

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., NOVEMBER, 1858
Volume 8—No. 11.

Mendelssohn and Judaism.

MOSES MENDELSSOHN, a non-Christian Jew by birth and conviction, was born at Dessau in 1729, and died 1786, aged 58 years.

This able writer and excellent man is celebrated, not less for the services rendered to his own people, his "kinsmen according to the flesh," by his labors as a Hebraist and expositor of Jewish affairs, than for those which literary Germany associates with his distinguished name. No man has done more to soften the rigor of that hostility which embittered the lot of the German Israelite a century ago. Since Maimonides, no Jewish writer, not excepting the famous Manasseh ben Israel, has exerted a greater influence on the Jewish mind. He was one of those who have wrought even more by what they were than what they did. His writings are considered as a valuable contribution to the literature of the country of his national captivity; but his character as an upright, magnanimous, and religious man, is a legacy to all modern Israelites more valuable than his writings; and, had he lived in the days of Jehovah's Davidian Son, Jesus, would have made him a Nicodemus; and have probably caused that holy and just one to have pronounced him "not far from the kingdom of God."

Having commenced his career as an author, he formed an intimate friendship with Lessing, another literary celebrity of the time. "Lessing loved Mendelssohn," says his biographer, M. Samuels, "for his excellent heart and highly cultivated understanding, and Mendelssohn was no less attached to Lessing for his inflexible consistency and his transcendent abilities." In Lessing, who was the son of a Lutheran clergyman, than whom, however, no man was ever more free from the prejudices of creed and nation, Mendelssohn found a hearty sympathy and an effective fellow-laborer in his various projects for bettering the condition of the German Jews; an object which then, and at all times, lay nearest his heart. Indeed, the known friendship of so eminent a man for one of that race, in defiance of all the prejudices of the age, was scarcely less important to the Jews in general, than it was to Mendelssohn in particular.

When Mendelssohn's fame was at its height, and zealous Gentiles were wondering that so enlightened and exemplary a man should retain the faith of his fathers, his peace and religious liberty were somewhat pressingly assailed—though with no unkind intentions—by a challenge from the celebrated physiognomist and clergyman, Lavater, who sought to involve him in theological controversy, which modern Israelites, very unlike their ancestors in the

days of Jesus and the Apostles, are very anxious to avoid, especially when the issue formed is between the modern Judaism and the harmonious Christianity of the Old and New Scriptures. Lavater would not admit that a man could be religious, and yet not a Christian by profession. It was not enough with him that Mendelssohn was religious according to the Israelitish standard, he insisted on a formal and public renunciation of Judaism in favor of what he considered Christianity, that is, Swiss-divinity! In order to bring about this result, he dedicated to him his translation of Bonnet's "Inquiry into the Evidences of Christianity," with the request that he would refute it in case he should find the argument untenable; and that if it should seem to him conclusive, he would "do what policy, love of truth and probity demanded, what Socrates doubtless would have done had he read the work and found it unanswerable;" thus, says Hedge, offering him the alternative, either to incur the odium of his own people by formally abjuring the faith of his fathers, or to draw down upon himself the wrath of the clergy by a public assault on their religion.

To a timid and sensitive nature like Mendelssohn's constitutionally averse from all controversy, and especially from controversy on religion, such a challenge was perfectly overwhelming. Prostrate with ill-health at the time, he suffered intensely from this attempt to drag him forth from the strict reserve which he had always maintained on these subjects. But rallying himself, he adroitly put by both horns of the threatened dilemma in a letter which satisfied all parties concerned, and which drew from Lavater a public apology and retractation of his peremptory challenge.

We publish the previous lines concerning M. Mendelssohn, that the reader may understand the circumstances which produced the following letter; and we publish the letter itself that he may be able to discern from it, as from intelligent and unquestionable Jewish authority, the true position and mental condition of modern Israel in regard to the issues between them and all other religions of the earth. The letter is admirably written, and is doubtless expressive of the policy which actuates all classes of Jews who care anything about Judaism; for controversy is as dangerous to modern Judaism as it is to the modern Gentilism of the east and west; therefore it is the wisdom of the serpent neither to read, hear, nor dispute on the subject of religion. It is truth alone that is advantaged and gains by controversy. Modern Judaism (and by this we mean all that is not in rigid conformity with Moses and the Prophets) as even Mendelssohn would seem to admit, is not true—nor modern Gentilism—and therefore they fear a bold and magnanimous encounter in the light of the word. Annexed is the—

LETTER TO J. C. LAVATER.

Honored Philanthropist: — You were pleased to dedicate to me your translation from the French of Bonnet's Inquiry into the Evidences of the Christian Religion, and most publicly and solemnly to conjure me "to refute that work, in case I should find the main arguments in support of the facts of Christianity untenable, or should I find them conclusive, to do what policy, love of truth, and probity bid me, what Socrates would have done had he read the work, and found it unanswerable;" which, I suppose, means, to renounce the religion of my fathers, and embrace that which Mr. Bonnet vindicates. Now, were I ever mean-spirited enough to balance love of truth and probity against policy, I assure you I should, in this instance, throw them all three into the same scale.

I should deem myself beneath a worthy man's notice, did I not acknowledge, with a grateful heart, the friendship and kindness you manifest for me in that dedication, which I am fully persuaded flowed from a pure source, and cannot be ascribed to any but benevolent and

philanthropic motives. Yet I must own that it appeared to me exceedingly strange, and I should have expected anything rather than a public challenge from a man like Lavater.

It seems you still recollect the confidential conversation I had the pleasure of holding with yourself and your worthy friends in my apartment. Can you then possibly have forgotten how frequently I sought to divert the discourse from religious to more neutral topics, and how much yourself and your friends had to urge me before I would venture to deliver my opinion on a subject of such vital importance? If I am not mistaken, preliminary assurances were even given that no public use should ever be made of any remarkable expression that might drop on the occasion. Be that as it may, I will rather suppose myself in error than tax you with a breach of promise. But as I so sedulously sought to avoid an explanation in my own apartment amidst a small number of worthy men, of whose good intentions I had every reason to be persuaded, it might have been reasonably inferred that a public one would be extremely repugnant to my disposition; and that I must have inevitably become the more embarrassed when the voice demanding it happened to be entitled to an answer at any rate. What then, sir, could induce you to single me thus, against my well-known disinclination, out of the many, and force me into a public arena which I so much wished never to have occasion to enter? If even you placed my reserve to the score of mere timidity and bashfulness, these very foibles would have deserved the moderation and forbearance of a charitable heart.

But my scruples of engaging in religious controversy never proceeded from timidity or bashfulness. Let me assure you that it was not only from the other day that I began searching into my religion. No, I became very early sensible of the duty of putting my actions and opinions to a test. That I have from my early youth devoted my hours of repose and relaxation to philosophy and the arts and sciences, was done for the sole purpose of qualifying myself for this important investigation. What other motives could I have had? In the situation I was then in, not the least temporal benefit was to be expected from the sciences. I knew very well that I had no chance of getting forward in the world through them. And as to the gratification they might afford me—alas! much esteemed philanthropist! —the station allotted to my brethren in the faith, in civil society, is so incompatible with the expansion of the mind, that we certainly do not increase our happiness by learning to view the rights of humanity under their true aspect. On this point, too, I must decline saying any more. He that is acquainted with our condition, and has a human heart, will here feel more than I dare to express.

If, after so many years of investigation, the decision of my mind had not been completely in favor of my religion, it would infallibly have become known through my public conduct. I do not conceive what should rivet me to a religion to appearance so excessively severe, and so commonly exploded, if I were not convinced in my heart of its truth. Let the results of my investigation have been what it may, so soon as I discovered the religion of my fathers not to be the true one, I must of course have discarded it. Indeed, were I convinced in my heart of another religion being true, there could not, in my opinion, be a more flagitious depravity than to refuse homage to truth, in defiance of internal evidence. What should entice me to such depravity? Have I not already declared, that in this instance, policy, love of truth, and probity, would lead me to steer the same course?

Were I indifferent to both religions, or derided and scorned, in my mind, revelation in general, I should know well enough what policy suggests, when conscience remains neutral. What is there to deter me? Fear of my brethren in the faith? Their temporal power is too much curtailed to daunt me. What then? Obstinacy? Indolence? A predilection for habitual notions?

Having devoted the greatest portion of my life to the investigation, I may be supposed to possess sufficient good sense not to sacrifice the fruit of my labors to such frivolities.

Thus you see, sir, that, but for a sincere conviction of my religion, the result of my theological investigations would have been sealed by a public act of mine. Whereas, on the contrary, they have strengthened me in the faith of my fathers; still I could wish to move on quietly without rendering the public an account of the slate of my mind. I do not mean to deny that I have detected in my religion human additions and base alloy, which, alas! but too much tarnish its pristine lustre. But where is the friend of truth that can boast of having found his religion free from similar corruptions? We all, who go in search of truth, are annoyed by the pestilential vapor of hypocrisy and superstition, and wish we could wipe it off without defacing what is really good and true. Yet of the essentials of my religion I am as firmly, as irrefragably convinced, as you, sir, or Mr. Bonnet, ever can be of those of yours. And I herewith declare, in the presence of the God of truth, your and my creator and supporter, by whom you have conjured me in your dedication, that I will adhere to my principles so long as my entire soul does not assume another nature. My contrariety to your creed, which I expressed to yourself and to your friends, has since, in no respect, changed. And as to my veneration for the moral character of its founder! had you not omitted the reservation which I so distinctly annexed to it, I should concede as much now. We must finish certain inquiries once in our life, if we wish to proceed further. This, I may say, I had done with regard to religion, several years ago. I read, compared, reflected, and—made up my mind.

Yet, for what I cared, Judaism might have been hurled down in every polemical compendium, and triumphantly sneered at in every academic exercise, and I would not have entered into a dispute about it. Rabbinical scholars, and rabbinical smatterers, might have grubbed in obsolete scribblings, which no sensible Jew reads or knows of, and amused the public with the most fantastic ideas of Judaism, without so much as a contradiction on my part. It is by virtue that I wish to shame the opprobrious opinion commonly entertained of a Jew, and not by controversial writings. My religious tenets, philosophy, station in civil society, all furnish me with the most cogent reason for abstaining from theological disputes, and for treating in my publications of those truths only which are equally important to all persuasions.

Pursuant to the principles of my religion, I am not to seek to convert any one who is not born according to our laws. This proneness to conversion, the origin of which some would fain tack on the Jewish religion, is, nevertheless, diametrically opposed to it. Our rabbins unanimously teach, that the written and oral laws, which form conjointly our revealed religion, are obligatory on our nation only. "Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob." We believe that all other nations of the earth have been directed by God to adhere to the laws of nature, and to the religion of the patriarchs. Those who regulate their lives according to the precepts of this religion of nature and of reason, are called virtuous men of other nations, and are the children of eternal salvation.

Our rabbins are so remote from Proselytomania, that they enjoin us to dissuade, by forcible remonstrances, every one who comes forward to be converted. We are to lead him to reflect that, by such a step, he is subjecting himself needlessly, to a most onerous burthen; that, in his present condition, he has only to observe the precepts of a Noachide, to be saved; but the moment he embraces the religion of the Israelites, he subscribes gratuitously to all the rigid rites of that faith, to which he must then strictly conform, or await the punishment which the legislator has denounced on their infraction. Finally, we are to hold up to him a faithful

picture of the misery, tribulation, and obloquy, in which the nation is now living, in order to guard him from a rash act, which we might ultimately repent.

