

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, MAY, 1857  
Volume 7—No. 5.

---

Did Moses teach Immortal Soulism, or Resurrection to Immortality of Body?

"A seeker after Truth" has a suspicion that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive; in other words, that the thinking I myself called by those names, is in intellectual activity somewhere. He has no idea that this Abraham-I, this Isaac-I, and this Jacob-I, are the bodies, which, in the days of their existence, were supposed by their simple-minded contemporaries to be the real Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for, says he, "their bodies were dead." Now, this is equivalent to saying, that the Abraham-body is one thing; and the Abraham-possessive pronoun, a different thing. Thus the he is alive, and the body the "he" calls his, is dead; but Terah styled the thing that came out of his loins, Abram, and AIL-SHADDAI afterwards called it Abraham; so that between Terah, God, and our correspondent, we have an Abraham who is at once both dead and alive.

But the Scriptures know nothing about dead and alive Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs; nor of disembodied living men. It speaks of men who were dead and are alive again; but never in a single instance, of men being dead and alive contemporaneously.

They treat of man and his destiny; and in their beginning define what sort of a creature it is they style man. Moses, the go-between, or Mediator between God and the Hebrew Nation, "who," says Paul, "was faithful in all his house (or kingdom) as a servant, for a testimony of these things that were to be spoken after"—Heb. iii. 5; —the great prophet contemporary with the beginning of THE AION (*απ' αἰῶνος*, Acts iii. 21) who have given the only authentic account of the origin of things, has given us also a very intelligible definition of Man. He tells us that Man is a living Soul. He does not say, that man is an everliving, or an immortal, soul; nor that his body contains an immortal soul; but yehi hahahdahm lenephesh khayyah, which literally rendered signifies, the groundling shall be for a living creature.

But, perhaps, we had better give the whole of Gen. ii. 7; and, as we have among our subscribers Jews, who accept and reject Jesus as the Messiah or Christ, we shall give it in the Hebrew as well as in the English.

Translation.

And JEHOVAH ELOHIM, the I SHALL BE, the Spirit of Mighty Ones, Job xxvi. 13; Ps. xxxiii. 4; civ. 29, 30, formed the groundling, dust out of the ground, and he breathed into his nostrils breath of lives, and the groundling was for a living creature.

We have rendered the word Adam by groundling, as the word in our language that is nearest to the original. Groundling is any thing pertaining to the ground: so also adam is that which belongs to adamah, the ground. The adam before it became a living thing, is termed simply "dust out of the ground." The Spirit-former was the potter, and the dust when formed, the clay. Before breath entered into its interior, it was a clay-statue moulded into an "image" of God; and capable, when made a living creature of developing THEIR "likeness." Hence it is written, "THOU madest him a little lower than the ELOIIM, or Angels"—Ps. viii. 5. When the Spirit that garnished the heavens, that same Spirit afterwards incarnate in the resurrected Son of Abraham and David, inspired the clay-statue's lungs with "breath of lives," the groundling became like other breathing frames, a living creature. It became latinically a living human; a word derived from humus, ground: hence homo, for humo, from humus, the latin for man, or a thing made of earth. Thus, an adam is a human, or ground, soul; a soul taken "out of the ground," and therefore "earthy," or a groundling, as we have rendered adam, from its affinity to adamah.

The nishmah khaym is a compound air common to all breathing frames. It is therefore styled khayim of "lives." It is breathed into men and all other creatures of every kind. The nishmah is the atmospheric air, which is compounded chiefly of oxygen, nitrogen, and electricity. In this medium, which is the breath and spirit of Jehovah Elohim, every breathing groundling lives and moves and doth exist. This is evident not from observation only, but from the words of Moses; who in recording the threatened destruction of all antediluvian beings, says, "Behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is Spirit of lives (asher-bo ruakh khayim) from under the heavens; every thing which is in the earth shall die"—(Gen. vi. 17. Then also, in recording the entrance of the saved into the ark, he says, "They went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh wherein is Spirit of lives (ruakh khayim.)—Gen. viii. 15. And again lastly, in recording the execution of the judgment he says, "every man and beast, all in whose nostrils was the breath of the Spirit of lives, (nishmah ruakh khayim) of all that were in the dry land, died." Vs. 21, 22.

This death of the world was accomplished by stopping the supply of air and Spirit from the nostrils of all creatures. This was done by submerging them in a medium incompatible with the respiratory process. It was a cutting off of the supplies mechanically. In ordinary death the same thing occurs on chemical principles, which are equally the agents of God. When the vito-chemical processes of digestion and respiration are stopped, all ground-souls become nephahshoth maith, bodies of death, or dead bodies. In Scripture, the stoppage of these vital processes is termed God's gathering of His spirit and breath. Thus, it is written, "If he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust."—Job xxxiv. 14. Hence "the breath of lives," or the "breath of the spirit of lives," are lent of God, the loan being for an appointed time, rarely exceeding three score years and ten, except by reason of strength. Constitutional weakness may shorten the loan-period, as strength may lengthen it. The clay-statue lives so long as payment is deferred; but when the deposit is withdrawn from its nostrils, it is the resumption of the Spirit's own, the statue falls, and crumbles into its native dust.

Such is the account handed down to us in the most ancient of all records, of the constitution of the creature made in the image and likeness of God; and because he and all other animals are sustained in life by the Spirit, and not by separate and independent spirits, ghosts, or "souls" of their own, therefore Moses styles that same Spirit "Jehovah Elohim of the spirits of all flesh."—Numb. xxvii. 15.

But in all that Moses has written about the ground-soul of Paradise, he has not given the first hint of the existence of an immortal, or deathless, ghost therein. He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, who believed in metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls; the basis of which is the incorporeal migration and immortality of souls. Nevertheless, Moses takes no more notice of the dogma than if he had never heard thereof.

Rabbinized and clericized, which are other names for paganized, readers of his writings think they can see immortal-soulism in the phrases breath of life and living soul! Man, say they, has an immortal soul in him; for it was breathed into him by God as the breath of life, which coming from his mouth was a particle of his divine essence! This was the living soul which Adam became! Now this is drivelling nonsense. As we have seen by the passages adduced, Moses teaches that the "breath of lives" is in the nostrils of all the beasts of the field, as well as in the nostrils of the groundling of Paradise; by parity of reasoning, therefore, if such it can be called, all animals have immortal souls as well as the animal man. Neither does the phrase "living soul" prove the immortality of an inner man; for Moses styles all other creatures of the air, earth, and sea, *nephesh khaiyah*, "living soul," as well. —Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 30. In the verse last quoted, the Hebrew is *ulakol romais al-hahahretz asher-bo nephesh khaiyah*, that is, "And to every thing creeping upon the earth which (has) in it living soul." Hence, if living soul mean immortal soul, then snakes and lizards have immortal souls, which is absurd.

"There is spirit in man,"—Job xxxii. 8; but it is one and the same spirit that is in all other animals; for the Scripture saith, "They have all one spirit (*ruakh ekhad*); so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for the whole is a breath. All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."—Eccles. iii. 19-20.

This Spirit then is not the man, any more than it is the beast, It is not the I myself—the thinking I; but that which is lent to *Me Myself*, whether it be to man-me or to beast-me, for the necessities of the temporary existence of the animal-me.

The "thinking I" of the Gentile schools is a mere metaphysical abstraction; the nature of which the schoolmen, with all their boasted philosophy, have never been able to agree upon: "and there is hardly a question," says one of them, "which shows more sensibly of what human weakness is capable when guided solely by its own lights. They dispute much with each other about what the soul is, where it resides, whence it derives its origin, and what becomes of it after death. Some believe the heart itself to be the soul. Empedocles says, it is the blood which is mingled in the heart: and others, that it is a certain part of the brain. Many affirm, that neither the heart, nor the brain, are the soul itself, but only the seat of the soul; and that it is a breath, or else a fire. This last is the opinion of Zeno, the stoic. Aristoxenes, the musician, who was also a philosopher, makes it consist in a certain harmony of the different parts of the body. Xenocrates places it in numbers, as Pythagoras had thought before him. Plato distinguishes three parts in the soul. He places the principal, which is reason, in the head; and makes the two others, choler and cupidity, reside, the first in the breast, and the other under the heart. Aristotle perceiving that not one of the four principles of which according to him, all things are made, was susceptible of the properties of the soul, as thinking, knowing, loving, hating, &c, supposes a fifth, to which he gives no name; calling the soul by a new term, that according to Cicero, signifies a continued and uninterrupted motion, but a term in effect, of which the most learned neither understand nor can explain the force.

"This is the enumeration Cicero gives us of the various opinions of the philosophers concerning the nature of the soul; and concludes this detail with these words: 'which of all these opinions is true, some god may know; we content ourselves with inquiring which is the most probable.' The system of the Academy which he espoused, was that the false is universally mingled in such a manner with the true, and resembles it so much, that there is no certain mark to distinguish them from each other. Accordingly Cicero, in the places where he mentions the immortality of the soul, speaks of it almost always with doubt, and as one who supposes the system for and against it equally possible and rational."

"Many of the philosophers admitted only bodies, and no pure spirits distinct from matter. Of this number were the Stoics. They did not believe that the soul was absolutely immortal, but only made it live a great while, like crows, says Cicero. Vossius, in his treatise upon idolatry, believes, that by that great while, they understood the whole duration of the world till the general conflagration. For according to the Stoics, by an ultimate revolution, the whole world was to become only fire. "Particular souls were then, with all the rest, to be resolved into and blended with the Universal Soul, their first principle. Till then they were to inhabit the upper region, (that is, Skyana,) where they would have nothing to do but to philosophize at their ease. Supremely happy in the clear vision of the universe, Cicero, who, though a pagan, would have made a very good professor of popular Christianity, describes this beatitude in the philosopher's heaven with a kind of enthusiasm which the clerical rant of the pulpit cannot transcend. "Certainly," says he, "we shall be happy, when, with our bodies, we shall have thrown off all passion and disquiet. What now constitutes our joy, when, free from all care, we apply ourselves orderly to some object that engages and delights us, we shall then do with far greater liberty; abandoning ourselves entirely to the contemplation of all things, which it will be given us to know perfectly. The situation itself of the places which we shall have attained, in facilitating to us the views of celestial objects, and in kindling in us the desire of penetrating their beauties, will enable us fully to satisfy the insatiable ardor natural to us for knowing truth. And it will discover itself more or less to us, in proportion as we shall have been more or less solicitous to nourish ourselves with it during our abode on earth. What a sight will it be, when we shall be able, at one view, to behold the whole earth, its situation, figure, limits, and all its regions, whether inhabited, or desert and void, through excessive heat and cold!"

The pagan philosophers who taught the immortality of soul, give it a different employment after death. The question, however, has greatly exercised and divided the learned dunces of all ages. As to Plato, as well as Socrates, his master, and Pythagoras who preceded them, he believed the soul to be immortal. Cicero says, that Plato seems to endeavor to persuade others of its truth, and to be fully convinced of it himself.

Plato, treading in the steps of Socrates, opens two ways for souls after death: one of these lead such as have sullied themselves with crimes and violence upon earth to a place of torments; and by the other ascend to the august assembly of the gods, the pure and innocent souls, that, during their abode in bodies, have had as little intercourse as possible with them, and have industriously imitated the life of the gods, from whom they derive their origin, by preaching every kind of virtue." Rollin.

Such were the doctrinal speculations of the heathen from Moses to Jesus, in regard to immortality. It was "the wisdom of the world;" loved by the dark-minded misleaders of the multitude, who therefore, styled themselves philosophers, and their craft philosophy, from *φίλος* philos, *a lover σοφίας* sophias, of wisdom. But Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles, though

great lovers of wisdom, were lovers of "the wisdom that is from above," not of the earthly, sensual, and devilish wisdom that exhales from the flesh of sin, unenlightened by the testimony of God. There is a natural antagonism, an inherent enmity in the wisdom of God, to the wisdom of the worldly wise. Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, utterly repudiated it; so that in regard to Moses and the Prophets, immortal-soulists admit, that the dogma they delight in is not to be found in the Old Testament; yet, inconsistently enough, they put fragments of Moses' writings into their crucibles, and blow hard to sublime them into vapor!

