

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, AUGUST, 1854—
Volume 4—No. 8

MEMORIAL OF THE BLESSED AND ONLY POTENTATE.

It has been well remarked that “there is in the original an appropriateness, a wonderful exactness, in the use of the many names of God, which in our version is almost entirely lost. These it is one of the chief offices of an interpreter to restore.” “The Lord, the Lord of Hosts” is one of these names. Here “Lord” is twice repeated, as though there were but one and the same word in both the places of the original text. But this is not the case. There are two, which are as distinct as existence and supremacy. Ha-Adon, Yehowah tzevaoth, is the original phrase, from which the reader will perceive that “Lord” is there represented by Adon and by Yehowah; so that the personage referred to is “The Adon, the Jehovah of hosts,” or armies, who “shall lop the bough with terror; and cut down the thickets of the forest with iron”—Isaiah 10: 33-34.

In Genesis 24: 14, Adon is applied to Abraham as the superior of “his eldest servant of his house that ruled over all that he had.” This ruler of Abraham’s estate was Eliezer of Damascus, whom he had thought to make his heir, in the absence of children. It is also applied to Potiphar as Adon to Joseph, whom he had purchased for twenty pieces of silver. Hence, the word implies sovereignty and ownership, and is therefore applied to God as the Adon kol-ha-eret, the sovereign and owner of all the earth; and to his representative Image as Adon ha-adonim, Sovereign Possessor of the sovereign possessors of the world.

Jehovah is the name which the chief of ha elohim, the angel-gods, announced as the memorial of Him “who only hath deathlessness, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see”—1 Timothy 6: 16. The historical origin of the name is this. “An angel of the Lord,” styled by Moses ha-elohim, the of gods, a particular one preeminent among the rest, and in the common version “God,” appeared to him in a flame of fire in a bush—Acts 7: 30. When he drew near, “the voice of the Lord came to him.” The way Moses relates this is significant. He says, “when Jehovah saw that he turned aside to see, Elohim, or Gods, called to him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I!” He then goes on to tell us what “he (Jehovah) said;” or, as Stephen has it, what “came to him in the voice of the Lord.” A voice coming to a person is a message sent; which is the reason why Stephen styles him in the bush an angel of the Lord—he brought the voice, word, or message, from “THE BLESSED AND ONLY POTENTATE,” whose angel, or messenger, he therefore was. So that what is contained in that

voice must be referred to “the Invisible God,” and not absolutely to the speaker who conversed with Moses.

After the angel had delivered his message, Moses inquired, in the event of his conveying it to Israel as coming to them from the God of their fathers, and they should ask his name, what he should say unto them? The angel replied that his name was, ehyeh asher ehyeh. These are the letters of the name, Masoretically pronounced. The verb ehyeh is the first person singular of the future, and should therefore be rendered, I shall be. In the common version, ehyeh asher ehyeh is translated “I am that I am;” but this incorrect. It should be, I SHALL BE WHOM I SHALL BE. This is the name of Him who sent the angel in the bush to Moses, given in answer to the question, “What is the name of the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?” Reduced to a single word, and expressed in plain English, EHYEH, or I SHALL BE, is their God, or Elohi, who sent Moses to Israel in Egypt. “This is my name for ever,” or to the Age—Zeh shemi le-olahm—saith the “HE-WHO-IS, God of the fathers”—Yehowah-Elohi, “and this (name) is my memorial to the generation of the age—we zeh zikri le-dohr dohr.”

Exodus 3: 14, must therefore be read thus, “And Elohim said unto Moses, I SHALL BE WHOM I SHALL BE; and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, I SHALL BE hath sent me unto you. And Elohim said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, HE-WHO-IS, God of your fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name to the Age; and this is my memorial to the generation of the age.”

By comparing the two following words, the English reader will be able to see the external relation between Ehyeh and Yehowah without the points. Ehyeh is aeie, and Yehowah is ieue. The latter is the third person singular, present participle, eue, or Masoretically, howeh, HE IS, with i or y, called Yood, prefixed, and pronounced ye. This prefix converts howeh into a proper name called a verbal noun, as Yehoweh or Jehovah: aeie I SHALL BE, an ieue, HE WHO IS, are the phrases which express the etymological relation of these words of the “memorial,” or name by which an invisible one is kept in remembrance by the faithful.

The fathers did not know God by this name, consequently the mystery it unfolds was concealed from them. This appears from Exodus 6: 2. “And Elohim spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I, the HE WHO IS, even I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by (the name of) EL-SHADDAI, God Almighty; but by my name YEHOWAH was I not known to them.” Abraham “was fully persuaded that what God had promised he was able to perform,” because when he was ninety-nine his friend had announced himself as “God Almighty”—Genesis 17: 1. But Abraham did not know from that name, that the God who is, SHALL BE the Seed promised to him. If we can apprehend the significancy of the Memorial, we may understand the allusion of Jesus when he said to the Jews, “Before Abraham was born, I am.” Of the God who spake to Moses it could be said, he was in Abraham’s time, he is in Moses’, and he shall be in the Age to Come, the Almighty. This doctrine is taught in the voice that came to Moses, and in the memorial—“I, who was known to Abraham as God Almighty, do now exist; and SHALL BE WHOM I SHALL BE, even Abraham’s Seed.” “I SHALL BE WHOM I SHALL BE” was nothing less than a declaration that He would manifest himself in the Flesh as the Woman’s Seed who shall bruise the Serpent’s Head. The Common Version fails entirely to bring out this prophetic signification of the name Jehovah, which is almost everywhere rendered “Lord” in common with Ahdon; but converts it into a

simple memorial of self-existence. Ehyeh asher ehyeh, “I shall be whom I shall be,” they have rendered, “I am that I am,” as if it were, ani howeh asher ani howeh. The Israelites in Egypt were looking for a deliverer on account of which they were suffering reproach. The answer to their inquiry of Moses, “What is his name who sends you to us?” would have failed to meet their hopes if the reply had been simply, One who exists: but to tell them it was the He who shall be—the One who is to come—their attention would be gained, and the highest expectation and enthusiasm excited.

It is worthy of remark that “the Blessed and Only Potentate” did not say, “I AM he whom I shall be;” but “I shall be” that personage. He was the “I” dwelling in unapproachable light; but the “He who shall be” is the image of that ever-invisible “I.” It is this “I” that existed before all things, and that created all things; and whose Spirit exhaling in grateful incense said, “O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” It was this “I” concerning whom Jesus said, “Thou Father, art in me, and I in thee:” “The words that I speak, I speak not of myself: but the Father who dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.” It was “THE WORD” by whom all things were made; and without whom was not any thing made that was made. “In him was life, and the Life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.”

When the “HE whom I shall be” was conceived in Mary’s sinful flesh by the formative power of the Holy Spirit, the time had come for the “I” to manifest himself as THE FUTURE BEING. “The Word became flesh, and dwelt among the Jews, (who beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” The father appears in the son; so the “I” appears in the “Whom I shall be,” as God in Christ reconciling the world to himself. The physical generative union of the Blessed and Only Potentate with “sinful flesh,” or human nature, had never occurred till the Word became flesh; so that the Word-Flesh, or “Whom I shall be,” is fitly styled, “The Only-Begotten of the Father.” Something more, however, was necessary than generative union for the manifestation of the “I” or God-Word-and-God-work manifestation through the Flesh. This necessity was supplied by “THE ANOINTING”—Isaiah 10: 27, by which the Ehyeh, or I shall be, was filled with the Yehowah, or He who is. The descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of a Dove upon the head of Jesus, was the filling of the Ehyeh with the Yehowah—of the I shall be with the He who is. Thus, the anointing taken as interpretative of the Memorial paraphrases it after this manner: “I, the Blessed and Only Potentate, who send you, Moses, to Israel, through the anointing of my Spirit, shall be whom I shall be”—“God manifested through flesh,” called Christ, or THE ANOINTED ONE.

Thus, by the proclamation of the Memorial and Name of the Blessed and Only Potentate to Israel, was their redemption from bondage introduced. He was announced to them as the “Who is, and who was, and who shall be”—as the “Who is” by Yehowah; the “Who shall be” by Ehyeh; and the “Who was” by El-Shaddai. This did not represent to their minds three Gods; but, on the contrary, ONE ONLY. Hence the celebrated passage in Moses, “Hear, O Israel; Jehovah our Elohah is One Jehovah!” The literal English of this is, “Hear, O Israel; He who is our Strength is One.” This is true. But the manifestation of that “One” to Israel was an element of “the mystery of Godliness” which “the darkness comprehended not.”

The identity between the Who is and the Who shall be is also seen from the fact that the sender of Moses to Israel styles himself both Who is and Who shall be in Exodus 3: 14-

15—as, “Thou shalt say, I shall be hath sent me unto you;” and again, “Thou shalt say, Who is hath sent me unto you”—not two senders, but one only.

It is worthy of remark that the Memorial Ehyeh asher ehyeh, “I shall be whom I shall be,” and the Name Yehowah, “He who is,” are to be the remembrancers of the Strength of Israel until a certain generation of the nation, styled dor dor, a generation of the race. The particular generation is indicated by the phrase le-olam, to the Age. They are God’s name and memorial till the manifestation of that generation of Israel existing at the commencement of the Age of which Messiah is the founder. They are not his remembrancers “for ever,” or throughout all generations, or “to all eternity;” for then the “I shall be whom I shall be” would never be, being always in the future tense. When the thing declared is fully accomplished to the extent originally purposed, the name, Jehovah, ceases to be a remembrancer of the future. Hence, the generation and the age indicated as the “unto,” must be those contemporary with the shall be, merging into the have been, or the am; that is, with the accomplishment of the prophecy contained in the name.

But, one might inquire, “Were not the Age and Generation referred to, those contemporary with the Incarnation and the Anointing?” I should answer in the negative. The reason will appear from the testimony. On Moses complaining that Jehovah had failed to deliver Israel while he had provoked Pharaoh to make their bondage worse and worse, the Angel of the Bush, in renewing the promise of deliverance, resumed the subject of the Name by which the Deliverer was henceforth to be known. Connected with that name, Jehovah, certain things are defined as things to be accomplished by Him who assumed the name. When he said, “I shall be whom I shall be,” his manifestation in the “whom” was for the accomplishment of what is noted in Exodus 3: 6-8, 13-22; and in Exodus 6: 2-8. In the latter place it is written, “I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name, Jehovah, was I not known to them. And I have also established my COVENANT with them”—For what purpose? —“to give them the Land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers. . . .And I have remembered my covenant.” Here then is the reason why God assumed the name of Jehovah—as a memorial that he remembers his Covenant concerning the Land until he has put Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in possession of it by the “whom,” indicated in the name “I shall be whom I shall be.” When the reader, therefore, hears or sees the word “Jehovah,” it reminds him, not only of the Incarnation and the Anointing, but of the great purpose to be accomplished by them in the fulfilment of the promises covenanted to Abraham and David, as elsewhere appears. God in Christ the Fulfiller of his promises to the fathers is the name “by which he was not known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;” for “they all died in faith not having received the promises”—Hebrews 11: 13.

Such is the testimony of Paul, delivered many years after the Anointing and Ascension to “the right hand of power.” The Lord Jesus, then, did not “give them the land of Canaan” in the sense in which it was covenanted to them by El-Shaddai. Hence the Age and the Generation contemporary with the Incarnation, Anointing, and Ascension, are not the termini of the Name Jehovah in the true sense of the Memorial; and as they have not received the Land of Canaan since, the Age and Generation are still among “the things that shall be hereafter;” unless, indeed, the present generation of Israel continue till the appearance of the Lord. The accomplishment of the promises to Abraham marks the epoch styled in the text before us, le-olam, eis ton aiona, and le-dor-dor, so improperly rendered “for ever,” and “unto all generations,” in the English Version of the Bible.

