhine, surrounded by Hessian territories, and bordering on the duchy of Nassau. Arrived in this city, we followed the road from the station, not knowing exactly whither. We found ourselves at length in the Platz, in the vicinity of the Prussian guns, ready loaded for any emergency in these troublous times. Hard-by we found the Hotel de Paris and excellent quarters. I never ate a mutton-chop with mealy potatoes, overlaid with French bread, and the sweetest fresh butter and aromatic coffee, with such a relish before. This was our supper, prepared as French cooks only know how. In a reasonable time we retired to bed, where, in the heart of Germany, I wish the reader good-night "till we meet again."

* * *

From the New York Chronicle.

AEIDO—HADES.

"The derivation of this word, like all other words, becomes important only as it regards the reason of its original use or primeval application. The etymological meaning was its only meaning at first. Its usage must determine its meaning in after-times.

"It is derived from the Greek *a*, negative, signifying not, and *eido*, to see. Etymologically, therefore, it means an invisible place. In Pagan mythology it comprehends all the fabulous mansions of the dead. Among the Jews who used it, it signified the region allotted to the souls of men after the death of their bodies and prior to their resurrection. It is in this sense the Messiah and the apostles employ it. The word is not expressive of either a place of happiness or misery. The condition of its inhabitants is revealed by other words; for it is the region of all the departed, good and bad; and happiness and misery depend on the character of the beings themselves.

"It has been thought by some that it sometimes signifies the grave. After a careful examination of all the places of its occurrence in the New Testament, I am satisfied that in that volume it never has that signification. In Acts 2: 27 we read, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in the invisible state, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.' Here hades is regarded as the place, not of the body, which goes to corruption, but as the place of the soul. The body for the grave, the soul for hades till the resurrection."

S. E. SHEPARD.

* * *

HADES AND SHEOL FOR BODIES, DUST AND ASHES, NOT FOR GHOSTS.

I have been requested by one of Doctor Shepard's friends, and, while I pen this, a member of the flock he undertakes to feed in green pastures and to lead beside still waters, to examine the above for the benefit of the unlearned, that they may know if the Doctor—who has been appointed revising critic, or something like it, to the now-preparing, or to-be-prepared, forthcoming new translation of the Bible Unionists—have the mind of the Spirit, as the result of his etymological divinations over hades, one of the chief of the opprobria of the spiritualism of the Gentiles, familiarly styled theology. So reasonable a request it was impossible to eschew. The Baptist Chronicle containing the article was procured, the criticism read, considered, and rejected as untenable, and at variance with the teaching of the Word.

The Doctor begins by telling us the derivation of the word. It is derived from the Greek alpha, a, which in composition has the force of our un, which gives a negative import to words, and is equivalent to not. Being preceded by the aspirate, which represents our h, the first syllable of the word is spelled and pronounced ha. The second syllable, des, is derived from the infinitive of the verb eido, which is, idein, and found as the last word but one in the Doctor's quotation from Acts 2: 27, and signifies to see. Hence, when ha is prefixed to idein, it makes haidein, that is, not to see. Out of this negative infinitive, a noun or name has been formed by subscribing the first, or iota under the a, and writing it, pronounced hay; and by changing the ein, into es, pronounced aes, or for the whole word haydays. Now, these transformations do not at all affect the radical meaning of the verb: they only convert a verb into a noun, with the simple difference that, whereas a verb signifies to be, to do, or to suffer, a noun is the name of any thing that exists or of which we have any notion. Hades, therefore, retaining the idea of not seen, or invisibility, becomes a name for the hiddenness of any thing not perceived by our organs of vision: so that the unseen, the invisible, or invisibility, fully express the import of the name.

It may be seen from this, that an elephant may be in Hades as much as a man; for when both are dead and buried, or put out of sight, they are in invisibility, or the unseen, and therefore, in Hades, having entered, eis, that is, into it.

Having told the reader the derivation of this substantive noun, he proceeds to treat it as an adjective, making it express some quality respecting another noun, such as, topos, that is, place, in the sense of region, etc. His words are, "Etymologically, therefore, hades means an invisible place." Now, from what we have seen of its etymology in his analysis and mine, the idea of place or region has no existence in the etymon or root. Hence, his affirmation that "it means an invisible place," is an assertion without proof, and therefore, inadmissible as a critical definition of the term.

But it appears to me, that my friend does not weigh his words in a well-adjusted balance ere they trickle from his pen. He not only casts invisibility (hades) into his crucible, and brings it out, topos aoratos, that is, an invisible place; but he translates place into no place, and then uses place as signifying the same thing as state. Taking his definition of hades for the word itself, he says, "The word, an invisible place, is not expressive of either a place of happiness or misery." This is as near to no place as words can approach, when a place is the subject of criticism in relation to intelligent beings. "Happiness and misery," he says, "depend on the characters of the beings themselves;" who, whether good or bad, all alike inhabit this invisible place, or region. Now, I suspect, if one were to visit the Doctor's invisible place, and to converse with some of the miserable characters there, we should find

that to them it was a miserable place; it certainly would be a miserable place to the good, if what the Doctor says be true: that “it is the region of all the departed, good and bad.” The most elegant mansion above ground, filled with all that the pleasure-loving could conceive of and desire, would be hell to good people if they were shut up with and compelled to endure the company or presence of miserable characters such as thieves, adulterers, murderers, drunkards, and vulgar, beastly, and obscene rowdies of all sorts. What then must Dr. Shepard’s invisible place be to the righteous, with all the rascalion souls of the disembodied wicked there who have been put under ground since Cain sent Abel to the then unpeopled and dismal solitude! The “enmity” which God has put between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman would be as rampant in the Doctor’s under-ground, invisible place, as in all places above the sod. The popes, the priests, and the kings—a formidable host when collected together in the same place with the righteous, which are few, would be as devilish against them as ever. My friend’s soul-receptacle must be a horrible place for both parties—Pandemonium in an uproar—the righteous and the wicked wailing and gnashing their teeth at being shut up together with society so uncongenial to each.

But my friend says that his soul-receptacle (the soul for hades, are his words) is a place neither of happiness nor misery. But happiness is the state of being happy. A happy soul is a soul in happy existence, or a happy thing. Now, a thing occupies space which becomes to it its place, for something must be somewhere or in some place; the place, therefore, of a soul in happiness, or the reverse, must be a place of happiness or the contrary. The Doctor admits that the souls are happy or miserable in themselves as dependent on their characters; it is inevitable, therefore, that if his invisible place contain disembodied ghosts of the two classes, it must be a place of happiness or misery, being the abode of happy and miserable ghosts. But he says it is neither. Then what is it the place of? If souls are neither happy nor miserable, what conceivable condition are they in? I know of no other possible conclusion than that they are in a state of stupor in which they are unconscious of all possible impressions, which excludes dreaming as well as all wide-awake mentality—a stupor of soul which is death itself. A place which, in relation to human beings, is said to be neither a place of happiness nor misery, is either no place at all, or it is a place of the unconscious dead. These are the two horns of the Doctor’s dilemma, by either of which he can be tossed ad astra as his critical or theological sensitiveness may suggest as most agreeable to the inner man.

I have said that he uses state and place as synonymous. This appears, first, by his telling us that Hades means an invisible place, and then translating *eis hadou*, by “in the invisible state;” and second, by referring to his translation and saying concerning it, “Here hades is regarded as the place of the soul.” So little precise is my friend in the use of words.