Thus, you see, the religion of my fathers does not wish to be extended. We are not to send missions to both the Indies, or to Greenland, to preach our doctrine to these remote people. The latter, in particular, who, by all accounts, observe the laws of nature stricter than, alas! we do, are, in our religious estimation, an enviable race. Whoever is not born conformable to our laws, has no occasion to live according to them. We alone consider ourselves bound to acknowledge their authority; and this can give no offence to our neighbors. Let our notions be held ever so absurd, still there is no need to cavil about them, and others are certainly at liberty to question the validity of laws, to which they are, by our own admission, not amenable; but whether they are acting manly, socially, and charitably, in ridiculing these laws, must be left to their consciences. So long as we do not tamper with their opinions, wrangling serves no purpose whatsoever.

Suppose there were amongst my contemporaries, a Confucius or a Solon, I could, consistently with my religious principles, love and admire the great man, but I should never hit on the extravagant idea of converting a Confucius or a Solon. What should I convert him for? As he does not belong to the congregation of Jacob, my religious laws were not legislated for him; and on doctrines we should soon come to an understanding. Do I think there is a chance of his being saved? I certainly believe, that he who leads mankind on to virtue in this world, cannot be damned in the next. And I need not now stand in awe of any reverend college, that would call me to account for this opinion, as the Sorbonne did honest Marmontel.

I am so fortunate as to count amongst my friends, many a worthy man, who is not of my faith. We love each other sincerely, notwithstanding we presume, or take for granted, that, in matters of belief, we differ widely in opinion. I enjoy the delight of their society, which both improves and solaces me. Never yet has my heart whispered, "Alas! for this excellent man's soul!" He who believes that no salvation is to be found out of the pale of his own church, must often feel such sighs rise in his bosom.

It is true, every man is naturally bound to diffuse knowledge and virtue among his fellow creatures, and to eradicate error and prejudice as much as lies in his power. It might therefore be concluded, that it is a duty, publicly to fling the gauntlet at every religious opinion which one deems erroneous. But all prejudices are not equally noxious. Certainly, there are some which strike directly at the happiness of the human race; their effect on morality is obviously deleterious, and we cannot expect even a casual benefit from them. These must be unhesitatingly assailed by the philanthropist. To grapple with them, at once, is indisputably the best mode, and all delay, from circuitous measures, unwarrantable. Of this kind are those errors and prejudices which disturb man's own, and his fellow-creatures' peace and happiness, and canker, in youth, the germ of benevolence and virtue, before it can shoot forth. Fanaticism, ill-will, and a spirit of persecution, on the one side, levity, Epicurism, and boasting infidelity on the other.

Yet the opinions of my fellow-creatures, erroneous as they may appear to my convictions, do sometimes belong to the higher order of theoretical principles, and are too remote from practice to become immediately pernicious; they constitute, however, from their generality, the basis on which the people who entertained them have raised their system of morality and social order; and so they have casually become of great importance to that

portion of mankind. To attack such dogmas openly, because they appear prejudices, would be like sapping the foundation of an edifice for the purpose of examining its soundness and stability, without first securing the superstructure against a total downfall. He who values the welfare of mankind more than his own fame, will bridle his tongue on prejudices of this description, and beware of seeking to reform them prematurely and precipitately, lest he should upset, what he thinks a defective theory of morality, before his fellow-creatures are firm in the perfect one, which he means to substitute.

Therefore, there is nothing inconsistent in my thinking myself bound to remain neutral, under the impression of having detected national prejudices and religious errors amongst my fellow-citizens—provided these errors and prejudices do not subvert, directly, either their religion or the laws of nature, and that they have a tendency to promote, casually, that which is good and desirable. The morality of our actions, when founded in error, it is true, scarcely deserves that name; and the advancement of virtue will be always more efficaciously and permanently effected through the medium of truth, where truth is known, than through that of prejudice or error. But where truth is not known, where it has not become national, so as to operate as powerfully on the bulk of the people as deep-rooted prejudice—there prejudice will be held almost sacred by every votary of virtue.

How much more imperative, then, does this discretion become, when the nation, which, in our opinion, fosters such prejudices, has rendered itself otherwise estimable through wisdom and virtue, when it contains numbers of eminent men, who rank with the benefactors of mankind! The human errors of such a noble portion of our species, ought to be deferentially overlooked by one who is liable to the same; he should dwell on its excellences only, and not insidiously prowl to pounce upon it, where he conceives it to be vulnerable.

These are the reasons which my religion and my philosophy suggest to me for scrupulously avoiding polemical controversy. Add to them my local relations to my fellow-citizens, and you cannot but justify me. I am one of an oppressed people, who have to supplicate shelter and protection of the ascendant nations; and these boons they do not obtain everywhere, indeed nowhere, without more or less of restriction. * Rights granted to every other human being, my brethren in the faith willingly forego, contented with being tolerated and protected; and they account it no trifling favor, on the part of the nation, who takes them in on bearable terms, since, in some places, even a temporary domicile is denied them. Do the laws of Zurich allow your circumcised friend to pay you a visit there? No. What gratitude then do not my brethren owe to the nation which includes them in its general philanthropy, suffering them, without molestation, to worship the Supreme Being after the rites of their ancestors? The government under which I live leaves nothing to wish for in this respect; and the Hebrews should therefore be scrupulous in abstaining from reflections on the predominant religion, or, which is the same thing, in touching their protectors, where men of virtue are most tender.

* Justice and gratitude require me to observe, that this was written in the middle of the last century. Enlightened Europe presents, in our days, but one state to verify it.

By those principles, I have resolved invariably to regulate my conduct; unless extraordinary inducements should compel me to deviate from them. Private appeals, from men of worth, I have taken the liberty tacitly to decline. The importunities of pedants, who arrogated to themselves the right of worrying me publicly, on account of my religious principles, I conceive myself justified in treating with contempt. But the solemn conjuration

of a Lavater, demands at any rate this public avowal of my sentiments: lest too pertinacious a silence should be construed into disregard, or—into acquiescence.

I have read, with attention, your translation of Bonnet's work. After what I have already stated, conviction becomes, of course, foreign to the question: but, even considered abstractedly, as an apology of the Christian religion, I must own it does not appear to me to possess the merit which you attach to it. I know Mr. Bonnet from other works, as an excellent author; but I have read many vindications of the same religion, I will not only say by English writers, but by our own German countryman, which I thought much more recondite and philosophical than that by Bonnet, which you are recommending for my conversion. If I am not mistaken, most of your friend's hypotheses are even of German growth; for the author of the *Essai de Psychologie*, to whom Mr. Bonnet cleaves so firmly, owes almost everything to German philosophers. In the matter of philosophical principles, a German has seldom occasion to borrow of his neighbors.

Nor are the general reflections premised by the author, in my judgment, the most profound part of the work; at least the application and use which he makes of them, for the vindication of his religion, appear to me so unstable and arbitrary, that I scarcely can trace Bonnet in them. It is unpleasant that my opinion happens to be so much at variance with yours; but I am inclined to think, that Bonnet's internal conviction and laudable zeal for his religion have given to himself a cogency in his arguments, which, for my own part, I cannot discover in them. The major parts of his consequents flow so vaguely from the antecedents, that I am confident I could vindicate any religion by the same ratiocination. After all, this may not be the author's fault; he could have written for those only who are convinced like himself, and who read merely to fortify themselves in their belief. When an author once agrees with his readers about the result, they will not fall out about the argument. But at you, sir, I may well be astonished; that you should deem that work adequate to convince a man, who, from his principles, cannot but be prepossessed in favor of its reverse. It was probably impossible for you to identify the thoughts of a person, like me, who is not furnished with conviction, but has to seek it. But if you have done so, and believe, notwithstanding, what you have intimated, that Socrates himself would have found Mr. Bonnet's arguments unanswerable, one of us is, certainly, a remarkable instance of the dominion of prejudice and education, even over those who go, with an upright heart, in search of truth.

I have now stated to you the reason why I so earnestly wish to have no more to do with religious controversy; but I have given you, at the same time, to understand that I could, very easily, bring forward something in refutation of Mr. Bonnet's work. If you should prove peremptory, I must lay aside my scruples, and come to a resolution of publishing, in a counter-inquiry, my thoughts, both on Mr. Bonnet's work and on the cause which he vindicates. But I hope you will exonerate me from this irksome task, and rather give me leave to withdraw to that state of quietude which is more congenial to my disposition. Place yourself in my situation; take my view of circumstances, not yours, and you will no longer strive against my reluctance. I should be sorry to be led into the temptation of breaking through those boundaries which I have, after such mature deliberation, marked out to myself.

I am, with most perfect respect,

Yours sincerely,

MOSES MENDELSSOHN.

Berlin, the 12th of December, 1769.

To this Lavater replied in a second letter, which gave rise to another publication on the part of Mendelssohn, entitled,

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS.

* * * * *
* * * * *
* As to what regards Bonnet's work, I confess, that my judgment on it referred entirely to the purpose for which it was recommended to me by Mr. Lavater. I might, it is true, have taken for granted that it was not at all Mr. Bonnet's aim to oppugn, by his Inquiry, any religious persuasion whatsoever, least of all Judaism; but that he had only the benevolent intention of leading, by means of a more wholesome philosophy, back into the paths of truth, the sceptics and weak in faith of his own church, who have been deluded by a false philosophy, to laugh at religion, Providence, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection, and retribution as absurd superstitions. In this light I should have considered Mr. Bonnet's work, in order to form a more correct estimate of its merits.

But the unlucky dedication had at once deranged the proper aspect of things. And as that was the point from which I started, and not knowing that the author had disapproved of the translator's proceeding, I read the whole performance under the impression that it was levelled against myself and those of my persuasion. In this view, then, the use and application which Mr. Bonnet makes of philosophical principles, could not but appear to me loose and arbitrary; and I could say, with propriety, that I was confident I could vindicate, in the same manner, any religion one pleases. * * * * * I will mention a single point by way of illustration.

Mr. Bonnet constitutes miracles the infallible criterion of truth; and maintains that if there be but credible testimony that a prophet has wrought miracles, his divine mission is no longer to be called in question. He then actually demonstrates, by very sound logic, that there is nothing impossible in miracles, and that testimony concerning them may be deserving of credit.

Now, according to my religious theory, miracles are not, indiscriminately, a distinctive mark of truth; nor do they yield a moral evidence of a prophet's divine legation. The public giving of the law only could, according to our creed, impart satisfactory authenticity; because the ambassador had, in this case, no need of credentials, the divine commission being given in the hearing of the whole nation. Here no truths were to be continued by actual proceedings, no doctrine by preternatural occurrences, but it was intended it should be believed, that the divine manifestation had chosen this very prophet for its legate, as every individual had himself heard the nomination. Accordingly, we read (Exod. xix. 9), "And the Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak unto thee, and believe thee forever:" (Exod. iii. 12,) "And this shall be a token unto thee, When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain." Our belief in a revealed religion is, therefore, not founded in miracles, but on a public legislation. The precept to hearken to a wonder-working prophet (Deut. xviii. 15,) is, as our rabbins teach, a mere implicit law, as given by the legislators, and quite independent of the intrinsic evidence of such wonders. So does a similar law, (Deut. xvii.6) direct us to abide, in juridical cases, by the evidence of two witnesses, though we are not bound to consider their evidence as infallible. Further information on this Jewish elemental law will be found in Maimonides' Elements of the Law, chap. 8, 9, 10. And there is an ample illustration of this passage of Maimonides, in Rabbi Joseph Albo, Sepher Ikkarim, sect, i., cap. 18.

I also meet with decisive texts in the Old Testament, and even in the New, showing that there is nothing extraordinary in enticers and false prophets performing miracles; * whether by magic, occult sciences, or by the misapplication of a gift truly conferred on them for proper purposes, I will not pretend to determine. So much, however, appears to me incontrovertible, that, according to the naked text of Scripture, miracles cannot be taken as absolute criterions of a divine mission.

