

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, JULY, 1855—
Volume 5—No. 7

THE SIGN OF THE SON OF MAN INDICATIVE OF HIS APPEARING IN POWER
AND GREAT GLORY.

“And there shall appear in the heaven the Sign of the Son of Man.”—Jesus.

(Concluded from June 1855.)

But the reader must not suppose that the Seven-Angel Sign disappeared from the heaven with “the settlement of Europe” by the Treaty of Vienna. The history of the countries of the Beast and his image to the present time, sufficiently indicates that the sign has never vanished, but that its significancy hitherto always obtains. The civil wars and discords of Spain, Portugal, and Naples, still evinced the droppings of divine wrath upon the worshippers of the Beast’s Image, from the vial of the fifth angel of the sign. They continued for several years after the sixth angel-power commenced its wrath upon the Euphratean Desolator of the Holy Land; and did not entirely cease until the vial of the seventh began to drip upon “the Air” in 1830.

The sixth and seventh wrath-messengers of this sign in the heaven, usher in the Son of Man in power and much glory; and the contemporary resurrection and manifestation of his associate-brethren, the Saints, or “Kings of the East.” Who is so blind as not to see the Sign in its sixth and seventh phases in the heaven? What is indicated, or can be indicated, by the calamities that have so grievously affected the Ottoman world since 1820, and are still exhausting its vitality, but that the sixth Messenger is pouring out the wrath of God, predetermined since the days of Daniel, “upon the great river Euphrates,” the power by which the desolation of Israel’s land has been perpetuated to the full end of 1290 years? It is self-evident, and requires no argument to prove it. The calamities affecting Ottomania for the past 34 years, are an element of the Sign in the heaven indicating the approaching resurrection of the saints; for the testimony says, that the power is drying up “that the way of the Kings from the Sun’s risings may be prepared.” This is figurative language. The “sun” is the symbol of the angel-power “standing in the sun” of the Gentile heavens—Revelation 19: 17, which at a remote period previously “clothed the woman.” That angel power is “the Sun of Righteousness that ariseth with healing in his wings to them who fear His name.” At his rising they shall go forth; and tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of their feet in the day that he shall work, saith the I shall be of armies; or, He who shall be Commander-in-Chief of armies, as indicated in this chapter by “a sharp sword going out of

his mouth, that with it he might smite the nations.” The Saints are kings and priests for God proceeding from the rising of the Sun, the bright Day, or Morning Star, destined of Jehovah to illumine the world. The Ottoman power is drying up to make way for them; and is therefore the present sign in the heaven that their redemption draweth nigh.

But their rising, or “going forth like dew from the womb of the morning,” cannot come to pass till the Sun of Righteousness himself appear in glory. In order, therefore, to give their brethren “who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord,” a sign in the heaven specially indicative of his appearing, a very remarkable sign is revealed in connection with that prefiguring “the dying of the sick man.” This sign in the heaven which pertains to the wrath of the Sixth Vial, is described as “Three unclean effluences—pneumata ek—like frogs from the Dragon’s mouth, the Beast’s mouth, and the False Prophet’s mouth.” As the Seven-Angel Sign is in the heaven, this must also be there. It is not like “an earthquake,” to be observed among the people; but in the heavens that rule over them. The Frogs, the Dragon, the Beast, the False Prophet, and their Mouths, all belong to the heavens, being representative of powers and governments, not of the multitudes they rule. The Dragon symbolises the Constantinopolitan dominion, of which the Ottoman government is the “mouth;” the Beast, the Germano-Roman, of which the Austrian is the “mouth, and the False Prophet,” the papal, of which the Roman is the “mouth.” From these governments were to issue “spirits,” breathings, or utterances, called the “spirits of demons”—pneumata daimonon; the utterances of Genii. The demons of the Apocalyptic air are an aerial order, having much to do with human affairs, and occupying a middle position in “the air” between the emperors and the peoples. They are political interpreters, or ambassadors, from the gods of one nation to the authorities of another; and through them passes all political divination, or diplomacy; for the gods, or crowned heads, mingle not directly with the multitude, but through these media is ever carried on the intercourse between the heavens of the political world. The reader will not understand me as speaking of demons or genii of the air we breathe, which, by the priestly varlets of the papacy are said to be scared out of their wits, if they have any, by the ringing of bells sprinkled with “holy water!” These belong to the theologies of Plato, Rome, Geneva, Bethany, &c.; not to the doctrine of Jesus and John. The demons or genii they refer to are the Diplomats of Constantinople, Vienna, and Rome, such as Lords Stratford de Redcliffe and Westmoreland; de Bourqueney, Gortschakoff, and Buol. The notes and protocols which issue forth from the mouths they affect are effluences, styled in the common version “unclean spirits of devils like frogs”—the expression of that “SECRET DIPLOMACY” so characteristic of their proceedings.

That the “Frogs” of the sign in the heaven are representatives of the French power, I need not undertake to prove in this place; for it must be an established truth in the minds of all who have paid attention to the evidence I have elsewhere adduced upon the subject. The demon effluences, then, are said to be “like Frogs,” because, when the secret diplomacy becomes public in the Constantinople and Vienna “notes,” and “points,” and “treaties,” they are found to display the operation of the French power.

Such, then, is the sign in the heaven concurrent with the drying up of the Euphrates-power, and the interpretation of its elements. Does history afford us any counterpart to it in the past or present of the world? The question seems to me superfluous. Surely that man must be hopelessly blind who cannot discern it as the sign of these times in the heaven. Try the literary exposition by the facts, and see how admirably they harmonise. There is the French power, in parliamentary documents acknowledged to be the originator of the present crisis in the east: and with which the entente cordiale is matter of much felicitation on the part of the

English government. This cordial understanding results from the policy of the French power being thoroughly anti-Russian; and thus securing to commercial England a strong military ally against Russian aggression on India. Napoleon fears the ascendancy of the autocrat in Europe, and Britain his ascendancy in the East; so that, not their love for each other, but their mutual fears of a common foe, establish a cordiality between the two powers, that causes England to forgo her ancient rivalry, and to follow in the wake, or, at least, to do nothing not previously approved by the policy of the Frog-power.

Again: In the Sign in the heaven the Dragon is mentioned first, as the power out of whose mouth an unclean spirit was to go forth. Now, look at the fact. Before the present war was declared, Constantinople was the field of demonism. The demons, or diplomatists of France, Russia, Austria, and Britain, worked diligently in their calling there; so that for a time the eyes of all the world were turned to Constantinople to see what would come of it. At length the question started by the Frog-power about the "Holy Places in Jerusalem," and which brought the irascible Menschikoff to Constantinople to obtain a settlement of it in favour of the Autocrat, caused a voice to issue from the Dragon's Mouth, declaring war against Russia; and so placing itself in a like position with France in relation to its anti-Russian policy, and therefore making its unclean spirit, or policy, homoion batrachois similar to the frogs.

But, in process of a short time, all eyes were turned from Constantinople to Vienna. The former city ceased to be of any diplomatic interest. Before this "Great Eastern Question" began to be agitated, I interpreted this sign in the heaven, and showed that the unclean effluences, or spirits, were to go forth from Constantinople, Vienna, and Rome, as the localities from which the "Mouths" were to express their warlike policy, and in the order of their position in the text. Now, the reader can see that in relation to Constantinople as the place of the Dragon's Mouth, and the Frog-like policy to proceed from it, my interpretation was correct; nor can he fail to remark, that events are still travelling in the course of my exposition. The sign in the heaven of the Son of Man's appearing, is in its SECOND PHASIS. This is the working of the Demons under the influence of Frog-policy upon the Beast-power, until its Mouth shall enunciate a policy resulting from the disturbing influences generated by the Frogs. The demon-working in the metropolis of the Beast has been hitherto secret, indefatigable, and complicated; but the result will be when the Austrian government comes to speak out plainly, a belligerent declaration, extending the war which has been originated by the policy of France; for its effluence is to be similar in its tendency to the frogs. All eyes are now upon Vienna, seeking to penetrate the tendency of things. Will the demonism at work there bring peace and assurance to the powers of the heavens, confirming their dynastic privileges, and consequent enslavement of the peoples forevermore: or will it result in extending the war into Germany and the Rhine? This is the exciting question of the hour, which those who discern not the Sign of the Son of Man are unable to answer. The scriptural response is, that there will be no peace for the consolation of the wicked. The Frog effluences of the demons exhaling from the three Mouths, are signs of wrath, not of mercy and peace. The spirits, or effluences, are signs to the servants of God that the Lord is standing at the door, and knocking. The plenipotentiaries—daimones of the dragon, beast, and false prophet, mouths, are unwittingly producing notable results or signs—poionta semeia in the common version, working miracles—or working telegraph as it were, to signalise the faithful and wise—the instructed in the signs of God—of what is in the offing. Providence could have proceeded with the drying up of the Euphrates power to the end, as it has been doing for the past thirty-four years, and have brought the power to account under the walls of Jerusalem, without the present tedious and notable diplomatic campaigns in Constantinople and Vienna,

and hereafter in Rome. It could have done so; but, in that case, there would have been no Sign in the heaven indicating whether the end were near, or still afar off. The Demons of the Powers are therefore making Signs for us to interpret by the Book of Signs, the Apocalypse, that we may know that the Son of Man ere long will arrive at Jerusalem in power and much glory; and not only that we may know, but that we may be benefited by that knowledge, in preparing to meet him in peace.

But before the sign in the heaven of the Son of Man's appearing is complete, it must pass from its present into a third and last phasis. Vienna will become diplomatically as quiescent as Constantinople. All eyes will then be turned to the demonism of the Court of Rome. So long as the breathings or expressed policy of the Beast's Mouth fall short of frog-like belligerency, there will be harmony and concert of action between France and Austria; and Italy will be exempt from the horrors and ravages of war. This, however, is a condition of the Peninsular that cannot continue. If the powers of Italy were just and good, and the people righteous; they might expect, as Israel of old, protection from evil; but it is not so. Italy is the home of powers at enmity with God and men; and their peoples, like the ancient Amorites, full of uncleanness and abomination. There can be no peace for such as these. Jezebel may say in her heart, "I sit Queen, and am no widow, and sorrow I shall never see!"—but, when she least expects it, she will find herself involved in a diplomatic crisis which will not fail to exhale from her "mouth" a frog-like policy that will bring upon her the hatred of the kings, and desolation at their hands. France and Italy may then be in arms against Austria; and struggling, not for ascendancy, but for national exemption from Russian, or Russo-Austrian rule.

When this third spirit like to the Frogs shall have gone forth from the False Prophet-power's mouth, the sign in the heaven will be complete. The full effect of the three-fold sign operation will then remain to be worked out. This full effect is not simply to create general war; this is but a means conducive to the end proposed. The full effect will be a coalition of the kings of the Roman Earth and whole European Habitable against Jerusalem and the power in garrison there. The signograph says, that the Frog-war policy expressed by the Three Mouths is to bring the kings together, for a particular war. The word is *synagagein*, which signifies to bring together in amity, as allies are brought together; thus *xenos emen, kai synagagete me*, "I was a stranger, AND YE WELCOMED me." But war among the powers precedes this amicable coalition, as we see at the present crisis. France, England, Sardinia, Naples, Austria, and rumour says, Spain, Portugal and Holland, have declared themselves against Russia, and consequently against whatever powers may side with the Czar. This, however, is only a proximate result of the Frog-policy; for, when that Frog-power shall disappear from among the powers of Europe, their relative position to the Czar will undergo a change. This may be illustrated by what has already occurred in the history of France. In 1812, Austria, Prussia, Holland, Spain, Italy, including Naples, Lombardy, the Roman States, and Sardinia, with all the Duchies, Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, the Confederation of the Rhine, &c., all coalesced with France against Russia; but after the retreat from Moscow the Napoleon spell was broken, his vassal kingdoms threw off the yoke, and the coalition was dissolved. Imperial France had to combat for her existence; and Russia, at the head of the kings of the earth, having broken her horn, entered Paris in triumph, reduced it to a kingdom, and fixed its limits to those of January 1, 1792, the old confines before France became the Messenger-power of the first vial. Russia is again the object of a hostile coalition under a Napoleon; but it will not stand. Military reverses in Germany or Italy, or in both, when the present war shall have fairly entered into its second stage, will prepare the way for the suppression of the Frog-power, and the consequent ascendancy of the Czar in the councils

of the powers now and hereafter confederate with Napoleon, Britain and Turkey principally, if not, alone, excepted.