State has relation to condition, quality, circumstances, etc.; place, to space, local relation. The state of a body without life is a death-state; its quality is that which is peculiar to all animals that have breathed their last—corruptible. Place has regards to the space this corrupting body would occupy. State also applies to the living. A sinner is a man or woman of a certain quality. He is sinful. He is pervaded by the sin-quality which reigns over him, and reduces him to the worst kind of slavery, which is to work all uncleanness with greediness. This being his character, or nature and practice, he lives as a felon under sentence of death; and consequently, in a state of sin and death. A saint is in a different state. A saint is one whose transgressions have been blotted out, and who is therefore no longer under sentence of death, but under a sentence of life eternal; and consequently, in a state of obedience and life. Here are two spiritual or moral states or conditions, with a something between them as a dividing line, or as a gate which must be passed through in leaving the sin-state and entering

the holy-state. But does this doctrine concerning state teach anything in regard to place? Man being the subject of both states, we infer that they exist upon earth, because it is his dwelling-place; but what are their geographical boundaries, if any, do not appear. Now hades expresses a quality from which the idea of place cannot be extracted. If I am told that an elephant or a man is in invisibility, eis hadou, and nothing more be said, I cannot tell whether they be living or dead, for they may be invisible in relation to me, but seen of multitudes besides. My friend has therefore no right to add the word place to invisible, nor is it necessary to postfix state thereto, for unseen expresses the condition or circumstance as far as signified by the word.

Having then stripped this word hades of the Gentile mysticism with which it has been invested by Romish and Protestant philosophy, I proceed to notice my friend's quotation from the Acts. It is perfectly true that hades is not the Greek word for grave, though by implication it is so rendered properly enough. When a dead man is covered up in the ground, he is invisible, or in invisibility. Now, if it is said of one we know to be dead and buried, he is in invisibility, we associate the phrase with the grave; so that the idea of the grave is mingled with the idea of invisibility; and thus, in relation to the dead, the grave implies invisibility, and invisibility implies the grave; the one implies the other, which is what lexicographers mean by a word that has radically or etymologically no relation to a thing, coming to represent that thing "by implication."

My proposition, then, is, that etymologically hades signifies neither place nor grave, but that by implication it does. Dr. Shepard, in effect, denies this. He says, "After a careful examination of all the places where hades occurs in the New Testament, I am satisfied that, in that volume, it never has the signification of grave." This is an unqualified statement. As a critic of the forthcoming translation, such a declaration ought never to have appeared from the Doctor's pen. Surely he is acquainted with the fact that words have meanings by implication which are not found in their roots; but in the declaration quoted he seems to have no idea of the existence of such an ordinary feature of human speech.

The example he selects from the New Testament to prove that hades does not refer to the grave, is most unfortunate. In the first place, it is not an original New Testament passage, but a Greek version, made about 250 years before Christ, of the original Hebrew, penned by David some 750 years before the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and quoted by Luke from the Septuagint into the Acts. A critic would therefore no more refer to it as a correct expression of the original idea penned by David, than he would refer to the English version as an authority in any question of verbal criticism. The Doctor should have given us a literal translation from David, and not a loose version of a Greek version of the original. In the next place, the quotation is most unfortunate, because it was cited by Peter as a reason why David's son could not remain in Joseph's sepulchre, and see corruption like other men, because David had predicted that Messiah's "flesh should rest in hope." What was the ground of this hope of Christ? The question is answered in the Doctor's quotation, which with its context would be better rendered: —

"Moreover, my flesh shall dwell in hope,
Seeing that thou wilt not leave my soul in invisibility,
Nor wilt thou permit thine Holy One to see corruption."

Here is a parallelism, or the correspondence of one line with another. The first line contains a declared truth; the second line gives the reason why the thing declared shall be; and

the third line, being equivalent to the second in sense, explains the meaning of the terms in which the reason is expressed. There are synonymous parallel lines containing parallel terms, which express the same sense in different but equivalent terms. Thus, “flesh,” “soul,” and “holy one,” are parallel equivalents; that is, flesh is soul, and soul is holy one; therefore holy one is flesh and capable of corruption, as the third parallel line intimates. Jesus, it is admitted, is the subject of the parallelism. When the Spirit by David said, “my flesh,” he meant Jesus, who was the Word’s flesh. When God forsook him on the cross, the flesh or body in which God had manifested himself to Israel, was left in the hands of Joseph of Arimathea, who laid it in a tomb, which was afterwards walled up and sealed. Where was God’s flesh then? In invisibility. If it had been left there, what would have been the consequence? It would have seen corruption. The flesh named Jesus, was the soul in invisibility. The Spirit of the Father returned to it, and Jesus left the sepulchre. Before crucifixion he said he had power to take up his life again. These were the words of the Father spoken through him, and found their fulfilment in God raising him from the dead. By not leaving Jesus in invisibility after this manner, the Holy One of God was not permitted to see corruption. The flesh dwelling in hope is a phrase indicating that when the flesh was dying it was approaching the term of its existence, in hope of a resurrection without experiencing the common lot of humanity—destruction, or a return to the dust through corruption. The reason of that hope is in the second parallel. To see corruption in invisibility is evidential of the soul referred to being a corruptible substance. Such is the teaching of the text.

But, to get still more conclusively at the mind of the Spirit, we must consult the very words of David, and not merely a translation, or version, of them made nearly eight centuries after he penned them. What he wrote was this,

Kevohdi wy-yahghel livbi shahmach lahkain
lahvetach yishkohn aph-besahri
lisheohl naphshi lo-thaazohv ki
shachath lirohth chasidekah lo-thithtain

The following is a literal translation:

Therefore my heart was glad, and my mind rejoiced;
My flesh also shall-lay-down-to-rest in-confidence,
That myself thou-wilt-not-allow-to-remain in-a-cave,
Thou-wilt-not-deliver-over thine Holy One to-experience destruction.

In the above, the terms in English consisting of several words are connected by hyphens, to show that they answer to single words in the Hebrew text.

The apostle Peter informs us that “David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would RAISE UP the Christ to sit upon His throne; foreseeing this, he speaks concerning the resurrection of the Christ, that his soul should not be left in invisibility, nor his flesh see corruption. This Jesus God raised up.” In this comment he tells us, in effect, that the Hebrew text was not a prophecy about a disembodied ghost in “the spirit-world,” but about the resurrection of the dead body laid in Joseph’s cave, “hewn out of a rock,” named Jesus; for he says, it was Jesus that was raised. He also informs us why the dead Jesus was not left to destruction in invisibility; it was that he might at some future time sit upon the throne of his father David, and rule over the house of Jacob during the age. Had he experienced destruction

in the cave, the Abrahamic covenant would have remained a dead letter; and there would consequently have been no repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus; no obtaining a right to eat of a tree of life in a Paradise of God; no restitution of all things connected with the Hebrew nation; no kingdom of God with its Davidian throne; no blessedness of all nations in Abraham and his seed; no destruction of the last enemy, Death; no establishing of our planet in eternal glory and perfection. "If Christ be not risen, then is our faith vain, and we are yet in our sins; and they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