I could, therefore, perfectly well maintain that an argument, founded on the infallibility of miracles does not decide anything against the believers in my religion, since we do not acknowledge that infallibility. My Jewish principles will fully bear me out in the assertion that I would undertake to vindicate, by similar reasoning, any religion one pleases; because I do not know any religion which has not signs and miracles to produce; and surely every one has a right to place confidence in his forefathers. All revelation is propagated by tradition and by monuments. There, I suppose, we agree. But according to the fundamentals of my religion, not miracles only, but a public giving of the law, must be the origin of tradition.

It will now be seen that the assertion of mine, which Mr. Lavater calls singular, is not only compatible with the belief in a revelation, but that it even emanates from the very elements of my religion As an Israelite, I have argued on Israelitish principles. How could I have done otherwise, under the impression that Mr. Bonnet meant to controvert those principles? But now that I am aware that this excellent author's design was to oppugn the unbelievers of his own church only, and to show them that the doctrines which they revile, are, by far, more reconcilable with sound reason than their own fantastic deliration, many difficulties which I have met with on reading the German translation, of course vanish of themselves; and I must own, that, so far as its scope goes, the work is more important, and more worthy of Mr. Bonnet's pen than I had at first an idea of.

* How are we, for instance, to account for the Egyptian magicians? In the Old Testament (Deut. xiii. 2), a case is laid down, when we are not to hearken to a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, even if he give a sign or a wonder, but put him to death. In the New Testament, it is distinctly said (Matt. xxiv. 24.), "for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders," &c. Not to mention other texts.

Remarks, by the Editor.

THE WISDOM OF THE WORLD NOT NECESSARY TO THE COMPREHENSION OF THE WISDOM OF GOD.

A SINGULAR notion possesses the human mind, both Israelite and Gentile, from which M. Mendelssohn was not free, any more than the clergymen of his time and ours. He tells us in the letter to Lavater that he had from his "early youth devoted his hours of repose and relaxation to philosophy and the arts and sciences for the sole purpose of qualifying himself for searching into his religion, and of putting his actions and opinions to the test." This may be all right and necessary enough when one has a religion based upon the arts, sciences, and philosophy of a dark and barbarous age, such as Hindooism, Mohammedanism, Popery, Modern Judaism, and Protestant Sectarianism; but certainly not necessary for the searching into the merits of the religion taught by Moses, Jesus and the Apostles. How was the generation contemporary with Moses qualified to receive him as Jehovah's prophet, and to search into the religion he delivered to them? That generation of Egyptian slaves and brick-

makers were anything else than philosophers, artists, and proficient in science. Moses was the only exception to this we are acquainted with; and he, as we are informed by a New Testament teacher of his doctrine, "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians;" and he was chosen of Jehovah to give to his unlearned countrymen a religion totally at variance with, and subversive of it all. When their posterity became learned in the wisdom of the Chaldeans and Greeks, the only effect of it upon their minds was, not to qualify them for the discovery of truth—"the wisdom hidden from the ages and the generations, even the hidden wisdom of God"—but to cause them to corrupt the law, and to depart from Jehovah, and to make the word of God of none-effect by their traditions, as Jesus often told them. Nor was this peculiar to those times. German philosophy, and the arts and sciences of Mendelssohn's times were no more qualifying for such a work than the wisdom of the Egyptians, Chaldeans and Greeks. This is proved in the case of Mendelssohn himself who, notwithstanding all his learning and intellectual keenness, could not, though in possession of the Old and New scriptures, discern the Christianity taught by Moses and the prophets, nor the Christianity of Jesus and the Apostles in harmony with it, and totally different from "the Names and Denominations" of the Gentile "religious world." The arts, sciences, and philosophy of his hours of repose and relaxation only enabled him to "detect in his religion human additions and base alloy," but did not enable him to see that the whole nation is cursed by Moses and the very law in which it boasts; and every intelligent Israelite knows that death rests upon all the accursed. Israel rejects the Bible Christianity, and holds on professedly to a religion whose institutions and precepts from the nature of things they cannot keep, and which curses them if they don't! Surely this is infatuation!

Our Gentile clergy, whose principles are more heathen and Rabbinical than Scriptural, have adopted the same fallacy as the basis of all their theological establishments for the development of youthful "divines"—the necessity of indoctrination in "the wisdom of the world" to qualify them to search into religion and to teach it! By "wisdom of the world" we mean, philosophy, arts, sciences, philology, "divinity," and so forth. But that this is not necessary to the understanding of "the wisdom of God in a mystery," but rather positively a preventive, is proved by the fact, that so long as they work by "rhetoricians' rules" they never come to the knowledge of truth. College lore when used in drawing forth the truth is a darkener of counsel by words without knowledge. Its perniciousness is seen in its causing counterfeits to pass current for real coin; and in causing the Bible to be neglected, and the truth to be evil spoken of when presented to the people. The colleges of our day are mere stereotype foundries where the errors of past generations and defunct errorists are stamped upon the soft metal of a rising race. We are not opposed to useful, secular learnings as a qualification for the business of life; but the idea of the knowledge of the wisdom of this stupid world being necessary to the searching of God's religion—the religion of Moses and Jesus which are one—and the teaching of it. No such qualification is necessary. Jesus did not choose many wise men after the flesh, but the foolish of the world to confound the wise. Paul was the wisest of the serpent tribe he chose to confound his fellows of Rabbi Gamaliel's school. He chose mostly unphilosophical and unscientific "laymen" to be his apostles to the learned Israelites and Gentiles of their age, all of whom they mightily confounded and annihilated. He did not choose Jewish clergymen and rabbis; he passed by them as unworthy of trust and confidence as he will do again when he comes in power to close the synagogues and churches of the earth, to punish the clergy of every sect and name, and to proclaim their occupation gone!

MODERN RELIGIONS MERE BASE ALLOY.

M. MENDELSSOHN admits that he has detected in his religion "human additions and base alloy, which too much tarnish its pristine lustre." Israelite religion in its pristine lustre is that delivered to Israel in the wilderness. It was undermined by what he truly styles "the pestilential vapor of hypocrisy and superstition." This "pestilential vapor" is Rabbinical Judaism, which he seems to have had no real sympathy with, but tolerated, lest in trying to abolish it "the essentials" should go with it. He firmly believed in the essentials of his pristine religion, which are the whole law; for said Jehovah, "Cursed be every one who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." Now that law commanded all Israel to keep the Passover, the Pentecost, and Feast of Tabernacles, not in the dwelling places of their captivity, but in the place Jehovah should choose to place his Name there—in Jerusalem. He commanded an annual Covering of Sins according to the Levitical ritual; and many other things he commanded under pain of curse, expatriation, and death. M. Mendelssohn firmly believed in all these essentials, yet neither he nor his coreligionists go up three times a year to worship Jehovah the King at Jerusalem; nor have the sins of Israel been covered levitically for nearly eighteen hundred years; nor have they any sacrifice, &c.: what then would be the condition of an enlightened Israelitish conscience but for some Rabbinical Traditions to whisper in its ear, "Thou shalt not surely die!" Truly might M. Mendelssohn be afraid to wipe off these, for then the Mosaic Religion would stand out in such pristine brightness, condemning every Israelite who sought justification by it, that there would be no refuge for him but in practical atheism; or in the Substance of the Mosaic Shadows, which is of Jesus as the Christ. Mosaicism is not "base alloy," but genuine gold, and stands related to Modern Judaism as the faith of the Anointed Jesus does to Modern Gentilism. These isms are both counterfeits, mere pewter shillings, fit only to be nailed to the counter for their baseness—the obfuscators of the truth by which its glory is eclipsed

THE CHRISTIANISM OF MOSES FOR ALL NATIONS.

ACCORDING to the principles of his religion, that is, of the essentials which he firmly believes, extension by proselyting is no part thereof. But this is not according to Moses and the prophets. Moses foretold the extension of Jehovah's religion which would be received by those whom Israel did not regard as "a people," but considered in the light only of fools—"I will move them to jealousy with them who are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation." This is Moses' testimony with which Isaiah's is in accord. For the Spirit of Christ in that prophet says, "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, "Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name." But to Israel he saith, "I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts" (modern Judaism.) Here are two witnesses, Moses and Isaiah, to the extension of their faith to other nations, because Israel would not continue in it, but fell away to their own traditions. How could a non-Israelitish nation, the Greek for example, seek for Jehovah that asked not for him, or find Jehovah without seeking for him, if Jehovah had not sent out messengers to the Greeks revealing to them the knowledge of the true God, and inviting them to become his people? This was proselyting them—inviting aliens to the Commonwealth of Israel to become citizens, and heirs of all the good things promised to Israel and Judah to be employed by an obedient generation of the nation in the Olahm to come. Rabbins may dissuade Gentiles from becoming Rabbinists, but Jehovah invites them to become Israelites indeed, saying, Let not the son of the foreigner that hath joined himself to Jehovah speak, saying, Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold I am a dry tree! For

thus saith Jehovah to the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in my house, and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and daughters: I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off.

"Also the sons of the foreigner that join themselves to Jehovah, to serve him, and to love the name of Jehovah, to be his servant, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar: for mine house (or temple) shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples."

How different all this from what M. Mendelssohn tells us he is taught by his religion. We read here nothing about the Noachides, and the laws of nature; but of keeping sabbaths and laying hold of a covenant. If by the religion of his fathers is meant that of Moses and the prophets, we see that it does wish to be extended. Rabbinism may not, because it cannot; for it is losing ground rapidly on every side; and it is sometimes good policy to make a virtue of necessity. There is nothing in it worth the attention of a Gentile, any more than there is in Gentilism worth the attention of a Jew. They do well, therefore, to dissuade from circumcisions, for Paul, as well as they, teaches that "he that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law," which no Israelite but Jesus of Nazareth ever did; yet even he was cursed by it, according to what is written, "Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon a tree."

M. Mendelssohn errs in believing that the religion revealed to Israel is formed conjointly of the written and oral laws. The oral laws are destructive of the written law, which is proof that Jehovah never revealed them; for he is too wise and truthful to reduce his own laws to a nullity. No, the written is his; the oral belong to those perverse Israelites whom Moses characterizes as "children in whom is no faith." Jehovah commanded them a law as they admit, yet none of them pay the least respect to; but "they walk in a way that is not good after their own thoughts."

FAITH INWROUGHT IN ISRAEL BY MIRACLE.

WE agree with M. Mendelssohn that "miracles are not, indiscriminately, a distinctive mark of truth," if by "miracle" we are simply to understand something wonderful. In this sense many miracles have been performed in confirmation of imposture. These are what Paul styles "signs and lying wonders constituting the working of Satan," or the adversaries of the truth. The Romish idolatry is famous for these to this day. If a miracle were wrought on confirmation of doctrine which nullified that of Moses and the Prophets, the miracle would be no evidence of the truth of that doctrine and the erroneousness of theirs. The scripture use of miracles, or rather of signs, wonders, powers and gifts, is that of divine co-witnessing to propositions stated, and proved according to the scriptures of the prophets. When a miracle is manifestly beyond human power, it is unquestionably a divine attestation to the truth of doctrine, and a prophet's supernatural legation.

The revelation of the Mosaic religion was in itself a miracle upon a grand scale. There were thunder, lightning, earthquake, angelic trumpeting, and the Voice of God, all which made Moses and the Nation tremble and quake for fear. Mendelssohn is, therefore, wrong. Israel's belief on their prophet's divine legation, and in the religion they received with him, was inwrought by miracle. In Exod. iv, is a very precise testimony upon this point. Moses

urged that if he went to Israel with a mere verbal statement of his mission, they would not believe him. Jehovah, therefore, gave him power to do signs, "the voice" or significance of which would convince them: and it is said, that "he did the signs in the sight of the people; and the people believed." Their faith was founded upon the power of God.