As the Son of Man comes to Zion for her redemption, and for the destruction of the power of her adversaries, we would reasonably expect that the sign in the heaven of that coming would be significant of things pertaining to Jerusalem. Now, this we find to be the case in revelation and in fact. The prophecy reveals that the operation of the sign results in the alliance of all the kings; and that the sixth messenger power, whose mission it is to exhaust the strength of the Ottoman by the wrath he brings upon it, leads them on to occupy a position in the Holy Land. The words are, "And, SYNEGAGE, he brought them together into the place called Hebraistically, ARMAGEDDON." If it had been said, Hellenistically, we might have sought for the place of this great military convention of powers in some country of Greece; but the introduction of a Hebrew name in a Greek dress, with an intimation that it is Hebrew, is a hint to the reader that the event treated of has to do with Hebrew affairs. The Armageddon assembly of powers, therefore, is to be sought for neither in Germany, Italy, nor Greece, but in the Holy Land: and the working of things in the signs must tend to that result.

We have an example of this mode of directing attention to the Holy Land in conjunction with the Greek empire, in Revelation 9: 11. I know of no difference of opinion worthy of regard as to the arena of the torment of the First Woe revealed in that chapter. All agree that it was the locality of the Saracen wars, which intensely affected the Holy Land, which they first invaded, and from whence they spread over the provinces of the Greek empire, to which for 150 years their devastation was almost exclusively confined. This arena of scorpion torment is indicated by the name bestowed upon the Locust-power; as, "The name to it acquired in Hebrew is Abaddon, and in the Greek the name is Apollyon:" that is, its terrible ravages in the Holy Land acquired for it there the name of Abaddon, or the Destroyer; and its fearful desolations in the countries where Greek was the language of the people, obtained for it the name of Apollyon, which also signifies Destroyer. Upon the same principle, the place where the kings will be assembled as the result of the Frog-sign in the heaven, will acquire the name of Armageddon, being in the country to which the Hebrew is indigenous.

The interpretation, then, of this sign-name must be sought for in the Hebrew tongue and history. It is compounded of two words, namely, ar and Megiddon. The former word embraces not only the idea of an encampment, but also that of watch-posts; hence, a military encampment, or place occupied by armies. Megiddon was the name of a fortified city of Manasseh, which was given also to a part of the great plain of Esdraelon. It is derived from gadad, to cut in, or hew, to break in upon. Hence, a military encampment broken in upon and hewed in pieces in the country of the Hebrews, is the signification of the phrase "called in Hebrew Armageddon." Encampment, slaughter, Palestine, are the three ideas suggested by Ar-Megiddon, ideas suggestive of the testimonies of Daniel, Ezekiel, Joel, Zechariah, Hosea, &c. Daniel says, "The King of the North shall plant his palatial tents between the seas to the mountain of the glory of holiness." This defines the area of the encampment as extending from the Mediterranean to the Sea of Tiberius, and from thence south to the city of Jerusalem. This includes the plain of Megiddon and the plain of Jezreel. Ezekiel says, the King of Magog shall come like a storm from the north against the mountains of Israel, upon which he shall fall with terrific slaughter. Joel says, the nations shall assemble and gather themselves to the valley of Jehoshaphat, where they shall be trodden down as grapes in the wine-press of divine fury. Zechariah says, they shall first capture Jerusalem; and Hosea, that the day of Jezreel shall be great. Besides all this, Armageddon is suggestive of the

manner of the overthrow of the kings; for, as the encampment of Midian on the same ground, panic stricken by the blasts of Gideon's three hundred trumpeters, fled, and fell by mutual slaughter; so will the king of the north and his confederates fall before the Kings of the Sun's risings at eventide, who, with lamps blazing, and trumpets sounding loud and long, shall chase them as thistle down before the blast. "The Lord my God shall come in—all the Saints with thee:"—"thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord!" "The Lord shall come with the messengers of his power:"—and all this when the Frog-sign now in the heaven shall have accomplished that appointed for it to do.

Such is the testimony of revelation in the case. Jerusalem and the Holy Land must occupy a prominent place in the diplomatic discussions which result in the gathering together of the kings. The Eastern Question began about Jerusalem, as every one knows; and it will find its solution there, which is expected by very few. "When ye see Jerusalem encompassed with armies then know that the desolation thereof approaches." This was the sign of signs to those who witnessed the judgment of Gehenna upon Judah. And to this generation it may be said, "Keep your eyes upon Jerusalem. For when ye shall see the Holy City encompassed by the armies of the north, and taken, then know that at any moment the Lord may appear in power and much glory."

Reader, look narrowly into the prophecy before us. You will find no sign given intermediate between the Frog-sign and the intimation of the speedy appearing of the Lord. The sign of the Frogs immediately precedes the words, "Behold, I come as a thief!"—it must therefore be the sign in the heaven of that coming. Do you not see "the water," or life, of the political Euphrates "drying up;" and that while this evaporation is in progress, the diplomatists, or demons, of the text, are hard at work at Vienna, as they have been at Constantinople, and will hereafter be at Rome; and do you not perceive that it is France (not England, which at present has no other foreign policy but to keep on good terms with the French emperor) whose policy gives tone and action to the councils of Europe? Do you not see, also, how this policy, notwithstanding all the twaddling about peace, results in treaties of offence and defence against Russia and revolutionists, and in raising troops for carrying on "a great war?" Now, suppose you desired to represent all this by heraldic devices, or symbols, could you possibly invent anything more appropriate for the purpose than what is described in Revelation 16: 12, 14? Then here you have the sign of your times fulfilling in the heavens of the political world. By it you may know assuredly what will shortly come to pass. Watch then, for in so doing you will be blessed; if, by what you discern, you are stirred up to provide yourself with a wedding garment, and are careful to keep it unspotted; so that when the Lord appears you may not be found naked, and exposed to shame.

Finally, then, remember the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus, which he has never modified nor repealed, saying concerning the gospel of the kingdom he began to preach in Galilee, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." Do this, and thenceforth walk worthy of the kingdom and glory to which this gospel calls, or invites you, looking for the Lord from heaven, and you will shine as the brightness of the firmament in the beauties of holiness forever.

EDITOR.

March 10, 1855.

* * *

JESUITISM AND GREAT INTELLECT.

Look at the Catholics of the United States in comparison with the Protestants. In the whole of America there is not a single man born and bred a Catholic distinguished for anything but his devotion to the Catholic Church. I mean to say, there is not a man in America, born and bred a Catholic, who has any distinction in science, literature, politics, benevolence, or philanthropy. I do not know one; I never heard of a great philosopher, naturalist, historian, orator, or poet, amongst them. The Jesuits have been in existence three hundred years; they have had their pick of the choicest intellect of all Europe—they never take a common man when they know it; they subject every pupil to a severe ordeal, intellectual and physical, as well as moral, in order to ascertain whether he has the requisite stuff in him to make a strong Jesuit of. They have a scheme of education masterly in its way. But there has not been a single great original man produced in the company of the Jesuits from 1545 to 1854. They absorb talent enough, but they strangle it. Clipped oaks never grow large. Prune the roots of a tree with a spade, prune the branches close to the bole, and what becomes of the tree? The bole remains thin, and scant, and slender. Can a man be a conventional dwarf and a natural giant at the same time? Case your little boy's limbs in metal, would they grow? Plant a chestnut in a tea-cup, do you get a tree? not a shrub, even. Put a priest upon a priest's creed as the only soil for a man to grow in; he grows not. The great God provided the natural mode of operation—do you suppose He will turn aside and mend or mar the universe at your or my request? I think God will do no such thing. —Parker.

* * *

THE POPE CURSING NICHOLAS. —In a letter from M. Gaillardet, of Paris, to the French papers in New York, is a passage which we find translated in the National Democrat, which reads thus:

When the Emperor Nicholas was on a visit to Pope Gregory XVI, in Rome, in 1844, the Holy Father reproached him with his persecution of Catholics in his dominions. The Czar did not deny the various ukases which the Pope had designedly collected, and pointed out to him with his finger. He even frankly avowed them, and justified them too, remarking that he had done so because he, of course, could not look upon Roman Catholicism as the true religion. At these words Gregory rose from his seat, and resting his two hands on the shoulders of the Czar, said to him in the presence of Cardinal Acton: "Well, then, Emperor of Russia, I, in my double capacity of old man and the head of the Church, pronounce you accursed, and sooner or later this malediction will reach your front, however high and lofty in place and power it may be."

* * *

Britain is forming a Turkish army of her own. By a convention with the Ottoman government, she is to maintain a certain body of Turkish troops in her pay. They are to be officered by British officers. Thus, she is putting a red coat upon the Turk, and marshalling him under her standard for the last contest in the Holy Land.

* * *

SUMMARY OF THE CHRISTIANITY REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

“He that believes and is baptised, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.”—JESUS.

1. All nations shall be blessed in Abraham. —Proof; Galatians 3: 8; Genesis 12: 3.
2. Abraham and his seed, the Christ, shall possess the Holy Land forever. —Proof; Genesis 13: 15; Galatians 3: 16-19.
3. Abraham having died, must therefore be raised from the dead to live forever, and possess the Holy Land. —Proof; Luke 13: 28.
4. Abraham’s seed, the Christ, dying, must also rise from the dead to deathlessness; and departing from the earth, must return to possess the Holy Land for ever: which likewise necessitates the final expulsion of the Gentiles from the country. —Proof; Leviticus 25: 23; Psalm 10: 16; 37: 29, 32-34; Zechariah 2: 12; 14: 4; Ezekiel 45: 7-8; 48: 21; John 1: 11; 14: 3; Acts 1: 11.
5. Abraham’s seed shall be Melchizedek King of Jerusalem. —Proof; Genesis 14: 18; Psalm 110: 4; Hebrews 7: 1-28.
6. The High Priest and King of Jerusalem shall possess the gate of his enemies; and having triumphed over the kings of the nations who hold in captivity his brethren and their goods, shall bring forth bread and wine when the Passover shall be fulfilled in the kingdom of God: and shall then and there as priest of the Most High bless Abraham and all his seed, who shall give him tithes of all. —Proof; Genesis 22: 17; 14: 17-20; Revelation 19: 11-21; 20: 4; Luke 13: 28-29; 22: 15-16, 18, 30; Ezekiel 45: 21; 43: 7-9; 45: 13-16.
7. The “seed of Abraham” is not only singular, but multitudinous. Christ: “they that are Christ’s at his coming;” afterwards the Twelve Tribes of Israel who walk in the steps of his faith; and the many nations joined to the Lord in the day when he dwells in Zion—are all comprehended in the phrase. —Proof; Galatians 3: 16, 29; Romans 4: 12, 18; Psalm 72: 11, 17; Genesis 17: 5; Zechariah 2: 10-11.

* * * “The flesh profiteth nothing” in the matter of the Heirship of the kingdom. —James 2: 5. “If children of God, then heirs of God, and coheirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”—Romans 8: 17; John 1: 12-13. The peasantry or tenants of an estate, are not the heirs of the estate; neither are the subjects of a kingdom the heirs of that dominion. The gospel invites men to coheirship with Christ of the Holy Land forever; and, by consequence, of all glory, honour, riches, dominion, and blessedness, covenanted to it throughout all generations. As the Land and its attributes are, by Jehovah’s will and testament, devised to Abraham and his seed upon a principle of faith, and not of flesh, “the flesh,” as Jesus saith, “profits nothing;” that is, no man can claim joint inheritance with Abraham and Christ because he is hereditarily descended from “the friend of God.” As the promises pertain to Israel—Romans 9: 4, Gentiles must become Israelites before they can claim them; and as the promises are covenanted to faithful and obedient Israelites, Jews must believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom as well as men of other nations, that they may become “Israelites indeed,” and heirs of God’s kingdom and glory. Hence, “They are not all Israel who are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children—John 8: 39, but in ‘Isaac shall thy seed be called.’ That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God (and consequently not heirs of God); but the children of the promise are counted for the Seed.”—Romans 9: 6-8.

