

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., FEBRUARY, 1859  
Volume 9—No. 2.

---

The Mosaic and Nazarene Teaching Concerning God.

No. VII.

The subject of this article, in relation to the Old and New Testament revelation of "God," is the Effluent Manifestation of the Eternal Father in the Cherubim.

The first place where "Cherubim" occurs is in Gen. iii. 24, which we translate thus: — "And He caused to dwell at the east of the Garden of Eden the Cherubim, and the flame of destruction (lit. of the sword) turning itself to guard the way of the tree of the lives." From this and the context, we learn, that the dwelling place of the Cherubim was east-ward in Paradise and contiguous to the tree of lives, to which none could approach who were unfaithful and disobedient. This is the teaching of Moses, who, though acquainted with the Egyptian dogma of "immortal souls" in the mortal bodies of all men, women, and babes, taught that there was no immortality for faithless and wicked men. In this Moses and all the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, are all agreed. Men must become Cherubim, they must dwell in Paradise and there eat of the tree of life, as the condition of an interminable existence. All others are obnoxious to the "flame of destruction," styled by Daniel "a fiery stream that issues and comes forth from before the Ancient of Days; in whose presence minister thousand thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand." In this Daniel exhibits the allegorical signification of the Mosaic narrative respecting the devouring flame, It issues and comes forth from before the Ancient of Days and his thousands, at which time, Daniel testifies, "the judgment sits, and the books are opened." The Eden Cherubim, and Daniel's Ancient of Days and company, are doubtless allegorical, the former of the latter; for Moses wrote not only of the literal, but of that in such a way that he intended something else than is contained in the words literally taken. His writings are therefore both literal and allegorical; and to understand them in their allegorical sense we must pay strict attention to their literal significance, which is "the form of the knowledge and the truth." The literal narrative is "the form;" "the knowledge and the truth" the allegorical signification of that form.

Daniel's Ancient of Days and the ten thousands that surround him in judgment are equivalent to "the holy messengers and the Lamb" in Rev. xiv. 10, where we find fire and brimstone before them tormenting their enemies—the full allegorical development of the Eden Cherubic flame that guarded against all approach to the "tree of the lives" by the

unfaithful and disobedient. "Whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the lake of fire burning with brimstone."

The etymology of the word "Cherubim" is said by Gesenius to be obscure; and he suggests what he calls "a new derivation." He says "if the word be of Semitic origin, perhaps we may take the root charav as having a meaning like kharam "to prohibit from a common use." Hence, to consecrate, &c. "So that 'cherub,' would be keeper, warden, guard, that is, of the Deity, to guard against all approach." Hyde, in his "Religion of the Ancient Persians," page 263, supposes that "cherub" may be the same as קרוב the first letter being koph, instead of caph, and signifying one near to God, his minister—one admitted to his presence." Both these derivations are in accordance with the truth concerning the Cherubim, —nevertheless, not satisfactory to our mind. We believe that the word is derived from the root rachav, "to ride," whether on an animal or in a vehicle. By transposing the first two letters and heemantively inserting wav before the last, we have "cherub" or that which is ridden—in the plural, "cherubim." This convertibility of the verb rachab into the noun "cherub" is illustrated in Psal. xviii. 11, thus—

wi-yoph	cherub-al	wy-yirchab
flew &	cherub-a upon	rode-he-And

In Psalm civ. 3, the clouds are styled Jehovah's r'chub or chariot, which is "ch'rub," with the first two letters transposed.

The "Cherubim," then, constitute a vehicle, in and upon which the Eternal Power self-styled "Ehyeh" or "Yahveh," otherwise "Jehovah," rides as in a chariot. Hence, David, in speaking of them, in 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, terms them ham-merchavah hak-cheruvim, "the chariot of the Cherubim," which, he says, "spread out and covered the ark of the covenant of Yahveh." The Spirit is the rider, and the Cherubim the "clouds," the "horses," the "chariots," the "living creatures," the "wheels," the "great waters," the "winged host," upon which he rides. Hence, of the Eternal Spirit it is said, "Behold, he cometh with the clouds,"—the clouds of his witnesses, of whom the present evil, aion, or course of things, is not worthy—Rev. i. 7; Heb. xii. 1; 1 Thes. iv. 17; and again, "Was thy wrath against the sea that thou didst ride upon thine horses, thy chariots of salvation? \* \* \* Thou didst march through the sea with thine horses, through the heap of great waters."—Hab. iii. 8, 15; also, "Whither the Spirit was to go the living creatures went \* \* \* and they ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning. And the noise of their wings was like the noise of great waters, as the voice of the Almighty, as the noise of a host."—Ezek. i. 12, 14, 24; Rev. i. 15, xix. 14. In this last citation, wings, great waters, Almighty, and host, all refer to the same company—a multitudinous embodiment of the Effluence of the Eternal Father, who soars on these wings of the Spirit. wy-yaideal chan-phai ruach.—Psal. xviii. 2