Jesus was sent to them in like manner, preaching the gospel and doing signs such as none before him had been able to do. The law came through Moses after he had been duly attested to Israel; and so also came the wisdom of God in a mystery on the day of Pentecost after the divine legation of Jesus had been established. But here we must conclude for the present, as time and space prevent us adding more till a more convenient season.

A Visit to the South West.

ON Wednesday, Aug. 18th, about ten days after our return from Canada, we entered upon a circuit which, when completed, described about three thousand miles. At Baltimore, we laid over, staying until next morning with our excellent and worthy friend, Brother Lemmon, who for several years past has been a firm and unflinching advocate of the truth in that Rome of the United States. Next day we reached Washington, D.C. There we stayed a few hours, which we consumed in visiting such of the brethren as were within reach. We were gratified at finding them united, and brotherly kindness reigning in their midst. We trust that such will always be the case. It would be well for all, in every place, to be ever mindful of the words of the apostle, who says, "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil-speaking be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as also God, in Christ (ο θεός εν Χριστώ) hath forgiven you."—Eph iv. 31. And elsewhere: "Let love be without dissimulation. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another. . . . Love one another, for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." "Let all your affairs be done with love." "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." "Submit yourselves one to another, in the fear of God." "Let your moderation be known unto all. The Lord is at hand. Be anxious for nothing." "Be all of one mind, having compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous," (or as we should say, in common speech, be gentlemanly.) "Finally, brethren, be perfect, be of good comfort, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you." We cannot conceive how, if these precepts be observed, any difficulties can arise among the brethren of Jesus Christ. If he were upon earth, he would act towards them upon these principles. Did he not lay down his life for his brethren, and that, too, even while they were yet enemies; thereby leaving us an example that we should walk in his steps? We have more knowledge of the truth than any other people, let it, then, operate a better practice, that is, a more Scriptural one than their's. It would have been better for us never to have known the truth, if in the "hour of judgment" we have no more to offer than that we obeyed the truth in baptism. This would be the one talent hid in a napkin, for which there is no other recompense than, "Thou wicked and slothful servant, be thou as unprofitable cast into outer darkness: there shall be there weeping and gnashing of teeth."

From Washington we resumed our rail-roading by way of Richmond and Lynchburg, Virginia, Knoxville, Tennessee; Dalton, Georgia; and Stevenson, Alabama, to Memphis, Tennessee—over twelve hundred miles, by this route, from New York city. We arrived at Memphis about 6 P.M., August 22, putting up again at the Commercial. Not knowing where to find any of our friends in the city, we concluded to hasten on to Looxohama, Mississippi. We were told that the cars started at 7 A.M. from the M. & T. R. R. depot, and that after

breakfast, at 6.30, the omnibus would call and convey us thither. Supposing this to be all correct, we breakfasted at the hour appointed, and waited patiently for the omnibus till 7 o'clock; but none came, and upon inquiry were coolly informed that the cars left at 5.20 A.M. This was very provoking at the time, but eventually proved to be a very fortunate and agreeable disappointment.

Having no employment but to watch the clock till 3 P.M., when the cars would leave again, we purposed to visit "the points of interest" about town; where, however, little to interest a traveller can be found. Alluvian, sun-baked and powdered is the general characteristic of the thirsty soil. Dust in summer and mire in winter interest the public mind of this cotton mart with painful intensity. These annoyances the authorities were endeavoring to subdue by covering some of the streets with a thick coating of coarse gravel. This is a point of great interest to all who have experienced the incompatibility of levigated alluvian with West of England and Spitalfields black, and a free and healthy respiration. We hope the experiment will succeed, for a hot, dusty town in summer and a quagmire in winter are sore and trying evils to those who are not well skilled in the patient possession of the soul. We picked our way through the powder to the bluff which rises far above the Mississippi, in its highest stage of water. From this elevation there is an extensive view up and down its ample waste, as it flows between the shores of Tennessee and Arkansas. Memphis is called the "Bluff City," from this high mass of rockless deposit. All this region is water-formed liquid-mire, hardened into clay.

The sun being too hot, and the prospect too little interesting, we soon retreated to the shady places of the city. We noticed some stores and the Gayoso House, which would have been creditable to the architecture of an eastern city; also an enclosure, laid out a la Paradise, for the peripatesis and ventilation of the people. These points disposed of, we began again to long for 3 o'clock. It occurred to us meanwhile that our friend, whom we mistook a year ago for a Memphian hydropathic doctor, had a son-in-law keeping a dry goods store, from whom we might learn if he were in the city, for we were expecting he would meet us there. We found the store, but not the merchant, who had sold out to a successor. We inquired if they knew Mr. Webber, commonly styled Parson Webber? "Yes, he had been there about five minutes ago." Did he say anything about one Dr. Thomas? "Yes, he had come to Memphis to meet him." That is fortunate; I am he. When will he be here again? "Shortly; he has gone to see about some repairs to his buggy, when he will probably return. Walk in, sir, and take a seat; here is to-day's paper. He will not be long." We had not been long seated before our friend returned, looking as hale and hearty as hydropathy in a warm climate could make. We were mutually glad to see one another in the flesh again. He had received our letter, but did not expect our arrival until the 23d inst. He had come in on purpose to meet us, so that had we not been disappointed in the morning, his journey would have been fruitless, and our future operations considerably embarrassed. We very soon made arrangements for these. We were to proceed to Looxohama by the 3 o'clock train, and fill what appointments might have been made in Mississippi. In the meantime he would return to Fayette co., and make appointments there, and then meet us in Mississippi, and convey us thence in his buggy to Tennessee.

But about appointments in Mississippi, we were in the dark. While waiting for the Charleston and Memphis train at Dalton depot, in Georgia, a gentleman who had just landed from Chattanooga, inquired if we were not "Parson Thomas?" "No, sir," we replied, "we are doctor Thomas," medicine, not parson, craft being our profession. "Oh," said he, "it is the same. I heard you a year ago in the Baptist Church at Tyro, Marshall co., Mississippi. I am on my way east to purchase goods for my fall supply. Mr. J. G. Jeffries was to have accompanied

me, but the sickness of his family prevented." Shall I be likely to find him at Looxohama? "I think not." We were sorry to hear this, as it was to him we had written about appointments. But even this little cloud disappeared. Having dined together, brother Webber and self adjourned to the Commercial, to take the omnibus to the depot. The clerk informed us that a gentleman had been inquiring for us. On looking over the hotel register, we found it was the veritable Brother Jeffries himself; he had dined there, expecting to meet with us. But he had left, and we could learn no further about him. Brother Webber, however, said he would go to the late Col. Logan's, his brother-in-law, where, nevertheless, he would not have found him. But on his way thither, he met him on the street, and speedily brought him to the Commercial, to which he would have returned no more. We were more than glad to see him. We learned that appointments were made at Looxohama and at Thyatira, in Marshall co. We had only time to speak a few words, as the omnibus was about to start for the depot. It is said to be "all well that ends well," however painful the "all" may be before the end comes; it was certainly so in our case. Our morning's disappointment had resulted in the development of many appointments, and the obscurity of our course made clear before us.

Arrived at the depot, we met a friend and subscriber to the Herald, formerly of the choir pertaining to the Campbellite Church in Nottingham, England. We hope Mr. Fanning will pardon our "wickedness," for so designating the community there whose members rejoice in the anti-prophetic divinity of their Bethanian superior. We cannot style them the "Christian Church," as is customary in Tennessee, because of one great deficiency in their system and his—the lack of Christianity. We know of no other name more appropriate, or we can assure our Nashville, Tennessean contemporary we should delight to use it. Well our friend, the former chorister in British Campbellism, and at present even a member of the Campbellite church in Memphis, where faith in disobedience is tolerated, if it will only remain quiescent—met us there, to accompany us to Mississippi. Before we started, he directed our attention to his pastor, our old friend, Dr. Barbec, who was picking his way amid the gullies of desolation near the station. Being afraid to venture far from the platform, as the train was about starting, we called to him, and inquired of his weal. He came up and exchanged salutations, and reminded us that we had not yet replied to his letter on p. 249 of the Herald for 1857, and that the idea of world-burning had not altogether faded from his mind. It is true we have not yet done so, but will ere long, though, as far as the doctor is concerned, he knows all we have to say upon the subject, inasmuch as, in a three hours' conversation with him last year, we went pretty fully into the matter. However, we promised to attend to it, and bade him hastily "Adieu!"

From all we hear from members and outsiders, the Campbellite Church in Memphis is in a very unsatisfactory condition, even to its friends. A faction has grown out of it, called the United Brethren, whose "charity" embraces the pious of all denominations. These meet in the Odd Fellows' Hall. The money power has got the upper hand, as in its sister church in New York city; and wherever this is the case, corruption is sure to reign, and the voice of truth is silenced. It is the pastor's paymaster, and will not permit him to trouble it with unpalatable and unfashionable principles. Extortioners are said to have the rule there, and such extortion as what they call "the world" reprobates. The meetings are thinly attended, and bid fair to be totally forsaken. What are the leaders of this boasted "reformation" about? Have they abandoned the reform enterprise as a hopeless affair? We doubt not there are some honest-hearted among the people, who had better "save themselves," for if they abandon their salvation to their leaders, they will assuredly be lost. The rulers had forbidden Brother Webber to preach to them, unless he would agree not to preach "Dr. Thomas' views," which, of course, they knew nothing about, as they neither read the Herald, nor hear what we have to

say. But it is all the same. Bro. W., however, did not consent to forego his convictions, because they chose to style them our views. He succeeded in causing them to retract their resolution, and to leave him free. He preached to them on Sunday night, when more than the usual number attended, though but little notice was given.

On arriving at Sonatahobia station, we hired a couple of horses, and started through the forest to Looxohama, where we arrived sometime after dark, at the house of Brother J. G. Jeffries. We learned here that since he had departed for the east, the opposition had exalted itself, and had declared that we should not be admitted into the Masonic Hall. The schoolmaster was ordered not to admit us, and much more of the same sort, not worthy of notice here. The spirit and talent of the opposition will appear from the following lines, picked up in the road, near one of the village stores. We give it literatim et verbatim:

"NOTICE. —It is reported that Dr. Thomas will shortly be at the residence of his few, but warm friends in the neighborhood of Looxohama to teach them, and as many as may attend in a misterious manner the way of life; but the people of De Soto county and the rest of the State are too well posted to be stuffed with any thing that we knowe to be in direct opposition to the Bible. Therefore Let us as intelligent men and women treat the Imposture as we would one that attempts But cant Rob us of our bible and our Religion.

"Atest [METHODIST C
"anti Thomasism, [PRESBYTERIAN."

Of course, we could do nothing in the State of Mississippi, and in the more immediate domain of the De Sotos, after so learned and rhetorical a proclamation as this! A county and State so well posted in Methodism and Cumberland Presbyterianism could hardly have the truth "stuffed" into them under the operation of omnipotence; certainly not, if that operation demanded of the subject the meditation of a sound mind upon the law and testimony of God. We did not visit them to "Rob them of their bible and their Religion." When a man contemplates robbery it is to acquire something he esteems worth risking his liberty or neck for. He does not seek to obtain unlawfully what he regards of no account. We have a Bible, published by royal authority, "appointed to be read in churches," and can read it for ourselves, without the aid of note or comment. We want no other Bible than this in English. The Methodist C. Presbyterian Bible we care nothing about; no more than we do for the Mormon Bible or Koran; nor for the M. C. P. religion either. We deem them so utterly worthless as to be not worth stealing. We did not journey thirteen hundred miles to steal, but to destroy—to destroy the influence of every other system than the truth—by infusing into the people a spirit of independence and research, that they may no longer be befooled and led by the nose, as they happen to be led.

We spoke thrice at private houses to a few untrammelled by the surrounding superstitions. On the following three days we addressed the people at the Reformers' house, called Thyatira. The audiences here improved daily, so that on Lord's Day, the house, which is large, was nearly full. Certain Campbellites, however, would not come to hear, because they did not believe what we preached; albeit, they went to a Methodist "big meeting," which, being mere rant and noise, was more in accordance with their taste.

