

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME:
A Periodical,
DEVOTED TO THE INTERPRETATION
OF THE
“LAW AND THE TESTIMONY,”
AND TO THE DEFENCE OF
“THE FAITH ONCE DELIVERED TO THE
SAINTS.”



This is the Olde
Armys of France

BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

“I, John, saw that out of the Mouth of the Dragon, and out of the Mouth of the Beast, and out of the Mouth of the False Prophet, three unclean effluences like Frogs (for they are agencies of DEMONS—ambassadors of the political aerial—producing sign-events,) issued forth to the Kings of the earth and of the whole habitable to bring them together for the war of that great day of God the Almighty.” This sign complete, and then “Behold, I, Jesus, come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth.”

—Revelation 16: 13-15.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.
1858.

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. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., JANUARY, 1858
Volume 8—No. 1.

Concerning the Compilers of the Old Testament Scriptures.

BY SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

Extracted from his " Observations," for the Herald
BY THE EDITOR.

When Manasses set up a carved image in the house of the Lord, and built altars in the two courts of the house, to all the host of heaven, and used enchantments and witchcraft, and familiar spirits, and for his great wickedness was invaded by the army of Assarhaddon, King of Assyria, and carried captive to Babylon; the Book of the Law was lost till the eighteenth year of his grandson, Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 5-7. Then Hilkiyah, the high priest, upon repairing the temple, found it there, (2 Chron. xxxiv), and the king lamented that their fathers had not done after the words of the book, and commanded that it should be read to the people, and caused the people to renew the holy covenant with God. This is the Book of the Law now extant.

Then Shishak came out of Egypt, and spoiled the temple, and brought Judah into subjection to the monarchy of Egypt, (which was in the fifth year of Rehoboam); the Jews continued under great troubles for twenty years, being "without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law; and in those times there was no peace to him that went out, nor to him that came in, but great vexations were upon all the inhabitants of the countries, and nation was destroyed of nation, and city of city, for God did vex them with all adversity," 2 Chron. xii, 2-4, 9; xv, 3, 5, 6. But when Shishak was dead, and Egypt fell into troubles, Judah had quiet ten years. And in that time Asa built fenced cities in Judah, and got up an army of 580,000 men, with which, in the fifteenth year of his reign, he met and overcame Zerah, the Ethiopian, who had conquered Egypt and Lybia, Troglodytica, and came out with an army of 1,000,000 Lybians and Ethiopians, to recover the country conquered by Sesack, 2 Chron. xiv, 1, 6-9, 12. And after this victory, Asa dethroned his mother for idolatry, and he renewed the altar, and brought new vessels of gold and silver into the temple; and he and the people entered into a new covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers upon pain of death to those who worshipped other gods; and his son, Jehoshaphat, took away the high places, and in the

third year of his reign sent some of his princes, and of the priests, and Levites, to teach in the cities of Judah; and they had the Book of the Law with them, and went about throughout all the cities of Judah, and taught the people. This is that Book of the Law which was afterwards lost in the reign of Manasses, and found again in the reign of Josiah, and therefore it was written before the third year of Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xv. 3, 12, 13, 16, 18.

The same Book of the Law was preserved and handed down to posterity by the Samaritans, and therefore was received by the Ten Tribes before their captivity. For when the Ten Tribes were captivated, a priest of the captivity was sent back to Bethel, by order of the King of Assyria, to instruct the new inhabitants of Samaria "in the manner of the God of the land," (2 Kings xvii, 27, 28, 32, 33); and the Samaritans had the Pentateuch, or Five Books of Moses, from this priest as containing the law, or "manner of the God of the land," which he was to teach them. For they persevered in the religion which he taught them, joining with it the worship of their own gods; and by persevering in what they had been taught, they preserved this Book of their Law in the original character of the Hebrews, while the two tribes after their return from Babylon changed the character to the Chaldean, which they had learned at Babylon, 2 Kings xvii, 34, 41.

And since the Pentateuch was received as the Book of the Law by the Two Tribes and by the Ten Tribes, it follows that they received it before they became divided into two kingdoms. For after the division, they received not laws from one another, but continued at variance. Judah could not reclaim Israel from the sin of Rehoboam, and Israel could not bring Judah to it. The Pentateuch, therefore, was the Book of the Law in the days of David and Solomon. The affairs of the tabernacle and temple were ordered by David and Solomon, according to the Law of this Book; and David, in Psalm lxxviii, admonishes the people to give ear to the law of God, means the law of this book. For in describing how their forefathers kept it not, he quotes many historical things out of the books of Exodus and Numbers.

The race of the kings of Edom, before there reigned any king over Israel, is set down in the book of Genesis, (ch. xxxvi, 31;) and therefore that book was not written entirely in the form now extant, before the reign of Saul. The writer set down the race of those kings till his own time, and, therefore, wrote before David conquered Edom. The Pentateuch is composed of the Law and the history of God's people together, and the history hath been collected from several books, such as were the history of the creation, composed by Moses, Gen. ii, 4; the book of the generations of Adam, Gen. v. 1; and the book of the wars of the Lord, Num. xxi, 14. This book of wars contained what was done at the Red Sea, and in the journeying of Israel through the wilderness, and, therefore, was begun by Moses. And Joshua might carry it on to the conquest of Canaan. For Joshua wrote some things in the book of the law of God, Josh. xxiv, 26, and, therefore, might write his own wars in the book of wars, those being the principal wars of God. These were public books, and, therefore, not written without the authority of Moses and Joshua. And Samuel had leisure in the reign of Saul, to put them into the form of the books of Moses and Joshua, now extant, inserting into the book of Genesis the race of the kings of Edom, until there reigned a king in Israel.

The book of the Judges is a continued history of the Judges down to the death of Sampson, and, therefore, was compiled after his death, out of the acts of the Judges. Several things in this book are said to be done "when there was no king in Israel," Judg. xvii, 6; xviii, 1; xix, 1; xxi, 25; and, therefore, the book was written after the beginning of the reign of Saul. When it was written, the Jebusites dwelt in Jerusalem, Judg. i, 21; and, therefore, it was written before the eighth year of David, 2 Sam. v, 8; and 1 Chron. xi, 6. The books of Moses,

Joshua, and Judges contain one continued history down from the creation to the death of Sampson. Where the Pentateuch ends, the book of Joshua begins; and where the book of Joshua ends, the book of Judges begins. Therefore, all these books have been composed out of the writings of Moses, Joshua, and other records, by one and the same hand, after the beginning of the reign of Saul, and before the eighth year of David. And Samuel was a sacred writer, (1 Sam. x, 25,) acquainted with the history of Moses and the Judges, (1 Sam. xii, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,) and had leisure in the reign of Saul, and sufficient authority to compose these books. He was a prophet, and judged Israel all the days of his life, and was in the greatest esteem with the people; and the law by which he judged the people was not to be published by less authority than his own, the law-maker being not inferior to the judge. And the book of Jasher, which is quoted in the book of Joshua, (Josh, x, 13,) was in being at the death of Saul, 2 Sam. i, 18.

At the dedication of the temple of Solomon, when the ark was brought into the most holy place, there was nothing in it but the two tables, (I Kings viii, 9;) and, therefore, when the Philistines took the Ark, they took out of it the Book of the Law, and the golden pot of Manna, and Aaron's rod. And this and other losses in the desolation of Israel by the conquering Philistines, might give occasion to Samuel, after some respite from those enemies, to recollect the scattered writings of Moses and Joshua, and the records of the patriarchs and judges, and compose them in the form now extant.

The book of Ruth is the history of things done in the days of the Judges, and may be looked upon as an addition to the book of the Judges, written by the same author, and at the same time. For it was written after the birth of David, (Ruth iv, 17, 22,) and not long after, because the history of Boaz and Ruth, the great grandfather and the great grandmother of David, and that of their contemporaries, could not well be remembered above two or three generations. And since this book derives the genealogy of David from Boaz and Ruth, and omits David's elder brothers and his sons, it was written in honor of David, after he was anointed king by Samuel, and before he had children in Hebron, and by consequence in the reign of Saul. It proceeds not to the history of David, and, therefore, seems to have been written presently after he was anointed. They judge well, therefore, who ascribe to Samuel the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth.

Samuel is also reputed the author of the first book of Samuel, till the time of his death. The two books of Samuel cite no authors, and, therefore, seem to be originals. They begin with his genealogy, birth, and education, and might be written partly in his lifetime by himself, or by his disciples, the prophets, at Naioth in Ramah, (1 Sam. xix, 18-20,) and partly after his death, by the same disciples.

The books of the Kings cite other authors, as the book of the Acts of Solomon, the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel, and the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah. The books of the Chronicles cite the book of Samuel the Seer, the book of Nathan the Prophet, and the book of Gad the Seer, for the acts of David; the book of Nathan the Prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the vision of Iddo the Seer, for the acts of Solomon; the book of Shemajah the prophet, and the book of Iddo the Seer, concerning genealogies, for the acts of Rehoboam and Abijah; the book of the kings of Judah and Israel, for the acts of Asa, Joash, Amaziah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Manasseh and Josiah; the book of Hanani the Seer, for the acts of Jehoshaphat; and the visions of Isaiah, for the acts of Uzziah and Hezekiah. These books were, therefore, collected out of the historical writings of the ancient seers and prophets. And because the books of the Kings and Chronicles quote one another,

they were written at one and the same time. And this time was after the return from the Babylonish captivity; because they bring down the history of Judah and the genealogies of the kings of Judah, and of the high priest, to that captivity. The book of Ezra was originally a part of the book of the Chronicles, and has been divided from it. For it begins with the last two verses of the books of Chronicles, and the first book of Esdras begins with the last two chapters thereof. Esdras was, therefore, the compiler of the books of Kings and Chronicles, and brought down the history to his own time. He was a ready scribe in the law of God; and for assisting him in this work, Nehemiah founded a library, and "gathered together the acts of the kings and prophets, and of David, and of the epistles of the Kings concerning the holy gift," 2 Mac. ii, 13. By "the acts of David," I understand here the two books of Samuel, or, at least, the second book. Out of the acts of the Kings, written from time to time by the prophets, he composed the books of the Kings of Judah and Israel, the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah, and the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel. And in doing this, he joined those "Acts" together, in due order of time, copying the very words of the authors, as is manifest from hence, and that the books of the Kings and Chronicles frequently agree with one another in words for many sentences together. Where they agree in sense, there they agree in words also.

So the prophecies of Isaiah, written at several times, he has collected into one body. And the like he did for those of Jeremiah, and the rest of the prophets, down to the days of the second temple. The book of Jonah is the history of Jonah, written by another hand. The book of Daniel is a collection of papers written at several times. The latter six chapters contain prophecies written at several times by Daniel himself; the first six are a collection of historical papers written by others. The fourth chapter is a decree of Nebuchadnezzar. The first chapter was written after Daniel's death; for the author saith, that Daniel continued to the first year of Cyrus; that is, to his first year over the Persians and Medes, and third year over Babylon. And, for the same reason, the fifth and sixth chapters were also written after his death; for they end with these words, "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus, the Persian." Yet these words might be added by the collector of the papers, whom I take to be Ezra.

The Psalms composed by Moses, David, and others, seem to have been also collected by Ezra into one volume. I reckon him the collector, because, in this collection, I meet with psalms as late as the Babylonian captivity, but with none later.

