

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, SEPTEMBER, 1855—
Volume 5—No. 9

THE STATE OF THE DEAD.

BY THE AUTHOR OF
PARADISE LOST.

The Providence of God, as it regards the fall of man, is observable in the sin of man, and the misery consequent upon it, as well as in his restoration.

Sin, as defined by the apostle, is anomia, or “the transgression of the law,”
—1 John 3: 5.

By the law is here meant, in the first place, that rule of conscience which is innate, and engraven on the mind of man; * secondly, the special command which proceeded out of the mouth of God (for the Law written by Moses was long subsequent), Genesis 2: 17, —“Thou shalt not eat of it.” Hence it is said, Romans 2: 12, —“As many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law.”

* There is no innate moral law the transgression of which is sin. The thinking of “conscientiousness,” unenlightened by the word, is essentially erroneous, being always contrary to the mind of God. —EDITOR.

After sin came death, as the calamity or punishment consequent upon it. Genesis 2: 17, —“In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.” Romans 5: 12, —“Death entered by sin.” Romans 6: 23, —“The wages of sin is death.” Romans 7: 5, —“The motions of sin did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.”

Under the head of death, in Scripture, all evils whatever, together with everything which in its consequences tends to death, must be understood as comprehended; for mere bodily death, as it is called, did not follow the sin of Adam on the self same day, as God had threatened. **

** My sole command
Transgressed, inevitably thou shalt die,
From that day mortal; and this happy state

Hence divines, not inappropriately, reckon up several degrees of death. The first, as before said, comprehends all those evils which lead to death, and which it is agreed came into the world immediately upon the fall of man, the most important of which I proceed to enumerate.

In the first place, guiltiness; which, though in its primary sense it is an imputation made by God to us, yet it is also, as it were, a commencement or prelude of death dwelling in us, by which we are held as by a bond, and rendered subject to condemnation and punishment . . .Romans 3: 19, —“That all the world may become guilty before God.” Guiltiness, accordingly, is accompanied or followed by the terrors of conscience, Genesis 3: 8, —“They heard the voice of God . . . and Adam and his wife hid themselves . . .and he said, ‘I was afraid.’” Romans 8: 18, —“Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear.” Hebrews 2: 15, —“Who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” Hebrews 10: 27, —“A certain fearful looking for judgment.” It is attended, likewise, with the sensible forfeiture of the divine protection and favour; whence results a diminution of the majesty of the human countenance, and a conscious degradation of mind. Genesis 3: 7, —“They knew that they were naked.” Hence the whole man becomes polluted: Titus 1: 15, —“Even their mind and conscience is defiled:” whence arises shame. Genesis 3: 7, —“They sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons.” Romans 6: 21—“What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death.”

The second degree of death is called spiritual death; by which is meant the loss of divine grace, and of that innate righteousness, (Innocency. —EDITOR.) wherein man in the beginning lived unto God. Ephesians 2: 1, —“who were dead in trespasses and sins.” Ephesians 4: 18, —“alienated from the life of God.” Colossians 2: 13, —“dead in your sins.” Revelation 3: 1, —“thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead.” And this death took place not only on the very day, but at the very moment of the fall. They who are delivered from it are said to be “regenerated,” to be “born again,” and to be “treated afresh;” which is the work of God alone. (Through his word believed. —EDITOR.)

The third degree of death is what is called the death of the body. To this all the labours, sorrows, and diseases, which afflict the body, are nothing but the prelude. Genesis 3: 16-17, —“I will greatly multiply thy sorrow . . . in sorrow shalt thou eat of it.” Job 5: 7, —“Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward.” All nature is likewise subject to mortality and a curse on account of man. Genesis 3: 17, —“Cursed is the ground for thy sake.” Romans 8: 20-21, —“The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly.” Even the beasts are not exempt, Genesis 3: 14; 6: 7. So “the first born of beasts” in the land of Egypt perished for the sins of their masters, —Exodus 11: 5.

The death of the body is to be considered in the light of a punishment for sin, no less than the other degrees of death, notwithstanding the contrary opinion entertained by some. Romans 5: 13-14, —“until the law sin was in the world. . . death reigned from Adam to Moses.” 1 Corinthians 15: 21—“Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead;” therefore that bodily death from which we are to rise again, originated in sin, and not in nature; contrary to the opinion of those who maintain that temporal death is the result of natural causes, and that eternal death alone is due to sin.

The death of the body is the loss or extinction of life. The common definition, which supposes it to consist in the separation of soul and body, is inadmissible. For what part of man is it that dies when this separation takes place? Is it the soul? This will not be admitted by the supporters of the above definition. Is it then the body? But how can that be said to die, which never had any life of itself? Therefore the separation of soul and body cannot be called the death of man.

Here, then, arises an important question, which, owing to the prejudice of divines in behalf of their preconceived opinions, has usually been dismissed without examination, instead of being treated with the attention it deserves. Is it the whole man, or the body alone, that is deprived of vitality? And as this is a subject which may be discussed without endangering our faith or devotion, whichever side of the controversy we espouse, I shall declare freely what seems to me to be the true doctrine, as collected from numberless passages of Scripture; without regarding the opinion of those, who think that truth is to be sought in the schools of philosophy, rather than in the sacred writings.

Inasmuch, then, as the whole man is uniformly said to consist of body, spirit, and soul (whatever may be the distinct provinces severally assigned to these divisions), I will show that, in death, first the whole man, and secondly, each component part, suffers privation of life. It is to be observed, first of all, that God denounced the punishment of death against the whole man that sinned, without excepting any part. For what could be more just, than that he who had sinned in his whole person, should die in his whole person? Or, on the other hand, what could be more absurd, than that the mind, which is the part principally offending, should escape the threatened death; and that the body alone, to which immortality was equally allotted, before death came into the world by sin, should pay the penalty of sin by undergoing death, though not implicated in the transgression?

It is evident that the saints and believers of old, the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, without exception held this doctrine. Jacob, Genesis 37: 35, —“I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning.” Genesis 42: 36, —“Joseph is not.” So also Job, 3: 12-18, —“As an hidden, untimely birth I had not been; as infants which never saw light.” Compare Job 10: 21, Job 14: 10-13, —“Man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? . . . man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more.” Job 17: 13, 15-16, —“If I wait, the grave is mine house.” “Where is now my hope?” “They shall go down to the bars of the pit.” See also many other passages.

The belief of David was the same, as is evident from the reason so often given by him for deprecating the approach of death. Psalm 6: 5, —“For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?” Psalm 88: 10-12, —“Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness.” Psalm 15: 17, —“The dead praise not Jehovah.” Psalm 39: 13, —“Before I go hence and be no more.” Psalm 146: 2, —“While I live, I will praise Jehovah.” Certainly if he had believed that his soul would survive, and be received immediately into heaven, he would have abstained from all such remonstrances, as one who was shortly to take his flight where he might praise God unceasingly. It appears that the belief of Peter respecting David was the same as David’s belief respecting himself. Acts 2: 29, 34, —“Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day . . . for David is not ascended into the heavens.”

Again it is evident that Hezekiah fully believed that he should die entirely, where he laments that it is impossible to praise God in the grave. Isaiah 38: 18-19, —“For the grave cannot praise thee: death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth; the living, the living, he shall praise thee as I do this day.” God himself bears testimony to the same truth. Isaiah 57: 1-2, —“The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come; he shall enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds.” Jeremiah 30: 15, compared with Matthew 2: 18, —“Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not.” Thus also Daniel 12: 2, —“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.”

It is on the same principle that Christ himself proves God to be a God of the living, Luke 20: 37, arguing from their future resurrection; for if they were then living, it would not necessarily follow from his argument that there would be a resurrection of the body: hence he says, John 11: 25, —“I am the resurrection and the life.” Accordingly he declares expressly, that there is not even a place appointed for the abode of the saints in heaven, till the resurrection. John 14: 2-3, —“I go to prepare a place for you: and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” There is no sufficient reason for interpreting this of the body; it is clear, therefore, that it was spoken, and should be understood, of the reception of the soul and spirit conjointly with the body into heaven, and that not till the coming of the Lord. So likewise Luke 20: 35; Acts 7: 7, 60—“when he had said this he fell asleep.” Acts 23: 6—“the hope and resurrection of the dead;” that is, the hope of the resurrection, which was the only hope the apostle professed to entertain. (Milton errs in this. The hope and resurrection are two distinct things. Many will rise from the dead who will have no share in “the hope;” for “some awake to everlasting shame and contempt,” and have no part in “the Hope of Israel.”—EDITOR.)

Thus also, Acts 24: 21; 26: 6, 8; 1 Corinthians 15: 17-19, —“If Christ be not raised” (which resurrection took place for the very purpose that mankind might likewise rise again) “then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished;” whence it appears that there were only two alternatives, one of which must ensue; either they must rise again or perish; for “if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable;” which again indicates that we must either believe in the resurrection, (In the gospel of the kingdom, which includes a promise of resurrection to life.—EDITOR), or have our hope in this life only; verse 29-30, 32—“If the dead rise not at all, why stand we in jeopardy every hour? . . . let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die;” that is, die altogether, for otherwise the argument would have no force. In the verses that follow from verse 42 to verse 50, the reasoning proceeds on the supposition that there are only two states, the mortal and the immortal, death and resurrection; not a word is said of any intermediate condition. Nay, Paul himself affirms that the crown of righteousness which was laid up for him was not to be received before that last day: 2 Timothy 4: 8, —“henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.” If a crown were laid up for the apostle, it follows that it was not to be received immediately after death. At what time, then, was it to be received? At the same time when it was conferred on the rest of the saints, that is, not till the appearance of Christ in glory. Philippians 2: 16, —“That I may rejoice in the day of Christ.” Philippians 3: 11, 20-21, —“If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead . . . our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.” Our

conversation, therefore, is in heaven, not where we are now dwelling, but in that place from whence we look for the coming of the Saviour, who shall conduct us thither. Luke 20: 35-36, —“They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; for they are equal unto the angels, being the children of the resurrection,”—that is, when they finally become such; whence it follows, that previous to the resurrection they are not admitted to the heavenly world. *

Thus far proof has been given of the death of the whole man. But lest recourse should be had to the sophistical distinction, that although the whole man dies, it does not therefore follow that the whole of man should die, I proceed to give similar proof with regard to each of the parts—the body, the spirit, and the soul, according to the division above stated.

First, then, as to the body, no one doubts that it suffers privation of life. Nor will the same be less evident with regard to the spirit, if it be allowed that the spirit, according to the doctrine previously laid down, has no participation in the divine nature, but is purely human; and that no reason can be assigned why, if God has sentenced to death the whole of man that sinned, the spirit, which is the part principally offending, should be alone exempt from the appointed punishment; especially since previous to the entrance of sin into the world, all parts of man were alike immortal; and that, since that time, in pursuance of God’s denunciation, all have become equally subject to death. **

But come to the proofs. The Preacher himself, the wisest of men, expressly denies that the spirit is exempt from death; Ecclesiastes 3: 18-20, — “as the beast dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath (Hebrew, spirit,) . . . all go unto one place.” And in the twenty-first verse, he condemns the ignorance of those who venture to affirm that the way of the spirits of men and of beasts after death is different: “Who knoweth the spirit of man, (an sursum ascendat) whether # it goeth upward?” Psalm 146: 4, —“His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” Now the thoughts are in the mind and the spirit, not in the body; and if they perish, we must conclude that the mind and spirit undergo the same fate as the body. 1 Corinthians 5: 5, —“That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus:” the apostle does not say, “in the day of death,” but “in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

* A terrestrial organization of society under a constitution from heaven, established after the resurrection of the Saints and the advent of Christ. —EDITOR.