But the Eternal Spirit not only "rides upon," "soars upon," and "flies upon," but the Father by that Spirit also "inhabits the Cherubim." David in Psal. lxxxi., and Hezekiah, in Isaiah xxxvii. 16, say, in their address to Jehovah, "O, Yahveh of Hosts, Elohim of Israel, inhabiting the Cherubim, shine forth, Thou, He, the Mighty Ones, (athtah-hu ha-Elohim) Thou alone of all the kingdoms of the earth: Thou didst make the heavens and the earth." In this passage is a remarkable combination of titles and pronouns in the singular and plural numbers. Yahveh or Jehovah is singular; Elohim, plural; athta-hu, two pronouns in the singular joined to hah-Elohim in the plural: athtah signifies thou, and hu, he, in the third person, which in the original text are connected by a hyphen, thus, Thou-He. The common

version has it, "thou art he" in many places, but in the text before us they have omitted the "he" altogether, and instead of the literal rendering, "Thou-He, the Mighty Ones," they have substituted what was not written, namely, "thou are the God."

The words of Hezekiah literally translated into English are, "O, Shall-be of armies, Mighty Ones of Israel inhabiting the cherubs, Thou-He, the Mighty Ones, thou alone of all the kingdoms of the earth: thou didst make the heavens and the earth." This affirms that the Eternal Spirit is the sole creator of all that exists. He is one, and that unity is expressed by the singular verbal noun, Yah-veh, "Shall-be," and the pronouns, Athtah, "thou," and hu, "he." The Eternal Spirit (Heb. ix. 14) as creator is necessarily before all things, and is therefore the θεός, "Theos," and the λόγος, "Logos," of John i. 1, 3, where it is testified that "all things were made on account of Him; and without Him was made not one thing which exists." This same Eternal Spirit was effluently in Noah, in Moses, in David, and all the prophets, in Jesus and the apostles. One Spirit in these many persons. In the Mosaic system the Effluence of the Eternal Power was represented by "an oil of holy ointment," or "a holy anointing oil"—an unction that was not to be commonly used upon pain of death—Exod. xxx. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 20, 27. It was compounded of myrrh, sweet cinnamon, sweet calamus, cassia, and olive oil, after the art of the perfumer. The tabernacle with all it contained, with the altar of burnt offering and all its vessels, the laver and its foot, were all anointed with it, and thereby became most holy, so that whatsoever touched them became holy. Aaron and his sons were also consecrated with it when "the diadem of the anointing oil of his Elohim" was said to be "upon him." Lev. xxi. 12. The holy anointing oil was not to be used apart from these, for "upon man's flesh," saith the Law, "it shall not be poured."

The Cherubim were anointed with the most holy unction, by which also they became most holy. It was one holy anointing oil for many things, which in and of themselves differed nothing from that which was common. This principle of ONE IN MANY is thus foreshadowed in the law and the prophets—One Eternal Spirit-Power which "shall be" in the "mighty ones of Israel" as it was and is in Jesus of Nazareth—"Thou," Eternal and Anointing Spirit, art "He" in "the Mighty Ones of Israel," the Theos and the Logos creator of the heavens and the earth."

The "Holy Anointing Spirit-Oil" is styled by Peter in 1 Epist. i. 2, "the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets;" because "Christ" signifies "Anointed," and the Spirit that was poured out upon Jesus and constituted him anointed also, anointed them; hence it was said of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm."—1 Chron. xvi. 22. Speaking of the same Spirit, Nehemiah says, "Thou gavest Israel thy, good Spirit to instruct them; and many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them 'by thy Spirit in thy prophets;' yet would they not give ear: therefore gavest thou them into the power of the peoples of the lands"—as at this day.

By this Spirit-Effluence the Eternal Power inhabits the Cherubim. The common version makes David and Hezekiah say that Jehovah "dwells between the Cherubim." But the preposition between, is not in the original text. The words there are these yoshaiv hakcheruvim, "inhabiting the Cherubim." Hence, whatever the Cherubs may prove to be, the Eternal Spirit, self-styled Yahveh or Jehovah, dwells in them. Thus, "Jehovah will dwell (in the holy land) forever. The chariots of mighty ones (are) two ten thousands, thousands of glorified ones. The Lord is among them as on Sinai, in the holy land. Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captive captivity: thou hast received gifts AS THE ADAM; yea, even for YAH Elohim to inhabit rebellious ones."—Psal. lxxviii. 16, 18. This testifies the future

