

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, NOVEMBER, 1854—  
Volume 4—No. 11

---

“THE MILLENNIAL REIGN.”

While I was in Kentucky, my attention was drawn to a communication in the June number of Mr. A. Campbell’s Magazine under the above caption, over the signature of “A Friend of Truth;” and to Mr. Campbell’s extraordinary evasion of the reply the importance of the queries entitles them to. But, before offering any remarks, I will present the reader with the documents themselves:

“Elder Campbell. —With respect to the question of the nature of the events which are to begin the Millennial Reign of Christ, the following points are so clear and positive, that but few will deny any of them:

- “1. Said reign is to begin by a resurrection of some kind, of the righteous dead. — Revelation 20.
- “2. By a coming of Christ, of some kind. —Revelation 21.
- “3. By some kind of a destruction of the great mass of mankind as individuals. — Revelation 14: 9-11.
- “4. By some kind of a termination of the Fourth Universal Monarchy. — Revelation 19; Daniel 7.
- “5. By a reward of some kind to all the righteous as individuals. —Revelation 11 and 16.
- “6. By a reward of some kind to all the saints as a people or nation. —Hebrews 11; Daniel 7.

“The important question now presents itself: If the above texts do not prove that all the above events are to have a real and literal fulfilment, can it be proved from the Bible that like events will have a literal fulfilment at the end of the millennium? In other words, Do the Scriptures more plainly prove the above, or like events, to be literal, than the texts above referred to?

“This inquiry brings before us another important question: If there are no plainer Scriptures to prove that said events are more literal at the end than at the beginning of the millennium, does not the popular doctrine of the spiritual millennial reign involve or comprise a denial of Christ’s personal reign as taught in the Scriptures, or that he no longer exists personally as the Son of man? And is not this a denial of an important part of the faith in Christ which we are required to exercise in connection with repentance and baptism, in order to obtain salvation? Is not his future literal and personal reign as the Son of man, so important

an office resulting from his obedience here on earth, as that a denial of it amounts to a serious apostasy from the doctrine of Jesus Christ and Him crucified?

A FRIEND OF TRUTH.”

MR. CAMPBELL’S REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

“We have read with attention the preceding queries, and had we the name of the writer, (the italics are ours—Editor Herald,) might have attempted an immediate answer. But our rule is—and propriety demands it, as our experience proves—to have the name of those who desire for their communications a place on our pages and a response to them. The subject of the Millennium is one of growing importance, and of thrilling interest to the Christian community. We have had it often before our minds, and are glad to see that it is eliciting more attention than formerly, both in our country and in the Old World.

“As preparatory to these questions, there are certain preliminary matters which seem to command the attention of the student of prophecy. Such as,

- “1. The restoration of Israel to their own land.
- “2. The rise and fall of Babylon the Great.
- “3. The 1260 days.
- “4. The coming of the Lord.
- “5. The first resurrection.
- “6. The thousand years’ reign of the Saints.
- “7. The descent of the New Jerusalem.
- “8. The scenes following.

“These are to be our themes, the Lord willing, as soon as our readers are increased to 10,000. We have had this subject often before our mind, and more recently has it become more engrossing. We design to give to this great theme much attention, and to spare no pains to assist our readers in the investigation of the prophetic oracles; for the time has come ‘when many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.’ We are evidently approaching a new crisis in the ecclesiastic and political affairs of the world. If every four readers of the Harbinger would add one, the seats would be full for such a discussion. And while this is in progress, we shall be preparing our materials, and placing things in order for such a development as the progress of the age and our means and facilities may furnish.

“We have been and still hearing both sides, and collecting documents in aid and furtherance of such an object. It will unquestionably soon be, if it is not already, one of the most engrossing topics of our generation.

A.C.”

\* \* \*

“OUR RULE.”

If Mr. Campbell’s desire were simply to elicit truth and give it currency in his magazine, he would not fence our correspondents by such a rule as the above. The queries put by “A Friend of Truth” are as important, interesting, and to the point, and as worthy of a respectful and satisfactory reply as though his real name were appended to them. Why not then attempt an immediate answer? Oh, because Mr. Campbell is afraid that in so doing he

might be showing civility to the friends of the Gospel of the Kingdom, in which he has no faith; and affording his readers an opportunity, by what might be elicited, of becoming acquainted with it, and with the testimony and reasoning by which it is sustained, and proved to be the veritable “ancient gospel” preached to Abraham, and by Jesus and the Apostles, before and after Pentecost. This would not suit his crooked policy—a policy which, for these eighteen years, has uniformly sought to prevent certain of his contemporaries, whose views and characters he has misrepresented and assailed, from speaking for themselves in his pages. He has grown old in this injustice, and will probably die in it. By one expedient or another he has managed to hoodwink his readers as effectually as any Pope could desire. He has made them believe that Campbellism is the truth of God; and that whatever denies it is “opinionism”—mere “untaught questions and speculation,” that need only be stated by him to be despised! Hence his rule—just to give him the monopoly of his readers’ minds, to the exclusion of those he dislikes and fears.

That “Friend of Truth” was, with him, a suspicious person. The ground of suspicion was, that the answer of his last two questions in the affirmative would have placed Mr. Campbell upon the ground occupied by the Herald of the Kingdom. From our experience of the past, therefore, we do not hesitate to say that Mr. Campbell never will answer them affirmatively; and if he answer them negatively, he may as well give up the ghost as attempt “to assist his readers in the investigation of the prophetic oracles.” An affirmative answer of these questions condemns him as part and parcel of “a serious apostasy from the doctrine of Jesus Christ and him crucified.” He finds the questions very inconvenient; he therefore applies his rule to “A Friend of Truth,” and while giving his communication a place in his pages, rules off the “response.”

If Mr. Campbell had not so many years put Moses and the Prophets on the shelf as “an old Jewish Almanac”—to use his own style—he would not now be so ignorant of the gospel and its kingdom, and so unprepared to “attempt” to give immediate answers to queries such as, “A Friend of Truth’s,” whose points are elements inseparable from them, that he must ensconce himself behind a rule for their evasion. Mr. Campbell, it would seem, has not intelligence enough in the Word (for he will not “attempt an immediate answer”) to say if the things pointed are to have “a real and literal fulfilment” at the beginning or end of the millennium! Nor can he attempt to say whether or not the “popular doctrine of the spiritual millennial reign involve or comprise a denial of Christ’s personal reign, as taught in the Scriptures!” Nor will he attempt to give a hint whether a denial of Christ’s personal reign be “a denial of an important part of the faith in Christ which we are required to exercise in connection with repentance and baptism, in order to obtain salvation!” Nor, lastly, will he attempt to inform “A Friend of Truth” whether a denial of “Christ’s future literal and personal reign” do not “amount to a serious apostasy from the doctrine of Jesus Christ and him crucified,” without conformity to an arbitrary rule and an enormous fee!!! He is silent as the grave upon these important queries, which he gets rid of with all despatch, by simply remarking that he “might have attempted” an answer if he had possessed the writer’s name. What must “A Friend of Truth” think of such “a watchman” of the Bethany “Zion,” that when he asks for bread he receives a stone? When he inquires, “Watchman, what of the night?” the watchman turns his back upon him without deigning to notice him, and begins to cry out to the multitude, “The subject of the Millennium is one of growing importance and of thrilling interest to the Christian community. We have had it often before our mind—glad to see it eliciting more attention everywhere than formerly: only increase my periodical revenue to \$20,000, and I will then begin to spare no pains in assisting you to understand this great

theme. If every four of you will bring a stranger, the pit will be full, and the performance shall begin!”

Would Paul or any of the Apostles have dared to reply thus, in letter or spirit, to inquirers after truth? Would they have said, “Give us 20,000 pieces of silver, and we will then talk to you about the restoration of Israel and Judah, the rise and fall of Babylon, the coming of the Lord, the resurrection, the reign of the saints, the descent of the New Jerusalem, and the scenes following?” Nay, nay, ye friends of truth and honesty! “We,” say they, “coveted no man’s silver or gold, but have ministered to our own necessities, and have showed you all things, and have kept back nothing that was profitable, not having shunned to declare to you all the counsel of God.” They did not say, “There are eight themes in the counsel of God which are to be ours, the Lord willing, so soon as our hearers are increased to 10,000 at \$2.00 a head. Give us the cash, and we will then give you the spirituals!” On the contrary, they first sowed to the unthankful the spiritual things without fee or reward, in the midst of volleys of stones and curses; and afterwards reaped carnal things liberally from those of the enemy whom truth had captured in the fight. “They who preach the gospel (or all the counsel of God) should live of the gospel;” but—“make a note on’t,” Mr. Campbell and ye divinity students all—ye must first preach it, or ye have no right to justify your extortions for a living by this Word! Hear those words of Paul, ye that bargain for your hire before ye will open your mouths to “attempt answers” to the friends of truth: “Necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel! For a dispensation is committed unto me. My reward is, that when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge; that I abuse not my power in the gospel; for though I be free from all, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. I am made all things to all, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel’s sake, that I might be partaker of the gospel with you.” But Mr. Campbell, unlike “Paul the aged,” has become avaricious in his old age. He has been an editor some thirty-four years, professedly teaching “all the counsel of God;” yet it remains for him to begin to enlighten his readers on eight preliminary matters—themes with which every tyro in the gospel ought to be familiar—before he can attempt to answer a few self-evident questions; and this he will not do unless he is well paid in advance for publishing materials, which he has not yet begun to prepare and place in order; for his words are, “while this is in progress, (that is, pushing up the revenue to 20,000 pieces of silver,) we shall be preparing our materials and placing things in order for such a development as the progress of the age and our means and facilities may furnish!” After such a declaration, is it not easy enough to decide whether it be the love of the truth, or the love of money, that stimulates the zeal and ambition of “the Supervisor of this Reformation,” and President of Bethany College, for the preparation of young men for the Campbellite ministry, &c., &c.? Considering what a man of expediency Mr. Campbell is, I wonder he should have deemed it expedient, even for the sake of the pieces of silver, to tell the world so plainly that he writes about the Millennium, and “designs to give this great theme much attention,” (by which is implied that he has not yet given it much attention, though professedly a harbinger of it for the last twenty-seven years,) only in hope of a great pecuniary reward bargained and paid for in advance! What has he been doing with his readers in regard to “the preliminary matters,” all these years, that he cannot answer a few simple questions before them, without previously preparing them for what he may please to say? Has he been doing his duty as “a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth?” If he have, then there is no occasion for the present put-off of “A Friend of Truth.” If he have not, notwithstanding the large sums he has extracted from them under pretence of harbingering the millennium, of which he has given them no certainty or definite understanding, then it is a shame and a reproach unto him. But after all, how could he give them intelligence in this

matter, seeing that he has proved himself like the waves of the sea, unstable and double-minded in all his ways? He once professed to believe, and advocated the personal appearing of Jesus Christ to reign on earth one thousand years, which millennium, he thought, was to have begun about 1847! But he changed his opinion, (and with him, opinion it was; for had he received the reign as the result of God's teaching, it would have been faith not so easily bartered,) and rejected it; for the reason, as reported by one of his evangelists, still high in favour, to whom he gave it, that "baptism for the remission of sins"—"the Ancient Gospel," as he used to proclaim it—preached by his co-labourers, spread with such extraordinary rapidity that he regarded it as the appointed means for the introduction of the millennium, which would therefore be a spiritual reign of the gospel, and not a personal reign of Christ. Hence, as resurrection precedes reign, I have heard an elder of his reformation declare that the first resurrection happened in "the restoration of the ancient gospel and order of things," when "this reformation"—as it is technically styled by its supervisor—began!!!