** It was but breath
Of life that sinned; what dies but what had life
And sin? the body properly had neither.
All of me then shall die: let this appease
The doubt, since human reach no further knows.
Paradise Lost, X., 788.

This translation is according to the Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldee Paraphrase, Syriac and Arabic Versions.

Lastly, there is abundant testimony to prove that the soul (whether we regard by this term the whole human composition, or whether it is to be understood as synonymous with the spirit) is subject to death, natural as well as violent. Numbers 23: 10, —“let me (my soul, Hebrew anima mea, Lat. Vulg.) die the death of the righteous.” Such are the words of

Balaam, who though not the most upright of prophets, yet in this instance uttered the words which the Lord put into his mouth. Job 33: 18—“he keepeth back his soul from the pit.” Job 36: 14—“they die in youth” (Hebrew, their soul dieth. Lat. Vulg., anima eorum.) Psalm 22: 20, —“deliver my soul from the sword;” 78: 50, —“he spared not their soul from death;” 89: 48, —“shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?” 94: 17, —“my soul had almost dwelt in silence.” Hence man himself, when dead, is spoken of under the name of “the soul,” Leviticus 19: 28; 21: 1, 11, —“neither shall he go in to any dead body,” (Hebrew, dead soul.) Isaiah 38: 17, —“Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption.” The just and sufficient reason assigned above for the death of the soul, is the same which is given by God himself; Ezekiel 18: 20, —“The soul that sinneth, it shall die:” and therefore, on the testimony of the prophet and the apostle, as well as of Christ himself, the soul even of Christ was for a short time subject unto death (see Isaiah 53: 10, 12.) on account of our sins. Psalm 16: 10 compared with Acts 2: 27-28, 31, —“his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.” Matthew 26: 38, —“my soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.” Nor do we anywhere read that the souls assemble, or are summoned to judgment, from heaven or from hell, but they are all called out of the tomb, or at least that they were previously in the state of the dead. John 5: 28-29, —“the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth!” In this passage, those who rise again, those who hear, those who come forth, are all described as being in the graves, the righteous as well as the wicked. 1 Corinthians 15: 52, —“the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised.” 1 Thessalonians 4: 13-17, —“But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope: for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him: for this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend, . . . and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” They were asleep; but the lifeless body does not sleep, unless inanimate matter can be said to sleep. “That ye sorrow not, even as others who have no hope”—but why should they sorrow and have no hope, if they believed that their souls would be in a state of salvation and happiness even before the resurrection, whatever might become of the body? The rest of the world, indeed, who had no hope, might with reason despair concerning the soul as well as the body, because they did not believe in the resurrection; and therefore it is to the resurrection that Paul directs the hope of all believers. “Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him;” that is, to heaven from the grave. “We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.” But there would have been no reason to fear lest the survivors should anticipate them, if they who were asleep had long since been received into heaven; in which case the latter would not come “to meet the Lord,” but would return with him. “We,” however, “which are alive, shall be caught up together with them,” not after them, “and so shall we ever be with the Lord,” namely, after, not before the resurrection. And then at length “the wicked shall be severed from among the just,”—Matthew 13: 49. Daniel 12: 2, —“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.”

In such a sleep I should suppose Lazarus to have been lying, if it were asked whither his soul betook itself during those four days of death. For I cannot believe that it would have been called back from heaven to suffer again the inconveniences of the body, but rather that it was summoned from the grave, and roused from the sleep of death. The words of Christ themselves lead to this conclusion: John 11: 11, 13, —“Our friend Lazarus sleepeth: but I go

that I may awake him out of sleep: howbeit Jesus spake of his death:" which death, if the miracle were true, must have been real. This is confirmed by the circumstances of Christ's raising him; verse 43,—"He cried with a loud voice, 'Lazarus, come forth.'" If the soul of Lazarus, that is, if Lazarus himself, was not within the grave, why did Christ call on the lifeless body which could not hear? If it were the soul which he addressed, why did he call it from a place where it was not? Had he intended to intimate that the soul was separated from the body, he would have directed his eyes to the quarter whence the soul of Lazarus might be expected to return, namely, from heaven; for to call from the grave what is not there, is like seeking the living among the dead, which the angel reprehended as ignorance in the disciples, Luke 24: 5. The same is apparent in raising the widow's son.

* * *

THE MYSTERY OF THE COVENANT OF THE HOLY LAND EXPLAINED.

BY THE EDITOR.

According to the law ordained by angels in the hand of Moses, and styled "the word spoken by angels,"—Hebrews 2: 2, mankind are separated into the holy and the unclean. It constituted the twelve tribes of Israel "a holy nation," a special and peculiar people;—Exodus 19: 6; Deuteronomy 7: 6; 14: 2; while it left all other nations mere "sinners of the Gentiles;"—Galatians 2: 15; as all men were originally constituted by the disobedience of Adam, —Romans 5: 19, from whom they derive their descent. The national holiness of Israel was constitutional, not inherent. The nation was composed of a stiff-necked, perverse, and intractable people, who were more disposed to the wickedness of other nations, than to the practice of the law of Jehovah, their king. But the holy seed of Abraham was the substance in the nation's loins, on account of whom, and the things affirmed respecting him, it was not consumed—Isaiah 6: 13; 65: 8-9; Romans 11: 16; but carefully preserved, as having "a blessing in it," even "an inheritor of Jehovah's mountains," who shall cause his servants to rejoice, and the nations to shout aloud for joy.

Anything separated by Jehovah from things in general for his own special use is holy, irrespective of the nature or character of the thing. Hence, things animate and inanimate, animal, vegetable, and mineral, solid and fluid, &c., have all been constituted holy by the law. Thus there were holy utensils, holy and most holy places of worship, holy mountains and cities, and holy officials, though oftentimes very unrighteous men. The holiness of this kind was, the national holiness of the twelve tribes—a holiness conferred by the law of Moses, "which could make nothing perfect." It bestowed upon things a relative external holiness, a sort of halo of holiness confined to the surface, which left the mind and disposition, or heart of its subject, untouched.

Let us look into the matter a little more minutely. A babe though born of Israelites was unclean—Job 14: 4; 25: 4, which is the same thing as unholy, until its circumcision, and after presentation to the Lord. "Every male that openeth the womb, shall be called holy to the Lord." This was the law, but how great the number so called were wicked men, Israel's history shows abundantly. Some, however, desired to keep the law. They grew up "blameless"—Philippians 3: 6, observing all the precepts of the decalogue, conforming to the temple worship, and abstaining from contact with all legally unclean and interdicted things. This was a man's own righteousness acquired by working according to the law—Philippians 3: 9. This was the righteousness Israel followed after, which they sought to establish in

opposition to the righteousness Paul preached—Romans 9: 31; 10: 3; and styled by the prophets “filthy rags.” Many such men were ignorant. They had the token of the covenant in their flesh, but they were “children in whom was no faith,” and “without faith it is impossible to please God.” Thus an Israelite might be legally blameless, but if without faith, his legal righteousness could entitle him to no more than length of days in the land which the Lord had given his people. The twelve tribes inherited the land under the Law of Moses, which could confer upon their generations only a temporal life interest in the country. Could it have given them an everlasting inheritance therein, the nation, whatever its misdeeds, would not have been expelled; and its citizens might have attained to everlasting life as a recompense for keeping the law. The transgressions of Israel consummated in their rejection of the Gospel of the kingdom, would doubtless have brought down heaven’s judgments upon them, which would have ultimated in the triumph of the truth; but they would not have been punished in the way they have by an expulsion from their country, if the word spoken by angels in the hand of Moses, could have conferred an everlasting title to it.

Covenants are of no force until purged. “Almost all things are by the law purged with blood.” To purge anything in the Scripture sense, is to cleanse it from legal or from moral defilement; and to impart to it a virtue co-efficient with the detergent or cleansing principle. This is a general definition which may not apply in every case, but it is sufficiently precise for the subject on hand. The covenant made with Abraham was confirmed with Jehovah’s oath, saying, “Know of a surety,” and by the consumption of sacrifices by fire from heaven. — Genesis 15. This was confirmation not purgation. It was not purged until two thousand and eighty-nine years after, when a virtue was imparted to it co-efficient with the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than the blood of Abel; that is, the blood of Jesus, which he says, is “the blood of the New Will, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”—Matthew 26: 28. The history of the death and resurrection of Jesus, is that narrative which relates the story of the purging, or the rendering effective of the covenant, testament, or will, through which remission of sins, eternal life, and an everlasting possession of the land with all its inseparable attributes, may be obtained by every one who believes the things promised therein.

Four hundred and thirty years after the confirmation of the New Covenant (styled new because of its coming into force at a time when that of Moses had waxed old.) and sixteen hundred and fifty-nine years before its incipient enforcement, Moses dedicated or initiated “the law ordained by angels.” This he did with blood. “For when he had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the Book and all the prophets, saying, This is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined upon you.”—Hebrews 9: 18-20. Here was a solution of blood in water, into which a sprinkler of scarlet wool and hyssop was dipped, and the Book and people sprinkled by the hand of Moses. These materials were purification-emblems. “Without the shedding of blood there is no remission,” or sending away, as if sin and uncleanness were sent away into a land not inhabited. —Leviticus 16: 21-22. This is a first principle of God’s religion under both covenants. Blood is therefore regarded as purging, purifying, or cleansing. The only answer that can be given to the question, why is there no expiation without blood-shedding? —is that Jehovah wills it. The blood of the living creature is the life thereof; and as it has come under sentence of death, God wills that life shall make satisfaction for sin. —Leviticus 17: 11, 14. “It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” Water is also cleansing. Hence, “wash you, make you clean.”—Isaiah 1: 16. The water and the blood with which Moses sprinkled the Book of the Covenant and the people, find their antitypes in the blood and water that issued from the

pierced side of Jesus, with which he sprinkled the new covenant. Now, “where a testament (will or covenant) is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.”—Hebrews 9: 16-17. This is a principle which necessitated the institution of the mediatorship; and which caused Jehovah so readily to grant the petition of the Israelites to appoint Moses as his representative in his future dealings with them. Jehovah is the testator in both the covenants; but the principle says they are “of no strength at all while the testator liveth.” In this case, Jehovah must die, or find a substitute. The former supposition is out of the question; for if “God the mighty maker died,” the universe would die with him. All life would perish, and all nations cease; for in Him do all things live, and move and have their being. His wisdom, however, never at fault, has well provided for the emergency. Let us see how he has met the difficulty.

The Law of Moses was added to the covenant-promise of the land to Abraham till his seed should appear, to whom with himself the promise was made. —Galatians 3: 17-19. The law was added “because of transgression.” The nations had all apostatised from the way of the Lord expounded and inculcated by Noah, and afterwards by Melchizedec; and there were but few even of Abraham’s descendants who refrained from the worship of other Gods besides Jehovah. —Joshua 24: 14. The law was therefore added to preserve the truth from entire extinction; and not only so, but to kindle a light that should shine until the dawning of “The Day.” In the meantime, the day appointed had arrived to put Abraham’s descendants in possession of the land, to a limited extent, though the time had not come for the manifestation of the seed, that is, Christ. Until he appeared the tribes could not inherit under the will made to Abraham and Christ, which promised to them and those who should inherit with them, an everlasting possession of the country. A codicil, or supplementary will, as it were, was added to enable them to occupy the land until the Christ should appear. But, though the original will was confirmed, though not purged, it had no strength at all. It could therefore impart none to the supplement. Jehovah was the testator of the supplement, of course; for no one but he had a right to add to this will. But the supplement had no more force while the testator lived than the original will. It was therefore ordained in the hand of a mediator who should occupy the place of Jehovah. This mediator, as we have seen, was Moses. The case therefore stood thus. The supplementary testament is of no strength at all while Moses, the mediatorial testator, liveth. This brings out the reason why the anger of Jehovah kindled against Moses to the prevention of his entering into the land of Canaan, under his own law. No man can be a legatee under his own will. Hence, when Moses obtains an everlasting inheritance in Canaan, it will be as a legatee under the New Will, and not under his own. Being mediatorial testator it was necessary for him to die; for as long as he lived even the tribes could not cross the Jordan to possess the land. But he died, and without delay the country was invaded and possessed.