presence of Jehovah, or Yah-Elohim, as Adonai or Lords in the Holy Land in the midst of thousands of mighty and glorified ones as on Sinai in the days of Moses. These are the chariots of the Spirit—the Intelligences prefigured in the Cherubs. It testifies also that the Lord "from all eternity," (the Father) and the Lord "for all eternity," (the Adam), having as YAH, the Spirit, first necessarily descended, afterwards, as the Adam, ascended on high; that, in ascending, the YAH-ADAM led captive Death, which made a captive of Him, as it does of all mankind, and therefore styled "captivity;" and that then, "as the Adam," styled by Paul, who spoke the same things as David, "the Last Adam" and "the Second Man," he received gifts—"spirits" or spiritual gifts; to the end that YAH-Elohim—the Spirit of the Mighty Ones—"might dwell in the rebellious;" that is, in Gentiles, "by nature sinners," but enlightened by the Gospel of the kingdom and subjected to "the obedience of faith."

To such, that is, to once rebellious, but now obedient men and women, Paul, speaking of this indwelling, says, that "the One Father-Power has decreed the subjection of all things to the last Adam, except himself; and that when this subjugation is perfected, the Adam shall himself be ranked under the Eternal Power who subdues all things to the Adam, that Theos, the Eternal Father may be "all things in all men." This is Moses and David's teaching of One in Many—the effluence of the Eternal inhabiting men, and being "over all, and through all, and with all of them;" as it is also written, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and will be a father unto them, and they shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty;" and again, "He that sitteth upon the throne shall dwell among them—1 Cor. xv. 27; 2 Cor. vi. 16, 18; Eph. iv. 6; Rev. vii. 15—xxi. 3.

Here then are the Old and New Testament writers all teaching one and the same doctrine concerning the terrestrial manifestation of the Eternal Power—one central power over, through, and with many persons by its effluence, each person being eternal power incarnate, and these in their glorified aggregate represented by the Cherubim—the cherub-chariots of the Spirit.

Now that a cherub is representative of an exalted Power is evident from Adonai-Jehovah's address to the Tyrian Royalty, in Ezek. xxviii. 12—19; as:

- "Thus saith Adonai Jehovah, —  
 As a signet of curious engraving;  
 Full of wisdom and perfect in splendor  
 art thou.
13. Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of Elohim.  
 Every precious stone thy covering:  
 The ruby, the topaz, and the diamond,  
 The beryl, the onyx, and the jasper,  
 The sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle.  
 And the workmanship of thy tabrets and thy pipes was of gold in thee:  
 In the day of thy being created they were prepared.
14. Thou ANOINTED CHERUB, even I constituted thee a protector;  
 On the holy mountain of the Elohim thou hast been;  
 In sparkling gems thou didst walk to and fro.

15. Thou hast been upright in thy dealings from the day of thy being created, until iniquity hath been found in thee.
16. Through the greatness of thy traffic they have filled thy midst (with) extortion;  
And thou hast sinned, therefore I will break thee out of the mountain of Elohim;  
And I will destroy thee, O protecting Cherub, from amidst the sparkling gems.
17. Thine heart was lifted up because of thy splendor:  
Thou hast corrupted thy wisdom because of thy brilliancy:  
I will prostrate thee upon the earth;  
I will lay thee before kings to rejoice over thee.
18. From the greatness of thine iniquities through the unrighteousness of thy traffic,  
Thou hast polluted their holy places:  
Therefore I will cause to come forth a fire from thy midst;  
It shall devour thee, and I will give thee for ashes upon the earth,  
In the eyes of all observers.
19. All that know thee among the peoples were confounded because of thee;  
Thou shalt be calamities (to them) and nothing of thee till the Olahm." \*

\* That is. Nothing of thee in Eden till "the time of the end,"—which immediately precedes and terminates in Olahm, or the Millennium.

In this quotation, more correctly and therefore more intelligibly translated than in the common version, a political power headed up in the King of Tyre is styled an Anointed Cherub; and the reason appears to have been, because Jehovah had "constituted it a Protector" of peoples, which function is signified by outspread wings which are an important element of the Cherubic symbol. The Tyrian Power was an "anointed" Cherub in the same sense in which the pagan Cyrus, King of Persia, was "Jehovah's Anointed," or Messiah, who was surnamed of Jehovah before his birth, and 176 years before he appeared upon the page of Bible history—Isai. xlv. 1-4. The Eternal Spirit created and rode the Tyrian Power, as in a chariot: and developed it as an element of that system of powers, whose relations to Israel in the days of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, were allegorical of "the Powers that be," in their relations to the Hebrew nation, when the Russian Nebuchadnezzar shall make war upon the Anglo-Syrian protector of the Jews in "the holy mountain of the Elohim," and cast it out at the time just preceding the apocalypse of the Ancient of Days and his company of glorified myriads.