The soft place in the Doctor's etymologism, the quagmire in which all his astuteness is engulfed, is his theology. This is not peculiar to him. It is a weakness he shares with all the critics and translators of the professing world. They are too learned; too learnedly indoctrinated in school-divinity, and too ignorant of Moses and the Prophets to discern "the deep things of God" in simplicity and truth. There is no hope therefore of a respectable critical translation from such hands. Their brains are all addled by apostate theology, which pervades all their thoughts and ratiocinations. The spirit and traditions of old pagan Plato and his papistical disciples so pervert their naturally good perceptions, that, like inebriates in mania potu, they see ghosts and hobgoblins, blue flames, and sky-kingdom glories on the sacred page wherever they see "soul," "heaven," "spirits," hades, sheol, "hell," and so forth. This hallucination comes neither from etymology, syntax, nor Scripture, but from the theology, "the philosophy and vain deceit" with which they are so helplessly and hopelessly spoiled. My amiable friend the Doctor forms no happy exception to this rule. He has theologised into his head a theory about souls capable of some sort of an existence separate from body. He must therefore provide a place or region for them to eat, drink, sleep, and exercise in; because, assuming that his souls have length, breadth and thickness, they will necessarily require space, or elbow-room, to dwell in! The orthodoxy of the N.Y.B. Churches, among whose shepherds he is enrolled, requires that he should hold on to some dogma of the kind; for they would be convulsed out of their propriety if they should find in Dr. Shepard one who denied the existence of an "immortal soul" in sinful flesh! And to have a revising critic, too, who should strip Hades, Sheol, Nephesh, Psyche, and Pneuma of all the mystery thrown around them by theological versionists, and present them to the compositor in their etymological simplicity and truth; to have such a reviser in the company, side by side with Alexander Campbell, craftily (as some sensitive Baptists already intimate) giving a turn to texts to make them breathe out his baptismal regeneration, would certainly set the whole establishment in a blaze! Dr. Shepard's criticism on hades defines his position in soulology, and quiets all their apprehensions upon that score. "The body for the grave," saith he, and "the soul for hades till the resurrection;" while the Spirit by David and Peter saith, that Hades and Sheol are for both.

But, if what the Doctor styles "soul" have no existence save in the brains of those who are learnedly ignorant of Moses and the prophets, (and in that case their crania will answer for hades,) what becomes of his, and our friend President Campbell's soul-receptacle? Before his assertion that hades is for incorporeal ghosts can be admitted, he must prove that souls exist in sin-flesh capable of a disembodied occupancy of any place, region, or country, good, bad, or indifferent, after breathing finally stops. He must do this, and prove their existence, too, by plain, direct testimony from the Bible; for they who are taught of God will admit no other proof in the question of immortality than this. Will the Doctor undertake to prove immortal-soulism from Moses and the prophets according to this rule? If he say he cannot from the Old Testament, then I say, if he find it not there, neither can he find it in the New; for the writers of this declare, that they taught no other doctrine than what might be already

found in the Old. The Doctor would gain nothing but an unprofitable consumption of time, were he to plunge into metaphysics, which the wisest of the world's wise men have come to confess cannot untie the knot. Macaulay truly says (Miscell. iii. 322) concerning this matter, "As to the great question—What becomes of man after death? —we do not see that a highly-educated European, left to his unassisted reason, is more likely to be in the right than a Blackfoot Indian. Not a single one of the many sciences in which we surpass the Blackfoot Indians throws the smallest light on the state of the soul after animal life is extinct. In truth, all the philosophers, ancient and modern, who have attempted, without the help of revelation, to prove the immortality of man, from Plato down to Franklin, appear to us to have failed deplorably." There is no solving this question but by the law and the testimony. The existence of an incorporeal, immortal, human ghost, has never been demonstrated yet from these. Will Dr. Shepard eternalise his name by the feat? Until he do, his criticism upon Hades can only be regarded as a toy for the amusement of the feeble-minded, whose intellects have become attenuated and impoverished by the pseudo-philosophy of the schools.

The phrase, "my soul," in the English Bible, is a version, not a translation, of the Greek and Hebrew. The Greek sign for soul is psuche, from psuchain, to breathe, to cool, refrigerate; in the passive, to grow cold. Any thing, therefore, that is formed for breathing is a soul, whether it be warm or cold, living or dead. The body Jehovah prepared of Mary's substance, through which to manifest himself in Israel, was a soul or breathing-frame for that purpose; therefore, he styles it in David "my soul." When he forsook it, it became cold, inanimate, dead; and was laid in a cave or hollow place in a rock. The Greek noun fairly represents the Hebrew nephesh—that is, breath—from the verb nahphash, to breathe, respire. Hence the word is applied to animals of all kinds, including men, because they are capable of breathing; and as they cannot live independently of this process, it stands for life as well as breath or spirit. In the formula al-nephesh maith, "to a dead body," nephesh signifies body; and in Leviticus 22: 4, nephesh alone is used for a dead body. With the yod suffixed, as in the text before us, where it is written naphshi, it is very frequently me, myself. I have so rendered it; though it would have been as well rendered my dead body. The reader can take which he pleases, for both harmonise with the fact.

Lisheohl, some two hundred years ago, was properly enough rendered "hell;" because this, from the German holle, or hihle, signified a hole or hollow place. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," when our English version was made, signified, "thou wilt not leave my body in a hole." The King of Egypt's translators did not translate sheohl, but substituted the word hades, as expressive of the effect of being shut up in a sheohl, which would be to make one invisible. The particle l'—that is, in—they rendered by, eis, in English, into, to indicate that for Messiah to be invisible when dead, he must enter into some place to be in invisibility; so that eis hadou, is literally into invisibility—"thou wilt not leave my soul into invisibility," which, though not elegant English, is good Greek, and doubtless quite intelligible to Ptolemy and his people.

Lisheohl is the Hebrew interpretation, then, of eis hadou. It explains to us in what sense we are to understand the invisibility. I have rendered the phrase in a cave; because sheohl is derived from the verb shahal, that is, to dig, to excavate, to hollow out; hence the noun signifies a cavity, hollow place, a hole, cavern, &c. From the idea of digging comes readily that of searching out, inquiring, &c. The usual derivation of sheohl has been from the notion of asking, searching, or inquiring. Thus Abraham was laid in a cave with Sarah his wife. In process of time one looks in and searches them out, but not finding them, because reduced to powder, he inquires, "Where are they?" The answer to the question is lisheohl, or

in demand: a dead body laid in a cave, dissolved, searched for, but not found, is not only in sheohl, but lisheohl techtiyah, in the lowest part of the cave; in the common version rendered the lowest hell.