But the death of Moses did not purge the supplemental will. It was necessary to purge it with blood, and also for the testator to purge it himself; for the will was not only to bequeath a conditional temporal-life interest in the land but to give to the inheritors a hypothetical remission of sins. Had Moses dedicated it with his own blood, his blood must have been shed in the article of death. But this was out of the question. His blood would have answered no better than the blood of a calf or a goat, and not so well; for Moses had transgressed, and the blood of a transgressor could purge nothing: calves were at least innocent of transgression though without communicable virtue or spirituality. The blood of animals was therefore appointed for the purging of his will. He was to sprinkle it and the people with a bunch of scarlet wool and hyssop, emblematic of the sprinkler of the covenant, which should come into force when his should be ready to vanish away —Hebrews 8: 13;

even of Him, “whose head and hairs are white like wool, as white as snow” —Revelation 1: 14, on whom was laid the scarlet robe, emblematic of the sins of his people—Isaiah 1: 18.

But the efficacy of a covenant depends on the virtue of the blood with which it is purged. This principle is fatal to the idea, of perfectibility by the Law of Moses; for “it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.”—Hebrews 10: 4. Hence it was weak and unprofitable, and made nothing perfect. —Hebrews 7: 18-19. This defectiveness of the law which even faith in the unpurged Abrahamic covenant could not remedy—Hebrews 9: 15, was referable to the nature of the sacrifices with whose blood it was dedicated; and to the weakness of the flesh—Romans 8: 3—which it could alone sanctify—Hebrews 9: 13—without reaching the inward man. Calves and goats were as destitute of righteousness as they were devoid of sin, their blood therefore was a negative principle and could impart no virtue to a covenant by which those who were sanctified under it could obtain a title or justification to eternal redemption. And furthermore let it be observed, that besides this defect their blood was unprofitable for everlasting results as being the blood of the dead, and not of the living. It was therefore ceremonially incommunicative of any kind of vitality. Even the blood of the innocent and righteous Jesus, would have been as unprofitable for covenant purposes as the blood of Moses, Abel, or calves, if he had not risen from the dead. This is the doctrine taught concerning him in David. The thirtieth Psalm is prophetic of Messiah’s death and resurrection. “All things must be fulfilled that are written concerning me in the psalms,”—Luke 24: 44, said Jesus. In the third verse of the psalm quoted, the spirit which afterwards in him and spoke by him, says of him, “O Jehovah, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave: thou hast kept me alive (or preserved me from corruption,) that I should not go down into the pit, (or be reduced to dust.)” In the eighth verse he says he “cried to the Lord and made supplication.” This occurred before his soul went down into the grave. In view of its hypothetical continuance in that gloomy place, he inquires in his supplication, “what profit is there in my blood, if I go down to the pit (or become dust?) Can the dust praise thee? Can it declare thy truth?” This interrogative argument teaches the doctrine of the fifteenth of Corinthians—1 Corinthians 15: 17-18, that if Christ be not raised from the dead, or in other words, be mere dust in the pit, “faith is vain;” sins are not remitted; and dead believers are perished: which is equivalent to saying, “there is no profit in his blood;” for it was shed for remission of sins, which, however, are not remitted, if He be not raised up, or “healed” of the “evil disease” which laid him in the tomb. —Psalm 41: 8. An unrisen Christ is an unprofitable sacrifice. His blood could purge nothing; and as to praising God, and declaring his truth in heaven or earth, it would be impossible; for “the dead know not anything”—Ecclesiastes 9: 5, in the day of their return to their dust their thoughts perish—Psalm 146: 4; and therefore the dead cannot praise Jehovah. —Psalm 115: 17. Jesus was “delivered for our offences;” but if he had not been raised, we should have remained unjustified, and in our sins, and without any title to things everlasting; happily, however, for the faithful, God raised him from the dead; whereupon the Apostle adds, “and was raised again for our justification.” Thus, his blood was made profitable, and he is prepared to praise Jehovah and to declare his truth in the midst of Israel’s congregation—Psalm 22: 22-23, 25—when the time comes.

Now this doctrine being true of the blood of an unresurrected, innocent, and righteous man, it is clear that the blood of dead animals, such as calves and goats, must be utterly worthless for anything else than a shift devised for the exigency of the case. They had no righteousness; therefore their sprinkled blood would constitute no one righteous: they had no life; therefore it could impart no title to eternal life: and not being human, they could not expiate humanity’s offence, inasmuch as the wisdom of God determined that sin should be

“condemned in the flesh,” not representatively of animals only, but literally in that of man. — Romans 8: 3.

As it was not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins, and this being the blood of the Mosaic covenant, it was as impossible for that instrument to give the twelve tribes or a single faithful Israelite, even a title to inherit the land forever. “The wages of sin is death;” Hence sins untaken away, or transgressions unredeemed, leaves the transgressor under death’s sentence. A man under sentence of death, is as good as dead; he is therefore styled “dead in trespasses and sins.” This was the condition of the whole nation under the law. No man thereof could show his title to eternal life in Canaan, or elsewhere. A faithful Israelite might hope that when Messiah came, he would not prove like Adam the first, but be obedient unto death; and by his shed blood, purge the Abrahamic covenant in which he believed, and by thus redeeming the transgressions committed by the faithful under the law—Hebrews 9: 15, gave them justification unto life eternal, by which they would be enabled to possess the land forever. No, the only title to the land the Mosaic Law could give was conditional and limited to their mortal existence upon it. Hence the reward for keeping the commandments of Jehovah, is affixed to the first of them. Let the reader observe what it is. It is not a promise of the Gentile “heaven beyond the skies,” but of long life in Palestine. Hear the words, “Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.” This an apostle says “is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest live long upon the land” (Epi tees gees, land not “earth” according to Moses). Paul quoted this as an exhortation to believers residing in Ephesus. It was a motive to them, because they believed the gospel of the kingdom which promises life upon the land, and by consequence, upon the earth, forever; but it is no principle of action with the moderns, as they have no faith in the actual or real accomplishment of the covenant-promises made to Abraham and his seed.

We see, then, the nature of the Mosaic Law purged by inferior or unprecious blood. It could not give a title to eternal life, and was therefore incapable of imparting everlasting righteousness to any—Galatians 3: 21; and nothing short of an everlasting righteousness can constitute a man an heir of the kingdom of God in the covenanted land. By obedience to this law no flesh can be justified, for by it comes the knowledge of sin, without the power of deliverance. —Romans 3: 20, 28. “It made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did.”—Hebrews 7: 19. What could this better hope be to a people already living in the land promised to their father Abraham? Could it be that when they became dead men, they should be metamorphosed into ethereal shadows, and having exhaled with the vapours of earth into the aerial regions, waft about on zephyrs, or take a higher flight to idyllic amplitudes beyond the skies? Is this the better hope, the Christian’s hope, brought in by Jesus “the surety of the better covenant?” O, egregious nonsense! Mere Gentile imbecility and foolishness! Show us ye “wise!” where such a hope is written. Produce your purged covenant in which it is promised and confirmed by Jehovah’s oath. But why call upon you for proof when none exists. Supposing that such a crazy fiction could have foundation in the promises of God, all of which are covenanted and purged, it must be written in the covenant confirmed to Abraham. But on studying that instrument we find there nothing of the kind—not the remotest hint of such a hope. That covenant expanded into the promises made to David, and illustrated by the writings of the prophets, leaves not the reader in a labyrinth of doubt and vague uncertainty about the better hope. These scriptures bind us down to the better covenant in our inquiries after the better hope. Now who that studies the Book of the Covenant with an opened understanding, can fail to see what hope that is promised of Jehovah to Israel, which is better than the hope promised to them in the inferior covenant of Moses? Moses set before

them such an occupation of the land as is amply illustrated in their turbulent and eventful history. They had possessed the land indeed; but the Mosaic testament gave them no other hope than a prolonged, and prosperous, and peaceful life in it, if they forsook not the covenant. This was a hope, like the hope of the nations, bounded by things seen and temporal. After death Moses promised them nothing in his will, not even resurrection. The better covenant, however, purged by the blood of Jesus did. It promised them a resurrection from the dead; it promised them incorruptibility and life; it promised them that they should “possess the land, and dwell therein forever;” it promised them exaltation to the kingdom and the power, and the glory to be manifested there; and to the possession of dominion over all the nations of the earth; it promised them the inheritance of these things when the seed of Abraham and of David should sit upon the throne of his glory; and as the Branch of righteousness, execute judgment and justice in the land. This was the better hope of the better testament, and surpassed the Mosaic in desirableness, as infinitely as things unseen and eternal do those that are seen and temporal.

But as “all the people” were sprinkled with the blood by which Moses dedicated the covenant, he enjoined upon them before they could attain to the inferior hope it set before them, so also is it necessary that every one, without exception, should be sprinkled with the precious blood of the better testament, even with that of Jesus, before he can become entitled to the better hope. The blood of the New Covenant speaks better things than the blood of the Mosaic. It speaks of the “good things to come” of which Jesus is the high-priest, and not Aaron. It speaks of the good things of the better hope, and of the eternal redemption he hath obtained for his people individually and nationally. It is Israel’s Hope emphatically; and no gentile man or nation can partake of it, that is not sprinkled with the blood of the covenant that sets it forth. Even Israel’s own nation will partake of it in no sense until “all the people” are sprinkled by the covenant blood; for it is by virtue of that blood alone, that they possess the land to be expelled no more; and as for the righteous dead, it is “by the blood of thy covenant, O Messiah, that Jehovah sends forth thy prisoners out of the pit, in which there is no water.”—Zechariah 9: 11.

But Moses sprinkled the Book and all the people with a bunch of hyssop and scarlet wool. He had a vessel containing the water and the blood within convenient reach; but where is the blood of the better covenant? How can access be obtained to it? How can it be sprinkled upon all the people from age to age, and generation to generation, who shall inherit the hope when the time of its development shall arrive? These are questions easily replied to from the testimony of God. The blood of the covenant was poured out of Jesus’ side, bathing his body, and dripping on the dust of Palestine. Had any one caught the blood in a vessel, and with a bunch of hyssop and scarlet wool sprinkled even believing people around, it would have availed them nothing. It would have been presumptive evidence that those upon whom it was found had been engaged in his murder; but it would have been no proof of their interest in the hope of the covenant which it dedicated. It was, when pouring out, the blood of an unrisen Christ; and therefore of no then present efficacy. After Jesus had come to life again, and ascended to the Father, the blood which was dried up was nowhere to be found here; nor if to be found, was it then known to what use it was to be applied. It is evident, therefore, that the existence of, or accessibility to the material blood, is not a question needing to be entertained; and that it was not intended to be used ceremonially, as Moses used the blood of his will. Romish priests pretend to manufacture, or rather incantate wine into material blood of Christ, which like greedy cannibals they permit none to quaff, but their impious selves. But the common use of the covenant blood in sprinkling or drinking was never intended. The blood of the covenant which sanctifies, is no common or unholy thing. It is too precious to be

dispensed indiscriminately in any sense; or to be placed at the disposal of ignorant and fleshly-minded priests. Save the drops that bedewed the dust, Christ took with him his blood to heaven; for “with his own blood he entered in once into the holy place,” “into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.” Standing there before the throne, he appeared as a lamb that had been slain, his wool of snowy white, dyed scarlet with his blood. There is the blood of the covenant; not on earth, but in the holiest of all.