Brother Webber having joined us at this place, we proceeded, after concluding at Thyatira on Sunday, to Fluellin's Cross Roads, where we again addressed the people pretty largely assembled, in a carpenter's shop. The Baptist and Methodist preachers were among the

crowd, and with the rest paid very close and respectful attention. We circulated some tracts at divers points in hope of better things at a future day.

On Monday, Aug. 30, it had been appointed for us to speak at Collierville, Tenn. We drove thirty miles to meet the engagement, and when we arrived we found the Cumberland Presbyterians in full shout upon the ground. The house is a free one, and as they were in possession, we were superseded. We went, however, to witness their proceedings. The preacher started on his way by asking, "Who, then can be saved?" After talking over half an hour, he concluded his discourse without answering the question, and left us all completely in the dark, as far as his efforts were concerned, upon the whole subject. We inferred, however, from his after proceedings, his view of what one must do to be saved, and who could be saved, and how they could be brought to salvation. Brother Webber and self were sitting upon the front bench, which we afterwards found to be "the mourning bench," or "anxious seat." We had placed ourselves there unwittingly, not for the purpose of mourning, but for the better hearing of the discourse. Before us, and along the aisles of the house, the floor had been well strewed with straw. Speaking of straw, reminds us of the threefold classification of religion we met with in Kentucky a year or two ago. A Campbellite friend there told us that in his vicinity there were three kinds of religion—wind religion, water religion, and straw religion! Were these Romanism, Grecism and Protestantism? Not exactly, but still of the same family. We wished the terms defined, for they seemed to us rather obscure. "Wind religion, then," said he, "is the Baptist, which comes by 'the wind blowing where it pleases;' the water religion is the Campbellite, which comes by dipping in water for remission of sins; and straw religion is all that other sort of religion that comes by squatting and rolling in the straw!" Here, then, we were in the very sanctum of straw religion! The preacher, the Rev. Boanerges Bellowattem, came down from the "sacred desk," and, standing in the straw, invited all to come forward who wanted to "get religion." A young girl, about fourteen or fifteen, started from her seat and squatted in the straw, burying at the same time her face in her handkerchief, and spreading her arms be-shawled upon the bench—a very snug position for a public nap upon the straw. We hardly think, however, that she could have slept very soundly, if at all; for the noise of the parsons was enough to have awakened Baal from his sleep!

As soon as the girl was in position, Parson Bellowattem proceeded to start us from ours. He placed himself before us, and within a handbreadth of our person, and began to vociferate over our head to the people, to repent lest they should go to hell, and so forth. We could not have moved without pushing him aside, so we patiently endured the nuisance till exhaustion caused him to pause for breath. He then moved his position, and Brother W. and self shifted to another seat. To make the confusion worse confounded, Cumberlands sang while their parsons shouted, ejaculated and beat the air. While all this was going on, another man was kneeling on the straw by the girl's side, putting into her ear, in a less noisy but impassioned manner, straw-religious sentiments, by which she was to find peace and get straw religion! But all seemed to be of no avail. The intermingled noise and song failed to magnetize the crowd, and Cumberland Presbyterianism in the straw proved to be parturious mons, but without yielding even a ridiculous mus! And this fardel of bawl and folly passes for Christianity in this "land of Bibles!" Rush thirty miles an hour for three or four days to rob the people of such stuff as this! We have oceans of such trash at our very doors.

Next day we went to Macon, Tennessee. Brother Webber had been induced to make an appointment at this place by the flattering assurances of certain who had heard us at Fisherville the year before. The assurances we did not believe, but as he had made the appointment for three days, we determined to fulfil it. It turned out as we expected. Those

who expressed the most anxiety to hear, manifested the least interest in hearing. They indeed made the appointment, but provided no accommodation for the people. The first day they were not there at all; on the next, one was there, but left before we had finished. The place of meeting was the Academy, a large room, with here and there a boy's bench. About thirty collected on the first occasion; on the second more; and on the third most. We gave them some tracts, and having done the best we could to "open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of satan to God," we left them, having incurred no obligations, in the hope that the bread cast upon the waters may be found some future day.

Next day we had purposed to go to Memphis, but rain prevented, and we did not arrive there till Saturday, Sept. 4, about 2 P.M. Brother Webber without delay hired the Odd Fellows' Hall, for that night and Lord's Day. We spoke three times there, and on Sunday night had quite a numerous meeting. To tell the reader all the topics we discussed upon, and an outline of what we said, would be a volume in itself, for we had spoken fourteen times, averaging nearly two hours each. We had planted and watered, and that was all we could do; the increase is beyond our control. Brother Webber aided us all he could, and without him we could not have got access to the people, to whom we were personally unknown. He and his neighbor, Brother Anthony, are the first fruits of Tennessee into the Gospel of the Kingdom. The Lord preserve him to that inheritance, to whom be the glory in the ages of the ages. Amen.

On Monday evening, at 7 o'clock, we left Memphis, by steamer, for Cairo, 240 miles distant, on our way to Henderson, Kentucky. We arrived there about 2 A.M. on Wednesday, Sept. 8. The Ohio river being too low for navigation, without the risk of being detained upon a shoal or bar for days together, we took the cars at Cairo for Evansville, via Vincennes. We arrived at the Ohio again at 9.30 P.M., and in the morning hired a buggy to convey us to Henderson, twelve miles below.

We found the brethren on this county in good health, and generally with unabated interest in the truth they have confessed. We spoke every day from Saturday to Lord's Day week, inclusive. Though it was a very busy time, the attendance in the week was much better than a year ago. Two were added to the congregation from among the Campbellites, by obedience to the truth of baptism. They had well considered the matter, and will, we believe, be a credit to the faith before the world, which is ever more ready to discern the shortcomings than the virtues of the saints.

On Tuesday morning, at 9 A.M., We left Evansville for New York, via Indianapolis, Dayton, Columbus, Baltimore and Philadelphia, and arrived at Mott Haven on Thursday at 11.30 P.M. We were detained several hours by accident east of Zanesville. Ohio. Our iron horse fractured one of its legs—the stud on one of the driving wheels broke close off to the spoke, so as to paralyze the right piston rod. No other damage was done, and when another locomotive was obtained, we proceeded without further accident or delay, and arrived as narrated, alter an absence of five weeks, during which we had travelled nearly 3,000 miles, and addressed the people three and twenty times.

EDITOR.

A Canadian Conference, and the Doings Thereat.

(CONCLUDED.)

The next speaker was Elder Sweet, who is but Mr. Marsh's echo. He spoke on 2 Peter 1 chap., in an expository form; but more particularly from verses 5-11. He echoed death, burial, and resurrection; but does not he see that Peter is showing the Christian's advancement, and not a sectarian one? Peter shows them for whom he was writing, that their career commences by believing the great and precious promises, 2 Peter, i. 4. Without knowing the future promises can you commence aright? Were the death, burial and resurrection, future promises when Peter wrote? But here Peter shows the end of the Christian's career, which the promises direct us to, in verse 11, even an entrance into the everlasting or Aionion kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence, at the beginning of the Christian's career, it commences with faith in future promises, and ends with the reception of the kingdom. But Sweet said that the Christian goes step by step. But he missed the first step, therefore, at the end of the journey, one falls short, and being weighed in God's balances, you will be found wanting! Why do you preach the kingdom at all, if it is unnecessary for faith? Why? Because you are with a people that believe it, and from whom you obtain "the almighty dollar."

Sweet, then, in the course of his subject, was trying to wound me. But his sword is wood and not steel; therefore it could not hurt much. (Sweet had only just come to the conference, having been delayed by the boat.) But he made use of language that I was well acquainted with, and that much amused me; such as, "Tis so," and "Doctrine of devils," &c. His outpourings were a tirade of abuse of certain people whose names he did not mention, but still well known to me. He was trying to condemn their motives—his own, of course, being quite pure!

The next morning being Sunday, Sweet spoke from John iii: "Ye must be born again;" but said nothing of the good seed sown by Christ, from which the children of God are produced, Matt. xiii. 19, 23, 37, 38.

In the afternoon, Friend Marsh spoke on the Influence of the Spirit. In the evening, I spoke on the first and second Adams, of which I shall not speak at this time, as I am afraid that I may take up too much of your space. When I closed my subject, I was called aside by Friend Marsh in company with Elder Sweet, for a private interview. My letter in your July Herald, was then brought up. He stated that I had styled him Friend Marsh, instead of Brother. I said that I could not acknowledge him as a brother in Christ. He said by this that I had unchristianized him. I stated that a Christian was one that not only believed the Word, but obeyed it. He then said that he had used all his influence to get me into the field as an evangelist; and if I did not retract, he must bring it before, his brethren, to put himself in a consistent position. I then asked him. Do you think, sir, that I am creeping after dollars, to the sacrifice of truth? No; I would rather beg my bread first. He then said that I could send letters to him, and not put cudgels in Dr. Thomas's hands to whip him with!

Friend Sweet said that I had unchristianized Friend Marsh, which was ridiculous. I said that it was not I, but the word, as I was well acquainted with his position. But Friend Marsh said, "you consider me to be dishonest from this paragraph in your letter (on the Gospel and its Obedience); however, he displays a vast amount of weakness, in order to support and defend the position occupied by the children of disobedience." In reply, I told him that I could not see how he could be honest with such amount of argument, reason, and

Scripture, and still maintain his position in disobedience. I then referred him to the sound reasoning of Brother Allen, in *The Expositor* of June 1st, and I referred to his weak reply, which to me, was really insipid. He then asked me if I would retract nothing in that letter? I then said, "No, not one single iota; for I conscientiously believed every word to be the truth." Friend Marsh and his echo, Elder Sweet, then withdrew for a little private conversation, and I left them.

The next morning the conference met at eight, when all favorable to the cause were invited. Friend Marsh then spoke to me privately, and said that if this was brought before the meeting, that it would cause division. I told him that I still maintained my position, and that I was not seeking after the dollar to the sacrifice of a good conscience. I stated that I had labored in the field alone, and if I had still to put up with privations, I should have a greater reward; that I was not looking for present reward. Sweet then called me. This was all outside the house, before the conference commenced. The letter was then again produced, and a crowd began to come around. We then went into the meeting house, and conference commenced. The chairman who had presided before, then arose and stated that he would rather that another chairman be proposed, on account of the painful difficulty that had arisen. This chairman told me that he was baptized into Sky Kingdomism thirty years ago; he is an elder of the so-called "Church of God." After a few remarks from the chairman, Marsh arose, and commenced by saying that he had left Rochester unprepared with any subject to address the people on; that he knew my extreme views on baptism (as was admitted by Friend Stephenson, and that they talked it over on the boat); hence he concluded to speak from the Hebrews, avoiding if possible, crossing my track. But after he had delivered himself, I had taken his subject and reviewed it. But Friend Marsh, are you afraid of your expositions being put in the crucible of God's word? God's word is the law and the testimony by which we are enabled to discover if there be any light in you, Isaiah viii, 20.