* * * “They who are of faith the same are the children of Abraham,” whether before or after the advent of Christ, in power and much glory. Sonship by faith of the gospel of the kingdom before his return, entitles to immortality and a joint-possession with him of the Kingdom of Israel and the dominion over all nations to be attached to it: but Sonship by faith after his return entitles only to a terminable-life share in the Millennial blessedness possessed by Israel, Jehovah’s First-Born, and the nations, when they exist as the political inheritance of Christ and his Saints.

* * * Israel and the Gentiles of the ages and generations preceding Christ’s return, who are not of the “one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one Hope of the Calling,” are in the lo-ruhamah and lo-ammi-state; but after he shall have consummated “the hour of judgment,” Gentiles and Jews will obtain mercy as the people of God. —Hosea 1: 6, 10; 2: 23.

8. The everlasting possession of the Holy Land by Abraham, by Christ, by them who are Christ’s, and by the Twelve Tribes grafted into their own olive tree again, was covenanted and typically confirmed 430 years before the night of the exodus from Egypt, and the promulgation of the Mosaic Law. The commencement of the everlasting possession, of course, was to begin at some time subsequently to the bringing of that typically confirmed covenant into force. —Proof; Genesis 15: 7-21; Galatians 3: 17.

As Moses was the mediatorial testator of the Sinaitic, so Christ was the mediatorial testator, or representative of Jehovah, of the Abrahamic covenant, or will. The Sinaitic came into force at the death of Moses; and so, likewise, did the Abrahamic at the death of Christ, which was the anti-typical confirmation thereof; for “Jesus Christ became a minister of circumcision on account of the truth of God, in order to confirm the promises made to the fathers.”—Romans 15: 8; Hebrews 9: 15-16.

9. The Law of Moses was an additional covenant imposed upon the Twelve Tribes because of transgressions, until the Seed, or Christ, should come, to whom the promise of the everlasting possession of the Holy Land was made. —Proof; Galatians 3: 19.
10. Circumcision outward in the flesh was a token or sign of the covenant betwixt God and Abraham; and a mark or seal of the righteousness counted to him because of his believing the promise that he should be the father of many nations which should be blessed in him, when as yet being an old man and his wife past bearing, he had no child. Hence, it was a sign that “all nations should be blessed in him;” and a seal of his faith in that gospel—circumcised flesh significant of previously circumcised heart and ears in regard to the truth of God. The cutting off the flesh of faithful Abraham memorialised “the putting off of the body of the sins of his flesh,” when his faith in the promises of God was counted to him for righteousness or remission of sins. But multitudes of Israelites and Mohammedans are circumcised who have no faith. This is not true circumcision; for “that is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but circumcision is that of the heart, in spirit not in letter” of the law. A heart devotedly believing the gospel of the kingdom, or “the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ,”—Acts 8: 12, and putting on Christ by being immersed into him—Galatians 3: 27—being so in Christ, who, like Abraham, had the sign of the covenant in his flesh, and the righteousness thereof in his heart, such an one is “circumcised with the circumcision made without hands in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: having been buried—

syntaphentes—with him in the baptism, by which also ye are raised up with him through the faith of the energy of God, who raised him from among the dead:” therefore the apostle says to the saints at Philippi, “We are the circumcision, who worship God in spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.”—Philippians 3: 3; Colossians 2: 11-12; Genesis 17: 1-11; 18: 18; Romans 4: 3, 11, 18-19.

Who that understands this would affirm, that the sprinkling of an infant’s face with water was appointed by Christ or his apostles “in the room of circumcision?” But this is gravely affirmed by the teachers of the systems of the schools, reputed by their disciples wise, and great! Let the people beware of such; for “if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch!”

11. The seed of Abraham, or Christ, “the shepherd and stone of Israel,” was to descend from the tribe of Judah before it ceased to be a State sovereignty, and from the God of Jacob. Judah, the mother-tribe of Messiah, and God his father, was the prediction of Jacob. This Son of God and of Judah was also to come of David, and therefore necessarily of some female of “his house and lineage.”—Proof; Genesis 49: 8, 24; 2 Samuel 7: 12-16; Hebrews 1: 5; Isaiah 7: 14; Luke 1: 26-35.
12. The Son of God and of David, called Messiah in the Hebrew, Christ in the Greek, and Anointed in the English, is to sit upon the throne of David, and to govern his kingdom and the nations with great glory “for a season and a time,” or 1000 years. — Proof; Isaiah 9: 6-7; 24: 22; Psalm 89: 3-4, 24-29, 34-37; 72: 11; 67: 4; Daniel 7: 12; Revelation 11: 15; 20: 4.
13. The throne and kingdom of David in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, are the throne and kingdom of Jehovah; and the king enthroned there is Jehovah’s Viceroy over Israel and their tributaries. —Proof; 1 Chronicles 28: 5; 29: 23; 2 Chronicles 9: 8; Jeremiah 3: 17; Psalm 2: 6.
14. Jehovah’s throne and kingdom with dominion over all nations throughout all generations are covenanted or guaranteed to a man of the house of David, styled the Anointed of Jehovah, the Lamp of David, and Jehovah’s Name. —Proof; Psalm 2: 2; 132: 11-18; 89: 24; Isaiah 30: 27.
15. Jehovah’s throne and kingdom over Israel were not to exist uninterruptedly in the Holy Land from their foundation to the last generation of mankind: they were to be “overturned,” and the power of Israel scattered by their enemies until the times of the Gentile Powers shall expire, and He shall come in the name of Jehovah “whose right they are” by covenant with his fathers Abraham and David. —Proof; Ezekiel 21: 25-27; Daniel 12: 7; Luke 21: 24; Psalm 119: 22, 26; Matthew 23: 39; 21: 42-44.
16. The era introduced by the epochal ending of the times of the Gentiles, is “the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory;” the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel; the times of the Restitution of all things pertaining to Israel; the building again of the tabernacle of David; the giving of the kingdom of God to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof; and so forth. — Proof; Matthew 19: 28; Acts 1: 6; 3: 21; 15: 16; Amos 9: 11; Matthew 21: 43; 1 Peter 2: 9.

17. The era of the restoration of Jehovah's throne and kingdom of Israel in the Holy Land is the beginning of "the Day of Christ," or "the Day of Vengeance" upon the enemies of Israel and the Saints; and "the Acceptable Year of the Lord," for the approved. GENTILISM, in all its civil and ecclesiastical manifestations, will be abolished; and all things Jewish, compatible with the sacrificial and sacerdotal attributes of Jesus of Nazareth restored. From this epoch David shall never want a son to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; nor the priests, the Levites, a man before Jehovah to do sacrifice continually. —Proof; Jeremiah 33: 14-26.
18. "Because he hath poured out his soul unto death, therefore He shall divide the spoil with the mighty." Hence, David's immortal son who is to be king for Jehovah over Israel and the nations, ascends Jehovah's throne in Jerusalem at some time subsequently to his resurrection from the dead—"God would raise up the Christ to sit upon David's throne."—Proof; 1 Chronicles 17: 11; Psalm 2: 7; 16: 8-11; Isaiah 53: 10, 12; Acts 2: 29, 31; 13: 34.
19. The kingdom of Jehovah, the kingdom of David, the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of Israel, and the kingdom of heaven, are all one and the same kingdom, consisting of the united twelve tribes under David II as "their prince for ever," established in the Holy Land; which will then be PARADISE IN EDEN. —Proof; Ezekiel 34: 22-31; 37: 21-28; 36: 35; Isaiah 51: 3.
20. When the God of Heaven shall set up this kingdom again, the priests and rulers thereof will be like the king of the Jews himself, deathless and glorious; while the twelve tribes of Israel, the subjects of the kingdom, though blessed in Abraham and his seed with all other peoples, will still have with them lives terminable in death. —Proof; Daniel 7: 18; Revelation 2: 7, 26; 3: 21; 5: 10; 20: 6; Isaiah 65: 20; 1 Corinthians 15: 25-26.
21. The Messiah was to be the Messenger of the Abrahamic Covenant, bearing a message to the children of Israel, therein announcing peace to them through himself, when he should be established "Lord of all" upon the throne of David. —Proof; Malachi 3: 1; Acts 10: 36; Isaiah 9: 7.
22. When he bore God's message of peace to Judah, he came not to bring the peace, but only to preach it. —Proof: Matthew 10: 34.
23. The bringing of the blessedness of Abraham upon Israel and the Nations, through the restoration of Jehovah's throne and kingdom in Jerusalem and the Holy Land; and the promotion of obedient believers, taken from among Israel and the Gentiles upon the principle of faith in the things covenanted to Abraham and David, to a share with Christ in the "power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing" of the coming dispensation—is the subject-matter of the gospel. Hence, the Message of Peace to Israel is styled "the gospel, or glad tidings of the kingdom of God;" "the word of the kingdom;" "the hope proclaimed in the word of truth of the gospel;" "the hope of the gospel;" "the hope of the promise made of God to the fathers;" "the hope of Israel," and so forth. —Proof; Matthew 4: 23; 13: 19; 24: 14; Luke 4: 43; 8: 1; 9: 2, 6; Colossians 1: 5, 23; Acts 26: 6; 28: 20, 23, 31.

24. To inherit the kingdom of God is not to be a mortal subject of it, but to possess the glory, honour, power, riches, immortality, and blessings of it, as a king and priest thereof.
25. "In Messiah's days the righteous shall flourish." Hence, the kingdom of Jehovah and of his anointed will be righteousness, and peace, and joy; therefore the unrighteous, the fearful, and the unbelieving, cannot inherit it. —Proof; 1 Corinthians 6: 9-10; Ephesians 5: 5; Galatians 5: 21; Revelation 21: 8; 22: 14-15.
26. A man is naturally unholy, and cannot make himself righteous; and as God has concluded all, both Jews and Gentiles, under sin whose wages is death, they must, without respect of persons be justified, or "made righteous," that grace may reign in them through righteousness unto eternal life in the kingdom of God. —Proof; Romans 3: 9, 19; 6: 23; Galatians 3: 22, 26-27.
27. Jesus exhorted those he came to invite to repentance, "to seek first the kingdom of God, and God's righteousness." He places the "kingdom of God" first in the sentence, because the "righteousness of God" is only for the justification of those who believe the truth concerning his promised kingdom. Hence, in recording the justification of the Samaritans, it is stated, that "they believed the things CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, and THE NAME of Jesus Christ; and were immersed both men and women."—Proof; Matthew 6: 33; Acts 8: 12.
28. The phrase "the righteousness of God" is expressive of that system of means whereby sinners who are subjected to it become righteous in heart and state. It is contained in the Gospel of the kingdom, and makes that gospel "the power of God for salvation to every one that believeth." He that does as the Samaritans did, is himself "made the righteousness of God in Christ," "whom God hath made unto the justified wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."—Proof; Romans 1: 15-17; 2 Corinthians 5: 21; 1 Corinthians 1: 30.
29. The righteousness of God without the law of Moses, attested by that law and the prophets, is sometimes styled "the wisdom of God in a mystery," or secret, which was kept secret during the times of the ages—chronos aionios; but through the apostles was made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets made known to all nations for the obedience of faith; sometimes it is styled "the mystery," "the mystery of Christ," "the mystery of the gospel," "the word of God, the mystery which hath been hid from the ages and the generations, but now is made manifest to his saints," "the mystery of godliness," and so forth. It was styled "a mystery," because it was so long and impenetrably hid, that the prophets, who uttered oracles concerning it, and the angels themselves, could not see into it. —Proof; 1 Corinthians 2: 7; Romans 16: 25-26; Ephesians 3: 3; Colossians 1: 25-26; 4: 3; 1 Timothy 3: 16; 1 Peter 1: 9-12.
30. "The Fellowship of the Mystery of Christ" is expressive of the truth, that "God is no respecter of persons; but that in every nation he hat feareth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted by him." It teaches that Gentiles should be fellow-heirs with Jews, and of the same body with them, and partakers of his promise concerning the Christ, through the gospel: that is, that Jews and Gentiles, by the obedience of faith, should attain to one new manhood before God; and be equally eligible as heirs to the possession of the kingdom. —Proof; Acts 10: 34; Ephesians 3: 6; 2: 15.