But will the many hundreds of subscribers already enlisted remain content in view of the implications necessarily effluent from the bargain proposed? Have they been so long excluded from the "preliminary matters"—the eight themes—and is their access to them, after thirty-four years, even now only problematical, consequent on raising the 20,000 pieces of eight? Is it not enough to let them know that they have been kept in ignorance while the light has been shining elsewhere, without provoking their indignation that their illumination depends upon raising the cash? O ye patrons of The Millennial Harbinger, your editor is just rewarding you according to your works! Ye have glorified and sustained him in the unrighteous policy that has excluded the truth from his pages, and now he makes merchandise of you for certain pieces of silver! You hallelujahed him while attacking the character, misstating and denouncing the views, and robbing of their rights, those who said, and were prepared to prove, that the truth of God was crucified and set at naught by Mr. Campbell's teaching. I say, "robbing of their rights;" for when men are misrepresented before a certain public, they have a divine as well as a Roman right to speak for themselves before that same public, a denial of which is violence and robbery of right. Mr. Campbell has uniformly acted with this violence to certain I could name, and it is to perpetuate this wrong that he has fabricated a rule which most effectually prevents any of the proscribed, under the protection of an incognito, calling in question by testimony and reason the scripturality of his traditions. He demands the names of all comers, and if among them he should read those he has crossed with the mark of the beast, God's truth, however convincingly sustained, would be excluded from your perusal over their proper signature. This is a notorious fact and undeniable; and in such unrighteousness ye have countenanced your editor for years; and for once he acts justly, rendering to you all according to the evil of your work.

He says truly, that the millennium is a subject of growing importance and thrilling interest, and that it will unquestionably soon be, if it is not already, one of the most engrossing topics of our generation. But to whose efforts will men be indebted for this? Certainly not to The Harbinger of the Millennium. It is high time Mr. Campbell changed the name of his magazine, for he started it as the harbinger of a personal reign of Christ on earth for one thousand years, which he has since rejected for a momentary post-millennial return from sky-kingdomia to escort the living remnant of saints from this planet to kingdoms in or beyond the Milky-way! The millennium not having commenced, this return is at least a thousand years off. There is no sense, therefore, in which his magazine can be the harbinger of a millennial return, unless William the Conqueror may be styled the harbinger of Queen Victoria. There remains but one sense, then, in which it, or he, is a harbinger; and that is, of the reign of Campbellism for a thousand years, during which, according to his favourite but incredibly

absurd hypothesis, all sects shall merge themselves into “this reformation!” This he styles the mission of his brotherhood—a millennial union of all “Christians” through its influence! Surely the gentleman that can rank this among the possibles must either be selenised, vastly credulous, or fast asleep. But were it possible, it is far from desirable; for it would bring back the millennium of “the dark ages,” and overshadow the nations, if not with barbarism, and feudality, and superstition, at least with a Gospel and Bible eclipse; for could such a thing by any possibility come to pass, it would make God a liar, and all the prophets mere deceivers of the world. We protest, therefore, against such foolishness, as mere “thinking of the flesh,” making of none effect the law and testimony of God.

A gentleman, then, with such a bee in his bonnet, in undertaking to expound the millennium for 20,000 pieces of silver, bargains to perform an impossibility; and whatever his intentions may be, in effect undertakes to raise money upon false pretences. A gentleman whose theory affirms that Abraham, when he died, inherited the promises made to him in the true spiritual and only sense of the literal words, and that too, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight years—the period from the death of Abraham to the crucifixion—before the Abrahamic covenant was brought into force by the death of the testator—Hebrews 10: 16-17, that the promise of the holy land to him was fulfilled in its occupation by the twelve tribes under the law; that the “for ever” possession of the country was antitypical of the typical Mosaic occupation, and fulfilled to every saint when at death his “immortal soul” is wafted into Abraham’s bosom in the better or heavenly country; that the throne of the celestial universe is David’s throne, and that the “everlasting covenant made with him,” which was “all his salvation and all his desire,” was fulfilled in Solomon, in the ascent of Jesus “to the right hand of power,” and the translation of David’s immortal and “divine particle” to heaven, although the Scriptures say that the thing called “David” by his contemporaries and countrymen “has not ascended to heaven,”—the gentleman or lady, whether he sit in the temple of God, or she ride a scarlet beast, whose theories affirm such Babylonish silliness as this, however pious, however high their standing among literary ecclesiastical hierarchies, however diligent in collecting documents in aid and furtherance of “millennial exposition”—documents, by-the-bye, compiled and published in one volume, one thousand seven hundred and fifty years ago—however theologically orthodox, need yet to be taught what be the first principles of the oracles of God!!! Such gentlemen and ladies know nothing of the matter as they ought to know it; and when they bargain to raise the wind by leading the credulous, it is the blind leading the blind to prostration in the ditch!

The eight “preliminary matters” that “are to be” Mr. Campbell’s “themes,” when the revenue has run up to \$20,000, are familiar topics to the readers of the Herald, especially to those of them who understand the gospel of the kingdom. The Herald, Elpis Israel, and Anatolia, have caused the light to shine into the minds of many who, like their author, till taught of the prophets, once groped for the wall in “this reformation” darkness. They are not themes which are to be, but themes which are known and read of all. They know assuredly from the testimony of the “Old Jewish Almanac,” that the two houses of Israel, and Judah are to be planted again in the holy land, a united kingdom and nation, occupying it “for ever,” by virtue of the new or Abrahamic covenant brought into force by the death of Jesus, its mediatorial testator; they know that Babylon the great has risen, and will fall after the resurrection of the heirs of the kingdom, and the proclamation of the glad tidings of the age, announcing that “the hour of God’s judgment is come,” and before the fall of the papal thrones of the Gentiles; they understand that the one thousand two hundred and sixty years of papal, civil, and ecclesiastical prevalence over the saints will end at the appearing of Jesus Christ, when he and the saints, who are his brethren and coheirs—not subjects—of the

Kingdom, will begin to consume and destroy the Gentile organizations, represented by Daniel's fourth beast, and John's seven-headed dragon, ten-horned and two-horned beast, and the image of the beast's sixth head, and occupying the cast-out and unmeasured court which is without the Holy Temple; they understand that the Lord will come as a thief at the end of the 1260 years, and raise and transform the first-fruits, gather them together in the air, and so make a wave-offering of them before Jehovah; they understand that the thousand years' reign of the saints with Christ over the twelve tribes of Israel, and the nations to earth's utmost bounds, is THE REIGN to which they are invited in the Gospel of the Kingdom—that they are called to a resurrection of interminable life, that they may enter upon this reign, and retain it with glory and honour without end—that it is the "ONE HOPE OF THE CALLING," and that to be ignorant of it, is to be "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them;" and to deny it, to deny "the faith of Christ which we are required to exercise in connection with repentance and baptism, in order to obtain salvation;" they understand that the New Jerusalem is the aggregate of the glorified first-fruits, on each of whom "Jesus writes the name of his God, and the name of the city of his God, New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from God," where they had been waved before Him; and that the scenes which follow their descent are represented in Revelation 14: 6-20; 16: 18-21; 17: 13-14; 18; 19; 20: 1-6; 21: 24; 22: 5; 4: 5. These things have become household words to them; and happy are they in not having to go to Bethany at this late hour, to pay two pieces of silver, and to wait the filling up of the ten thousand seats in Mr. Campbell's pit—which will most likely become more and more deserted instead of filled, as the coming of the Son of Man approaches—ere they can be indoctrinated in his preliminaries before he arrives at the queries of "A Friend of Truth."

It is easier to discern the faith than to divine the person of Mr. Campbell's correspondent. I have not the least suspicion who he is; but I perceive that one mind would serve us both. He doubtless believes that the texts he quotes proves that the events they reveal will have a real and literal fulfilment at the introduction of the millennium; and that there are no plainer Scriptures to be found proving their literal fulfilment at the end. He knows well enough that he cannot find testimony in the Bible affording the shadow of an opinion that their accomplishment will be postmillennial. Mr. Campbell knows this too; hence his desire to concoct "preliminaries," by which to prepare the uninitiated ten thousand for the reception of his perversions of the literal truth to some fanciful theory of his own! "A friend of Truth" has no such need of preliminaries; but, believing the literal accomplishment of the testified events at the beginning of the thousand years, he perceives that the popular doctrine of the spiritual millennial reign, which is in Mr. Campbell's tradition also, "involves a denial of Christ's personal reign, as taught in the Scriptures"—a denial of "an important part of the faith in Christ, which we are required to exercise in connection with repentance and baptism, in order to obtain salvation;" and that such a denial "amounts to a serious apostasy from the doctrine of Jesus and of him crucified." This is evidently his conviction; and one to which every believer of the gospel must come whose faith stands in the wisdom of God, and not in the traditions of "the learned." To deny Christ's personal reign on Jehovah's Davidian throne, as Mr. Campbell and all other spiritists do, is to deny the kingdom of God, and, consequently, the glad tidings or gospel concerning it; for, no personal reign, no kingdom; and no kingdom, no gospel; and no gospel, no faith; and no faith, no justification, sanctification, adoption, or redemption. The gospel of the kingdom is the glad tidings of Christ's Millennial Reign with the Saints, his immortalised and glorified associates, in and under whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed—glad tidings to Israel and the nations, promising them deliverance from those who now keep them in ignorance and oppress them; —glad tidings to individuals, promising them glory, honour, incorruptibility, life, possession of the world, and

power over the emancipated and enlightened nations, on condition of believing what God has promised concerning this reign, also the things concerning Jesus as his mediatorial testator and anointed monarch of the world; being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and patiently continuing in well-doing to the end. This being the truth, and nothing but the truth, whatever antagonises or mutilates it, is not only a “serious,” but deadly, apostasy from the doctrine of Jesus the anointed king, and him a “crucified one.” All of which is dedicated, with due respect, to the editors, pulpit-orators, and presiding oracles of tottering and crazy Christendom, by their well-wisher,

THE EDITOR.

August 20, 1854.

\* \* \*

### VISIT TO VIRGINIA.

Arrive in Lunenburg—The people drawn off by Superior Court—Young and Old America at meetings—Campbellism in extremities—Proceed to Powhatan—Speak at Fine Creek two days—A candidate for baptism tempted of Satan—Discourse to the people on the great issue between the Powers of the Earth and those of Heaven—Withstood by an ecclesiastical hireling—Christ’s Kingdom not of this world explained—Elymas proclaims that he can prove in ten minutes that the gospel I preach is false—A scene—My reply to Elymas—How churches are split—Elymas rebuked—Two of his flock baptised.

On the evening of August 29<sup>th</sup>, I left New York, on a visit to Virginia, to fill the appointments previously announced in the Herald. In twelve hours I was in Washington, and in eight more in the city of Richmond. Here I sojourned for the night, and on Friday morning left for Lunenburg, where we arrived in due course and without accident, which, in these days of wholesale destruction by steam-power, is a ground of congratulation and thankfulness to God.

My first appointment was on Saturday, Lord’s day, and Monday, at Leadbetter. On the first and last days the meetings were thin, owing to the sitting of the Superior Court, before which several criminal cases were being tried. The heads of families around were summoned for jurymen, in some penalty if they did not attend, to hear evidence, and to decide upon it, in matters of no personal interest to them at all. I had also summoned them to come and hear “the testimony of God,” upon their judgment of which is suspended their eternal destiny. But though the Scriptures say that the testimony of God is greater than the testimony of man, the hearing of the latter was practically deemed of more importance; for many who expressed a desire to be at Leadbetter went to Court, lest they should be damaged in the purse, which to this generation is a graver consideration than the consequences certain to ensue from the neglect of “the law and testimony of God,” or the manifestation of a preference for things human rather than divine.

In reflecting upon the often-urged excuse, “Oh, I exceedingly regretted I could not be there, but I had to go to Court,” I sometimes ask myself, “If people will not incur a fine of a few dollars to hear the Scriptures expounded by one who they profess to believe is able to interpret them aright, what is the prospect for their rejoicing in the loss of all things for Christ, under the pressure of tribulation for the Kingdom of God?” This is a question I do not like to scrutinise too narrowly, lest in comparing the self-sacrificing spirit of the apostolic age with the extreme selfishness of this, I should be compelled to answer the Lord’s inquiry, “When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith upon the earth?” with a deeply-intoned and emphatic “No!”