But Moses and the Prophets refuse to testify in favor of their tradition. Moses defines the I myself to be a corporeal reality; not a gaseous aura respired from the nostrils, or exhaled from the pores of the skin. Thou thyself is the second personal pronoun of I myself, which is the first. The definition of thou is therefore the definition of I; for "I" is "thou" when spoken to. Moses tells us in the plainest language, what the personal "thou" is; and in so doing informs us what is the Thinking I.

Thus, he tells us that when the animated clay statue was placed in Eden's garden, Jehovah Elohim said, "Thou mayest not eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: for after the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." But he disobeyed, and did eat. He was therefore arraigned at the bar of judgement; and being convicted, was sentenced in the following words: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Here the thou that sinned, was also the thou that was sentenced; and that thou the Spirit declares came out of the ground and goes to the ground again.

How different this doctrine to that of the heathen who misled the people of old, and fill the pulpits of "Christendom" at this day! Our heathen contemporaries tell us that the thou that sinned was an Immortal Soul in the creature—that spark of ethereal fire given off from the substance of God. But this is destructive of their crotchet; for if this be granted, then it cannot be immortal; for the penalty reads, "dying thou shalt die." Whatever is affirmed to have sinned, it is that same thing that is sentenced to death. But, instead of approving the words of the Spirit, these pseudo-ambassadors of Christ, these transformed ministers of Satan rather, point-blank deny them, or what is equivalent, make them of none effect by their blasphemies. The Spirit said to the intelligent creature he had formed, "Thou art dust." "No," say they, "thy body is dust; but thou art a spark of heavenly flame. Eating thou shalt not die. God doth know this. Thy body, which is nothing, may go to the dust; but God doth know that thou art immortal, and shalt ascend and be as the Gods, to know good and evil." This is the lie of the Serpent and his Seed in all their generations. It pervades all their superstitions, by whatever name they are denominated. It is the basis of idolatry, both papistical and mythological; and without it the "Names and Denominations" could not exist. But for this Lie, there could be no worship of saint-ghosts, no purgatory, no mounting and flying to skyana on the down of angels' wings, &c.; the whole system of "Christendom" in theory and practice would phantasmagorically disappear, were this to be abandoned; and the world would be relieved from the hypocritical presence of the baldest imposture that has afflicted it since men began to corrupt the way of Jehovah in all the earth.

But the constitution of "Christendom" is judicial. It is a judgment entailed upon its populations for glorifying the misdeeds of their predecessors. God gave them the truth in the Scriptures; but they have done their best to suppress them; and failing in this, to pervert them in blending their theological glosses with their testimonies. They began this work in the first

century, and the Apostle, seeing what it would ultimate in, recorded the following sentence against them, saying, "Because they received not the love of the truth to their salvation, God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe A LIE; that all may be condemned who believe not THE TRUTH, but take pleasure in the falsehood."—2 Thess. ii. 10,12. This strong delusion and system of falsehood, is the spurious Christianity of (Greek, Roman, and Protestant Christendom, all of which is founded in the Serpent dogma of sin-flesh immortal soulism, dearly loved and fondly cherished by all the Serpent's Seed. It is the lie piously and devoutly believed by the condemned. It is the lie subversive of the truth; and all who teach it are practically the enemies of the truth.

Moses, then, did not teach the system of error represented by the phrase, "the immortality of the soul;" but the very reverse, He presents us with a living creature, the head of an animal world; but with no more immortality in him than the creatures of his domain. But one inquires, "Is no doctrine of immortality recorded in the writings of Moses?" Certainly there is. Moses teaches the immortality of body; and the resurrection of body to that immortality: he does more, he teaches the immortality of body without even tasting of death, and all consequent on the Obedience of Faith.

He teaches the immortality of body by transformation of the living creature in the record of the words of Jehovah Elohim in Gen. iii.22: "Behold the groundling was as one of us, to know good and evil: and for fear that at this time he should put forth his hand, and take also from the Tree of the Lives, and eat, and live to the Aion; therefore Jehovah Elohim sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to cultivate the ground which he was taken out of." From this it is evident, that had the man been permitted to eat of the Tree of the Two Lives, a change would have come over his nature; and instead of living only 930 years and then dying, he would have been alive now, and continuing to live until Messiah's Aion, or the Age to Come. This longevity would have been corporeal, and attained by a rebel without tasting death. But, as the length of days which Wisdom hath in her right hand is not for rebels, Adam was expelled from the garden that he might return to his mother as the penalty of his sin.

But that which the Clayman of Eden was not permitted to obtain, one of his contemporaries experienced. Concerning him Moses writes, "Enoch walked with the Elohim, and was not found; for the Elohim took him away." Paul in commenting upon this, says, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found because God had translated him; for before his translation, he had this testimony that he pleased God; but without faith it is impossible to please him."—Heb. xi. 5. Here then was a man, who 57 years after the death of Adam, became immortal by transformation; by which also the Antediluvians were taught that the immortality of the Tree of Lives was corporeal, and not ghostly.

But the writings of Moses not only teach incorruptibility and life of body by transformation, but the same also by resurrection. In Exod. iii. 14—16 it appears thus: When the Angel in the bush, one of the Elohim, as the messenger of the Spirit commanded the reluctant Moses to appear in Israel a second time, and announce himself as their heaven-appointed deliverer from Egyptian bondage—as a savior sent by the Ail-Shaddai of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—"When they shall say to me," said Moses, "What is his name?" What shall I say to them?" He did not think it fit that he should go to Israel as the messenger of another, and not be able to tell the name of Him who sent him. The Angel of the Bush was not angry with Moses in asking for the name of Abraham's friend. The Spirit that dwells in light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see, caused his Elohim, who visited Abraham's tent, and partook of his hospitality, to announce him as AIL-SHADDAI—

God Almighty Ones; or the Strength of the Almighty Ones. But the time had come when the Spirit chose for himself "a New Name" As he had determined to assume the nature of Abraham, and to manifest himself as his seed, the Messiah or Christ, he chose a name with reference to that manifestation. In answer, therefore, to the question of Moses, "When they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I reply?"—The angel-Eloahh as the messenger of the Spirit, said in behalf of that Spirit, ehyeh asher ehyeh, I SHALL BE WHO I SHALL BE: and he said, thus shalt thou say to the sons of Israel, EHYEH, I SHALL BE hath sent me unto you.

Now, whenever the word Yehowah, or as it is written in English, Jehovah, occurs, we must remember, that "I shall be who I shall be" is the exposition of it. Jehovah is the name of the Spirit; and declares of that Spirit that He was before Abraham; that He is with Moses in Egypt and the Wilderness; and that He shall be: first, on the Messiah; and secondly, in the Saints, both of whom, that is, Messiah and the Saints, in glorified manifestation shall be Jehovah Elohim; or the Eternal Spirit incarnate in the glorified bodies of the redeemed: "GOD the all things in all Saints" 1 Cor. xv. 28.

But what has this new name to do with the Mosaic teaching of resurrection? Very much, as we shall presently see. When the new name had been announced to Moses, the Elohim said to him, "Thus shalt thou say unto the sons of Israel JEHOVAH Elohim of your fathers, Elohim of Abraham, Elohim of Isaac, and Elohim of Jacob, hath sent me unto you; this is my name for the Aion; and this my memorial for a generation of a generation."

Now the phrase "Jehovah Elohim of your fathers," rendered into plain English, is "I shall be the Mighty Ones, or I shall be the Gods of your fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." It is not I am the Gods; but I shall be their Elohim. But why did not the Spirit say to Moses I am their Elohim? Because Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead while Moses was at the bush as they are now; and the Spirit is not the God of the dead, but of the living; therefore in saying "I shall be their Elohim," the record teaches that THEY MUST RISE AGAIN TO LIFE THAT THE SPIRIT MAY BE THEIR GOD OR STRENGTH.

Moses, then, teaches the resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, bodily from the dust of the earth, in which they now sleep. He also informs us what they will rise for—that they may possess the land of Canaan with their seed in the Aion; when Abraham shall be the father of many nations; his seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and all nations of the earth be blessed in him. This is the Future State which Moses teaches: a state in which the world shall be ruled in righteousness by A THEOCRACY, composed of men taken from all previous generations, upon the principle of belief of the promises of Jehovah, and obedience to his will.

From these premises it is manifest to every mind unspoiled by the vain philosophy of Jewish and Gentile schoolmen, that the doctrine of Moses upon the subject before us, resolves itself into the following points:

1. That the real man is corporeal; fashioned into the form, or image, of Elohim; with a natural ability, when living, of manifesting intellectual and moral attributes like theirs—"ELOHIM said, Let us form man in OUR image, after OUR likeness."—Gen. i. 26.
2. That the real man existed before he breathed the breath of lives; for on inhaling that breath "man became (or was for) a living soul," or creature.

3. That the real man is either animated organized dust; or organized dust without animation: and that when the dust ceases to be organic, the man has no more existence than Adam had before he was formed out of the ground.
4. That "a living soul" is a living creature. The Mosaic use of the phrase is generic; "man" being a species of "living soul:" "lion," "tiger," "dog," &c, being other species of living souls; to which man, untamed by divine principles, has a lively resemblance.
5. That "breath of spirit of lives" is in the nostrils of all living souls; and consequently, that it is not the principle of immortality or deathlessness: if it were, then all lizards, snakes, and toads, would be immortal; for they all have it.
6. That immortality is deathlessness of body; and the reward of faith in the promises of God, as illustrated in the case of Enoch.
7. That man, destitute of faith in the declarations of God, is wholly mortal; being under sentence of returning into the ground from whence he was taken; as exemplified in the history of Adam.
8. That deathlessness or immortality of the real or corporeal man (and Moses hints at no other post-mortem sort of man), is attainable by transformation without returning into the ground; or, by being taken out of the ground, through resurrection, after having returned thither.
9. That man being a living soul in common with all beasts, fowls, reptiles, and fishes (to which he is likened in Acts x. 12, 15, 28), and being animated by the same "breath of spirit of lives," is in his original formation mortal. That is, "living soul" is essentially a terminable organization of dust. The "inferior" species of living soul all die, though they transgressed no law; and this is proof that living soul is a terminable nature apart from any moral consideration. "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for they have all one spirit,"—Eccles. iii. 10; so that what is true of beasts is also true of man. Man-soul is terminable like lion-soul, hyena-soul, or fish-soul.

And here we must enlarge a little, to make the doctrine of Moses so plain that he who runs may read. When man transgressed the Eden-law, no miracle was required in the execution of the sentence "dying thou shalt die;" neither was it necessary that any change should be operated upon his ground-nature, and that of his companion-souls, to involve him and them in the common catastrophe of "THE FALL." Ground-nature animated by breath of spirit of lives being terminable of itself, all that was needful was simply to let it alone; at the same time preventing man-soul from making itself an exception to ground-soul in general, by eating of fruit that would have immortalized it, being, by its planter, ordained to that end.