After these things, Antiochus Epiphanes spoiled the Temple, commanded the Jews to forsake the law upon pain of death, and caused the sacred books to be burned wherever they could be found, and in these troubles the book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel was entirely lost. But upon recovering from this oppression, Judas Macabeus gathered together all those writings that were to be met with, (2 Mac. ii, 14;) and in reducing them into order, part of the prophecies of Isaiah, or some other prophet, * have been added to the end of the prophecies of Zechariah; and the book of Ezra has been separated from the book of Chronicles, and set together in two different orders; in one order in the book of Ezra, and in another order in the book of Esdras.

* This was, doubtless, the fact; for Matthew, in ch. xxvii, 9, assigns a prophecy therein quoted, to Jeremiah, which is found in Zechariah xi, 12, 13. Matthew 'who was guided into all the truth by the Spirit,' (John xvi 13,) corrected by that Spirit the error of the Maccabean compilers. —Editor of the Herald of the Kingdom.

After the Roman captivity, the Jews, for preserving their traditions, put them in writing in their Talmud; and for preserving their Scriptures, agreed upon an edition, and pointed it, and counted the letters of every sort in every book; and by preserving only this edition, the ancients various lections, except what can be discovered by means of the Septuagint version, are now lost; and such marginal notes, or other corruptions, as by the errors of the transcribers before the edition was made, had crept into the text, are now scarce to be corrected.

The Jews, before the Roman captivity, distinguished the sacred books into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographia, or holy writings, and read only the Law and the Prophets in their synagogues. And Christ and his apostles laid the stress of religion upon the Law and the Prophets, Matt. vii, 12; xxii, 4; Luke xvi, 16, 29, 31; xxiv, 44; Acts xxiv, 14; xxvi, 22; Rom. iii, 21. By the Hagiographia, they meant the historical books called Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, the book of Job, the Psalms, the book of Solomon, and the Lamentations. The Samaritans read only the Pentateuch; and when Jehoshaphat sent men to teach in the cities, they had with them only the Book of the Law; for the prophecies now extant were not then written. And upon the return from the Babylonian captivity, Ezra read only the Book of the Law to the people, from morning till noon, on the first day of the seventh month, and from day to day on the feast of tabernacles; for he had not yet collected the writings of the prophets into the volume now extant, but instituted the reading of them after the collection was made. By reading the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues, those books had been kept freer from corruption than the Hagiographia.

In the infancy of the nation of Israel, when God had given them a law, and made a covenant with them to be their God, if they would keep his commandments, he sent prophets to reclaim them as often as they revolted to the worship of other gods; and upon their returning to him, they sometimes renewed the covenant which they had taken. These prophets he continued to send till the days of Ezra; but after their prophecies were read in the synagogues, those prophecies were thought sufficient. For if the people would not hear Moses and the old prophets, they would hear no new ones, no not "though they should rise from the dead." At length, when a new truth was to be preached to the Gentiles, namely, that "Jesus was the Christ," God sent new prophets and teachers; but after their writings were also received and read in the synagogues of the Christians, prophecy ceased a second time. We have Moses, the prophets, and apostles, and the words of Christ himself, and if we will not hear them, we shall be more inexcusable than the Jews. * For the prophets and apostles have foretold, that as Israel often revolted and broke the covenant, and upon repentance renewed it, so there should be a falling away among the Christians, soon after the days of the apostles; and that in the latter days God would destroy the impenitent revolters, and make a new covenant with his people, (Israel.) And THE GIVING EAR TO THE PROPHETS IS A FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTER OF THE TRUE CHURCH. For God has so ordered the prophecies that in the latter days "the wise may understand, but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand," Dan. xii. 9, 10. The authority of emperors, kings, and princes is human. The authority of councils, synods, bishops, and presbyters is human. The authority of the prophets is divine, and comprehends the sum of religion, reckoning Moses and the apostles among the prophets; and "if an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than what they have delivered, let him be accursed." Their writings contain the covenant between God and his people, with instructions for keeping this covenant, instances of God's judgment upon them that break it, and predictions of things to come. While the people of God kept the covenant, they continued to be his people; when they break it, they

cease to be his people or church, and become "the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews, and are not." And no power on earth is authorized to alter this covenant.

The predictions of things to come relate to the state of the Church in all ages; and amongst the old prophets, Daniel is most distinct in order of time, and easiest to be understood; and, therefore, in those things which relate to the last times, he must be made "the key of the rest."

The above was published after the decease of Sir Isaac Newton, by a relative, in 1733.
Dec. 9, 1857. EDITOR.

* The most "pious" among the Gentiles stumble most at the word, being disobedient to it. With these, it is so much of "the word" as suits their natural feelings; and that little as interpreted and "applied" by what they call "the Holy Ghost." The self-interpreting word with them is "dead," and "kills." A dead word killing is a literary phenomenon of their system! They are made alive by abstract spirit, whose teachings, when compared with the word, is found to contradict and nullify it. Against such a spirit may God defend the saints! —Editor of the Herald.

Christianity the True Judaism.

NO. 2.

THE reader will, doubtless, remember that in the September number of our previous volume, we gave him an account of certain meetings at 106 Centre Street, New York, under the caption of "Christianity the True Judaism" the professed object of which, on the part of the originators thereof, was the conversion of infidel Jews to "the truth as it is in Jesus." In that account he would learn how we came to be mixed up with it; how Dr. de Lara proved to be "a Tartar hooked and captured by the challenger," a son of Andover Congregational Christianity; and how our part in the demonstration came to an expected end. But, in addition to these things we would remark here, that, though we could no longer seem to cooperate with the parties who commenced the meetings, we did not abandon the endeavor to convince the Israelites that, although Romanism, Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Methodism, Baptistism, Unitarianism, Mormonism, Millerism, Campbellism, and such like, are no part or parcel of Christianity—the doctrine of Jesus and the Apostles was the mystery of God contained in the writings of Moses and the Prophets, revealed or explained in the preaching and teaching of the Nazarenes; and that, therefore, "THE TRUTH" was such an interpretation of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as placed their several teachings in perfect harmony with each other. In order to carry out the endeavor, unmixed even in the appearance of fellowship with the before-named "damnable heresies" of "Christendom," we withdrew from the flash-of-lightning depot * in Centre Street, to 187 Bowery, which our brethren had hired for regular meetings, but which had not been hitherto occupied at nights, having been unwilling to divert public attention from the Centre Street meetings, so long as there seemed to be scope for advocating Bible Christianity in the face of Flash-of-Lightningism and Rabbinical Judaism.

* Flash-of-lightning-depot—so we denominate the Hall where, as "the challenger" said of religion—"religion is obtained in an instant;" and where the Methodistically converted Jew, the Rev. Mr Harris, even that same Gentilized son of Abraham, after the flesh, who, on an occasion previously reported in the Herald, told his audience, that there was converting power

in the wood of the altar rail—advised unbelieving Jews to retire into their closets and pray to the Lord for faith in Jesus as the means of getting religion!! This is flash-of-lightning or instantaneous religion—animal-magnetic spiritualism—the faith and piety of the pretended orthodoxy of the day.

As we stated in the September number, "the Challenger" made no apology for the insult we considered he had offered to us, in what he said about certain coming to the meetings with their friends whom they had brought there to applaud them. If he had had no allusion to us, it is reasonable to believe that he would have promptly announced to the audience that he alluded no more to Dr. Thomas than he did to Dr. de Lara. This would have been the straightforwardness of honesty and righteousness. But instead of so doing, he allowed us to remain under the imputation, and put off any explanation with the remark, that "he would think of it."

Having devoted some days to the thinking, he excogitated the following serpentine curiosity explanatory of his course; which his colleague, the chairman of the meetings, testifies was badly conducted in regard to us.

THE CHALLENGER'S EPISTLE TO THE EDITOR.

DR. THOMAS—Dear Sir, —I think it necessary for me to address you a few words relative to your remarks last Sunday evening at our meeting in Centre Street.

I do not see what right you have to take offence, and that so late, at the remarks about applaud two weeks ago at our meeting in Centre Street. I declared then, both to Dr. de Lara and to the audience, that I did not mean him. You heard it, and yet you did not say then a word. And again were there no other persons who spoke at the meetings, and who could be base enough to bring in applauders and disturbers of our meeting? Dr. de L. could take offence since my remark was made, after an applaud which was meant for him. I need scarcely say that I did not think so mean of you as to do what I remarked in general, and you took it as an offence to yourself. I need not tell you, and I am not bound to, whom I meant. I thought that I had cause to think certain parties in the room disposed to applaud every thing that would be derogatory to Christianity in general. Now, as this is foreign from our object of meeting with the Jews, I made, therefore, those severe remarks at our then meeting. I have, therefore, no cause to make an apology to you.

Your remarks at our last meeting sounded very strange, not only to me, but also to others. I must say, however, that my remark was unguarded; though the reproof, I am sure, was deserved in certain quarters; and it seems that it was pocketed there.

My visit to your house, I assure you, was not dissimulation. I was sincere in my invitations to you, and they are still standing. Excuse me for speaking as I do; for though it does not become in a young man to speak so to a father in Christ, but circumstances compel me. All that I feared was your fierce, and so I think, unwarrantably sweeping denunciation of all Christians in other churches beside your own. But Mr. Lederer (the chairman—Ed.) told me that he took that precaution. This made me glad; and I rejoiced to have you come to our meetings, and to take part in them. For then I was secure against any and every sectarian tendency in our meetings. This we cannot suffer in our meetings, for reasons that you may easily see and appreciate.

About my telling, "loud enough for you to hear," to brother Lederer, "Set him down!" this, I am sure, must have been when your remarks were extended beyond the limits of time allowed to us to occupy the chapel, and not meant to refuse you an opportunity to speak that which you spoke, and which I adore, and love as the truth of God. That I differ from you in points, have no doubt; but that I love all that I see in you is according with Christ Jesus, this, I trust, you will believe me.

Should you be pleased to give us your presence next Sunday evening, D.V., I would beg you not to make any mention of this letter in the meeting. Let it be dropped, I would say.

Finally, I remain, your brother in Jesus the Christ, the Hope of Israel, in spite of your denouncing me, and the church to which I belong as of the Apostasy: and believe me to be your sincere friend and friend of your family; and beg that you will revise every feeling that has grown out from your thinking me to be otherwise.

Should you choose to answer me, I would inform you that on Saturday (D. V.) I move to 349 East 10th street, New York.

EPHRAIM M. EPSTEIN.

April 27, 1857.

Mr. Ephraim, in the above, is evidently in parturiente; the product, however, is unsatisfactory. He clearly considers it a base thing to bring applauders to a meeting; and for the first time, and in the letter before us, vindicates himself from referring to us in his "unguarded remark." Individual persons were charged with bringing their friends to applaud their speeches. There were no speeches applauded but Dr. de Lara's and ours: but he says, he did not mean that either of us were guilty, and silences any further inquiry by refusing to disclose of whom he spoke! The reader will make his own inferences.