On Lord's day there was no court to turn the people from "the word of the kingdom," saying in effect, "If you go to hear Moses and the Prophets expounded instead of coming to Court, you shall be fined five dollars." The audience, or rather the assembly at Leadbetter was, therefore, inconveniently large. A "good congregation" is a comfortably-filled house of intelligent listeners and inquirers after truth. More than these are inconvenient. At Leadbetter the house was crowded by many who came, not to hear so much as to see and be seen, while many others who wished to hear were excluded from the interior by boys and girls. This may be a very good arrangement for such meetings as those got up lately at Cool Spring, in the same county, by certain ranting preachers, named Coleman, Shelburn, &c., whose mission is to scare children into fits, (paroxysms of fright,) and dip them for the remission of sins; \* but for us who seek to reason with the thoughtful and intelligent out of the Scriptures, the condition is any thing but convenient. Children should be taught deference to the ancient, but unfortunately this is not characteristic of "Young America," which is too "fast" to be polite. At Good Hope, on the following Sunday, a huge railroad omnibus full of school-girls drove up and poured its contents into the midst of a crowded house, in the middle of the discourse. This might have passed without comment, but when men of sober-minded intelligence, interested in the exposition of the Word, had to vacate their seats, and leave the house to giddy, chattering children, their "politeness to the ladies" is too extreme to be approved. No; let the seats be occupied by those who come to hear and be instructed, and let boys and girls give place to them. Let not Old America ignore its dignity, and prostrate itself before the giggling insipidity of roystering levity and inexperience.

---

\* A letter before me informs me that these "reform preachers," as they style themselves, at their meeting "dipped about twenty little children, of whom some were related to me, and know no more about the hope of the promise made of God to the fathers than the people who condemned Paul; in fact, they never read their Bible in their lives." One of them, about nine years old, not long before their dipping, being troublesome, was told to sit down and be quiet, and read the Testament. "Oh," said she, pouting, "I don't like that book; it is the dullest book in the world!" Soon after this she heard Messieurs Coleman, Shelburn, Pendleton, and others, preaching hell-fire, damnation, and the Devil, and spinning long yarns about little children's immortal souls being escorted, like the ghost of St. Shelburn's son, by clouds of angels to the world to come beyond the skies! This was enough. The children wanted to go and see young Shelburn in heaven, and to escape out of the Devil's clutches; so the parsons rushed them into the water to wash away their sins, lest they should die before they were dipped, and go to hell. This is the "ancient gospel," and its obedience preached and contended for by Campbellite evangelists in Virginia! At the Cool Spring meetings a co-editor of the Millennial Harbinger, and Professor of Bethany College, was a conspicuous actor. His name is recorded with the others. Their Cool Spring converts are a fair specimen of the scriptural intelligence of those who patronise Virginia Campbellism as incarnated in the Colemans, the Shelburns, and the other small craft of their expiring community in the South. The Bible is of no further use to them than to keep up appearances before the people. They know but little about it, and the little they are supposed to know they know not how to use. Intelligent men and women of the world are beyond their reach. Being in the dark, they are unable to enlighten such. They perceive this, and therefore in despair they turn to babes. By dipping these they keep up an appearance of doing something; but while they tumefy their sect, they excite the reprobation and disgust of all reflecting people, and especially of those who witness their proceedings, and know the truth.

---

The gospel of the kingdom is certainly gaining ground in this county, which is considered by the enemy as its “stronghold” in the State. The influence of its opponents is rapidly declining, and our friends are acknowledged by the non-sectarian part of society to be the most intelligent in the Scriptures, and the most regardful of their authority, of any class of the professing world. This is undeniable, and the ground of considerable enviousness on the part of those who cannot bear the light because their deeds are evil. I hope our brethren in these parts will appreciate the high honour they have attained to in the providence of God; that, namely, of being the pillar and support of the truth in the wilderness. Let them shine as a pillar of fire in the night, holding forth the word of life, and showing by their good behaviour in Christ its transforming influence over their minds.

The week-day congregations at Concord and Good Hope were not only “good,” but excellent—such as it was a pleasure to speak to, because they listened as if desiring to understand. On Lord’s day, September 10<sup>th</sup>, I had to stand in the door-way, the crowd being as numerous under the arbour as within the house. This, however, is an inconvenient position for speaking, and one, therefore, I am always desirous of avoiding. It was gratifying, under all disabilities, to see so great a multitude assembled to hear reputed “heresy.” In no region of country have greater efforts been made to suppress what we believe and teach; but notwithstanding all the power of the enemy brought to bear against the truth for years past, it has survived all his malignity and reproach, and at present commands the respect of the intelligent and sober-minded. Campbellism is in ruins there; and well and richly it deserves its fate. A persecutor of the truth, its zeal without knowledge has brought it into contempt. Its preachers have degenerated into fanatics, having neither the word nor spirit of the truth. In the plenitude of their malevolence, they still delight in acting the part of Elymas the sorcerer, who sought to turn away the deputy of Cyprus from the right way of the Lord. “It is in Lunenburg,” says the Elymas of *The Intelligencer*, “that Thomasism has performed its greatest achievements. . . . Dr. Thomas has succeeded in carrying with him some respectable and influential men in Lunenburg, and they become so much enamoured with his talents, and so blind to his delinquencies, that, notwithstanding the absurd notions that he has so recklessly poured forth, they continue to cling to him.

“We cannot but regard Dr. Thomas and his coadjutors as under the awful anathema of the apostle Paul, who says, ‘If any man, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which I have preached unto you, let him be accursed.’ Now Paul tells us what gospel he preached—1 Corinthians 15: 1, 5—‘that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose again upon the third day according to the Scriptures.’ And he says it was by the gospel that the Corinthians were saved. Now these people deny that this is the gospel; and they profess to preach a gospel about Christ’s second coming, and setting up his Kingdom in Palestine, and they require persons to believe that, and to be baptised into the hope that he will come and establish his Kingdom in Palestine; and they call this the Hope of Israel.

“They are also exceedingly profane. One of their preachers recently declared in Lunenburg (A. B. Magruder, a lawyer in Charlottesville, Va.) that this gospel would not save one; and he also declared that Christ had no power, though he himself declared that all power in heaven and earth was given to him. They also affirm that Christ has no kingdom, and that he is not reigning, but that his Kingdom is yet to be established, and that he is to commence his reign in 1866, notwithstanding it is explicitly declared that he is placed at the right hand of the Father, there to sit till all his enemies are made his footstool; and though Paul affirms that he must reign till all his enemies are destroyed; and though John speaks of him as the Prince

of the kings of the earth; and Paul also says that he is placed far above all principality and power, and every name that is named. Now I cannot but regard these people as scorners and scoffers. They may, some of them, think they are right. They may have succeeded in deceiving themselves. We certainly wish them well, and desire their salvation, but we must regard them as wicked and injurious. They have done immense harm in Lunenburg and the surrounding country. They have succeeded in bringing religion into contempt; they have filled the worldlings with scorning, and hardened them in their sins. They have caused persons to ridicule the ordinance of baptism. Some of them have been immersed, as I am informed, three times.”—C. I., August 26, 1854.

One R. S. Coleman, a hireling evangelist of Campbellite ecclesiasticism, is the editorial Elymas of the C. Intelligencer, in which these reproaches have found vent. What he says, however, is of small account, for being a person of remarkably small calibre, and, like all such when not enlightened by the Word, an envious and prejudiced creature, he has but little weight with men of intelligence and unbiased mind. I quote them from his paper merely to show the spirit and ignorance of the opposition to the gospel of the Kingdom in Virginia. If it should even be proved—which no one has been able to do yet—that we believe and preach a gospel different to Paul’s, it yet remains to be shown (which cannot be done) that preaching hell, damnation, and the Devil to little children, and dipping them into the hope of going to young Shelburn’s spirit-home beyond the skies, is the gospel preached by Paul. This is Campbellism in Lunenburg—the system to which we have done “immense harm”—the “religion” we have happily succeeded in bringing into well-merited contempt, so that worldlings are filled with scorning at such a preposterous substitute for the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. It is immersion upon such a basis they cordially despise, not baptism founded on an intelligent confession of the truth. No greater compliment can be paid us than to be denounced as preachers of “another gospel,” “profane,” “wicked,” self-deceivers, “scoffers and scorners,” by people who proclaim diabolism and ghostism for the gospel of Christ! If they had but one-millionth part of the Bible testimony for their sky-kingdomism and diablerie we have for the gospel of the Palestine Kingdom, how happy they would be! But, poor creatures, neither Scripture nor reason will condescend to smile upon their foolishness! They repudiate Israel’s hope with the contempt of ignorance; they are therefore forced to embrace the Pagan’s hope, or none. Surely this is an unhappy dilemma, yet it is the alternative embraced by all “alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them,” being mere Gentiles, and aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers, therefore, from the covenants of promise. The blind Elymas who presides over The Intelligencer professes to wish us well, and to desire our salvation. This looks very benevolent in print, but will not deceive those who have learned to read his character stripped of its hypocrisy. A well-wisher, indeed, and greatly desirous of our salvation, must be he who, according to the printed testimony of one of his co-labourers, declared “he did not want to go to heaven if he thought Dr. Thomas was to be there!” But he need not refuse to “go to heaven” on that account. He will not find me “beyond the skies,” being quite satisfied with a bodily resurrection or transformation to possess with Christ the Palestine Kingdom, and with him to reign over the nations upon earth. Such a kingdom and reign he sets at naught. Very well, if evil can be well. It is only those who believe in them can inherit them. We are journeying back to back, he towards the sun, moon, and stars; I towards Zion in the Holy Land, where I hope to arrive when the Lord shall appear in his glory to reign there. So long as we journey in these directions, Elymas and myself will never meet in the same heaven. He need not, therefore, be alarmed for this.

Having fulfilled my appointments in Lunenburg, I proceeded to Tomahawk Station on the Richmond and Danville Railroad, where a friend had agreed to meet me, to convey me thence to Fine Creek meeting-house in Powhatan. On my arrival I found him waiting. We were soon en route together, making the best of our way through a very rough and desolate country. After driving eight or nine miles, darkness came upon us in a "piney old field," where we mistook the track, and were soon "brought up" at a fence, through which no opening appeared. "Whose land," said I, "are we upon now?" "Parson Coleman's," was the reply. "Indeed! would it not be a curious phenomenon if magnetism were to be transmitted from us along his land to him? Do you think he would be able to find rest any more while I remain in Powhatan?" I had heard from several individuals of his having, some two or three years ago, taken fire-arms, threatening to shoot his brother, with whom he had quarrelled. Who could tell but, being mesmerised, he might appear in arms, crouching, Indian-like, behind the fence to get a shot at me! Many a truth has been playfully spoken. The Elymas of the *Intelligencer* became excited, and within forty-eight hours travelled ten or twelve miles to give me a blow that should prostrate me, as he hoped, in the dust for ever!!! For the present, however, we escaped, having found the inlet to Mr. Samuel Harris's farm, where we sojourned till the ensuing day.

On Wednesday, September 13<sup>th</sup>, we arrived at Fine Creek. There are there two meeting-houses, one a free house, the other a new erection for the Baptists, when they shall have paid the builder. This new house is large and comfortable, being lathed and plastered, and well supplied with seats. My appointment was for the old free house, but the builder of the new one insisted that this should be occupied as better adapted for the occasion. The house being still in his hands, he considered that he had a right to open it to whom he pleased; accordingly, he opened the doors, and invited us to avail ourselves of his hospitality. The audience was better than I expected for a working-day, and gave ear as though it were desirous to understand.

The discourse being finished, Mr. Harris, a member of the Campbellite church meeting at Corinth, in that county, a respectable man, and of good standing with his brethren, applied to me to assist him in obeying the gospel of the Kingdom in the name of Jesus Christ. It was therefore arranged that he should meet me there on the morrow with changes of raiment, and that I should immerse him after the people were dismissed. On his return home he communicated his intention to his ecclesiastical associates of putting off Campbellism with the old man, and of putting on Christ by being immersed on an intelligent belief of the Kingdom's gospel, and from whose fellowship he announced his purpose to withdraw. He did this, not that it was necessary, but to prevent them from saying that he had treated them with disrespect.