But, it might be very pertinently inquired here, "Suppose man had been obedient to the Eden-law, would he have died, seeing that his nature was terminable of itself?" To this we reply, Yes and No. Yes; if Jehovah Elohim had left him in statu quo: and No, if he had sent him to eat of the Tree of the Two Lives, to which he denied him access because of transgression. Had he continued obedient, he would doubtless have been admitted to this tree, that in eating thereof he might have been "changed," like Enoch, "in the twinkling of an eye," though not, like him, removed from earth undefiled by sin. From the Mosaic history, then, of the transactions in Eden, it is evident:

10. That groundlings can only attain to life and incorruptibility by eating of a Tree of Lives; and

11. That, when they have so eaten, their ground-natures are no longer "living souls" incapable of existence beyond the terrestrial atmosphere; but spirit-bodies, which can live where no "breath of spirit of lives," but pure ether only, is found: bodies, which are not breathing frames, but incarnations of spirit, and therefore life, absolute and independent of all subordinate conditions. Such are Enoch, Moses, Elijah, Jesus; and such, also, will be all who shall be born of the Spirit, by transformation and resurrection from among the dead.

Such is the doctrine, not of Moses only, but of all the Prophets. They all, like Moses, by their silence, refuse to testify to the existence of an "immortal soul" in Sin's Flesh. When they speak of "soul," they testify that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die;" "He kept not back their soul from death;" "Hear, and your soul shall live," which teaches, by implication that it was previously dead; and "That soul will I destroy from his people," which teaches its destructibility—a quality of soul the opposite to immortality, the basis of which is indestructibility. Of Messiah, the prophets say, "If thou, Jehovah, shalt make a trespass-offering of his soul;" "He exposed his soul to death;" "Thou wilt not leave," saith the Spirit, "my soul in the grave;" and, "God will redeem my soul from the grave." Thus the prophets speak of "soul," showing thereby that they regarded it as mortal and destructible; and in death the tenant of the grave, from which it is redeemable through resurrection alone.

In our next article upon this subject, we shall answer the inquiry, "Did Jesus and the Apostles teach the Mosaic doctrine of Immortality?" Till then we commend what we have written to the candid consideration of the reader, in hope that he will search the Scripture, and see if we have not spoken according to the oracles of God.

EDITOR.

---

From the Gospel Banner.

### Who are the Heirs of the Kingdom of God?

The Jews, that is, Judah's and Benjamin's descendants, say they are: that the Messiah will come and set up his Kingdom, and they will be called back again to the land from whence they have been ruthlessly banished many hundreds of years, there to receive the reins of government by which to rule the world. Are they right, or rather cherishing "a strong delusion" that shall vanish away and leave them nothing but subjects of that universal kingdom? Let us see what the scriptures says upon that subject. The Prophet Isaiah in the lxxv. chap. 2-16:

"I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts; a people that provoked me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick; which remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels; which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day. Behold, it is written before: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the Lord, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom. Thus saith the Lord, As the new wine is found in

the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it: so will I do for my servants' sake, that I may not destroy them all. And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks, and the valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in, for my people that have sought me. But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish a drink-offering unto that number. Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: that he who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes."

Now, who is this people that are so perverse and disobedient? Who? They who slew the prophets of the Lord and sacrificed unto Baal? Who cast down the ordinances of the Jehovah under their feet, and progressed in their iniquity until as a final consummation they rejected their promised Messiah and long looked-for Deliverer, and delivered him bound to the ferocious soldiery of Pagan Rome to be crucified? Who was it but the self-same Jews who said "stand by thyself, I am holier than thou,"—the proud boastful Pharisee who loved flattering salutations and greetings in the public streets? They think because they can trace their genealogy down through the ages past to the old Patriarch who was so sorely tried, and who was the great recipient of the glorious promises; because their line of descent is plainly traced down from Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah and his brethren, and that the God of those Patriarchs has promised so faithfully that their descendants should inherit the land again; that they must perforce be the chosen ones in that Kingdom. Daniel says, in the vii. chap, of his prophecies and 27th verse, that "the dominion and Kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High," when Gog is judged; and where will the Israelites be then, at the coming of the Messiah? They will be where they are now, scattered abroad upon the face of the earth. Then it is evident that the Israelites as a nation are not to be the heirs of a future Kingdom. Heirs of an estate are the possessors, not the subjects of it. They have the control of its resources and finances, while the subjects of it are the producers of those resources and finances. The Jewish nation will be restored to its land, and will become mightier and more powerful than any nation that has ever existed upon the earth, but at the same time they will be the governed and not the governors.

If then, they, the "chosen people," are not to be the heirs, the question recurs who are "the saints of the Most High," of whom Daniel speaks as possessing the Kingdom? Well, let us see what says Isaiah, chap. lxy. ver. 1: "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name;" and lxvi. chap. 5, ver.: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." Who were those that were not called by Jehovah's name and were cast out by their brother men? Who but the Gentile nations around the Israelitish camp? The Gentile nations of modern times, although they spurn the Jews from them, and spit upon them; yet the reviled scorn their revilers, and

drive them from their feasts and worship, denying that they have any right or claim upon the promises made to the Fathers.

The apostles were sent by Jesus to preach the Gospel unto the Gentiles, that from among them might be taken a people for his name. Paul, Acts xxviii. 4-6, after being rejected by his own people, went to the Gentiles. The same apostle, Rom. ix. 6, 7, 8, says, "the children of the promise are counted for the seed," and at the 20th verse says, the Gentiles have attained to the righteousness of the faith; and x. 1-3, if the Jews lost the heirship by setting up their lineal descent and self-righteousness in opposition to God's righteousness, let us be careful and watch, and be warned by their loss, lest we also come short of that great blessing. Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2; Psalm xxxiv. 18; and li. 16, 17; Matt. v. 3, 10 All of these references show plainly who are to be the future rulers in the blessed Kingdom of our Lord, when he shall come to the earth and establish his throne upon Mount Zion. The meek in spirit are the spiritual seed of Abraham—the chosen ones of God.

Oh! what a prize to strive for; with what vigilance ought we to pursue the race from its commencement to its glorious termination. With what steadfastness ought we to fix our eyes upon the great reward, and press forward to obtain the prize of our calling. An immortal crown of living glory; a joint heirship with the great Messiah, in the everlasting Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world. Shall we be there to inherit that glorious reward, and receive the gracious commendation of "Well done, good and faithful servant?" Let us strive for it, brethren, strive faithfully and diligently, for great will be our reward if we come off conquerors; yea, more than conquerors through Him who died that we might have everlasting life.

"Well done, thou good and faithful one!"  
Methinks I hear the Saviour say;  
"Thou hast been faithful, thou hast won  
The crown of life's eternal day.

"That thou receivedst, thou didst use,  
As every faithful servant ought;  
Now, thy reward I'll not refuse;  
Receive the boon thou long hast sought.

"For every triumph over sin  
When thou didst crush the tyrant down,  
Receive unto thyself, from him,  
A brilliant jewel in thy crown!

"A name that's named on none beside;  
A robe washed white in my own blood,  
Component of the 'Mystic Bride;'  
Christian! sayest thou not 'tis good?"

## The New Heavens and New Earth.

“There is a limit to the revelations of the Bible about futurity, and it were a mental or spiritual trespass to go beyond it. The reserve which it maintains in its informations, we also ought to maintain in our inquiries—satisfied to know little on every subject, where it has communicated little, and feeling our way into regions which are at present unseen, no further than the light of Scripture will carry us.

“But while we attempt not to be ‘wise above that which is written,’ we should attempt, and that most studiously, to be wise, up to that which is written. The disclosures are very few and very partial, \* which are given to us of that bright and beautiful economy, which is to survive the ruins of our present one. But still there are such disclosures—and on the principle of the things that are revealed belonging to us, we have a right to walk up and down, for the purpose of observation over the whole actual extent of them. What is made known of the details of immortality, is but small in the amount, nor are we furnished with the materials of any thing like a graphical or picturesque exhibition of its abodes of blessedness. # But still somewhat is made known, and which, too, may be addressed to a higher principle than curiosity, being like every other Scripture, ‘profitable both for doctrine and for instruction in righteousness.’

\* Not so few and partial as the writer imagines. —ED. HER.

# Of immortal-soulism and skyanian abodes, nothing is revealed. —ED. HER.

“In the text before us, there are two leading points of information, which we should like successively to remark upon. The first is, that in the new economy, which is to be reared for the accommodation of the blessed, there will be MATERIALISM, not merely new heavens, but also a NEW EARTH. The second is, that as distinguished from the present, which is an abode of rebellion, it will be an abode of righteousness.

“We know historically that earth, that a solid material earth, may form the dwelling of sinless creatures, in full converse and friendship with the Being who made them—instead of a place of exile for outcasts, it may have a broad avenue of communication with the spiritual world, for the descent of ethereal beings from on high—that, like the member of an extended family, it may share in the regard and attention of the other members, and along with them be gladdened by the presence of Him who is the Father of them all. To inquire how this can be, were to attempt a wisdom beyond Scripture; but to assert that this has been, and therefore maybe, is to keep most strictly and modestly within the limits of the record. For, we there read, that God framed an apparatus of materialism, which, on his own surveying, He pronounced to be all very good, and the leading features of which may still be recognized among the things and the substances that are around us—and that He created man with the bodily organs and senses which we now wear—and placed him under the very canopy that is over our heads—and spread around him a scenery, perhaps lovelier in its tints, and more smiling and serene in the whole aspect of it, but certainly made up, in the main, of the same objects that still compose the prospect of our visible contemplations; and there, working with his hands in a garden, and with trees on every side of him, and even with animals sporting at his feet, was this inhabitant of earth, in the midst of all those earthly and familiar accompaniments, in full possession of the best immunities of a citizen of heaven, sharing in the delight of angels, and while he gazed on the very beauties which we ourselves gaze upon, rejoicing in them most as the tokens of a present and presiding Deity. It were venturing on the region of conjecture to affirm, whether, if Adam had not fallen, the earth that we now tread

would have been the everlasting abode of him and his posterity. But certain it is, that man, at the first, had for his place this world, and at the same time, for his privilege, an unclouded fellowship with God, and for his prospect an immortality, which death was neither to intercept nor put an end to. He was terrestrial in respect to condition, and yet celestial in respect both of character and enjoyment. His eye looked outwardly on a landscape of earth, while his heart breathed upwardly in the love of heaven. And though he trode the solid platform of our world, and was compassed about with its horizon, still was he within the circle of God's favored creation, and took his place among the freemen and the denizens of the great spiritual commonwealth.

“This may serve to rectify an imagination, of which we think that all must be conscious—as if the grossness of materialism was only for those who had degenerated into the grossness of sin; and that when a spiritualising process had purged away all our corruption, then, by the stepping-stones of a death and a resurrection, we should be borne away to some ethereal region where sense, and body, and all in the shape either of an audible sound, or of tangible substance, were unknown. And hence that strangeness of impression which is felt by you, should the supposition be offered, that in the place of eternal blessedness, there will be ground to walk upon; or scenes of luxuriance to delight the corporeal senses; or the kindly intercourse of friends talking familiarly, and by articulate converse together; or, in short, anything that has the least resemblance to a local territory, filled with various accommodations, and peopled over its whole extent by creatures formed like ourselves, having bodies such as we now wear, and faculties of perception, and thought, and mutual communication, such as we now exercise. The common imagination that we have of paradise on the other side of death, is, that of a lofty aerial region, where the inmates float in ether, or are mysteriously suspended upon nothing, —where all the warm and sensible accompaniments which give such an expression of strength, and life, and coloring, to our present habitation, are attenuated into a sort of spiritual element, that is meagre and imperceptible, and utterly uninviting to the eye of mortals here below—where every vestige of materialism is done away, and nothing left but certain unearthly scenes that have no powers of allurements, and certain unearthly ecstasies, with which it is felt impossible to sympathize. The holders of this imagination forget all the while, that there is really no essential connection between materialism and sin, —that the world which we inhabit had all the amplitude and solidity of its present materialism before sin entered into it—that God, so far, on that account, from looking slightly upon it, after it had received the last touch of his creating hand, reviewed the earth, and the waters, and the firmament, and all the green herbage, with the living creatures, and the man whom he had raised in dominion over them, and He saw every thing He had made, and behold it was all VERY GOOD. They forget that on the birth of materialism, when it stood out in the freshness of those glories which the great Architect of Nature had impressed upon it, and then “the Morning Stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy,” They forget the appeals that are made everywhere in the Bible to this material workmanship—and how, from the face of these visible heavens, and the garniture of this earth that we tread upon, the greatness and the goodness of God are reflected on the view of His worshippers.