31. The gospel of the kingdom was preached to Abraham, to the tribes in the wilderness, and to Judah by Jesus before his crucifixion; it was afterwards preached by the apostles, in his name, for the first time on the succeeding Pentecost. "In his name" is a phrase indicating something peculiar in their preaching of the gospel of the kingdom as compared with Christ's. That peculiarity consisted in their inviting all who believed the glad tidings of the kingdom to become heirs of it by repenting and being immersed in the name of Jesus as the Christ, who was to be raised up to sit upon David's throne, for the remission of their past sins. In announcing this new way of justification, they preached "the mystery of the gospel," for the first time on Pentecost: and some years after, Peter preached "the fellowship of the mystery of the gospel" to Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. —Proof; Galatians 3: 8; Hebrews 4: 2; Matthew 4: 23; 24: 14; Acts 2: 38, 30; 10: 34-43.
32. When Jews believed the gospel of the kingdom; that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ destined to occupy the throne thereof; that he died for sins, and rose again for the justification of the believers of that Gospel; and were immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—they did not cease to be Jews; but became "Israelites indeed," "Jews who are such inwardly," "Jews who in saying they are Jews do not lie," and so forth; and when Gentiles, or men of other nations, believed and did the same things, they did not continue to be Gentiles, but became Israelites in every particular, save that of the accident of natural birth, "fellow citizens with the saints of Judah;" that is, by "the adoption which pertains to Israel."—Proof; Romans 2: 28-29; Revelation 2: 9; 3: 9; Ephesians 2: 11-22; Romans 9: 4-8.
33. The righteousness of God as a system of means for making believers of the gospel of the kingdom righteous, is based upon the death and resurrection of Messiah. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." This is witnessed by the law of Moses and the prophets. "In sacrifice and offering, and burnt offerings, and offering for sin, which were offered by that law, Jehovah had no pleasure;" for "it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Therefore it was necessary that one, not born of the will of man, or of the lust of the flesh, but of God, should become a sin-offering—that one "who knew no sin should be made sin" for believers of the gospel; that he might "bear their sins in his own body to the tree;" that by putting him on, "they might be made the righteousness of God in him." No son of Adam has ever appeared among men capable of fulfilling this necessity but Jesus Christ. The Messiah must therefore needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead. In pouring out his life into death as an offering for sin ("for the life of the flesh is in the blood itself;" and "it is the blood that maketh atonement for the life or soul"—Leviticus 17: 11), he poured it out as the life-blood, or vital principle of the covenant, or will, God made with Abraham concerning himself and his seed of all classes thereof; which, as the Mosaic had then "waxed old," and was about soon, that is, in about 40 years after, to "vanish away," is styled the "new," or "second" covenant, testament or will, though typically confirmed 430 years before the law was added; but, by the death of Messiah, then newly, or for the first time, brought into force; by the which will, initiated, vitalised and consecrated by the sacrifice of Messiah's body, they who are called to the kingdom are sanctified or made holy.—Proof; Hebrews 9: 22; 10: 4-14; 8: 13; Matthew 26: 28; Hebrews 10: 9.

34. But, if Messiah must needs have suffered to bring the sanctifying Abrahamic covenant into force, he must of necessity also have risen from the dead; for an unresurrected Christ would have been unprofitable for the purposes of Jehovah. God's system of righteousness would have been incomplete and inefficient; repentance, remission of sins, and eternal life, in the name of Christ, would have been impossible: faith in the gospel of the kingdom, and in Jesus as the Son of God and David, and therefore rightful sovereign thereof, would have been vain; resurrection and kingdom there would be none; in short, the promises of God would fail, and all mankind would perish. —Proof; Psalm 30: 9; 1 Corinthians 15: 14-19.
35. The death, burial, and resurrection of the Christ, are the facts of the gospel's mystery, and that he died for the sins, and rose again for the justification of believers in the covenants of promise and the name of the true Messiah, is the signification or doctrine of the facts. That Jesus of Nazareth is that Messiah, has been attested of God according to the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; so that it is the truth, that Jesus is the Son of God and of David, who has been raised up to sit upon their throne in Jerusalem as High Priest and King of Israel; and that he died for sins according to the prophets, was buried, and rose again from the dead for the justification of the faithful. —Proof; Romans 4: 25; 1 Corinthians 15: 1-4.
36. "The name of Jesus Christ" is a phrase summarily expressive of the things which make up the scripture character, styled Jesus in the Greek, Jehoshua in the Hebrew, and I shall be the powerful in the English. "The name of Jehovah," saith Isaiah, "cometh from far." The prophetic and apostolic testimony concerning Messiah is the definition of this name; because Messiah is "God manifest in flesh." To "believe on his name" is to believe the testimony concerning the Christ, and that Jesus is he. "The blood of Jesus, the Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin;" and he is a propitiatory for sins— a propitiatory through faith in his blood for the remission of sins that are past. This sin-cleansing quality makes the name of Jesus Christ purifying to all the believers of the gospel, upon whom it is scripturally named. —Proof; Exodus 33: 19; 34: 5-7, 14; Isaiah 7: 14; 9: 6-7; 30: 27; Jeremiah 23: 5-6; Zechariah 6: 12-13; Luke 1: 31, 33; 1 John 1: 7; 2: 2; Romans 3: 25.
37. When a woman is united to a man according to law, his name becomes her's; and in acquiring that new name, she acquires all that it legally imparts; so also when a believer of the "things concerning the kingdom of God and of the name of Jesus Christ," is united to Jesus according to "the law of faith," the name of Christ becomes his, and he is called a Christian; and in that act by which Christ's name is named upon the believer, he acquires a right to all it scripturally imparts.
38. Repentance, remission of sins, sonship to God, and immortality, are offered to devout believers of the gospel of the kingdom, in the name of Jesus Christ. —Proof; John 1: 12-13; 20: 31; Luke 24: 47; Acts 2: 38; 4: 12; 10: 43; 13: 38-39, 26; 1 John 2: 12.
39. The substratum of repentance is a disposition of mind, such as was in Abraham, resulting from the understanding of "the word of the kingdom," and the full persuasion that what God hath promised therein, he is able also, and will perform. —Proof; Luke 1: 17; 3: 3; Romans 4: 3, 18, 20-21.

40. The Abrahamic disposition of mind resulting from faith in “the exceeding great and precious promises of God;” that is, “the divine nature” thus created in a man—is granted to him for repentance in the name of Jesus Christ. —Proof; 2 Peter 1: 3-4; Acts 5: 31; 11: 18; 2: 38.

Anxious bench repentance is “the sorrow of the world that worketh death,” and which needs, therefore, to be repented of. It is the anguish of convicts ignorant of the truth, who abhor martyrdom for their sins. —2 Corinthians 7: 10; Malachi 2: 13.

41. Immortality is deathlessness. God only has a nature in which the death principle never existed. Incorruptibility and life constitute immortality; so that immortality may be defined, life manifested through incorruptible body. A diamond is incorruptible, but not living; therefore, it is not immortal. Paganism defines immortality to be, a particle of divine effluence in all men, hereditarily transmitted, and having personality and consciousness after death! The Scriptures, however, reveal no such conceit. The immortality they bring to light is, “life and incorruptibility through the gospel;” or, “eternal life through Christ’s name.” Immortality is promised only to those who are justified by the name of Jesus; and being justified, walk worthy of that name. In being introduced “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” a right-minded believer of the truth obtains “a right to the tree of life, and to an entrance in through the gates into the city,” or kingdom of God. —Proof; 1 Timothy 6: 16; 2 Timothy 1: 10; John 20: 31; 1 John 5: 11-13; 1 Corinthians 15: 53, 42-44; 2 Corinthians 4: 14; Romans 2: 7; 8: 11, 23; Revelation 22: 14.
42. Jesus said that the gospel of the kingdom he preached before his crucifixion, should be preached in all the habitable subject to Rome, for a testimony to all the nations thereof; and that he that believed it and should be immersed should be saved through His name. This condition of salvation has never been modified or repealed since it was decreed. It is, therefore, in full force unto this day. Paul was saved from his past sins, and obtained a right to eternal life and the kingdom, by believing that gospel and being immersed; and being an honest and earnest man, he preached to others the faith he had confessed and obeyed, and pronounced a curse upon all, whether angels or men, who taught otherwise than he. —Proof; Matthew 24: 14; 28: 19-20; Mark 16: 15-16; Luke 24: 47; Acts 22: 16; Galatians 1: 6-9, 23.
43. Believers of the gospel Jesus preached, are justified by faith, **THROUGH HIS NAME**; that is, their Abrahamic faith and disposition are counted to them for repentance and the remission of sins, in the act of putting on the name of Jesus Christ, which is the same “as putting on Christ.” Paul says to such, “In Christ Jesus ye are all children of God through the faith. **FOR AS MANY AS HAVE BEEN BAPTISED INTO CHRIST HAVE PUT ON CHRIST**: and if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Hence, the evidence of a man’s being Christ’s by faith, is his being scripturally baptised into him. —Proof; Romans 5: 1; 6: 3-5; 1 Corinthians 6: 11; Galatians 3: 26-29.
44. There is but one way for a believer of “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” to put him on or to be invested with his name; and that is, by immersion into his name. Baptism is for this specific purpose: namely, for the introduction of devout believers of the truth into the name of Christ, that through it they may receive repentance and the remission of sins, and a right to eternal life. From

the day of Pentecost to the end of the Apostles' mission, there was no such thing as an unimmersed Christian, though there were many who had passed through the water that were a disgrace to the name. —Proof; Acts 8: 12, 16; 2: 38; 10: 48; 19: 5; James 2: 7; 1 Peter 3: 21.

45. Sectarianism is not Christianity. The aggregate of sects vaguely termed “the Church,” or the ecclesiastical system of Europe and America, is “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.” These “abominations” are the “harlots” styled “Women”—Revelation 14: 4—with whom Christ’s virgins “are not defiled.” Every system or tradition that makes the Word of God of none effect is a harlot abomination, and proceeds from the “carnal mind,” that is, from the thinking of the flesh, ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom and the obedience it requires. This is the fountain and origin of all those heretical formula which are incorporated in the Romish and Protestant sects, which are all of them “corruptors of the simplicity that is in Christ.” As a whole, they are “THE APOSTASY”—foretold by Daniel and Paul, whose character is confusion worse confounded, and its institutions demoralising and subversive of the truth. They preach “another Jesus,” are animated by another spirit, and proclaim another gospel, than those ministered by the apostles. Their “faith” is the credulity of excitement or of authority; their “Lord,” the thing they call “the Church;” their “baptism,” an irrational and blasphemous invention; and their “hope,” the mere baseless fabric of a vision. It is because of these abominations and their fruits, that the judgments of God are impending. From such a system of defilement, then, it is imperative on every man who would be saved to separate himself, even if he have to stand alone; as it is written, “Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”—Proof; Revelation 17: 5; Matthew 15: 6-9; Romans 8: 6-7; 2 Thessalonians 2: 3; 2 Corinthians 11: 1-4; 6: 15-18.

46. The sincere inquirer after the truth is respectfully invited to examine carefully the Scriptures appended to each paragraph. He is expected to receive nothing as proved till he has done this, if he aspire to the high privilege of being “taught of God,” without which he cannot scripturally come to Christ. —John 6: 43-45. If a Jew or Gentile, acknowledging that Jesus is Jehovah’s Messiah, Christ, or Anointed, come to understand the things set forth in these paragraphs, he will have attained to a comprehensive knowledge of “the truth as it is in Jesus.” If this knowledge be heartily received, it will exorcise him of all the theological foolishness of the schools, and renew him after the image of the Creator. It will “form Christ in him the hope of glory;” so that “Christ will dwell in his heart by faith,” if that “faith, working by love,” be permitted to attain perfection.

Let the reader, then, be persuaded to search the Scriptures as for hid treasure. The Bereans did so, although they were instructed by an apostle himself. If, then, they received nothing without first searching the Scriptures, to see if Paul, though inspired, spoke in accordance with them; how much more necessary that, in this cloudy and dark day, the reader should prove all things by Scripture before he accept anything, from whatever source, as good. “The Bereans received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether the things Paul spake were so: THEREFORE, many of them believed.” Go, reader, and do thou likewise!—Colossians 3: 10; 1: 27; Ephesians 3: 17; James 2: 27; Acts 17: 11-12.