The formula liroth shachath was rendered by the Seventy, idein diaphthoran, that is, in the English version, to see corruption. In relation to this word shachath, Gesenius says, "The Seventy often render shachath by diaphthoran, as if from shahchath, to corrupt; not, however, in the sense of corruption, putridity, but of destruction. The Greek word is indeed received by Luke in the sense of corruption in Acts 2: 27; but it would be difficult to show that the Hebrew shachath has this sense even in a single passage as derived fro shahchath." The noun shachath signifies a pit, or pit-fall, for the destruction of wild beasts; a cistern having mire at the bottom; a subterranean prison; &c. It signifies these things as means of destruction, being derived from shahchath, to destroy; and in Niphil, to be destroyed by putridity. A body allowed to remain in a pit in which it has been entrapped would in process of time disappear by the corrupting process; which is the destruction indicated by the phrases "going down into the pit;" the pit "shutting her mouth upon" one; the "lowest pit;" a "bringing down to the sides of the pit;" "death feeding upon them," and so forth. Such a pit is styled "a horrible pit;" "the pit of destruction;" "the pit of corruption," &c. Hence, to deliver one over to see the pit is more than remaining three days in a cave; it is to perish in that cave by a resolution into dust, which is to experience destruction. Had the nephesh, or "soul," named Jesus, been allowed of God to remain in Joseph's cave, it would have perished through corruption. The questions in Psalm 30: 9, in view of such a result, are very appropriate. The Spirit, under such a supposition in relation to Messiah, saith for him, "What profit in my blood, if I go down to the pit? Can the dust praise thee? Can it declare thy truth?" The answer is, that if Christ had gone to dust like other men, his blood would have been no more profitable than Abel's; and he would have been unable to praise God, or to declare his truth, in going forth with the apostles, cooperating with them, and confirming the Word by signs following. "To see a pit," then, or "to experience destruction," are the correct rendering of the formula of our text, liroth shachath. The reader can take which he pleases; for to deliver over the "soul," or "holy one," named Jesus, to see a pit, would have been for him "to experience destruction."

Because dead bodies shut up in caves, holes, graves, tombs, sepulchres, &c., go to dust, "Hell and Destruction" are associated together. The words are, "sheohl wa-abaddohn are before Jehovah;" and "they are never full." This hell is a something that may be entered by digging. Thus, in Amos 9: 2: "Though they dig into hell—vish-sheohl—thence shall mine hand take them." After they had finished digging, they would be in a cave or hollow, where they might become invisible—aoratos—and be in invisibility—eis hadou—to mortal eyes; still, they were not hidden from the eyes of Jehovah, whose Spirit pervades every atom that exists. Hence, sheohl and hades are for corporeal souls, be they living or be they dead: if dead, and they be left there, destruction follows; but if they be taken thence by resurrection before decomposition, as in the case of Jesus, the words of the psalmist are fulfilled concerning him, "I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for Jehovah sustained me." It is so also in relation to the brethren of Jesus, the difference being in the duration of the sleep, and their sleep being in dust, which his was not. But those who wake not to endless life, dust is their serpent-meat for evermore.

With Pagan mythology, and the Jewish opinions about hades, to which Dr. Shepard refers, we have nothing to do. With "the taught of God" they are of no more value than the opinions of Gentile theologians of the present age. The Jews had made void the word of God

by tradition, and fables borrowed from the Greeks, with whose mythology they were perverted long before Jesus brought life and incorruptibility to light in the gospel of the kingdom which he preached. Life manifested through an incorruptible body is the immortality offered in this gospel to those who become the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus: and to them only, as a part of the recompense of reward. This great doctrine is fatal to mythological soulology; and consequently, utterly subversive of my friend's receptacle for the departed spirits of his creed. When he learns the gospel, and becomes obedient to the faith, he will be astonished that he could ever have penned a criticism so unscriptural and vain.

EDITOR.

* * *

ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

THE HERALD'S USEFULNESS.

My Dear Friend: —I continue to receive the most gratifying intelligence of the extensive usefulness of the "Herald" as a recruiting officer in mustering heirs for the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ at hand, who, doubtless, will hereafter add their testimony to the divine truth, "He that winneth souls is wise:" and that you may then shine as a glorious star in the heavenly hemisphere, is the heartfelt prayer of

Yours very faithfully in Israel's Hope,

RICHARD ROBERTSON.

London, England, December 9, 1853.

* * *

Our friend's testimony is encouraging to the friends of the Herald on both sides of the Atlantic. Our career in "the good fight" has been like heaping Ben Lomond upon Ben Nevis, an almost hopeless enterprise. The "new things" brought out of the treasury, and spread before its readers upon its tablets, are so much at variance with Gentile philosophy, styled "orthodox theology," with which the people's minds are imbued and perverted, that we find prejudice, and bigotry, and superstition, and stereotyped "piety," as well as unbelief, arrayed against them. Now, it is no mere pastime, to overcome these. It requires a continual dropping to wear them away. I am therefore indeed glad to hear that British rocks are softening, and that the gospel of the kingdom is making an impression upon them. It is truly encouraging to the labourer who looks for his reward in the Age to Come; for it is very disheartening to encounter insurmountable opposition with rigid self denial, and to have no adorning jewels in the presence of the Lord. I am happy in being so placed that I can labour for distinction in the kingdom of God without absolute despair. These are such faithless times, times in which indifferentism, or fleshly feeling, or tradition, supersede the Word, that testimony and reason are almost without effect upon the public mind, so that the hope of doing much on a grand, extended, and imposing scale, is entirely excluded. But happily for us, something may be done, which affords us scope for proving our faith by our works. The Bride has to be prepared for meeting the Lord without rejection or rebuke. This is the work of our time that invites the cooperation of believers in word and deed. The Herald, which is the editor's representative in places inaccessible, is an humble contribution to this, which they who not merely read (for that is a benefit absorbed in self) but of their penury endeavour to sustain and circulate it, have the honour and privilege to share in. And the honour of sending from America to Australia and New Zealand, and from Britain to California, a herald to preach the

glad tidings of that glorious kingdom which is to rule over all in the Age to Come, and to teach the things concerning it, especially in a dark day like this, characterised by the profound ignorance of “the wise and prudent,” is great indeed. It is marvellous that comparatively so few appreciate it. Let us be glad, however, that some do. May their number be greatly increased; and what they do, may they do it as unto the Lord, and not to man, and they will be sure not to lose their reward.

The following extract is of a later date in the same month, from the hand of Mr. R., to whom, on behalf of myself and the friends of the Herald in America who desire its circulation in Britain, as well as of its well-wishers there, who by his agency obtain it as easily as if published in London or Edinburgh, I return sincere and unfeigned thanks for his business-like punctuality and disinterested kindness in its affairs. May we all come to uniformity of vision in the great salvation, and rejoice together in the kingdom of God! My readers like to know what influence is being exerted by the currency of our ideas in divers parts of the world, and therefore wish from time to time to find an “*Analecta Epistolaria*” in the Herald, which, like the face of a watch, indicates the working of our principles in the public mind. It is to gratify this laudable curiosity that I introduce it now and then; and that they may be encouraged to exert themselves more than hitherto for the extension of the Herald’s circulation, which, from our extracts, they will perceive is not an affair terminating in the profit of its editor and the printer, but which operates to the casting of the minds of intelligent men and women into that mould which we believe to be the truth confessed by the Lord Jesus before Pontius Pilate, and to bear witness unto which, in the face of death, he came into the world.

Mr. R. says, “Among my receipts for the Herald, there is an anonymous donation of two shillings and sixpence from a poor man in Aberdeen to assist the editor of the Herald in its publication. Such an item is indeed more gratifying than all the vain applause of the multitude; and in addition to which, I could extract from the abundance of my correspondence, a volume of heartfelt prayer that has ascended to heaven on your behalf as a diligent and faithful servant of ‘the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.’”