The name Jehovah is, then, still a covenant-memorial of the future; and is borne by him who is “the Only Begotten of the Father.” Gabriel was sent to Mary to tell her to name her son, Yehoshua; which is a word compounded of Yehov, or Jehov, and shua, powerful. Ptolemy’s seventy translators of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek express this name by Yesous, in that language; and we by JESUS in ours. The Hebrew name of the Lord Christ pronounced by Gabriel signifies JEHOVAH THE POWERFUL. This is the name of naitzer, “The Nazarene,” and was given to Him “because He shall save his people from their sins”—Matthew 1: 21; and because “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the House of Jacob for the ages, and of his kingdom there shall be no end”—Luke 1: 32. There was another reason why he was named Jehoshua, or Jesus. Matthew tells us that it was because of what Isaiah had spoken concerning him. Having related how Yehotzedek, or Joseph, the husband of Mary, was also commanded to call her son Jehoshua, he goes on to say, “Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name IMMANUEL, which being interpreted is, GOD WITH US.” Well might he be called Jehovah the Powerful, being God in the midst of the Hebrews, to “put down the mighty from their thrones,” and to “help his servant Israel in remembrance of his mercy (as he spake to their fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed) for the Age.” But has he done this? Unquestionably not: for when he appeared in Israel ten-twelfths of the nation were in vassalage to the Romans; and ever since their condition has been waxing worse and worse. He was Jehovah powerful for the Age and Generation to come, when the mercy promised to Abraham and to his Seed shall be possessed. God in Israel’s midst, he will then dethrone the Kings of the Gentiles; and, as a Horn of Salvation for them in the House of his servant David, save them from their enemies, and from the power of all them that hate them; and remember his Holy Covenant, the oath he swore to their father Abraham, that he would grant unto them, that they being delivered out of the hand of their enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their life—Luke 1: 68.

The name Jesus, then, is God’s memorial of all this. It reminds us also that when he puts his hand to the work of national redemption, “he will save his people from their sins”—his people who have died in faith not having received the promises, as well as those who are yet alive, and waiting obediently for his appearing. No one is effectually saved from sin until he becomes immortal; because “the wages of sin is death.” But Jesus is powerful for this; for God will raise us up by Jesus, who is the resurrection and the life.

The New Testament interpretation of what the Jews term “the incommunicable name Jehovah” sustains the exposition I have given. They may well style the meaning of “Jehovah” incommunicable. They who reject, or do not understand, the Incarnation, or “God manifested in flesh,” are not able to communicate the signification of Ehyeh asher ehyeh, or Jehovah. But Christ has himself declared in the revelation given to him, that its signification refers to the future in connection with him. In the exordium, John writes to the seven congregations in Asia Minor, sending them the greeting of the Father, saying, “Grace unto you and peace from Him who is, and who was, and who is coming; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne;” and of the Son, saying, “and from Jesus Christ the faithful witness, the First-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth.” “He who is, and who was, and who is coming,” or shall be revealed, is the Blessed and Only Potentate’s memorial delivered to Moses. It is repeated in these words, “I am the Alpha and the Omega, beginning and end, saith the Lord, who is, and who was, and who is coming, the Almighty,” or El-Shaddai. After John heard this, a great trumpet-like voice behind him said, “I am the Alpha and the Omega,

the First and the Last;" and on turning round he saw one like to the Son of Man, who continued, saying in addition, "also the living one; and I became dead, and behold I am living for the age of the ages." In these words, Jesus appropriates to himself the Father's memorial, and so announces himself as the "whom" El-Shaddai, the "who was," said to Moses, "I shall be." Jesus is, then, the "who is, and who was, and who is coming, the almighty;" and therefore, Jehovah and El-Shaddai—Jehovah the almighty. This should be remembered; because the present gathering of the Gentile hosts, which has been initiated by the Eastern Question, is to be consummated in Armageddon, where the war of the Great Day is to begin. He who meets the world in arms there is "God Almighty," for the great day is his. That almighty one is Jehoshua, as his name imports. Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews—God in the midst of Israel.

From what is now before the reader, it must be apparent that "Lord" is an exceedingly defective substitute for "Jehovah." There is nothing in the word "Lord," Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or English, that points to an incarnation, and a fulfilment of a Covenant. It ought, therefore, never to be used where the original is Jehovah. Adon, in the sense of sovereignty and ownership, is very well represented by "Lord," and quite an appropriate prefix, as Ahdon Yehovah tzevaoth, Adon-Jehovah of armies; in the most literal English, "Lord Shalt-be-whom-I-shall-be of armies." Ahdon prefixed to Jehovah indicates that "He who shall be," or "is coming," is sovereign and proprietor of the world; and being "Lord of armies," that he will be "Powerful"—shua. These explanations present us with the import of the New Testament phrase Lord Jesus; in Hebrew, Ahdon-Yehoshua. It is the same as Lord Jehovah of armies—the sovereign proprietor of the armies of Israel, because he is KING OF ISRAEL. Hence it is of the Lord Jesus the prophet speaks when he says, as quoted at the beginning of this article, "The Ahdon, the Jehovah of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror; and cut down the thickets of the forest with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a Mighty One." By reference to Ezekiel 31: 3, it will be seen that "the bough" and Lebanon, are representative of THE ASSYRIAN. The prophecy, then, declares that Ahdon Yehoshua, or the Lord Jesus, shall prostrate the Assyrian. When did the Lord Jesus ever do this? Where was the Assyrian in the days of his flesh? Where is he now? Every one knows that there was no other form of the Assyrian power in his day than the Roman to conquer; and that Jesus did not prostrate him then. But where is the Assyrian now? He is manifesting himself on the prophetic area in his last form in the kingdom of men. In a few years, the territory of the old Assyrian empire lying between the Euphrates and Tigris, with Jerusalem and the region of Lebanon, will acknowledge the sceptre of the Czar. He will be a lofty cedar among the fir trees and "thickets of the forest." When he has attained to his full height, he will be a Colossus fitly represented by the Image Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream. His fragile dynasty will be "the Clay" of its Feet and Toes; and will constitute a power, apparent for the first time upon Assyrian ground "in the Time of the End;" for never till then will there have been a Russo-Assyrian Autocrat in possession of Lebanon and the Holy City. This rising power is the Assyrian of the Latter Days, destined to fall on the mountains of Israel by the hand of Ahdon Jehoshua, the sovereign proprietor of the Land.

The Lord Jesus is to overthrow him "with terror," and "with iron;" that is, by terrible slaughter with the edge of the sword: for "by his sword will Jehovah plead with all flesh, and the slain of Jehovah shall be many." Read Micah 5: 2-6, where it is testified, that He that should be born at Bethlehem should be "Ruler in Israel," and "be the peace when the Assyrian should come into their land." "And they shall waste the land of Assyria by the sword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof; thus shall HE deliver from the Assyrian, when he cometh into our land, and when he treadeth within our borders." This is

yet future, not having been yet accomplished. Turn to Revelation 19, and you will there see the Lord Jesus equipped for war at the head of Judah and the Saints. What does that scene represent if not the preparedness of Jehovah “to punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the Kings of the earth upon the earth?”—Isaiah 24: 21. He rides Judah—Zechariah 10: 3—bow—Zechariah 9: 13—in hand, and commands the sword of Zion—Zechariah 9: 13—upon their foes.

What shall we say to these things? Who can prove the contrary? If true—and true they are unquestionably—what becomes of the scholastic theologies of our day? They are proved to be mere foolishness. This has been the nature of the world’s wisdom from the beginning. Let the reader awake, for it is high time; and free himself from it all. The pulpit speculations are mere thinkings of the flesh, which generate a “piety” and a “spirituality” that are faithless of the truth, and which, therefore, do not rejoice in it! Study the Name of the Lord, for it is a tower of strength into which the righteous run, and are safe. How much do we find in the names of God! Blessed be his name to the Age, even to the age of everlasting. Amen.

EDITOR.

* * *

“THE GOOD CONFESSION.”

“All things must be fulfilled,” said the Lord Jesus, “that are written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me.” When these words were spoken, the writings known among us as the New Testament had no existence. When, therefore, Jesus said, “Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me,” he exhorts us to search Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms; which is indispensable, for he adds elsewhere, “If ye believe not Moses’ writings, how can ye believe my words?” It was impossible; for the words of Jesus were his preaching; and he preached the “Gospel of the Kingdom,” and himself as its King—“the Gospel of God, which,” says Paul, “he had promised by his Prophets in the Holy Scriptures.” He preached what they predicted; disbelieve this, and his preaching is denied.

The Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, are the testimony for Christ; while the written testimony of the inspired Apostles is the testimony for Jesus, that he is the Christ “of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets did write.” This being proved, he came to be styled Jesus Christ, as though that were his family name. But neither Jehovah, Joseph, nor Mary, were named Christ. Jesus did not, therefore, inherit the name by descent; nor did he acquire the title till he began to be about thirty years old. The word designates a person who had been, or was to be, anointed with oil, or spirit represented by oil. Aaron, Saul, David, Solomon, &c., were anointed with holy oil by Jehovah’s command, and were therefore “The Lord’s Anointed Ones,” or Christs. Moses and the Prophets foretold the appearing of a Son of David who should be Son of God, and anointed with spirit without measure. For 4087 years after the formation of Adam, the world had been unvisited by the personage who thirty years afterwards was to be thus anointed. At that time, 4117 of the world’s age, Jesus emerged from the Jordan, and the Spirit, descending in the form of a dove, rested upon him, and thus poured out upon him, filled him, and so anointed him. This was the fulfilment of the prophecy in Daniel about sealing the prophet, and anointing the Most Holy. It was the christening of Jesus by which “he was made Christ,” as he has since been “made Lord.”

When John the baptiser was performing his mission, Priests and Levites were sent to him from Jerusalem to inquire if he were the Christ or not. He replied that he was not; but that he was his forerunner. Soon after this, Jesus was publicly anointed; and forthwith claimed to be the person of whom Moses and the Prophets wrote. This was nothing less than laying claim to the kingdom of Israel and throne of David for ever; so that thenceforth it became a great national question with all Jews, seeing that John repudiated all pretension to the dignity, “Is Jesus of Nazareth the Christ—the Prophet like unto Moses, —or, do we look for another?” There were great debates among the people upon this question. Some favoured the claims of Jesus, while others from various reasons of state policy rejected them altogether. After his crucifixion the question was revived and enlarged. It was not now simply, “Was Jesus the Anointed King of Israel?” But, “Is he the anointed King of Israel raised from the dead to sit upon David’s throne for ever?” Yea, said the apostles, this is our proclamation concerning him: “Nay!” said their opponents, “we deny it.” Upon this point then God and the apostles joined issue with the rulers of the nation. Wherever they went they maintained that Jesus is the Christ, and God hath raised him from the dead; and so triumphantly did they establish its truth to the conviction of multitudes, that “Jesus” and “Christ” became inseparable ideas; and came at length to lose the form of a proposition, and to be merged into a name for the Lord of Israel and the world.