We may remark, furthermore, that "the challenger" has denied, through Mr. Lederer, the chairman, that he invited us to their meeting; which the latter now affirms we attended for the purpose of breaking up. But in the letter before the reader, Mr. Epstein plainly admits it. "I was sincere," says he, "in my invitations to you, and they are still standing." It is plain, therefore, that what we stated is the truth. We were invited by Messrs. Epstein and Lederer for their own purposes; and we accepted their invitation for ours: not for the purpose of breaking up their meetings, but for the vindication and advocacy of Bible-Christianity against Rabbinical Judaism, and all Gentile Counterfeits, of whatever "name" or "denomination" they might be. We were true to our banner, knowing no compromise nor surrender. The people heard us gladly; and even of the clergy present, one said, "he could have sat all the night to hear us." Can the chairman, a member of our own body, say the same? Did he think, when he took "that precaution," referred to by Mr. Epstein, that we were going to allow the argument with Judah to be encumbered with the Gentilism of his employers, in which, if his words are for aught else than to conceal his thoughts, he has no more faith than we. Though he admits that Mr. Epstein has treated us badly, where has Epstein's bad treatment of us placed him? It has caused him to abandon his brethren, from whom he has received nothing but kindness; and to throw himself wholly into the arms of the Gentiles, whose "charity" is ample enough to embrace all save those who obey the faith once delivered to the saints, and earnestly contend for it. Mr. Epstein's course is in keeping with his principles. He is an Andover-Divinitarian; and believes that the simple belief of the Messiahship of Jesus makes a man a Christian. He cannot, therefore, approve of our sweeping our decks clear of all his beloved "churches," for which we have no more respect than he has for Mohammedanism. But Mr. Lederer's former

professions are not so. He professed to believe "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ;" and after the example of the Samaritans who believed the same things, "was immersed." He even admits the truth now; yet, we grieve for his sake to testify, that he is cooperating with the enemies of the truth, and lending himself to the promotion of their schemes for the proselytizing of Jews to the Abominations of the Earth.

We have thought it right to bear this testimony against brother Lederer's course, because he now pretends to blame our individual self and the church to which we belong in this city, for his alliance with Satan. At the time of his immersion, he was a tract distributor, or missionary of some society in New York. So long as we supposed he confined himself to the labor of convincing Israelites, that Jesus was the Son of David and the Son of God covenanted to Israel, we did not protest against his receiving \$450 per annum from the Society's funds; though we were in hope, that he would get into some secular employment, and so become independent of it altogether. His attendance at the weekly celebration of the love and sufferings of Christ was very irregular; and far less frequent than to hear us speak, an irregularity, however, in which he is not the only member of our ecclesia worthy of blame. We have been forbearing towards them all, putting the best construction upon their cases, in supposing that the will to do right was overruled by circumstances beyond control. But recent developments have proved that continued forbearance is connivance of wrong; and that the forsaking of the assembling of ourselves together according to scriptural precept and example, is the beginning of apostasy. Brethren were therefore deputed to wait upon brother Lederer, who had deserted our assemblies ever since the day he remonstrated with us for affirming, in our reply to Dr. de Lara, that the world's Christianity (by the world, we mean, the professors of Gentile Pietism) was not the Christianity of the New Testament; but an apostasy from it—a period of several months; and to ascertain the cause of his absence, and to invite him to come to our meeting, and there explain himself. But he did not come. He admitted that we had the truth; but that the world above defined, had a better spirit than we! Thank God, we have not surrendered to Satan, nor compromised our principles and birthright, like Esau, for a mess of society's pottage! "A better spirit!"—the spirit of compromise and surrender better than the spirit of earnest contention for the ancient faith delivered to the saints! The former spirit succumbs to Gentilism for lucre's sake; the latter resists the devil, with the panoply of God, at the risk of everything beloved. We repudiate the "better spirit" as a false and lying, and hypocritical and guileful spirit; for no spirit is of God that ignores "the gospel of the kingdom," and the obedience it commands. We are not surprised at any opposition from Mr. Epstein, so long as he regards Andover Divinity as the religion of Christ. If an honest disciple of this school, he is bound to oppose us; and as watchman of the craft, to lift up his warning voice against us. But we are surprised at brother Lederer, to whom we have shown nothing but kindness and liberality. The peculiarity of the case, however, is not of difficult discernment. He does not like "the good fight of faith," when the spirit of the fight gets so elevated as to endanger the rations. Had the Society that employs him discovered that he was in "church-fellowship" with that "old infidel" that withstood Centre Street religion and Rabbinism, they might have discharged him from their employ. But what a sorry account we should have had to give at the tribunal of the Lord—that, for fear of injuring the temporalities of our friends, we had forborne to testify against the apostasy; and had stated truth so guardedly, and in such general terms, that its friends even could scarcely discern a feature of its original face! We are sincerely grieved for brother L., who has turned his back upon us; and pray that he may be recovered out of the snare into which he has fallen; and yet become courageous for the truth even unto bonds, imprisonment, or death.

Mr. Epstein errs in saying, that we "denounce all Christians in other churches beside our own." We do not denounce Christians at all. Show us a Christian after the pattern of those first called by that name at Antioch (Acts xi. 26) and be they of our ecclesia or of others, we see only a friend and a brother, unless he prove a traitor to the same. Paul warred against strongholds, reasonings, and every high thing that exalted itself against the knowledge of God (2 Cor. x. 5) and so do we. In this warfare we only know "friend truth." We fight for this friend; so that all who fight for her also will be found on our side. We know nothing of her as identified with "churches," or "Christians of churches;" but as we find her in Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles. We have no vested interest in church or denomination; nor do we desire any, neither would we accept them. We can therefore afford to tell Satan what the Bible says concerning them. The adversaries may not relish such independence and plainness of speech; but what is that to us? Our business is to state and defend the truth, and leave all consequences to him "who gives the increase."

Mr. Epstein is wrong in saying he wished us to be set down for the reason he assigns. We had not begun our remarks when he cried "Stop him!" We were stepping forward to begin; so that his cry could only be interpreted as expressing his wish that we should be prevented from speaking.

We are sorry that we cannot accept the fraternity of Mr. Epstein. He has no difficulty in recognizing us as a Christian. We cannot, however, return the compliment. He falls far short of the conformation of the man who is, according to Paul, "renewed by knowledge after the image of his Creator." We read of no such men in Christ on the page of the New Testament after the Andover type of Mr. Epstein. Bible-Christians believed in the apostolic revelation of the mystery (Rom. xvi, 25) hidden from the ages and the generations; (1 Cor. ii, 6, 9) and believing this as exhibited in Jesus were immersed into the Name of Jehovah Elohim, according to the formula in Matt, xxviii, 19. Flash-of-lightning religion has nothing to do with this. It is too electrical for us—too animal-magnetic; a religion beginning and ending in the flesh. We wish him joy of his brethren; but we respectfully decline being numbered among the same.

Mr. Epstein's letter not having come to hand till after the insertion of advertisements for evening meetings at 187 Bowery, we left it in abeyance until now. "We had withdrawn from Centre Street, where we saw clearly that nothing could be done by the agency in the ascendant but to Gentilize the Jews, an enterprize in which we could not possibly cooperate. We notice it here historically in illustration of the policy that presided over and directs the Judeo-proselytism of the heathen. For ourselves, we do not desire to convert Jews into Gentiles; but rather to intensify their nationality, and to make them "Israelites indeed in whom is no guile." We say to the Jews, be devoted to Moses and the Prophets; glory in your nationality; love the country of your fathers above all lands; hope for your restoration, and independence of all Gentile sovereignty; and have no fellowship with their scripture-nullifying "names and denominations." Be Jews in faith as well as flesh; "for without faith it is impossible to please God;" and the flesh profits nothing:" it is the Jehovah-Spirit that makes alive. But with all this, we say to them, accept JESUS OF NAZARETH, the noblest of your race, as the covenanted Son of David and of God—ani ehyeh-lo leav, wehu yiyeh-li-levain—2 Sam. viii, 14; and in him be constituted the righteousness of God; for his name—yehowah-tsiddkainu—is to be proclaimed to Judah, Israel and Jerusalem for righteousness— Jerem. xxxiii, 15,16.

At the meetings in Centre Street, Mr. Epstein made two very ridiculous assertions, which elicited the contempt of many that heard them. Addressing the Jews present he said, "You are not Jews;" and speaking of himself and coreligionists added, "We are the true Jews." This reminded us of the Millerites, who could scarcely speak of natural born Jews without contempt and insult; and who declared that God had finally cast them away; and do not believe in the "salvation," which Jesus says "is of the Jews:" nevertheless these Jew-hating Gentiles cried with loud voices through the land "We are the true Jews! We are the Israel of God!" Mr. Epstein and the Millerites presumptuously affirm what they cannot prove from the scriptures of truth. If they will consult Rev. ii, 9; and iii, 9, they will discover that they are not the first who "have said they are Jews, and are not, but do lie." Satan's synagogue is famed for pretensions it has no just title to. None are Jews of the higher order — destined associates of Israel's King in the kingdom of Jehovah—save those "who walk in the steps of that faith of the father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised"—who believe the gospel preached to him, and obey it in the name of Jesus. Neither Mr. Epstein nor the Millerites have done this; therefore their claim to be "Israelites in deed" is presumptuous and absurd.

Having withdrawn our countenance from Centre Street, we invited the Jews to meet us in the Bowery, where they should be heard with all patience, and without interruption or insult. Some attended, and among them our new friend Dr. de Lara; who about five minutes before the meeting opened, caused the following letter to be handed to us: —

Epistle from Dr. de Lara, a Non-Christian Israelite, to the Editor.

DEAR AND HONORED SIR — In your address last Sunday evening you observed, that the New Testament perfectly agreed, or harmonized, with the Old; or you may have used an expression conveying this idea.

I can conceive the idea of a Christian by birth and education giving his assent to this proposition, and conscientiously believing the doctrines which Orthodox Christianity tells us are taught in both volumes: you are, however, aware that these two points, namely, the disagreement or agreement between the exclusively Jewish, and the Christian sacred books, and the doctrines of orthodox Christianity, said by the latter to be revealed in both volumes—that these are the very points at issue between Jews and Christians.

A devout Jew may perhaps be brought to the belief that the Personage stated by Christians to be the Messiah, had already appeared; and that Jesus of Nazareth was He; that his history was recorded in the books of the New Testament; and he may give his assent to the purely historical parts of these books. Believing in the divine power of performing miracles, since he finds a display of that power in the Old Testament, he may even believe in that other part of the New Testament in which history and miracle are blended together as they are in the books of the Old Testament. The same God who enabled and permitted Moses and Elias to perform miracles, may have bestowed the same power upon another mortal; and that mortal may have been Jesus of Nazareth as well as any other man. I say, that a devout Jew may, perhaps, be brought to believe all this by inquiries satisfactory to his own mind; and by his own reasonings founded upon such inquiries; but I have very strong doubts of such a view of the case ever becoming universal, or even general, among the Jews; or that they will extend beyond a few, very few, and isolated instances, and amongst Rabbinical Jews exclusively.