THE FIRST YEAR OF WAR.

The war is now one year old. It completed its first year last Wednesday, March 28th. Parliament was informed on March 28th, 1854, that her Majesty was about to commence hostilities with the Emperor of all the Russias. The anniversary of so sad and terrible an event as a great European war, must needs be painful. The most righteous cause, the most far-sighted and magnanimous policy, the most consummate management, the most unbroken success, the most splendid victories, cannot take away the inherent evil and painfulness of war, nor convert its anniversary into a day of gladness and feasting. But this March 28th, 1855, cannot fail to strike every Englishman as an anniversary of peculiar pain and special bitterness. This first year of war has not merely been signalled by the sorrows and horrors inseparable from all wars—from struggles the most righteous, and conflicts the best conducted; it has not only been a year of bloody battles, of protracted sieges, of deranged commerce; it has been all this and something more. It has been stamped by peculiar horrors and unexampled calamities. It has been a year of shame, a year of transcendent stupidities, of disgraceful mistakes, of continuous and sustained mismanagement, of national discomfiture more dishonourable than the most signal defeat of our army in the field, more terrible even than the invasion of our shores. It has revealed national incompetence, national bewilderment, and national helplessness. It proclaims the stupidity of the most sensible people in the world; it publishes the incapacity of the most practical nation of the world. It found her, in her own estimation, the foremost power of the earth, and by the acknowledgment of the world a very great power. It has left her marvellously lowered in her own opinion, and in that of her neighbours. It found her in the fulness of pride and apparent strength, it has left her deeply humbled and sorely stricken.

No wise man expects very much from the first year of any war, reckons not upon its triumphant termination in a few months, nor anticipates the prostration of a powerful antagonist by the first stroke. Such things have now and then happened; the first Napoleon took only a few months to overwhelm Austria in 1805, and a few weeks to crush Prussia in 1806. But such wonders are of very rare occurrence indeed. No wise man has any reason to quarrel with the British Government because the first year of war has not been a year of unbroken and splendid victories, because miracles have not been enacted, and because the mighty empire of Russia has not been brought on its knees by the first blow. But every tolerably sensible man, every tolerably honest man, has the best reason to assail the Government for having carried on the contest in the most stupid, the most bungling, and the most ineffective manner—for having perpetrated every conceivable error of policy, and committed every imaginable mistake of management—for having declined the only mode of immediately prostrating Russia, that of destroying her commerce, a warfare most fatal to Russia, and least injurious to England—for having selected the wrong mode of attack, and having accumulated every sort of blunder in its prosecution—for having chosen the wrong point of assault, and sought the wrong Allies—for having conducted this solemn and momentous business of England in dishonourable and disastrous subserviency to the wishes and interests of Austria—for having sacrificed the lives of from 30,000 to 40,000 British soldiers in pure and wanton waste, without a single good result being obtained, a single important blow struck, a single valuable object gained, or the smallest progress made towards the humiliation and depression of Russia.

Not one of these fearful shortcomings has been avoided; every one of these enormous transgressions have been committed. It is naturally expected that a country at war with Russia or any other country, would select that mode of warfare most disastrous to its antagonist, most

easy and least injurious to itself, and would avoid that for which its forces are least qualified, and which experience has shown its antagonist most powerful to resist. Now it most singularly happened, that the very mode of warfare wherein England especially excelled, was the only form of attack really formidable and fatal to Russia; that the weapon whereof England was the great master, was the only weapon that could prostrate the Muscovite, and that England was peculiarly unfitted to conduct that form of assault which Russia had shown herself best able to repel. England's naval supremacy placed Russia absolutely in her power. Mistress of the seas, she was mistress of the fate of Russia. She might have efficiently blockaded every Muscovite port; she might have asserted her old maritime principle, and seized Russian goods wherever found; she might have stopped the whole export trade of Russia; she might have prevented a single hide, a single pound of tallow from reaching any part of the world separated from Russia by sea; she might have kept all colonial produce from Muscovy, and hindered every comfort, luxury, and refreshment of the genial south from gladdening the inhabitants of the powerless north. The stoppage of the whole export trade of Russia would have ruined the Russian nobles, convulsed the Russian empire, and compelled the most stubborn and unbending Autocrat, the Czar most enamoured of war, to choose between the conclusion of peace and the loss of his throne or his life. Such a mode of warfare would have been especially easy, and almost bloodless for Great Britain, it would have cost scarcely a single British life. England could have done this alone, without the aid of France. The Muscovite navy has not ventured forth, and the trade of Russia, and the existence of Russia, lay at the mercy of the wooden walls of Old England.

To all this will be answered that such a course of action, such an adherence to our old principles of maritime warfare, such a stoppage of the whole trade of Russia would have involved us in difficulties and hostilities with the United States; would have given Russia an ally in America. We do not deny the difficulties which it might have occasioned with our Transatlantic kinsmen, but we do not feel in the least convinced that it would have inevitably led to hostilities. We believe that the Americans would have talked very big, would have made a terrible clamour; but we do not believe that so prudent a community would have courted the unavoidable destruction of its fleet and ruin of its commerce, which must have ensued from a conflict with the two greatest naval powers in the world, Great Britain and France. It would have been far better for England to have run all risks as regards America—to have adhered to the maritime principles which she has so often and so triumphantly asserted, to have struck at once her strongest and her easiest blow, to have most sorely smitten her antagonist with the least hurt to herself—than to have heaped on herself all manner of shame, and sacrificed utterly in vain the lives of 30,000 men. Such a course would have been altogether honourable and patriotic, and infinitely less disastrous than the course we have followed, even had America braved the combined naval strength of England and France, which we do not believe that she would have done.

But our Ministers not only declined the mode of warfare most fatal to Russia and most favourable to Great Britain—they not only threw away the weapon in the use of which Englishmen most excelled, and Muscovites were especially awkward—but they absolutely adopted the method of attack wherein Englishmen are least likely to succeed, and which Muscovites have proved themselves best able to withstand—the method of invasion. Of all the great powers, England is least qualified to effect an invasion, and Russia is best qualified to repel one. Though a valiant, Englishmen are not a military people. Their habits are not warlike, and their standing army is too small to allow of distant expeditions. It is some consolation for us to reflect that at the very outset of the war we deprecated anything like a distant military expedition. Of all countries in the world, Russia is the least susceptible of

successful invasion. Her position renders her all but inaccessible and unassailable. History bears ample and recent record to the difficulties of invasion, and the disasters of invaders. Two of the greatest monarchs and greatest commanders of modern times ventured upon the experiment, and reaped nothing but ruin—lost army, glory, and empire in the well-defended realm. Charles XII of Sweden led the veteran and victorious host which had overthrown the Muscovites on many a bloody field into the heart of Russia, to utter discomfiture and entire destruction. The most marvellous military genius, and the most powerful sovereign of modern times, Napoleon the Great, hurled the forces of Western Europe upon the Northern Europe, to encounter discomfiture no less signal and ruin no less terrible than that of his Swedish predecessor. Undeterred by these tremendous warnings, undaunted by the huge discomfitures of these mighty men, our small rulers repeated the experiment, and so far with results not very different. Sebastopol has been besieged six months, and at the end thereof we are not so near to the capture of the place as we were at the beginning; but of the 54,000 Englishmen who have landed in the Crimea, not more than 15,000 remain under arms. Nearly 40,000 either have perished or are disabled. We have kept back the strength of our arms, and struck Russia where she was strongest. We have spared her where most vulnerable, and spent ourselves most freely where we have least to throw away. We have spared her defenceless trade, and assailed her impregnable fortress. Russian commerce has flourished, while British blood has been pored out for nothing. Last year Russia received £10,000,000 of English gold, while England lost thirty thousand of her men on Russian ground.

Such is the manner in which the first year of war has passed. We might easily darken the picture: we have not sounded the shame in its depths, nor given the aggravation of the horrors. We have only dwelt upon the leading blunders, upon the mistakes of policy in the conduct of hostilities. We have not dilated upon the frightful details of mismanagement, upon the horrors revealed before the Committee of Inquiry. We have not dwelt upon the diplomatic delinquencies, upon the immolation of England to Austria, upon the selection of Vienna instead of Constantinople as the place of conference, upon the iniquity and absurdity of the Four Points. We have said enough, however, to set forth the sorrowful and shameful character of the first year of hostilities. Better a dishonourable pacification than a conflict so fearfully mismanaged. Better an inadequate peace than another such year of war! It would be exceedingly disgraceful and deplorable for this lavish expenditure of blood and treasure to purchase only a worthless and a transient arrangement; but another year of such warfare would be still more sad and still more shameful. If the nation wishes to have the conflict carried on until an honourable and abiding peace is obtained, it must put forth energy enough to hurl our present rulers from office, and bring them to a strict and stern account. — Birmingham Mercury.

* * *

ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

A WORD OR TWO FROM VIRGINIA.

Doctor John Thomas: —Dear Sir, — I am pleased with your writings, and believe them scriptural. I can say, Sir, you certainly have the law and the testimony on your side.

My friend, Mr. A. Anderson, was kind enough to send me *Elpis Israel*, which I think is a book of books. You have therein displayed more close study and research than any commentator I have read, either ancient or modern. You have certainly, Sir, brought forth the

light out of darkness, though you will not understand me to say that I sanction or agree to every part; for in the propagation of the world I take issue. You will understand me—there is no past nor future with God. Now, Sir, it seems to me, according to the arrangement that it was impossible to re-people the world without transgression. Consequently, the order of arrangement was made accordingly. My notion is, that all creation became corrupt at the fall, even to the elements; and that all created things below man, both animal and vegetable, partook of the nature of the curse; therefore they became corrupt, and propagate. Again, you say all are raised from the dead: now, I can't exactly say "amen" to that. I don't conceive that the Gentiles have ever had a law since the transgression; therefore, partaking of the nature of Adam, and dying in that state. I can see no necessity for a resurrection. The great apostle to the Gentiles says that both the just and unjust are to be raised. Well, I agree very well to that; but, I think a man must lay claim to something that does not belong to him, to make him "unjust," or, at any rate, that which he is not entitled to. Well now, Sir, let us look around us, and we find about eight hundred sects, all claiming an interest in the blood of Christ; and according to the law and the testimony, not one is right. They, I consider, are the unjust ones, and will be raised in order to their justification, could they do it. But no; they are doomed to the second death. I think you leave your readers rather in the dark as regards the creation of systems of worlds, filling eternity, filling immensity, and coeternal with the great God who fills all, and in all; and those systems of worlds being perfected and going to perfection forever and ever.

I am not in the habit of scribbling my notions, and you will find they are not made quite so plain as might be to suit many; but, Sir, I know a hint to you is enough to understand what I mean, or the idea intended to be conveyed.

You certainly, Sir, have sealed the mouth of the Great Supervisor upon David's throne, and the promises of the fathers, the Coming of the Lord, the Settling of Palestine, &c., &c.

Can you possibly believe that he believes what he pretends to teach? don't you think sinister motives have their influence? Well, my dear Sir, on the day of reckoning we shall find who will be justified, and who will not.

You will accept assurances of regard from
Orange Co., Virginia, May 6, 1855.

LANCELOT BURRUS.

* * *

OUR TERRESTRIAL SYSTEM BEFORE THE FALL.

Our friend says, that his notion is that all creation became corrupt at the fall, even to the elements. This is the general idea. Moses tells us very plainly, that when the terrestrial system was completed on the Sixth Day, that God reviewed all that He had made, and pronounced it "very good." But, in what sense was it very good? In an animal and physical sense; for it was a natural and animal system, not a spiritual one. Such a system is essentially one of waste and reproduction; and was organised with reference to what God knew would come to pass. This is implied in the placing of the earth in such a position with respect to the sun, moon, and stars, that there should be a diversity of seasons, &c. Thus, fall and winter, seasons of decay and death, were institutions existing before the Fall; and presented to Adam

and Eve phenomena illustrative of the existence in the physical system of a principle of corruption, the extent of which, however, they might not have been fully apprised of.