If a Gentile of our day be asked, “Do you believe in Jesus Christ?”—it represents to his mind, with a simple change of person, about the same thing as, “Do you believe in Pontius Pilate?” He thinks you are asking him, if he believes that there ever were such persons as Jesus Christ and Pontius Pilate? His reply is, “Yes; I do not recollect when I did not believe it.” But, ask an intelligent Jew of the first, nineteenth, or intermediate centuries, holding on to Judaism, and he would say “No.” But he would no mean by “no” that he does not believe there ever was such a person as Jesus; but that he does not believe that Jesus was the Christ to be raised up as a horn in David’s house for the restoration of the kingdom and Throne of Israel. This restoration, termed by Peter, “the restitution of all things spoken of by all the prophets since the world began,” is Israel’s hope; but to sectarian Gentiles known only as something that obtains in the undiscovered realms of transpolar space. When therefore they profess to believe in Jesus Christ, they do not make “the good confession” witnessed by all who confessed Jesus in apostolic times. It was not his existence, or mere sonship that they confessed; but the same confession he himself made before Pontius Pilate. He did not confess that he believed in his own existence; or that he was the Son of God; or that he was the saviour of the world; or that he was an atonement for sin through the shedding of his blood: but that he was born to be the King of Israel. Paul reminds Timothy that “he had confessed the good confession before many witnesses,” which Christ Jesus had “witnessed before Pontius Pilate.” Now the reader can easily satisfy himself what this confession was by turning to John’s account of the trial of Jesus at the bar of the Little Horn of the Goat. Pontius Pilate, the representative of this power in Jerusalem, asked the accused, “Art thou the King of the Jews?” Had Jesus denied it, he would have denied that he was the Christ; and by denying the truth have saved himself from death by crucifixion, with the loss of “the joy set before him” in the gracious promises made to David. But he denied not; for “he came into the world that he should bear witness unto the truth.” The truth he witnessed in answer to Pilate’s question was, “Thou sayest it, I am a King. To this end was I born.” Pilate understood him to say by this, that he was king of the Jews; for he afterwards asked the question of the clamorous people, “Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?” The same thing is evident also from the superscription he placed on the head piece of the cross.

But, it may be inquired, If Jesus witnessed that he was born to be king of the Jews, seeing that he who made such a claim must of necessity be the rival of Caesar, who was then the acknowledged king of the Jews, how could Pilate, Caesar's friend and representative, say, "I find in him no fault at all?" The answer to this is found in the statement Jesus made of the time and origin of his kingdom. As to the time of it, he said "My kingdom is not of this world;" as to the origin of it. "My kingdom is not now from hence." In regard to the time, Christ's kingdom did not belong to the Mosaic Kosmos constituted by the law, and contemporary with the Little Horn Power in its undivided form as represented by Pilate. Christ's kingdom belongs to a Kosmos characterised by the coexistence of Ten Kingdoms on the Roman earth, as known to exist at present. Had it belonged to the Mosaic era Christ's servants would have given battle to the enemy in his defence. This is true of his kingdom to whatever epoch it may belong. Its establishment is sure to be opposed by "the Powers that be;" because the earth is not large enough to contain Christ and them. His servants will therefore fight against them, and "grind them to powder." Then as to the origin of the kingdom. It was not to originate at that time from Jewish enterprise. It is to be set up by the God of heaven, and the saints; that is, by Christ and his associates, who shall take the kingdom and the dominion under the whole heaven. The armies of Israel, and a mixed multitude of Gentiles, will be a great sword in their hands to execute upon the goat nations and their governments "the judgment written." Pilate had sagacity enough to perceive that the royalty of Jesus would not disturb the existing government; and therefore leaving the future to take care of itself, he pronounced the prisoner at Caesar's bar faultless before the law—"I find in him no fault at all." How wicked then his condemnation to the cross!

Of what value then, is the popular belief in Jesus Christ while it denies the truth he witnessed before Pontius Pilate? "Theology," or pulpit tradition, and collegiate divinity speculation, denies that Jesus was born to rule over Israel as king upon the throne of his father David on Mount Zion. It laughs to scorn so outrageous a supposition! Yet no truth is more plainly taught in the Bible. Popular belief in Jesus is a mere matter of course assent to current opinions concerning him, and totally insufficient as a foundation for union to his name. It does not confess the truth, being ignorant of it; and is therefore of no efficacy for the renewal of the heart, and purification of the soul.

EDITOR.

* * *

PISTIS IS NOT METANOIA—FAITH IS NOT REPENTANCE.

Dr. Thomas. Dear Sir: —In reply to my note of inquiry you say, that if God present a proposition to the intellect, metanoia is to think with that proposition, or to approve as true what God affirms is true. This, it appears to me, confounds pistis with metanoia, or faith with repentance. To approve a proposition as true is to believe a proposition. Metanoia is never used in this sense. On the contrary, it is distinguished from pistis, or faith.

2. In preaching the gospel of the Kingdom Jesus said, repent and believe in the gospel. Here are two commands. One requires the change of mind so frequently enjoined in the gospel; and the other the approval of what he said as true. The proposition to be believed was, "The Kingdom of God is at hand." To receive that proposition as true was to believe; but it was not to repent. Your definition of repentance is a good definition of faith, but not of repentance. You cannot repent a proposition, but you can believe one. No one is commanded to metaneo, repent the truth, but all were required to believe it.

3. Faith always relates to a proposition to be approved as true—repentance relates to a course to be abandoned. Hence Peter said to the Sorcerer, “Repent of this thy wickedness:” and the Son of God said, “Except metanoesoin, they repent of their deeds, I will cast them into great tribulation.” Faith relates to truth to be believed—repentance relates to error to be abandoned.

4. In your first article upon this subject you excepted to my saying that “godly sorrow” was the parent of repentance. If this is a mistake, I am sorry, and can only do as the father of all other men did when called to account for his error, namely, impute the blame to a third person. Paul is blameable if I have mistaken a father for a son, as you allege. For had he not said that “godly sorrow produced repentance,” I should never have regarded “godly sorrow” as the parent of repentance. I suppose it impossible for a son to produce his father. You will please excuse my mistake and accept my apology.

5. Meta, the first syllable in metanoia, which you render with, in composition means change.

- a. Metabaino, translated to depart, remove, go from, pass from, has always reference to change of place.
- b. Metaballo. When the barbarians who had entertained an unfavourable opinion of Paul saw that he was unharmed by the viper, metaballomenoi, they changed their opinion, and said, “He is a god!”
- c. Metago. James says, metagomen, we turn about, that is, change the course of, the whole bodies of horses by bits.
- d. Metadidomi. Jesus and his apostles use metadidomi for imparting, that is, changing the possession of.
- e. Metathesis. Paul says, metatithemenes, there being a change of the priesthood, there was a necessity also for metathesis, a change of law. By faith Enoch metetethe, was translated, changed as to his abode, or transported, not interpreted. A change of place is also indicated as, metathesin, “removing those things that are shaken.”
- f. Metairo. And it happened that when Jesus had finished certain parables, meteren, he departed, or changed locality.
- g. Metakaleo. When a change of place is required, we find meta in composition with kaleo, to call, but never when a change of place is not required. Joseph metakalesato, called his father to him. Send therefore to Joppa, kai meta kalesai Simona, and call hither Simon.
- h. Metakineo, means also a change, and is rendered “moved away from the hope of the gospel.”
- i. Metallasso. “Who, metellaxan, changed the truth concerning God into a falsehood.”
- j. Metamorphoo. Jesus metamorphothe, was metamorphosed, or changed in form.
- k. Metapempo. When meta is used in composition with pempo, to send, and the sending related to a change of place, its usual sense is discernable. Send men to Joppa and call for Simon—was warned by a holy angel, metapempsasthai, to send for thee into his house—I came without gainsaying as soon as metahempsasthe, I was sent for.
- l. Metastrepho. The sun metastraphesetai, shall be turned into darkness is clearly indicative of change. There are some who metastrepsai, change or pervert the gospel. Let your laughter metastrapheto, be turned into mourning.

6. Many other instances might be cited to show that change is generally indicated by compounding meta with a verb. Sun (long sound of u) is the appropriate preposition to use in composition to express connection or agreement. Sunnoeo, and not metanoeo, etymologically signifies “to think with.”

7. I think that on reflection you will, Dr. Thomas, agree with me that pistis, faith, and not metanoia, repentance, is the appropriate Greek word by which to express an intellectual approval of what God affirms to be true.

8. To satisfy you fully that metanoia, as used in the New Testament, does not signify to think with, I will quote a few passages, and in these quotations give it that signification, as follows: Think with, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Think with, and believe in the gospel, for the kingdom of God is at hand. And they went out and preached that men should think with. Except ye think with, ye shall all likewise perish. If one went to them from the dead, they will think with. If thy brother think with, forgive him. Think with, and be baptised, every one of you. But now he commands all men everywhere to think with. These passages are so many demonstrations that your interpretation is incorrect. But if you understand metanoeo to mean a change of mind, especially with reference to purpose, all is consistent,

I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully yours,

S. E. SHEPARD.

New York, April 13, 1854.

* * *

NO REPENTANCE WITHOUT FAITH.

“He that is first in his own cause seemeth right; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.”—Proverbs.

Before proceeding to the exposition of the fallacies revealed in my friend’s epistle, it will be as well to reproduce what I have already said upon the subject before us. My words were as follows:

“First then as to metanoia. It is a word derived from metanoeo, which is itself compounded of meta, and noeo—the meta having the force of with, in the sense of on the same side with; also towards: while noeo has its root in noos or nous, signifying mind, understanding, intellect; comprehensive of its states or affections. Hence the verb noeo is expressive of the operations of the intellect, as, thinking, considering, attending, pondering, &c.: to think with is therefore the radical idea of metanoeo—so that if God, for instance, present a proposition to the intellect, metanoeo is to think with that proposition, or to approve as true what God affirms is true.

“Now, metanoia, being the verbal derivative, expressing what exists, it signifies A THINKING IN HARMONY WITH, say the thoughts of God, or with any other conversed with, as the case may be. When a sinner is exhorted to metanoia, a change of mind is implied; because the thoughts of God are essentially antagonistic: but I do not find in the etymological analysis the radical idea of change. These things being admitted, it follows that

no one is the subject of gospel metanoia whose thoughts are not the thoughts of God revealed in the gospel of the kingdom.”

Such is the text against which my friend discourses in his epistle. As he is theoretically opposed to “multiplying words without knowledge,” I will briefly note the points of his lucubrations as follows: he says that,

1. Faith is not repentance;
 2. Godly sorrow produces repentance;
 3. Meta in composition means change, and
 4. Metaneo does not in the New Testament signify to think with.
1. With respect to his first point, the proposition that “Faith is not repentance” is so self-evident, as to leave no room for dispute. I never said it was, nor affirmed anything like it; so that the Doctor need not have multiplied words in denying it. He very erroneously, however, imagines that I have said something tantamount to it in saying, that “if God present a proposition to the intellect, metanoia is to think with that proposition, and to approve as true what God affirms is true.” But in these words, I was speaking of an affection, state or condition of mind—that kind of mentality that must exist in addition to the mere intellectual assent to the truth of the things proposed. The following illustration will perhaps express my meaning more clearly to the apprehension of the reader. A child who venerates its parents by whom it has never been deceived, is so mentally disposed that whatever they affirm it acquiesces in upon the authority of their assertion. However startling or improbable the assertion, the child will maintain against all denial that it must and can only be true, “because father and mother declared it.” It thinks with its parents, no matter what they say; it believes they cannot lie, and is therefore prepared for the examination of whatever testimony and reasoning they may submit to it for its approval. If they present a proposition to it, though it may not understand it, it thinks with that proposition, not against it, and approves it as true because they affirm that it is true. It is not fully persuaded in its own mind as the result of an independent examination of testimony. This would be pistis, or faith; but it is humble, teachable, confiding—prepared for believing with intelligence.