The blood of the covenant being in heaven, and we upon the earth, there must exist some appointed thing as a medium of access to it. The blood is to justify and sanctify, or to cleanse and make holy, those who are sprinkled by it. Such are said to stand in the grace of God, rejoicing in hope of his glory. If then we ascertain how access is obtained into this grace, we also learn how access is obtained to the blood of the covenant. Paul says, “we have access by faith;” a saying which agrees with that of the prophet, “the just shall live by his faith.”—“God,” says Peter, “put no difference between Jews and Gentiles, purifying their hearts by faith.” “I send thee,” said the Lord Jesus to Paul, “to open the eyes of the Gentiles, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them who are sanctified by faith which is into me.” “A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” “There is one God who shall justify the Jews on account of faith, and the Gentiles through the faith.” Such is the testimony of scripture on this all-important subject, which summarily amounts to this, that the sons of Adam are purified, sanctified, justified, or pardoned, and obtain eternal life by faith; in other words, as the apostle says to those who had been delivered from their past sins, “in grace ye are, having been saved (sesosmenoi) through the faith; and this not of (or originating from) yourselves (ex hymon); but the gift of God.” By faith in the faith the great salvation is obtained when the better hope which is the subject of it is no longer unseen, but an eternal and accomplished reality.

To say that a man is purged, purified, or cleansed is the same as to affirm that he is justified, or constituted righteous, and sanctified or made holy it is sin that makes unclean—unclean by nature, because born of sinful flesh; and unclean by practice, because transgressors in the sight of God. The cleansing process is therefore intellectual, moral, and physical. The work begins by cleansing the intellect, casting out as it were all the devils that have established themselves there through the doctrines of fleshly men. This is done by the truth understood and believed. If the soil be good, the truth sown in the understanding will take root in the heart, or moral sentiments, and bring forth “fruit unto holiness, the end of which is everlasting life.” In this way the whole heart is cleansed by a faith yielding obedience, as the apostle saith, “Ye have purified your souls (intellectual and moral faculties) in the obedience of the truth—en tee hypakoe tees aleetheias.” The person so cleansed has no more conscience of past sins, but is able to stand in God’s presence without shame or fear as Adam was before he fell. This is a spiritual cleansing, but no less real and literal for that. “Ye have purified your souls in the obedience of the truth through the Spirit—dia Pneumatos.” Spirit operating upon soul and spirit. How? By the word of truth evangelised enlightening the mind, and creating a right disposition. It is God’s work, not man’s; for the apostle saith, “Of his own will the Father of Lights begat us by the word of truth;” “and this,” saith another, “is the word which is evangelised unto you.”

But the cleansing of the soul needs to be followed by the cleansing of the body to make the purification of the man complete. If the spiritual cleansing have been well done (and if the word of truth have done it, it will) the corporeal cleansing will be sure to follow. Not, however, as a physical effect of the truth diffusing itself over the body as nervous influence

from the brain, and so annihilating evil in the flesh; but a corporeal purification effected by the Spirit at the believer's resurrection, or transformation, as a part of the reward promised to all such who "patiently continue in well-doing." A man so cleansed is every whit whole; and qualified to receive and enjoy the hope of the better covenant by the blood of which he had been "purged from his old sins." Justification and sanctification, therefore, are consequent upon cleansing; hence if a man refuse to be cleansed, or be not cleansed, it is folly for him to talk of being just, or holy, or righteous in the sight of God. He may be what the world calls "good and pious;" he may overflow with the milk of human kindness, be very "wise," and learned, devout of tone, oily in speech, of solemn face, and exuberant in profession of "love" to Christ and all mankind, and may pass before his fellows as a saint too holy for this nether world: but if he have not submitted to the righteousness of God "in the obedience of the truth," he is but a "pious" sinner, uncleaned, and therefore unholy and profane.

(To be continued in our next.)

* * *

BAPTO-MILLERITE DENNISISM

IN ZEALOUS AFFECTION AGAINST THE EDITOR'S INTERPRETATION OF THE PROPHETIC WORD.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." —PROVERBS.

Since writing our "Editorial Dialogue with Crito," but before the number of the Herald containing it was mailed to its destination, and between the brief interval of our return from Kentucky, and departure for Virginia, we received among the letters that had accumulated in our absence the following earnest epistle from our much-esteemed friend, J.B. Cook, who has "a zeal of God, but not," as we believe, "according to knowledge." It will be seen from what follows, that this is precisely the judgment he has formed of us. He is not, however, content to treat us with the same forbearance we have exercised towards him (of which, indeed, he makes grievous complaint); but urges us to come out, and wrestle with him in our own proper person, that we may either, we suppose, receive his blessing, or forever after go halting upon the thigh! But the heat of the weather is very oppressive, and our good friend in a great perspiration from the "prolonged suspense" he has endured (which too plainly indicates the arterial activity, and therefore torridity, of his constitutional furnace); that cool and unexcited as we are, we scarcely know how to accept the challenge of so zealous and fervid a combatant! He is calling us out to what he evidently regards our sure and certain overthrow. Surely this is enough to give one pause before he expose himself to such disaster. Alas, poor David with thy string and stone, may we not tremble with thee as thou issuedest forth from the tent of Saul! For forty days Goliath boasted against the "silence" and inaction of Israel, which he regarded as "a concession" of defeat! Truly he was a great and formidable opponent; but then what chance has an uncircumcised Philistine against the ruddiest stripling of the armies of the living God? He preached defiance to his own destruction. "Give me a man," cried he, "that we may fight together;" and after less than "a yea" a feeble youth stepped forth, and laid him lifeless with the dust! What a lesson for the uncircumcised! But to the epistle of our friend Cook, which was fast receding from our view. He says:

"Dear Brother,

I yield to brother Marsh's wish, and send the article enclosed. Now do be patient, and meet the points, if possible. I am grossly in the dark if you are not utterly mistaken. But I am willing to be corrected. I may not have guarded every point, nor any point, as I might against

attack. My object is to develop the subject more fully. Now please take up the points as they stand, and admit or rebut; but do not dodge them, and prolong the suspense of honest inquiry. Thus in all kindness I suggest. I have made my points as palpable as possible, that there may be no misunderstanding.

You are requested to read this article; and should you judge best to say nothing, then (so far as I am concerned, very well) please return it soon, at first convenience, to me in Rochester. Please don't delay in publishing if you intend to publish; and drop me one line saying, "I publish or not," as you decide. And much oblige yours

J. B. COOK.

Rochester, June 8, 1855.

* * *

REMARKS.

We will endeavour in patience to possess our soul, as our friend desires. And surely we have given him an earnest of how patiently disposed we are in "not one word having come from the Author of Anatolia for near a year," in answer to the much he has written against our views in the columns of the Expositor. We will try to be still more patient, and to reason gravely against what to our mind is self-evidently at variance with the truth.

We willingly accept our friend's alternative. Either he is grossly in the dark, or we are. Disobedient as he is to the gospel of the kingdom in our belief, we cannot both be right. If his views of faith and obedience be scriptural, he is one of "the servants of God;" but if ours be the scriptural ones, he is not one of those servants, however pious he may be as a Baptist, a Millerite, or an advocate of the chartology of Sir Edward Dennis. This is a more important consideration in the premises than some of our readers may suspect. Now, let them note the following proposition and its proofs, and we think they will discern the principle, that

The revelations of God are made known to, and for the benefit of, his servants; and for no others.

In proof of this give heed to the following testimonies.

1. "Surely Jehovah God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."—Amos 3: 7.
2. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them His covenant."—Psalm 25: 14.
"His secret is with the righteous."—Proverbs 3: 32.
3. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him TO SHOW UNTO HIS SERVANTS things which must shortly come to pass."—Revelations 1: 1; 22: 6.
4. "The Secret of God shall be finished in the days of the seventh angel, as he had declared the glad tidings to his servants the prophets."—Revelation 10: 7.
5. "None of the unjustified shall understand; but the instructed shall understand."—Daniel 12: 10.

Now, in these passages "Jehovah's servants," "them that fear him," "the righteous," and "the instructed," are those that "do righteousness;" for "he that doeth righteousness is righteous." To those servants who do "God's righteousness," Jesus says, "thenceforth I call

you not servants . . . but friends;” and “Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.” Now, he has commanded men who would be his servants and friends, to believe the gospel of the kingdom he preached before he was crucified, and to be baptised. If any man doubt that the Lord Jesus has thus commanded let him turn to John 12: 48-50. He there tells us that the Father gave him commandment to speak a certain word, which is life imparting; and by which word men are to be judged in the last day. Peter told Cornelius that that word was sent to the children of Israel, and began to be spoken by Jesus in Galilee after John had finished; and Matthew testifies that the word he preached was the gospel of the kingdom—see chapter 4: 23. Now this being uncontrovertible, Jesus said, “This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the habitable for a testimony to all the nations” thereof; and that this might begin to be effected he furthermore said to his eleven apostles after his resurrection, “Go ye into all THE STATE and preach the gospel to every creature; he having believed and having been baptised shall be saved; but he having not believed shall be condemned:” and that the preaching of this gospel of the kingdom might be carried on to its full accomplishment as a sign of the approaching end of Judah’s commonwealth, he sent Peter to Cornelius, and Paul to the Gentiles at large, saying to the latter, “I now send thee to them, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by that faith (which leads) into me.”

Here, then, was one of the things commanded to be done by the Gentiles if they would be recognised by the Lord Jesus as his servants and friends! But if we do it not, he pronounces sentence of condemnation upon us, and we remain in the darkness under Satan’s power.

Now, we believe, that our friend Cook is too honest a man, and with all his traditions has attained to too much knowledge of the nature of the kingdom, to affirm that before he was numbered into the Baptist Denomination he believed the gospel or glad tidings of the future Palestine Kingdom. But, before he was numbered he had a faith of some sort. Now, suppose at that particular point of time one had said to him, “it is written, He having believed not the gospel of the kingdom shall be condemned,” what plea could he have put in why the condemnation should not rest upon him? He would, perhaps, have said, “I believe in Jesus as Son of God;” but it might be objected by his questioner, “Do you believe the gospel of the kingdom that Son of God was sent to preach?” He would have been dumb! For he knows well he was ignorant of the whole matter. Now will any scripturally enlightened man, nay, will our friend Cook himself, affirm, that the dipping of such a subject in water under any formula, would constitute him a justified, and sanctified servant and friend of God? Such an one would be destitute of the faith which leads into Christ, therefore no dipping could place him there; and not being there, he would be no part of “Abraham’s Seed,” and consequently “a stranger from the covenants of promise.”