Among the first who heard of Mr. Harris' intention was Elymas of the *Intelligencer*, alias his next neighbour and ecclesiastical associate—Robert Lindsay Coleman. "We felt," says this person, "a strong desire to save this gentleman from the delusion that was likely to be fastened upon him; and as the Doctor and his comrades seek to make the impression that we are all afraid of them, and as we were not a hireling to flee (but a hireling to stand. — Editor Herald) when the wolf cometh, . . . we determined to attend his meeting, and make an effort to rescue one for whom we entertained sincere regard. On our way to the meeting we overtook this neighbour, but found him so much under the influence of excited feeling that nothing could be done for him."

When I arrived at Fine Creek I saw Mr. Harris in conversation with some one whom I did not recognise, for I had not seen Elymas for sixteen years, and should not have known him without information. It was he, still “labouring with” Mr. Harris to save him from being “fastened upon” by “the delusion” that the God of heaven will, through Jesus, cast the Gentiles out of Palestine, and “raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and raise up its ruins, and build it as in the days of old: that they (Israel under their immortal rulers) may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the nations to whom His name shall be proclaimed”—the “delusion” that the Lord will do this which he hath promised in the days of the Ten Toe kingdoms of the Latter-Day Image shown to Nebuchadnezzar in his dream. To save Mr. Harris from this “delusion,” Elymas laboured hard; and, as a sort of clinching argument to all the rest, whatever they may have been, like Satan of former days, when as an angel of light he tempted Jesus, he appealed to his pride of life, saying, “Well, anyhow I would not be immersed by Dr. Thomas, for he is a man of no character!” But Mr. Harris rebuked the sorcerer who sought to turn him away from the faith, saying that “he need not talk to him after that fashion. He knew Dr. Thomas, and had read his writings for years, and was well acquainted with those who knew him well, and that his character was unimpeachable and good.” Thus in effect he rebuked the tempter, who then departed from him for a season.

While this temptation was in course, I entered the house. As I was turning in, Capt. Cosby, the builder of it, touched me on the shoulder, and under the excitement of one that had something to communicate that tickled him, said, “Doctor, there are two Campbellite preachers here to hear you today!” “Are there?” said I, “and who may their reverences be?” “Coleman and Isaac Spencer!” “Very well; then I’ll give them something to think about.” And saying this, I passed into the house, requesting that they would come in when they thought it time for me to begin. The captain was going to add, as he afterwards told me, “And Coleman is going to oppose you today.” But of this I was ignorant, until his purpose evinced itself in the course he pursued.

When the people came in, Mr. Spencer, whom I recognised, with a companion whom I judged to be Elymas by his being in company with him, seated themselves exactly before me, but still out of the line of vision, as the bulk of the audience occupied the seats on my left, leaving but a dispersion in the centre. Mr. Coleman, perceiving this, soon became dissatisfied with his position. Mr. Spencer behaved with great decorum, sitting with the immovability of an old Roman statue where he first placed himself, so that he might almost have been taken for one of the Conscript Fathers about to be slain of the Gauls when they invaded the Senate. Not so, however, the “lean Cassius” near him. Sweating under the “delusions” fastening upon him, he thumbed the pages of his little book dementively, crossing his legs alternately, and turning his body from side to side, till, like a pea parching in a frying-pan, intensity became so impulsive that he popped from his seat, and “lighted” upon the end of a bench in the direction I was looking. And there we will leave him, vainly endeavouring by little arts to divert my attention from the subject before me to his simple self!

I read the second Psalm, which I undertook to expound to the people. I proved to them that it was testimony concerning the Christ, and that, as they admitted that Jesus was that Christ, or Anointed King, it was testimony concerning him. The psalm brings into view two parties in belligerent hostility to each other; the one, the nations under the kings of the earth; the other, Jehovah and his King. The ground of their hostility is also revealed, namely, the sovereign possession of Zion, with dominion over the nations to earth’s utmost bounds. The kings of the nations and the rulers of the Jews claim Zion and the world

as theirs, but Jehovah and his King dispute their claim, and demand their possession for themselves. This being the issue, it is joined by Christ and his adversaries, as plaintiff and defendants in Caesar's court, where judgment is given against Christ, who appeals to God. He is executed for treason, but God justifies his treason in raising him from the dead, as his Son, begotten on his resurrection-day. "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." Being raised, Jehovah invites him to ask for an inheritance, and in the same passage the inheritance asked for is defined: "I will give thee," saith Jehovah to his resurrected Son and King, "the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Christ, then, in being constituted "the heir of all things," is the heir of these; the earth and its inhabitants under a heavenly constitution, is the joy set before the Christ—the "all things" of which he is the heir.

The manner in which Christ is to take possession of this inheritance is also revealed, namely, by war, as it is written, "Thou shalt break them (the kings of the earth and the nations) with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel"—an idea expressed in Daniel by the words, "The kingdom of God shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms."

But as a proof that the issue of the matter is yet future, a proclamation is to be made to the kings of the earth, exhorting them to be wise, and to receive instruction, to the end that they may make peace with the Son, serve Jehovah with fear, and rejoice with trembling, lest they perish in his wrath when kindled but a little. This proclamation was not made to Pilate and Herod, who were Gentiles, and concerned in the condemnation of Christ. It is a proclamation to be made when the Lord comes to plead with all flesh by fire and sword: "For by fire and by his sword will Jehovah plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many." At that time, he saith, "I will send those that escape of them (Judah) unto the nations that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory unto the nations." These proclaimers are represented in Revelation 14: 6 under the symbol of an angel or messenger, flying in mid-heaven, having the glad tidings of the age to evangelise to the dwellers upon the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people, saying with a great voice, "Fear God, and give glory to him, because the hour of his judgment IS COME." The kings of the earth will hear this proclamation, but, like Pharaoh, they will put wisdom and instruction far from them, saying, "Who is this God, that we should fear and do homage to him?" Their refusal to "be wise" and to "be instructed" is indicated in the apocalyptic representation of the controversy, where the Ten Kingdoms are exhibited as making war upon the Lamb, and gathering their armies together against him; but they "perish by the way," for "the Lamb shall overcome them," and having done so, seize upon the spoil which they have long so unrighteously appropriated and oppressed. "He shall break in pieces the oppressor," and their kingdoms shall become Jehovah's and his Anointed's, and he shall reign for ever. Zion will then be his, and the nations too; and the words of Jehovah will obtain a matter-of-fact accomplishment, that, though the rulers of Israel and the kings of the earth combine to exclude Jehovah's King from his paternal throne—that is, David's—"Yet set I my King upon Zion, the hill of my holiness."

I endeavoured upon the minds of my hearers that this psalm taught that there would be a great issue joined between the powers of heaven and the powers of the world, and that the possession of the Holy Land and City, with dominion over Israel and the nations for a thousand years, was the prize proclaimed for them who shall be victors in the fight.

I went on to show that the New Testament introduces to the notice of mankind a Jew, who claims the prize as his by deed of gift to David and his heirs for ever. That this remarkable personage was Jesus, known to be the Son of David, and acknowledged of God also to be His Son. Being Son of David and Son of God, he claimed to be the Child promised to David's house, upon whose shoulders the government of Israel is to be for ever, —Isaiah 7: 10-14; 9: 6; —in other words, he claimed to be that David who should be King and Prince of the Jews for ever—Ezekiel 37: 21-28.

I remarked that, in maintaining his claim to Jehovah's Davidian throne, inseparably connected with Zion the hill of His holiness, Jesus came into collision with the contemporary rulers of the country. I remarked, emphatically, that Jesus was put to death for maintaining his right to the throne of David, and not for saying that he was the Son of God. It is true the Jews accused him of blasphemy, in saying that he was the Son of God, thereby making himself equal with God; and therefore, as a blasphemer, ought to die by their law. But, first, they failed to convict him of blasphemy; and, secondly, however guilty they might have chosen to consider him, since their subjection to the Romans it was not lawful for them to put any man to death. The Jews, therefore, could only put him to death "by the hands of sinners," that is, by the Romans. But these had no law by which to slay a man for blasphemy against the God of Israel, however guilty he might be. The adversaries of Jesus had therefore to move the Roman power against him upon another ground. Accordingly, they accused him of treason against Caesar, saying that they "found him perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is anointed king." Pilate understood this charge to signify that Jesus claimed to be king of the Jewish nation, which he was accused of perverting, or alienating from its allegiance to the Emperor of Rome. This is evident from the question he put as soon as the charge was made; for "Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews?" The proconsul at no time asked him, "Art thou the Son of God?" but ever and anon, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" That Jesus was king of Israel was either true or false; if false, where did he ever deny it? Nowhere. Then it was true; and therefore he said, "For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth;" and this truth he confessed before Pilate, when, in answer to his question, Art thou the king of the Jews? he replied, "Thou sayest; for I am king." After this confession, which Paul styles "the good confession, witnessed before Pontius Pilate," can there exist any man of sound mind and honest heart who would stand up and say that Jesus did not confess that he was king of the Jews? He denied not, but confessed that he came into the world to be king of the Jews; and so all his contemporaries understood him to affirm—Herod and Pontius Pilate, the chief priests, Jews, soldiers, malefactors—all.

Having, with many words, proved this position, Mr. Coleman popped up and ignored all I had been saying, by impertinently asking if Jesus said he was the King of the Jews? "Certainly," said I; "that is the very thing I have been showing." "Where," said he, "did he say so?" I then repeated substantially what I had said before; and added, that after Pilate had heard his confession, he gave him the title he claimed, saying to his nation, "Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?" And still later brought him out to the people, and said, "Behold your King!" The chief priests also bore witness that he said he was their king; for when Pilate wrote the cause of his death, they said, "Write not, The King of the Jews, but that HE SAID, I am King of the Jews."

Elymas then turned his back on me, and began to harangue the audience about the kingdom of Jesus being not of this world; so that, as the Jews are of this world, Christ could

not have meant that he was their king in the sense Dr. Thomas contended for. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, my friends, . . .

At this point I called the gentleman to order, saying, "Mr. Coleman, listen to me! This audience has been convened here today not to hear you, but me. I have much to say to them, but nothing to you individually. You will please, therefore, to take your seat, and not consume precious time in vain declamation." Upon this he popped down as quickly as he popped up, and I proceeded to say—

My friends, I had not intended to dwell upon the phrase I read, and upon which the person who has just sat down attempted to declaim, because it would lead me into a digression not necessary to the comprehension of the subject before us. I regret that my attention has been called to it, because my exposition will result in convicting him of profound ignorance of the first principles of the oracles of God. But he has provoked his own confusion; so upon his own pate let the fire burn.

He would have you believe that Jesus told Pilate that his kingdom was beyond the skies when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world!" Do you think the chief priests would have envied Jesus as the heir of a sky-kingdom; and it was for envy they delivered him to Pilate? Do you imagine they would have said, "Lo! this is the heir of kingdoms in the skies; go to now, and let us kill him, and the vineyard shall be ours?" Do you suppose that if Jesus, in preaching the gospel of the kingdom, claimed only a throne and kingdom in the skies, the chief priests would have said to Pilate, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend; for whosoever maketh himself king speaketh against Caesar?" How could a man making himself king of a dominion in the skies, in so doing speak against the Roman emperor, or the rights of any other of the kings of the nations? The sky-kingdom gloss of the Great Teacher's words is the drivelling imbecility of a palsied and effete theology—a theology that has befogged the brain and paralysed the intellect, not only of Mr. Coleman, but of all the unfortunates who, like him, can see no more in the Book of God than the phantoms of their own perverted and disordered imaginations.