The donation is indeed a gratifying incident, and all the more acceptable as being spontaneous. Two and sixpence is a large sum to a poor man in the north of Scotland; and from its being contributed anonymously, it is good evidence that the demonstrations of the Herald have touched his heart. Though subjected to much misrepresentation and reproach by the adherents of a profitable “orthodoxy,” I shall work on, encouraged by the good wishes, the prayers, and the substantial contributions of the poor, whose privilege it has been from the beginning to support the proclamation of the gospel, and to have it preached to them as the heirs of the kingdom which it reveals.

EDITOR.

* * *

WORD FROM CANADA.

Dear Brother Thomas:—The menacing position of all parties in Europe, and the Turkish war, have produced a very general interest in Canada. Two editions of “The Coming Struggle” have been sold out, and the demand is still unsatisfied. One of them was the revise published by you in the Herald. Still there are very, very few, who will go the whole length, and embrace “the Gospel of the Kingdom” by obeying it—only here and there one.

During the year that is now closing, three have become obedient to the faith in Paris; one of whom has since “fallen asleep,” her “flesh resting in hope” assured that she will not be left in the grave; but when “the Hope of his people” shall appear, she will arise to share in the glory, honour, and immortality of the kingdom of God. Her sister intends to sojourn in New York for a season, when she will in all probability attend the meetings in Convention Hall (By a notice on the cover of the current Herald, it will be seen that our meetings are removed from Convention to Knickerbocker Hall.), where I trust she will be received by brethren having the same faith and hope. It may be interesting to you to know that, tired of the lifeless religion of Protestantism, she was a short time ago almost an avowed infidel, until, meeting with Elpis Israel, she began to understand the true meaning of the Scriptures, and the glorious destiny they hold out to the human race. After a careful investigation of the subject, she was convinced of its truth, and “gladly” descended beneath the wave; and so being “buried with Christ in baptism,” she arose in the similitude of his resurrection to newness of life.

The Herald still maintains its interest. Indeed, as the course of events develop themselves in accordance with the expositions of prophecy given in its pages, it grows more and more interesting. We are now evidently upon the eve of most important changes and revolutions. No one can tell what may be the state of the world by the end of the present winter. Even Britain, with all its boasted prosperity, may be the scene of famine and wretchedness, any thing but pleasing to contemplate. The demands of her millions of unrepresented yet intelligent people cannot much longer be evaded; starvation and insult will lend the energy of desperation to their cry for justice, which, if not conceded, will produce terrible vengeance. But how can they get justice! A little while will prove to them that the help of man is vain; and that no system of government devisable by the ingenuity of men will insure a “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity,” promotive of the general good. Jesus Christ, the real emancipator of the race, can alone speak peace to the nations, and still the turbulence of human passions. Till he appears, may you be preserved to direct the minds of many to the knowledge of “the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ.”

Yours in the hope of immortality,

GEORGE L. SCOTT.

Paris, C. W., December 27, 1853.

* * *

PROSPECTS IN CANADA.

Brother Thomas—Dear Sir: —I embrace the opportunity of Brother Scott’s letter to send you a few common-place observations and experiences.

In a word, the great cause progresses in Canada West slowly, but surely. By the circulation of some twenty thousands of the “Coming Struggle”—principally your edition of it—the minds of the great mass of the people have been turned to the attention and examination of the “good time coming.” Also, not a few of the clergy, seeing the way the wind is blowing, have taken up the tune, and discourse ineloquent music—but it is mixed up with a great deal of nonsensical stuff. Still, I think the people in this question are considerably wiser than their teachers. But I must make a notable exception in the person of James Inglis, lately of Detroit, but now minister to the Baptist church in Hamilton. I am somewhat convinced that he understands the Gospel of the Kingdom—is enthusiastic about it, and

proclaims it with its obedience daily. Then again, there is his brother David Inglis, of the Free Church in Montreal, who very well understands the prophetic Word, and longs for the realisation of the promises made to the fathers, but of course he is immersed in the destructive notions of baby-sprinkling, &c. Altogether, I am happy to intimate that the soil in Canada is being well prepared, and the “good seed of the Word” may germinate and bring forth not many days hence. And what you ask has been particularly done in the sowing department. Besides Mr. Inglis’ predilections as aforesaid, he has a pamphlet in the press on the “Great Salvation,” a copy of which you will receive in due time. He is also projecting a monthly journal to be devoted to the subject. Under considerable opposition, brother Scott has been holding forth at Paris. Your humble servant too has been doing a little. For sounding forth the Gospel of the Kingdom and its obedience within the holy precincts of the Campbellistic sanctum in Toronto, he was “cast out;” nevertheless, the truth laid hold of not a few, and some submitted to its influence. I may state that the old gentleman who presides over its destinies (not Mr. James Leslie, for he presides over the disciples of the old stamp) is one of our Canadian nabobs, and is presently aspiring to the honours of an M.P.P. He is mad against the proclamation that the “Lord Jesus is coming soon with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment” and “reign in Mount Sion—in Jerusalem, and before his ancients, gloriously.” In fact, he by no means relishes the idea that his large tracts of land lying around the basin of Lake Huron are not worth any more than a dozen years’ purchase. I have also been sounding forth the proclamation of the blessed gospel in many of the towns and villages of this promising “province of the British empire.” Although the folks generally are very obtuse, by reason of the erroneous teaching to which they have all along been subjected, yet I am pleased to state they listen to me and others similarly engaged, patiently, attentively, and sometimes absorbingly. Still I am aware that it is the novelty of the statements which attracts their ear; but the moneycrats amongst them, when, like our would-be M.P.P., of Toronto, they must give up their lease of this world’s goods, gear and property, and take up their cross and follow the meek and lowly Jesus from the cross to the crown, they don’t like it, but bellow forth, “Heresy and heretics.” But the truth, notwithstanding, shall search out the precious gems which will dazzle in the courts of the heavenly Jerusalem!

Dear Brother, I see no reason why you should permit MacLean of Toronto, and a host of other publishers, here, there, and everywhere, to manufacture their bread and butter out of your brains. Permit me to suggest at this juncture, that if you could yourself get up a quarter’s worth of valuable matter for the use of the people as such, I could assure you, that in Canada at least (where Dr. Thomas is beginning to be generally and favourably known) it would meet with most extensive circulation; and as a consequence, your *Elpis Israel* and *Herald* will be more sought for by and by.

May God our Father bless and protect you in the great work in which you are engaged, till the day of Christ.

Yours, in the patience and kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,

W. M. WILSON.

Paris, C. W., December 26, 1853.

* * *

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OBEYED.

Dear Sir: —By the perusal of your writings, I am happy in being able to testify, myself and wife have been enlightened in the gospel of the kingdom of God. As the result of this, trouble came upon us about baptism; not in regard to the mode, nor concerning that we were satisfied; but as to whether the immersion we had been before subjected to in our ignorance of the gospel of the kingdom, would be accepted by the Father as the “One Baptism” of His appointment. We had been immersed on the usual profession by the Baptist church of this city, under the preaching of Edwards, “the converted sailor,” as he is styled. Our convictions, as far as they went, were honest. A few months afterwards we became acquainted with the views of the Adventists, and finally we obtained your *Elpis Israel*—a book that has been the means of opening our understandings to the Scriptures, so that the Bible appears like a new book to us. For this cause we rejoice and give thanks to God, seeing that he has yet some honest and faithful witnesses, who are “rightly dividing the Word of truth.” Are not these of the “Olive Trees” furnishing oil for the lamps or candlesticks that they may see the darkness which surrounds?