The Cherubim stationed as guards at the east of Eden's garden were certain Elohim or powerful Ones, detailed by the Eternal Spirit for the protection of the Life-Imparting Tree, and "the Way," that led thereto. Hence, all communications from the Eternal throne for the instruction of mankind would pass through them. Themselves corporeal focalizations of spirit, they were vehicles in and by which were conveyed "the mysteries of the faith," into which they desired to look, but were not able—1 Pet. i. 12; Mark xiii. 32. These "conveying vehicles" or chariots of the Eternal Spirit, were "public official spirits sent forth for service on account of those hereafter to inherit salvation"—Heb. i. 14. Hence, they are styled Maalchim-Yehovah, angels or messengers of the Eternal Power, self-styled Ehyeh, Yahveh or Jehovah. David, addressing these Angel-Elohim, says, "Bless ye Jehovah, ye his angels, mighty of power, executing his command, hearkening to the voice of his word. Bless ye Jehovah, all ye his armies, his attendants executing his pleasure:" and elsewhere, "O Jehovah, my Elohim!"—

O Eternal One, my Mighties—"thou art very great, covering thyself with light as a garment, spreading out the heavens as a curtain; who makes dark clouds his chariot; who goes on the wings of spirit, making his messengers spirits, his attendants a flaming fire. He established the earth upon its foundations, that nothing shall be moved during the age and beyond." olahm wah-ed—Ps. ciii. 20; civ. 1—5.

[To be Continued.]

---

### Thinkings of the Flesh.

"The thinking of the flesh is death: because it is enmity against God; for to the law of God it is not subjected; nor indeed can be."—PAUL.

DEAR SIR, —I am well pleased with your interesting periodical, and wish to continue my contribution to its support.

I have never had the pleasure of reading much that you have written, but in all that I have perused you seem to assume the authenticity and genuineness of the writings of the Old and New Testaments as proved. Now I am aware that President A. Campbell has been pleased to say, that he did not envy the heart or brains of any man who denied the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth; but that is mere bombast and subterfuge. Such men as Gibbon, Hume, Volney, Voltaire, etc., were as gifted by nature, and perhaps almost, if not quite as learned (save Greek criticism and lore) as he, or any other "divine" of this or the last century; and I believe with as much moral character as "the Clergy" generally possess—this is my humble opinion.

It would give not only myself, but many of my friends, and I have no doubt most of your readers, much pleasure to see a series of essays in The Herald from your pen upon the following subjects; namely,

1. Miracles are not susceptible of proof adapted to our nature and experience; that is, they are opposed to the laws of nature, and against human experience.

Christianity is based upon miracles; therefore Christianity is not susceptible of proof, and consequently, is as a fable to us. See Hume's argument in Starkie on Evidence, where the editor attempts a refutation, and involves himself inextricably!

The old argument or illustration, that we believe such a man as Caesar lived over two thousand years ago from human testimony, is not applicable, and is foolish; because there is nothing in opposition to nature and human, experience, in that testimony; but in the miraculous testimony concerning the birth, death, and the resurrection of Jesus, there is. Are not miracles just as necessary to our faith as to that of the ancients?" I mean, as necessary to see them performed as for them?

2. A system professing to set forth the nature and conditions of eternal life, should be adapted to the comprehension of the masses.

The Bible by its voluminousness and occultness cannot be understood by the great body of the people; therefore, if the Bible be "the Book of Life" it is not addressed to the bulk of mankind—like Caligula's laws, out of reach of the subjects!

3. The Bible teaches that Christian faith must be based upon the word of the living God, and not upon the wisdom of the schools.

Not only the ignorant, but the learned have to depend on human testimony, human industry, human agency, which are the media through which they receive the so-called "divine testimony." Therefore, their faith is not of God, but of men—is not reliable, and cannot become the basis of a hope, that will "be an anchor within the veil," to draw our floating and billow-tossed barks toward "the haven of rest eternal;" hence one of the difficulties of thinking men to lay hold and persevere in the "One Hope."

4. It is assumed by you that Adam and Eve were made capable of the development of character, but had actually none; which seems to be true. Now there are subjective and objective forces acting upon man. The Bible informs us that Eve was acted upon by objective forces, which was "evil," because it turned the scale, and thereby produced a preponderance of the animal over the moral powers, and consequent perversion of those organs, which were intended, (if properly exercised) to produce pleasure in the adaptation of the means, to "multiply and replenish the earth." God, therefore, being the creator, or what Atheists term "prime causation" of all things, He is the author of evil, both affirmatively and negatively speaking; because he directly created the objective force (or evil force) that operated upon Eve; and he is indirectly, or negatively, the author of evil in withdrawing good from Eve and her suffering children! Whence came sin? Now it might have been all right thus to have created "evil" the mother of Sin (!?) but the Bible, or rather people say the Bible denies it; and now where is the doctrine of Optimism?