“No, my brethren, the object of the administration we sit under, is to expiate sin, but it is not to sweep away materialism. By the convulsions of the last day, it may be shaken, and broken down from its present arrangements; and thrown into such fitful agitations, as that the whole of its existing framework shall fall to pieces; and with a heat so fervent as to melt its most solid elements, it may be utterly dissolved. \* And thus may the earth again become without form and void, but without one particle of its substance going into annihilation. Out

of the ruins of this second chaos, may another heaven and another earth be made to arise; and a new materialism, with other aspects of magnificence and beauty, emerge from the wreck of this mighty transformation; and the world be peopled as before, with the varieties of material loveliness, and space be lighted up into a firmament of material splendour."—Dr. Chalmers.

\* This is fiction. Peter's words here used did not refer to the terrestrial strata. —ED. HER.

---

## Open Council.

In this Department of the Herald all that is printed is not therefore approved. The Editor is only responsible for what appears over his own signature.

---

From the Southern Literary Messenger.

### The Inefficiency of the Pulpit.

When we consider the vast appliances abroad in this country for the propagation of Christianity, is not every serious and reflective mind surprised and disheartened at the apparently poor and inadequate result? There are in the United States, perhaps, forty-five thousand evangelical churches—and adding various irregular places of worship, the number would reach sixty five thousand. There are more than thirty thousand regular ministers; besides an irregular Methodist clergy of some thirteen thousand local preachers; making in all forty-three thousand preachers of the Gospel. # A very respectable proportion of these men are the best educated men in the country. The others, are, perhaps men taken from the people, and sent out to preach on account, it may be presumed, of their speaking faculties. One day in every week is appropriated to this body; it belongs exclusively to them.

# That is, the thing the 65,000 call "Gospel," which is not "THE GOSPEL," but a heathen version of the same. —ED. HER.

No busy hammers, no holiday pageants, no extra play-bills, as at Paris, no government-bands as at London, break in upon the solemn stillness of the day. All is tranquil, quiet. The sabbath bells (most dulcet sound!) peal forth with unobstructed voice from every spire in the land every seventh day in the year. Public sentiment gives its sanction to the consecrated observance. The arm of the Law restrains all secular engagements. From so many pulpits, twice or three times, on that day, proceeds one general and uncontradicted testimony. "Tidings of great joy" are proclaimed from every mountain-top and in every valley, week after week—with the grandest of themes to inspire, and the most tremendous of sanctions to enforce. This makes no reference to the innumerable week-day exercises conducted by ministers, which in the way of regular sermons, prayer-meetings, revival services, miscellaneous addresses, &c, &c, would swell the number of appeals per week on this one topic, to the number of at least eighty thousand. Imagine a disciplined band of thirty thousand men, (saying nothing of the irregular Methodist licentiates,) steadily enforcing one cause, week after week! Men, too, of respectability and intelligence; with an audience, by associations and education, favorably prepossessed and inclined towards the subject. Imagine an active band of thirty thousand political speakers—with no opposition—thus steadily haranguing through every week a long succession of able minds having preceded them in the work—and what system could withstand them! How feeble have been the efforts of all other societies compared to each persistent, constant, methodised work as this! How poor the

advocacy of any other philosophy compared to this eighteen hundred years' steady and sleepless energy! Take any one village: Sunday after Sunday we meet the same faces, sing the same hymns, hear the same appeals; and after five, ten, fifteen years, where are the results? How many intelligent, thoughtful men have been enlisted?

Think, too, how these efforts are underlaid and backed by the tremendous social influences that work to the same end. The influence of wives, of mothers, of daughters, husbands, sons; the tone of society; the sentiment of the press; the religious books, tracts, newspapers; the Sunday-schools, Christian Associations, Bible societies, missionary societies, tract societies—with their agents, colporteurs &c., over the whole country—the efforts of individual Christians, &c, &c.; these subtracted, and how much remains to be set down to the account of legitimate pulpit work?

We presume no one, on taking this view of the matter, will doubt that the result of pulpit ministrations, taken as a whole, is enormously inadequate. No one, we think, can fail to see, that such a vast system of appliances ought to make an impression beyond what has followed from it. The press, for example, another power of the present age—clashing, diverse, multiform as it is—exercises an authority that has overshadowed every other; and why should a body, organized, compact, acting in concert, make itself less felt? There are fifteen hundred editors in the United States, and forty odd thousand ministers; which are the most potent? We mean in themselves, independent of the intrinsic authority and prestige of their subject matter? Certainly religion exercises in this country a very large and widely-reaching influence; but mainly this proceeds from a momentum already acquired—from an energy long ago accumulated; and the question to be considered is, how much do the existing ministry add to the acting force? What accession do they contribute to its velocity and volume?

What then is the explanation of these things? What will account for the obvious discrepancy between so much expenditure and such meagre returns?

We put aside, of course, at once the one great operating cause which contributes to obstruct and nullify the Gospel; we mean that coordinate with and inherent in the subject. Any one who apprehends at all what true religion is—as the implantation of a new vital principle, the transfusion and impenetration of a radically diverse energy—will not wonder if only here and there some one evinces the transformation. It is the doctrine of a sound philosophy, and of the obvious construction of Scripture, that nothing less than the almighty power of Deity can effect this change. In one sense, therefore, it is not to be wondered at that the world has been slow in accepting Christianity. All the activity of man is futile, all the effort of the Church is impotent, until the dry bones shall be touched with the spirit of life. \* All this is true, but this is far from being the whole truth. God works by means; the ministry have been ordained to preach the Gospel, and the blessing of the Spirit has been plighted for their success. Give us an active, skilful, sanctified ministry, and the dew of heaven will be forthcoming. #

\* Spirit of Life. "My words," saith Jesus, "are spirit and they are life."—ED. HER.

# The very reverse of the "clergy" who are "workmen," or tinkers rather, that "need to be ashamed," being incapable of "a right division of the word of truth."—ED. HER.

Putting aside, then, this question of supernatural influences, we propose to inquire why it is that the Christian ministry do not effect more than seems to result from so much

labor. We confine our inquiry to this country, though it will apply also to the evangelical pulpits of England and Scotland.

A writer in the Edinburgh Review has divided the church parties of the English church into the High-church, the Low-church and the Broad-church. We would divide the churches (evangelical) of our country into the Democratic, the Conservative and the Genteel. The first will embrace the Methodist and Baptist denominations; the second, the various Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, &c, and the third the Episcopal Church. For the purpose of our inquiry, we class together, first, the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, &c, Churches, and proceed to a consideration of the causes affecting their denominational development. We shall subsequently take up the Methodist and Baptist Churches with reference to the same question, premising that we regard the causes operating in the two cases to obstruct the progress of Christianity as, in most respects, essentially different.

Take the Presbyterian Church (Old and New School). Here is a body numbering say three hundred and seventy-six thousand. There are, perhaps, four thousand ministers. They are the best educated class of men in the community. In the way of general information and polite culture, unless the Congregational ministry be an exception, there is no question of it. That they are good men no one will have a doubt of it. \* That, as a body of Christians, they are faithful, devout, laborious, will be as freely admitted. Take them generally, their piety is of a high type. They are earnest, sincere, humble Christians. # They give their lives to their work. They toil year after year on small salaries—often in trying situations—for the cause they are linked to. Here is piety, earnestness, learning, faithfulness, activity; what should there be to obstruct? What was the increase of the Presbyterian Church during the year last reported? The Old School numbered in 1854 two hundred and twenty-five thousand members; in 1855, two hundred and thirty-three thousand—an increase of eight thousand, about one to every twenty-eight. The New School numbered, in 1854, one hundred and forty-one thousand members; in 1855, one hundred and forty-three thousand—an increase of two thousand, about one in eighty. The ministers of the Old School church numbered, in 1854, two thousand two hundred; those of the New School sixteen hundred. The number of converts to each minister of the first, was three and two thirds; to each minister of the second, about one. Sixteen hundred preachers preach a whole year, and each of them has at the end of the period one convert.

\* There can be no doubt of the contrary. Jesus said to one, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." Shall we, then, admit the undoubted goodmanship of the clergy who blaspheme the truth, and live by the merchandize of souls, pretending to cure them for a price, but leaving their disease untouched? Do we call quacks, pretenders, empirics, "good men?" Nay, impostors rather! —ED. HER.

# Piety of a high type. How many types of piety are there? Which the highest, which the lowest? The Bible only recognises one, "the obedience of faith," all other pieties are phrenological excitations merely. Presbyterian high type is pharisaic; they appear to unenlightened men to be righteous; but they who understand New Testament Christianity deny that they are "Christians," and reject their piety as spurious. —ED. HER.

On the other hand, take that portion of the Episcopal Church in which religion is not a mere system of posturing, of fashion, or of elegant sentiment, and where will you meet a more refined and beautiful Christianity? \* (see over page) What church besides this could have

produced that glorious and saintly minister, Henry Martyn? The modesty, the purity, the simplicity, the truthfulness, the self-denial, the delicacy, the refinement, the zeal, the culture, the sweetness of temper—was not he the true forth putting of the true, real, apostolical Church of England? It seems harder (as compared with other denominations) for the Episcopal Church to throw itself cordially into the great popular evangelical movement of the day, but when it does do so, how entire, and single-minded, and unreserved the consecration! How pure, how true, how hearty the cooperation! Then, all the graces of Christianity seem to acquire new vigor from all that is pleasing and beautiful in the politer circles of social life. Here we find a clergy that are all emphatically gentlemen. They are no less faithful, earnest, laborious, than those we have just spoken of. They are also men of education. What are the statistics of the Episcopal Church by the last returns? In 1853, there were one hundred and five thousand members of the Episcopal Church in the United States; in 1854, there were one hundred and seven thousand. The increase is two thousand, about one and one fourth to each minister.

\* Beautiful Episcopal Christianity! Beauty of the whited sepulchre type; the burning beauty, rather, of the eldest harlot daughter of its Roman mother. —ED. HER.

One of the chief obstacles in these churches to a more rapid and marked success lies, we believe, in the character of their preaching. Eleven thousand Presbyterian and Episcopal sermons are delivered every week, and how are they delivered? Accustomed as we are to good speaking in this country, let any one saunter some Sunday into (for example) a Presbyterian church. After hearing the choir sing a hymn or two, and one very short and one enormously long prayer, the preacher commences the main service of the occasion. He is boxed up in a pulpit. He would think it sacrilege if he omitted to take a text, and accordingly a text he takes, applying naturally, or in the way of conceit, to his subject. With this placarded thus in imagination above him, and which according to his taste, he recurs to constantly as a sort of refrain, he launches out into his discourse, which will be sensible, or decorous, or fanciful, or vapid, but always formal—the sermon is written out. The speaker has come there with a discourse in his pocket, and its apothegms and its appeals he gives over to his auditors, whenever he can lay his finger on them. On their part, the congregation come to hear a sermon; yes, they come to hear a sermon; a certain amount is to be dispensed, and a general assent to be returned, and the church breaks up, and all go home. The sermon is criticised, the sentiments may be applauded, and it is considered very good advice, and there the matter ends.

No one heart has been touched, not one emotion awakened, not one resolution adopted. Not a human being, it may be, but, in a general way, has assented to or admired the sermon; not one who, especially, and with a personal application, has grappled with its thoughts in his heart.

How poor to such a listener such a speech-making as this; after listening to the fervid appeals in the forum, where every sentence strives towards a mark, or to the varied, easy familiar elocution of the stump!