The light we had thus obtained made our former darkness visible, and a conviction was produced that our immersion in our ignorance did not introduce us into Christ. Our feelings were therefore troubled until we were immersed into him, confessing faith in the Hope of Israel or the kingdom of God, and the things concerning the name of Jesus as Lord and Christ. Because of this second immersion, and of the breaking of bread at my house by a few who, like myself, are waiting for the consolation of Israel, I was excluded from a little church here also professing to be looking for the kingdom of God. It now comports with their views of Christian propriety to laugh at me, and to bestow upon me the contemptuous and reproachful epithets usually conferred on those who reject the stereotyped opinions of the day. But I am not to be moved or troubled by nicknames and hard speeches. There is a glorious triumph near for those who prove faithful to the end.

Being poor in this world’s goods, I am unable to gratify my desire to do something extra for the support of the cause which ought to lie nearest to the heart. Accept of our thanks for the benefit we have received from your studies, pursued closely through many years of reproach and self-denial, and which your readers obtain for the inconsiderable amount of two dollars a year.

Yours, in the hope of Israel,

BENJAMIN G. CHASE.

Detroit, Michigan, January 2, 1854.

* * *

BUT ONE TRUE GOSPEL IN THE BIBLE.

There is no conviction more reasonable or scriptural than that the immersion of an individual ignorant of “the gospel of the kingdom” cannot unite him to the name of the Lord Jesus. Some reason as though there were two gospels—one the Gospel of the Kingdom; and the other, the Gospel of the Name of Jesus. The former, though true, they regard as a non-essential, vainly supposing that a man may be saved by faith in the personal history of Jesus, though he may never have heard of the Kingdom of God! These non-essentialists can never get beyond the scene of the crucifixion, and the “eternal sonship” of Jesus, where they lose

themselves in the maze of Athanasian perplexities. All that is essential with them is, that Jesus is the Son of God; that he died to make satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; was raised from the dead, and ascended to heaven, where he will remain until he returns to destroy the earth. These are the principles of the faith-alone system—all-sufficient for the salvation from sin and its punishment—eternal agony and liquid fire—of those who believe them! With some, the number of these principles may be still further reduced without jeopardy of soul. Repent of your sins, and believe that Jesus died for you, and thou shalt be saved. This is called “believing in Jesus!” Only believe this in the popular sense of belief—that is, “feel like it’s so”—and you have the theological minimum of “salvation by grace!” Such is the molecule to which the Apostasy has reduced “the gospel of God which he had promised before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures”—Romans 1: 1-2, under the morbid excitation of cautiousness feeling like it’s true! Interpreting the creed of the Non-essentialists by⁷ their practice and its practical results, the understanding of the prophets in which the gospel is promised (a promise still unfulfilled) is of no importance, being, in their view, unnecessary to salvation. How many of those whom they despatch to glory on angels’ wings through their “consolations of religion,” know anything about the gospel of God exhibited in the word of prophecy, “to which,” Peter says, “men do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place?” Nay, where are the preachers who can define the gospel of God which he hath promised in Daniel, or in Ezekiel, or in Isaiah? But what is the use of further question? They know nothing about it, for their systems ignore the prophets in the case: and being themselves ignorant and blind, they who are led of them can only repeat the foolishness they hear.

There is but one gospel. There never has been more than one true gospel from the pronouncing of the sentence upon the Serpent to the present time, in which the Serpent is rising to great pre-eminence preparatory to his being bound by the Woman’s Seed. Hence, the gospel promised in the prophets is the gospel Jesus preached; and the same that was preached by the apostles in his name after his ascension; and the same that has been confessed by all true believers for the past 1800 years. It comprehends what the Scriptures teach concerning the Sonship of Christ, the death of Christ, the blood of Christ, the burial of Christ, the resurrection of Christ, and the ascension of Christ; and concerning Jesus of Nazareth, as the Christ discoursed of by Moses and the Prophets. These are important and essential incidents, and necessary constituents of a justifying faith; but a person may believe them, and yet be ignorant, and consequently faithless, of the gospel. Gospel is “glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people”—i.e., to all Israel’s tribes; “for there is born to you—Isaiah 9: 6—this day in the city of David (Bethlehem) a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord”—Luke 2: 10-11. Now take this angelic definition of the heavenly message indicated in the word “gospel,” and say, What glad tidings of great joy were there to all Israel in the death, burial, resurrection, and sonship of Jesus, as now exhibited by “converted sailors,” and other oratorical thumpers of velvet cushions and “sacred desks?” A disputant would reply, that, “as the eternal divine Son of God, he died to propitiate the Father’s wrath against all mankind, and so to procure for them who believe this, forgiveness of sins, and a consequent escape from endless torment in fire and brimstone, which is glad tidings of great joy enough.” But, granting that this is the salvation procured, what glad tidings is there in this “to all the people,” seeing that so infinitesimal a portion of Israel has accepted Jesus? This is a question the disputers of this world cannot answer. Remission of past sins, and a hope of eternal life, as the line of a man’s spiritual horizon, is but a meagre gospel, as is everywhere proved by the meagre effects the belief of it produces. What does God propose to raise righteous men to eternal life for? In what sense was the birth of Jesus glad tidings of great joy to all the people of Israel? Bible answers to these questions will bring out from the prophets, like the action of light, a daguerreotype image, the subject-matter of the gospel of the kingdom of God, promised in the

sacred writings of the Hebrews. In answer to the latter inquiry, read what Micah says the man born in Bethlehem is to do for Israel—Micah 5; 2-7; also in Isaiah—Isaiah 49: 1-12: and in reply to the former, see the answer on record in Daniel 7: 18, 22, 26-27, and repeated by Jesus in Matthew 25: 34. The righteous are raised to eternal life, to possess, in all the Age, the Kingdom of God restored again to Israel, with the government of all nations thereunto annexed. The possession of this universal dominion implies also the possession of the world, with all its riches and glory—1 Corinthians 3: 21-23. This inherited for 1000 years, is a foretaste of what is to come when the 1000 years shall have passed away. This is a great inheritance for earthborns; and he that is not satisfied with this in conjunction with the Lord Jesus, does not deserve to be considered. It will be a noble inheritance, and all that shall be honoured to share in it are required to believe what God has promised concerning it—i.e., the Gospel of the Kingdom—and to obey it: for “though Jesus were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him”—Hebrews 6: 8-9. Yea, verily; for “to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams: for rebellion (disobedience) is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness as iniquity and idolatry”—1 Samuel 15: 22, which are all punishable with death by the law of God. Men impose upon themselves, with their sacrifices of prayer, and praise, and pious talk, as a substitute for obeying the truth. Thus, like Saul, they reject the word of the Lord; therefore he will reject them from being kings over his realm in the age to come.

Brother Chase has done well in obeying the gospel of the kingdom; let him now continue in well-doing, fearing nothing. The Lord’s people are known to him by their childlike obedience to his word. All is mere talk that falls short of this. The obedience of faith is God’s test by which he tries the professions of the children of men, who are generally so perverse that, like Naaman, the Syrian, they are ready to do any great thing he does not require, but stubbornly refuse to submit to the simple action he prescribes.

EDITOR.

* * *

IMPORTANT ADMISSIONS.