But, if he say, that before he was dipped he did believe the gospel of the kingdom hereafter to be set up in Palestine, with the twelve tribes of Israel for its subject-nation, and Jesus and his brethren, the Saints, for its glorified and immortal rulers, —then he involves himself in the unpardonable guilt of apostasy; for when he became a Millerite these ideas were an offence to his inmost soul. The alternative, then, for our amiable and zealous friend is infidelity or apostasy as a Baptist and a Millerite. Which horn of the dilemma will he accept? While, however, he is settling this important question with his own conscience, we will proceed to remark, that Jesus Christ did not receive the apocalypse from God that he might send and show by it, coming events to infidels and apostates, dipped or sprinkled; but, on the contrary, that he might show them to those “who keep the commandments of God, and have

the testimony of Jesus Christ.”—Revelation 12: 17; 13: 10; 14: 12. To these “in the time of the end” the symbols of the prophets become intelligible, because they are “taught of God;” who always begins the work of instruction by teaching his disciples the first principles of his oracles before he enlightens them in the profounder mysteries of his word. Hence, the reason why so few in this time of the end are able to interpret the prophets. Few of the would-be interpreters are taught of him. They are like our friend Cook, taught of Capt. Miller, or of Baptistism, or of some other Gentilism before they have attained the faculty of thinking unbiasedly for themselves. Hence their heads are preoccupied with the traditions of men, which so oppress their faculties, that when they would think in harmony with the word they are for ever straying off into the old foolishness, and losing themselves in the clouds. For this reason it is that we wrote ANATOLIA, and propose hereafter to write an interpretation of the Apocalypse; because we know of no interpretation in existence in harmony with THE GOSPEL JESUS PREACHED. How can men interpret the prophets successfully who are in ignorance of this great burden of prophecy? Paul says, that the gospel to which he was separated “God had promised before through his prophets in the holy scriptures.” The gospel is therefore the burden of prophecy, which prophecy those who know not the gospel are ever and anon most absurdly trying to explain. It is therefore not to be wondered at that their failure is universal. If Mr. Miller had understood the gospel the world would never have had Millerism to laugh at; and if that remnant of his disciples who were for burning up the world last June, had been students of the scriptures instead of being occupied in wresting them to their own destruction, they would have saved themselves a world of mortification and reproach.

Our friend Cook must take it in good part when we say, that it is impossible for him to understand so long as he remains as he is. Jehovah says that “None of the unjustified shall understand;” for such are not right in the head, and therefore wrong in the heart: because the good seed are they “who understand with the heart, and are converted.” Now, he will recollect how often he used to quote Daniel in ’43 to prove that Millerites were “the wise,” and all others, especially the “carnal Judaisers,” “the wicked;” as in the common version, “None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand!” In those days, we were classed among “the wicked,” and he among “the wise.” But he now confesses that he was not wise in ’43; and, as he then recognised no middle class, that confession places him among “the wicked,” and us among “the wise;” because time has proved that we did understand. What evidence does his subsequent history present that he is not still among “the wicked,” with whom his own judgment has placed him? We know of none. Need we then enter into a laboured argument to prove that he is “grossly in the dark” in showing that we are “not utterly mistaken?” Our amiable friend acknowledges that he was “grossly in the dark” in ’43; and though he has been collecting some scattered rays upon immortality, the punishment of the wicked, the restoration of the Jews, &c., it is not much longer than a year ago, if so long, that on coming into contact with “exegetical theology,” then newly imported into Rochester, his instability was again manifesting itself in his advocacy of Sir Edward Dennis’ theory of the cloudy habitation of Jesus and the saints, not in, but ballooning, as it were, over the Holy City! There is no telling where to find our friend Cook long together; for he seems to be everything by turns, and nothing long. He classes himself with “the wicked,” and then marches upon us with banners flying for a fight! For a whole year we have imposed silence upon ourselves which he sadly misinterprets. In a note to his article, he says, “The Doctor’s silence for near a year, is it a concession of his error?” Nay verily, dear friend, it is no concession; but arising from extreme unwillingness to deliver our convictions, even in the most guarded and softened words, lest their intention or animus should be misconstrued. We are encouraged, however, to hope that the plainness of our speech will be accepted without

offence. Our friend says, "I am willing to be corrected;" and as we take him to be an honest man, we believe he means what he says; and will accept of our correction as the faithful wounds of a friend. We hope so; for we can assure him, that we only break silence for the satisfaction of himself and friends. We have no desire to say anything harsh or offensive; but when called out, and we consent to answer the call, our views will find expression after a fashion of their own.

I am sorry, however, that our friend has not a better opinion of his points than appears from his admission. "I may not have guarded every point," says he, "nor any point, as I might against attack." This, however, he ought to have done to the best of his ability. We see many vulnerable places in his entrenchments, through which we shall easily carry the points; but as he is so very bellicose, and having at length stirred us up to battle, we would rather storm a Sevastopol, than blow up an ill-defended Kertsch.

We do not know upon what ground our friend exhorts us not to "dodge his points." He has certainly never seen anything in our writings evincing a disposition to "dodge" questions, or to get round them. He will see by these remarks that we march straight up to his encampment and break in upon it without ceremony. He doubtless perceives that instead of amusing himself and friends in firing whole broadsides upon our positions, he has yet to learn how to handle his pieces without shattering himself into annihilation! But if he will fight, we can assure him he shall have no reason to complain of not being fairly, and sufficiently hewed in pieces.

But all we can do this month is what is already done. Being on the eve of starting for Virginia time fails us to do more than to leave this preface for the printer to work upon in our absence. On our return, we will carry his "points," and see if they are not more dangerous to himself than to those against whom he points them. So till then may it all be well!

EDITOR.

July 4th, 1855.

* * *

A CHRISTIAN HEBREW'S ADDRESS TO HIS COUNTRYMEN.

In our report of the meeting at the Asbury Episcopal Methodist Temple, for the organization of the "American Hebrew Christian Association," we remarked that brother Lederer addressed the Jews present in German. But not being sufficiently acquainted with that tongue, we were unable to give a report in our June number of what he said. This inability, however, has been satisfactorily supplied by brother Lederer himself, who, at our request, has furnished the following translation of his address, for the readers of the Herald, who, we assured him, were deeply interested in all things pertaining to Israel. Could we have furnished it in our June report, it would have formed an admirable contrast to the absurd rhodomontade of "The Rev." Mr. Harris, and have shown how different the effect of the Gospel of the Kingdom upon the human understanding, compared with that produced by the galvanised wood-altarism of the Apostasy. The reader, however, can reperuse Mr. Harris' rant, and then read brother Lederer's address, and he will yet be enabled readily to perceive the difference, and to discern the wonderful dissimilarity essentially existing between the thinking of the flesh and the thinking of the Spirit in a form the least pretending. As brother Lederer writes in a language not his own, the reader will make all necessary allowances; and consider the ideas, rather than the form in which they are expressed. Born in Bohemia, and domiciled in

Hungary, the German of the address and the English of the translation are both, though not equally, barbarous to his tongue. His English, however, is highly creditable, considering the short time he has attended to its rules. The following are his remarks:

Brethren and Sisters of Israel,

Longer than sixteen centuries ago the history of the new covenant makes no mention of a Jewish-Christian congregation or brotherhood, although the same history tells us of a great number of pious, faithful, and strong defenders, yea, martyrs for the sake of their Messiah—Jesus of Nazareth—who were of our nation—Jews indeed.

It would take too much time, and be beyond our ability, to count all those men who are mentioned in sacred history and written in the book of life; I may only, therefore, make the following few remarks to encourage your hearts and to elevate your joy in the Lord.

About the year of our Lord 130, a certain man, named Marcus, was elected as Bishop of Aelia (this was the name of the renewed city of Jerusalem under the reign of the Emperor Hadrian). “That Marcus,” says Eusebius of Caesarea, “was the first bishop of Gentile birth; his fifteen predecessors were all of the Hebrew race, resided at Jerusalem, and kept the knowledge of Christ pure and unadulterated; they preached the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, as Jesus—Messiah—himself and his apostles preached it.” “Because,” continues the same author, “the whole church of believers consisted of faithful Hebrews from the time of the Apostle until the war with Severus, under the reign of Adrian.” The names of those fifteen overseers were—Jacobus, Simeon, Justus, Zachaus, Tobia, Benjamin, John, Mathaie, Phillippi, Seneca, Justus the Second, Levy, Epherus, Joseph, Juda. Yet in the course of their times the Gospel was passing over to the Gentiles; and in the same measure as the Church of the Messiah increased by accessions from the Gentiles, the Jewish-Christians stepped more and more backward, until they receded entirely from view. Only a few of Jehovah’s ancient people of the covenant shone like glittering stars in the history of the Church of our Messiah, the King of Israel.

When the abomination of the Popes of Rome overspread the world, darkened the light of the Gospel, and pushed aside the pure doctrines of the Messiah, the single stars of Judah’s race disappeared from the so-called Christian heaven—a thick veil was thrown over our people; for what honest and intelligent Jews could be persuaded to embrace that cruel idolatry for the holy religion of the Messiah? Only here and there a few unhappy Jews, who, either to save their lives or their property, confessed seemingly, and did homage to the false god of Rome. Of course those unhappy men did all they could to make the world forget that they were Jews—that they belonged to that people once the beloved first-born of Jehovah, but now delivered up for a shame and scorn of all nations upon the earth, because of their unbelief. They were ashamed of the name of Israelite—the most glorious name ever a nation bore.

Since the time of the Lutheran Reformation a bright spark out of Israel again glittered here and there, and left beneficent and blissful traces behind them. But in the current century, and especially in the last twenty years, a new life has begun more particularly to move the dead and dry bones of our people; and almost as in the days of old, a great many have become believers that the Lord Jesus is the promised Messiah, the King of the Jews, amongst whom a considerable number of highly learned and respectable men, who, by their piety and true Christian conduct, receive the esteem of their fellow men. Allow me, dear brethren, to make mention of some of those men who are considered true disciples of our Messiah in our time:

Professor Neander (the author of renowned Church History); Professor Ladis, Dr. Biesenthal, and the bookseller Low, at Berlin; Dr. Cappadosa and his brother; Dr. Da Costa, a missionary in Amsterdam; Israel Saphir, Isadiou Tauber, of Pesth in Hungary; Mr. Elvin and the brothers Rorber, in Hamburg; Hausmeister, in Strassburg; and finally, who knows not the name Herschell, of London, that unwearied labourer for Israel; and, last of all, I mention a man who recently made the good confession, that Jesus of Nazareth is the anointed King of the Jews, Dr. Israel Pick, one of the Rabbis of Lemburg.

But yet more: the national ambition of Israel was awakened in those who acknowledged Jesus the Nazarene as their Messiah. They were not ashamed to be called “Jews.” On the contrary, they became convinced that they have to boast of, and that it is a great honour to be, a real Jew. I hope, my dear Jewish brethren and sisters, that you all who are present participate with me in rejoicing that we are Jews, because one of our ancestors, the Apostle Paul, boasted of and felt very glad that he was a Jew. He says to the Gentiles when he speaks of the Jews, “To whom pertain the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.” Yet more: “Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.”

Salvation cometh only of the Jews. Already the mightiest and most intelligent nations verbally acknowledge Jesus the Messiah of Israel as Lord, who will soon appear again on earth in power and great glory, to judge and rule over all in justice and in righteousness.

And this, my beloved brethren, is our hope, that the same Jesus who died on the cross for our sins, and arose from the dead for our justification, and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in Heaven, will descend again upon the earth to renew the fallen Tabernacle, the overturned throne of his father David, to reign in the midst of his again gathered, again favoured people, Israel in Jerusalem, the capital of that land of which we Jews are the legitimate heirs, according to God’s own promises; for thus saith the Lord by the mouth of his servant Isaiah:

That hope of Israel has been preached by our blessed Messiah himself, as well as by all his Apostles; and for the sake of that hope Paul was summoned before the judgment of Caesar. It is true that that most important part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—the glad tidings of the restoration of Israel as a nation in Palestine, under the personal government of their King, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of David—has been long ago forgotten entirely; our Gentile friends in spiritualising the Word of God have deprived Israel of their hope, and interpreted all those precious promises, given exclusively to Israel, for a spiritual Israel. They have fitted all to the “Church,” though it accords with the testimony no better than “the fist upon the eye,” (a proverb in German, signifying the unfitness of a thing; so that when an interpretation is unsuitable and far-fetched, they say “It looks no better than the fist upon the eye.”). Yet, notwithstanding the already mentioned circumstances, and also, that until this very time there is a great multitude of pious ministers and Doctors who are continually spiritualising away the inheritance of Jacob, and evaporating the hope of Israel, we—we Jews—who, by the grace of God, have become the co-heirs with the Lord Jesus, we Jews know that all the promises of God are yea and amen. The God of Israel is faithful, and will carry out his purposes in the due time.