The modern, or self-styled enlightened Jew (whether he is justly entitled to this denomination, or not, is not now the question,) may regard Jesus of Nazareth as a

philosopher, a moralist, the Socrates of his age and country—as a man, who, discarding all the laws that govern man's conduct in his relation to God, yet conforming to them in compliance with custom just as the wise Socrates in his last moments ordered a cock to be sacrificed to Æsculapius—disbelieving himself in divine revelation, and regarding with contempt the sacrifices, observances, and ceremonies taught the doctrine of a certain prophet, that true religion consisted in the practice of virtue, mercy, justice, and humanity; that the Creator and Father of all mankind had not and could not have, selected one very small and almost insignificant fragment of the human family to make it his chosen and favorite people to the exclusion of all the rest. I say, a philosophical Jew may entertain this conviction rejecting the doctrine of a Messiah, whether temporal or spiritual altogether; and, if I am not much mistaken, such are the views entertained by modern Jews, though not by Modern Judaism (for the difference is marked) and are gaining ground rapidly.

All this, I say, may be possible, and partly is true: the moment, however, a Jew is told that God has a Son, and that there are three persons, three essences, three somethings or anythings, in the Godhead; and that these three distinct units or Unities, constitute only one unit or One Unity—and that that Tri-Unity is the God of Israel, the Jehovah of the Old Testament: —the moment, I say, a Jew is told this, he shrinks back, and stands sternly aloof. The devout Jew points to the declaration on Horeb, "I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." And again, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one." The philosophical Jew regarding God as an incorporated, invisible, incomprehensible Being, rejects with scorn and ridicule the idea of such a Being having a Son; of coming "down" (as it is called) from heaven, and enacting with the Virgin Mary the scene related by Luke. He smiles contemptuously at the idea of three being one, and one being three; and maintains that a book which teaches such an absurd doctrine, and contains such disgraceful tales, is utterly contemptible; and that the writer who could propagate a falsehood so glaring, a story so evidently fabulous, and blasphemous to boot, cannot be otherwise than a liar and impostor, or a man who wrote, or was only fit to write for the nursery; and that any writer that could declare, that there are three persons, or three anythings, in One Godhead, if he himself honestly believed such an absurdity, ought to be set down as demented, and only entitled to pity, and to a cell in an asylum.

Both sections of the Jewish world on being told that the writers of the New Testament were all Jews, (and admitting for the sake of argument that they were so,) deny that, provided they were in the full possession of their mental faculties, the possibility of their honest belief in the history of the Annunciation, the Miraculous Conception, and the Incarnation, though the pharisaical and rabbinical Jews might, perhaps, admit the possibility of the story of the Resurrection and Ascension. They deny that any Jewish writer could have believed in the doctrine of the Trinity (I use this term conventionally, and as a laconism;) that therefore as Jews they never could have written this; and if this doctrine be found in the New Testament, it has either been foisted in there, or the writers were not Jews.

Now they open the New Testament, and there they find it distinctly recorded, that the Virgin conceived of the Holy Ghost—a spirit, an incorporeal existence (which is itself a contradiction in terms)—a carnal intercourse between a spirit and a woman, a mortal, mere flesh and blood! They find there, further, the following expressions amongst others used by Jesus of Nazareth, "I and my Father are one;" "Before Abraham was I am;" which is bad grammar at all events. "Of these things knoweth no man, no not even the Son, but the Father who is in heaven." They find John telling them, that "In the beginning was the word, and the word was God, and the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;" which, though they laugh

at such language as that of an idiot, they find it written there, "The only begotten Son of the Father." They are told that Thomas addressed Jesus as "My Lord and my God. John tells them distinctly, that "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit;" and that "these three are one." Prima facie, therefore, they find the doctrine of the two natures inferentially; and that of the Trinity plainly taught in these books, taking them as they are.

Comparing these declarations of the New Testament with the stern commandments of God on Sinai, and the declaration of the unity of God in Deuteronomy; upon your declaration, therefore, and with the New Testament before them, they ask, "How can you reconcile these, to them, so evidently clashing declarations? How will you be able to show, that the New Testament agrees and harmonizes with the Old?"

As your views differ very materially (or at least appear to do so to me) from those of the generality of Christians, I should be glad to hear your exposition of the doctrines of the Two Natures, and of the Tripersonality; and see how you reconcile these doctrines with that of the absolute unity of God, as revealed in the Old Testament.

I am, with the highest regard,

Dear and Honored Sir,

Yours, very truly,
D. E. DE LARA.

New York, May 9, 1857.

Remarks on Dr. de Lara's Letter.

BY THE EDITOR.

DR. DE LARA'S letter seems to have been originated in a spirit of astonishment, incredulity, and candor: —of astonishment at our statement concerning the entire and absolute harmony of the teaching of the two Testaments, in the face of the dogmas of "Orthodox Christianity," referred to, —of incredulity, because of the unphilosophical and irrationalistic character of the facts testified in the New Testament; and of candor, in seeming, though by education hostile to THE NAZARENE, to desire a fair examination into "the stone of stumbling" presented to the Jewish mind in "the things concerning his Name."

We can easily appreciate the astonishment under which he seems to labor. Our declaration, which we here admit, of the entire and absolute harmony of the teaching of Moses and Jesus, is calculated to excite astonishment— confounding astonishment — in the mind that has no other idea of the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles than the parody thereof exhibited in the old wives' fables of what Dr. de Lara styles, "Orthodox Christianity." But, we do not affirm the harmony of "Orthodox Christianity" interpretations, or rather "imagination, high things, and thoughts," (2 Cor. x. 5,) with the teaching of God in Moses and the Prophets: we are therefore under no obligation to attempt the impossible task of reconciliation. We do not believe in the self-styled "Orthodox Christianity" of the world. It is not the Bible teaching of the Spirit of the Christ which was in Moses and the Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles. Admit what Nehemiah and Peter testify, that one and the same spirit was in them all, and that that spirit was God's, "in whom is no darkness at all;" and it follows of necessity, as we have affirmed, that the doctrine of the Old and New Scriptures is entirely and absolutely harmonious and uncontradictory—1 Pet. i. 11; 2 Ep. i. 21; Neh. ix. 20, 30. We believe in the doctrine of God, in the Deep Things of God revealed by his Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 6-16,) not

through disobedient fanatics, or a clergy, Jewish or Gentile, infidel thereof; but revealed by his spirit in the spirit's own words through the holy and faithful heroes of the faith, to whom under God we are indebted for the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This is the Christianity of our faith which we are prepared to state, illustrate and prove in opposition to Modern Judaism, Jewish nationalism, and Gentile Perversions of the truth.

Dr. de Lara appears incredulous. He is reported to have said in one of his speeches at Centre Street, he cared nothing for Moses and the Prophets. He may perhaps, care more than the report of his words gives him credit for. We rather think, that he meant he did not care for their testimony as proof of Messiah having appeared; for we find him saying in a certain periodical, "he did not care if fifty prophets had prophesied the coming of Messiah, unless the facts can be adduced to prove that the Messiah had come." From the letter before us, it is difficult to determine with certainty whether he is "a devout Jew," "an enlightened Jew, a "Rabbinical Jew" or "a philosophical Jew." We suspect he is in feeling a Jew, archaeologically devout, unfettered by Rabbinism, and giving credence only to what the thinking of the flesh, untutored by revelation approves. From these elements seems to be generated the spirit of the letter before us. A Jew incredulous of those oracles committed to his nation's care, is a hard and slippery case to deal with. We feel no interest in arguing with such a Jew; for he has lost his Jewishness, and disappeared in the bottomless pit of nations—the undistinguished multitudes of earth. In the midst of uncertainty, then, we have preferred to view Dr. de Lara as a professed believer in Moses and the Prophets, too enlightened therein to be hoodwinked by Rabbinism, but not sufficiently so to see into their attestation of the righteousness of God in Jesus as the Christ — the Yehovah-tzidkainu. We will not think of him as a rationalistic or philosophical Jew. Rationalism and "philosophy" in religion may do for Gentiles, but is highly unbecoming in a Jew. A Jew ought to be a man of faith; and not a mere rationalist or fleshly pietest: but unhappily, and generally speaking, they are true to the character given of them by Moses in whom they glory, who says, "They are a very froward generation, children in whom there is no faith" — Deut. xxxii, 20 — really as faithless of Moses as of Jesus, if faith is to be measured by conforming to the obedience it demands. A Jew faithless of the Mosaic teaching must necessarily be a rejector of Jesus of Nazareth apostolically displayed. Moses spoke of Jesus; and therefore Jesus inquired, "If ye believe not Moses' writings, how can ye believe my words?" This is the secret of Jewish incredulity: not that the testimony for Jesus is insufficient for faith; but because of their extreme frowardness in making void the word of God by Moses and the prophets, through the corrupting influence of their traditions.

There is a candor about Dr. de Lara's letter that is quite attractive. Its points are distinctly stated, and the views of its writer boldly averred. This is according to our taste. We like a man to stand out in his true character; and not to appear one thing and be another. Moral honesty and moral courage are virtues which few possess in this age of sham. Neither Jews nor Gentiles are pre-eminent in these respects. The former fear one another, and have not lost their terror of the Gentiles. Many, as of old, do not confess Jesus for fear of losing caste — of being cast out of the synagogues, or denied sepulture among Judah's dead: while Gentiles confess Jesus, but know not his doctrine, or fear to bear his cross lest the clergy should blow upon them. Between the two there is nothing to rejoice in. The world is wilderness, and its oases desert. Bold and sterling honesty of purpose and principle is the desideratum of the times. Sham and swindle everywhere abound, and few remain to do battle for the truth at all hazards against the world. Candor and courage are exceedingly scarce.

On the evening upon which Dr. de Lara's letter was handed in we had perused it, marking its point with pencil as we proceeded, and then answered them in general terms before the audience. After we had finished Dr. de Lara arose and apologized for having afforded us no time for examination; and hoped that we would believe that he did not design to extort an advantage by taking us at unawares. We graciously accepted the apology, being satisfied that such was not his policy; but that he really desired the information indicated in the concluding paragraph of his epistle. This being our conviction, and recognizing the importance, the primary importance, of the subject on the great question at issue between the disciples of Modern Judaism and the writers of the New Testament, we announced, that on the following Sunday evening we would lay before the audience the

MOSAIC AND NAZARENE TEACHING CONCERNING GOD.

INTRODUCTION. The renewing Efficacy and Importance of the subject.

The vital importance of understanding the Bible revelation of God will be manifest to those who admit the authority of the New Testament in matters of faith and practice, in considering the testimony of Him "who proceeded forth and came from God;" and who, in "giving to the disciples the words which the Father gave him," said "Thou givest to thy Son jurisdiction of all flesh, that everything which thou hast given to him, he might give to them aionian life. And this is the life of the Aion (αἰώνιος ζωῆ) that they should understand thee (γινώσκωσι σε) the only true God, and Jesus Anointed whom thou sendest" — John xvii., 2, 3. From this testimony we learn,

1. That the life of Messiah's Aion is not for all mankind;
2. That the life is for those specially donated to the Son; and,
3. That the attainment of this life by those specially given to him is consequent upon their intellectual enlightenment concerning what constitutes "the only true God," and the relation to him of Jesus in his anointing.

The apostle John, who heard the utterance of this teaching, and who had delivered the same to the Jews and Gentiles whom he and his colaborers were sent to enlighten with the light of life, reproduces the same doctrine in his first epistle, saying to them, "We have comprehended (οἶδα ἐν) that the Son of God is come, and hath given to us discernment that we might understand the True One, and we are in the True One, in his Son Jesus the Anointed. This is the true God, and the life of the Aion (ἡ ζωὴ αἰωνίου.) Little children keep yourselves from the idols—ch. v. 20.