Perhaps our adventurer has found his way into an Episcopal church. There is a death-like propriety. All is still as the grave. It is a "dim religious" edifice. There is stained glass, and lofty groined arches. People step about as if the ground were haunted. A genteel grave sexton moves mysteriously from pew to pew. There are solemn texts starting out from the walls. The great emblem of Christianity is there broadly prominent, and now ingeniously

evolved. Fashionable ladies and gentlemen, no one knows how, gradually fill the church. A solemn form comes silently forward in a stately robe, and, amid multitudinous folds, dramatically kneels in prayer. A strain of dream-like music breathes through the spacious aisles. And presently, "The Lord is in his Holy Temple, let all the earth keep silence before him," from a clear, chaste voice, initiates the pageant. The different parts of the service are then more or less devoutly gone through—one of the most splendid and imposing rituals that the imagination has ever conceived, and one the most calculated to touch and impress an imaginative heart. A hymn is then read from the chancel, and sung in the gallery; and then twenty-five minutes are devoted to the reading of a perfectly unexceptional and elegant production.

And that is the trumpet-call erst uttered "in the wilderness," and which was thundered at Caesarea before Felix and Drusilla, touching that "righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come"!

This is the dainty method by which the tremendous import of the Gospel—like arrowroot to the dying—is communicated to the mawkish stomachs of the higher society.

How often is a true, manly, straight-forward address heard in such a pulpit?

Such are no highly colored pictures of the preaching we hear in Presbyterian and Episcopal churches. Of minor points we will not just now speak. We commenced by speaking of the sermon. Here, as we have said, lies, we believe, one of the great and main obstacles to the success of these churches. It is in the mode of the preparation, and delivery, of these sermons, that is to be found in a great measure, we think, the source of that barrenness of results which characterizes this preaching. The Sunday address is prepared in the closet as a paper to be read, or as a discourse to be declaimed from a manuscript, and the mind becomes directed rather at a certain abstract theme, than on the audience itself as a body of living men to be incited to real action.

The great question to be decided is, whether written sermons are effective? We assume, for such is the case, that the organizations in question do write their sermons. We know the vast difference of opinion that exists on this subject. We know how many of the most highly intelligent advocate it a priori. But our convictions are not at all the less implicitly established: we are, almost without a wavering of opinion, decisively fixed in our conclusion, that MS. sermons are the bane of these churches—and hang upon their ministries like a pestilential vapor, when it behoves that they should be breathing the free and open air. It is like the dry and sickly temperature of a close and heated room, when what is wanted is the pure and life-fraught warmth of the light from Heaven.

The great object of the preaching of the Gospel, is to produce a certain result. The great end is a certain practical effect. Any contrivance, however respectable; any appliance, however elegant, is utterly worthless which does not conduce to this object. We hold in all things, that the great aim should be, to be practical. That system of farming is best which is practical; that system of law is best which is operative; that scheme of ology is best which produces; that method of preaching is best which convinces—and leads to action. In the most of the ordinary affairs of life human necessities soon adjudicate how a thing is to be conducted. An individual soon finds where his efforts are to be directed, and the stern voice of hunger, or one equally as imperious, soon blows to the winds any visionary edifice. In effecting any great moral objects—the result of which does not immediately bear upon our

current necessary wants—there is a wider margin left for the dreamer; and speculative systems often gasp on for centuries, before their utter futility has been universally assented to. How long any system of education may be fortuitously prosecuted, when it is utterly unprofitable! How long any political measure may be clung to with bigotry, when the evils it refers to have been wholly unmitigated! From one cause to another—perhaps mainly from indolence—it has become in some churches now almost universal to use MS. sermons. These are read more or less strictly according to circumstances. The address may be prepared specially for the occasion—or it may, as occasion offers, be brought out by the minister from his treasures "new and old."

The great end, we say, of preaching is to convince—or it may be persuade. The world is regarded as a ruined and fallen race—a reprobate and blighted species—and to its vast multitudes comes a missionary of the cross proclaiming a method of safety, and invoking the sin-enthralled victims to hearken to his message. The audience is admitted to be one the most deaf to the subject-matter addressed to them; the interests are allowed to be the most momentous that can concern a thinking intelligence. How should this message be conveyed? Will rose-colored paper and an adjustment of didactic proprieties—or a dull, sleepy dissertation in theology or ethics—re-fire such an element? Will even an able, sensible, well-digested dissertation, be the method of reaching those men? Let us suppose a case. A band of highway robbers have waylaid a gentleman on the road; they have taken his effects and are proceeding to murder his family and servants; he is filled with emotion; he wishes to plead for their lives; he wishes to put forth that potent spell of human eloquence; how shall he proceed? Shall he call for pen and paper and write out the considerations? —or shall he loose the faculties that God has given him, and pour forth from his impassioned heart the warm and living current of pure and true emotion? Or let us suppose the gentleman has been captured; and some idle day in the shade—like Caleb Williams in the fiction—should undertake to appeal to the robber band on their enormities and crimes. Should he best read to them from a moralist in his pocket, or prepare for the occasion some well-ordered discourse; or should he speak to them directly—in the language of human nature—and with the absence of all effort—and in such tones as would seem appropriate?

The whole error proceeds from a radical misapprehension of what public speaking consists in. We understand all effective public speaking to mean eloquence. Now, what constitutes eloquence? What suffices to make a man eloquent? Our answer is, that every sensible, unaffected, earnest discourse is eloquent. Let a man be sensible; let him be natural; and let him be in earnest; and he will be eloquent. Whatever impresses a man is eloquent. Whatever gesture even expresses a human sympathy is eloquent. Even in conversation, every unaffected, earnest-minded man, who talks good sense, is pleasing—or, in other words, eloquent. Every such person gets the attention. What then has a public speaker to do? He is to address a jury. In the first place, of course, the matter must be sensible; on his part, all that is necessary is simplicity of manner, and seriousness of purpose. If he has no purpose, he will not be eloquent. If he is not charged with a thought, he cannot fill with that energy another intelligence. Or even if he is, he must deliver it simply—he must not do violence to nature. Such a man, if he has a story to tell, will be listened to. \*

\* Paul says, "I came not to you with excellency of speech or of wisdom (that is, with the eloquence and wisdom of the Greeks) declaring unto you the testimony of God; my speech, and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom; but in demonstration of spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand on man's wisdom, but in the power of God." Such preaching as this the sermonizers cannot attain to. —ED. HER.

The question arises then, can these conditions, on the occasions of public speaking, be met by a written discourse? Our answer is, that as a general thing, they cannot. One of the essential elements is absent at once. We mean the naturalness of the procedure. There must be a propriety in the action. We will illustrate what we mean—the subject matter of a conversation may be very sensible, and a man may be very much impressed with the topic in question: but the very moment his discourse begins to be formal, it ceases to impress any second party. If he uses a manuscript, or if he converses memoriter, the sympathy is dissipated, and the attention is withdrawn. Indeed, earnestness cannot well express itself through such a medium. Earnestness modifies itself by the temperature around it. It conforms itself to the thousand fluctuating accidents of the moment. In seeking expression, it moulds its utterances to the shifting media that they encounter. The warmth of the object toward which it tends, governs the fervor with which it goes forth. Its alternations are instantaneous, and it passes with unappreciable rapidity from one form of manifestation to another. When it may nearly have reached its object, the observation of some condition in that, may instantaneously carry it to its destination, differing entirely in the tone and movement it had in its inception. The fixed character of writing—until the hearer shall have voluntarily placed himself in the condition of the reader—is utterly at war with all this. The appearance of any effort repels at once any one who is listening to language. The taste requires a simplicity and a flexibility on the part of the speaker which can hardly be dispensed with.

Therefore, in conversation—even if a man has earnest feelings—any formality or stiffness is at once repudiated. The whole thing must be simple—the whole thing must be natural. The observations may not be inherently stiff or formal—but only relatively as regards the circumstances. If individuals were all very philosophical persons, and willing to place themselves at the point of the speaker, the matter might not be stiff, might not be formal, but people are not philosophers—they are not willing (and very properly) to be approached in this way. They do not place themselves at the point of view of the discourses; it is his part to draw them there. He must take them in the passive, relaxed state he finds them, and address them accordingly. To this the speaker must adapt himself. Any very formal discourse—anything savoring in any degree of labor—anything evidently gotten up—will at once appear incongruous, and no man who is in earnest could adhere to such a formula. Earnestness, therefore, as well as fidelity to nature, would inevitably be excluded from a conversation or writing\*.

\* Therefore James says, "Contend earnestly for the faith as delivered to the Saints." Let the clergy learn "the faith," let them cordially embrace it, let them discard their sermons, and then plead for it as if they believed it, "earnestly;" if such a course were possible for them, the evil the writer deploras would be corrected, But the case is hopeless. —ED. HER.

The same considerations apply to a written speech. The audience is promiscuous. They are to be addressed according to circumstances. The feelings of the speaker, and the "environment" to (use one of Carlyle's words) of the occasion, must modify the manner and the subject-matter. There is the same appearance of formality in pulling out a manuscript. There is the same recoil from the regular set-to that is unavoidably suggested. There is the same want of flexibility in running current with the shifting modifications of thought. The directness—the simplicity—the subtle and sympathetic fluctuations of language—the impalpable and inter-penetrative refinements of intonation—the shading or re-touching of the current thought—the lowering or making room for the tone of emotion—these and a thousand unappreciable accidents cannot be met, any more in a discourse than a conversation, by the unyielding and rigid mould of a written preparation. It is almost impossible, until the moment

arrives, for any one to foresee what will be precisely appropriate to the occasion. There must not be any pedantry. The speaker must exhibit the most perfect ease. No expression must ever rise higher than the tone of the audience at each precise instant, nor fall below it. The very moment this is done the speaker ceases to be natural, and excites disapprobation. A speaker should indicate the appearance of confidence—the appearance of sympathy. There should seem to be a community between him and his audience. He should have the absence of reserve—a directness in his manner—which should at once awaken fellowship. To attempt this with something formally gotten up, is unnatural on the mention of it.

We think, therefore, the same objections—at least in a very considerable degree—lie, as to this point of naturalness, against a written speech, as against a written colloquy. On the same reasoning employed with regard to the latter, it is equally difficult, with a manuscript address, to exhibit any earnestness. Earnestness, as we have said, always expresses itself naturally, and when it attempts to find utterance through any other medium, it is shocked and driven back. (No man can be in earnest in speaking to another, unless he meets with sympathy—unless he is understood—unless he is attended to.) And the very nature of earnestness is to adapt itself to circumstances, and to conform to propriety. The very moment a man gets up to speak, he must not only be charged with his subject, but he must go about expressing himself in intelligible language—the language of the multitude. He breaks down at once, the very moment he ceases thus to utter himself. He is thrown out of rapport with his audience—there is nothing in common between them. However much, then, he may have his subject at heart, his speech is no longer earnest—for he has ceased to be understood—and the language of passion is at once abated, when it meets with no sympathy. And all this, supposing that even the speaker is able to sympathise himself with what he had previously written, [to sympathise with it in the very manner he did originally when he composed it.] But the remarks already made with regard to conversation, and the reader's own reflections, (with some qualifications to be presently noted,) will amply establish this point.

We announce, therefore, this conclusion, that it is extremely difficult for a written discourse to be a good speech. This is the conclusion we would come to on an *à priori* view. The essentials of eloquence cannot be complied with. We do not mean (as we have before intimated) that the writing itself may not be eloquent. Inherently, it may be a very fine composition. But we speak of it as to the purpose in hand. We speak of it as a speech. We regard it as intended to be communicated orally to a mixed audience.