Now this childlike disposition is metanoia or that condition of the mind, understanding, intellect, or “heart,” which constitutes the moral foundation for a scriptural or justifying faith; so that the operations of the intellect and sentiments—the noi—are on the same side with God and his truth, and not against them. No person is the subject of gospel metanoia who does not think with, towards, after God, and therefore against his former self in his ignorance. As I have said before, the thinking of a sinner and the thinking of God are essentially and totally different kinds of thinking. It is evident, therefore, that when a sinner comes to think with God, he must think against his former mode of thinking, which implies that he has turned from that condition of mind to God. If an idolater or image-worshipper, he may have renounced the adoration of idols as the result of God’s teaching, showing its absurdity, and vindicating his own claim to the exclusive veneration of his creatures: still, though “turned from dumb idols to serve the living and true God,” such a person might yet be ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom. He would be the subject of ten eis ton Theon metanoian; the metanoia towards God but not of pistin ten eis ton Kyrion lesoun Christon, “the pistin or faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ.” In apostolic times men

were brought to think with God before the name of the Lord Jesus was preached to them for faith. “Except ye be changed and become as the children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of the heavens.” This was metanoia, which preceded faith in Jesus, but not faith in God; and as necessary to justification as belief of the truth. In the doctor’s third paragraph he says that “faith always relates to a proposition to be approved as true;” by which I understand him to say that Faith is the belief of a proposition. This may be the “faith” of his “brotherhood;” but it is not the sort of faith the apostles preached. With them faith was the belief of the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ with metanoia of heart—a full persuasion of the exceeding great and precious promises of God only very partially fulfilled as yet in Jesus Christ—the hypostasis, or assured expectation of things hoped for, a certain persuasion of things not seen.

He thinks that the proposition to be believed in the exhortation, “Repent and believe in the gospel,” was that “The kingdom of God is at hand.” But in this he is manifestly mistaken. The kingdom of God being at hand was the reason given why they should believe in the gospel of that kingdom. Mark says, “Repent ye, and believe in the gospel;” to which Matthew adds, “for the kingdom of the heavens has approached.” The gospel is one thing, and the basileia, or kingly power of the heavens, another. The Jews were exhorted to think with God and believe in his gospel; because His incarnate power was to be the future king of the heavens of Daniel’s beasts was in the midst of them.

2. The Doctor’s second point is, that “Godly sorrow produces repentance.” He says, he never should have regarded this as the fact if Paul had not said so. But the Doctor has misunderstood Paul. The apostle did not say that godly sorrow produced repentance in an unjustified, or unbelieving sinner. He refers to the effect of sorrow according to God on the minds of saints in Corinth, who, before they had obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, had been subjects of that condition of mind called metanoia. It was not “sorrow” of any sort that produced this prebaptismal metanoia; but speech and preaching in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, producing faith unfeigned and obedience, by which they were washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The question before us is not the working of metanoia in those already saints; but the producing of it in ignorant sinners. In sinners it results from the opening of their eyes after the apostolic method so amply illustrated in Acts. The sorrow of sinners is not godly sorrow, but the sorrow of the world which works death. This was not the sorrow of the members of the Corinthian church. An incestuous brother appeared among them. His iniquity was reported to Paul; and that while it existed among them, instead of mourning on account of it, some were glorying in Paul, others in Apollos, others in Peter, others in Christ; others because of certain gifts; thus they were puffed up for one against another. This both grieved and angered the apostle, and caused him to write his first letter to them, rebuking them sharply, that they might return to their former condition before God. The letter produced the effect he desired. He had shown them the mind of God with respect to them, which when they understood caused great sorrow. The apostle did not rejoice at this, but that they sorrowed into thinking with God upon the case of their incestuous brother, so as to approve themselves to be clear in the matter. Thus “sorrow in accordance with God worketh a thinking with (him) into a salvation not to be regretted.”

This passage, then not being appropriate to the case before us, the Doctor is certainly mistaken in making metanoia the son of “godly sorrow,” or rather of “sorrow in accordance with God” in regard to the unenlightened and therefore unjustified sinner. In the case of the saints in Corinth, the sonship of metanoia may be granted; but we are not treating of the metanoia of saints, but of the prebaptismal mentality of sinners, with respect to whom I repeat with Paul that it is “the goodness of God” apprehended, and not sorrow of any sort, that “leadeth to metanoia.” But as the Doctor so gracefully begs to be excused for the mistake Paul has so unwittingly led him into, I must not press him too hard upon this point. He will no doubt revise his “metaphysical consanguinities,” and put “godly sorrow” in his right place at a more convenient season.

3. His third point is, that meta in composition means change. He has quoted twelve words from Greenfield’s Polymicrian to prove it. I do not see any use in his having taken so much trouble to prove what has not been denied. My words were before him, saying, “When a sinner is exhorted to metanoia, a change of mind is implied; because the thoughts of a sinner and the thoughts of God are essentially antagonistic: but I do not find in the etymological analysis the radical idea of change;” that is, the idea of change in either of the root-words of the compound. Nor has my friend in his long array of Greek words been able to prove it. Some of the compounds he quotes mean change of some sort by implication, while neither of the words signify it in themselves absolutely. Meta as a preposition does not signify change; but with, together with, on the same side or party with, in aid of, by means of, against, among, to, towards, after, behind, over, beyond. Seeing then that the idea of change is not in the preposition, nor in the verbs and nouns joined to it in composition, how comes it that its compounds sometimes signify change of some sort? The answer is, that change is implied. Thus, metaballo is compounded of ballo, to cast, and meta, towards. It occurs in Acts 28: 6, and is rendered, “they changed their minds.” When the viper bit Paul, they said, “No doubt this man is a murderer.” This was the sentence they cast against him. But when they saw him unharmed, they reversed the judgment, and cast towards him, saying that he is a god. Cast towards is the literal signification of the word; to change their minds, the meaning by implication.

All the Doctor’s words, which I have arranged lexicographically, may be treated in the same way with the same result. The process, however, would occupy too much time and space. As to his, synnoeo, there is no such word in the New Testament; we may therefore be content with metanoeo as expressing all that synnoeo could convey, and more.

4. There are two words used by the New Testament writers which are both rendered by the same English word in the common version—metanoeo, and metamelomai. In the Doctor’s Polymicrian quotation he has omitted all notice of the latter. If he turn to his lexicon he will find this definition: “To repent, i.e. to change one’s mind from a painful motive; feel penitence, sorrow, or remorse.” Metameletheis, is affirmed of Judas when he saw the condemnation of Jesus. If the Doctor compare his dictionary definitions of the two words, he will perceive but little difference between them: there both signify repent, to change opinion, to feel sorrow or remorse. Yet there is such an important difference between metanoeo and metamelomai, that while men are exhorted to metanoeize, they are never exhorted to metamelomize. The reason is found in the root-elements of the words: metanoeo signifies to think in harmony with, or on

the same side with, which of course leads to harmony of action; while *metamelomai*, to be concerned in aid or behalf of, from *meta*, in aid of, and *melei*, it concerns Judas was concerned in aid or behalf of Jesus. He returned the money and declared him innocent, thinking thereby to aid him; but his murderers said, "What is that to us?"—as much as to say, "We don't care for his innocence; we have procured his condemnation which we required, and shall take care that his execution follow." All Judas' concern in behalf of Jesus—all his penitence, sorrow, or remorse, could benefit neither Jesus nor himself; therefore he committed suicide, and Jesus was put to death.

Our word *repent*, derived from the French *repentir*, ought never to be used for *metanoeo*, because it always implies sorrow; and the gospel *metanoia* enjoined upon sinners has nothing to do with sorrow, being a joyous condition of the mind. This *metanoia* is produced by the announcement of glad tidings, which in the nature of things cannot bring sorrow to the believer. When the 3000 and the jailer anxiously inquired what they should do, they were concerned in behalf of themselves; and if there had been no help for them, they would have been in the predicament of Judas, being hopelessly *metamelomized*; but they were exhorted to become the subjects of *metanoia* "in the name of Jesus Christ." Into this they were led by the "many other words" of testimony and exhortation delivered to them by the Spirit of God through Peter. His testifying worked in them a mode of thinking in harmony with the truth concerning Jesus, which was *metanoia* out of his name, because, however Abrahamically dispositioned, they had not yet put it on. But when, believing the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus as the Christ, they were immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, their previous *metanoia* became *metanoia* in the name; in other words, a renewal of the inner man made complete in Jesus. Mere belief of a proposition will not produce this "new creature" which is "a partaker of the Divine Nature." Paul says, "We are renewed by knowledge after the image of him that hath created us;" which knowledge Peter styles, "the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord . . . by whom, di hon, are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that through these (that is, by faith in them) ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature." The "faith" of the Doctor's sect is "belief of a proposition;" so that it has no idea of the gospel *metanoia*. All it can conceive concerning it is what is expressed in the Polymicrian definitions and references. Being ignorant of the "exceeding great and precious promises," it cannot divine the state of mind, the *metanoia*, produced by the belief of them. The Divine Nature in a believing human heart is equally foreign to its conceptions. This being the effect of a full persuasion of the covenanted promises, his "Brotherhood" is an alien in respect to it, because it makes them void by its traditions. This mere belief of a proposition is the real cause of all the iciness, worldliness, mental poverty, blindness, and nakedness, of his sect. Assent to a proposition and immersion are the height and depth, length and breadth, of its divinity. Beyond this all is a blank; and *metanoia* is "change of mind," resulting in good-fellowship as a citizen of the church and world as indicated by the word "reform!"

My friend's sect has doubtless *metanoized* in the sense of changing its mind; for it is no longer in these days of the same mind as in the days of its beginning. It has changed its mind for the worse. In its beginning it courted inquiry into its doctrines; refused in theory or practice to call any man Rabbi: proclaimed its readiness to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good; announced its readiness to open its meeting-houses "to the Devil himself," whom it was not afraid to hear, so confident it

was of its ability successfully to resist him; repudiated the “one-man-system;” denounced the hireling in a storm of indignation; proscribed schools and colleges as the parents of pride, conceit and spiritual death; and satirised without mercy the “benevolent institutions” of sectarianism as mere clerical devices for the advantage of the craft! But Campbellism has changed its mind, and desires to become oblivious of these peculiarities. It has practically abandoned all these things, and is as desirous to stave off inquiry as it was formerly zealous to promote it! If its mind be the mind of Christ now, it was not the mind of Christ in the beginning; if it were in the beginning, then it is not so now: but it is more than probable that neither now nor in the beginning had the mind of Christ any thing to do with the enterprise. Its change of mind has been but from one fleshly mode of thinking to another: but what is worse than all is, that it seems determined not to think with God, but against him, being seized of a spirit which prevents the exceeding great and precious promises obtaining access to their minds.

It is evident, then, from our experience of this sect, that when John, Jesus, and the Apostles before Pentecost, went forth, saying to Judah, Metanoieite, they meant something more than “change your mind and purpose.” Their minds and purposes were not good when the proclamation began along the Jordan, and in Galilee. But they might have been like my friend’s “brotherhood,” and have changed their minds from the approving of the righteousness of the Pharisees to the cultivation of a novelty of their own. But we are not left to guess at what sort of a metanoia the Jews were exhorted to. The angel of Jehovah who appeared to John the Baptist’s father, has told us all about it. He has defined it in the following words far more to the point than Dr. Shepard will find it in the Polymicrian Lexicon. Speaking of the metanoia John’s preaching was to effect, the angel said, “Many of the sons of Israel shall be led to the Lord their God. And he shall go forward in his presence, in the spirit and power of Elijah, to restore the minds of the fathers in the children, and the unbelieving to just persons’ mode of thinking; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.” John’s mission was the making ready a company of Abrahams, Isaacs and Jacobs out of their posterity contemporary with Jesus. This he effected by reviving through the Elijah-like spirit and power of his preaching their dispositions and mode of thinking in such men as the apostles. Put these together in one man, the Abrahamic disposition and mode of thinking, and you have the metanoia to which the Jews were exhorted, because his Celestial Majesty was in the midst of them. This was something more than a change of mind resulting from sorrow, and merging into a barren assent to a proposition, and “reform!”