5. By induction, it is now understood and taught by Physiologists, that the conditions of health and therefore of happiness and disease, and consequently of misery, are founded on, or rather are analogous to, the immutable laws of nature, or of nature's God; and that every obedience and infraction of said laws, produces corresponding pleasure and pain, without any exception. Now it follows that in order to be perfectly healthy, and, of course, happy in all our physical and intellectual functions, it is necessary that we understand those laws, or conditions, and obey them. Well, this is in the power of all rational men and women, because they are discernible by observation and experience. Now, by analogy and the general positive teachings of the scriptures, you have (as I believe, properly) come to the conclusion, that the conditions of "heirship" and enjoyment of the future kingdom are equally certain, definite, immutable, and inexorable in their requirements; and as certain in their results as the laws of health deduced as aforesaid. You also teach that they must be understood, in order to be obeyed unto eternal life. There are scarcely any two of "the learned world" that apply the principles of Hermeneutics in the same direction with reference to the doctrines of Christianity: and perhaps there is no man living that professes to UNDERSTAND the great scheme of redemption perfectly; and consequently, he cannot adapt his course in this life to its perfect requirements. Therefore, none are in Christ; and if not in Christ they are not "heirs;" and if not "heirs" will never enter upon the enjoyment of the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Where then is the material for that grand superstructure, "the building not made with hands?" Where are the saints to come from that are to fill the earth after the coral insect has reared her mighty piles to fill up the oceans with new continents in obedience to an instinct of her nature? \* I tremble under the contemplation of the awfulness of the conclusion that certain modes of reasoning lead to upon this grave, sublime, and eternal theme—"the end of the beginning" and its consequents!! \* But where is the water to go to?

6. It is now generally admitted by "the scientific world" (and I believe it) that mind is the resultant action of the brain—that a sane mind is the result of a sound brain; that a sound brain corresponds to the soundness of the whole respiratory, muscular, and vital systems; and that therefore the moral tone, as well as the physical and the intellectual, depends finally upon hygienal laws. Now Jesus of Nazareth himself, and Moses in the law, disregarded these laws, instead of preaching and practising them; which (it is argued) is a proof of, either that he was an impostor, or that he did not come to be the saviour of mankind, except in a special sense, and toward a special few, who might hereafter discover and obey these hygienic laws. Now this was leaving the matter very uncertain, indefinite, and inconclusive; as well as manifestly a reckless disregard on his part of the laws of nature, or of nature's God, whose Son he claimed to be! But I must quit before I wear your patience clean out.

I do not present the above as my own positions, or, in other words, as my convictions. Yet? except the first two arguments, they are of my construction. For many years I had difficulties to encounter in the investigation of the claims of the Scriptures, which were somewhat obviated by a very careful reading of the debate between the now President Campbell and R Owen, of Lanark, Scotland; and yet some of the same difficulties presented themselves after reading that work, that followed the reading of Paley, the great blunderer; and Bishop Watson, the simple; and Dr. Nelson, the quaint; and all the others upon the "Evidences of Christianity." But after reading some of your writings, one of the most "ungetoverable" difficulties vanished, which was this: —I believed that man is mortal. I did not believe the popular idea of eternal torments, because it is contrary to the former position, and also derogatory to the character of God, as I believed; and therefore, being always taught that the Bible taught this doctrine, I discarded the Bible; but you have harmonized "that thing." However, I have some difficulties yet, and hope, if not inconsistent with your plan, that you would take these subjects, and give them the benefit of your fruitful pen. I do not believe that Hume's argument has ever yet been fairly answered.

Excuse the length and haste with which I have penned this scrawl. It was the best I could do under the press of business, and very bad state of health.

Yours truly, in search of truth.

WILLIAM OGLE, M.D.

Louisiana, Feb. 27, 1858.

---

#### Our Assumption.

WE admit that we have reasoned and expounded upon the assumption, that the writings of the apostles were AUTHENTIC, or had everything necessary or requisite to give them authority; and were GENUINE, or not spurious; but just what they claimed to be, as expressed in themselves. From personal examination, we were satisfied of the authenticity and genuineness of the books usually denominated "the Scriptures;" and in our course of life, having been thrown among those who professed to believe that the Bible contained the only revelation of the mind, will, purpose, and promises of God, extant among men; and that it is, consequently, not only authentic, but the only authority to be deferred to in all religious questions and controversies: —having stood related to such as these, we have not hitherto labored to convince them of what they professed to believe already; but confined ourselves to the confirmation of their professed belief, in trying to impart to them an understanding of what it taught. We have succeeded in the work to some limited degree; but not to the extent

the testimony and the labor bestowed authorized one to expect. The reason probably is, or at least it may be one reason, that our unconvinced readers do not really believe the Bible-teaching to be the voice of God—that they merely acquiesce in the current opinion that the Bible is His word in some sense or other; but really believe nothing at all about the matter.