But one will tell us, that after all, written discourses are impressive; they are listened to: men are wrought upon by them: they are delivered in an impassioned, fervid spirit: great preachers do adopt this method of speaking. A distinction must be drawn here between the ordinary manuscript preaching, and the memoriter method of pronouncing an address. They are by no means the same. We think far more can be urged in behalf of this, than in favor of the usual half-speaking, half-reading, method which prevails. As to the instances of men having succeeded well on the manuscript plan, Samuel Davies, Dr. Chalmers, Mr. Wadsworth of Philadelphia, are eminent examples. Of the brilliant oratory that may be exhibited on the memoriter method, the French pulpit, and our ordinary formal orations on certain special occasions, are instances affording sufficient proof. We hear also constantly in our pulpits most impressive discourses read from the manuscript. We have only to say, that we believe such a speaker as Dr. Chalmers succeeded in spite of his method—which we regard as essentially vicious. A man may read with power, but it does not prove, that reading is inherently as efficient as speaking. Even Dr. Chalmers is said to have been more powerful in his extemporaneous efforts. There are minds (one in a thousand, perhaps,) that can re-produce

the precise course of feeling they originally experienced in the composition of a sermon, that can call up again, with the same vivid distinctness, and the same tone of emotion, —in spite of the effort to remember, or the effort to read—the very same conceptions previously experienced—and that can exercise the self-mastery to hand them over in this manner, weeks after their production, to a promiscuous company. The memoriter speaker may do this, and make a most effective speech: the reading speaker may have read with feeling, and moved his hearers with his written reflections; but the first will have been a most difficult and painful effort; the second will have been no speech at all, but have only evinced how much may be even accomplished by good reading. Very few persons, as we have said, can do the first, and very few can do the second. Frequently the manuscript speaker combines the two methods reading sometimes, and speaking from memory at others. His address will be effective just in proportion as he counterfeits real speaking.

But as to any capacity of pleasing generally by reading a discourse, we do not believe in it—we mean comparatively speaking. It requires, first, the talent to write what will sound well when delivered, and, secondly, the talent to induce a mixed audience to listen to what is read to them. The memoriter method, we believe, is far more specious. We know that men frequently—and it is easy to conceive of it—prepare elaborate orations, and recite them on this plan in the most eloquent manner.

But in either of these cases, what a struggle must it be for the speaker (unless he reads out and out) to keep his thoughts before him—to keep their ranks unbroken! How difficult to re-produce precisely the original train of emotion! to keep up the delicate poise that is to be maintained in the audience! A speaker may work his audience up to his state of mind—but to keep them in that attitude with a rigid train of thought, that has nothing to yield on its part, and must rely altogether on sustaining its tone—is difficult exceedingly. If the discourse is from a manuscript, there are constant interruptions, from difficulties in catching the sentences. If delivered memoriter, the slightest jar confuses every thing instantaneously: a slip of memory, or some agitation of mind, or inattention on the part of the audience, will produce disorder throughout.

And, then, whatever may be adduced of the effects of this speaking (and we have seen something of it,) can there be the same directness of approach that there is where the speaker sees precisely what is wanted, and departs himself accordingly? Supposing that a very successful, eloquent oration of this sort has produced a certain general impression—does it reach down immediately to the individual conviction like a straight forward, direct, hand-to-hand appeal? When a man gets up, and speaks right off, bringing himself at once in contact with his audience—with nothing pretentious—with nothing high-flying—with nothing "philosophical"—with nothing didactic—but simple, plain, outspoken, earnest—how it reaches the heart! Plain men sit under the overshooting reverberations of that deep-throated artillery. It must be remembered, that the audience is promiscuous—rough, blunt men—that have a sympathy like yours, if you will approach them as a man. There is a tie between you, if you will give them your confidence. They want no finely-worked sentiments: no dainty moralities: no solemn harangues: no wire-drawn speculations: no scholastic discoursing: no attempts at fine writing, no general remonstrances: they want direct, personal appeal: they want to be touched at the very quick of their natures: they want to be talked with as men with a man. If you can do this in an elaborate oration, you are at liberty to write your sermons.

There is a vast amount of importance to be attached to this point: a written discourse may be equally pleasing with a spoken one, without being as effective. I may hear a very

grand and a very eloquent written sermon, and may have been carried away with many passages—and even in a general way been led to serious thinkings—but this is not the thing. The difficult point lies beyond all this: it is that last retreat of the carnal conscience, that citadel of reserve in every human heart, which it is so difficult to carry. The main stand is made here. The outworks are often broken down. Good resolutions are constantly made. The great question is, how to carry this? The fight here must be hand to hand. Conventionalities must be thrown aside. Fine sentences effect no opening. A general firing will accomplish no advances. The only method is an assault. That wall must be scaled sword in hand. Your parchments and your book sentiments must be thrown to the dogs. The strong language of nature is now what is wanted—no affectation—no labor—no wordiness—no form.

It must, we say, be remembered, that the object of preaching is to persuade men to act. To impart certain opinions: to arouse certain feelings: to communicate certain facts: this may be done in writing: but you must see a man whom you want actually to put in motion. And so again, in the matter of speaking, these opinions, these feelings, these facts, may often as well be communicated in a written discourse, as after (what is called) the *ex tempore* method: but to induce action, a more immediate and unembarrassed appeal is necessary. The more impassioned, the more earnest, the more deeply solicitous a man is, the more thoroughly, the more absolutely he dispenses with all forms. All the prepared appeals in the world would not suffice for a person to cry to a drowning man. If the imperilled man were stupefied or perhaps reckless, and the alarmist would excite him from his lethargy, that cry must be as piercing and as home-reaching as possible. To induce that man to strike out and swim, the movements of passion must be perfectly uncontrolled. So if there is a storm approaching, how should we attempt to get the seamen to make provision against it? Or if a country is threatened with war, and there is a pressing demand for men, what sort of a speech would be apt to be most effective? Just in proportion, it is evident, as the occasion is urgent—just in proportion to the speaker's sense of any crisis in question—just in proportion as he is impressed with his subject—just in proportion as he feels its tremendous associations—just to that extent will he utter the voice of nature—will he draw from living waters.

It is implied in our remarks, that there are occasions on which written discourses seem to be appropriate: to which we will add this qualification, that almost universally such written discourses be delivered memoriter. Certain dissertations of a didactic character and certain formal orations are best, perhaps, delivered in this way. But the exception appears hardly to militate against what we are mainly contending for. Anything didactic or discursive, as has been said or intimated, is not intended to influence directly the action of men: it is generally addressed to meditative minds, and aims rather to instruct the understanding, or to please the imagination, than to incite to activity. There are topics which call for sermons of this character; but we are regarding preaching in the main, we have said, as directed to the one great point of a call to repentance, and as an attempt to bring the heart to an active determination toward a new course of living. In a formal oration, it is almost universal to have it written out; but, on these occasions, no active effect is aimed to be produced: certain general considerations (which the very occasion makes formal) are usually presented: elegant delineations are addressed to the fancy, elegant sentiments are clothed in fine language: and the exhibition is usually denominated an "intellectual treat." Such a thing has its uses: but this is an oration: it is not public speaking. That is not the method to move masses of men. A fine poem read might have produced a similar effect; but the effect is not that aimed at by a man who wants to make a man a Christian.

But even to take the case of a didactic discourse, how much feebler in its effect upon a company of promiscuous people would a written paper be, than the same sentiments delivered in a familiar, popular way, by a man who understood how to speak!

We will not inquire how far written discourses might be admissible, supposing every audience composed of studious, intelligent men. Perhaps (some may think) such men giving their attention to anything sensible, might be readily enough reached by a philosophical paper—just as a judge is often in court. But we do not even credit this: they would listen to the logical part of the discourse, or they would give attention to its abstract discussions: but when it became a practical, individual matter; every one of them remonstrated with as a wicked and fallen creature, and called upon by the speaker to do a certain thing; we do not believe the written paper is the battery to use against them. Here their intellectualism would have the same torpor as among a less select circle, and they would be found to be men with like passions with others.

But leaving all these speculations to take up our original question—what practically, is the method of reaching the masses? Here is an audience on every court-green, a congregation at every street-corner, how are these men to be preached to? In our cities, in our villages, in our mountains and valleys, on our frontiers and at our wharves, a teeming population of human beings are supposed to be perishing. How shall they be cried to? Shall a man go to them with a volume of sermons, or a bundle of MSS., and undertake to fix upon them a conviction of wickedness and a resolution of amendment? Did Paul stand thus on that Athenian hill? Did Peter cry thus on that day of Pentecost? Called George Whitfield thus to those Kingswood colliers? How are these things conducted in worldly affairs? How does the representative of any secular idea promulgate it through the world?

How does the lawyer speak in the court house? \* How does the public man speak to the masses? We would curiously put the question, how does it happen that those speakers in our country, whose business is a practical matter, all speak *ex tempore*? It cannot, all be accident. It cannot be merely from the effect of a long custom. There must be a principle in it. There must be an impelling cause, which has regulated of itself how certain professional speakers were to bring themselves in communication with the people.

\* A lawyer, though he preaches for pay, does so with earnestness, that he may convince the jury and defeat his opponent; that he may obtain his client a *quid pro quo*, and by zeal for the interests of his employers enlarge his practice. A clerical hireling reads sermons to occupy the time, being as well paid without convincing, as though he proselyted his tens. —ED. HERALD.

What would any one think of a lawyer who got up to address a jury with a manuscript speech spread out on a desk? How many jurors would listen to him? How many would go to sleep? What contortions and convolutions would his client conduct himself through, while the great facts of his case, the pregnant points in his evidence, were thus being spun away into impractical syllogizings, into impalpable fantasies! That adroit lawyer stands there, knowing what he has to do. In a difficult school he has learned himself deeply in human nature. He knows that that rough man, with his horse out at the fence, doesn't want any fine sentiments. He knows that any abstracted mode of reasoning—sensible as he is—would be utterly lost on him. He knows that remotely planted premises, far reverted postulates, strike no chord in that rough-hewn intellect. General considerations, compactly-built argumentations, subtly-related trains of thought, play around him innocuously. There is a certain style of communication that

that man can understand. It must be the language he is accustomed to. It must be in a mould that he can appreciate. It must be strong, blunt, graphic unconstrained. Let no one think it may not be eloquent. Let him go to the court-house, and see. Let him listen once to a really good county court speaker, and then to a "seminary" preacher. It is the language of men; the other is the sentiments of books. The one comes fresh and in life from nature; the other is artificial, scholastic, abstract. The advocate has a special end to produce; he has a distinct object ahead of him, and he finds no difficulty in approaching it. There is no difficulty in speaking when there is something to be said. No man feels at any great loss for words when he is pleading for mercy; no lawyer is ever embarrassed when he understands his case. He sees clearly that he wants a particular thing done, and he feels a deep interest that it should be done, and he speaks plainly what he has to say: and he speaks naturally and earnestly. It need not be said that men can't speak *ex tempore*. They can speak *ex tempore*. It is done every day. It is done habitually by a whole class of speakers before every court. And these men speak well, too; they speak incomparably better than the pulpit. Their speaking produces in the aggregate a much greater effect.

Again, let us take the stump. Let us see how our politicians address themselves to the masses. Did any one ever see a MS. on the stump? Now here is a sort of abstract topic, if you choose, as the topics of the pulpit are sometimes called, and the practice is, for speakers universally to speak without manuscripts—and perhaps, also, universally without having committed their speeches. We ask for the explanation of this. These men speak like the lawyers. They are equally practical, equally acquainted with the people. No one will deny, that as a class their speaking is very fine. Compared with pulpit addresses, their speeches are strikingly effective. We do not mean that they often convert a partizan from one side to the other. That has its own explanation; but we mean that they make good speeches. How easy their manner is towards their audience! How perfectly good-fellowly and invitative of confidence! What an entire absence of all stillness—all pedantry—all embarrassment—all effort! How familiar their style—and how carelessly they vary it from one key to another!