Mr. Coleman, who pretends to be a teacher, ought to know much more than he gives evidence of. He ought to know that "world," which occurs twice in John 18: 36, in the Gentile vernacular, is not the correct interpretation of the original Greek words it is made the countersign of in the common version of the Scriptures. It is only profound ignorance that will affirm that "world" in the Scriptures means the earth and all the people upon it, and must be so interpreted wherever it occurs. Mr. Coleman ought to know that there are three very dissimilar Greek words which, in the New Testament, are all rendered "world," but whose real signification is very different. These are, *aion*, *oikoumenes*, and *kosmos*. The first of these signifies duration, without defining how long; it may, therefore, be finite or infinite, according to the nature of the subject treated of. Hence, it stands for age, or a certain course of things. Christ, says Paul, was offered in the end of the *aion*, or Mosaic age. The second word signifies habitable or inhabited, and defines that portion of the earth pertaining to civilisation. The third word is *kosmos*, which imports any constitution of things, from *kosmeo*, to arrange, or set in order. This is the meaning of the word in the text, where a particular *kosmos* is alluded to; as "this *kosmos*." "My kingdom is not of this *kosmos*; if my kingdom were of this *kosmos*, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but my kingdom is not now in this place." "Art thou king, then?" said Pilate. "I am king," said Jesus. "For this I was born, and for this came I into the *kosmos*, that I might testify to the truth. Every one being of the truth heareth my voice." On a previous occasion he

said, "I am sent only to the lost sheep of THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL." This was the kosmos into which he came—the house of Israel, organised into a kosmos or world of its own by the Mosaic constitution.

The kingdom of Jesus did not belong to that kosmos, as is well understood by "every scribe instructed for the kingdom of God," which Mr. Coleman manifestly is not. When Jesus "comes in his kingdom," "he will sit and rule upon his throne, and be a priest upon his throne," which was not possible for him to do so long as the law of Moses continued the unamended constitution of Jehovah's nation. Before Jesus could take possession of his father David's throne and kingdom, the Mosaic covenant, which had "waxed old," must be "taken away" by the Little-Horn-of-the-Goat power, as predicted in the eighth and ninth of Daniel; for Jesus not being a priest after the order of Aaron, could not be High Priest of Israel till it was abolished, because the Mosaic law "spake nothing concerning priesthood" relatively to one of Judah's tribe, from which Jesus came. The High Priesthood of the nation was to be changed from the family of Aaron to that of David; so that Paul says, "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." The kingdom of Jesus, therefore, belongs to a kosmos, or constitution of things in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, in which it shall be lawful for him to occupy the throne as King and High Priest of the nation.

But it may be objected, "Is he not a High Priest now?" Yes; "over the House of God;" but not over the Jewish nation. He is "High Priest of good things to come" for those "who hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope steadfast unto the end"—a confidence and hope which are mere foolishness to Mr. Coleman, and to all like him who know not the gospel of the kingdom preached by Jesus and his apostles. Such are no members of Christ's household, on whose account he hath entered within the veil, there to make reconciliation for them in the presence of the Father; he is no High Priest for them, being the Mediator of a covenant established on promises which they despise.

Not only was the kingdom of Jesus not of the Mosaic kosmos, but it was also not of a kosmos contemporary with the Roman power in its undivided form. His kingdom belongs to "the fulness of times," when the God of heaven shall "gather together under one head again all things by the Christ;" that is, all things Jewish, when the times of the Gentiles are finished—times which are synchronised with the Roman system of nations in its Ten-Horned constitution. In the days of Pilate, the Roman Habitable, or oikoumene, was under Tiberius Caesar. It was then one empire, including Syria and Palestine. But Christ's kingdom is to be set up when this fourth dominion consists of two imperial legs and ten regal toes; for, speaking of the powers represented by these toes, the Spirit saith, "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." This kingdom is the one Jesus styles his, and to which the gospel he preached belongs. The toe-kingdoms, which his kingdom is to grind to powder when it falls upon them, had not only no contemporary existence with him and Pilate, but did not even begin to exist for centuries after; he might, therefore, truly say, "My kingdom is not of this kosmos; but, if it were, then would my servants fight," &c.

After this explanation I proceeded with my discourse, leaving Elymas to chew the cud of his own presumption. Having shown that Jesus suffered death for maintaining his right to reign on Mount Zion as King for Jehovah over Israel, as expressed in "the superscription of his accusation." "This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," I remarked that, though judgment was given against his claim by those who then had possession of Jerusalem and the

Holy Land, and though, when he rose from the dead, he left that country without prosecuting his claim to his inheritance any further; nevertheless, though 1818 years had elapsed since he departed to lay his petition before Jehovah, his claim was as valid as on the day he first announced it in Galilee; for there is no statute of limitations to invalidate it. It has been held in abeyance during that long period; but never for a moment hath it entered into the mind of Jehovah and his Anointed to abandon it.

The coming of Jesus Christ, then, in power, is to restate his claim to the kings of the earth, whom he will find colleagued with a power in actual occupation of Jerusalem and Palestine, and to demand of them a peaceable surrender of their kingdoms into his hands; in default of which he will proceed to execute the writ of restitution, in “breaking them with a rod of iron, and dashing them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” Thus the controversy about the Palestine kingdom, between Jesus and the possessors of the Holy Land, will be revived, but with very different results. Eighteen hundred years ago Jesus lost his life in the dispute; while, in a few years more, he will come off victorious, having wrested Zion from the enemy, punished the refractory kings of the earth, and seized upon their thrones. Then will he sit for the first time as King for Jehovah upon Zion, the hill of his holiness; and the sixth verse of the second Psalm will have become an accomplished fact. Judgment will then have been executed for the plaintiff, who, as “the Lord of armies, shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously.” Zion will then have “put on her strength,” and Jerusalem, the holy city, “her beautiful garments,” and from that time “there shall no more come into her the uncircumcised and the unclean;” but “she shall be called the throne of Jehovah; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the Name-Bearer of Jehovah, to Jerusalem; and after the imagination of their evil hearts shall they walk no more.”

With many other words I continued to illustrate this statement from the prophets and apostles; and then observed, that the situation for the settlement of this claim of Jehovah and his King to Jerusalem, the Holy Land, and dominion over the nations, was even now preparing. The Eastern Question was the predicted sign in the Gentile heavens of the appearing of the Son of Man as a thief to “break in pieces the oppressor,” and to take the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven of the fourth beast. It began about Jerusalem, and can only be settled there. I said more about the sign than can be reported in this place; and, in concluding, remarked that, of whatever kosmos the kingdom of Jesus might be, his servants would have to fight for him, as the armies of the nations would fight to uphold the kings that rule them. Here I called the attention of the audience again to the scene in the nineteenth chapter of the Revelation to John, and added that Jesus was exhibited there as the Royal Commander of Israel at the head of his forces, prepared for war with the kings of the earth. In explaining this scene I proved that the symbols of the seventh trumpet-period were representations of things a long time previously revealed in the writings of the prophets. I showed this Revelation 10: 7, which testifies that “In the days of the voice of the seventh messenger, when he shall sound, the secret of God should be finished, even as he hath declared the glad tidings to his servants the prophets.” Now this battle scene being of the seventh trumpet-period, we must turn to the prophets for an interpretation. We are at no loss to know who the monarch is astride the white horse; but what the latter represents does not so readily appear from the text. The Royal Equestrian is the “King of kings, and Lord of lords,” who in the seventeenth chapter is styled “the Lamb,” which the least instructed in the Scriptures understands to signify JESUS OF NAZARETH, called by John the Baptist “the Lamb of God;” so that the interpretation of Revelation 17: 14 is, “The ten-horn kings shall make war on Jesus of Nazareth, and Jesus of Nazareth shall conquer them.” Well, here is the King of the Jews; but what is that he rides in the battle? And what is that sharp sword that

goeth out of his mouth, with which he is to smite the nations? The prophets will enable us to answer both these questions satisfactorily.

Addressing Israel, the rod of his inheritance, Jehovah saith, “Thou art my battle-axe, and weapons of war; for with thee I will break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms, . . . and with thee will I break in pieces captains and rulers”—Jeremiah 51: 19-23. Since these words were uttered the very reverse of this has happened to Israel; for instead of breaking nations and destroying kingdoms, they have themselves been broken, scattered, and peeled.

Again, “I will make her that was cast off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth even for ever. . . . Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion; for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thine hoofs brass; and thou shalt beat in pieces many people; and I will consecrate their gain unto Jehovah, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth”—Micah 4.

Again, “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. . . . And he shall speak peace to the nations; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth: . . . even today do I declare unto thee that I will render double unto thee; when I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim, and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man.” Here the twelve tribes of Israel are brought out as “weapons of war,” Judah being the bow, and Ephraim the arrow; and all collectively as the sword of the Mighty One, their king. In the Apocalypse this sword is represented as going out of the mouth of Jesus, because by his word of command the operations of the sons of Zion of all the tribes against the sons of Greece are directed. The sons of Greece are “the goats” of the confederacy indicated in Ezekiel’s prophecy of Gog, the Mishmar, or Protector of the kings of the Greek and Latin churches.

The prophet continues, “And the Lord shall be seen over them (the sons of Zion) and his arrow (the ten tribes called Ephraim) shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord God shall blow the trumpet, and shall go with whirlwinds of the south.” Thus are the goats punished: “For the Lord of armies hath visited his flock, the house of Judah, and hath made them as his goodly horse in the battle.” This explains the white horse that Jesus is to ride. He stands related to the Jews in their future wars as a rider to his horse. Thus in the Apocalypse he is represented as King of the Jews, and Generalissimo of the armies of Israel in “the war of that great day of God Almighty,” when “the kings of the earth and of the whole habitable” shall contend with Him for Palestine and the dominion of the world. But “the Jews shall be as the mighty who tread down their enemies as mire in the streets in the battle; and they shall fight.”

Then addressing myself to Elymas, I inquired, “Why shall the Jews fight, Mr. Coleman?” Upon which Mr. C. arose, and, with a very long face turned towards the audience began to extemporise a lamentation upon the shocking treatment he had experienced. But not having put the question to him for this purpose, I called him to order, saying, “Mr. Coleman, hear me, if you please, Sir! When I spoke to you, I did not call you up to make a speech; you can do that at some more convenient season. You asked me a question, which I answered respectfully; I therefore thought I would be even with you, and ask you another; but as you cannot tell why the Jews shall fight, you will please resume your seat;” then addressing the

people, I continued, "You perceive, my friends, that Mr. Coleman knows nothing about the subject, so we must let the question be answered by the prophet, who says, "And the Jews shall fight, BECAUSE THE LORD IS WITH THEM"—"they shall fight at Jerusalem"—"and they shall confound the cavalry" of the enemy; for, "saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with consternation and blindness, and his rider with madness;" "and I will strengthen the house of Judah, and I will save the house of Joseph, and I will bring them again to place them: for I have mercy on them: and they shall be as though I had not cast them off"—let all Millerites make a note of this—"for I am the Lord their God, and will hear them"—Zechariah 9, 10, 12, 14.

Thus were occupied some three hours in endeavouring to open the eyes of the people to the perception of this great and interesting subject. I urged upon them the necessity of their "seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness" before all other things, if they would have everlasting life. I said much about the kingdom, also concerning the righteousness they must be the subjects of who would possess the kingdom. In treating of this, baptism was of course referred to, especially as there was one present to be baptised that evening. I remarked that immersion into the name of God was for believers of the Gospel of the kingdom only; and that immersion predicated on a mere confession of faith in Jesus Christ being the Son of God in the ordinary Gentile acceptation of the phrase, was not the "one baptism" enjoined by the apostles; but a corruption of the institution, and a characteristic of the offshoots of Babylon which practise dipping. To be united to the name of God, we must follow the example of the Samaritans, of whom it is testified, that "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptised, both men and women." They believed these things first, and were afterwards immersed; but the nominal Christians of this cloudy and dark day get dipped without any scriptural knowledge of the kingdom and name of Jesus at all. Such immersions are worth nothing; for the subjects of them have no faith to be counted to them for righteousness or remission of sins—they are (to use the words of President Campbell) "no better than a Jewish ablution." Search the Scriptures, then, of Moses and the Prophets, after the example of the noble-minded Bereans, who received not the word of the apostles even, unless they found it to agree with those ancient records. Their search resulted in believing the gospel of the kingdom Paul preached in the name of Jesus as the future occupant of its throne. Search ye therefore the Scriptures also, that ye may see if the doctrine I have taught this day be in harmony with the testimony of the prophets and apostles. If it be not, reject it; but if you find that I say not any thing but what they teach, still reject it if you will; but remember that it is at the peril of life and happiness in the age to come.