This intellectual comprehension of the True God is renewing, and capable of developing the likeness of his moral or spiritual image in the illuminated. This is clear from many passages of scripture. Jesus, the Image of the Invisible God, in addressing the Father said, "I have given them (whom thou hast given me) thy word: sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth — Jno. xvii, 8, 9, 14, 17. And again, "Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you — xv, 3. And John says, "the Spirit is the testifier, because the Spirit is the truth — 1 Ep. v. 6. And Paul alluding to the transforming efficacy of God's revelation of himself comprehended and believed, tells obedient believers of the word, that they had put off the old man with his deeds, and put on THE NEW made new again by exact knowledge (εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν) after the image of him creating him — Col. iii, 9, 10. Here are two

characters, or moral natures, in relation to one and the same animal man. Ignorant of the true God and Jesus the anointed whom he has sent, the man A. B. is "alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in him" — Eph. iv. 18; and is invested with "the body of the sins of the flesh" as with an apron of fig leaves. He is then in the Old Man state, and stands before God as Adam and Eve in Eden obnoxious to the anger of offended Deity. He does not know or comprehend the Almighty. He thinks he is altogether such an one as himself, fickle, inconstant, mutable and false. He is as ignorant of his character, or Name, as he is of his hypostasis or substance. In the fulness of the ignorance he turns "philosopher," and presumes to discourse of God, and of Soul, and of the ground of acceptance with him! The presumption of this Old Man of the Flesh, laden with sins and superstitions, is marvellous! He has filled the world with his lucubrations, or skotifications rather, and calls them "wisdom," "theology," "divinity," "philosophy," and so forth. Adam habited in fig leaves under the inspiration of the Serpent, is the incarnation of them all. He was THE WORD OF THE SERPENT MADE FLESH; the Federal Patriarch, or Chief Father, of all who walk in his steps: — the type, or representative patterns of all clerical and philosophical Jews and Gentiles who, "with the flesh," or its reasonings and gospel-nullifying traditions and practices, "serve the law of sin."

Now of the clerical or rabbinical wisdom, and philosophy of this Old Man, the wise men and scribes whom the Jehovah-Spirit sent to Israel, speak in very contemptuous terms. Concerning the rabbinical and philosophical Jews of all times, to say nothing of the Gentiles who have plundered their traditions, they say, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness," Job v, 13. "Forasmuch as this people, (Israel,) draw near with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men"—their traditionizing and philosophizing rabbies; "therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, a marvellous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid. Woe unto them that seek deep to hide their counsel from Jehovah, and their works are in the dark, and they say, Who seeth us? and who knoweth us? Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay; for shall the work say of him that made it, He made me not? Or shall the thing framed say of him that framed it, He had no understanding? Is it not yet a very little while and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed a forest?" Thus testified the Spirit of Christ in Isaiah, concerning the wise and prudent men of Israel, (ch. xxix, 13,) who professed to know God, but in their works denied him. Their wisdom and understanding have shrivelled and perished from off the land, in which they took counsel against Jehovah and his Anointed, to burst their bands asunder, and to cast their cords away, Psalm ii. The stately cedars of Lebanon have been hewn down, and their fruitful fields a forest; and all because "they knew not the true God and Jesus the Anointed."

But, as the Spirit of Christ in the same prophet, and in the same place, also testifies, although Jehovah has poured out upon the staggering guides of Israel the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed their eyes, and covered the prophets and rulers, and seers; and the vision of all is become as the "words of a sealed book," which the learned confess they cannot explain; yet the deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind see out of obscurity and out of darkness; the meek also increase their joy in Jehovah, and the poor among men rejoice in the Holy One of Israel." How literally this began to be accomplished in the day when Jehovah cut asunder his staff, Beauty; for whom, as the Spirit of Christ in Zechariah predicted, Judah and Israel's rulers weighed out to the traitor Judas thirty pieces of silver; and afterwards cast the blood money to the potter for the purchase of his field, ch. xi. 12-13. In that day, when "the

poor of the flock were waiting upon Beauty," the deaf were made to hear, the blind to see, the meek to increase their joy, and the poor to rejoice in the broken staff Beauty, in the hand of the Holy One of Israel. "The poor had the gospel preached to them." When the deaf and the blind were cured, they rejoiced in what they heard. They embraced it as the wisdom of God, confirmed to them by him with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and by the resurrection of Jesus, on the reunion of the fragments of the broken staff he had severed in his hand: "So, says the prophet, "the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of Jehovah."

But the rich and powerful of the flock did not know, and do not know to this day. They are still the deaf and the blind, with all their "vast learning" (!) and philosophy. We go to the Holy Land, the arena of Zion's controversy, and we inquire with Isaiah and Paul, Where are the wise? Where is the scribe? Where the disputants of the Mosaic Aion, who withstood "the truth as it is in Jesus?" The standing answer is, that "God hath made foolish their wisdom;" yea, the wisdom both of Jews and Greeks; for, says Paul, "the world by wisdom knew not God." They had wisdom, but he pronounced it "foolishness;" and James steps in and adds his testimony, that their wisdom was from beneath, being a lie against the truth, and earthly, sensual, and devilish, ch. iii, 14, 15.

Such is the wisdom of the Old Man of the Flesh. It can rise no higher in conceptions of God than the zenith of its own halo. He thinks as he feels, and his feelings are only blind. Being a creature of earth, and sense, and sin, his conceptions of God are earthly, sensual, and devilish. He proclaims him to be an incomprehensible existence, without body or parts. Having assumed this, he deposits him in every created thing, and pantheistically worships him in men, birds, beasts, creeping things, and their images. In this assumption, the philosopher, the theologian, the idolater, all meet together upon common ground. This is their "One God," whom they represent as fierce, vindictive, cruel, and implacable, who, but for some more benevolent being, interposing between him and men, would increase his own glory and enjoyment, and satisfy his eternal justice, by tormenting them in fire and brimstone endlessly. This is the God created and worshipped by the Old Man of the Flesh; worshipped, not because he loves him, or sees any thing in him to admire, but because he is afraid of him. Hence all the fancy superstitions he has devised are all based upon one common error of the brain, namely, the necessity of the worshipper doing something to placate the Deity. The prescriptions extant in the Old Man's dispensary for the purpose are multitudinous. Some of the most notable with which the world is empiricized and overspread, are those of cutting the flesh with knives after the manner of Baal; of causing children to pass through the fire after the manner of Moloch; of "covering the altar of Jehovah with tears, with weeping, and with crying out," after the practice of the priests in the days of Malachi; of straining at gnats, and paying tithes of mint and cummin in the fashion of hypocrites; of self-immolation under the fervid wheels of Juggernaut; of voluntary martyrdom, after the manner of the disciples of the Nicolaitanes, Balaams, and Jezebels of the early centuries after Christ; of papistical penance in afflicting the body for its commendation to God; of many long "prayers" or rhapsodical rants, weeping, and cryings out for religion, after the manner commonly witnessed at the camp meetings and revivals of the names and denominations which now fill the unmeasured court of the Gentiles, Rev. xi, 2. These, and ten thousand other absurd practices of the temple, the synagogue, and church, are all expressive of the common error referred to above, and indicate the total ignorance of Jews and Gentiles, both of the Mosaic and Nazarene teaching concerning the Holy one of Israel.

Now, it is to exorcise A. B. of this Old Man, to deliver him from him, to cast the demon out, to "put off the old man and his deeds" from A. B.; to strip him of the fig leaves, and to put on the sacrificial victim's skin, the garment appointed of Jehovah Elohim, to hide or cover his sin or shame, that "the knowledge of God" or system of divine truth, hath been devised. The Old Man of Sin's Flesh, who is the Devil, cannot be converted. His destiny is destruction; for "for this purpose was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the Devil," or the works of the flesh, which are the same things: and "forasmuch also as the children (of his Father) are partakers of flesh and blood, He (the Son) himself, likewise, took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil" 1. John iii, 8; Heb. ii, 14. Hence the Old Man of the Flesh and his deeds are doomed to extirpation from the earth at the hands of Jesus and his brethren. The Devil and all his superstitions of temple, synagogue, and church, whether dissentient or established, are all to be destroyed. Clergymen and Rabbies, philosophers and fools, will not indeed "go to the devil," but far better will vanish with him from the earth, which will remain emancipated and blessed for "the meek" whose heritage it is.

But if the Old Man cannot be converted, A. B. may. Our friend A. B. may "be taught of God," not by direct spirit-afflation, according to the Old Man's theology, but by the direct operation of the heavenly ideas of God upon his brain-flesh. These ideas are the living spirit, the divine agent, in conversion, which, when understood and believed, inscribe upon the tablet of A. B.'s intellect and affections "the Law of the Spirit of the life in the Anointed Jesus" which "Spirit," as he himself hath said, "it is that makes alive," and "the words which I discourse to you, is spirit and is life—πνευμα εστι και ζωη εστιν. That is, spirit is the words, and life is the words discoursed. The spirit or power of the words is in the ideas they represent; and those ideas generate intellectual and moral, that is, spiritual life; which life having been fully developed in a character approved of Him from whom the ideas originate, is permanently manifested in "the crown of life," the reward of righteousness, which is received by the resurrected and transformed made incorruptible and immortal, or deathless, by "the Lord the Spirit."

Here, then, is a New Man created by the Spirit, who is the rival and deadly enemy of the Old Man, generated of blood, of the will of the flesh, and of the will of man. The germ of the New Man is the ideas of God. These ideas are aggregated in what Peter terms "the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord." If A. B. have this knowledge in him, God's seed is in him; "the Word of the Kingdom" is there; he knows the True One, and his knowledge leads him into the True One—into his Son Jesus the Anointed; and he comes to know that "this is the true God, and the life of the Aion."

When A. B. knows God, and Jesus the Anointed, apostolized, or sent; in other words, when he has believed into the true God, in believing the Gospel of the Kingdom, by obeying it; in the act of obedience, styled and Peter "the obeying of the truth," he puts off the Old Man of the Flesh with his deeds, and puts on the New Man of the Spirit. He is still A. B.; but he is no longer A. B. invested with fig-leaf devices. He is A. B. in a new character. Instead of thinking with the Old Man in his wickedness and folly, he thinks with the Spirit. That is, God's thoughts and ways have become his. He understands, believes, and loves what God has spoken by his Spirit in the prophets, in Jesus, and in the apostles; so that his thinking is now no longer "the thinking of the flesh," which is always wrong, when speculating upon divine things; but "the thinking of the Spirit," which is always right, so long as the seed of God abideth in him.