The pulpit is the only place where manuscript speeches are made. Our deliberative bodies all speak without writing. In our State legislatures, and in Congress—as in the House of Commons and the British Senate—it is almost universal to speak as it is done at the bar and before popular meetings. Does any one suppose that John Randolph ever wrote out his speeches? Or that Mr. Henry ever trusted to the fixed type of a manuscript? We suppose Mr. Clay never wrote a speech in his life. If any place would justify a written speech, it is a body like our Senate, or the House of Commons. *Ex tempore* speaking is equally practiced at our Temperance meetings—our scientific conventions—our religious anniversaries—the associations, conferences, conventions, general assemblies of our churches, &c, &c.

We think this is the duty of the pulpit, to bring itself practically in contact with the masses. A system of easy writing is not efficient. The language of it, and the manner of it, is not the way to reach the great soul of humanity. The more direct—the more personal—the more real its vivid utterances, the more instant, the more abounding, will be its results. Every thing that tends to break down the barrier between the clergy and the people, will tend to bring the latter more in fellowship and in sympathy with their teachers. Let the preacher get up in his congregation as a man. Let him stand forth there as one of the people. Let him, as Alexander Campbell, we thought once, happily did it, address his "fellow-citizens."

(To be continued.)

---

## Analecta Epistolaria.

### Approves the Best, and yet the Worst Pursues.

Dear Sir, —I recently sent some propositions to the Baptist preacher, who deals in spiritual merchandize at the Barrens, to this effect:

1. Eternal life is a matter of promise;
2. The eternal life of man is hid in the Christ who is the Prince of Life; and,
3. Eternal life is conditional.

He argued them all, and in concluding, said, "they were certainly true;" and yet he preaches immortal soulism. How absurd!

Another of their order recently at the same place, said, that to teach that Christ Jesus would reign on the earth was carnal. If so, I think that you could show that all the prophets and apostles were carnal; for they teach it unmistakably to the conviction of every ingenuous student of the Bible.

Since our organization, we have been principally their theme. They do not study the prophets, and are therefore unable to bring forth things "new;" and they soon tell all they know from their school-books. Hence, the necessity of so often changing their preachers.

We shall be on the look out for your appointment for this country.  
Your brother, in Israel's hope,

J. M. STONE.

HENDERSON, KENTUCKY,  
March 7, 1857.

---

### The Warfare.

DEAR SIR, —I cheerfully embrace this opportunity of forwarding my subscription for the Herald, which is your due, in the full conviction that the laborer is worthy of his hire; and that the information and instruction you give through its pages are an ample equivalent for its price.

It would be a pleasure if I could obtain some subscribers for the extension of its proclamation; but the people here in general, have quite a different view, believing that man has an immortal soul which receives at death its rewards and destiny; and endorsing all the articles of their Legion-creeds, "for they are many:" so that the prospect of enlargement hereabouts is not flattering.

If I were to give any encouragement and admonition it would be, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might," and in all your warfare handle "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," and no man shall set on you to hurt you.

The warfare is an obstinate one in this day of darkness and superstition. If ever men loved darkness rather than light, it is in this our day; for they seem to think, that any belief different from what they hold, is heretical, no matter how plainly expressed in the Bible.

What a pedestal of sand professed "Christendom" stands on! What a destruction awaits it, when the enemy comes in upon it like a flood!! Labor on; "preach the Word;" "hold forth the Word of Life," if that by any means you may save some.

Yours, with good will,

M. P. CHAPIN.

WOOSTER, INDIANA,  
March 23, 1857.

---

A Macedonian Call.

DR. THOMAS, —There are four persons in this vicinity intelligent in the Gospel of the Kingdom, who are desirous of being immersed by you, if we could avail ourselves of your valuable services. We have all been immersed in the days of our ignorance, and are not at ease on account of our present condition in this matter. I think a series of lectures, at this place, either by you or Brother Magruder (so I style him because I love him), would be a means of much good at this time. If you design visiting Virginia shortly could you not come here also? If not, I will try to prevail on him to come. Please let me know through the Herald.

Yours, in hope of an inheritance in the Kingdom and Age to come,

J. BROSIUS.

BOTETOURT SPRINGS,  
ROANOKE, VIRGINIA,  
March 13, 1857.

Will Brother Magruder respond to the above? If he cannot, perhaps brethren Anderson or Passmore can. At present, it is not in our power. We expect, indeed, to visit Virginia this year; but cannot now say precisely when.

EDITOR.

---

"He had no Faith."

BROTHER THOMAS, — I noticed in your December Herald that the editor of the Expositor had denied saying to me that he had no faith when he was immersed; and that you gave the name of your informant, which was just what you should have done.

When I received the Expository I found under the caption—Valid Immersion—Elder Marsh there saying, that he did not wish to accuse the doctor or Brother Pierce of lying, but that the statement was incorrect, or in itself untrue, &c. Now, Brother Thomas, I wish to say to you and to all that knew me, and to all that may become hereafter acquainted with me, that I love Elder Marsh; and that I love him too well to cover up his faults: and I trust that he has the same respect for me. I will not, I dare not, disguise truth, or begot the eyes of others. What I said to you was strictly true. Brother MacMillan (who was present at the time in Elder Marsh's office) is a man of stern integrity and ability; and a more worthy man does not exist. I wish he were better known among Christians; in short, he may be called one of the noblest works of God. But notwithstanding all this, he is mistaken. It was not "on a specific point of the Gospel as expounded by Dr. Thomas," as Elder Marsh has said. The facts are these.

Brother MacMillan and myself had been reading over Elder Marsh's articles on "Valid Immersion," and could not realize that it came from the pen of so worthy a man, that he should be so much in the fog, I could not bear to have him "pulling at every post." We made an appointment to call on him at his office. We found him there, and I at once broached the subject. We talked with him alternately, trying to show him his error; but it seemed difficult to bring him to a point. At last I said to him, "You are aware that the Apostle Paul says in Eph. iv. 4, 5, 'that there is one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism,' and also 'one Hope of the Calling;' now the question lies here, Did you have the one faith, and the one hope we are called to, at the time you were immersed?" "Oh," he replied, "we had no faith at all; we were in the school of Christ." But I cannot believe, that a man is in the school of Christ where such dogmas as the following are inculcated, or when he was teaching them—namely, that all men have in them immortal souls, that these are immaterial, and constitute the man proper; and that the body is a clog to the soul, and that at death the immaterial thing leaves its prison, and passes into a kingdom above, where there is said to be neither time nor space: by which traditions the lie direct is given to Christ and the apostles, who have said that "the meek shall inherit the earth," and that that inheritance shall be for ever, &c. Call that the school of Christ where such dogmas are taught! God forbid that I should endorse such a sentiment. Call that the school of Christ where traditions are delivered, which have neither the Bible nor common sense to sustain them! The fact is, our friend is in the fog; and consequently has nothing but fog to fight with. I have seen him, Brother Thomas, there before; and when he got out he was glad; and I was glad to be able to forgive him for calling me "a Judaizer;" and I believe, he will do the same thing again. He cannot walk in darkness long; and I must say to you, what I have said to his face (and to J. B. Cook's likewise), they have preached so long what some people call "Gospel" (and they supposed it was such themselves), that the cross is too great to become "as little children," and be reimmersed. Their ministerial dignity stares them in the face. They probably feel a little, as did the Pharisees of old at Jordan; they would not confess their sins to a man whose meat was locusts and wild honey; neither would they be taught by that Nazarene, notwithstanding they were confounded by him in his answers and teachings; neither would they be taught by those fishermen, although they had the argument every time.

I am glad, Brother Thomas, to see that you have patience with him. The elder is a noble man. I have lived door-neighbor to him, and know him "like a book." I would not hear him slandered, and not defend his cause. He, I mean Marsh, means to be honest, and he is honest, long-suffering, and kind; he is easy to be entreated, except when his path is crossed. His honesty is seen then; for he will not pass by the doctrine or by him that teaches it, with silent scorn and contempt as many will; but he will fight himself into the belief of it, if he cannot overthrow it. I have been present in his office, and heard him most shamefully abused by little upstarts, who were not fit to unloose his shoes, and he would bear it all.

I have often heard, Brother T., of drowning men catching at straws; and, I think, our friend is at that desperate pastime. I see that in his Jan. No. 1, he publishes from Elias Smith's New Testament Dictionary. He was the founder of the Christian DENOMINATION, of which Elder Marsh was a member. The latter seems to represent that he was a true follower of Elias Smith; but that a large majority of them dissented from the doctrines their nobles laid down, in consequence of which his sojourn with them was not unfrequently marked with sore trials. Now, if that be true, our friend did apostatize, though a little after his brethren. When I moved to Rochester, which was in the fall of '48, and began to teach the things concerning the Kingdom, it seemed to him like a curious doctrine; and he made similar remarks to others; and in speaking of me, he often branded me with the epithet of "a Judaizer;" and was much opposed to such a doctrine. For eight years, or more, of my acquaintance with him, we have

had many a long conversation upon the subjects at issue between yourself and him: and this is the first intimation that he ever believed such sentiments; and not longer ago than last winter he told me, that at the time of his immersion he had no faith but was in the school of Christ. Now, Brother Thomas, when I get all these facts into one compound, it presents to me a very singular one. May God save him (with a little sacrifice on his part) and dispel the cloud of dust stirred up by his own feet; and that we may all meet in the everlasting Kingdom, is the prayer of your brother,

JOSEPH PIERCE.

ADDENDUM. — I see that things have come to a crisis in Rochester, as I expected. That spirit of which J. B. Cook is possessed (he and others style it the Spirit of Christ), is a strange one; and one with which I wish to have nothing to do, nor much to do with him who has it. They are in their own eyes perfect; but in mine, knowing their conduct, quite the reverse; for I found them "sensual and devilish," J. B. Cook being foremost and chief. I have been intimately acquainted with him for years. At first, I thought him one of earth's finest (and I now think he means well); but I have been compelled against my wish, to change my opinion of his merits. That spirit by which he is guided makes him believe that he hath the whole truth and cannot err; though all the truth he has got is borrowed from others. I am acquainted with some obscure individuals from whom he borrowed through the week, to deal out to his congregation on Sunday. But when they differed with his spirit on the Spirit, denying the presence in him of that Spirit which Christ our Saviour had—the Holy Spirit—which he sent on Pentecost to bear witness of Him, and to glorify Him in the signs and wonders with which he confirmed the word of the apostles—J. B. Cook's spirit was incensed. Guided by this spirit, by low cunning and intrigue, he will plot at midnight, and manoeuvre to expel from his church men who differ from his spirit, whose shoes he is not worthy to unloose. I witnessed the operation of that spirit at Rochester; and I observed that it converted J. B. Cook into any thing but a gentleman; much less a Christian, deporting himself less honorably than a low politician, made yet lower by the spirit of grain.

Well, what spirit can we term it but "the spirit of error?" By this same spirit he was very sanguine that his former Baptist faith was the truth; by this same spirit he was afterwards taught to apostatize to Millerism; by this same spirit he was moved to apostatize from Millerism to the medley he now holds to be the truth: deny the genuineness of this spirit, and it quickly shows the cloven foot. It is an evil spirit, and ruinous to the possessed. That the truth may enter in, and cast out the demon, that he may be healed, and clothed in a right mind, is the sincere desire of his well-wisher.

JOSEPH PIERCE.

MELUGEN GROVE, LEE, ILL.,  
March 1857.

---

### School of Christ."

IN THE SCHOOL OF CHRIST WITHOUT FAITH? —Query.

A school, from the Latin schola, is a house or place of instruction and discipline. It is also a system of doctrine delivered by a teacher and his assistants. If a doctrinal system be taught in that teacher's house which he repudiates, it is taught in his school in opposition to, or perversion of his school; and it is not difficult to understand, that such a state of things is tolerated only till an opportunity favors for the teacher to expel such adversaries, or Satans, from his place of instruction and discipline.