My dear brethren, glorious things are in store for us who are of Israel; but if we would have a share in Israel’s kingdom—if we would be partakers with Christ, our King—we must

then walk in the light of the Gospel—we must believe what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles taught, and we must also do according to the commandments of Jesus: we must be obedient to our glorious King, and we must show to the world the fruits of our faith—kindness, benevolence, and meekness towards every man; and truth, sincerity, and faithfulness in all our doings. Yet the sweetest and most costly fruit of faith is love—lovingkindness toward all, especially to the brethren.

Therefore, brethren, let us make a covenant; let us constitute a brotherhood in the name of our Messiah; let us not stand separate in the world, pining away amongst the nations, as if we had not had one father, Abraham; as if we had not one and the same hope. Let us encourage one another in the time of affliction; exhort one another, if we err from the right way; and help and assist one another, if we are in want and distress. When we do thus, then the names of Judah and Israel will again be exalted to that high degree, so admirably illustrated by the Christian worthies of our nation contemporary with the time of the first appearing of our glorified Messiah and King. Be not afraid, be not ashamed, my dear Jewish brethren, if the world calleth us “proselytes.” It is not true. We are not the proselytes: but all those of the Gentiles who profess Jesus, our King, as their Lord, they are the proselytes. We are the root, they are the branches; they do not bear us, we bear them—numerous, and rich, and mighty as they may be; and few, poor, and unnoticed as we are. We know that there was a time when the Apostle Peter must be instructed by a vision from heaven before he dared to receive a pious Gentile family, a Cornelius and his house, into the Church of the Messiah, and that only with that revealed purpose of God could Peter make his defence successfully before the congregation at Jerusalem.

But, my dear friends, you must not misunderstand me, as if I would imply that we have any prerogatives over and above our adopted brethren of the Gentiles. No, by no means. All they who become true Israelites by adoption are the children of Abraham like ourselves; because, before God “there is no respect of persons”—there is no difference between Jew and Greek, slave or free: all are equally guilty, and can only be saved upon the same terms—by Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah. Yet this I would say, that there are testimonies in the Word of God speaking of promises in particular to Israel, the literal Israel, consisting of flesh and blood, not of gas, that must be also fulfilled in the literal, and not in a spiritual Israel.

In meeting the objections that have been made to our enterprise, of organising a “Jewish-Christian Brotherhood,” as if we were tending to form a new sect, I would like not to be misunderstood. I would tell you in few words that we have nothing to do with any ism or ist in the world. No matter to what “visible church” any of us may belong, none of us must lose sight of our common hope, our common Messiah, or King, who is—or, rather, should be—the chief cornerstone of all churches—our all in all. Let none of us forget that we are not baptised in the name of Luther, or Calvin, or John Wesley, nor into any other name under the heaven, but into the name of Jesus; and before that glorious name all others must stand in the shadow of midnight, highly as we may esteem them. My dear brethren, I repeat it once more, the object of our association is for nothing else than to encourage, to exhort, to comfort, and to help one another; to forbear and to forgive one another; or, with one word, to love one another!

And now, my dearly beloved, let me conclude with the last words of the Prophet Micah: “Who is a God like unto thee? that pardoneth iniquity and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger forever, because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our

iniquities, and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depth of the sea. Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old.”

* * *

OF THE NECESSITY OF THE REIGN OF CHRIST.

This is a question of the highest importance, and of rapidly increasing interest. It is worthy of the deepest consideration. The common idea of the world goes no further than the vague conception of a kingdom established in the heavens ever since the creation. The Kingdom of the Creator is the only kingdom which the world will recognise. The religious world, as it is called, will venture a step further, and admit a kind of spiritual kingdom, established in the hearts of true believers. A strange kingdom indeed! A kingdom scattered here and there amidst the multitude of unbelievers, and which never more than a fifth established in the hearts of those who call themselves “the people of God.” Yet both the worldly and religious are satisfied with these empty shadows, and quite pleased to think that the earth is left to them to govern and improve; and that no interruption is to be feared from the personal presence of the Lord. They cannot bear to think that after all their projects of improvement, their boasting of imaginary success, their vast collections of gold and silver, their fluent speeches—the world is still going onward to destruction, and can never be regenerated but by the presence of the Lord. And yet this is not only a scriptural truth, but it has become fearfully self-evident. The necessity of a new government has become visible over all the earth. The impossibility of human government is forcing itself upon the minds of all. Europe is divided between the two great powers of Absolutism and Revolution. Each watches the other with glaring eyes; suspicion, perfidy, and hatred fill the breasts of all, and nothing but opportunity is wanting for the dread conflict to begin. The true description of the European States is that of Absolutism kept in check by Anarchy, and Anarchy held down by Absolutism. The two rival powers, locked in each other’s arms, roll and struggle on the ground in a conflict of life and death, and effectually obstruct every hope of progress. This unnatural state is unendurable, and must end either in the triumph of one of these odious antagonists, or in the complete subversion of moral principles through the increasing violence of every hateful passion. Society cannot exist amid a perpetual action and reaction, which tear its fibres into pieces and rend asunder all its ties. England, with its boasted advancement, is dying, like America, of excess liberty, like a wild horse running himself to death. And yet it is not liberty after all, but tyranny in disguise—the tyranny of the lowest minds. The balance of our constitution is destroyed. The Sovereign is only a splendid name. The high-born aristocracy, which inherits the honour of its ancestry, is scarcely permitted a single legislative right, it must tamely register the laws which have been enacted by the Commons. The Commons themselves are equally debased, and have now become common indeed. Men, ignorant of everything except their own small profession, without education or high thoughts, or the lofty recollections of their ancestry. These men of the most selfish hearts and the meanest minds, have usurped the direction of affairs, and are labouring for the advancement of their own class, completely indifferent to the destruction of all others. The rural population, reduced to the utmost distress by recent measures, is crowding into our great cities, contending with each other for the bare means of existence, and exposed to the demoralising influences and squalid misery of our over-peopled towns. Slowly, and unperceived, the false measures of government are undermining the fortunes and prosperity of the whole nation, and bringing on a state of pauperism or anarchy; yet no man suspects the approaching crisis, or is honest enough to acknowledge its approach.

But there is one circumstance of the present day, which alone is sufficient to paralyse the wisest government, and to reduce human sagacity to despair—and that is, the increase of population. (Before the Eastern War is over, England will have no reason to complain of its excess. —EDITOR HERALD.) The limits of the Old World have long been fixed by the laws of policy and nations. One country when over-peopled cannot intrude upon the frontiers of another in order to expand its territory. There are no western woods like those of the New World to receive for ages the overflowing multitudes. The people, shut up within the landmarks of their ancestors, strive in vain to expand, and ask for room to live. They crowd into the great cities for bread, and they find hardly room to die. The very grave-yards are overfilled. Life swarms above the soil and Death below; and the two worlds of the living and the dead are brought into hideous competition! The tortured Government heaps up its statistics, its reports, its waste-paper enactments, to form an embankment against the tide. The dread waters roar and swell and overtop the barriers. Science and agriculture exhaust their skill to palliate the suffering. The disease becomes fiercer every day, and threatens to destroy the physician and the patient. Amidst these scenes of perplexity and despair—this grim battle of life and death—there is but one triumphant class, and that the most, most sordid of all—the manufacturing interest. This class rejoices in the ruin it has made. It sweeps together from the corners of the land, all the fragments of the broken population; collects them in the great towns like a drove of bewildered oxen, and compels them to work like beasts of burden from morning to night, for the bare necessaries of existence. It reduces men below the brutes, crowded together in poisonous alleys, without the light or air of heaven—without leisure to look into themselves, without a hope or even a fear for eternity. Far away from the fresh face of nature and the fields, more brutalised and wretched than the savage, who can look at least on the pure sky, and stray along the banks of some wild, sequestered stream. The savage himself lives on nothing worse than human flesh; but the master manufacturer lives upon the very souls of men! Earth to him is but a grinning workshop, and heaven and hell are a laughable imposture. He grinds the souls and bodies of thousands that he himself may revel in luxury and ease, and (shame to his hypocrisy) that he may be admitted to a haughty bow from the aristocracy, which he pretends to despise. The race of the PERCYS and the PLANGTAGENETS, if careless of the blood of others, were equally careless of their own. They were the first to enter the field of danger, and the last to leave it. But the chivalry of the Cotton Mill is of a different order. Men who have never exposed a finger to a scratch; who surround themselves with all the ease and luxury of wealth, and then wear out the souls and bodies of their slaves in order to aggrandise themselves, while they slander our troops whose blood has been shed in the protection of our commercial empire. Such is the chivalry, the aristocracy, which now holds the government of England. What result may we expect from so ignoble a supremacy? Nothing but national degradation under the power of men who have proved themselves hitherto incapable of one elevated thought. Nothing but national misery, where the interests of the many are sacrificed to the aggrandisement of the few.

MEN OF SCIENCE have equally been tried and found wanting. At the commencement of the Revolution of 1848, the most eminent men of science were placed at the head of the French Government. Wonders were expected from their concentrated talents, and a millennium of philosophy was thought to be at hand. But the failure of the French philosophers was the most pitiable spectacle of that year of follies. Nothing was effected, either civil or military. France was compelled, for her own existence, to place herself first under the government of a soldier, and then under that of an adventurer; and both the soldier and the adventurer have shown more political wisdom than all the men of science united! Philosophy can never raise her head again, nor will she ever again be entrusted with the

cabinets of empires. And it has been found in all ages, that men of science are, of all men, the most unfitted for the conduct of public affairs. In Germany, the men of learning and science have also made a trial of their skill in the Frankfort Parliament, and the result was only not more pitiable than in the case of the French Philosophers, because nothing more pitiable could exist. Childish weakness was the characteristic of both, without the redeeming quality of childish innocence. They were all as wise as doves, and harmless as serpents. And thus terminated forever the Millennium of Philosophy, and the empire of the sword has been revived.

On great and momentous truth has now been forced upon the minds of all thinking men, and of all who can think like men. The world is advancing to some unknown point. Some great collision is at hand, or some complete and final revolution. The highest point of civilisation is the lowest point of godliness. And having reached the highest point of civilisation, the world is found in a dreadful state. It can go no further in civilisation without being overwhelmed by its own multitudes; and it can go no further in ungodliness, without casting off all connection with God. It is, therefore, manifestly approaching some unknown point—some fearful crisis. This truth is perceived by many, but it is felt by all; and men look in each other's eyes with the expression of a crew driven before the wind on some iron coast. The FUTURE, the future is the paramount subject of every mind. Kings, statesmen, philosophers, and revolutionists, all are occupied with the FUTURE; and all are equally perplexed. Suns, stars, and comets have been depended on in vain. Monarchs, statesmen, and conquerors have each been tried; each have succeeded for a day and promised for a century; but the efforts of all have been defeated. "Cursed is the man that putteth his trust in man." So says the Scripture; and that curse is indefeasible!

Oh! earth, earth! when wilt thou learn in the history of the Past the desperation of Future—and welcome the Kingdom of Messiah as thy last and appointed refuge, saying, "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, who art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken unto thee thy great power, and hast reigned." Meanwhile, in spite of the rage, and enmity, and impostures of the world, the prophetic sentence shall be executed—"I will overturn, overturn, overturn (David's throne), until He shall come whose right it is; and I WILL GIVE IT HIM."