#### FLESH AND BLOOD NOT THE AUTHOR OF THE BIBLE.

But though we have assumed that our readers were in truth believers in the authenticity and genuineness of the Bible, we have ever been presenting them the strongest possible testimony for its divine origin and authority in showing them, that from the very nature of the peculiar principles and doctrine it revealed, and which we have endeavored to teach them, it must have come from a source independent of the laws to which flesh and blood are subjected. In other words, that the truly philosophical way to faith in the Bible is to understand its teaching. We never yet heard of a man who understood it, denying that God spake by the prophets and apostles; but we have heard of many learned in the wisdom of the world, but fools in the teaching of the Bible, who reject it as a cunningly devised fable. These persons have been unable to define and expound one of its first principles, and yet they have rejected it with scorn and contempt. Such a course as this would be condemned as exceedingly unphilosophical and reprehensible by those very persons, if bibliofidels were to act so in relation to the subjects they favored and approved. We conclude, then, that the first step to faith in the authenticity and genuineness of the scriptures is to understand the doctrine, or teaching, in other words, THE SYSTEM OF IDEAS—they reveal. This system will be found to be *sui generis*—as high above any system elaborated by human wisdom, or rather folly, as the throne of the Eternal is above this nether earth. From our experience and observation of flesh and blood in its literary and spiritual enterprizes, which are in accordance with the history of the world in all ages, we are certain that no combination of brains working by blood arterial, under the excitation derivable from all that is in the world, and from their inner consciousness, could elaborate such a system of ideas as is peculiar to the Bible alone. To any one that understands it, it is manifestly not of the flesh; nor in harmony with the flesh; the flesh it never flatters, but denounces it as utterly destitute of any good thing; and condemns it to death, corruption, and final abolition from the earth. Hence, as it makes war upon the flesh; and rejects it as profiting nothing in regard to the eternal destiny of the children of Adam; all who are of the flesh walking after its principles, impulses, and failings, reject it as unsuitable to nature, to nature's laws, and to nature's conception of nature's God.

Nay, verily; nature, that is, flesh and blood, or ground-nature is not, and could not in the very nature of things be, the author of the Bible. Its ideas are too grand, too luminous, too exalted for souls of dusty origin to conceive. None but a Mind comprehending all things at a glance; that sees the end from the beginning, with all those intermediate devious and entangled complications weaving out that predetermined consummation; —none but such a mind could have built up, during four thousand years, the pyramid of thought destined to stand out from a background of seventy centuries, the observed from base to point of all earth's ransomed people, so long as the sun and moon endured. The Bible-system of ideas being of this character, we find it impossible to attribute any other origin to it than that which it testifies of itself—that "prophecy was not actuated at any time by man's will, but the holy men of God spake being moved by the Holy Spirit." This is Peter's testimony to which also Paul consents, saying, "In many portions and in various ways God formerly spake to the fathers in the prophets, during these last days he spake to us in a Son, whom He appointed heir of all things:" and the apostles both agreed with Nehemiah, the old Tirshatha of Jerusalem, who addressing Jehovah, saith, "Thou gavest also thy Good Spirit to instruct our

fathers" in the wilderness. "Many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by thy Spirit in thy prophets, yet would they not give ear."

#### UNENVIABLE HEARTS AND BRAINS.

As to President Campbell's saying, it is a mere flourish of trumpets; for our own part we would rather have the heart and brains of one denying the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, than Mr. Campbell's heart and brains, who, professing to believe it, neither receives the gospel nor practices the precepts, he delivered. "No one can say that Jesus is Jehovah but by holy spirit"—that is, by God's spirit in the prophets and apostles, teaching through them, and confirming the Word. Now all the testimony for Jesus is contained in the scriptures. If it be not there, it is no where else among men. Many a heart and brains is denied access to that testimony by educational and circumstantial hindrances, whose owner would otherwise not only confess that Jesus is Jehovah, but would also believe the gospel and obey it, if he could but free himself or be freed, from their trammels. The men whose hearts and brains are not to be envied, are those having the hearts and brains of presidents, professors, theologians, and clergymen, who are ever babbling about divinity in trinity, and making the word of God of none effect by their traditions. It is such men as these that have perverted the people, and turned them into merely nominal believers of the Bible, which is literally of no use in the matter of clerical piety and religion. The Bible has fallen into desuetude; and "ignorance" has become among Protestants, who once boasted that the Bible was their religion, truly "the mother of devotion." In fact, infidelity now reigns in church and world, and all its "hearts and brains" are overpowered with spiritual surfeiting and drunkenness.