Having closed my address, Elymas, who had been in torment of a long time, judging from his extreme restlessness, popped up again, and called out that he could show that Dr. Thomas preached another gospel! "Oh," said I, "that needs no proof; I admit it; the gospel I preach has no identity with yours, and sorry should I be if it had." "I can prove," he exclaimed, "that he has preached a false gospel to you!" "Ah," said I, "that is quite a different thing, but more easily said than done." "I can do it in ten minutes; and at some future time I will preach at this place, and show that Doctor Thomas preaches a false gospel!" "Then come and hear him, my friends, and bring all you can with you. No," I continued, "part of that advice I will withdraw; bring none with you who have not been here today. You have all heard me, and it is only such that should hear him when he speaks of me. Were he even disposed to speak the truth, and to do justly, he knows so little about the subject that he could not do it. Bring, therefore, not another man besides yourselves to hear him, for he would hear

without being able to detect his misrepresentations and perversions of the truth.” Having said this, I left the stand.

As he had said he could show in ten minutes that I had preached a false gospel, Captain Cosby and Messrs. Winfree, Harris and Perkins urged him to do it on the spot. But he began to make excuses, saying “It was too late—the people were worn out; it would be an imposition upon them, (“None at all,” said I,) and I can only have a short time to reply to his three-hour speech.” “Plenty of time,” exclaimed several. “I’ll sit here till sun-down,” said one; “And I’ll stay here till morning, if need be,” said another; “Go on, go on!” repeated several. Finding, then, that he could not back out without exposing himself to the derision of the people, he very reluctantly ascended the tribune, whence he delivered himself after the following classic style:

“Dr. Thomas says that Russia will be triumphant! I once thought so myself; I begin to doubt it now. Dr. Thomas thinks so, and is so confident about it, that I don’t believe it will come to pass. He takes great credit to himself for predicting that this war would break out, and that Russia would triumph. I don’t think any thing of that! Why, Napoleon predicted that fifty years ago! Besides, doesn’t everybody know that it has been the opinion of all the great statesmen of the world since Peter the Great that the Russians would get Constantinople in the end?”

This was proof No. 1 that I preach a false gospel! The second was like unto it. Behold it. He continued:

“Dr. Thomas says that man has no soul!”

Here I rose to order, and remarked to the audience that that charge was false, and that he knew it; and that if he repeated it, he would utter deliberately what he knew to be a lie. That what I believed and taught was, that man is a being composed of body, soul, and spirit, which, when their union is dissolved, are incapable of thought, word, or action. That from death to resurrection, consequently, dust and character are all that pertain to the former man; who, because he is to rise again, is said to sleep in the dust. At his resurrection he comes forth bodily, and, if accepted, becomes incorruptible and deathless, as a part of his reward for righteousness; so that in relation to him, the corruptible body “puts on” incorruption, and the mortal body immortality; and the saying is accomplished that “Death is swallowed up in victory.” He continued:

“Well, Doctor Thoma says that man is unconscious in death”—

“And,” said I, “have you not sense enough to know that a man may become unconscious from a blow on the head, and that that rather establishes my position than sustains your imputation?” He then proceeded upon another tack, saying,

“Dr. Thomas’ gospel just suits the carnal mind. It is the sort of gospel that would have pleased the Apostles when they asked the Redeemer ‘If he would not at that time restore again the kingdom to Israel?’ It is just the thing for the Jews. When I was in Lunenburg there was a Jew at my meeting, and he sneered at me all the time I was speaking; but when Dr. Thomas goes there he hears him gladly! One of their preachers recently declared in that country that Christ had no power, though He himself declared that all power in heaven and earth was given unto Him, and John calls Him the Prince of the Kings of the earth.”

In the absence of Mr. Magruder, the preacher alluded to, I rose to say, that what he said was, that Jesus had no regal power as king on the throne appointed for Him. He believes that Jesus has all exousia, or authority, to do as he pleases, and that by virtue of it he sent the Apostles to forgive sins in his name; but this is very different from regal power over nations. He is not Prince of the reigning kings of the earth, but of those kings who shall hereafter reign with him on earth, which is a very important distinction. After this, Elymas tried it again, saying,

“Dr. Thomas is the man to make money by preaching!”

“And were it so, which happens not to be, you are the last man in the world to reflect on another for that; you, who receive fifteen hundred dollars a year for preaching Campbellism!”

“No, I don’t, Sir!” said he tartly.

“From a thousand to fifteen hundred, at any rate.” This he did not attempt to deny. I heard afterwards that his salary in Richmond was \$1,200. He had been offered \$1,500, but he pettishly refused to be hired at that price, because it had been offered to one D. S. Burnet before him. He went on to say that—

“A man who preached the gospel should live by the gospel.”

“But there’s the rub. You must be sure to preach it before you can live by it; or that text gives no countenance to you.”

“I have sacrificed much for the truth. Dr. Thomas has sacrificed nothing. He had nothing to sacrifice. I was once a popular Baptist preacher, but I left them; my salary has never covered my expenses. The gospel Dr. Thomas preaches can’t be the gospel the Apostles preached. I was told by one of his friends that he had been studying it for fifteen years, and had only just come to the understanding of it.”

“I wish,” said a gentleman who had risen behind me, “that when you undertake to report my sayings you would speak the truth, Sir! I said no such thing. I am sick of Campbellism, and am determined to have no more to do with it.” He proceeded:

“Dr. Thomas is a learned man; he has devoted his days and nights for years to the study of the Prophets and to languages; and it has taken him a long time to work out the things he teaches, which are far beyond the reach of ordinary men.” He was continuing in a strain of flattery, when I found it necessary to cut it short, and to urge him to come to the point, on the ground that time was precious, as the sun was fast descending, and I had yet to immerse, and afterwards to travel some 20 miles. As yet he had proved nothing, nor touched upon a single testimony or argument I had adduced. The people wanted Scripture and reason; but, as yet he had produced none. Several persons had left in disgust at his sorcery, and others were becoming quite impatient of his twaddle. After this he began to make an effort to get at something which, stripped of all circumlocution and declamation, seemed to be as follows: —

1. That the gospel I preached was false, because it took people so long to get to the understanding of it; whereas, in the days of the Apostles, a few minutes, or at most an hour, was sufficient;
2. That when Philip preached Jesus to the Ethiopian he said nothing about the kingdom I plead for;
3. That the idea of setting up the kingdom by war cannot be correct, because Jesus said, "He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword;" and,
4. That the gospel is defined in 1 Corinthians 15: 3-4; and that whoever preaches any thing else for gospel than this, is accursed, and his preaching false.

These matters being delivered with a face that had been steeled and case-hardened for the occasion, (for he afterwards confessed that he had gone determined not to be disturbed at any thing that might be said,) his ten minutes was converted into an hour, at the end of which he left the subject where it was before he attempted to touch it. It was a lame and limping effort; and if the gospel of the kingdom, rickety and footless thing, as he denominates it, have no adversary more efficient, and no artillery more destructive to make war upon it in this generation than R. L. Coleman and his hour's speech, our service in its defence will be very holiday pastime indeed. Having descended from the tribune, I took his place, and reviewed his points briefly, as time pressed hard, and to the effect following:

First, The length of time some people take to come to the understanding of what I teach, is no proof of the gospel of the kingdom I preach being false. If such an argument were to be admitted, it would militate equally against the Apostles themselves as against me; for Paul saith, that some with whom he had to do were "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." See how, "slow of heart to believe" were the disciples even, who were instructed by Jesus himself for three years and a half in "the mysteries of the kingdom." It is quite a mistake to imagine that faith comes in a few minutes, or, as the phrase is, that man may "get religion" in a flash. The renewal of man's heart, after the image of Christ, which is the basis of repentance in his name, is not instantaneous on hearing the word, but a progressive change consequent on searching the Scriptures to an enlightened comprehension of them—"they searched the Scriptures, and therefore they believed."

Queen Candace's treasurer is a case far from being parallel with the little children of nine and ten years old, whom Mr. Coleman and his colleagues dipped the other day on their assenting to their question, "Do you believe that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God?" or with the generality of Gentiles who, by the preaching of damnation and the Devil, are scared into the water to join a church. The Ethiopian official was either a Jew in the service of the Cushite Queen, or a proselyte of the Mosaic religion; at all events, he was a student of the Prophets, which Mr. Coleman and his contemporaries generally are not. The cases are not therefore equal; so that no conclusion can be deduced from the Ethiopian's case as an argument for the scripturality of the instantaneous religion-gettings of our day.

If people are long and find it difficult to comprehend me, it is not because of the intrinsic abstruseness and obscurity of the system, but because of their minds being preoccupied with all sorts of theological foolishness. It takes so much time to disabuse their minds of this, that they grow old under the sound of the truth before they can perceive what the few advocates of it are driving at. Add to this their general indifference to religious truth, their listlessness, educational bias, and neglect of the Bible, and you need not wonder at the length of time required to open their eyes, and to bring them to the obedience of faith. If their minds were as the sensoria of little children, a simple statement of the Gospel of the kingdom,

with explanations and testimonies, would do the work—they would hear with earnest attention, comprehend with facility, believe heartily, and obey. But this is not their mental constitution. They are neither inquisitive nor industrious, but willing to expend large sums of money on hirelings to do for them their religious thinking and theatricals. Thus the hirelings are to the professing world what the brain is to the mortal body. Repudiating Moses and the Prophets, they are necessarily ignorant of the Apostles. Hence, their thinking is “the thinking of the flesh”—the unenlightened expositors of human folly; which being congenial to mankind, their traditions run like wildfire through the community, and throw the truth and its word into the deep obscurity of the wilderness. I have to contend against all these hindrances in my endeavours to enlighten the people; therefore my progress with them is slow, discouraging, and not always sure. Still, there is this consolation, that I am proving my own faith, and find myself in no worse a position than Noah, Elijah, and the Messiah himself, who in the days of his flesh was forsaken of all, and was denounced by those who appeared to men to be righteous, for a madman, blasphemer, devil, and perverter of the people.

Secondly, The eighth chapter of Acts, from which Mr. Coleman has read to you about the Ethiopian, is the most unfortunate selection he could have made, in support of his allegation against the gospel of the kingdom, which, although it was preached by Jesus and the Apostles, he styles “a false gospel.” The chapter shows us that to “preach Jesus” is to preach the gospel of the kingdom. It is possible that Mr. Coleman may admit that Philip preached the same gospel to the Ethiopian that he preached to the Samaritans. If he do, his Campbellite fabric tumbles about his ears with a loud crash. For when Philip “preached Christ to the Samaritans”—verse 5—we are told that he preached unto them the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ; and that when they believed them they were baptised, both men and women—verse 12. For Philip, then, to “preach Christ” and to “preach Jesus” was one and the same work, whether the preaching were addressed to Jew, Samaritan, or proselyte, be they a multitude or only one.

“He didn’t preach about the kingdom to the Ethiopian!” exclaimed Elymas: “there’s nothing said about the kingdom there; it says, ‘he preached unto him Jesus;’ that is, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”

Though I had just shown by the foregoing argument that to preach Jesus was necessarily to preach the kingdom of God, this Elymas of a parson (see Acts 13: 8-10) denied that it was preached to the Ethiopian, because the word kingdom was not in the text! Some people are either natural simpletons, who are capitally deficient in the upper story, and therefore can neither reason themselves nor perceive a demonstration; or they are perverse bigots, bent on mischief. To which of these classes Mr. Coleman belongs, I leave for them to judge who know more of him than I; but of all the preachers I have had to do with, I never encountered so impervious and feeble-minded a sophist before. He seemed to have no idea of logic or proof, for if he quoted a text he appeared utterly incapable of constructing an argument upon it.

I rejoined to his exclamation, “Certainly he preached about the kingdom, for the kingdom is the subject-matter of the gospel, and inseparable from it.”