“To satisfy you fully,” saith the Doctor, “that metanoieo as used in the New Testament, does not signify to think with, I will quote a few passages, and in these quotations give it that signification.” He then gives the passages, which the reader can refer to in the Doctor’s last paragraph. In this he has taken what I termed “the radical idea of metanoieo,” and quoted it as though it were its contextual idea. Now the doctor, as a revising critic of the Union Baptist version, ought to know that the root-significations of words in composition take an implied meaning, as in the case of the more than a column of words he has transcribed from his Polymicrian. The doctrinal implication of metanoieite is, “Be with God as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were in disposition and mode of thinking.” This was to think with, or to be of the same mind with God; and if the Doctor can find any word or phrase in the English language to express it, that word or phrase is the countersign of metanoieo.

My friend must think I am easily satisfied to the full, if he imagines his eighth paragraph is convincing! Even the radical signification will do in all the texts he cites except

one, if God be supplied after “with.” Read “think with God,” and the truth is well expressed in the implication that results. The text to be excepted is, “If thy brother think with:” supply thee, “forgive him:” the brother’s thinking with the offended party shows a state of mind fit for reconciliation.

Having thus disposed of all my friend’s points, I would like to know of him, why he strains at gnats and swallows camels? He has occupied the greater part of his epistle in marshalling his Polymicrian against a man of straw—in proving that certain words compounded of meta signify change of some sort by implication, which never was denied: but, though he asked me in his note to give him the meaning I attached to gospel as used in Mark 16: 15, which I did in about three pages of this periodical, he is as silent as the depths of sheol on the subject. Why does not my friend storm the citadel? Why does he content himself with distant skirmishes? Why not cross bayonets at once; charge home, and demolish the “wooden throne?” He knows what I mean by this. My friend and his brotherhood have made a great noise in the world about ancient Christianity, the ancient gospel, and the ancient order of things. I understand their views of these things as well as they do themselves; and besides, understand the Prophets, with whom confessedly they have almost no acquaintance: yet they believe themselves far more enlightened than a heretic like myself. Why then do not they demolish me, and prove that I am in error, and they wholly and solely right? I deny their knowledge of the gospel. I am ready to show them from their pulpits what it is; but they will not hear: I exhibit it in the Herald, but they will not read, nor attempt its refutation: but persist in dogged silence, and hide themselves in a cloud of Greek. The timidity of errorists is proverbial: will my friend prove that the proverb does not apply to him?

EDITOR.

* * *

A FEW PLAIN WORDS ABOUT POPERY AND THE POPE.
BY AN ANONYMOUS ENGLISH WRITER.

Seeing there is so much talk just now about Popery and the Pope; that the whole kingdom has been parcelled out into Popish Bishoprics under a Cardinal Lord Archbishop of Westminster, and that we are placed under the spiritual dominion of Romish priests, it may not be amiss if we inquire what we shall be expected to believe, and what we shall have to submit to, —what in fact Popery really is, —before we shut up or burn our Bibles, and forsake our present religious teachers.

Shut up and burn our Bibles! you say. Aye, to be sure. No one ever heard of Papists allowing the Bible to be read by the common people. Now I am not surprised that the Roman Catholics dislike the Bible, for very much the same reason that Ahab, the King of Israel, disliked Micaiah, the prophet of the Lord—1 Kings 22: 8. It is hard not to contract a strong dislike to that which is for ever bearing testimony against one. To love an enemy is one of the most difficult of attainments; and the Bible everywhere speaks against Popery, and prophesies, not good, but evil of it, just as Micaiah did of Ahab. It is natural therefore that the Papists should dislike it. We ought not to expect any thing else. But I am somewhat surprised that they do not take more pains to conceal their dislike of it, for it certainly does not look well that a (professed) Church of God should fall out with the oracles of God. It has an ugly appearance, to say the least, to see a (so-called) Christian Church fall out with the Christian Scriptures.

Now we know the Pope hates Bible Societies, and forbids his people to have anything to do with them. It certainly looks bad that when Christ says, "Search the Scriptures," a Vicar of Christ, as he calls himself, should say, "No, you shall not even have them." Let us however do the Pope justice. He does not forbid the use of the Bible altogether, but only in the vulgar tongue. The English Catholic may have a French Bible, and the Frenchman a Dutch or English one. The mischief is in having it in a language which they can read.

The Papists say that the Bible is the source of heresies. They trace all the errors which prevail to the use of the Scriptures; but Christ gives a very different account of the matter. He says—Matthew 22: 29—to the Sadducees: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures." And Paul in writing to Timothy says, they are "able to make thee wise unto salvation." The Romanist tells us that our religion is only three hundred years old, but here is an Apostle who lived eighteen hundred years ago, writing amazingly like a Protestant about the Holy Scriptures.

We have besides an advantage for understanding the Bible, which we have not for any other book whose author is not personally accessible. We can, at any moment we please, go and ask Him to interpret to us any difficult passage. St. James tells us, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." So then we have the Bible to inform us, and we have constant opportunities of consulting its Author in regard to its meaning. Is not this enough? I am satisfied.

But it strikes me that the Papists themselves hardly believe that their religion is scriptural. For if they did, why should they not put the Bible into the hands of the people, and advise them to read it, that they might become good Roman Catholics?

I wonder that the Papists, in forbidding the Scriptures, do not except St. Peter's Epistles. Was ever any Catholic forbidden to read the letters of a Pope? I believe not. But if they may and should read the letters of the Popes, why not let them read the Epistles of the first of the Popes, as they call him, Peter? I should like to know why it is worse to read the letters of Pope Peter than of Pope Pius? They acknowledge that he wrote two epistles; why not let every Catholic have them? I do not wonder that they wish to keep out of sight of the people the Epistles of Paul, who says he "withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed." Paul forgot at the moment that Peter was supreme and infallible. (Infallible means not liable to err, or mistake.) We are all liable to forget. Perhaps it is because Peter says nothing about Rome, unless by Babylon he means Rome; and not a word about his being Bishop of Rome, and Pope! He seems to have had no idea that he was a pope. He says in his 1st Epistle, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." An elder! was that all? Why, Peter, do you forget yourself? Do you not know that you are a Universal Bishop, a Primate of the Apostolical College, Supreme and Infallible Head of the Church? Ah, this Infallibility! We all know the Church of Rome professes infallibility, but when did she get it? It was transmitted from Peter, to be sure! Christ gave it to him, and he handed it down. But was Peter infallible? There was a day when I suspect he did not think himself infallible—when, smitten to the heart, he went out and wept bitterly. There is no doubt he made a mistake when he so confidently pronounced, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee," and we know that this was after Christ had said to him, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock," &c.

If Peter was infallible, I wonder he did not at once settle the difficulty of which we have an account in Acts 15. Why was the matter suffered to be debated in the presence of his infallibility? It seems that Peter, on this occasion, claimed no pre-eminence, nor was any

particular deference paid to him by the council. He related his experience precisely as did Paul and Barnabas. James seems to have been in the chair on that occasion. He speaks much more like an infallible person, than any of the rest. He says, "Wherefore my sentence is," &c. What a pity it is for the Church of Rome, that Peter had not said that instead of James. We should never have heard the last of it. But it was the Bishop of Jerusalem, and not the Bishop of Rome, who said it.

But again, if Peter was infallible, I am surprised that Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." That was not the way to treat a Pope. But Paul had always something of the Protestant about him. And yet Peter did not resent Paul's treatment of him, for in his second Epistle he speaks of him as "our beloved brother Paul." I suppose that Peter himself did not know he was infallible. Men do not always know themselves.

But if the superiority among the disciples belonged to Peter, how was it that when the dispute arose among them, who should be the greatest, our Saviour did not take Peter instead of a little child, and set him in the midst of them? The disciples could not have understood our Saviour's declaration. "Thou art Peter," &c., as the Church of Rome interprets it, or that dispute about superiority could never have arisen.

But if Peter were not infallible, why should we think that the Popes are? It might seem unkind, were I to quote from history some of their practices; and sometimes there have been two and even three Popes at one time, each of whom consigned the other to a place worse than Purgatory. But as some of the Roman Catholics say that a man's doctrine may be infallible, while his practice is imperfect, we will look at some of their infallible doctrines.

Their priests are not allowed to marry—but Peter we know had a wife, and Paul says he had power to take a wife with him in his journeys, like the other apostles; and St. Paul, in laying down the duties of a Christian Bishop, says that he should be the husband of one wife, and he further says that Marriage is honourable in all. He does not except the clergy.

Now really, as it is well known that many of the Popes had families, and made no secret of it, but contracted marriages for their illegitimate children with some of the first families in Italy, I do not think it improbable that many of the Romish priests would copy their Head Bishop's example. There are some ugly tales told about these things in Catholic countries, which will not bear repeating. But common sense will tell us what must come of a parcel of young men and women taking vows not to marry. I see therefore no sign of infallibility in this doctrine, but just the contrary; for our Bibles tell us that "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry."

Then again, there is the doctrine of Confession to the priest. Old and young, male and female, are enjoined to tell him their most secret thoughts and emotions, and thus the purest mind is poisoned and corrupted, by being made to think upon and talk about impurity. For to aid in this disgusting work, the priests have the most particular directions, and questions are put which could only occur to the most abandoned of mankind. I know that I would not suffer my wife or daughter to undergo the filthy cross-examination of a set of men, though they had taken vows of chastity. But I do not find that penitents in the Bible were directed to go to the priests with money in their hands and get absolution; David, Hezekiah, Ezra, Daniel, and

others, all went direct to God, and found acceptance and pardon. And does not common sense tell us, that when we have offended any one, we should confess our sine to the person we have offended? If a child offends his father, does he go to a third person to acknowledge it, when his father is near at hand; and above all does, he go to a brother who has equally offended? Yet this is Popish doctrine. It sends us to a brother as deep in the offence as we, to confess to him that we have sinned against our father, when that father is near by; and when, moreover, he says, "Come to me!" The Prodigal went straight to his Father, and so did the Publican, and we know how he received them.

But while writing this, I have recollected there is one New Testament example of confessing to priests, and as I like fair play, the Catholics shall have the benefit of it. Judas Iscariot did not go to God with his confession. He went to the chief priests, and it was to them he said, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood." Here we must confess is an example of confession to a priest. But it is the only one, I believe, in the Bible, and the example is not an encouraging one. Judas also took money to the priests; so that the Papists have authority (such as it is) for that part of their practice. Let us do them justice, and give them the advantage of every particle of Scripture which really makes in their favour, for I am sure they need it. Poor Judas! He got nothing by going to the priests, and perhaps it was their cruel and contemptuous treatment of him that determined him, in his despair, to go and hang himself. How differently would even Judas have been treated, had he gone with a broken heart to our great High Priest, Jesus! Ah! it would have been better to go to Him whom he had betrayed, than to them to whom he betrayed Him. I think we had better always to go to Him, notwithstanding the example of Judas. David said it was better to fall into the hands of God, even for correction, than into the hands of man.

We have all heard of the doctrine of Purgatory, which all Romanists are required to believe. The Bible we know speaks of two places beyond the grave, but we find nothing about a third; we are taught that sin is washed out by blood—not burned out in fire. "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from ALL sin." What is then left for fire to do? The spirits of the just made perfect ascribe no part of their salvation to fire. No, their ascription is, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood"—Revelation 1: 5. What a horrible idea, that after Christ's blood has been applied to the believing penitent, the expiation is not complete till the soul has been subjected to an intense flame, for no one knows how long! The Penitent Thief did not go there, and yet if any one needed Purgatory, surely he did, for he had no time to do penance. I can find nothing about it in the Bible; and yet we are told a good deal about believers. Hark! here is a voice from heaven; now we shall know how it is: "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours." They that die in the Lord, rest, you see. Then certainly they are not in Purgatory. I do not know what you think about this but it would be poor comfort to me, when on a sick and dying bed, to think of resting in flames for an uncertain time.