Dear Brother: —You have remained faithful, although I have so long neglected you. I have always regularly received your periodical, and I rejoice in its late improvements. It is decidedly a superior paper. Little of the credit is mine, however; for you have not heard from me these last two years, either as “a sympathiser,” or as rendering “material aid.”

I agree with you that a man must believe the gospel to be saved; but whether the one thousand years’ reign be embraced in the elements, first principles, or rudiments, of that gospel, is with me a query. I think there is something to learn after we become Christians, and that the one thousand years’ reign is of that nature. The hope of that which is incorruptible, undefiled, and will never fade away, is the hope to which we are begotten.

I think with you that baptism to be valid and true must be preceded by faith in the gospel. But you yourself admit that the gospel in all its details is more than the gospel in its grand outlines. All our growth in divine knowledge through life, is but an increase in the knowledge of the details of the gospel; yet a knowledge of the gospel in its great, strongly-marked outlines, is absolutely necessary to a man’s becoming a Christian. The only difference between us is, What is embraced in those things necessary to be understood and believed in

order to justifying faith? I cannot yet see that Jesus' reigning in Jerusalem for one thousand years over men in the flesh is an item of the gospel necessary for a son of Adam to understand and believe in order to have righteousness imputed to him. It appears to me as a part of the details, or filling in, to be learned as we add to our faith courage, and to courage knowledge.

Excuse more at present, and believe me,
Yours truly,
Buffalo, N. Y., November 14, 1853.

FRANCIS B. SCOTT.

* * *

THE MILLENNIAL REIGN THE GRAND TOPIC OF THE GOSPEL.

It is a great thing in these latter days for men to arrive at the conviction that a belief of the gospel is indispensably necessary to salvation. It is another great step in advance for the same persons to aver, that immersion must be preceded by faith in the gospel to constitute it the "one baptism;" and a still greater for such to admit that a knowledge of the gospel in its great, strongly-marked outlines, is absolutely necessary to a man's becoming a Christian. My worthy friend and correspondent has arrived at these conclusions, so that there is no issue between us on these vital questions. There is, however, still a difference which prevents us seeing eye to eye in all things. The immersed are justified by faith in the great, strongly-marked gospel outlines acquired before baptism. This is a great principle, and one which no man can overturn. But then, What is that gospel which is so indispensable to salvation? This is a question which *The Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come* does not answer satisfactorily to my friend. Its definition he cannot as yet assent to—a definition of the gospel which makes the ground it occupies unique, and contrapositional to all the world. *The Herald's* definition of the gospel places it on Noachic ground, upon which the truth has stood dauntless in all ages; and there it will stand however feebly sustained, unfraternally with any system or doctrine which fails to teach the indispensable necessity of obeying the gospel of the kingdom in order to the possession of the same.

It is with my intelligent correspondent a query, whether the one thousand years' reign of Christ and his brethren over Israel and the nations, be embraced in the first principles of the gospel. In reply, I should say, it would be passing strange if it did not; for the gospel is the glad tidings of the reign of God's kingdom in the possession of Christ and the saints over all nations—"His kingdom ruleth over all." This gospel was preached to Abraham, saying, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"—Genesis 12: 1-3; 22: 18; Galatians 3: 16. Would it not have been strange if Isaac had asked his father Abraham, saying, "Is the blessedness of all nations embraced among the first principles of the gospel preached to you by the angel of El-Shaddai?"—and Abraham had replied, "No, my son?" Isaac would have been confounded. The blessedness of all nations in him was the thing promised, and without which there was no gospel or good news for the nations. It is the embodiment of all the principles from first to last. The one thousand years' reign of Abraham's Seed over all nations confederated in him, is their blessedness in him. Abolish this reign and the principles it embodies, and the glad tidings are dissipated into thin air. There is then no kingdom for the saints, and consequently no recompense of reward; for all that the gospel evangelises to them is concentrated in, and inseparably connected with, the kingdom. If there be no kingdom for Christ and his brethren on earth, there is no blessedness in store for the nations. Their case is hopeless; and the future of the world is damnation and ruin—sin triumphant over a howling wilderness.

The kingdom is the very A B C of the gospel—no kingdom, no gospel; hence the phrase, “the gospel of the kingdom of God.” This is equivalent to the glad tidings of God’s one thousand years’ reign. So unquestionably is this king-dominion the, not a, first principle, that it sometimes stands for every thing connected with the gospel. Hence, while Jesus was preaching the gospel of the kingdom, he said to one, “Go thou and preach the kingdom of God.” And in the Acts it is recorded of Paul that “He spake boldly in the synagogue at Ephesus for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God”—Acts 19: 8. He afterwards took his stand in the school of Tyrannus, and disputed there daily for two years, doubtless about these same things of the kingdom. Now, I would ask, suppose we had no more testimony in the Bible about Paul’s preaching at Ephesus than the above, what would we say was the great subject-matter that pervaded all his discourses and disputations? Unquestionably, the kingdom and the things concerning it. He preached the things concerning the kingdom of God, and about nothing else. But, says an objector, he preached about the Lord Jesus; for “all Asia heard the Word of the Lord Jesus.” True; and “the Word of the Lord Jesus” is “the Word of the kingdom,” which he himself scattered broadcast in Israel, which honest and good hearts received with abiding joy. But the objector means, he preached “Christ crucified.” So he did, for this was one of the things of the kingdom Israel could not receive. A crucified inheritor of David’s throne, whose resurrection they denied, was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness. They did not understand that the Covenant of the kingdom could have no force, and consequently that there could be no everlasting kingdom, without the death of its Royal Testator. Jehovah had testified to David that his Son and Lord should be raised up from the dead to sit upon the throne—Acts 2: 30; so that the death and resurrection of the Christ, and therefore of Jesus as that Christ, are things pertaining to the kingdom, which, however, is not perceived by those who are ignorant thereof. His blood is the blood of the Covenant of the kingdom by which it is dedicated; and being dedicated by so precious a principle, none but those who believe the gospel, or things of that kingdom he preached, and yield the intelligent obedience he commands, can be cleansed thereby, and as a consequence, with him share in its joy.

There is, doubtless, something for men to learn after they become Christians; but it is saying little for the intelligence of a pretender to that much-abused name to plead the necessity of his adding to his faith a knowledge of the covenants made with Abraham and David, as a legitimate increase to his post-baptismal acquisitions! These covenants must be understood before baptism, for they contain the gospel. They are not difficult of comprehension. A man who believes what God Almighty has promised in them, and the things testified of Jesus, believes the gospel of the kingdom. The details are the amplifications of the things covenanted, with revelations showing how they are to be established on the earth. Here is scope for post-baptismal increase of knowledge which will keep a man engaged for life.

Our friend says truly enough, that “the hope of that which is incorruptible, undefiled, and will never fade away, is that to which we (that is, true Christians) are begotten.” In saying this he has the words of Peter before his mind, which I will quote in order that our friend’s demonstrative pronoun “that,” which he uses twice, may be apostolically interpreted. The apostle says to those who are “elect unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ—elected through sanctification of the Spirit: —Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from among the dead, (even) to AN INHERITANCE incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heavens for you, who are kept by the power of God through

faith unto a salvation prepared to be revealed in the last time. In which ye greatly rejoice”—1 Peter 1: 3. From this it appears that our friend’s “that” is a hope of living again by resurrection to the possession of an incorruptible, undefiled and undecaying inheritance. Peter’s contemporary brethren were begotten to this by the annunciation of glad tidings to them. His words are, “begotten again through the Word of God, living and abiding to the Age; and this is the word which as glad tidings is announced to you.” The hope Peter defines as above made the Word announced glad tidings, or gospel, to them. They were begotten to this hope, so that in order to become heirs of it—heirs of the incorruptible inheritance—they became obedient, that “in the obeying” they might be sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ, which is the blood of the Covenant of the Inheritance made with Abraham.