But, if the Satanic teaching be not taught in his schoolhouse, but in some other place, then the teaching is in no sense in his school, but in some other school, which becomes in respect of his a hostile and rival establishment.

Now, "the Christ," in the sense of the ANOINTING SPIRIT whose name is JEHOVAH, has a system of doctrine and a place, or house, where it is delivered. The disciples or scholars, in this school, are all they of whom He who is "THE RESURRECTION" says, "I will raise them up at the last day." In fact, they are the schoolhouse as well as the scholars; for it is written of them, "Christ's house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of THE HOPE firm unto the end."—Heb. iii. 6. Now, concerning them, the Spirit in Isaiah and Jesus saith, "THEY SHALL BE ALL TAUGHT OF GOD."—John vi. 45. It is evident, then,

1. That "Christ's school" is where God is the Teacher;
2. That it is the company in the midst of which God's truth is taught;
3. That that company is composed of those who intelligently confess God's truth; concerning a certain and well-defined thing styled by him in his teaching "THE ONE HOPE OF THE CALLING; and,
4. That the recognised scholars are they, who "having heard and learned of the Father," lay hold of the confidence and rejoicing of that Hope, and do not let go, but "hold fast to the end."—Heb. x. 22, 23.

The SCHOOL OF ANTICHRIST is a rival establishment. It is divided into many classes, which are designated by divers "Names and Denominations." Its teaching is not uniform, as it contains many Rabbis pledged to heterogeneous systems and opinions. The Spirit of the School is the spirit of "the Flesh of Sin," which inspires them with sentiments in harmony with its affections and desires. What they suppose, think, or imagine the Scriptures ought to signify, that they affirm it teaches; and what they manifestly declare contradictory of the traditions of the Antichristian Rabbis, these pronounce to be heretical; and receivable only in "a spiritual sense," that is, as importing the contrary, or something different, to what is plainly expressed.

The disciples of this school, like their teachers, are unanimous chiefly in darkening the counsel of God by words without knowledge. It is characteristic of them that they speak what they wish, and all speak different things. Confusion worse confounded, is the real principle of their "chairs." Instead of holding truth "firm to the end," they do not know when they have got truth, but are ever shifting and changing from one set of opinions to another, as in the case of our friend J. B. Cook and others. In this, their conduct is the very opposite of the disciples of Christ's school. When these come to understand the word of the truth of the Gospel of the Kingdom, they hold fast to the end. They do not become in turns Baptists, Campbellites, Millerites, Medleyites, &c.; these are the conversions of Antichrist's school, where classes are changed to suit the occasion. A man may, indeed, pass through all these classes, and then become a disciple in the School of Christ; but then this is only effected by leaving the one school for the other, and when he gets into Christ's, there he remains, "learning of the Father," that he may be thoroughly purged of clerical foolishness, and "go on to perfection."—Heb. vi. 1.

The Father-Spirit, whom no man hath seen, nor can see" (John vi. 46; 1 Tim. vi. 16), teaches the scholars of Christ's school by the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, whose doctrine is in true and perfect accord. These writings are able, and do, make wise the teachable unto salvation—2 Tim. iii. 15-17; Psalm xix. 7. They turn those, who become as little children (Matt, xviii. 3, 4), from the fables of apostate Christendom to the simplicity of Christ. They give him introduction into his school by bringing him to an enlightened obedience of the one faith. Since the day of Pentecost, a man of faith enters the school by obeying the Gospel of the Kingdom. Attending the meetings of Christ's scholars, or speculating on mysteries does not constitute a man a scholar, any more than a visitor is a university student because he attends the lectures of the institution, or talks about the subjects treated of by the professors. A man must matriculate before he can be recognized as a disciple of the school. A formal admission to school membership is necessary; and this formality must be according to Scripture. A man ignorant of "the Hope of the Calling" cannot possibly find admission. He must obtain "confidence" and "rejoicing" in this; and this is only obtainable through "understanding the word of the kingdom." —Matt, xiii. 20, 23. Mark that in verse 20, "hearing the word" is the cause of "receiving it with joy;" and in verse 23, the hearing and understanding, if the ground be good, of bearing fruit. "The sentiments of all Christendom" are not taught in the school of Christ; it is the law and the testimony which find an honorable and distinguished place there; but which are comparatively nothing regarded or thought of in "the Names and Denominations." Where the Spirit of prophecy reigns, heathenism has no place. Heathenism, and the "One Hope of the Calling" cannot coexist in one and the same believing heart. The latter is as much as a "true heart" can contain. It has no room for heathenism; and immortal soulism and sky kingdomism are heathenism. These dogmata are not taught in Christ's school; but are emphatically the characteristic crudities of Doctor Antichrist's protections. Where he reigns, they triumph; and no scope is found for the truth. He is an Egyptian; and a so-called "school of Christ" where his "sentiments" find place or favor, is a school for which we have no more taste or affection than our correspondent. With him we say, Forbid it, O ye heavens, that we should endorse such a spurious concern!  
EDITOR.

---

### "Spiritualism," more attractive than the Bible!

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS, —We have had meetings most of the time since you were here. Occasionally we get a hearer who will acknowledge, that the plain literal interpretation of the "word" favors our position; and yet they will go after the things wherein they have been reared with this acknowledgement upon their lips. We have had a lady here lecturing upon "Spiritualism," who ignored the Bible, and drew a crowd. Alas for these days of darkness! When will the people learn to love the truth? When will the Bible, "the sure word of prophecy," be unto them as "a light shining in a dark place," illuminating their understanding and opening up to them a glorious immortality, by a resurrection from the dead. They are pleased with the delusion, that makes death a gate to endless joy, and bids their spirits range Elysian fields without space, and whose hours have no time. Alas, men have not forgotten the fault of our first parents, but still aspire to be gods, instead of seeking to obtain heirship in the inheritance promised to Abraham, by a better resurrection. But we must plod on, content to be accounted as heretics and the offscouring of the earth, until Jesus comes. Now is the day of the powers that be, but then will be our time. Until then, let us wait patiently, holding fast to the prize.

Yours, in the one hope,

L. Z. BAKER. AURORA, ILLINOIS, March 24, 1857.

When in Aurora last year, the people were invited to come and hear what the Bible revealed of that real spirit-world wherein the rulers of its nations shall all be spirit-men, because born of the spirit from their mother earth; but alas, few, very few, of the townspeople responded to the invitation! Since then, however, a sort of witch of Endor, having a familiar spirit, a presumptuous enemy of that great Book, to which the world is indebted for whatever of mortal excellence it contains, has visited them; and like Simon Magus, the Samaritan, has bewitched them with her sorcery! They crowded out to hear a woman ignore the Bible; and reveal to them the mysteries of a spirit-world, by the Mesmeric excitation of flesh! If this be not an evidence of extreme gullibility, then there is no credulity on earth. What a practical comment on clerical influence and teaching in Aurora! The clergy of all sects there are the formers and keepers of the Aurora conscience, which crowds the courts of the sorceress and the infidel; but cannot be induced to lend an ear to "what the Spirit saith to the churches!"  
EDITOR.

---

### Balancing Accounts.

DR. THOMAS, —In the Herald for March, I noticed the lines "for distribution by F.G.C," and feeling convinced in my mind that they possess more poetry than truth, I have, in an off-hand manner, endeavored to balance accounts with him, by adding in more truth than poetry; and though thereby it may not read so smoothly, it tells no doubt a truer tale, and truth is what we need in this our day. So here it is:

### The Clergy.

"Those holy men whom God in Christ ordained,  
To promulgate the doctrine they maintained;  
By whom the Gospel's banner was unfurled,  
And free salvation to a ruined world  
Proclaimed in Christ, the great Messiah's name;  
Who sent them forth these tidings to proclaim,  
Are all now numbered with the 'prostrate dead,'  
Waiting the coming of their living Head,  
To raise the great assembly of the blest,  
To life's immortal sabbatimal rest.  
'But ere' they ceas'd to breathe, and fell asleep  
In Him, to whom they gave their lives to keep,  
'They all predicted that, in days to come,'  
[The evil worked e'en then and ruined some,]  
'False prophets and false teachers would arise.  
And turn men's itching ears from truth to lies.  
All which has come to pass as then foreseen,  
Foreknown and shown by those inspired men.  
'Whether by birth of high or low degree,  
Their learning what, or what their gifts may be,  
Is not the question. 'Tis enough to know,  
[And known it is that all these things are so;]  
That men there are in this enlightened age,  
Who madly dare an open war to wage,  
Against the throne and majesty of God,  
The Prince Messiah, and his written Word.

Reckless of truth, and in assertion bold,  
As were apostates in the days of old,  
[Whose fables were so cunningly devised]  
Their main design so artfully disguised,  
And so alluring, the 'fat' baits they set,  
'Thousands were drawn into the fatal net.'"

Yes, many follow their pernicious ways,  
Causing the righteous few in these our days,  
Who walk the narrow way of Scripture truth,  
As did the apostles in the church's youth,  
To be ill spoken of in every where,  
And persecuted sorely all they dare.  
The multitude by following thus to ill,  
The wide gate crowd and tread the way of sin.  
'Bad at the best, and waxing worse and worse,  
Foes to themselves, and to the world a curse,  
These dark designing men on mischief bent,  
And on the ruin of men's souls intent.'  
They preach for hire, for filthy lucre's sake,  
Devouring widow's houses—no mistake.  
They beg from hungry men to feed the full  
And o'er the flock watch well to get the wool;  
Bind burdens on men's souls that can't be borne,  
Nor yet to lighten one, a finger turn  
'To speed their course' their banner is unfurled  
In merchandize bazaars o'er all the world.  
"My reference is to" these "and such as" these,  
Who whine and flatter every way to please,  
And hold men's persons in admiration,  
To obtain their dear-loved aspiration.  
'In whose dark brain,' the 'darker' idea rolls,  
The immortality of wicked souls.  
'Men who to speed, and carry out their plans,  
Would wrest from God the destinies of man;  
With iron horns would push to God in heaven  
The sin-stained seed—the unrighteous leaven  
Of disobedience. 'All of Adam's race,'  
Without regard to faith or pard'ning grace.  
"Deceiving still, and being still deceived,  
And hoping in the end to be believed,  
They would, and do, their minds are so perplexed  
Involve in midnight gloom the sacred text.  
Would by a blast blow out the holy light  
That shines therefrom upon our mental sight.  
Their own 'Traditions' rather than forego  
Wisdom's eternal councils overthrow;  
Annul the laws which God to man has given,  
And 'their traditions' give as laws from heaven.  
And 'would above God's own anointed Son,'

Transport themselves to an eternal throne.  
In skykingdomia's visionary realm,  
On board the phantom ship without a helm.  
"These heresies with which their 'faith' is stamp't,  
Are older than they say, but newer 'vampt;'  
For heathen Socrates and Plato too,  
Believed what they believe, and say its true.  
The Serpent said the same, 'Thou shalt not die.'  
His clergy all still herald forth the lie.  
'Voltaire, and Volney, Gibbon, Hume, and Paine,  
Than these 'more honest men,' and quite as sane."

Washington, D. C, March 17, 1857.

---

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL. —Archdeacon Blackburn said, —"The more any man is convinced of the immortality of the soul from the principles of Aristotle or Des Cartes, the less will he concern himself about the Gospel account of futurity." Again he says, —"All those fine-spun notions of the immortality of the soul, and all the artificial deductions from that principle, teaching nothing but the art of blowing scholastic bubbles, which will certainly go peaceably to their rest, without the least detriment, either to sound learning or true religion."

Let any mighty man in the Scriptures give us a "Thus saith the Lord, the soul is immortal."

---