There is another curious doctrine which Papists hold to be infallible. Supererogation they call it, a long word they have coined on purpose, the meaning of which is, that when good people have done enough for their own salvation, all they do over and above, goes into a common treasury of the Church, who can sell this surplus stock to rich sinners who fall short. Now we are commanded to love God with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength, and till we have done this, we have not done enough; and it was because we could never do this, and must have perished, that Christ suffered, the just for the unjust. I do not

think the wise virgins were Papists, for when they were asked for oil, they said, “Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you.”

That the poor should like Popery when they know what it is, I can’t imagine, for it is not a poor man’s Church. Christ, according to them, does not open heaven till mass has been had and paid for, so that either our Saviour was wrong when he says, “How hardly shall they that have riches enter the kingdom of God,” or else Popery is wrong, for they are the very men who can enter most easily, having the wherewith to purchase indulgences and masses.

The poor must serve their time out in Purgatory, while the rich can buy themselves out. ‘Tis true there is a service once a year, on the second of November, (they call it All-Souls’ day,) when mass is said for all Catholic souls in Purgatory. Now a poor Catholic must feel very disconsolate who is taken with mortal sickness soon after, with the prospect of burning in the flames at the very least till the next All-Soul’s day. But I am afraid, as it takes so much money and time to get a rich Catholic out, that the benefit is not much when it comes to be divided among so many as die every year; and so it would appear is their own opinion, for to help themselves, in most Catholic countries they have Benefit Clubs, to which they subscribe weekly, and a member on his death is entitled to a mass to give him a lift out of Purgatory—provided his subscription be duly paid up. Ah, this is the rub! Here are the very words. I have copied them from Rue 7 of a Dublin Purgatory Club: —“Every subscriber shall be entitled, without distinction, to the benefit of One Mass each, provided that such Member or Subscriber shall be six Months a Subscriber to the Institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of the departure!” I wonder what Peter would have thought of these Spiritual Benefit Clubs!

In another of them to catch honorary members, from “Those respectable persons who wish to contribute largely to this truly meritorious and charitable association for relieving the distressed poor, who may allow at the rate of 7½d, or 10d, or 1s. per week, paid quarterly in advance, which grand subscriptions will be faithfully “registered and transmitted from our books to the books of Eternal Life.” “There will also be some Masses immediately celebrated, ACCORDING TO THE SUBSCRIPTION.”

Peter says, that, “we are not redeemed with such corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ,” but his infallible successors seem of a very different opinion. But I think Peter is the better authority of the two, and should be very unwilling to have years or ages of torture depending on the Subscription.

Now if good Catholics have to endure all this burning in Purgatory, no wonder they think so little of burning the bodies of Protestant heretics. And as that which is infallible cannot change, we will not forget the hundreds of fires that were once kindled in every part of this country. But as Bishop Latimer said to Bishop Ridley when about to perish in the flames, “Brother Ridley, we shall this day light a candle in England, which by God’s grace shall never be put out,” so shall the lamp of God’s Word continue to be a light unto our feet, to conduct us onward to temporal and eternal happiness; although the other day a Romish priest in Birmingham did take a person’s Bible and burnt it. For my part, I am afraid that a man that hates God’s blessed Word so much as to burn it, would not scruple to burn those who love it, if he had but the power.

Many of us have thought that it was an old-fashioned prejudice that fancied any danger from Popery in these enlightened days but let us look at Rome. Not long ago we read

in the papers that the Roman people were so sick and tired of the Pope and his Government, that they rose against them; and that he sneaked away, behind a Protestant nobleman's carriage, disguised as a livery servant. A pretty convincing proof this, that those who know him best like him the least. "Well," thought I, as I read it, "this does not look much like God's Vicar on earth; but 'the hireling fleeth because he is an hireling.' Servants in livery may be very respectable and good sort of people, but we should not seek among them for an Infallible Pope, and a successor of St. Peter. His poor deluded followers in other countries will surely now have their eyes opened to his blasphemous pretensions!"

Directly the Pope's back was turned, the Inquisition was abolished; orders came for thousands of Bibles from the Roman people; and printing-presses were set to work in Rome itself, for it seemed impossible to supply the demand for the Scriptures. No sooner, however, did he return, than the Inquisition was restored; the gentleman (Dr. Achilli) who had been most active in Bible distribution was clapped into it, the printing-presses stopped, and the people everywhere commanded to deliver up their Bibles to be destroyed. Depend upon it, the Bible is as much hated by Romish priests in England as in Rome, and the Bible-burning in Birmingham is but a sample of what we should have everywhere in this country. Popery changed, indeed! its tyranny, its Bible-hating, and its superstitious mummeries can never change, or it would no longer be Popery. Why, the present Pope, since his return, has proclaimed a new miracle—that an image of the Virgin Mary has been miraculously winking its eyes, "to the great advantage of the faithful;" and I don't know what honours are being paid to it. Just fancy what English Roman Catholics of plain common sense must think of such impostures as this, warranted by one who is styled an Infallible Head of the Church. Who can wonder that infidelity is general in Popish countries among the better informed of the people.

Had the Pope been left to himself, we should have heard very little of a Sovereign Pontiff. But we read in our Bibles that the kings of the earth shall give their power unto the Beast; and so foreign armies were sent to force the Pope and his authority upon an unwilling people. And those armies are obliged to be kept there, or he would again be driven out. And though at present he may speak great swelling words, we know where it is written of the apostate Church of which he is the head, "For God hath put it in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their power unto the Beast, UNTIL THE WORDS OF GOD SHALL BE FULFILLED." And again, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues," for "she shall be utterly burned with fire."

There are many other things on which I should like to say a few words, but a handful of corn is as sufficient to show the quality as the whole sack; and I hope that the few samples I have given will put us all thinking, and reading our Bibles, and praying too, for God's Holy Spirit to guide us in the way of truth; and then we shall have reason to bless him for this impudent meddling of the Pope.

But we have also something else to do besides thinking, and reading, and praying, — for God works by means. Protestantism should be a religion of protesting, but many of us have nearly forgotten what were the sins of Popery which led our forefathers to protest against, and to abandon it. Our CIVIL LIBERTIES are in as much danger as our spiritual privileges. Papists boast that as Popery is infallible, it never changes, and cannot change. Let us take them at their word, and act accordingly, uniting in addressing the Parliament and the Throne, and telling them that though Popery claims infallibility, we do not, and that we fear we have made a mistake in seeming to allow by some of our concessions to what we thought

full religious liberty for our fellow-subjects, the intermeddling of a foreign power; that we are now convinced by experience that Popery is, and ever must be, the enemy of our country and of mankind, and that it should not be allowed unlimited license in this Protestant kingdom; that British females should not be allowed to be inveigled into taking vows of celibacy; that convents and monasteries should not again be suffered to pollute the soil from which our forefathers uprooted them; and that we will have no Jesuits (who have been for their crimes expelled in turn from every Roman Catholic country) allowed to interfere in our families, and undermine their principles.

That while we would have no persecution of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, we would have such additions to our statutes as may be necessary to have them, equally with ourselves, protected from the aggressive and deadly machinations of a foreign priesthood, which has ever been the bitterest enemy of our country. And that we will, at all hazards, and at any cost, preserve those scriptural privileges which our forefathers purchased with their lives, and which, under God, are the only safeguards of our individual happiness and our national prosperity.

* * *

TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR TO THE MILLENNIUM.

The writings of the early Fathers of the Christian Church have been sometimes greatly overrated on the one hand, and at other times as unjustly depreciated, on the other. It has been maintained that from this source, all our theology ought to flow, and that by this standard the Word of God ought to be expounded. Did not those individuals, it has been triumphantly asked, who lived next to the age of Christ and his apostles, know better what doctrines they taught and what expositions of Old Testament Scriptures they gave, than those who live at the present day? Others, on the contrary, express the utmost contempt for the writings of the Fathers; collect from their works numerous instances of false exegesis, and then exclaim, in the words though not in the spirit of Lord Bacon, "We are the true ancients." Both these opinions are manifestly erroneous, and hence the question arises, What degree of importance are we to attach to the writings of the early Fathers? Though we cannot elevate them to the rank of judges, and implicitly bow to their exposition of Scripture, yet we must regard them as honest men, and perfectly competent to give an impartial account of the leading doctrines which were believed in their day. It is indeed admitted, that error was introduced at a very early period into the Church, and that in the first three centuries of the Christian era we find the germ of almost every error that was afterwards developed in the anti-christian apostasy. But it cannot surely be supposed that, at so early a period, the essential doctrines of the gospel would be denied, or so greatly perverted as to destroy their distinctive features, and consequently we may believe that the doctrines taught by Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian were generally the same with those contained in the New Testament. The nearer, therefore, that any writer lived to the time of the apostles, the more important is his testimony respecting any particular doctrine. Viewed in this light, the testimony of Justin Martyr is of the utmost importance. He was born in the Greek colony of Flavia Neapolis, near to the ancient Sychem in Samaria, and, previous to his embracing Christianity, was well acquainted with the leading systems of Grecian philosophy. He afterwards went from place to place in his philosopher's mantle, expounding the Scriptures, and defending Christianity against both heathens and heretics. His larger Apology presented to the Roman Emperor in defence of the Christians, and his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, were written about the middle of the second century, and at a period when individuals must have been living who had seen and

heard some of the apostles. Justin had also visited Palestine, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Rome, so that he had ample opportunity of being well acquainted with the leading teachers in the Christian Church.

The clear, decided testimony of such a man as Justin Martyr to the personal reign of Christ on the earth has always been felt to be peculiarly valuable. He repeatedly maintains that two advents are recorded in Scripture: one in which Christ should come as a sufferer, in a mean and despised form, and that he should be at last crucified; but in the other he shall come with great power and glory. “For the prophets,” says he, “proclaim two of his advents; one indeed, has already taken place, when he appeared as a dishonoured and suffering man; but the other is announced when he shall appear with the glory of heaven, with his angelic host, when he shall also raise the bodies of all men”—Apology, I., chapter 52. But what proof have we that this second advent is premillennial. We have the most conclusive evidence in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, when he endeavours to convince his opponent that Christ is the Messiah promised to the fathers. But the Jew naturally affirmed that Jesus could not be the Messiah, for the prophets announced that he should come as a glorious conqueror, and yet Christ was mean and despised. In obviating this objection, Justin says that there are two appearances of Christ mentioned: one in which he was put to death, but in the other his murderers shall recognise him whom they have pierced, and the tribes shall wail, tribe by tribe, the women apart, and the men apart; but that in the mean time Christ sits at the right hand of the Father, till the times are completed. “Our Lord Jesus Christ,” says Justin, “was forthwith received into heaven, while the times were fulfilling; and he that is about to come and speak bold and audacious things against the Most High is already near at the door, who, Daniel intimates, shall remain for a time, and times, and the half of a time. And you, ignorant how long he is about to continue, expound it otherwise; for ye say that a time denotes a hundred years. But if this is the case, then the Man of Lawlessness shall reign at least 350 years, according to that which is spoken by the holy Daniel, ‘And times,’ where not less than two times can be intended”—Dialogue, chapter 32. By the 1260 days, mentioned in Revelation, and the time, times, and the dividing of a time, in Daniel, the early Fathers understood three years and a half, during which Antichrist shall reign. At the close of this period, they thought Christ should come, and consume the Man of Sin with the breath of his mouth and destroy him with the outshining of his presence. In confirmation of this theory, and as an illustration of the passage already quoted we may notice that Justin thus describes the manifestation of the man of sin previous to Christ’s second coming: “There are two appearances of him (of Christ) announced. The first, indeed, in which he is announced as suffering, and without glory, and crucified; but the second, in which he shall appear with glory above the heavens; when also the Man of Apostasy who utters enormously insolent things even against the most High, shall dare to do unlawful things against us Christians upon earth.” The two appearances of Christ are also illustrated, according to the allegorising spirit of the age, by the two goats on the annual day of atonement; the one was sacrificed and the other was sent into the wilderness. The first goat, it was alleged, was typical of a suffering, the second of a glorified, Redeemer.