Death and corruption, then, with reproduction, the characteristic of spring and summer, is the fundamental law of the physical system of the Six Days. Adam and Eve, and all the other animals born of the earth with themselves, would have died and gone to corruption, if there had been no transgression, provided that there had been no further interference with the physical system than Moses records in his history of the Six Days. Let us, by way of illustration, confine our attention to the two animals at the head of animated nature, called Adam and Eve. Concerning them, it may be inquired, "If they would have died under the proviso above stated, how can Paul's saying be true, that 'Death entered into the world of sin?'" True; the death principle was an essential property of their nature; but as they did not die till after their transgression, death did not enter in till after that event. But, the inquirer means, "If they would have died anyhow under the proviso, how can death be said to be the consequence of sin?" Death is not the consequence of sin, sin being the original physical cause—but the physical consequence of a moral act. If thou doest thus and so, "dying thou shalt die;" but just reverse this saying, and let it read, If thou doest thus and so, "dying thou shalt NOT die." Here are moral acts with diverse physical results. Now, if these two results are ordained upon two essentially dying creatures, because animal creatures, what is implied? Why, that in the one case the dying process shall not be interrupted, and therefore death would follow: while in the other, the process should be interrupted, and therefore life should be established. In the former case, all that would be necessary would be to let things take their natural course; but in the latter, this would not do; and therefore it would be necessary to bring into play a transforming force which should change the very good animal nature into a very good spiritual, or incorruptible nature, which latter formed no part of the system of the Six Days.

Now, these conditions were fulfilled by the arrangements in Paradise, where sin first made its appearance. There were there two trees; the one styled "the Tree of Lives;" the other, "the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil;" and which, because of the penalty attached to the eating of its fruit, may be styled "the Tree of Deaths." The lives and the deaths of Adam and Eve were predicated, not upon any peculiarity of their animal constitution, but upon the relations they might come to sustain to those two trees in Paradise. Moses has given us the history of their case, and from this we learn that they placed themselves under the law which sentenced them to death by eating of the fruit they were commanded not to eat. Now, all that was necessary for this sentence to take effect was just to allow the laws of the animal economy to take their course, and the result would be death and corruption, or a return to the dust from whence they were taken.

But, the inquirer wants to know, Suppose they had lived in the obedience of faith all the time that might have been appointed for their probation in Paradise, would they not have died? Certainly they would, if there had been no arrangement divinely interposed to prevent death. This arrangement existed in connection with the Tree of Lives. We learn from the Mosaic account that the eating of that tree would impart immortality or deathlessness; for we are told that they were expelled from Paradise that they might not eat of that tree and live forever. It is certain, therefore, that the animal nature they possessed was essentially a mortal nature, and required to be physically operated upon by the power transmissible through contact with the tree of lives to change it into a nature constitutionally capable of enduring forever; which the animal nature is not.

We have an illustration of what would have happened to Adam and Eve if they had continued in the obedience of faith, in what we are taught is to occur in the case of the obedient believers belonging to the generation contemporary with the appearing of the Lord Jesus in power and great glory. These, designated by Paul as “we who are alive and remain,” he declares “shall not sleep, but shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet.” This was not revealed till he communicated it; for he styles it “a mystery,” or secret, which, says he, “Behold I show you.” Here, then, are persons found living in the obedience of faith at the Lord’s appearing. Every one admits that they are constitutionally animal and mortal, though, it is revealed, that they shall not die, if they be of the living remnant contemporary with His appearing. Their not dying is conditional, as in the case of Adam and Eve—if they be found in the obedience of faith, and if contemporaries of the advent; otherwise not. But in not dying into death, as with Enoch and Elijah, the dying process which commences with birth must be interrupted and terminated by the interposition of divine power; even by that power that rebuilds the bodies of the dead upon new physical principles; in other words, by the Spirit of God that would have changed the eaters of the Tree of Lives in Eden; that raised up the mortal body of Jesus; and that will raise up and change the saints by Jesus, when in their case “mortality shall be swallowed up of life.”

There was no miracle wrought in executing the sentence under which Adam and Eve placed themselves. That is to say, there was no new physical principle infused into their nature that was not there before they transgressed. The introduction of miracle would have been in the instantaneous transformation of their mortal animal nature into the immortal spiritual nature on their eating of the fruit of the Tree of Lives. But there was no scope for the exercise of extraordinary power; for it is only obedience that gains access to that tree, whether in the Paradise of Eden, or in the Kingdom of God. If they had continued obedient, death, though lurking within them, would not have been allowed to enter into the world; it would have had no victims; but they transgressed—their thinking became perverse, or contrary to the letter of the Word of God, and their practice like it, —they sinned; and the physical tendency of animal nature to dissolution became “the law of sin and death” within them, because its abolition was prevented on account of sin.

From these premises it will be seen, that we dissent from our correspondent’s “notion” that all creation became corrupt (by which we understand him to mean, constitutionally impregnated with corruptibility) at the Fall. We believe that the change consequent upon that calamity was moral, not physical. The natural system was the same the day before the Fall as the day after. A palace, though destructible by time or any other cause, may nevertheless be “very good” when its building is completed: so also our terrestrial system, though susceptible of deterioration, was physically “very good” after its kind. Adam and Eve were innocent and undefiled but without character. They became immoral; and the practice of vice has made their descendants what we see.

* * *

RESURRECTION NOT UNIVERSAL.

Our friend in Orange is under a mistake in supposing that we maintain, that the resurrection of every man, woman, and child of Adam’s posterity, is the doctrine of Scripture. His words are, “You say, all are raised from the dead: now I can’t exactly say ‘amen’ to that.” Nor can we. We believe, that the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the just and of the unjust who have died under times of knowledge, whose knowledge they have accepted: and the

resurrection, a thousand years afterwards, of “the rest of the dead” who have intelligently rejected it. Of the former were the contemporaries of the Lord Jesus who lived under the times of the law. To some of them he said, “there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when he shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast out.” This testimony proves, that when the kingdom of God is established, these victims of despair will be there; and secondly, like Adam and Eve from Paradise, they will be expelled from it; so that, while Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, all the prophets and the saints, will be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life, they will be driven forth to misery and death. Besides these unjust there will be those who, placing themselves under law to Christ, run well for a time, but become weary of well-doing, and turn like washed hogs to their wallowing in the mire. These all rise from the dead at the coming of the Lord to receive according to their demerits. The rest of the dead are those who never came under a constitution of righteousness; not because they did not know how, but because they refused to do so. Having been enlightened, but preferring darkness to light, they will arise to judgment at the end of the millennium.

Besides these three enlightened classes, there is a fourth which returns to the dust forevermore. This class is very large, and consists of all whom God from whatever cause has left in helpless ignorance. He is not a hard master reaping where he hath not sowed, and gathering where he hath not scattered. Men who do not come to the knowledge of the truth, not because they will not, but because they cannot, are like the old Athenians under “times of ignorance which God winks at.” He winks at their ignorance in not raising them to judgment as the others. But though not raised to judgment, neither are they raised to life, or saved in any sense; for “they are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them.” Though I do not pretend to define the boundary line between “times of ignorance” and “times of knowledge,” I am very much inclined to conclude that the “eight hundred sects” our correspondent classifies as the unjust, may belong to the “times of ignorance,” and be winked at as the old Athenian idolaters were. They are “sinners of the Gentiles,” very pious in their way, well-intentioned, and fair-spoken; but still ignorant of the truth, and hopelessly so, because of the blinding effect of the several Gentilisms imposed upon them by their tutors and guardians. They believe their systems to be God’s, and they have a zeal for them as though they were embodiments of the truth. But alas! no mistake could be greater or more fatal. As our correspondent says, “according to the law and the testimony, not one is right;” and it is by this testimony all things are to be adjudicated when the Lord appears. As Paul said of Jews and Gentiles in his day, so we may truly affirm of the pious sectarians of our’s, “There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth * * * they are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” Paul’s contemporaries may have deemed him to be very uncharitable in speaking thus; but he regarded that no more than we: he declared the truth of the matter, which is now as thoroughly reproduced as if no interval or change had elapsed since he wrote. The “eight hundred sects” neither believe, preach, nor practise, the things taught and commanded by Jesus and his apostles. Let a man acquaint himself with these, and proclaim them to either of “the orthodox four,” not to mention the others, and he would find that if they heard him once, they would not repeat the “indiscretion” a second time. “There is none that understandeth, they have all gone out of the way;” and there is none but God that can divorce them from their traditions, and translate them into light. If He do it not, their case is hopeless. They cannot deliver themselves, for they are bound hand and foot by their systems “as they happen to be led.” Shall such born-slaves of human folly, trained into it by scholasticism while their minds were incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong, or the false and the true, “made subject to vanity not willingly,”—shall such be raised from the dead that their “hidden

things may be judged according to Paul's gospel"? Can they be regarded as under times of knowledge? I should think not; for Isaiah teaches us, that when Jerusalem shall arise and shine, because her light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon her, "darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people." This is the condition of all "Christendom" at the present time; as all must perceive who understand the truth. The clergy teach the people to consider this century as gloriously enlightened! O foolish and blind! If the Nineteenth be light, what must the First have been! Compare the two and note the difference. The "eight hundred sects," the farthing rushlights of today through which its glory blazes, were unknown to the apostles and their brethren; who were nevertheless, "light in the Lord," and "shone as lights in the world." Where is that pre-existing non-sectarian light? Who knows? Not one of them; for by their flickering rushlights they cannot pierce the gloom; their eyes are blinded, and they cannot see, however bright the true light might burn before them.

It is most charitable to hope that they may not be held responsible; but, as there is no eternal life in the kingdom of God but through the obedience of faith, and as they have all wandered off and lost the way, that they may "remain in the congregation of the dead," upon whom the sentence rests, saying, "they are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; for thou hast visited and destroyed them, and caused all the memory of them to perish"—Isaiah 26. There are no scripturally recognised substitutes for the truth and its obedience. If men honestly desire salvation, let them seek these with their whole heart. Gentilism in whole or in part, can save no man. It is mere rhanstised mythology, perversive of the truth. Let us be contented with "the simplicity of Christ" unadulterated in the apostolic and prophetic word; and pray earnestly for his return, that all sects may be abolished in the enlightenment of their adherents; and that henceforth, in returning to the dust, they may die in the Lord, and their works follow them to a resurrection unto life at the end of the Millennial Reign.

* * *

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM PROGRESSING.

Dear Bro. Thomas: —I am much obliged to you for your article on The pre-existence of Christ in the last Herald, to which, I think, no scriptural objection can be made. Like all truth, it shows that if we would understand the Word of God we must study it without regard to the opinions of men, proving the truth by the truth itself.

A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of immersing into the "One Faith," bro. Alex. Packie, one of the most intelligent and devoted members of the North Street congregation. Like myself, he did not leave it until after he had presented the truth as taught by prophets and apostles, and they rejected it. Unable to recognise them as believers of the gospel preached by Jesus and the apostles, he had but one alternative as a follower of Zion's king, namely, to obey the injunction, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean, &c." Some of the North Street congregation say, that they believe "the gospel of the kingdom," and yet have so little respect for the honour of the King as to hold up the hands of those who oppose this glorious proclamation, apparently unconscious that their action disproves their words.

I have also had the pleasure of baptising into the "one faith," sisters Packie and Williams, both from the North Street congregation. They have been influenced only by the Word of God, in which they are most intelligent.

Our little congregation meets at my house every Lord's Day at 10½ A.M., to break the loaf. I hope it will not be long before we may venture to take a room for more public teaching, as there is some hesitation with parties to come to a private house, though freely invited, and cordially welcome.

Enclosed you have a check for one hundred dollars, which you will apply as you may deem best for the good cause.

Yours very truly,

WM. P. LEMMON.

Baltimore, Md., May 10, 1855.

* * *

We have similar cases in New York, Jews and Gentiles, who profess to believe the gospel of the kingdom, yet seek to make themselves comfortable in Baptist, Campbellite, and other encampments of its avowed enemies. On Campbellite asked another Campbellite, saying, "If thou believest these things what business hast thou in Seventeenth Street?" "Oh," said he, "I am there for the sake of the company!" The plain English of which is, that he delights more in the company of the enemies than in that of the friends, of the truth. But such people practise upon themselves a grievous deception if they imagine that the Lord, who is "the truth" also, will say to them, "Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into my joy." They are neither well-doers, good, nor faithful; but "fearful and unbelieving," whose portion is "the Second Death."—Revelation 21: 8.