Whatever is possessed by an heir through his father’s will is an inheritance. All who believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom with honest and good hearts become brethren to Jesus, and consequently, as he is Son of God, children of God; and says Paul, “If children, then heirs of God, and JOINT-HEIRS with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together”—Romans 8: 17. This proves that Christ and his brethren are all heirs of the same inheritance. Would it not be passing strange if they who are begotten to a living hope of an inheritance by the gospel should continue ignorant of it, not only at their baptism, but for years after it; and some even, who are esteemed as very pious by their brethren in darkness, die without suspecting what the “that” is to which they are supposed to be begotten?! Paul writes in a plain and straightforward manner to them whom he had begotten by the gospel: “We,” says he, “preached to you the gospel of God without charge; and charged you to walk worthy of God, who hath called you (in the gospel he preached) unto his kingdom and glory”—1 Thessalonians 2: 12. This was the inheritance to which they were begotten—they were called to “inherit the kingdom.” Kingdom and Inheritance in gospel style are synonyms. The gospel of the kingdom is the gospel of the inheritance, and concerning them Paul thus speaks: “To Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. God saith not, And to Seeds, (in the plural,) as of many (persons,) but as of one (person,) saying, And to thy Seed, who is Christ. And this I say, that the Covenant before confirmed by God concerning Christ, the Law (of Moses,) which was 430 years after (the confirmation of the Covenant,) cannot disannul, that it should make the promise (covenanted) of none effect. For if (the right to) the inheritance be from law, it is no more from promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise. The law was added because of the transgressions until the Seed (Christ) should come, to whom the promise (of the inheritance) was made”—Galatians 3: 16-19. It is easy to see what the inheritance covenanted to Abraham and his Seed is, by reading his biography by Moses. When Abraham was in Canaan after Lot had separated from him, the angel of the Lord met him with a message from El-Shaddai, saying, “All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy Seed (Christ) during the Age. Walk through the land in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee”—Genesis 13: 14-17. The confirmation of this promise is related in the fifteenth of Genesis. The Land of Canaan is the royal domain—the place of the kingdom; and therefore synonymous with it, so that he who obtains a covenant-right to the land also obtains a right to all the things to be manifested upon it in the Age to Come.

This royal inheritance announced in the gospel is “incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading,” because it is not to be left to other people—Daniel 2: 44, as other royalties are. It is the Saints’ encampment for 1000 years; and as fresh and glorious at “the end” as at the beginning. The land is where it was in Abraham’s time; but the royalty to be annexed to it is “reserved in heavens.” Peter did not say “in the heavens,” because the elements which constituted the civil and ecclesiastical heavens of the world in his day, were not to form the

royalty of Jesus and his brethren. Jesus declared this plainly in his confession before Pilate when he said, “My kingdom is not of this world,” or constitution of things upon the Roman earth. As if he had said, “I am a priest as well as a king; and so long as the Mosaic heavens continue, I cannot be High Priest in Israel, not being of Aaron’s order.” There being a change of the priesthood, there must of necessity be a change of the law; hence the necessity of the passing away of the heavens contemporary with Peter and Pilate, to make way for other heavens, Jewish and Gentile, the elements of which may be incorporated into a royalty for Jesus and the saints. These heavens, which did not exist in Peter and Pilate’s day, do exist now; for they are the kingdoms of this latter-day world that are to become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of his Anointed—Revelation 11: 15. Hence, this divine royalty is styled, “The Kingdom of the Heavens.” It is in reservation there. Democracy cannot destroy these heavens, or kingdoms, by converting them into republics; because they are reserved for the saints; as it is written, “The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions (or heavens) shall serve and obey him”—Daniel 7: 27. “Flesh and blood,” says Paul, “cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” It is an inheritance then. Therefore James says, “God hath chosen the poor of this world, RICH IN FAITH, as heirs of that kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him.” The reason Paul gives for his saying about flesh and blood, is because “corruption cannot inherit incorruptibility.” It is therefore an incorruptible inheritance, and consequently “undefiled and unfading,” as characterised by Peter.

Such, then, is the definition of our friend’s demonstrative pronoun “that,” to which he truly says “we” (by which I understand him to mean Christians of the old apostolic stamp) are begotten by the gospel as our living hope. Let him not forget that these were “rich in faith,” and “through faith” kept by God’s power unto a salvation prepared to be revealed in “the last time,” or latter days. They were not such poverty-stricken professors as we are familiar with in these times, who have not got faith enough to be justified, much less have they enough to enable them to “overcome the world,” that they may “inherit glory.” Men come to be immersed with a mere belief of creed-facts, having no faith in the covenanted promises, being ignorant if God have promised any thing demanding their conviction of its truth! Justifying faith is belief of what God has promised concerning the inheritance, or “things hoped for and unseen”—Hebrews 11: 1. To “believe on God” is to know and believe what he has said he will do, as Abraham did; and to believe on Jesus, or “in” him, is to believe the gospel of the kingdom he preached, and illustrated in his parables. An assent to creed-facts is the “faith” (pardon me, reader, for such a prostitution of that eminently significant scriptural term) of the Apostasy, Greek, Latin, and Protestant; which ignores certainty in any thing, but that Jesus Christ was the “eternal son” of God, “was crucified, dead and buried,” “rose again on the third day, and ascended to heaven, whence he shall come again to judge the quick and the dead,” in some way about which pulpit orators and professors entertain a multiplicity of contrarious suppositions! A declared assent to these “facts,” mixed up with the stereotyped phraseology of humanly-excited Cautiousness, Conscientiousness, Veneration, Marvellousness, indicative of “piety” of the old pharisaic stamp, is the ordinary “profession of faith” which precedes immersion, or admission into a Gentile church. Now, I have no hesitation in saying under the instruction of the Scriptures, that such a profession was never counted to a man for righteousness before, at, or after baptism; and that a subsequent understanding of the doctrine of the Covenanted Inheritance is not adequate to the patching up of such an old tindery garment, so as to cover the wearer’s nakedness and to hide him from future shame. He must throw away his rags, and wash his flesh in water, and so put on the wedding-robe, which is woven without a seam in the beauties

of a holiness which is the result of an intelligent obedience to the faith of the covenants made with Abraham and David, and brought into force by the death and resurrection of their Son and God's, who is the Lord Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

* * *

A CHRISTIAN CHURCH DEFINED.

A CHURCH of Christ is an association of men and women who, from the heart, have believed the good news concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Christ; and with the mouth have confessed that the Lord, even Jesus, is he; and have therefore been immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, that in the act of immersion their previous faith may be counted to them for righteousness or remission of sins, and their antecedent faithful, loving, and self-denying disposition may be granted to them of God for repentance. Such an association is an "heritage of God," even though "false brethren may have crept in unawares." Can any one give a more scriptural definition of a Christian church than this?

EDITOR.

* * *