Justin Martyr maintained further, that Elias would come, previous to Christ’s appearance. Trypho objected against Christianity that Elias had not come according to the prediction of Malachi. Our author replies, that as John the Baptist, in the spirit and power of Elias, preceded Christ’s first coming, so Elias shall come personally before his second advent—Dialogue, chapter 49.

But the most complete exposition of the common view of the Church respecting the Millennium is contained in the 80th and 81st chapters of the Dialogue with Trypho. The subject is introduced by a question from Trypho. “And Trypho answered to these things: Tell me, O man, since thou art anxious to be certain in all matters, cleaving to the Scriptures. But tell me, do you truly confess that this place, Jerusalem, shall be built, and do you expect that before Christ come, your people shall be gathered together and rejoice with Christ, together with the patriarchs and prophets, and with our race, and even with the proselytes? or that you may seem to excel us in these questions, are you not at liberty to confess to these things? And I replied: I am not so reduced to extremities, O Trypho, as to say things that I do not think. I will confess then to thee; and first, that I and many others think that these things shall be accomplished as truly as you do; but I acknowledge to thee again that there are also many Christians who are (not?) pious and pure who do not entertain this sentiment. For I have shown you that there are some that are called Christians who are atheists and ungodly heretics, because they teach all blasphemous and atheistical and foolish doctrines. But that you may not be the only one to know that we hold this doctrine, I will compose a treatise, according to my ability, of all our doctrines, in which I will write also that which I have acknowledged, and that which I acknowledge to you. For I am determined not to follow men or men’s doctrines, but rather God and those doctrines derived from him. For if you converse with some that are called Christians, they not only do not acknowledge this doctrine, but they also dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; they also affirm that there is no resurrection of the dead, and that as soon as they die their souls are received into heaven. You do not acknowledge them to be Christians any more than those Jews, when it is rightly understood, who confess that they are Sadducees, or that they belong to the similar heresies of the Genistae, and Meristae, and Galileans, and Helleniani, and Pharisees, and Baptistae—you even hear me with difficulty enumerating these things; but these are indeed called Jews and the children of Abraham, and they confess him with their lips, while, as God himself exclaims, their heart is far from him. But I and those that are orthodox Christians in all things, maintain that there shall be a resurrection of the flesh, and we shall spend a thousand years in Jerusalem when it has been built and beautified and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and the others confess. For Isaiah thus speaks concerning the thousand years: —Isaiah 65: 17-25. I continued, When, therefore, it is affirmed in these words, ‘For according to the days of a tree shall be the days of my people, even according to the works of their labour,’ we think that a thousand years are intimated in a mystery. For as it was said to Adam, ‘In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die,’ we know that he did not fulfil a thousand years. We know also, when it is said that the day of the Lord is as a thousand years, that this doctrine is referred to. And since also there was a certain man among us, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, having composed a Revelation, predicted that they who believe should dwell in Jerusalem with our Christ, and after these things there shall take place the universal and, as appears, eternal judgment, simultaneously with the resurrection of all. For even as our Lord said, —they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but shall be equal to the angels, being the children of the resurrection of God”—Dialogue, chapters 80 and 81.

In this important quotation, it will be observed that there is an apparent contradiction. According to the received reading, Justin says: “But I acknowledge to thee again that there are many Christians who are pious and pure who do not hold this doctrine.” And then he goes on to enumerate such parties who call themselves Christians, and yet attempted to subvert the very foundations of divine truth. Critics have endeavoured to remove the difficulty in two ways. Some propose to read the clause thus: “But I acknowledge to thee again that there are many Christians who are not pious and pure who do not hold this doctrine;” and then it is

argued that such individuals ought no more to be called Christians than the adherents of the seven heretical sects among the Jews should be called the children of Abraham. Others think that no conjectural reading is admissible, and that the difficulty is sufficiently cleared up by the fact, that though pure and pious Christians denied the millennial reign of Christ, they were not orthodox Christians in all things. "But I," says he, "and those that are perfectly orthodox Christians in all things." The first mode of obviating the difficulty renders the passage entirely consistent with itself, and indicates a regular process of thought, while according to the second, the imperfect, but pure and pious Christians are simply mentioned, and then, by an abrupt transition of thought, the entire argument is made to bear against heretics who were unworthy of the Christian name. And though in the Greek of the New Testament a conjectural reading is entirely inadmissible, yet this is very far from being the case with the writings of the Fathers, as their works have not been guarded by the Church with such scrupulous care as the inspired volume. But according to either exposition, it is admitted that the personal reign of Christ on the earth with his saints was the prevalent doctrine in the Church during the second century—a circumstance which surely points to an earlier origin.

Justin reminds his opponents that the Christians believed in the personal reign of Christ just as truly as did the Jews that Messiah should come. The Jewish Rabbis taught that the Messiah, immediately on his coming, would reassemble the scattered tribes, and that every Israelite who did not, like the Sadducees, deny the resurrection of the dead, would enter upon the enjoyment of a thousand years, under the dominion of their triumphant King. "How many," asks one, "are the days of the Messiah?" Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Rabbi Jose, the Galilean, said: "The times of the Messiah are a thousand years according to what is said in Jeremiah 23: 4: For the day of God is a thousand years."

The vanity of human life is never perhaps so keenly felt as when we contrast its shortness with the duration of many trees, and even with most of the works of art. The oak lives a thousand years, and many of the works of man exist long after he is dead. When, therefore, it is said that the days of God's people shall be as the days of a tree, even as the works of their hands, it is intended that during the millennium the curse shall be removed, and man shall regain his original position in the universe of God.

There is another passage in the writings of this distinguished Father which evidently refers to the millennium, and from which some have very unfairly attempted to show that sensuous notions were connected with this great event. It is as follows: "That Christ preached the gospel, and himself said, The kingdom of heaven is at hand; and that it was necessary for him to suffer many things of the Scribes and Pharisees, and to be crucified, and on the third day to rise again, and again to come to Jerusalem to eat and drink with his disciples." Justin clearly refers to Matthew 26: 29, where the Saviour says to his disciples, "But I say unto you, I will not drink hereafter of this fruit of the vine, until that day I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Instead, therefore, of criticising Justin Martyr's sensuous notions too severely, let the opponents of Christ's pre-millennial advent recollect that he is almost quoting inspired language, and let them beware lest, in condemning the servant, they do not equally condemn the master. This ancient writer is indeed very far from indulging in sensual ideas when he represents believers as waiting for the coming of the Lord. He affirms, in harmony with Scripture, that the children of the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal to the angels; and he expressly says, "Whoever is faithful to the doctrine of Jesus, him will Christ raise from the dead at his second advent, and make him immortal, unchangeable, and free from all sorrow." And in another passage he says, "At his glorious advent Christ will in every way confound those who have hated him and unrighteously

apostatised from him: but his own people he will bring to enjoy repose, and fulfil all their expectations.” These quotations clearly show the nature of the millennium which the early Christians expected, for Justin is not the only writer of that period who entertained the same blessed hope. “In all these works,” says Gieseler in his Church History, “the millennium is so evident, that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal in an age when certainly such motives as it offered were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity.” But if this belief was necessary then, it is no less needful now. Contempt, and hatred, and malice have supplied the place of open violence, and consequently it is just as true as it ever was that it is through much tribulation that we must inherit the kingdom. In the metaphorical but deeply impressive language of Scripture, believers are still orphans, destitute and desolate, deprived of a Father’s care; they are still captives longing for the return of their sovereign to break their chains; and the Church, in her collective capacity, is yet a disconsolate widow subject to the world’s oppression and scorn, and continually expecting her Husband’s return. This glorious hope is, just as necessary now as it was in the past ages, to cheer us in adversity, to sustain our courage and invigorate our faith amidst our manifold trials, as we wait for the coming of the Lord from heaven. And surely it is a cheering thought that, for aught we know to the contrary, this may be the last generation of men who shall tread the earth in sorrow and sadness, and that before another age dawns, Christ may come and reign with his saints upon the earth. —From Waymarks in the Wilderness.

* * *

From the Gospel Banner.

SECTARIANISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY.

It is a grand mistake to suppose, that because the Bible is generally circulated, and churches and meeting-houses abound, therefore this is a Christian land. It is professedly Christian, we know, but profession, and practice are two things not always found united together. In order to be a christian, it is essential that the teachings of Christ be regarded. To disregard his teachings is a virtual denial of his name. No one has a right to it who does not believe his word, or the word of those whom he sent forth as his ambassadors. How important then to compare our faith and practice with the inspired word! “Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith.” We purpose to notice a few things held in common by the sects of the day, which are subversive of the doctrines of the Bible, and therefore anti-Christian.

1. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

This may be called the cardinal doctrine of sectarianism. It is held by all parties, from the “Mother of Harlots” to the youngest of her daughters. Catholic and Protestant here meet on common ground. And more than this. Mohammedan and Pagan also admit and glory in the same doctrine, and, in this respect at least, need no “turning from darkness to light.” It also bears the impress of age. Before Jesus brought “life and immortality to light by the gospel,” it was taught by heathen philosophers in the schools of Greece. And, at the present day, it is pretended to be proved to a demonstration by a new order of fanatics known by the cognomen of spiritual-rappers.

But does this universal adherence to the doctrine prove the point in question? Not at all. Christianity is not built on Pagan philosophy, nor dependent on demonology for proof of

the correctness of its doctrines. The Bible is the text book of Christians. “To the law and the testimony” alone they appeal for the truth of their articles of faith and practice.

The immortality of the soul forms no part of Christ’s teaching, nor is it found in the Bible at all. He taught that those who received and practised his word should not perish by death, but be raised from the dead at the last day, and that they should never die any more, but be like unto the angels of God—Luke 20: 35-36. The immortality he taught is not inherent in man, but dependent on character, is and to be manifested only in an incorruptible body, by a resurrection from the dead. It is those who are “worthy”—those “who by a patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality”—those who hear the voice of Jesus, and follow him, that shall have eternal life. See Romans 2: 6-7; John 10: 27-28; James 1: 12. The immortality taught in the Scriptures cannot be enjoyed without a resurrection of the body. This is plainly and forcibly taught by the apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 15. He says that if the dead rise not, “then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished” Now this is not true if the popular doctrine be correct. That which is immortal cannot perish or die. But God has said, “The soul that sinneth it shall die”—and “The wages of sin is death.” The language of sectarianism is the language of the serpent, “Ye shall not surely die”—and therefore anti-Christian, because opposed to the teachings of Christ.

2. The doctrine of an intermediate state of conscious enjoyment or misery.

This doctrine has arisen out of the former, and became absolutely necessary, in order to make the thing consistent. If the soul is immortal, then it will live after the body dies, and must exist somewhere. If righteous, it will be borne aloft on angels’ wings to a paradise above the skies, of which the poet sings:

“There I shall bathe my weary soul
In seas of heavenly rest;
And not a wave of trouble roll
Across my peaceful breast.”

But if unrighteous, then the immortal spirit

“Ascends to God, not there to dwell,
But hears its doom and sink to hell.”