Here, then, are two men, each of whom set up rival claims to A. B. —the Old Man of Sin's Flesh, or the Devil; and the New Man of the Spirit, or the Likeness of the Image of God. The likeness is Jesus Christ in A. B. dwelling in his heart by faith working, by love of the truth, Eph. iii, 17; 2 Cor. xiii, 5; Gal. ii, 20, v. 6. It is "A New Creature," or creation within him; and upon whom the Old Man of the Flesh is incessantly seeking to impose the yoke of his traditions. Being a great theologian and philosopher, he is ever laboring to bring the New Man into bondage, and to turn him from the simplicity which is in Christ. For this purpose he sets Moses against Jesus, prophet against prophet, Old Testament against New, and the New against the Old; puts them into his crucibles, for he is a great alchemist, and transmutes them into Rationalism, Transcendentalism, Natural Religion—into any thing, in short, to suit the occasion and the times—and dignifies them with the titles of philosophy, science, and "the higher law." But the New Man of the Spirit is free, looking searchingly into the perfect law of liberty, and having no respect to "the philosophy and empty delusion," and antitheses of gnosis, or "oppositions of science," falsely so called, in which the flesh delights. He troubles not himself about Trinitarianism or Anti-trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Arianism, or Socinianism. He has no more deference for these than for any other of "the works of the Devil," or for the Old Man himself. He does not commune with him in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, whom he has sent. The Old Man judges after the flesh; the New Man after the Spirit, in Moses and the prophets, among whom are included John the immerser, Jesus, and the apostles. The spirit of the Old Man is the spirit that exhales from the flesh, and is known as the "nervous fluid," "animal magnetism," "vital electricity," and so forth. It is secreted from the blood by the discerning system of vessels and membranes, supplied with the raw material by the process of digestion and respiration. This spirit of the Old Man of Sin's Flesh is the spirit which his disciples say "accompanies the word, and applies it in the conversion of the soul." The word, or letter, says, this hyperbolic sinner" (καθ υπερβολην α αρτωλόζ) killeth, but the spirit giveth life; by which he means, that the simple word itself, the doctrine, the testimony, and the commandments of Jehovah, are not perfect converting the soul; are not sure, making wise the foolish; are not pure, enlightening the eyes; but that what the Old Man or the Devil, calls "the spirit," is necessary to give them efficacy and power. "The word," saith he, "is a dead letter." True, it is dead as far as its ability to convert the devil is concerned; yea, and kills him, too. He feels this; and, therefore, speaks experimentally. This dead and devil-deadening word has power, nevertheless; for it never ceases to enrage him, especially when the New Man of the Spirit rejects the dogma of vitalizing the idea words of God by the animal magnetism of the flesh, as blasphemy.

The New Man of the Spirit is the mental likeness of God in Christ daguerreotyped, so to speak, on the fleshy table or sensorium of A. B., by the Holy Scriptures, "which," as Paul says, "are able to make wise to salvation, through faith, which is by the Anointed Jesus." It is only the A. B.'s thus enlightened that are "taught of God," and know Him. None else are made alive by the Spirit; and, consequently, none others "know God;" for he, and all the deep things pertaining to him, are "spiritually discerned."

Furthermore, the high importance of this great subject, that, namely, of knowing the true God understandingly, is manifest from the magnitude of the evil consequent upon not understanding him. Thus, in writing to the Thessalonians, Paul testifies, that the Lord Jesus shall be apocalypsed or revealed from heaven; and that in that apocalypse he will inflict condign punishment upon them WHO KNOW NOT GOD, and who obey not the Gospel of Jesus the Anointed. Surely here is incentive powerful enough to induce A. B. to study God's revelation of himself, and to obey the unadulterated word of the kingdom. Is A. B. wise? is he mighty? is he rich? Then thus saith Jehovah to him: "Let not the wise man glory in his

wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, nor let the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, THAT HE UNDERSTANDETH AND KNOWETH ME, that I, Jehovah, do exercise mercy, judgment, and righteousness on the earth; for in these I delight, saith Jehovah."

Theiopolitical.

"Disquietude of Nations in Perplexity."

This is one of the signs of the time preceding the storm-cloud upon which the Son of Man comes with power and much glory. The "perplexity" precedes the disquiet; for the nations become disquieted, as the sounding and rolling sea, "in" the perplexity. Is not this perplexity inaugurated in their present financial and commercial embarrassment? Is the distress that pervades the whole of Europe in spite of all the efforts of wealth and power to ward it off merely accidental? Or is it not rather the earnest of a change coming upon the world by the hand of God? Taken in connection with the drying up of the great river Euphrates, and the working of the Unclean Spirits like Frogs, (Rev. xvi. 12-14.) we firmly believe, that it is a notable result, to which the Spirit foresaw and predicted the Apostasy in its commercial and financial fructification would attain, just before the Great Change would come that is to abolish "the times of the Gentiles." Being foretold it is a sign. The following, which we copy from the New York Herald, seems to take this view of the matter, it regards it as a sign, though not a predicted sign, of an approaching change in the affairs of nations. The writer, however, greatly errs in his supposition that the signification of the sign is, that commerce is departing from old Europe to settle and enthrone itself in this western region of the earth, "whence both hemispheres are in future to be vivified and fed." The Spirit of Christ in Isaiah has declared that "He will extend peace to Jerusalem like a river, and THE GLORY OF THE GENTILES (their commerce, wealth, &c.), like a flowing stream,"—lxvi. 12; and that the nation and the kingdom that will not serve her shall perish; yea, those nations (and the United States among them, if contumacious) shall be utterly wasted"—Ch. lxi. 12. It is from Jerusalem, and not from Democratic Yankeedom, that both hemispheres are to be vivified and fed—a vitalization and nourishment which will proceed, not from the "almighty dollar" which the Old Man of the Flesh adores, but from the wisdom and knowledge that shall exhale from the Tree of Life in Jehovah-Shammah, "the City of the Great King," who will be there—Ezek. xlvi. 55. The following is the article referred to. —Editor.

The Mutations of Commerce—Indications of Approaching Changes.

The rapid and continuous spread of commercial distress over the whole of Europe, in spite of the efforts made by national banks and governments to arrest it, is amongst the signs of the times that deserve to be carefully noted. The suspension of the Bank of England charter was the panacea which, according to financial empirics abroad, was to cure the evils caused by the influence of our own embarrassments. This, with the aid of other precautions adopted by the Continental governments, would, it was thought, speedily allay all cause for alarm. Well, the Bank charter has been violated, contrary to the opinions and advice of all sound financial thinkers, and the French and other Continental governments have done all that lay in their power to allay the distrust which has rapidly diffused itself amongst all classes. Still the panic is spreading wider and wider, like a malignant epidemic, carrying misery and annihilation to commercial credit in its train. Instead of things getting better, they are getting worse, not only in England, but throughout the whole Continent. All the great centres of

commerce are profoundly disturbed. No man, however strong his commercial position, considers himself safe, and houses that have hitherto enjoyed the unlimited confidence of the public, have fallen under the ban of suspicion. In Hamburg, according to the last accounts, the failures were arriving so thick and fast business was altogether suspended.

Financiers are so accustomed to take a purely economical view of commercial disturbances like the present, that it is no wonder that the remedies which they prescribe should sometimes turn out failures. Thus, in England it was thought that the suspension of the charter and the extension of relief by the Bank of England to a few of the leading banking houses would have the effect of easing the position of the secondary establishments, and of gradually restoring confidence amongst the commercial classes generally. What is the fact? In Great Britain the middle class firms are falling by thousands, and credit is almost wholly annihilated. In France there is reason to believe that things are in an equally bad, if not worse condition—although the precautions taken by a despotic government to gag the press and make matters wear the best aspect possible, render it difficult to arrive at the facts. From the general tenor of the advices that reach us from all quarters, we are compelled to arrive, with the London Times, at the conclusion that European commerce is rotten to its core. There are organic derangements, like diseases, so desperate that no remedies or palliatives can avert their consequences, and Europe, we are convinced, is now suffering under the influence of a malady of this nature.

How else are we to account for the wide spread calamities caused by the reaction of our own disasters? Here we have already tided over the worst of our troubles, satisfied that we have been more frightened than hurt, and cool and comfortable, all things considered. We feel that we have youth and vitality in our favor, and that it will not take us long to recuperate from our temporary exhaustion. How, then, does it happen that the contre-coup of misfortunes which exert only a passing influence over us, should shake Europe to its very centre, and plunge it into the depth of distress and despondency in which we now behold it? People may attribute the deep-rooted consternation now prevailing abroad to excessive speculation, undue expansion, vicious banking, governmental extravagance, or any other of the fallacious causes that present themselves to the superficial thinker. The philosophy of the thing, however, lies within a simpler and more arbitrary compass than any of these reasons.

The commerce of the world is continually shifting the theatre of its operations, and the evidence of history goes to establish the fact that every mutation of this kind must lead to more or less of a general disturbance. Thus, when the Jews were the only bankers of Europe, each religious persecution which drove this people from the scenes of their commercial activity was followed by universal distress and suffering. In the same way when the commerce of Venice and Genoa was transferred to Hanse Towns and Holland, the change was marked by a concomitant disturbance in the financial relations of European countries. So it was, also, after each succession of violent measures taken by England to assert her commercial supremacy and to absorb the trade of the world.

Who can doubt, from the evidences of deep seated disturbance and organization which are now presenting themselves in the commercial relations of Europe, that we are now in the midst of another of those great changes which transferred the trade of Tyre and Carthage to Italy and Holland, and thence to the insular Western communities? Do not all the facts transpiring both in Europe and here tend to prove that the trade of the globe is gradually taking this direction, as the great commercial centre whence both hemispheres are in future to be vivified and fed?

The Principalities.

Question of the Danubian Principalities. —
Jersey: LE FEUVRE: 1857.

This work, said to be from the pen of a distinguished resident of the island, is a full and most luminous exposition of the entire question of the Danubian Principalities—lands which, the author prophesies, are "destined, before another half century, to witness the termination of the duel between the north and the west;" and there is certainly every present indication in Europe that this prophecy is not at all unlikely to be fulfilled.

The policy which the writer advocates as most calculated to render the Principalities an effectual barrier to any aggressive movement of Russia against Turkey, is the union of Moldavia and Wallachia into one independent constitutional State, under the dominion of a foreign prince of some one of the royal families of Western Europe. Such an union the vast majority of the Moldo-Wallachians themselves most fervently desire; but to any kind of union England was, and Austria, and of course Turkey, still are, opposed; whilst France, Russia, Prussia and Sardinia affect to be in favor of the union at least, but are not at all likely to agree to the item of "a foreign (western) prince." Russia, at all events, knows her game better than to consent to that. Our author thus clearly and forcibly indicates her wily and far-reaching policy:

"This war has left this question just where it found it. Russia, though for the moment checked and embarrassed, awaits but a favorable moment to renew her attack on Turkey. We have prevented Turkey from falling into the hands of Russia; but we have not advanced a single step towards determining the destiny of the various Christian nationalities comprising the population of Turkey in Europe, when the moment of the dissolution of the Ottoman Power arrives. * * *

"The treaty (of Paris) whatever may be its letter, is binding on two points, i. e. —To preserve Turkey from foreign invasion; and to compel her to adopt the necessary reforms. But did the contracting powers foresee that every step taken in Turkish reform was a step nearer the perdition of the Turks? That in proportion as intelligence, wealth, and commercial activity permeated the country, the Christian races will gradually obtain ascendancy over the Turks? That every railroad penetrating into the Christian provinces carries with it seeds, which sown amongst the enterprising Christian races, must in time bear fruits fatal to the Ottoman supremacy? * * *

"The policy of Russia to-day is but part of her ancient plan. To exhibit herself as the supporter of the union of the Principalities, is a sure way of securing to herself an unbounded popularity, not only amongst the Roumains, but also with the Slave and Hellenic races. Her policy in this, is as ably directed as ours is the reverse. It is impossible to suppose her sincerely desirous of seeing the Principalities strong, prosperous, and united; but her intense fear of seeing them irrevocably lost to her, and falling into the hands of Austria, has induced her to support the measure (of an union.) Though supporting the project of a simple union, she would oppose, directly or indirectly, that of a foreign prince. Under a Moldo-Wallachian Hospodar she would endeavor to restore her dominant interest in the united Principalities; and would no doubt succeed; and it is consequently just here that we should oppose her. A union under a foreign prince would, however, be an eternal bar to her intrigues. As it is, she hopes to gain, whichever way the question be decided. If the union be determined on, she will throw

her whole weight into the scale to obtain the election of one of her former slaves, Bibesco, Stirbey, Stourdza, &c, and, having won a general popularity by supporting the popular wishes, and secured a predominant interest with the new Hospodar, there is little doubt that she would find the Principalities as much at her command as before the union. If, on the other hand, the question be decided against the union, she will still have got the credit of having endeavored to carry the measure, and, the Principalities remaining in the state they were before the war, weak, divided, and governed by the Boyard miscreants, she will find—as she always has hitherto—the means of sowing perpetual dissension between them and the Porte, and will end at a favorable moment in absorbing them.