Gibbon, Hume, Volney, and Voltaire were men, whose want of faith in the Bible was mainly attributable to the hearts and brains of the clerical orders of their respective countries. Volney and Voltaire only knowing Christianity as burlesqued in the sprinkled paganism of Europe, renounced "the church" and uttered impieties against the Jesus of the idiotic and demoniac priests of Rome. Gibbon and Hume were surrounded by similar influences. They looked at Christianity through the state religions, or prostitutions, of Britain, and rejected it; as the Jews now reject it, because they do not understand the Old and New Testaments; and confound Romanism, Protestantism, and Sectarianism with the doctrine of Christ. It is the clergy that make men infidels by teaching them nonsense, which makes the Bible unintelligible and fabulous to all thinking men who try to interpret it by their traditions. This Gibbon, Hume, and others, found it impossible to do; and therefore, instead of rejecting the foolishness of the clergy, and holding on to the Bible as not responsible for the ignorance and sophistry of learned fools, they rejected the whole affair, and avowed themselves the disciples of Nature, and the hierophants of what is termed by that school, "Nature's God."

#### "MIRACLES."

Our correspondent has not stated in what sense he uses the word "miracle." In scripture, the word is τέρας, *teras*, a wonder; and is used in sixteen texts in the New Testament, but always in connection with other words, as ση ειον, *semeion*, a sign; δυνα ις, *dunamis*, power; or ερ-ισ ός, *merismos*, distribution. In Heb. ii. 4, Paul introduces the four words, saying, that God bore witness to the apostolic testimony "by signs and wonders, and various powers and distributions of holy spirit, according to his will." Objectors to the manifestations of divine energy as "opposed to the laws of nature, and against human experience," group these indiscriminately under the word "miracles," which they regard as violations of nature's laws; so that their proposition amounts to this, namely, "A sign, a

wonder, power and distributions of holy spirit, are all contrary to the laws of nature, and against human experience!" But in opposition to this, we venture to affirm, that these things are all in accordance with nature's laws, and in harmony with human experience in a multitude of instances. Thus, "the lights in the firmament of the heaven are for signs"—Gen. i. 14. The rainbow is a sign that the earth shall be no more submerged by a flood of waters—Gen. ix, 12, 13. Isaiah and his sons were for signs and wonders in Israel—ch. viii. 18. There is nothing in all this contrary to nature's laws or staggering to human experience; but perfectly reasonable in the bearings thereof.

But "wonders and signs" used oftentimes to go together. Thus, Moses was a subject of wonder in his own person. He put his hand into his bosom and when he drew it out, "it was leprous as snow;" and he put it in again, and withdrew it a second time, "and it was turned again as his other flesh;" This was wonderful, but was it contrary to nature's laws, and human experience? Do men never have the leprosy and get cured? Yes, but not so suddenly. Truly; and the suddenness of the thing made it an especial wonder. Its suddenness was not contrary to Moses' experience, for it happened to him; but then not as yet within the range of other people's experience; and as to human experience in general, we venture to say that it is not yet acquainted with all the wonders which are educible by the intensifying of laws already existing; many of which it is to be presumed, Human Experience, though very wise in its own conceit, has not yet discovered by its philosophisings and experiments!

Now the sudden infliction and cure of a disease (which on a larger scale was repeated in the case of Miriam, the sister of Moses) was not only a wonder, but a sign to be exhibited before Israel in Egypt, in confirmation of the truth that the God of Abraham had appeared to him, as he declared. This was what the wonder signified when performed in connexion with Moses' declaration, that the God of Abraham had appeared to him, and sent him to deliver them. When the wonder was performed, it became an item of human experience; and apart from any declaration only signified to Moses and those who saw it, the presence of a supernatural power; the declaration of the angel at the bush, made the wonder a special sign; and every Jew that rejoices in Moses as their deliverer from Egypt, is a living witness that a sign and a wonder are reasonable, and possible things, and according to the experience of 600,000 men, who in consequence of this experience put themselves under him as their commander and prophet king.

But all wonders are not genuine. Some in the scriptures are styled "lying wonders." Jannes and Jambres performed wonders "by their enchantments;" but had at length to give up the contest, and confess that Moses performed his wonders by the power of God. Paul also predicted that "power and signs, and lying wonders" would be displayed in the establishment of the Apostasy, which now, as a pall of intense darkness, overspreads the world. The existence of these very counterfeits in all the countries where the apostles labored through all ages since, is a standing and living testimony to the fact, that signs and wonders, powers and distribution of holy spirit, were formerly familiar elements of human experience, and assuredly believed to have been performed by the finger of God.

"I am Jehovah (saith the Spirit) the powers (elohai) of all flesh;"—"by me they live and move and do exist"—"is there any thing too hard for me?" Has he given laws to nature, and can he not work great wonders upon and through that nature; vastly greater than the natural mind has ever yet experienced or conceived? Is nature subject to no other laws than are known to men? Are their knowledge and experience to be the measure of Omniscience? Can not the power that made man raise him from the dead, give him sight, and heal him of

whatever malady afflicts him, in an instant? All these things he can do, and more than we can conceive; and upon principles it has not yet entered into the heart of man to divine. But not to dwell longer on this point we leave it with the remark, that the proposition concerning "miracles" is untenable in all its parts.