He then pressed upon the audience, that I had cast him off, together with the others of like precious faith with him; that I had placed him in an unfavorable light, and he had to place himself in a consistent position before the community, as he was about to leave that morning. He said he had used his influence to get me into the field. He then read extracts from the letter, and worked upon the people on their lacking the obedience of the faith, and on his being their oracle, and a stumbling-block to them that would obey the truth. He then spoke of his conversion, and tried to make it appear that I considered him an unconverted man. He then harped upon the children of disobedience who follow his traditions so congenial to the flesh. He endeavored to make this appear as if he were charged with teaching bad morals. Then he turned right over to the end of the letter (avoiding the great truths therein contained), and spoke of the theological sonship and world burning theory of Antichrist; and how that after all my influence, Brother Williams is not willing to retract anything; not willing to make any admissions: that I considered him dishonest. To this he added, that we were not to make baptism into the faith of the kingdom, a test of fellowship; and how (appealing to the audience in a way cunningly devised to excite the sympathy of his hearers,) Brother Williams is not willing to fellowship me as a brother in Christ! He then appealed again to the sympathies of the audience, by speaking of his sufferings; and spoke of making a proposition. Then addressing me, said: "Can you fellowship me as a Brother in Christ?" I replied, "I cannot fellowship you as a brother in Christ, for I know your position." Then he turned to the audience and said, "Is his perfection of faith?" He said that I had not a full knowledge of the kingdom; that I set myself up as a judge. But, Friend Marsh, is there not a Christian standard? it is that judges us, and it is by that standard we are to be judged. Then he spoke of bearing with one another, and that our object ought to be to serve men and women, to make men and

women good. True, Friend Marsh; but it must be according to God's standard of good, and not The Expositor standard. Then he spoke of men "holding the truth in unrighteousness;" and spoke again of bearing with one another; and closed up his speech by saying, that he could take Brother Williams by the hand.

I then ought to have replied, but was prevented by Friend Stephenson arising. He commenced by speaking of the faith once delivered to the saints, but did not say what that faith was. He admitted that the doctrine of the kingdom was not understood by those professing Millerism; but he did not know of any baptized into a world burning theory, but into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But, Friend Stephenson, into what other faith were the Millerites baptized, than that the Son should come and destroy all the nations together with the carnal Jews, by burning them up? Where then would be the promises of God in relation to the kingdom being restored to Israel? He then concluded by saying that he had doubts of his baptism—but not on account of the faith, but on account of the man who baptized him! Then Sweet arose, giving me no chance to reply; and our meeting had to commence in the Grove at half-past ten o'clock. Sweet's speech was to this effect: That I had unchristianized his friend; and that I had insulted the people by stating that Friend Marsh was their Oracle! He said that Marsh was as conscientious as I was; he denied the necessity of faith in the kingdom prior to baptism; he then quoted Rom. vii. 17: "Ye have obeyed that form of doctrine." He then said we believe that we have obeyed. But, Friend Sweet, your believing so, does not make it so! In the first chapter of that epistle, Paul says that he was separated unto the Gospel, and that this Gospel was a matter of promise in the (Old Testament) Scriptures, concerning Jesus as the heir to David's throne. Here Paul commences with the kingdom, and elsewhere says that he never said anything more than Moses and the prophets did say should come. Paul, then, as a separated servant, preached the kingdom of God. Were these Romans ignorant of the kingdom, which was the main point in Paul's teaching? and was not the faith of these Romans so much in Paul's teaching, that it was spoken of in the whole habitable? Rom. i. 8. It was faith, then, in Paul's gospel, which gospel, Paul said, he was not ashamed of, it being the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Now, Friend Sweet, can you be saved without believing Paul's gospel? This is Paul's form of doctrine—first believing in the gospel, which gospel he was ready to preach to those to whom he was writing; Rom. i. 15. Now let Paul answer his own question in relation to the gospel he preached at Rome; for Paul preached but one as the power of God unto salvation. Paul, what then did you preach at Rome? Hear him, in Acts xxviii. 23-31; this agrees with the gospel in Rom. i. 2. The gospel promised by the prophets in the (Old Testament) Scriptures. Here you find, then, that Paul does not confine himself simply to the death, burial, and resurrection, but includes the future kingdom, which was still a matter of hope; without which hope we cannot be saved, for Paul declares that we are saved by hope; but what a man hath why doth he yet hope for? Were these Romans baptized without a future hope? Might they not, then, ask, "what reward shall we have, therefore for all our sufferings that we shall have endured?" But Paul speaks of a class which had changed the truth of God into a lie, and was worshipping the creature for worldly emolument, more than the Creator; Rom. i. 2-5. Here, then, is the form of doctrine Paul preached—the kingdom and the name of Jesus, which he terms gospel. This gospel believed, constitutes us believers, then, through the washing spoken of in Rom. vi., and we become "called saints." Rom. i. 6. Called to what, Paul? 1 Thess. ii. 12: "Called to his kingdom and glory." This being the one hope of the calling (Eph. iv. 4), have you, Friend Sweet, obeyed this form of doctrine? Were you first called by the one hope of the Apostles, even the hope of the promise of God unto the fathers? Then, in obedience to the heavenly call, did you obey him who is the author of eternal salvation, by being baptized into the name of the Holy One? If so, then you can say Scripturally, I have (not I believe I have,) obeyed that

form of doctrine. But, Friend Sweet, this brings to my remembrance a passage of Holy Writ, "the word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two edged sword." But the word of man has got no edge at all; therefore your sword can have no effect, for it breaks across the Christian soldier's shield of faith; and with his helmet, the hope of salvation (even in the kingdom), he faces the enemy, looking for no quarter and giving none; breaking up the vain imaginations of men who exalt themselves. I have rather digressed from the subject, but pardon the digression. As the disciples of Christ are commanded to let their light shine, this being a rather dark spot, I have endeavored to show a little light with the candle of truth. To return, then, to Friend Sweet's speechification: he next spoke of love and affection; by which I suppose he means, that we must love all errorists, and not injure their finer feelings by telling them unvarnished truth. Friend Sweet (before giving me any chance to reply, fearing, no doubt, that I should destroy the influence which they had exerted), then made a proposition in these words: "We disapprove the spirit of the letter."

I then arose, and told Elder Sweet that he was working with craft; for it appeared to me that they wanted to carry their proposition to make some show in The Expositor—they wanted to carry it, not by the force of argument, but by the argument of force. The proposition being put and carried, I had a chance to speak a little. I then said that the meeting did not act in accordance with the word of Solomon: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame to him." I stated that they had not heard the letter, only extracts from it, (and many had come in that had not even heard the extracts); I asked them to show anything in that letter that was untrue; they had condemned it without a hearing, and without hearing my reply; there was no chance given me to reply, and the leaders appeared determined not to give me one. I then again stated that in condemning the spirit of the letter, they were condemning the Spirit of God, for there was a great deal of Scripture which was dictated by the Spirit of God; therefore, in condemning the letter, they were condemning the Spirit of God. The people that had previously condemned a thing they had never heard, did not know whether there was any Scripture in the letter or not; I told them of the unfairness of not allowing me to show that Friend Marsh had put a wrong construction upon the language used. These knowing ones, seeing the position in which they were placed, determined at all hazards to make something of it. They were compelled to put the proposition to the meeting in another form, after I had read the letter through to the audience. The proposition in its last form stands thus: "We disapprove the spirit of the letter towards Brother Marsh." This was all they could do; but, after all, they did not gain their point by carrying it unanimously. One of the brethren stood up to speak in my favor, but was soon hushed down. Then I tried to speak again, and asked Friend Marsh if he would prove that he was a brother in Christ? that the question all turned upon that. This was the charge, therefore God's word must be appealed to—this being the only standard of appeal—before they could pass condemnation. Then he stated that to believe the glad tidings, or gospel, was to believe the death, burial, and resurrection. I then quoted a passage or two of Scripture, to prove that to preach the gospel, was to preach the kingdom of God. They then stated that it would take too long to examine—there was no time; as soon as I would try to speak, they would call to order. But Marsh feared an investigation, notwithstanding he stated that he had published his faith to the world, to show that he was a believer in the kingdom. I said then, if that be true, you have become an apostate by being a Millerite; for now, I said, you deny Millerism as being the truth.

The time was nearly come for meeting in the Grove—half-past ten. Friend Marsh put out his hand for me to fellowship him as a brother in Christ; I said "No, sir, not as a brother in Christ." This, then, put an end to place and pay as an evangelist; this was horrifying in the extreme to some who were there, to see their Magnus Apollo rejected. Some of those who

were in favor of the proposition, after I had shown the nature of the case were sorry that they had hold up their hands against me. But the good seed has been sown, which is rather detrimental to Marshism; therefore, Marsh and his parasites were determined, if possible, like fowls of the air, to devour the precious seed. But the seed is too deep rooted in some hearts for them to pluck it out, and time will show that Friend Marsh and his parasites have done themselves no good. It has caused uneasy feelings in the camp, and I believe that even this will all work together for good for those amongst them who truly love God. Friend Marsh left that morning; leaving, no doubt, commands to his hireling what to do; and I think he is faithful to his master, for the sake of the pay.

In the evening, then, Sweet took up a subject on charity, from 1 Corin. xiii, showing that men, although they may be capable of explaining mysteries, although they may have faith to remove mountains, yet if they have not that sickly sentimentality called "charity" by the world, so as to give all classes the right hand of fellowship, we are nothing! But, Friend Sweet, this is not Paul's charity. Paul was not writing to sickly withering sectarians, but to believers of the truth, who were rejoicing in the truth and not in lies; they were believers in a pure gospel, not a perverted gospel; they were not believing in death, burial, resurrection, and a sky kingdom in the future, for Paul never taught any such hope

But not to tire the reader with Mr. Sweet's foolishness in detail, I would just state that his conclusion was to the effect that Methodists, Baptists, and others were all right, and that his father was a good Christian Methodist minister for forty years. He then appealed to their sympathies to make up their minds to be one, that at length they might have a happy home in the kingdom of Jesus.

The next morning I was about to leave the conference to those that had a mind to keep it on, giving them a chance to put any propositions they might think proper, without any future opposition on my part. Friend Stephenson came in the morning to invite me to attend the meeting, as I had said in one of my subjects, speaking of the land covenanted to Abraham, that the territory, according to the admeasurment of the British government in 1840, was 300,000 square miles. Well, Friend Stephenson said that he was going to prove that I had been misquoting Scriptures. I said that surely it was not a misquotation of Scripture, but that I had based the remark upon the authority of the British government, and not on the Scriptures at all. Then he withdrew his word "misquote," and said misapplication. He said that he would prove that they had measured the wrong land. Well, if that be the case, I had given my authority, and it did not make the promises of God of none effect. I told him that the Abrahamic promise defined the boundary; between the river Euphrates, the Mediterranean, and the Nile; his land being occupied by the people named in Gen. xv. 21. He invited me to attend, but I asked him, suppose he made a mile more or a mile less, then the issue would be between him and the British government. I told him that this was a mere quibble, to endeavor to throw dust in the eyes of the people. He then laid down what he intended to prove, in these words, I took them word by word from his mouth: "I will prove to the satisfaction of the audience, that it is a wrong promise. The promise that you take of the boundary of the Land of Canaan, is not the boundary of the Land of Canaan, never was, nor never will be; and is an ignorant perversion by those who have so used it; and those that have been baptized into that faith are baptized in as false a theory as the world burning theory." Any one can perceive by this heap of nonsense, what they were trying to do—to endeavor to work upon those minds who had been obedient to the faith, that their faith was based upon 300,000 square miles, when that I had never made such a statement before them before they were baptized. One of the brethren told him that he was not baptized into the faith of 300,000 square miles.

But, Friend Stephenson, is not the promised land, that on which Jacob lay? Is not the promised land, the land where Stephen delivered his last address? Acts vii. Is not the promised land where Christ was crucified? is not the promised land where Jerusalem once stood in all its glory? This is where I taught that the kingdom of God would be re-established; where Jerusalem would become "the throne of Jehovah"; where Jerusalem would become the centre of attraction for all nations—for all nations will go there to worship the one great King of the whole earth. Surely, Friend Stephenson, you do not display much wisdom upon this point.