“The blind policy pursued by England is in humiliating contrast with these astute views. While Russia can but gain by the policy she has adopted, it is impossible but that we must lose by ours. The Roumains, disgusted at finding themselves deserted by the Western Powers, will fling themselves into the arms of Russia to escape the horrors of the double government, to which we shall have condemned them: while, if, after all, they obtain their wishes without our aid, we shall have lost all political influence, not only with them, but with the whole Christian population of the Turkish Empire. Bulgarians, Serbs, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Illyrians, Albanians, and Greeks, will be enforced to believe, on evidence not to be confuted, that they have more to hope from Russia than from us, and this conviction will bear its fruits when the great crisis attending the dissolution of the Turkish Empire shall arrive. There are but two possible destinies for the frontier tribes of the Turkish Empire—separate independence with a future confederacy—or, absorption by their powerful neighbors; and, if we frustrate the wishes of the Moldo-Wallachians, we shall drive them to look to the latter as their only mode of escape from the detested yoke of the Turks.

"While carrying on an active Propaganda, and on every available opportunity showing herself the true friend of the Christian races generally Russia has pursued in reference to the Principalities a special and distinct policy. Her object has been to place them in such a position as to enable her to occupy them without resistance, whenever, and for whatever length of time, her designs on Turkey demanded. For this purpose the Propaganda would never have proved efficient. Independent of the repulsion existing between the Latin and the Slave races, Russia is too near the Principalities to be able effectually to conceal her real designs. Her frequent and cruel occupations, and her final absorption of the portion of Moldavia between the Pruth and the Dniester, have at last awakened the Roumains to a sense of her true aims. It was therefore because Russia had failed in winning the affections of the Roumains that it became necessary for her to adopt other means. This was to render the Principalities absolutely impotent; and, by employing every possible dissolvent, keep them in a perpetual state of disorganization. It was necessary to have in them a nation without an army, without fortresses, without a defensible frontier—with a ruined finance and undeveloped commerce; without, in fact, a moral or political existence; and how well she has succeeded, let the present state of the Principalities bear witness. And this is the state of things we are laboring to perpetuate! Under Russo-Phanariote Hospodars and a divided government this state of things has been produced, and under Russo-Phanariote Hospodars and a divided government we are going to condemn the Roumains to remain! We formally destroy the Russian Protectorate, and then contemplate restoring that very state of things under which the Russian Protectorate grew up, and, in restoring her creatures, the Russo-Phanariotes, to power, place her in a position where it is impossible but before long she will find means to regain her original ascendancy."

The treaty of Paris provides that the Divans of Wallachia and Moldavia, freely elected by the countries, shall be consulted. Despite every mean effort of Turkey and Austria, and we fear, England also, to prevent such a result, both Moldavia and Wallachia have returned a large majority of Unionists to the Divans. The Commission representing the Seven Powers assembled at Bucharest, are to consider whatever views may be declared by the Moldo-Wallachian representatives on the question of the union, and to prepare a plan for the future organization of the Principalities; which suggested plan is to be discussed by a Congress of the Powers, about to be held in Paris. But, says our author: —

"The views of the Seven Powers will in no way be modified by the opinions of the Divans, however formally expressed; and the six months of discussion contemplated by the Imperial Firman, will serve no other purpose than that of exasperating the parties on whose coolness and moderation everything depends; and cannot fail in exciting the Roumains to a degree which it may not be easy to restrain, should the Congress finally decide on refusing them the Union. Who can foresee the result of even a trifling émeute in Jassy or Bucharest, in the present state of men's minds? Austria, Russia and Turkey are all three prepared to rush in and occupy the Principalities, at the first pretext. It is reported that, on a recent occasion, the Turkish Commissioner in the Principalities, discussing the possibility of a disturbance, and assuming the right of the Suzerain to provide for public tranquillity, remarked — 'We could have ten thousand Turks here (at Jassy) in eight days.' 'We could have one hundred and fifty thousand Russians here in twenty-four hours,' replied the French commissioner.

"Russia has played her game so admirably, that, at this moment, she is arbitress of the whole question; and there is too much reason to fear that at the last moment she will lend her influence to Austria. It is impossible that Russia can desire to see the Principalities strong and united; and if she has seemed for a moment to support the project of an Union, it has been suggested by her alarm at the prospect of seeing them fall into the hands of Austria, and in order to reap a harvest of popularity with the Christians of the Turkish Empire; for, when the moment arrives to declare her true policy, she will adroitly contrive to shift the odium of seeming to oppose the wishes of the Roumains, to other shoulders.

"How unwise has been the policy of England, in determining to oppose the Union, time will show. How clumsy has been her mode of carrying on the contest, enough has already appeared to prove. We took the wrong side, and have been beaten! We attempted to throw our ægis over Turkey, and it has proved no protection. * * *

"Our influence and prestige in the East have received a blow which a quarter of a century will not repair. Redschid Pasha —the tool of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—sank from Premier, to President of the Council of the Tanzimat, and from which he was driven on the 3d September, to give place to Fuad-Pasha, the organ of French policy. The Firmans for the construction of the Euphrates Valley railroad and telegraph, which were prepared, and on the point of receiving the Imperial sanction, were withheld; and Lord Palmerston was forced to make the humiliating admission 'that the Turkish Government has not given permission for the carrying-out of that project.' So sure was the Government of obtaining the necessary concession, that the materiel and Engineers for the construction of the telegraph had already been sent out, and had arrived in the Levant, when notice of this sudden check was received!

"After the most obstinate contest on the records of diplomacy, we have been beaten—discreditably beaten. We have not only suffered a diplomatic defeat, but we have sacrificed our reputation for candor and honesty in the East."

Having thus given ample evidence of the ability and power with which our author treats his subject, we will merely add, that a careful perusal of his entire able work is a duty of all political readers who would obtain a mastery over one of the most complex diplomatic problems of the time. —Jersey Times.

A diplomatic problem containing in embryo the predicted destiny of the East and West, Russia must triumph by hook or by crook — by arms, diplomacy, or both. —Editor of the Herald.

Analecta Epistolaria.

The Old and New Covenants.

DR. THOMAS—Dear Sir—I can say, indeed that I am most highly pleased with the Herald of the Kingdom; and not only pleased, but edified. I do not know that I fully appreciate its value; yet I say in sincerity that I do esteem it the most highly of any publication I have yet seen.

I perceive you have once visited Canada. The people here, as in Toronto, are much opposed to the truth; though, I believe, if it were presented to them by you, or some other efficient person, some would believe and obey. It would be exceedingly gratifying to me to listen to your ministrations of the word; and my relatives here would also be pleased to see you at any time should you be again caused to visit this Province.

Some anxiety prevails among us here respecting the Covenants— Whether we are now living under the Old or the New? If under the Old, is not the Sabbath of the fourth commandment still obligatory upon us? If we Gentiles are not under the old, how do we get under the new? Have the days come as yet when the covenant mentioned in Jer. xxxi. 31, is made with Israel and Judah?

These subjects have weighed heavily on my mind for some time back. I cannot see that we are yet under the old covenant which was made with Israel when they were brought out of Egypt; and yet I do not fully understand how we enter into, or are brought under the new.

Should you deem it worth your while to give me your views on these matters, either by private epistle, or through your excellent paper, you will oblige those who are earnestly seeking to become “wise unto salvation.”

I herewith send you the names of two subscribers for the Herald. Instead of two, I wish I could send you two hundred; but. This is all I can do for the present. Wishing you all success in your labors of love for your fellow men, I subscribe myself your sister, waiting for the consolation of Israel.

C.H.

Komeko, Can. West;
Dec. 15, 1857.

Primarily and generally, there are Two Covenants—the Abrahamic and the Mosaic. These are styled “Old” and “New,” not with reference to the order of their record on the page

of history; but in relation to the time of their coming into force. The Mosaic, styled in Jer. xxxi. 31, "the Covenant which I made with Israel's fathers, when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of "Egypt"—this was instituted at Sinai 430 years after the typical confirmation of the promises to Abraham—Gal. iii. 17; Gen. xv. 18. The Mosaic continued in force for sixteen centuries, a period that brings us down to the time of Jesus and the Apostles. About six hundred years before their day, the Spirit of Christ in the angel Gabriel informed Daniel, as recorded in ch. ix. of his book, that Messiah the Prince should confirm a Covenant; and in the last half of the seventieth week of years from a certain decree, should cause to cease from sacrificing and offering. This teaches that Messiah was to effect a change respecting the Law as the result of his confirmation of a covenant, and consequently another covenant than the Mosaic.

This being the purpose of God, the apostolic writings record the fulfilment; Paul, who had made greater process in the Jews' religion than any of his contemporaries, who were more learned in Judaism than any Rabbi now living; and consequently Paul, even if he were not a Christian, is better authority in constitutional questions concerning the Hebrew Commonwealth than all Rabbies of our day—this same constitutional Jewish lawyer—Paul saith that the Mosaic covenant had been made old by the promise of a new one; and that in his time it was ready to vanish away—Heb. viii. 13. Furthermore, he tells us that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision of the truth of God, to CONFIRM the promises made unto the fathers."—Rom. xv. 8. These promises are the truth of God; and Jesus Christ was the confirmer thereof as Gabriel had foretold to Daniel. But, when did he confirm this new covenant?

This question is answered in the words of Jesus recorded in Luke xxii. 29, 30, and elsewhere, saying, "And I am covenanted for you, as my Father covenants for me a kingdom: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit upon thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel." "I am covenanted " — διατιθεαι, yes; yes; and in so doing, he said, "This is my blood of the New Covenant, being poured out for many for remission of sins."—Mat. xxvi. 28. "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father;" and therefore it was not *felo de se*. Jno. x. 17.