“He preached from Isaiah, and there is nothing about the kingdom there,” said he.

“Yes, there is, and more than you imagine.” I then turned to that prophet, and remarked that the Ethiopian was reading from a prophecy that commenced at the fifty-first and ended at the fifty-fourth chapter, inclusive.

“No,” exclaimed Elymas, “he was reading the fifty-third chapter, about his being led as a sheep to the slaughter.”

Upon this, I looked upon him and said: Listen to me. In your harangue you were complimenting me upon my diligent study and knowledge of the prophets; of whose writings also you admitted your own ignorance, which is apparent to every one. It is not, therefore, to be borne that ignorance should be a judge in this matter. I say that he was reading from a prophecy beginning and ending as I have said. In his day, Isaiah was not cut up into chapters, so that there was then no fifty-third chapter. The Ethiopian, who had gone to Jerusalem to worship, was reading, on his return from that city, a prophecy setting forth her future calamities, and her glory which should follow, when one should “plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thy God reigneth”—chapters 51: 16; 52: 7. He perceived that this Redeemer of Jerusalem was styled Jehovah’s servant, who should be exalted and extolled, and be very high; and before whom kings should shut their mouths. But in reading on, he got into the description of a servant who was to be made very low, and esteemed of no account by his countrymen, being oppressed also even unto death, without resistance. When he had got thus far in the reading, he was at a loss to comprehend whom the prophet was speaking of; whether of himself or of some other man. It does not seem to have occurred to him that he was speaking of him that was to “redeem Jerusalem”—verse 9—from “the hand of them that afflict her: which have said to her soul, Bow down, that we may go over.” At this juncture it was that Philip was ordered by the Spirit, who well knew the difficulty he was in, to “go near, and join himself to the chariot.” He did so, and from the place of the prophecy which embarrassed him, he began and “preached to him Jesus.” How long the discourse continued is not said; but it is clear that he convinced him that Isaiah spake not of himself, but of the Christ, who was to be a sufferer unto death before “he should bring again Zion,” and be called “The God (or King) of the whole earth.”

How much of the prophecy “from that same Scripture” Philip expounded is not testified; but the probability is, that he explained to him the whole, for the prophecy is descriptive of “the heritage of the servants of Jehovah,” whose righteousness is of his servant—chapter 54: 17.

If Mr. Coleman understood the prophets, he would be able to read the gospel of the kingdom in the good things affirmed in Isaiah’s report, which but few believe, purposed of God for Jerusalem in the future, when she shall awake, stand up, and put on her beautiful garments. Then the foundations of the state, or kingdom, of which she will be the throne, when it shall be proclaimed, “Thy God, O Zion, reigns,” will be laid with sapphires; her windows will be made of agates; her gates of carbuncles; and her borders of pleasant stones. These are her children; “precious stones” all of them, because they are all taught of God: and their proficiency is worthy of their instructor—they walk worthy of God, who teaches them—1 Corinthians 3: 12. Mr. Coleman is too blind to see any thing of the kingdom in this. God reigning in Zion conveys no hint of a kingdom to him. What can be done with such obtuseness? What, but to abandon him to the sport of his own presumption and folly?

The fact is, the kingdom was the Ethiopian’s hope, as it was, and continues to be, the hope of every intelligent and pious Israelite to this day. But until Philip “guided” him, he did

not know who was to occupy its throne, nor upon what new conditions men might become coheirs of it. He knew, being a student of the prophets, that the Christ, who was to be Son of God and Son of David, was to sit upon the throne in Zion as King for Jehovah, but he did not know who he was. Philip preached to him Jesus as this very person; and baptism in his name for repentance and remission of sins to every believer of Isaiah's report. And because of this, when they arrived at water on their way, he said, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptised?" Philip told him that nothing hindered, if he believed with all his heart; he then declared that he believed "that the Son of God is the Anointed Jesus"—that Jesus was he of whom the prophet spake as the Redeemer of Jerusalem, the healer of the breach, and the restorer of the paths to dwell in.

Thirdly, As to the setting up of the kingdom by war, reason and experience are with Scripture here. For a kingdom to be established in the Holy Land, whose king claims the dominion of the world, would, of necessity, superinduce a combination of all existing rulers of the world against him. The present war is being waged to preserve the balance of power, so that the greatness of one kingdom shall not overshadow the rest. What would be the result of the kingdom of God among a constellation of godless powers? The absorption of all power to itself, and war on their part to prevent it. The world is guilty before God; and he intends to teach it righteousness with judgment; as it is written, "When his judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness;" and "All nations shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, because thy judgments are made manifest." Now, by whom is the world of nations to be judged? Not by any one of those nations, certainly, for they are all guilty, and criminals at the bar. Mr. Coleman objects to the sword of judgment being put into the hand of the saints; he thinks (and it is but a think-so with him, for he knows not the Scripture) that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword absolutely. He does not understand that the use of the sword is interdicted only in the absence of Jesus; and that when he comes in power they will fight, as they would have done when he was in Palestine before, if his kingdom had pertained to that ancient kosmos. Hear what is written upon this point in Psalm 149:—"Let the children of Zion be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand: to execute vengeance upon the nations, and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron: to execute upon them the judgment written. This honour have all his saints."

"Oh," exclaimed Elymas, "that belongs to another dispensation!" "Pooh, pooh, man!" said I, impatient of his stolidity, "you know nothing about the matter. It belongs, my friends, to the 'administration of the fulness of times,' referred to in Daniel, when to the saints, previously prevailed against by the Little Horn power, judgment is given at the appearing of the Ancient of Days; and they take possession of the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, of the fourth beast symbol. Then the Gentile powers, represented by the scarlet-coloured beast and the drunken Roman harlot that rides them, who have led captive Israel and the saints, and killed them with the sword, shall go into captivity, and by the sword be killed in that great contest between Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, and the sin-powers of the world, for its dominion and the possession of Jerusalem and the Holy Land, we have been considering today."

The sun being nearly down, it became necessary to conclude at this point. On leaving the house, several expressed themselves very much gratified at what they had heard. Some said they had not heard so much of the gospel in all their lives before; and would like much to hear it fully discussed. I remarked that it would be both interesting and profitable; and if I had

time should like very well to engage in it, if a man could be produced of sufficient knowledge of Moses and the Prophets, and had sense enough to know when a thing was proved, and candour enough to admit it; but that it was mere waste of time and patience to concern oneself with such an adversary as the present.

While I was talking without, Elymas joined the group, and protruded himself again upon my attention. Something was said about my splitting churches, which caused me to remark that not a single church had ever been split by me. This caused an incredulous elongation of face. “Well, I will explain to you the process. A congregation invites me to address them, and I accept their invitation. What should I preach? Should I preach what they believe, what you believe, or what I myself believe?” “What you believe,” he replied. “Very well, that I do. Some that hear me become the subjects of new convictions. I go away, and, perhaps, they see me no more, but the ideas remain. These ideas are discussed; they gain ground, and cause an investigation, that brings into question what exists. Instead of meeting this new situation with scripture reason and a candid mind, such men as you begin to denounce and threaten, which free, sensible, and independent men will not regard. They maintain their liberty of speech, which you fail to suppress. Having no force in argument, you appeal to the argument of force, and by low intrigues you prejudice a majority against them; and when you think you are strong enough, or have sufficiently blackened their characters, you put their case to the vote, and vote them out of your synagogues! In this way, it is such as you that split churches, not I.”

He then made some remark, in a pious sort of tone, about a Christian spirit and prayers, which brought my patience to an end. Fixing my eyes steadily upon his, I said “Really, when I look at you, and hear you talk about your prayers, I can scarcely maintain a grave face! Your prayers! You, who have been vegetating in a hotbed of slander, and for years been pursuing the character of a man to destruction, because of his honest convictions—the prayers of such a man! The prayers of the hypocrite, Sir, are an abomination to the Lord!” and turning from him, I entered the carriage waiting to convey me to the water, to which Mr. Harris had preceded me.

The sun had descended below the tops of the forest oaks, and we had yet some three miles to drive. On our way we refreshed our outer man with some perishing ham and bread, which was the first we had tasted since breakfast at seven o’clock. Arrived at the water, preparation was made for baptism, when, instead of immersing Mr. Harris alone, I had the unexpected pleasure of passing through the water Mr. Wilson Winfree also, another who had been for many years a member, in good standing, of the same church with Mr. Harris. So that the efforts of Elymas to turn away his brethren from the faith, resulted in the immersion of two instead of one, and a hearty wish of “God speed you” from several of the people. From these facts, which can be authenticated by ample testimony, the reader can judge for himself, whether the gospel of the kingdom was regarded as having received a severe blow and great discouragement at the hands of Mr. Coleman, by those who heard him!

The sun having disappeared, my journey to Louisa was deferred to the following day. Bro. R. K. Bowles, who had come over to convey me there, and myself, accompanied brother Winfree to his hospitable abode, about five miles distant on the James River; while brother Samuel Harris, much strengthened by what he had heard, turned his face homeward, and “went on his way rejoicing.”

\* \* \*

From the Washington Union.

## FATAL EFFECTS OF PERVERTED RELIGIOUS TEACHING.

No. 2

### STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

Mr. Editor: An item of religious belief concerning the state of the dead having been noticed in the *Intelligencer* of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> of this month, and the editors having intimated as much as that their columns are now closed to the subject, allow me to say a few things upon the question so raised through the medium of your paper.

The inquiry whether the soul sleeps with the body in an unconscious state in the grave is not original with the present age. Whatever philosophy, aside from the teaching of the Scriptures, may say upon the subject, it is evident to my mind that the views of the first article alluded to are not sustained by the Bible, taken as a whole. The writer of that article has quoted a single class of texts, which depend for their true meaning upon the just rules of interpretation for the whole volume.

Suppose, in imitation of his example, we quote another class of texts, which on their face inculcate just the opposite sentiment. Take the parable of the rich man and Lazarus—Luke 16: 19, 31—which can have no intelligible meaning, even as a metaphor, if we admit the doctrine that the soul sleeps with the body in an unconscious condition. Again: Christ says to the dying thief—Luke 23: 43—“Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.” The Apostle says—Philippians 1: 23—“For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.” Again he says—2 Corinthians 5: 8—“We are confident, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord.” Much more might be quoted to show the ground of the doctrine received among professed Christians as to the state (especially) of the pious dead. But I will at this time add but a single passage more. It is the language of Christ in refutation of the Sadducees—Matthew 22: 31-32—“Have ye not read that which was written unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.” He meant distinctly to affirm that those patriarchs were still living; which was true of their spirits, though their bodies slept in the dust.

By a similar rule of interpretation, the passage in Acts 2: 34, affirming the non-ascension of David into the heavens, must refer to his mortal part, which, indeed, had not been raised and glorified, as the body of Christ was at his ascension. This is clearly the antithesis of Peter and the point of his argument, which was to prove the doctrine of the resurrection, and not to teach that the soul is unconscious till then. The passage in John 13: 33 has no relation to the question, as it was directed to those who die in their sins, and will never be in heaven, where Christ is, on that account. So in John 3: 13, the words, “No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven,” by no means prove that the soul is in an unconscious state. The phrase “ascending into the heavens” has several applications in the Scriptures, and its proper meaning in each place must be determined by the connection. See, for example, Ephesians 4: 8, 10; Acts 1: 9, 11; also 2 Corinthians 12: 2, 4. From these and many other statements of Scripture, the phrase in question must be modified to suit the nature of the subject; and if there be different gradations, properly termed the heavenly state, yet each implying also a different degree of power and glory, it is evident that no mere man

has ascended to that high estate, to be in a condition of equality with the Father: and in this sense the words of Christ are true, that no man hath ascended into heaven, &c., although all who have died in the faith have gone to be with Christ; and in the lower sense of being in a conscious state in His manifested presence, it is proper to represent that they have been removed from this world to Paradise or Heaven. Again: even in the most literal application of the passage, it does not teach the unconscious state of the soul; for but two persons are regarded as having been translated, of one of whom it is simply said that he was not, for God took him; and in regard to the other, that he went up bodily in a whirlwind, out of mortal sight, and afterwards appeared, with Moses, communing with Christ on the mount of transfiguration—thus showing that the ascension and descension were precisely the exceptions to the general rule in respect to the mortal part of man which the passage contemplates. But, whatever its meaning, it is evident that a state of unconsciousness for the soul was never intended to be affirmed thereby. The passage in the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of John—“thy brother shall rise again”—was spoken especially of his body and of the miracle then to be performed, and teaches nothing respecting the state or condition of the soul after death. That was the consolation Christ offered—that Lazarus should then be restored to them; it was a miracle to prove His power over death, but not to prove that, when we die, our spirits may not go to meet our friends in heaven. The other passages quoted in the article referred to, respecting the recompense of the righteous and the wicked in the earth, and also the sleep and the resurrection of the body, have too remote a bearing on the question to need any comment.