But like one of old, you are endeavoring to pervert the right way of the Lord; but whether you do it out of ignorance, or to support your friend Marsh, or to support the children of disobedience, to prevent them from obtaining an inheritance amongst the sanctified, I know not. You know that there is a cause for everything—there is a motive power. But I leave that for you to decide, betwixt God and your conscience; and I hope that you all will so learn the grand scheme of redemption through the medium of the word, that you will be enabled to perceive your own position in the sight of God, before the master of the household of faith riseth up and shutteth to the door; that you may not be without where there shall be weeping, &c, for then he comes to take vengeance on those that obey not the gospel. I lay this before your readers, that they may be enabled to see the craftiness of the professedly wise, whom God says he will take in their own craftiness. Hoping that you may be preserved to carry on the war against error and superstition,

I remain, sir, yours in the hope of coming off more than conqueror in the kingdom of
God,
Toronto, C. W., July 9, 1858.

J.WILLIAMS.

The Three Relations of Man.

"Man was created in the image and likeness of God;" he bore not only the outward form of the Spirit Elohim, called "God," in Gen. i. 1., but also partook of the divine attributes of mind. We are told that God is gracious, forbearing, long-suffering merciful, just, and pure; and a capacity for the development of all these qualities, He formed in the creature made in His own image, giving him besides, the sentiment of veneration, capacitating him for the worship of a Superior Being. Man, thus endowed with God-like capacities, was left to determine whether he would exercise them in the way appointed by his Creator, reflecting his glorious image and likeness, serving Him continually, and be at last crowned with eternal life; or whether he would suffer them to be perverted to the service of the adversary, reflecting sin, and stand at last under sentence of eternal death.

These two alternatives being placed before him, he chose rather to follow the road ending in eternal death. Being now alienated from the "likeness of God," and having formed an alliance with the adversary, his moral nature is blighted, sin throws the darkness of night over his spiritual perceptions, and he walks in "the valley of the shadow of death." Now, instead of mercy we find oppression; instead of God-like benevolence and compassion, is manifested harshness and revenge; for justice is found extortion; and in place of purity we have defilement; and where love should reign to shed a lustre over all, and be the moving power in the development of the inner man, there is hatred, anger, and strife.

Man, to be accurately studied, must be observed in three relations. First, in the position he occupies towards God; secondly, in the position he occupies towards his fellow

man; and thirdly, in his domestic relations. When in Paradise he communed with his Creator in childlike innocence and simplicity, —without fear or restraint—no thoughts of terror or distrust shadowed their intercourse; perfect confidence reigned, and consequent reliance on the divine wisdom and power. But soon these happy harmonious relations were disturbed, when man ventured to brave the just wrath of Almighty God, and to stand before Him in open rebellion. Now we behold God dealing with a rebel, a creature tainted by the unhallowed atmosphere of sin-emanation—the fruits of which were fully manifested in the history of Cain, who was the seed of the Serpent. Cain in all his actions, was evidently under the influence of all those passions and impulses which actuate the man of the flesh in our day; therefore, we conclude that they belong to the same class—that the man of the flesh now, is as much the seed of the Serpent as was Cain, the first development of the carnal mind in man. Thus we see a class of mankind called the seed of the Serpent, occupying a position of antagonism and deadly hostility towards God; and another class of their fellow creatures, called the seed of the woman. These latter God has determined to rescue from the evils entailed on their nature by the transgression of the first Adam; and to give them glory, honor, and eternal life, through the blood of His Son Jesus Christ, by obedience to his law, and absolute faith and reliance on His great wisdom, mercy, and love. By this means, those harmonious relations will be restored as at the first, and man will arrive at the state of perfection designed by his Creator, as the result of obedience. “God is love,” and we are told that “He so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that through Him they might have life.” “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,” “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.”

We are told that God has put enmity between two classes of mankind, called the seed of the Serpent and the seed of the Woman, and this enmity has continued, with but little intermission, from the days of Cain and Abel to the present time. In reviewing the history of man, as revealed in Scripture, we see at different periods, God reviving the contest between these two classes. When the antediluvian world was drawing near its close, “the way of the Lord was corrupted on the earth” by the sons of God intermarrying with the daughters of men; there was then a mixed seed, which was not according to the purpose of God, so he sent the Deluge and swept them all away except Noah and his family, who alone had found favor in his sight. Another separation then took place in the family of Noah; Shem was selected to preserve the chosen seed; from him, Abraham; and from Abraham, Jacob—“Jacob have I chosen, but Esau have I hated.” Here again, the enmity was revived between members of the same family. The Israelites were the chosen seed, and we read of many and frequent contests between them and the Canaanites, the despised descendants of Ham, and many other great nations of the earth. The political feud continues to the present time between these two classes, and will continue until the coming of Messiah, the woman's seed. In a social point of view, also, we see a very marked distinction and separation existing between the man of the flesh, and the man renewed after the image of Him who created him. Paul says, “The carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be;” so it follows, also, that the man renewed after the image of God, brought into harmonious relations with Him by obedience, holds an antagonistic position to the man of the flesh, subject to the carnal mind. Thus the Christian finds himself shunned, scoffed at, ridiculed, and in ages past the Church was made war upon, and her testimony silenced. The renewed man walks in the way of wisdom; delights in truth, uprightness, mercy, and justice; according to Paul’s instructions, he is “kind and tender hearted,” forgiving, not swayed by violent impulses and passions, but in patience possesses his soul; is subject to the ordinances of man for the Lord's sake; loves his neighbor as himself; and renders unto his servants that which is just and equal.

The sum and completion of all things is love; without this principle dwelling in the heart, man is as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." The numerous exhortations in Scripture, to cultivate this life-giving principle, leads us to the conclusion that it is one of the most essential elements of a Godlike character; first, love towards God, then love having human objects. No relation in which man can be placed, affords such ample scope for the exercise and perfecting of this beautiful principle, as the domestic relation. It is founded on love, therefore a fit school in which to perfect love. A man with his heart cultivated and purified in this relation, will not be found wanting in Christian love to his brethren. This is the basis of the social fabric, and a department very much overlooked and neglected by persons who seek to progress and advance in Christian graces. Let us go to the root of the matter. Let Christian men and women form an alliance on the principle of pure affection; let them have a due appreciation of that sacred institution, which Paul compares to the union of Christ to the Church; from which it is reasonable to conclude that man in his relation of husband, should develop those Godlike characteristics manifested in Christ, that self-sacrificing love, noble magnanimity, and faithful devotion; also, to be a guardian and supporter, counsellor and friend, to study the welfare and happiness of his companion, who is also created in the image of God, endowed with a fine perception and appreciation of all that is good and excellent and worthy of imitation; and, if under the influence of Christianity, is a good preceptor in things pertaining to principles of walk and conduct, while in matters pertaining to mere scientific investigation, she has to gain information from her stronger mate. So each according to the different capacities bestowed upon them by their Creator, may learn from the other. Both were created "very good," and their harmonious combination is productive of the highest and most beneficial results. Therefore let this relation of life receive more attention by all reflecting minds—those who study to improve in all things—and we shall have a society more perfect, more distinguished for all that loveliness so ornamental in character, and nearer resembling that state of things first instituted by God on earth.

Having thus given a very brief outline of a very important subject, it is respectfully submitted to the consideration of all "the household of faith," hoping it may arouse some to self-examination and improvement, and enable them to see the relations in which they stand, by the light of truth.

October 12, 1858.

ARISTOBULUS.

[Declined by the National Intelligencer.]
Modern Nomenclature and the Bible.

HAS it never struck the reader with surprise that, in this land of Bibles and Bible discussions, the phrases employed in speaking and writing of religious subjects, should be not only not borrowed from the Bible, but often in apparent opposition to its terms? Have we not adopted an artificial and unscriptural vocabulary, at variance with primitive usage, and in violation of the precept, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God?" For instance, we often hear from our pulpits and in our funeral and obituary addresses, that the dead shall no more appear on earth, that they have "gone to that bourne whence no traveller returns;" that "the places that knew them once shall know them no more forever." The venerable statesman and patriot, John Quincy Adams, gave utterance to the current popular faith when he said with his dying breath, "and this is the last of earth." Yet the Bible plainly declares the traveller shall "return," when the resurrection trump shall wake the sleeping dead, and "man shall stand again upon the earth;" and so death is not the last of earth. —Job, xiv. 12; Job, xix. 25; Dan., xii. 2; John, v. 28, 29; Rev. v. 10.

Again, do we not often hear that the righteous go to heaven at death, yet the Bible plainly testifies, "no man hath ascended up to heaven." The Saviour of mankind said to his apostles, just before his death and subsequent ascension to his Father's right hand, "Whither I go ye cannot come." It is declared of David—many hundred years after his death—"David has not ascended to heaven," and Solomon plainly assures us, Prov. xi., "The righteous and the wicked shall both be recompensed in the earth."

Again, men are often told that they will certainly live forever, that they possess immortal souls, yet in the inspired record, neither the phrase "immortal souls," nor the immortality of the soul is once to be found; whilst the Bible affirms, "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" "The King of kings and Lord of lords only hath immortality;" "The wages of sin is death, whilst the gift of God (to the righteous) is eternal life;" "He that hath not the Son shall not see life," for the Bible doctrine of future life, seems to be based, not upon the Platonic dogma of an immortal soul in man, but on the resurrection of the body—the divine and peculiar tenet of revelation, and the very pillar and support of the whole Christian fabric.

In the exhibition of the constitution and destiny of man, as expounded from our schools and our pulpits, the same unbiblical habit of expression is current. The dead are said to stand at the judgment bar of God the moment life is extinct, yet the Bible testifies that, "Man lieth down (in death), and riseth not till the heavens be no more. They shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." Jesus, the Great Teacher, declared, "The hour is coming when all that are in their graves (not in heaven or hell) shall hear his voice, and shall come forth;" and St. Paul affirms, "If the dead rise not, then they that sleep in Jesus are perished," which is certainly irreconcilable to the notion of their being in an intermediate conscious state of happiness. Moderns are wont to represent the dead as conscious in another and sentient world, whilst the ancients always represent their state as one of profound silence and unconscious repose, styling death the "land of forgetfulness," where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." They depose, "The dead know not anything,"—a death-blow, indeed, to modern spiritualism, and utter confusion to crazy rappers and their deluded victims.

Even in religious discussions, where the utmost precision in language is advisable, the same independence of Bible phraseology and plan is indulged.

Moderns beseech God to be reconciled to sinners; the ancients, the apostles, as ambassadors in Christ's stead, besought sinners to be reconciled to God. Moderns commend to us "revivals in religion," prayer meetings and anxious seats, mourning, tears and sighs, for the conversion of sinners, and the spread of the gospel. The ancients were evidently unacquainted with, and unpractised in, such agencies; they "so spake that a great multitude, both of the Jews and also of the gentiles believed." "They reasoned out of the Scriptures; they testified and exhorted; they preached the gospel of the kingdom of God;" and, as a consequence, many, like the Corinthians and Samaritans, believed and became obedient to the faith. Would it not be wise to adhere to ancient usages, and, like the holy men of old, to teach Bible truths in Bible words, and thus speak according to the oracles of God?

Washington, D.C.,
Oct. 4, 1858.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

Theiopolitical.

Behold, as a thief I come! Blessed is he that watches.

Condition of the Turkish Empire.