Such is the teaching of a majority of the sects. And yet this doctrine of an intermediate state has its difficulties. Hence there is a division in the camp on the subject: the majority or orthodox believing that the empire of death over the body is to exist only until the judgment, when the immortal spirits will be called back to their prison bodies, in order to receive judgment; while the minority reject the resurrection of the body as of no use, and look upon the spirit world as the final state. And certainly the last idea is the most reasonable, if we admit the soul to be immortal. But this is all foolishness—has no foundation in the Word of Wisdom. One error begets another. The Scriptures do not recognise any intermediate state of consciousness between death and the resurrection of the body. On the contrary, they teach that the “dead know not any thing;” that when man dieth, “in that very day his thoughts perish;” and that “the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence.” The word sleep, and consequently the idea it represents, is frequently made use of by the sacred writers to set forth the state of the dead. “Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him,” &c. So

also Job says, “Man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep”—Job 14: 12.

3. The doctrine concerning heaven and hell.

And what! is this teaching wrong too? Most assuredly. Compare the teaching of sectarian preachers on these topics with the revealments of the Bible, and you will certainly perceive a vast difference. The Bible says nothing about heaven and hell being located in the “spirit-world,” or of their being the abode of “spirits blessed,” of “spirits damned.” True, the Bible speaks of heaven, where God dwells, in “the light which no man can approach unto,” but that abode is not promised unto the sons of men. Of this heaven Jesus said, “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven”—John 3: 13. To this glorious abode Jesus ascended, and is now there as the High Priest of his people in the Holy of Holies. None but the High Priest was permitted to enter the inner sanctuary, where the cherubim overshadowed the mercy-seat and the ark of the covenant. He entered that Holy Place for the people. Even Jesus will not abide in heaven, but will come to our planet again, and take up his abode in it for ever. Peter, speaking of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, says, “David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool”—Acts 2: 34-35. Now if David is not in heaven—if no man hath ascended to heaven but Jesus, and he only for a limited time, as the representative of his people—what becomes of all the assertions of those who teach that the abode of the Eternal God is the dwelling-place of those who die in Jesus? And if Jesus did not enter in until he was clothed with an incorruptible and immortal body by a resurrection from the dead, how say some they can enter that glorious abode as naked spirits? The doctrine is full of absurdity, and shrinks into thin air when touched with the sublime doctrine of a future state as made known in the Bible.

“The earth hath Jehovah given to the sons of men.” Paradise was first located here. And when the earth is redeemed from the curse resting upon it, then Paradise will be restored. All things will be created new, or renovated. “There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away”—Revelation 21: 4. Is there not something worthy of God in this? A renovated earth peopled with immortal beings? There is nothing fabulous or mythological about this heaven, but all is real and substantial. It belongs to those things of which it is said, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him”—1 Corinthians 2: 9.

And what shall we say about the hell of the sects? It is described as a place of inconceivable and unending torture, where the immortal spirit will be eternally conscious of a separation from God and happiness. What an idea! Suppose this world of sinners had been abandoned of God from the time our first parents sinned to the present, what now would have been the state of the race? Probably exterminated—or, if not exterminated, so far debased as to be little better than the brute creation. Such is the tendency of sin, unrestrained. And yet the popular doctrine teaches that man, if found worthy of death at the close of this probationary state, will not die, but be kept alive for ever and ever, in a sinful condition, in order to be tormented. What a libel is this upon the character of God! It converts a just, holy, and merciful Being into a revengeful, cruel, and malicious tyrant. The Scriptures declare—“If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die”—“He who sows to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption,” or death—“Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death;” and who can gainsay his authority, or reverse his righteous decrees? Sin is an abomination in his sight. His holiness

cannot approve those who practise it. Therefore it is said, “they which commit such things are worthy of death;” that “evil-doers shall be cut off;” that “the transgressors shall be destroyed together;” that “the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away,”—Psalm 37: 20; that “the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither ROOT nor BRANCH,”—Malachi 4: 1; that “He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;” that “these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment,”—Matthew 25: 46; “whose end is destruction,”—Philippians 3: 19; “who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power,”—2 Thessalonians 1: 9; and that “the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death”—Revelation 21: 8.

From these references it will be seen that death, not life, is the result of sin; destruction, not endless torture, the punishment of the wicked. Sin has marred the perfect work of God, and renders the individual who loves it unfit and unable to fulfil the end of his creation; therefore He has wisely and mercifully proposed to destroy those whom he cannot save by his love, as made known by his Son Jesus Christ. The hell of the sects is not of God. The doctrine is heathenish and devilish. God is not implacable; when he punishes the transgressor with death, he does it because “one sinner destroyeth much good,” and

“One sickly sheep infects the flock,
And poisons all the rest;”

Therefore, “the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it”—Proverbs 2: 22. Then “the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it.”

* * *

THE JEWS OF PALESTINE.

The President and Trustees of the American Relief Society for the Indigent Jews in Jerusalem have issued an address to their co-religionists throughout the United States, on the subject of the deep distress which is now devastating the land of Israel’s past and future glory. “Poverty threatens to hasten the death of the pious pilgrims scattered through the four cities associated in holiness, who, in their dire condition, appeal in words that rend the hearts of all gifted to feel, for immediate relief from the horrors which encompass them. The Trustees have not the heart to place before their fellow Israelites the picture of woe brought to their view in well-authenticated documents; it will suffice to show the extent of the distress by the following extracts. Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart., in answer to a draft sent by the Society, writes: “The distress of Israel at the present moment is truly heartrending. The high price of provisions and house-rent, the diminution of the usual revenues for the poor, afford the best evidences of the state of the indigent.” The house of Leheren at Amsterdam, appeal in the fervent words of patriotism for the relief of the poor in Palestine, and state that ‘nearly half of the usual revenue will now be taken from the Jews in the Orient by the ukase of the Czar prohibiting his Jewish subjects from transmitting any money to Jerusalem.’ Leon Dyer, Esq., a respected citizen of Baltimore, writes: ‘Were I to describe the misery endured by the poor

Jews, it would scarcely be credited; yet it is increased a thousand fold at the present moment, owing to the unparalleled high price of food, which has caused numbers to die of starvation, and many more must share the like fate, unless relief comes from some quarter. The small-pox has been raging at Jerusalem since the middle of December, and when we left, January 17th, its virulence had not abated. Seven-eighths of the Jews in Palestine depend on support from abroad, which, at best, does not half supply their wants, and to which our happy country contributes a very small portion.”—Advent Harbinger.

* * *

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE.

The Journal de la Statistique Universelle of Paris publishes the following table of the successive encroachments of Russia from the fourteenth century up to the year 1832. It is drawn up from communications by M. M. Schmitzler, Maltebrun, Gen. Bem, and other statisticians:

GRAND DUCHY OF MOSCOW.

IN	EXTENT IN GEOGRAPHICAL MILES.	POPULATION
1328, at the accession of Yvan (Kaleta)	4656	6,290,000
1462, at the accession of Yvan I	18,474	
1503, at the death of Yvan I	37,437	
1584, at the death of Yvan II	125,465	
1645, at the death of Michel I	254,361	
1689, at the accession of Peter I	263,900	16,060,000

EMPIRE OF RUSSIA.

1725, at the accession of Catherine I	273,845	20,000,000
1762, at the accession of Catherine II	349,538	25,000,000
1796, at the death of Catherine II	334,850	33,000,000
1825, at the death of Alexander I	367,494	56,000,000
1831, at the taking of Warsaw	369,764	60,000,000

That is to say, that during the last two centuries Russia has doubled her territory, and during the last hundred years has tripled her population; her conquests during sixty years are equal to all she possessed in Europe before that period; her conquests from Sweden are greater than what remains of that kingdom; she has taken from the Tartars an extent equal to that of Turkey in Europe, with Greece, Italy, and Spain; her conquests from Turkey in Europe are more in extent than the kingdom of Prussia without the Rhenish provinces; she has taken from Turkey in Asia an extent of territory equal to all the small States of Germany; from Persia equal to the whole of England (United Kingdom); and from Poland equal to the whole Austrian empire. A division of the population gives—

2,000,000 for the tribes of the Caucasus.
4,000,000 for the Cossacks, the Georgians, and the Khirguiz.
5,000,000 for the Turks, the Mongols, and the Tartars.
6,000,000 for the Ouralions, the Finlanders, and the Swedes.
20,000,000 for the Moscovites (of the Greek Church.)
23,000,000 for the Poles (Roman and Greek Church united.)
60,000,000

The population of ancient Poland counts for two-fifths of the total population over an eighth part of the territory, and the Moscovite population for one-third of the total number over a tenth of the territory; in other words, even at the present time the Polish element is in a great majority as compared to all the others.

* * *

[From the Philadelphia Ledger, May 27].

PALESTINE MORTGAGED TO THE ROTHSCHILDS.

It is said abroad that Palestine has been mortgaged to the Rothschilds, as security for a loan advanced to the Sultan. The rumour further asserts that among the possibilities of the future, is the erection of Palestine, on the conclusion of a peace, into a Jewish kingdom, under the dynasty of the Rothschilds. That serious territorial alterations will grow out of the pending war, is incontestable; and this suggestion regarding Palestine, however visionary it may seem, is, therefore, not quite absurd.

That Palestine should fall into the possession of some other people than the Turks is desirable, on many accounts. Situated, as it is, at a distance from the central government, and liable continually to the exactions of pachas, or the indifference of governors, it offers no sufficient inducements for capital to settle there, or industry to remain. It is consequently in a state of progressive decay. Agriculture is neglected, trade finds little to support it, and ignorance, superstition and vice domineer over the land. From the farthest shores of Nazareth to the southern waters of the Dead Sea, a curse seems to hang over the country, blighting it like a pestilence, or a flight of Egyptian locusts.

There was a time, however, when Palestine was the most flourishing region, perhaps, on the face of the globe. Its valleys were filled with the low of cattle—its terraced hillsides glowed with golden crops; the vine dotted the landscape with purple grapes; and an almost continuous line of villages crowned the acclivities, in sight of each other, from the desert of Idumea on the south to Mount Libanus on the north. There is reason to believe that at the beginning of the Christian era, the whole land was like a vast suburb. The four Gospels are full of allusions which warrant this conclusion. But now desolation broods over the entire prospect. The footprints of successive invaders have deeply dented the surface of the country. The round, battlemented towers of the Crusaders rise amid the ruins of old Roman works, while modern Turkish fortresses lift themselves above the blackened walls of Roman castles. The axe and fire have gone over this once fair region in repeated surges of blood and conflagration. Centuries of war and oppression have exhausted the spirit of the people, have destroyed the old improvements, have turned what was once a continuous garden and vineyard into a comparative desert. No man can remember what Palestine once was, and

recall what it is at present, without wishing that equal laws and liberal institutions might restore it to its former splendour.

The creation of a Jewish kingdom promises the speediest method of arriving at this. There are millions of Hebrews scattered over Europe, who would avail themselves of such a restoration to return to the land of their fathers. Poland and Russia, especially, swarm with them. The oppression under which they suffer, wherever the Czar holds sway, would be an additional inducement for them to emigrate to Palestine. A Jew in Russia cannot wear a beard as he wishes, cannot appear in certain garments, cannot import even the Hebrew Scriptures, cannot enjoy the common rights of a citizen. When we consider the adventurous character of the race, and recall the great Jewish exodus which is even now going on, we cannot see any difficulty in the way of a Jewish emigration, such as would repopulate Palestine in a very few years.

There are difficulties in the way, however, and serious ones. A small kingdom, like Palestine proper would be, would hardly sustain itself against its mightier neighbours. But if, as appearances begin to indicate, the present war will end in the reconstruction of Turkey; and if that reconstruction should be based on a federal union, under the Sultan, of various independent provinces, then we see no reason why a Hebrew principality might not take its place in such a union, side by side with a Servian, a Russian, or an Albanian one.

* * *

EMANCIPATION OF THE JEWS IN TURKEY.

We are authorised to state, says the Jewish Chronicle of April 7th, that Lord Clarendon has intimated to one of our most distinguished co-religionists, that the privileges to be obtained for the Christians in Turkey will be extended to the Jewish subjects of the Porte.

* * *