Torquay, England, September, 1851.

* * *

A CLERGYMAN'S EXPERIENCE OF SOCIETY.

NO. 4.

March 10, 18—.

During the week it is my duty to preach two sermons to a congregation composed of very different classes. According to the general theory, my message is to be delivered to the soul. I have to awaken the consciousness of sin, to produce pain, and then to point out the remedy. I am to believe that all the members of my congregation are in earnest about their spiritual condition, have implicit faith in the doctrines that I am supposed to teach, and are willing to accept me as the authorised exponent of divine truth. I have failed—miserably failed. Of course, it may be my own fault. Possibly I am attempting to perform duties for which I have no faculties. But it is too late now to think of that. The custom is for every clergyman, qualified or not, to preach, and I must obey. * * * *

I am intensely conscious that I have a message to deliver, but, strange to say, after several months' experience, I find that I cannot deliver it within the pale of the Established Church. I have only shocked my congregation when I wished to open their eyes. Here is my story. I had made acquaintance, more or less intimate, with the different classes of persons in my parish. The best streets and the suburbs were inhabited by the wealthier sort. As I have said before, they were, for the most part, without education. To be sure, they had sent their children to school; but the sons had all gone into business at a very early age, and the daughters had been taken away from school at the period when the young ladies of this century are supposed to have completed their education. The consequence of this system may be easily imagined. From first to last, they were all worshippers of wealth. The dream of their existence was to accumulate money. For what, indeed, I never could discover. I often tried to find out how they spent their days. As for the men, they went down to their places of business, in the morning, and returned home, with their whole souls intent on loss and gain, to spend their nights in feasting. I do not mean that they were vicious or immoral. You could find no positive fault with men whose notions of living were confined within such narrow limits. You could only pity them and try to rouse them from their torpor. Everything in their houses betokened their love of sordid wealth. There was nothing graceful. The rooms were crowded with the most expensive furniture—massive chairs of bright mahogany, heavy sideboards, ugly portraits of different members of their families, gorgeous curtains, and resplendent fireplaces. But they were all for show. The drawing-room was rarely used. Except on grand occasions, the chairs and tables were literally packed up as if for removal. There was a cold, cheerless, and yet contemptuous look about everything. I felt sometimes as if I was stricken dumb by the sight. I knew that, in their eyes, the mere possession of so much wealth conferred an infinite superiority.

The women spent their days between buying fine clothes, gossiping, and husband hunting. Perhaps I was dull, but I thought that they did not know what conversation meant. At all events, I always felt quite isolated, as if I had not one subject in common with them. Now, what was to be done with such people? Certainly there were many, both men and women in my congregation, for whom I had profound respect. Some ladies there were who had formed themselves into a society for visiting the sick, others professed great zeal for the conversion of Jews and heathens. With a strong faith in spiritual Christianity, and an inexplicable belief in what is called the Millennium, they literally had no place in the world themselves, and did their best to seduce everybody else from its pleasures and pursuits. But I could excuse a good deal of this absurdity, for the practical philanthropy which it concealed or kept alive. It was the fine ladies and rich men who, at first, perplexed me most. As I said, I took orders under protest. I had forced myself into the profession of certain doctrines which I very soon found I could not conscientiously teach. My plan was this: It was very obvious that the people who came to church were professing Christians. I must speak to them as persons within the pale. It was easy therefore to ask them whether they lived up to their profession. I stated, in the plainest and most forcible language, the chief doctrines of Christianity, and then showed them that they were as far removed from Christian practice as the sun is from the earth—in other words, that they were a living lie. I abjured them to declare themselves. I besought them to do one of two things—either to reject the faith or to conform to the practice. I wished to bring matters to a test. I did not use vague platitudes about Heaven, Hell and the Divine wrath. That kind of preaching had long ceased to produce any effect save that of a pleasurable excitement. I am really astounded at the grim satisfaction with which Churchgoers (I will not call them Christians) can contemplate the prospect of several millions of people suffering eternal torment. But I made fierce and repeated attacks upon the idol which they all worshipped. I tried to destroy their faith in money, and, strange to say, they took it ill. They rebelled against

my iconoclasm. They called me in private hard names enough; I was everything bad by turns. Chartist, Communist, infidel—such was the man whom the bishop had appointed to be their teacher. After one sermon that I preached, it was bruited everywhere that I had become a Roman Catholic! Most innocently I had quoted—with a certain eulogium upon the man—a very remarkable passage from the writings of John Newman. Because I regretted that so much genius had gone into servitude, I was denounced as a heretic. No wonder, perhaps, when I recollect the impression produced in that same pulpit by a man who applied the most opprobrious epithets to some who, however mistaken, had still given up everything for the sake of conscience, and this to people who scarce knew the meaning of the word self-denial! Again, I happened to quote an apt passage from one of Macaulay's Essays, describing the system of the Roman Catholic Church—and, behold, I was again denounced as a Jesuit in disguise. * * * *

Even the poorer classes shrunk from this kind of teaching, and I was well nigh in despair: I made, however, one more effort. Why should I not try to speak to those who, from different causes, were never found within a place of worship? Among what are called the lower classes, were several mechanics and labourers, who openly rejected Christianity. It surely was my duty, at whatever cost, if not to induce these people to come to church, at least to assist them in working out the problem of life. Accordingly, I asked about a dozen of them to give me an interview. The meeting took place in the library of an institution to which they belonged. It was a narrow room, dimly lighted by gas. There was no carpet on the floor, and a few side shelves, nailed to the wall, were scantily furnished with books. Around a deal table in the centre of the room, were seated the men whom I had invited to meet me. With one exception they were all young. The elder, who acted as spokesman, was about fifty years old, but he looked more like seventy—his hair was quite grey, and the traces of thought and suffering were deeply marked on his brow. He evidently did not know whether to regard me as a friend or an enemy. He was surprised at my request, and though apparently not unwilling to meet my advances, had planted himself in a position of resolute self-defence. The younger men seemed less suspicious, and gave me a hearty welcome. I said, at once, that I had come to speak to them on subjects which I had only studied, but which to them were matters of life and death. I intended to speak with perfect frankness, and begged that they would throw off all restraint. I wished to know their difficulties, religious or social, and, so far as in me lay, to lend my aid in solving them. The older man answered me thus: —“We are very much obliged to you for coming. We are surprised, because, to tell the honest truth, there is no body of men for whom we have such contempt as the clergy. But we are ready to listen to anything you have to say.” I could not but know that the man was speaking the truth. The clergy, and religious people in general, had shunned his class as things “common and unclean.” The doctrines of Christianity were as a wall between them. I therefore, at once, acknowledged the justice of the censure, and explained that, though I had not come to make proselytes of them, I yet wished to show, if I could, that the clergy might still be men, and that Christianity was not the repulsive system they had taken it for. Now I was not speaking to ignorance. These men were employed, for twelve hours a day, in severe manual toil, but they found more time for reading and mental cultivation than the wealthy shipowners and masters who paid them their wages. They knew, as well as I was made to know Thucydides, the writings of Charles Kingsley; they were familiar with Emerson, had learned something of Carlyle, and were hard-working students of Gibbon. Of the social problems of the day, they had no need to learn. They were mistaken, terribly mistaken, in many of their theories, but they were in earnest, and, as I soon found, were ready to be taught. They utterly scorned the notion that I was doing them a favour. The pride of honest labour sat upon their brows. I must speak to them as one of themselves or else hold my peace. They had learnt to respect themselves, and they refused to

be slaves. Still, I had enjoyed opportunities which they had not; they could listen with gratitude to any honest man who would teach without despising them. And this I was willing to do. In point of religion they were what are called infidels, and, as such, rejected, as a whole, the system which contained the special doctrines from which they shrunk. I frankly said that I believed them so far in the wrong. I thought that it was quite possible to teach a social Christianity, with beneficial effect, while I ignored for the moment, all the obnoxious articles of faith. Accordingly I made this proposition: "I do not ask you to come to church; I even think that listening to our services might do you positive harm. But I am ready to preach a course of sermons on social subjects directly addressed to you, and intended to carry out into practice my ideas about a social Christianity." The notion seemed to please them, and they all agreed to come to church. Now, in honest truth, I did not think that I should shock any one by preaching on such subjects. I knew, of course, the prejudice that existed against the introduction of novel doctrines, but I hoped that all earnest Christians would sympathise in any effort that I might make towards the conversion, if you like to call it so, of a large number of my parishioners. I did not, at all events, anticipate the stormy opposition that I encountered. Yesterday I preached my first sermon. I commenced by an introduction, in which I openly stated my views, and I preached a sermon on one of the subjects which I knew to be engrossing public attention. The truth was that, almost unconsciously, I had shown that I did not believe in what is called the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament, and I had besides made a somewhat fierce onslaught on vices which I knew to prevail among, at least, the lower classes in my parish. I cannot describe the confusion which ensued. Next morning I found the parish in an uproar. The churchwardens were for writing to the bishop; I was told that half my congregation would absent themselves from church. In short, the unhappy sermon was infidel, communistic, and—worse than all—indelicate. I believe that some people would have shut their doors against me. I took it all very quietly, and offered my incumbent to resign my charge if he objected to my preaching. He offered no objection, and I am allowed to complete my course. * * * *

May 17, 18—

Altogether I have been successful. I do not mean to take any special credit to myself, but I am sure that if clergymen would reject that narrow theory, which confines their teaching to the inculcation of spiritual Christianity, and be content to deal, even with infidels, upon common ground, they would have an abundant reward. Believe me, a splendid career is before you! Why, if you really hold the truth in your hand, do you think that it applies only to the world beyond? What did your Master do? He was the foremost man in creation—and that, because there was not a human joy in which he could not share, no human woe with which he could not sympathise. Out with you! Proud Pharisees. Preach loudly in your pulpits, hurl forth your bitter sentences, slay this one and that one with the breath of your nostrils, condemn all the world, be worshipped by the few who surround your altars, but separate yourselves from all and everything that looks like heresy.

June 10, 18—

This cannot last. The Church of England is to the full as despotic as the Church of Rome. Every sect confines salvation within the pale of its own believers. Was there ever such a spectacle! Rightly are you named Protestant, for every sect and almost every individual is in a perpetual state of protest. Here is an Established Church unable to understand the signs of the times. She cannot see that she has lost her hold upon the hearts of the people. Her doctrines are not believed, her ritual is not observed, and yet, if a man tries to adapt the teaching of the Church to the wants of the age, he is forthwith denounced as a heretic.

* * *

PHRENOLOGY IN THE PULPIT.

TESTIMONY OF REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

It is very hard for a minister of the gospel, standing before a promiscuous audience, to deal with the facts of their minds, and their inward lives. It is a melancholy fact, that men know less about that which is the very element of their being, than about anything else in the world. I suppose if I were to go among the intelligent men of my congregation, I could get every variety of information on subjects connected with the daily business affairs of life—upon questions of political economy, upon various questions of commerce, facts concerning the structure of ships, steam-engines—I could collect any amount of information on all these, and a thousand other kindred subjects. But when I ask them what is inside of themselves, they can tell me of a great manufactory, and explain to me the operation and use of all the machinery in it; but upon the question of the machinery of their own minds, they cannot say a word. In regard to commercial matters, they know all about them; they have examined them, they have compared their ideas on these subjects, and have classified them. They believe themselves to be immortal creatures, that they have throbbing within them a soul that shall live as long as God himself shall live; yet, when I ask them any questions in regard to their inward nature, their only reply is, “I don’t know, I don’t know.” They do not know what their reason is; they do not know what is the nature of their moral powers; they do not definitely understand the nature or operation of any one faculty of their minds!