We thank bro. Lemmon for his liberal donation towards the support of "the good fight," which can no more be carried on through the press without supplies than the siege of Sevastopol. Our correspondence affords him satisfactory proof that he is indeed contributing to a "good cause"—that the Herald is an enlightener of the human mind in the knowledge of the truth; and not a mere supernumerary speculation for the benefit of the printer and proprietor. The Herald is a preacher that makes its way into divers dark places of the earth where otherwise "the joyful sound" would never enter. It carries the gospel of the kingdom every month to the other side of the earth at a cost that would not purchase a genuine Havana cigar. It proclaims to the New Zealanders from its own pages, and from the pages of a reprint established there, styled "The Herald of the Kingdom of God," edited by bro. S. G. Hayes, a Surgeon in Wellington—the glad tidings originally covenanted to Abraham and David; and the invitation given through the apostles in the name of Jesus, to all who believe them to become Abraham's Seed, and heirs according to the promise. It is by the pecuniary aid of such friends of the truth as brother Lemmon and those subscribers, who not only read and approve, but promptly send in their subscriptions, that the Herald exists, and is enabled to run to and fro to the ends of the earth, increasing knowledge among the children of men. May we all live till the Lord appears, and witness the triumph of the truth, which all profess to believe will in the end prevail. When that long-wished for victory is gained, he will feel most happy who has done most in promoting that result.

Having mentioned the New Zealand Herald, it may not be amiss to republish the prospectus, as it appeared in one of the papers of the country, August 23, 1854. Here it is:—

"The first number of a monthly periodical with the above title, edited by a Layman, will be published on the 2nd of October next. Its leading objects will be—

“1st. ‘Earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints,’ according to the Divine exhortation.

“2nd. To call attention to ‘The Signs of the Times,’ indicative as they are of the speedy ‘coming of the Son of Man in his Kingdom’ to take unto him his great power and to reign.

“3rd. To afford a medium for the free discussion of all topics embraced in ‘the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ.’

4th. To expose the errors of the various false systems of Religion which have from time to time been palmed upon mankind for Truth, and which are so subversive of the Religion of the Bible.

“Such being the leading objects of the Herald, it will become identified with no sect or party whatever. The Editor’s aim will be to ‘fight the good fight of faith with the two-edged sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.’ ‘To prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good.’ Being ‘fully persuaded in his own mind’ that the Truth can stand any test, and has nothing to fear, he courts the fullest inquiry and examination. Whatever appears in the pages of the Herald, whether editorial or otherwise, will at all times be open to the comments of every one who may feel disposed to criticise; and all questions relating to the Word of God will be inserted and answered.

It is believed that there are many intelligent persons who see plainly that there is something wrong in the Religious Systems of the present day, yet are unable to answer the question—What is truth? To such “The Herald of the Kingdom of God” cannot fail to be acceptable; it will show them “the truth as it is in Jesus,” and what they “must do that they may inherit Everlasting Life.”

* * *

THE TRUTH OBEYED.

Beloved Brother: —It is with great pleasure that I can now address you as my brother in Christ upon truly scriptural grounds; for we are now both travelling towards Zion, “the hill of Jehovah’s holiness,” to the city which hath foundations; not to an imaginary, aerial clime, where its denizens are supposed to float in ether like birds in air, singing without tongues, and reigning in unbounded space, or “beyond its limits,” &c. My wife and myself have fulfilled the determination expressed in my last, having obediently received the glad tidings of the kingdom about five weeks ago. And now, although at present alone in this city, we rejoice that we have attained to the knowledge of the truth; and are now deriving great comfort from the scriptures, which appear now in a very different light to what they did before the opening of our eyes.

There has been a Campbellite church established in this city recently, numbering, I suppose, from thirty to thirty-five. Most of them are a migration hither from churches east of this place; and have been congregationalised by an elder A. P. Jones, who has been discoursing here nightly for about two weeks. I attended occasionally, but only as a spectator; for I cannot join with them now, although I was formerly of their faith and order; and as I am not able to contend publicly against so much error, with any prospect of doing good, I have remained silent. I need hardly say how delighted I should be, if in your travels you could touch at this place, and lay before them the divine testimony concerning the Kingdom of God; for I am persuaded they know nothing about it. There are several on the neighbouring prairie that are awakening to the reality of your views of the gospel of God. One of my former

brethren in particular believes that what you preach is the gospel, and acknowledges that when he was immersed in New York, he did not understand it; but, says he can't come to the water as an unbaptised individual, judging himself to be one of the household of saints. He was, however, present at our immersion, and though he could not do likewise, he could not condemn us. But, having repudiated our Campbellite immersion, he feels that we have left him as it were alone. A feeling of loneliness has come over him which is not agreeable; he therefore went immediately after and joined the Campbellites in Rockford, for the sake of company.

We have received the Heralds regularly up to date, and are very much instructed by them. Should you find yourself at any time this year in this city, you may readily find my whereabouts by inquiring at the post-office.

Hoping that your useful life may be preserved, and that your family may enjoy with you the abundant blessings vouchsafed to all who look for the appearing of the Lord Jesus,

I subscribe myself a partaker in the hope,

JAMES WOOD.

Rockford, Illinois, May 11th, 1855.

* * *

THINGS IN DUBUQUE.

Dear Brother. — We have had some preaching and proselyting here lately, and are anticipating more. Mr. Alexander Campbell, I learn, is preaching in Chicago. Your interpretations are taking root here, and people are anxious to hear you again. Elpis Israel and Anatolia are sowing seed that must shortly spring up, and by its influence affect surrounding bodies. Men who dare not openly avow from whence the sentiments they teach are derived, propagate with impunity the doctrines of Elpis Israel; but, if accused of believing with you, would deny it, as Peter did Christ, with an oath.

How very few men there are to be met with now-a-days of independent minds either in religion or politics. The church here is in an unhealthy condition, and requires purifying.

Political parties here are made up of the basest materials, such as demagoguism, Irish Romanism, and rum, on the one hand, and a cowardly spirit of secret opposition to them, on the other. Of politics I have had my full; of religion, I intend to know more: with both I should be completely disgusted if I judged the principles of either by their pretended representatives in this place; but as this would be unjust, I shall look further and deeper; and draw my conclusions accordingly.

Ireland and Rome govern Dubuque.

Very truly yours,

T. R.

Dubuque, Iowa; May 1, 1855.

* * *

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

BY JOHN MILTON,

AUTHOR OF PARADISE LOST.

The visible creation comprises the material universe, and all that is contained therein; and more especially the human race. The creation of the world in general, and of its individual parts, is related in Genesis 1. It is also described Job 26: 7, &c., and 38, and in various passages of the Psalms and Prophets—Psalm 33: 6-9, 104, 148: 5; Proverbs 8: 26, &c. ; Amos 4: 13; 2 Peter 3: 5. Previously, however, to the creation of man, as if to intimate the superior importance of the work, the Deity speaks like a man deliberating: Genesis 1: 26. “God said, let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness.” So that it was not the body alone that was then made, but the soul of man also, (in which our likeness to God principally consists;) which precludes us from attributing pre-existence to the soul which was then formed—a groundless notion sometimes entertained, but refuted by Genesis 2: 7: “God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; thus man became a living soul.” Job 32: 8: “There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” Nor did God merely breathe that spirit into man, but moulded it in each individual, and infused it throughout, enduing and embellishing it with its proper faculties. Zechariah 12: 1: “He formeth the spirit of man within him.”

We may understand from other passages of Scripture, that when God infused the breath of life into man, what man thereby received was not a portion of God’s essence, or a participation of the divine nature, but that measure of the divine virtue or influence, which was commensurate to the capabilities of the recipient. For it appears from Psalm 104: 29-30, that he infused the breath of life into other living beings also: “Thou takest away their breath, they die . . . thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created;” whence we learn that every living thing receives animation from one and the same source of life and breath; inasmuch as when God takes back to himself that spirit, or breath of life, they cease to exist. Ecclesiastes 3: 19 “They have all one breath.” Nor has the word spirit any other meaning in the sacred writings, but that breath of life which we inspire, or the vital, or sensitive or rational faculty, or some action or affection belonging to those faculties.

Man having been created after this manner, it is said, as a consequence, that “man became a living soul;” * (see next page) whence, it may be inferred, (unless we had rather take the heathen writers for our teachers respecting the nature of the soul,) that man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual, not compound or separable—not, according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body, but that the whole man is soul, and the soul man—that is to say, a body, or individual substance animated, sensitive, and rational; and that the breath of life was neither a part of the divine essence, nor was it the soul itself, but, as it were, the inspiration of some divine virtue fitted for the exercise of life and reason, and infused into the organic body; for man himself, the whole man, when finally created, is called in express terms, “a living soul.” Hence the word used in Genesis to signify soul, is interpreted by the apostle, 1 Corinthians 15: 45, “animal.” Again, all the attributes of the body are assigned in common to the soul: the touch, Leviticus 5: 2, “If a soul touch any unclean thing”—the act of eating, Leviticus 7: 18, 20, “the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity:” “The soul that eateth of the flesh,” and in other places—hunger, Proverbs 13: 25, Proverbs 27: 7, “To the hungry soul every bitter thing is sweet”—thirst, Proverbs 15: 25, “As cold waters to a thirsty soul.”—

Isaiah 29: 8—capture, 1 Samuel 24: 11, “Thou huntest my soul to take it:” Psalm 7: 5, “Let the enemy persecute my soul and take it.”

*

He formed thee, Adam, thee, O man,
Dust of the ground, and in thy nostrils breathed
The breath of life; in his own image he
Created thee in the image of God
Express, and thou becam’st a living soul.
Paradise Lost VII, 523.

Where we speak of the body as a mere senseless stock, there the soul must be understood as signifying either the spirit, or its secondary faculties, the vital or sensitive faculty for instance. Thus it is as often distinguished from the spirit as from the body itself. — Luke 1: 46-47; 1 Thessalonians 5: 23: “Your whole spirit and soul and body”—Hebrews 4: 12, “To the dividing asunder of soul and spirit.” But that the spirit of man should be separate from the body, so as to have a perfect and intelligent existence independently of it, is nowhere said in Scripture, and the doctrine is evidently at variance both with nature and reason, as will be shown more fully hereafter. For the word soul is applied to every kind of living being; Genesis 1: 30: “Every beast of the earth wherein there is life,” (Hebrew “a living soul.”)** Genesis 7: 22, “All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, (Hebrew living soul.) of all that was in the dry land died;” yet it is never inferred from these expressions that the soul exists separate from the body in any of the brute creation.

** Living soul, “nephesh chayiah,” a general term to express all creatures endued with animal life, in any of its infinitely varied gradations, from the half-reasoning elephant down to the polype, which seems equally to share the vegetable and animal life. —Dr. A. Clarke. Notes on Genesis 1: 24. H.

On the seventh day God ceased from his work, and ended the whole business of creation; Genesis 2: 23.

It would seem, therefore, that the human soul is not created daily by the immediate act of God, but propagated from father to son in a natural order; which was considered the more probable opinion by Tertullian and Apollinarius, as well as by Augustine and the whole western church in the time of Jerome, as he himself testifies, Tom. ii. Epist. 82, and Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise on the soul. God would in fact have left his creation imperfect, and a vast, not to say a servile task, would yet remain to be performed, without even allowing time for rest on each successive Sabbath, if he still continued to create as many souls daily as there are bodies multiplied throughout the whole world, at the bidding of what is not seldom the flagitious wantonness of man. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the influence of the divine blessing is less efficacious in imparting to man the power of producing after his kind, than to the other parts of animated nature; Genesis 1: 22-28. Thus it was from one of the ribs of the man that God made the mother of all mankind, without the necessity of infusing the breath of life a second time, Genesis 2: 22, and Adam himself begat a son in his own likeness after his image, Genesis 5: 3. Thus, 1 Corinthians 15: 49, “as we have borne the image of the earthy:” and this not only in the body, but in the soul, as it was chiefly with respect to the soul that Adam was made in the divine image.# (see next page.) So, Genesis 46: 26, “All the souls which came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins.” Hebrews 7: 10, “Levi was in the loins of Abraham:” whence in Scripture an offspring is called seed, and Christ is

denominated “the seed of the woman.” Genesis 17: 17, “I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.” 1 Corinthians 15: 44-46, “It is sown a natural body . . . that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.”