THE hopes entertained by many at the close of the Crimean struggle, that the Turkish Empire was about to enter into a new phase of progress and regeneration, do not seem likely to be fulfilled. Could the promised change have been wrought by dint of diplomacy, or could the spell of evil habit have been broken by the magic of words spoken and written at the Conferences of Paris, the Othman dynasty would, undoubtedly, have been by this time in the enjoyment of the renewed lease of power and stability which the European Sanhedrim decreed it. The Porte was solemnly declared to be admitted into the fraternity of European Governments. The integrity of the Moslem empire was formally placed under the guarantee of Christendom. International relations were initiated upon the footing theretofore subsisting between the civilised nations of the world. No end of good advice was confidentially offered by France, England, and Austria, as to the best mode of hastening "the renovation of their valetudinarian protégé; and even Russia, after a little, began to be equally communicative of disinterested counsel to the sick man who had had so narrow an escape of her exclusive care. But as far as it has gone, the new system of competitive protection of the Sultan by his imperial neighbours does not work either satisfactorily or promisingly. Neither the moral or material interest of Turkey appear to thrive under it. Whether it be that the sense of self-preservation as an active impulse has been weakened, or that the jealousy proverbially felt by the weak for the intermeddling of the strong in its affairs has become morbidly intense; whether it be that the mischief lies in the apathy and indifference, confirmed, ii' not created, by being publicly taken in and done for by the joint-stock wisdom of Europe; or whether it be that all consistent policy at home or abroad is paralysed by the conflict of embassies at Constantinople, and that in the multitude of counsellors there is danger, —certain it is, that things just now are going ill with our invalid ally on the banks of the Bosphorus, and that his condition, albeit he does not very loudly complain, is one calculated to cause no small anxiety on his account. In truth, the very absence of complaint is one of the worst symptoms of disease in cases of the kind. There is as we all know, what was called by Sheridan "unconscious dying at top." A fracture, however complicated, may be set; a fever, however high or delirious, may be overcome; congestion of the vital organs may be reduced by prompt and vigorous treatment; and most other maladies may be wrestled with and conquered. But no cure has been found for softening of the brain, in either the political or the bodily frame.

The only recompense sought by the Western Powers for the sacrifices made by them during the Russian war, was that the Christian subjects of the Sultan should be placed in all respects on an equal footing with the Mohammedan population. This was unreservedly promised, and there is no reason to suspect the Porte of any wilful breach of faith regarding it. But the resolution and energy necessary to carry it into effect were, and are wholly, wanting. The celebrated tanzimat, ordaining the future equality of creeds in the eyes of the law, was promptly issued; and great was the satisfaction expressed in speech and print throughout all Christian countries. But it soon appeared that the tanzimat was likely to have little efficacy throughout the provinces of the empire. As a general rule, the Christian population were destitute of arms and organization, while their hereditary oppressors in each locality exercised undiminished powers of exaction without limit, and insult with impunity. Everywhere the Christians were led to expect that their sufferings were about to terminate, and that France, England, and Sardinia had secured for them and for their children immunity from extortion,

outrage, and humiliation on account of their attachment to the Cross. But two years have rolled by and everywhere the hope has been belied. Wherever any effort has been made to take possession of the civil rights thus promised and guaranteed to them, a storm of indignant resistance has burst forth on the part of the chagrined and jealous Turks. With few exceptions, the local authorities have lent their countenance to disloyal asserters of extinct laws; and in most cases they have overawed and suppressed any ill-concerted efforts at resistance.

In Candia and Bosnia matters have assumed a serious aspect. During the long and enlightened administration of Mehemet Pasha (favourably known to the English public during his residence here as ambassador), the Candiotes had been taught habits of mutual forbearance and respect unlike anything that had existed elsewhere. The Moslems had learned to appeal to the law instead of private vengeance in their quarrels with one another and with their misbelieving neighbours; while the Greeks, strong in their numbers, intelligence, and property, while tacitly permitted to retain the possession of arms, had been dissuaded to renounce all thoughts of using them in civil contentions, and to rely for protection on the justice of the Sultan's lieutenant and those acting under him. Their homes were secure, their churches splendid, their commerce flourished; and Candia was pointed to continually by superficial travellers and politicians as a proof that the Turks could govern well. But from the reaction in Java of Islamism, which seems to have commenced even before the conclusion of peace in 1856, the Turks at Candia have unfortunately not been exempt. Petty squabbles, the origin and particulars of which are already lost in oblivion, and which at any other time might have borne no weighty fruits, have, under a timid and vacillating administration, led to a state of things the most fearful and revolting. Turks and Christians had alike appealed to the authorities in the island to espouse their cause. A recent decree of the Porte, at the instance of its foreign advisers, had separated the civil from the naval and military administration; and the military governor in Candia, taking an opposite view of affairs to that avowed by the civil head of the executive, no timely agreement as to measures of repression could be come to, and the fanatical Turkish rabble terminated the dispute in their own brutal way. Finding the authority of the Sultan thus prostrate, the Christians turned for protection to the consuls of the European Powers, and made their public appeal to them in terms not likely soon to be forgotten. On receiving intelligence of the commotions in Candia, the Porte wisely resolved to send thither once more Mehemet Pasha, armed with plenary powers to restore order; and for a season it is possible that, by dint of his personal influence, he may succeed in doing so. But it is plain enough that this is but to rely on a temporary expedient for the means of holding society together; and that the mere fact of a majority of the population having been driven to appeal to representatives of foreign states for protection to their altars, properties, and lives, is, in itself the most comprehensive proof of their utter unbelief in the power of the Sultan's government to govern. In Bosnia under circumstances widely dissimilar, results ominously identical occurred, the main causes being the same. The Turkish conquerors of that fertile and populous province became the territorial lords of the soil, and adopted and perpetuated the feudal tenures they found existing there. The occupiers, as in Ireland, adhered to their ancient faith; and the traditional enmities of race and creed were mingled with the conflicting interests of class. On every side beyond their frontiers the Bosniacs saw their Christian neighbours exempt from the hardships and mortifications they were forced to endure. In Servia and Transylvania they beheld their fellows secure in the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of their industry and the rites of their national faith; nor were the examples of Wallachia and the Herzegovine lost upon them. It was with difficulty they could be restrained from rising in insurrection on various recent occasions; but promises of redress were continually reiterated, and at the peace of 1856 they were more disposed to permanent submission to the Porte. The miserable disappointment of the hopes then held forth to them has now alienated the Bosniacs

more than ever; and while we write rumours reach us that the state of smouldering civil war is such that Austria affects to consider it a sufficient justification for collecting large bodies of troops near the southern portion of Hungary, to be ready, doubtless, on the first pretence, to enter and take military occupation.

Of what has happened lately at Jeddah, and what is too likely to ensue in Moldavia, and Wallachia, should the people of those provinces learn that their interests and rights have been sacrificed to Turkish obstinacy and Austrian intrigue, we have not space here to tell. On all sides weakness and disunion mark the condition of the Turkish Empire. The old prestige of absolutism governing by the sword is gone, and the paper sceptre of an exotic legality seems to have already proved too heavy for the effete hand into which it was thrust two short years ago. The Porte is daily beset more and more by the rival admonitions of the Austrian, French, and English embassies. When Lord Stratford de Redcliffe resigned, it was supposed that in this respect a different system would be inaugurated; and that M. Thouvenel and Baron Prokesch would no longer find in the dandyism and dilettantism of his successor provocations or pretence for keeping up the dictatorial tone so bitterly complained of. But even this gleam of amendment, equivocal as it was, has suddenly been withdrawn. Lord Stratford is about to proceed as Ambassador Extraordinary to Constantinople. The ostensible pretext for this singular step is that he may take leave of the sovereign whose ablest adviser he has been for more than twenty years; the real purpose, no doubt, is that he may for a few months longer maintain, if possible, the ascendancy he has hitherto exercised in the councils of Stamboul. Sir Henry Bulwer, it is felt on all hands, has neither the force of character, knowledge, or ability to hold the Sultan on his tottering throne; and he is therefore for the time to be superseded by his energetic predecessor. But what a picture of imperial decadence, decrepitude, and decay is here? Lord Stratford may avert a catastrophe during his intended sojourn at Constantinople, but what will become of the desponding and distracted councils of the empire when he is gone? —London Leader.

Review.

Hadji in Syria.

Hadji in Syria; or Three Years in Jerusalem. By Mrs. Sarah Barclay Johnson. (Daughter of the Campbellite missionary in Jerusalem) Philadelphia; J. Challen.

EVERY man who occasionally loiters at second-hand book-stalls knows what a random dip in the "six-penny box," in the hope of lighting upon something rare or curious accidentally dropped there, is most likely to produce. If it be not a volume of old sermons, it is a hundred to one but the expected prize in his hand will be a "Howadji in Egypt," or a "Month in Mesopotamia," or a "Scamper from Gravesend to Grand Cairo," or a "Cantab in Candia," or a "Lawyer in the Levant," or "Smith in Smyrna," or "Jones at Jericho," or "Beyrout and Back Again," or "Figs and Gilaf," or some one of the minute variations of which such titles are susceptible. The manner and sentiment of such books will be found to be reducible to one or two types. There is the audacious imitator of Eothen, who scorns all vulgar details of steamboats from Marseilles, seasickness, exorbitant hotel-keepers, troublesome custom houses, rapacious consuls, and dashes boldly into the thing—wakes you up in Cairo as if you had been there all your life, or startles you on the opening of his first chapter with "Bucksheesh, O stranger!" so said the dark-haired camel-driver, as we were lazily lounging," &c. This kind of traveller is always sentimental, vague, metaphysical, and addicted to strange words. The evening with him "greys" and "glooms," the river "shimmers" and "sheens," the

fields are "greened with golden plenty." He asks the palm tree what it sings in its melancholy waving—waxes philosophical upon the infinite, and the finite, and is not above writing a comic chapter by way of change. There is also the matter-of-fact traveller, who rises early, and after performing ablutions and partaking of a hearty repast, consisting of omelettes, rice, figs, (he never spares you one item), goes down to see the marvels which his guide-book has described before him. Better than this is the heavy traveller, who reports learnedly upon the manners, religion, history, commerce, &c, of the country; but of all bores, the gentleman or lady who travels in the East with a view to confirming Biblical history is by far the worst. We know what he or she will say at every stage of the pilgrimage. At Caesarea we hear that "it was here that Paul spoke so eloquently before Felix Agrippa." At every point about Jerusalem we are favoured with such ejaculations as "Gethsemane! what magic is there in the name! Who is not familiar with the sad story connected with its sacred soil?" At Jericho, or at Tyre, we exclaim again "How deplorable the change, and complete the desolation following the curse of an offended deity!" At Bethlehem "a multitude of associations come thronging in upon the soul at the mention of that name which will never cease to be cherished in the inner sanctuaries of the heart." The recollection of the sepulchre will never fade from the enthusiastic voyager's mind "while memory performs her functions." The sight of some group of natives justifies the information that "with the Mohammedans the shaving of the head is never neglected, leaving only a small tuft of hair, by which they believe Mohammed will one day elevate them bodily to heaven." And forthwith, a propos of the bare mention of the name of that "self-styled Prophet," we open a dreary chapter with, "Mohammed was born at Mecca A. D. 569."

Poor "Mrs. Sarah Barclay Johnson" is a specimen of this latter class. She is no doubt a very worthy and pious lady, but unfortunately her book is not readable. She has nothing new to tell, and wearies her reader intolerably with scraps of guide-book knowledge. National peculiarities which she details are frequently no peculiarities at all as where she describes the collection of octroi duties at the "Jaffa Gate," in Jerusalem. As a specimen of her political economy we may mention that she considers this "heavy tax," as falling on the country people who bring in their wares, and therefore accounting for their dread of the soldiers who collect it. Mrs. Johnson's search for Scriptural coincidences and evidences of Biblical truth is laudable enough, but it should not be forgotten that the best cause may be injured by unreflecting zeal. It is not by discovering that customs described in Holy Writ are still in existence that writers like Volney and Voltaire are to be met, or "the infidel" convicted of obstinacy. Such coincidences prove nothing but that the Scriptures are of Oriental origin, which not even "the infidel" denies. The "truth of the Bible" must rest on other arguments. In manuscript, Mrs. Johnson's record of her "Three Years in Jerusalem" might have been valuable to her family and friends, who, if the excuse for publication in the preface be not an idle and a hackneyed fiction, did her no good service in sending it to the printers. —Leader.