They understand the nature of the soil of the earth; they know what it is capable of producing; they know the use of the plough, and all the implements of agriculture; they know what to do with a plant that is not thriving, they are skilful to impart to it a fresh life, and make it flourish. But if any plant that ought to grow in the mind is stunted and does not thrive, they cannot tell how to make that grow. They don’t know what to do to bring it forth.

It is difficult for a minister of the gospel to set forth the truth intelligibly in respect to its relation to the human mind. I think it is partly because men have not been curious in respect to themselves, and partly on account of the many bewildering systems of mental philosophy that are in vogue in our day. For if there were none of these systems except the old schools of metaphysical philosophy, I would defy any man to obtain by means of them any clear idea about the soul, for at best they are of but little more value than so many cobwebs. Men may study them, however, if they have a taste for them; if a man loves logic and discussion, let him take one of the old metaphysical mental philosophies, and he will have means of busying his mind until he grows tired of such business. But if a man wishes to know practically what he is made up of, if a man wishes a knowledge of human nature for definite practical purposes, there is no system which will aid him in acquiring that knowledge like the system of PHRENOLOGY; not interpreted too narrowly or technically, but in its relations to physiology and the structure of the whole body. And I may say here what I have never said before in the pulpit, that the views of the human mind, as they are revealed by PHRENOLOGY, are those views which have underlayed my whole ministry; and if I have had any success in bringing the truths of the gospel to bear practically upon the minds of men, any success in the vigorous application of truths to the wants of the human soul, where they are most needed, I owe it to the clearness which I have gained from this science. And I could not ask for the members of my family, nor of a church, any better preparation for religious indoctrination, than to put them in possession of such a practical knowledge of the human soul as is given by PHRENOLOGY.

I have avoided the use of the nomenclature of PHRENOLOGY in the pulpit as far as possible, because I did not wish to seem to be a mere teacher of a philosophical system, while I was a minister of the truth as it is in Christ; but I have now been so long with you, that I am justified in making this statement.

I may say, in regard to the objections sometimes urged against PHRENOLOGY, its tendency to materialism and fatalism, that the same objections may be made to any other system of mental philosophy. I do not think that such objections belong to PHRENOLOGY any more than to any system of intellectual science which you can possibly construct. Men's mere logical and speculative reason will always strand them upon the sands of fatalism or materialism; and it is the practical sense, the consciousness of actual liberty, that redeems us from a belief of the one or the other. Such doctrines dwell in the head, but never in the HANDS. —Phrenological Journal.

* * *

PROPHETIC DESTINY OF RUSSIA.

The Rev. Dr. Cumming addressed a very full audience on this interesting subject on Tuesday, the 29th ult., in Halkin Street, Belgrave-square, London.

The lecturer began by observing he had no desire to fit predictions in the Scripture to any present and passing events, however stirring. He desired impartially to ascertain whether anything was said in Scripture in relation to the Muscovite empire and its future, and to explain such references as he might discover fairly and without fear. It might be a contribution of some light to those awful subjects on which all parties felt so deeply, and most parties foresee so little. Our duty, he had no doubt, was to meet and repel, if able, the colossal power which for years had been making preparation to overshadow and enslave Europe. Whether we or Russia should eventually succeed might, perhaps, be inferred from prophecy more clearly than seems probable to those who have not studied the subject. The chapter from which he drew his views was the 38th of Ezekiel. He would first identify the names in that chapter as the names of nations destined to play a momentous part in the last days. The names of the nations therein given that were to form themselves into a confederacy in the last times were Gog, Magog, Meshech, Tubal, Gomer, Togarmah, and Tarshish. He referred to the first map of the ancient world, in Bagster's Polyglot Bible, as a very fair picture of the distribution of these races. He showed the descendants of Gog and Magog as inhabiting the east and north east of the Euxine, on the Don, the Dnieper, and the Caucasus. Josephus says, "The Scythians were called Magog by the Greeks."—Caucasus is Gog chasan i.e., Gog's fort. Meshech is settled amid the Moshic Mountains, east of the Black Sea. The river Araxes is Rosh in Arabic, and the people on its banks were first called Rosh. Rosh was the Russian. Tubal was the origin of Tobolsk; Meshech the source of Muscovy. It is the Prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal who is to head the last confederacy. Gomer first settled in Asia Minor, spread into the Crimea, formerly Cimmeria, —a word originating in Gomer, then extended into Germany, or Gomerland. These are to be united in pre-occupying Palestine, now a portion of the Sultan's dominions, and preventing the predicted return of the Jews. From the express prediction in Ezekiel 38, he gathered that this confederacy, of which the Prince of Rosh, Tubal, and Meshech was the leader (i.e. the Czar), had now begun his career. From one part of the chapter he gathered it would be arrested in its course for a little by a quiet, supposed by us to be peace; but only to accumulate again as a gigantic avalanche, driven by irresistible force

towards Palestine. Gomer, or Germany, would unite with Russia, and swell its bulk and add to its impetus. But he showed, after Chamberlain, that “Tarshish, and its lions, described as a commercial, warlike nation, having ships, and wealth, and traffic with the east, which was to oppose and meet the Prince of Rosh with great power, was in all probability the type and symbol of Great Britain.” The lecturer quoted from Bishops Lowth and Horsley, and showed that these great divines concurred in this. From all these and many other grounds he came to the conclusion that Russia would sooner or later possess the Mediterranean, seize Palestine, and on its plains, in the language of the prophet, finally perish amid the judgments of Heaven. He saw in our country’s present course—were only what should be our whole available resources pitched and pointed against Russia, with all our energy—the line of duty and destination also, and, therefore, her and your immunity, as a nation, amid the desolations soon to sweep broad Europe. While precepts alone were to regulate our conduct, it was nevertheless cheering to see it indicated and approved in the page of prophecy. He did not dogmatise on unfulfilled prophecy, still less dare to predict. All he sought to do was to ascertain if Scripture had spoken on the subject, and what it had said. It is clear that statesmen are at their wits’ end; the nation is perplexed; no solution of existing complications is given by any one. The student of prophecy may breathe a free air live on a loftier level, and bring down from the sacred oracles lights of no transient or misguiding tendency. He did not on so difficult a subject give forth dogmatical judgments, or denounce those who differed from him. He left what he had submitted as data for others to entertain, and arrive at or reject his conclusions.

* * *

REVIVAL PREACHERS. —Without disrespect to those concerned, we quote from the Christian Ambassador the following paragraphs:

“This class of ministers has always been regarded with great distrust by the most intelligent class in Christian sects, and in many quarters they have been tolerated rather than respected. At the late anniversary at Andover Theological Seminary, the Rev. M.P. Braman, of Danvers, one of the most talented Orthodox ministers of New England, denominated them the “Mendicant Friars of the Protestant Church.” And he said he had a copy of a letter in his possession from one of this class, in which, by way of negotiating the pay for his services, the gentleman stated that he expected to be instrumental in converting at least two hundred souls, and that they would be worth certainly a dollar a piece. If, added Mr. Braman, conversions were raised to a dollar the head, they should be warranted the genuine article!”

The Ambassador adds the following, which has a queer “ring” coming from a Christian:

“We copy the above from the Boston Transcript. The ‘Mendicant Friar’ we think, put too high a price on his labours. However, Mr. Braman (Br. Whitmore’s old opponent) ought to know the value of a soul when converted to orthodoxy. He thinks, if the article prove genuine, the conversion may, upon the whole, be worth a dollar. Rather dear! But how is the bogus to be distinguished from the genuine? By the brass, to be sure. St. Paul compares a counterfeit Christian to “sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.”

* * *

FRIEND truth before all our friends.

* * *

“BROTHER.”

“Brother,” in ecclesiastical phraseology, is a complimentary term used by one person towards another, expressive of benevolence and good will, or of a wish to be regarded as a friend. It is most frequently employed as a mere form of speech, importing no more than “My Dear Sir,” and “Your Obedient Humble Servant,” at the beginning and end of an epistle. That it is for the most part a complimentary epithet signifying nothing, that is, pledging parties to no principle, is evident from the fact that a little misunderstanding easily transforms it into “Sir,” or “Mister,” which are as easily converted into “brother” again by the healing of the breach. This is the Gentile use of the term—an expression of good feeling to a brother in the flesh.

In scripture its use and signification are various. Thus Lot said to the people of Sodom, “I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly.” Now, speaking of him, Peter says, that “Lot vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds.” He did not, therefore, fellowship their principles in styling them “brethren;” but used the term simply in a propitiatory sense, and expressive of his good will towards them in dissuading them from their wickedness.

It is also used in a national sense, as the phrase “fellow-citizens” is employed among us. Thus Stephen speaking of Moses says, “It came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel,” two of whom he addressed, saying, “Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?” At that time there were three millions of them in Egypt; and multitudes of them co-worshippers of idols with the Egyptians.—Joshua 24: 14. On the visit to the Temple after the Day of Pentecost, Peter addressed the “men of Israel” whom he charged with denying the Holy and Just One, and killing the Prince of Life, as brethren, saying, “Brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.” But, though styling them “brethren,” neither Moses nor Peter fellowshipped their religious principles, or regarded them as in a saved state.

The term, however, is employed in a higher sense than in the uses above recited. All who do the will of the Father in heaven are the brethren of Jesus, and therefore of one another. —Matthew 12: 50; 23: 8; Luke 8: 21. In this testimony, brotherhood is predicated, not on thinking, or believing, but on doing; that is, on obedience—an obedience resulting from belief of what God has announced for faith, and therefore styled “the obedience of faith.” A fraternity of such believers is styled “the brethren,”—John 21: 23, and many other places. Peter was one of these; but in styling them who denied the Just One’s claim to the kingdom and throne of David, “brethren,” he by no means compromised the principles of “the brethren;” or recognised the “men of Israel” as Christians, or the accepted of the Lord.

But there is a sense in which a brother may be a disciple, and yet not a Christian. This was the case with Saul of Tarsus from the time the Lord Jesus appeared to him on the road to Damascus until Ananias’ interview with him. Ananias addressed him as “brother Saul” before he had become obedient to the faith. He was therefore a “brother” in some sense. He was also a “disciple,” being under instruction from God. But though being instructed, or “taught of God,” he was not a “Christian” until he obeyed the words of Ananias. Having heard the word of God and done it, —Luke 8: 21, he became one of “the brethren,” even a brother of the Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore a Christian.

Now, if the reader understands these things he will be able to discern the sense in which we occasionally use the term "brother" when not applicable to the individual in the higher sense. There are non-obedient believers of the gospel of the kingdom who are under instruction, whose proficiency is defective in motive power: that is, their understanding of the truth is not comprehensive enough to move them to the obedience of commands. They have, perhaps, been dipped in water, but may be such babes in knowledge as to fear to repeat immersion lest they should commit sin; or as to think they can patch an old garment with new cloth and convert it into new! These are "brethren" who do not yet belong to "the brethren;" but like snails, with their house upon their back, are creeping along under a mountain of embarrassment in hope of liberty and rest. When we style such "brethren," we are not to be understood as recognising them as of "the brethren in Christ Jesus;" but as so many non-obedient Sauls of Tarsus whom Ananias has not yet visited. On the other hand, we very often apply the terms "Mister" and "Mistress" to those whom we believe are of "the brethren" in deed and in truth. In short, until we can read men's hearts and profession, "comes to be equivalent to principle," we are not disposed to employ "brother" as a term of exclusive fellowship for the theory and practice of any fraternity extant. The Rose of Sharon by any other name will smell as sweet; let us have the rose, and as far as we are concerned, call it what you please. The thing and not the name is what we want. Verbum sapienti sat est.

EDITOR.

August 25, 1855.

* * *