Now, having accomplished this decease and taken up his life again in rising from the dead, the Covenant with Abraham was antitypically confirmed. The antitypical Isaac was offered up; and received again by the Father by resurrection from the dead. This offering of Isaac's seed, the Christ, was the death of the Mediatorial Testator of the New Covenant; "for where a testament or covenant is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator." If there had been no covenant, new or old, there would have been no occasion for the death of Isaac's Seed. The Abrahamic covenant, then, is called New, because it did not come into force till the resurrection of Jesus, which happened in the vanishing period, "the last days" or "end of the" Mosaic "Aion."

This covenant confirmed by Jesus as its Mediator, (Heb. xii. 24,) is the covenant to be made with Judah and Israel, according to Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other prophets. It has not yet been made with Israel and Judah, that is, they have not been brought into the bond, or a delivering of the covenant. —Ezek. xx. 33-37. At the period of confirmation it was offered to Israel and Judah's brotherhood; but they rejected it with scorn, because it was offered in the Name of Jesus. This brotherhood which then existed in the Commonwealth of Judah is represented in Zech. xi. 14, as a staff in Jehovah's hand, named "Bands." They were in the

bands of the Old Covenant which bound them together as one nation. Now, the prophet teaches in this place, that the cutting asunder of the staff, BEAUTY, or the cutting off of Messiah the Prince in whom no fault was found, would be the disruption of an existing covenant (ver. 10;) and that after this, the other staff, BANDS, should be cut asunder, indicating the dissolution of the commonwealth of Israel and Judah. This came to pass accordingly in the Apostles' days, when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Little Horn. This was the epoch of breaking the old covenant, not of making the new, with Israel and Judah. When the new is made with them, the law of Jehovah will be in their inward parts and written in their hearts; and all Israelites will know him from the least of them to the greatest. This is yet to come to pass.

The Old Covenant was never given to the Gentiles. A man of another nation never came under it, unless he became an adopted citizen of the Hebrew Commonwealth. The Gentiles were not even called by the gospel until Beauty was cut asunder, or the Mosaic covenant was broken "with all the people." There is no obligation on Gentiles to keep the Jewish Sabbath. There is no one on earth, Jew or Gentile, that keeps it according to law; and any other observance of it only brings into condemnation. Gentile Sabbatarianism is a fig-leaf of the apron devised by the Old Man of the Flesh for the concealment of his shame. His teaching concerning it is mere twaddle.

The New, or Abrahamic, Covenant having been brought into force by the death of Jesus, Gentiles are invited to avail themselves of it, though for the time being Israelites reject it. The last eighteen hundred years has been a period of individual acceptance of the Abrahamic Covenant, and of national rejection of it. Multitudes of individuals have embraced it joyfully, and at the hazard of property, liberty, and life; but not a single nation has received it. It offers to individuals remission of sins, and inheritance among the sanctified through faith that leads unto Jesus Christ. In other words, it confers the right of life forever and of dominion over the nations in Messiah's Aion, commonly called "The Millennium."

When the day of Christ's power arrives the Israelitish nation will be willing and glad to receive it even from the Nazarine they now so cordially despise. Many other nations will also receive it; and rejoice with Israel in its blessing. This is the testimony of Moses as well as of all the prophets and apostles. But they do not, and will not, accept it in the absence of Jesus from the earth. They will therefore be subjects not rulers, mortals not immortals, people not princes, in the Age to Come.

"How do we Gentiles get under the New Covenant?" Individually? Yes. The answer to this question is, "By taking hold of it." But what does taking hold of the covenant consist in? In believing the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ: and then being immersed into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. — Acts viii. 12; Mat. xxviii. 20. In other words, believe the exceeding great and precious promises covenanted to the fathers Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David; and confirmed by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ; and having this faith, put on Christ by baptism into him—for in Hebrews, Paul says, "By the New, or Second, Will (covenant or testament) we are sanctified through the offering of Jesus Christ once." We are sanctified by the Abrahamic Covenant, which is made sanctifying by Jesus, the seed of Abraham, its mediatorial testator, having dedicated it by his blood. **IGNORANCE OF THE PROMISES COVENANTED TO THE FATHERS, EXCLUDES FROM THIS COVENANT—SANCTIFICATION, WITHOUT WHICH THERE IS NO SALVATION.** "Alienated from God's life," says Paul, "through the ignorance that is in them."—Heb. x. 9, 10. Let those who cannot get beyond the

faith and trembling of the demons, who as well as they believed that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, think on these things. Read James ii. 19; Mark i. 24, 34.

With the hope that sufficient has been adduced to relieve our correspondent of her difficulty, we conclude, wishing her and her friends a glorious participation in the consolation, in the expectation of which she patiently endures. EDITOR.

Dec. 21, 1857.

(From the Gospel Advocate.)

Revelations and Miracles, New and Old.

The great conflict of this age is between new and old revelations and miracles.

1. Natural religionists contend for new revelations from internal and external nature as evidences of the progressive tendency of human nature in this fast age. Newman, Parker and others belong to this school. These new revelations, they imagine, frequently come in conflict with Bible revelations, and, hence, the old are set aside to make room for the new!

2. "Spiritualists" have added a new chapter to the bible of natural religion. The appropriate teaching of this chapter is ghostology. They not only contend for the internal and external revelations of nature, but also for new revelations from the ghosts of the dead. These new ghost revelations often, as they suppose, contradict the Bible, and, therefore, they are driven to the necessity of attributing its supposed errors to the mistakes of the old-time spirits, in or out of the flesh!

3. Mohammedans, Mormons, Shakers, etc., profess to have real bona fide new revelations from the Spirit of God. They of course have but little, if any, regard for the Bible, supposing the new to be better than the old!

4. Catholics believe in the infallibility of the Pope and Romish Church. As there can be no infallibility without inspiration, they, consequently, are new revelationists, and hence the many ridiculous signs and wonders of Romanism!

5. Many Protestants, though they still say "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," yet, in effect, believe in new revelations, and, in some degree at least, repudiate the Bible!

1. All Calvinists who contend for the special influence of the Spirit in order to save the elect by partial grace, are virtually new revelationists. They also teach regeneration before faith. Now, if the Spirit does something for the Calvinistic elect which he refuses to do for others, by which they are regenerated and convinced of their election, that something is effected through the Bible as the means, or without the Bible. If through the Bible, then some new idea to make it special must be added, or it would be divine influence without an idea! If without the Bible, then there must be a new revelation, or it would still be divine influence without an idea! If through the Bible idea, then the reprobates may be saved as well as the elect, as that idea is common to all. But the notion of regeneration before faith amounts to regeneration without an idea new or old!

2. Arminianism, in reference to divine influence, is only a modification of Calvinism. Arminians as well as Calvinists contend for an influence of the Spirit preceding the word. The

former extend it to all, the latter confine it to their elect. Hence Methodists and others, by perverting a few scriptures, can prove that all men, whether in Christian or Pagan lands, Bible or no Bible, are the subjects of the "irresistible converting influence of the Spirit." Now if this influence is without the Bible idea, it involves a new revelation, otherwise it is a conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment without an idea!

3. But we have some Baptists, and perhaps some Disciples, who are great advocates for the word, as they suppose, who, nevertheless, seem to supersede it by their strange views of spiritual influence. They speak of a "miracle or influence over and above and independent of the word," and not connected with it! Now if it is independent of the word, it must be without the Bible idea, and if so, it implies a new revelation, or else it must be spiritual influence without an idea! This view is only a modification of Calvinism!

What, then is the conclusion of the matter? is it not the following?

1. Spiritual influence in and through the Bible idea of Christ.
2. Spiritual influences in and through the Christ idea of a new revelation!
3. Or spiritual influence without the Christ or any other idea!

Is it not philosophically and absolutely impossible for the Father, Son or Spirit, angels, saints or sinners, to think, will, feel, say or do any thing in reference to Christianity, by divine influence, without the Christian idea?

Now, if neither divine, angelic * nor human nature can have any Christian feeling by spiritual influence without the Christian idea, of what use is such an influence in heaven or earth? It never has, never will and never can do any good to preach it, write it, or pray for it. Suppose we send a thousand missionaries into the Pagan world to preach and pray for spiritual influences, with instructions to carefully conceal the Christian idea from the heathen mind. How many disciples to Christ would they make?

* The "angelic" nature is "divine:" in a moral sense men, even now, become partakers of the Divine nature through the knowledge of God. See 2 Pet. i., 4. —Editor Herald.

In all nature "God makes to grow" through certain means, on certain conditions. So, in all grace, the Spirit converts through the word on condition of faith and obedience.

If God is not as good in grace as in nature, Christianity is unworthy of God and not adapted to man. But Christianity is the climax of infinite love and wisdom, and, consequently, so intelligible, so credible and practicable that thousands, in the apostolic age, became Christians the first time they heard the gospel. # And doubtless it would be so now, were it not for the skeptical influence of sectarianism and the everlasting controversy about the wordless, idealess and senseless influence of Spirit.

But not as the result of such gospel preaching as is current now. —Editor Herald.

The cold-hearted speculation of Calvinism involves thousands in doubt whether God ever had any love for them. The Hopkinsian modification involves thousands more in doubt whether the Spirit will ever make them willing by regeneration without faith. The almost

innumerable hair-splittings of the self-styled orthodox and evangelicals about word and spirit, faith in facts, the power of Christ, historic faith, etc., so bewilder the great mass of the people, that they are afraid to use the means and comply with the conditions of salvation, lest they should make some awful mistake.

Last, and worst of all, is the raging, conflicting and antipodal sectarianism of the so called Christian world, which, perhaps, is driving more along the broad, dark road of infidelity to destruction than it guides into the straight and narrow way of life. No wonder conversions are now like angels' visits, "few and far between."

We need a new declaration of independence in religion as well as politics. A declaration that will ignore all the speculations and traditions of Protestants as well as Romanists, and bring us back to the simplicity of Christ and the apostles. This declaration, thank the Lord, has been made. * If we adhere to it we are safe, but if we depart from it we are at sea again, tossed and driven with every wind of doctrine, and who can divine where our bark will land?

The Lord grant we may preach "the word" and faithfully contend for "the faith" formerly delivered to the saints! #

J. J. TROTT.

Salem, September 4, 1857.

* It has; but that declaration is not to be found in Campbellism.

Do this, and all will work right. —Editor Herald.

General Havelock.

AT a meeting of the Hibernian Bible Society, held in Belfast, recently, the Rev. Mr. Graham, of Brown, related an anecdote of the Indian hero who is now winning the applause of all Europe. He said: "General Havelock, although a Baptist was a member of his (Mr. Graham's) missionary church at Bonn, and his wife and daughter were members of it for seven years. When General Havelock, as Colonel of his regiment, was travelling through India, he always took with him a Bethel tent, in which he preached the Gospel: and when Sunday came in India, he visually hoisted the Bethel flag, and invited all men to come and hear the gospel—in fact, he even baptized some. He was reported for this at head quarters, for acting in a non-military and disorderly manner; and the Commander-in-Chief, General Lord Gough, entertained the charge, but, with the true spirit of a generous military man, he caused the state of Colonel Havelock's regiment to be examined. He caused the reports of the moral state of the various regiments to be read for some time back, and he found that Colonel Havelock's stood at the head of the list; there was less drunkenness, less flogging, less imprisonment in it than in any other. When that was done, the Commander-in-Chief said, 'Go, and tell Colonel Havelock, with my compliments, to baptize the whole army.' "