Now, as to “the popular creed,” and “the dogma which can claim no higher authority than the heathen philosophy of Greece and Rome,” and which is entirely at variance with the teachings of Christ, the prophets, and apostles, we have nothing more to say than that not a single text in the Bible can be adduced to show that the soul sleeps with the body in the grave; and if it be meant that the opposite doctrine is unscriptural and heathenish, I deny the imputation, and say that the sleep of the soul with the body has been part of the doctrine of the ancient and modern infidelity, beyond a question. Traces of the same notion may be found in the oldest forms of Paganism. It constituted the fundamental principle of the Hylozoic atheism in the time of Homer and Hesiod. It pervaded the Gnostic heresies; was a chief tenet of the ancient Sadducees and their successors, in one form or other—the Materialists, the Soul-sleepers, the Necessarians, the French infidels—down to the least and latest, the disappointed and bewildered Millerites and Second-adventists, and all the fag-ends of that delusion.

Now, Mr. Magruder may not be aware of the pedigree of his sentiment on the state of the dead; but, when he comes to study it out, he will find that it owes its paternity to the rankest and baldest atheism; and that its believers have, in every age, been amongst the most determined and malignant enemies of the principles of the Christian faith. The truth is, men who broach such doctrines now-a-days are often ignorant of the history of human opinions, and suppose they have really found out something new, when, in fact, they have only uncovered some old and exploded theory.

Then, as to the case of the boy committing suicide because his mother told him he would see his sister in heaven, it is a curious piece of logic, indeed; just as though a doctrine cannot be true unless it never has, and never can be, perverted by poor weak human nature! On this principle, the boy’s death did not result from false, but from defective teaching. It was true as far as it went, but it did not go far enough, and therefore came short of what the Bible dictated. It taught the child a reunion in heaven, but not the nature of suicide. In ignorance or wilfulness, therefore, the boy launched himself into eternity, and it is for the final Judge to decide the character of that act, under all the circumstances; but the last of all uses which a

logical mind, knowing any thing of human nature, or of the general tenor of the Bible, should make of it, is that which is so piously, and I presume sincerely, attempted to be made of it by the writer in question.

SCRUTINY.

\* \* \*

### ARE THE DEAD CONSCIOUS?

Mr. Editor: Your correspondent, "Scrutiny," in the Union of the 30<sup>th</sup> ult., takes the affirmative of the above proposition, and, in reply to a communication addressed by the undersigned to the National Intelligencer, presents arguments and Scripture texts which he supposes to favour his position. 'Tis but fair, therefore, to allow me some space in your columns for a replication.

I submit, with all deference, that the texts cited, when fairly interpreted, do not sustain his conclusion. Let us examine them. Luke 16: 19: The rich man and Lazarus. Now, this was confessedly a parable, and we have the orthodox authority of Dr. Adam Clarke (Com. On Matthew 5: 26) that, "by the general consent of all, (except the basely interested,) no metaphor is ever to be produced in proof of a doctrine." Besides, the scene described is physical and personal, and not one in which phantom souls and airy, disembodied spirits figure. It was Lazarus (not his soul) which was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. It was the rich man (not his spirit) that died and was buried. He lifts up his eyes; he wishes his tongue to be cooled, for he is tormented in flame, &c. Can a "disembodied spirit" be tormented in flame? Has it a tongue that can be cooled with water? It is Christ who testifies, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones;" but here are spirits (according to your correspondent) who have both.

The state of the dead was not the subject of the discourse in Luke 16. The parable was spoken to convince the Jews that "if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded, though one 'rose from the dead.'" See 31<sup>st</sup> verse. An intermediate disembodied state is plainly and necessarily excluded by the very drapery of the figure.

The Thief on the Cross, Luke 23: 43, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise," is cited. Its pertinency and authority as proof is effectually annulled by either one of the three following considerations:

1. The words quoted, which are supposed to favour the current opinion, are spoken in reply to the petition of the thief—"Lord, remember me when thou COMEST (not goest) into thy kingdom." The reply is responsive to this question. It is, "On this day (of which you speak—the day of my coming) thou shalt be with me in Paradise." The Greek adverb is "seameron," which Donnegan's Lexicon defines to mean "on this day"—in the sense of this or that very day—the day of which you speak; and this is a better rendering than the "today" of King James's version. Thus understood, the promise of Jesus to the thief is, that he shall be with him in Paradise on the day of his coming, and not at death, when he certainly did not "come into his kingdom."
2. Again: Where was Paradise? Your correspondent will probably answer, "In heaven, of course." But where is the proof of this? Milton, in "Paradise Lost," and Moore, in "Lalla Rookh," will sustain his assertion; but the Bible utterly repudiates it. Paradise

or Eden was certainly located in Assyria. It was bounded on one side by the river Euphrates, and on another by the Tigris—Genesis 2: 4. It was on the earth, and not in or above the heavens. Adam and Eve were in Paradise, undeniably. Were they then in heaven? When Christ “comes in his kingdom” he will restore the righteous to Paradise—thus fulfilling the promise in Revelation 2: 7—“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.” The Paradise promised to the thief, then, was on earth, where only the BIBLE testifies it ever existed.

3. The undisputed facts connected with the transaction prove conclusively that Christ was not himself in heaven on the day of his death, for it is three days afterward that he says to Mary, “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father” —John 20: 17. Now, if three days after his death he had not ascended to his Father, how can it be that he was on the day of his death with the thief in heaven?

So much for your correspondent’s confident assertion that this text clearly proves his position! We see that, when fairly interpreted in the light of Scripture facts, it is directly opposed to his theory. The same conclusion awaits a fair exegetical examination of his other quotations. St. Paul’s “desire to depart and be with Christ” is admitted by Dr. McKnight, in the notes to his version of the Epistles, (see in loco,) to be a defective rendering of the Greek word translated “depart,” which he says is better rendered “return,” which would give us Paul’s earnest “desire for the returning and being with Christ”—of course on earth, and not in heaven. So, too, his citation of Matthew 22: 31-32, where Christ confutes the Sadducees who denied the resurrection, is most unfortunate for him. See the passage, 23<sup>rd</sup> to 46<sup>th</sup> verses. The subject of controversy was not the state of the dead, but the truth of the resurrection. The Saviour’s language in verse 31 is: “But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.” What is the import of this but as if He had said in so many words, “Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are dead, but God is not the God of the dead; yet, as He is their God, they must come to life by a resurrection, that this Scripture may be fulfilled, and He may be proved to be their God.” As the quotation from the law of Moses was to prove the resurrection, or to show “that the dead are raised,” unless you give the above construction to the passage, it is wholly inconclusive and irrelevant. Your correspondent says it was used to prove that Abraham, &c., were still alive; but would that have proved the doctrine of the resurrection—the point in dispute? Let candor dictate the answer.

Having thus disposed of the formidable array of authorities which “Scrutiny” has presented so complacently, I fear to extend this article to a greater length by any reference to Scripture texts, additional to those cited in my communication to the *Intelligencer* of the 18<sup>th</sup> of July, to which the reader is referred. I will content myself, for the present, with asking attention to the palpably inconsistent and irrational, not to say absurd, consequences to which his position that “the dead are conscious” must conduct him.

1. As, on this theory, the righteous are rewarded and the wicked punished at death, there is neither necessity nor propriety in a future resurrection-day. If the righteous are in heaven, with God, “in whose presence there is fulness of joy, at whose right hand there are pleasures evermore,” there can be neither sense nor reason in reuniting them by a resurrection with the body. They cannot be more than “full of

joy”—cannot enjoy more or higher pleasures than those “evermore;” and so the resurrection-day is at least a useless arrangement.

2. On the same hypothesis, a future judgment-day, in which all shall give an account of the deeds done in the body, is also vain, if not absurd; for if the fate of the dead is determined at death, as it must be if rewarded or punished at that time, what need of another judgment? Will you try them over again? Will you reward and punish first, and then institute a tribunal for inquiry into merits or vices, on account of which they have already been visited—for hundreds of years, it may be—with a just retribution? What would your correspondent think of the wisdom or righteousness of a human law which first rewarded the good and punished the evil, and long afterwards gravely summoned the parties before the judge to be tried for offences of which the good had already been acquitted, and the guilty already convicted and punished? And yet this is the folly his theory fastens on “the Judge of all the earth.”
3. To this hypothesis of your correspondent—“a dogma,” I repeat, “which can claim no higher origin than the weak and beggarly philosophy of the Greeks and Romans,” mere heathen mythologists, without the light of Revelation, and so necessarily ignorant of the truth as to man’s constitution and destiny—to these vain traditions about immortal souls and disembodied spirits, in regard to which the Bible is as silent as the grave, we may refer the occasion of all the pernicious delusions, the infidelity and superstition which preeminently distinguish the present age—an age, as has been well said, at once the most sceptical and the most credulous the world has ever witnessed—almost entirely deaf to the voice of truth, but of most easy faith as to the most arrant impostures and the most childish and absurd inventions. Witness the vagaries of Swedenborg—the invocation of saints—prayers and masses for the dead—the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the pretended saints of the calendar, and their shrines and images—the dreadful pictures of distempered imaginations, representing the horrible agonies of the damned in hell, long before the judgment is pronounced on them—and last, and not least, the false and pernicious rapports of pretended spirits of the dead, who are, however, not dead, after all, but manifest their vitality by tapping tables and skulking under the wainscoting and in the walls of our houses, sending us messages from the so-called spirit world!

Think you, Mr. Editor, that such palpable delusions as these could gain currency in the world—amongst those, too, reputed to be wise and conscientious—if they really understood and believed the wholesome truth, so plainly revealed in the blessed Bible in such express declarations as these? —“Man dieth, and wasteth away: yea, man yieldeth his breath, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so 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: 10-13.

“And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, &c.”—Daniel 12: 2.

“In death, O God, there is no remembrance of thee. In the grave who shall give thee thanks?”—Psalm 6: 5.

“The living know that they shall die, BUT THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANY THING; \* . . . also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in ANY THING that is done under the sun”—Ecclesiastes 9: 4-7.

“Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in the land of forgetfulness”—Psalm 88.

“The dead praise not the Lord, nor any that go down into silence”  
—Psalm 115.

“The Lord pitieth them that fear him, for he knoweth our frame—he remembereth we are dust”—Psalm 103: 13.

“Dust thou (not thy body) art, and unto dust shalt thou return”  
—Genesis 3: 19.

“The hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves (not in heaven or hell) shall hear his voice, and shall come forth,” &c. Jesus in John 5: 28.

With this sample of Scripture texts in disproof of “Scrutiny’s” orthodox though unscriptural position, which might be accumulated to almost any extent, I am content to refer the controversy, for the present, to the candid judgment of the reared. In the face of such plain testimony as that cited above, especially Job 14, Daniel 12: 2, and John 5: 28, your readers will be able to appreciate the worth of his assertion that “not a single text in the Bible can be adduced to show that the soul sleeps with the body in the grave.”

A. B. MAGRUDER.

Charlottesville, Va.

---

\* If your correspondent “Scrutiny” can convince Hon. Mr. Talmadge, President of the Spiritual Republic, or his Honour Judge Edmonds, of the truth of this plain declaration of Holy Writ, he might save them some trouble.

\* \* \*