. God on thee
Abundantly his gifts hath also poured,
Inward and outward both, his image fair.
Paradise Lost, VIII, 219.

But besides the testimony of revelation, some arguments from reason may be alleged in confirmation of this doctrine. Whoever is born, or shapen and conceived in sin, (as we all are, not David only, Psalm 51: 5,) if he receive his soul immediately from God, cannot but receive it from him shapen in sin; for to be generated and conceived, means nothing else than to receive a soul in conjunction with the body. If we receive the soul immediately from God it must be pure, for who in such a case will venture to call it impure? But if it be pure, how are we conceived in sin in consequence of receiving a pure soul, which would rather have the effect of cleansing the impurities of the body; or with what justice is the pure soul charged with the sin of the body?

But it is contended, God does not create souls impure, but only impaired in their nature, and destitute of original righteousness. I answer, that to create pure souls destitute of original righteousness, —to send them into contaminated and impure bodies, —to deliver them up in their innocence and helplessness to the prison house of the body, as to an enemy, with understanding blinded and with will enslaved—in other words, wholly deprived of sufficient strength for resisting the vicious propensities of the body—to create souls thus circumstanced would argue as much injustice as to have created them impure would have argued impurity; it would have argued as much injustice as to have created the first man, Adam himself, impaired in his nature, and destitute of original righteousness.

Again, if sin be communicated by generation, and transmitted from father to son, it follows that what is the original subject of sin, namely, the rational soul, must be propagated in the same manner; for that it is from the soul that all sin in the first instance proceeds, will not be denied. Lastly, on what principle of justice can sin be imputed through Adam to that soul which was never either in Adam, or derived from Adam? In confirmation of which, Aristotle’s argument may be added, the truth of which is, in my opinion, indisputable. If the soul be equally diffused through any given whole, and throughout every part of the whole, how can the human seed, the noblest and most intimate part of all the body, be imagined destitute of the soul of the parents, or at least of the father, when communicated to the son by the laws of generation?

It was probably by some such considerations as these that Augustine was led to confess that he could neither discover, by study nor prayer, nor any process of reasoning, how the doctrine of original sin could be defended on the supposition of the creation of souls. The texts which are usually advanced, Ecclesiastes 12: 7, Isaiah 57: 16, Zechariah 12: 1, certainly indicate that nobler origin of the soul implied in its being breathed from the mouth of God; but they no more prove that each soul is severally and immediately created by the Deity, than certain other texts, which might be quoted, prove that each individual body is formed in the womb by the immediate hand of God. Job 10: 8-10, “Thine hands have made me . . . hast thou not poured me out as milk?” Psalm 33: 15, “He fashioneth their hearts alike.” Job 31: 15, “Did not he that made me in the womb make him?” Isaiah 46: 24, “Thus saith Jehovah . .

. he that formed thee from the womb.” Acts 17: 26, “He hath made of one blood all nations of men.” We are not to infer from these passages, that natural causes do not contribute their ordinary efficacy for the propagation of the body; nor on the other hand, that the soul is not received by traduction from the father, because at the time of death it again betakes itself to different elements than the body, in conformity with its own origin.

With regard to the passage, Hebrews 12: 9, where “the fathers of the flesh” are opposed to the “father of spirits,” I answer, that it is to be understood in a theological, not in a physical sense, as if the father of the body were opposed to the father of the soul; for flesh is taken neither in this passage, nor probably anywhere else, for the body without the soul; nor “the father of spirits” for the father of the soul, in respect of the work of generation; but “the father of the flesh” here means nothing else than the earthly or natural father, whose offspring are begotten in sin; “the father of spirits” is either the heavenly father, who in the beginning created all spirits, angels as well as the human race, or the spiritual father, who bestows a second birth on the faithful; according to John 3: 6, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.” The argument, too, will proceed better, if the whole be understood as referring to edification and correction, not to generation; for the point in question is not, from what source each individual originated, or what part of him thence originated, but who had proved most successful in the employment of chastisement and instruction. By parity of reasoning, the apostle might exhort the converts to bear with his rebuke, on the ground that he was their spiritual father. God is as truly the father of the flesh as “of the spirits of the flesh,”—Numbers 16: 22, but this is not the sense intended here, and all arguments are weak which are deduced from passages of Scripture originally relating to a different subject.

With regard to the soul of Christ, it will be sufficient to answer that its generation was supernatural, and therefore cannot be cited as an argument in the discussion of this controversy. Nevertheless, even he is called “the seed of the woman,” “the seed of David according to the flesh,” that is, undoubtedly, according to his human nature.

There seems, therefore, no reason why the soul of man should be made an exception to the general law of creation. For as has been shown before, God breathed the breath of life into the other living beings, and blended it so intimately with matter, that the propagation and production of the human form were analogous to those of other forms, and the proper effect of that power which had been communicated to matter by the Deity.

* * *

IT WAS, AND IS NOT, YET IS.

The Beast which John saw arise out of “the Sea,” or Roman Nations of the Mediterranean, had “Seven Heads.” These seven heads, he informs us, have a twofold signification; one is, that they represent the Seven Mountains on which the Roman Jezebel, or, “that Great City which reigneth over the kings of the earth sitteth,” or is enthroned; the other, that they symbolise “Seven Kings,” or forms of government that have prevailed there.

As to the seven mountains or hills, topography presents us with their names as, Aventius, Capitolinus, Coelius, Esquilinus, Palatinus, Quirinalis, and Viminalis. Over these hills was the city Rome extended when John saw it in vision; and so notably was this the fact,

that this Imperial Queen of Nations acquired the familiar designation of the City of the Seven Hills.

On these seven hills, seven forms of government were to obtain in ordinal succession. John tells us that he was living under the dominion of the sixth head; for speaking of the heads as representative of “kings,” or sovereignties, he says, “five are fallen, and one is.” The fallen sovereignties are thus named by historians, viz., the Regal, the Consular, the Dictatorial, the Decemviral, and Tribunitial with consular authority. These had all passed away before John’s exile to Patmos. He was banished to that island by the sixth, or imperial, which was in effect established in the Seven Hilled City by Augustus Caesar twenty-nine years before the true era of the birth of Jesus, and consequent upon the battle of Actium, U.C. 723. It continued till A.D. 476, a period of 508 years, when it was abolished from Rome and Italy, (but not from Constantinople and the East) by the seventh.

The setting aside of the sixth to make way for the seventh sovereignty of the Beast, is signified in these words—“And I saw one of its heads slain as if unto death.” The blow appeared to be mortal, or one from which it would never recover. But both the prophecy and the history instruct the reader, that the abolition of imperial sovereignty from the Seven Hills was only for a time, at the expiration of which it should revive as the Eighth Head or sovereignty in Rome. This is indicated in the words, “And the plague of its (seeming) death was healed.”

The head with a scar upon it is styled “beast that was, and is not, yet is;” and to show that the beast here signifies a sovereignty connected with the Seven-Hilled City, the revelator adds, “And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the Eighth, and is of the seven;” that is, it is an eighth Roman sovereignty, and imperial like the sixth.

As John lived under the sixth, he might truly and fitly say of the eighth, in relation to those contemporary with its overthrow, “it was,” and in relation to himself, “it is not, yet is.” A time shall come when they shall say “it was, and is not;” because it is written concerning it, “it goeth into perdition.” We can say of the dominion of Alexander the Great, “it was, and is not;” because it once existed, but is not now in being: but John could not say that the Eighth “was” in the sense of its having passed away into perdition. There is a sense, however, in which he might say “it is not, yet is,” even in reference to his own time, “it is not;” that is, it did not ordinarily exist as “the eighth,” because the seventh had not then yet appeared; it might nevertheless be said of it, “it yet is,” because it is constitutionally “of the seven,” being like the head under which John lived, IMPERIO-PONTIFICAL. This is the true sense of “it is not, yet is.” We can say “it is,” because it exists; therefore we cannot say “it was,” because that would imply that it had gone into perdition; neither can we say “it is not,” for there being no other sovereignty like it, that would be to deny that “it is:” but the Sixth and the Eighth heads of the Seven-Hilled City being both imperio-pontifical, John could say “it is not, yet is.”

EDITOR.

* * *

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

An inspired apostle has declared that a bishop shall be the husband of one wife, but the church of Rome puts upon her priesthood a perpetual celibacy. It is necessary to the exercise of the pastoral office that a man should know by experience something of domestic life, and the man who lives in the ministry without a companion to cheer him has lost an essential element of usefulness. Marriage is an institution of Heaven, and every man has in his own soul, God-given instincts which lead him to a desire of domestic enjoyments. A priest, who, against nature, has bound himself to celibacy, has dehumanised himself, stepped out of the pale of natural law, and placed a barrier between himself and society.

The effects of celibacy upon a man's mind are disastrous in the extreme; the intellect and soul freeze under the withering influence of resistance to the laws of life. The Romish priesthood never could have ordered such horrid barbarities as have disgraced their very name, if by the domestic laws they had been linked to the great heart of humanity. But they changed under the influence of a corrupting celibacy, from men to demons, and then could coolly roast women and children, stone, rack, torture and murder men, without one compunction of conscience, or one thought of mercy.

But the influence of celibacy upon the morals is more destructive. The history of the church of Rome, for centuries past, proves that celibacy is a most onerous cause of profligacy in the priesthood. Romanists have themselves bewailed celibacy as a cause of immorality and sin. "St. Bernard, in the twelfth century, admitted and lamented the improprieties of the priesthood, 'who committed in secret such acts of turpitude as would be shameful to express.'" Cunangis declared the "adultery and impurity of the clergy as beyond description. They frequent stews and taverns, and spend their whole time in eating, drinking, rioting, gaming and dancing. Surfeited and drunk, these sacerdotal sensualists fought, shouted, rioted and blasphemed, and passed directly from the embrace of the harlot to the altar of God."

Agrippa, speaking of the fruits of celibacy, says: "One bishop, on one occasion, boasted of having in his diocese 13,000 priests, who paid their superior every year a guinea for leave to keep a concubine." Alvares, a Spanish author, asserts that "the sons of the Spanish clergy were as numerous as those of the laity." "They will pass," says he, "without confession, from the concubines to God's altar." Albert, duke of Bavaria, deplored the infamy of the German priesthood in glowing colours. "The recital," says he, "of clerical criminality would wound the ear of chastity. Debauchery has covered the ecclesiastics with infamy." An American writer of note, speaking of a past century, says: "Switzerland was the scene of similar profligacy. It rose to such a height prior to the Reformation, that the Swiss laity compelled every priest to take a concubine of his own, in order to preserve the safety of others." Clemingis also narrates, that the laity would tolerate the clergy only on condition of their keeping concubines. The French clergy were by no means behind those of other countries in this disgraceful career. According to the account of Measerey, an eminent historian, all the French ecclesiastics were in a sad state of irregularity. The majority had concubines, while some of the deacons had four or five female companions. The Italian and Roman clergy surpassed all others in infamy."

This is a general, yea, the universal statement reaching us from all lands and all climes. Clerical celibacy, says the late Regent of Brazil (himself a bishop), is the chief cause of public immorality in Brazil.

Facts might be adduced to almost any extent, showing the influence of celibacy upon the clergy of the Romish Church, and its tendency to immorality and crime. Facts, hideous, startling and overwhelming might be produced, but many of them would be too disgusting for the public eye. These facts have been recorded by the historian; they cannot be blotted out; they belong to all lands, and the immorality of the papal priesthood, so notorious in Europe, is chargeable not to the priests themselves, but to the system which enjoins on them to perpetuate celibacy. —Christian Era.

* * *

The war is very popular in Piedmont, except among the priests, and a few of the nobles who love despotism too well to see an Emperor of Russia humbled. The Convents Suppression bill is not likely to pass the Parliament as it was originally written; but I expect it will pass in some shape or other. The people are tired of seeing hundreds of idle monks eating the fruit of the earth without doing any good. The day for convents and monasteries is over in Europe. Even in Spain they are doing the same thing, and just now the Cortes have nearly passed a bill which will clear the country of mere drones.

* * *