#### CHRISTIANITY NOT BASED UPON MIRACLES.

It is said that Christianity is based upon miracles. To those who read the scriptures, but do not study them, this may be taken as evidently true. They see that signs and wonders are frequently narrated in the scriptures; and therefore imagine that the system of ideas they reveal is based upon what they consider a violation of the laws of nature; with which indeed, all the philosophers of the human race that ever lived, put together, have only been microscopically acquainted. The foundation of Christian doctrine is not signs and wonders, but the verbal promises of the Eternal who cannot lie. If signs and wonders had never been wrought, these promises would still remain. The signs and wonders were originally performed to convince the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of the ninth and forty-second generations from Abraham, that the Eternal Spirit spoke by Moses and Jesus. It is not necessary here to speak of the intermediate times; what we are aiming at is sufficiently established by what happened in the ninth and forty-second. These two generations are representative of the nation; and the purpose of Jehovah was to make this nation his witness as long as the years of God. Thus he saith to this nation, "YE ARE MY WITNESSES, saith Jehovah, AND MY SERVANT whom I have chosen; that ye may believe and know and understand that I am HE; before Me there was no AIL formed, nor shall there be after me. I am HE who SHALL BE (anoki anoki Yahveh;) and beside me no Saviour." "Ye are my witnesses. Is there an Eloah besides me? Yea, there is no Rock; I know not any"—Isai xliii. 10, 11; xliv. 8. Individuals and generations die and pass away; and the non-Hebrew nations, called gentiles, sooner or later perish from the earth; but the Hebrew Nation is immortal, as it is written, "Though I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee; yet will I not make a full end of thee, O Jacob my servant; but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished"—Jer. xxx. 11; xlvi. 28.

Here then is a witnessing nation for all generations, to whom, says Paul, "were committed the oracles of God. And what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the Faith of God without effect?"—Rom. iii. 3. He considered that this committal of the scriptures to Israel's care gave the Jews a great advantage over the Gentiles. Now Jehovah by his signs and wonders convinced this nation of the divine mission and inspiration of the prophets, whom they maltreated, rebelled against, and put to death often, because they would not prophesy to them "smooth things." Such a nation is certainly a credible witness in the premises—witnessing to the truthfulness and excellency of the men who convicted them of the most hideous abominations against God and men. This nation contemporary with Moses, with Jesus, and with ourselves, as living witnesses, testifies that the Eternal Power proved to them satisfactorily; and so demonstratively that they have never been able to forget it; that Moses had seen his messenger at the bush; and that he had been made a God to Pharaoh, with Aaron for his prophet; and constituted both at the bush and at Sinai, the Captain of their Salvation from Egypt; and the lawgiver, prophet, and king for the Eternal over Israel. That their faith in this had not wavered for three thousand four hundred years, and more; and that they have not, and could not honestly deny it, though extermination by the most cruel torments might impend. Were they to deny it, their whole history would pronounce them to be contemptible and perjured villains. It is impossible, therefore, that they can give any other

testimony concerning Moses than that which is on record in the public archives of the nation, called the Bible, or THE BOOK.

Now there is not in the world the first inkling of contemporary testimony even to cast a doubt upon the truth of this great national conviction no one can therefore say, "I do not believe that Moses ever existed; or that he was the Eternal's prophet, historian, and registrar." As faith is the belief of testimony; and the testimony does not exist, such an one can have no such faith. He may play the fool, indeed, and say "I don't believe;" and when asked the reason, say, "because I don't!" But what is the value of a fool's dissent from the united testimony of so ancient and renowned a nation as Jacob? It is lighter than vanity, and nought to be accounted of.

Well then. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, called the Pentateuch, contain a true and faithful account of things from "the Beginning" to the death of Moses inclusive, the nation to whom they were committed being witness in all its generations. Certainty in regard to this is a great foundation to stand on. They are authentic and genuine records; and being assured of this, we have "the assurance of faith;" and do not need "miracles," which could add nothing useful. The foundation of Christianity is laid in Genesis, where Moses has recorded the promises of the Eternal Spirit. We believe those promises, not because of signs and wonders, but because Moses, the servant of Jehovah, declares that God made them according as he has stated. The doctrine of Christ is based upon the promises in Gen. iii. 15; xii. 2, 3, 7; xiii. 15—17; xv. 5, 6, 18—21; xviii. 5—8; xxi. 10, 12; xxii. 15—18. These passages are the basis—Abel and the Sons of God before the flood believed the promise in Gen. iii. 15, as a matter of testimony; and Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, believed all the passages in the same way—they believed the promises without signs and wonders; so that their Christianity, which is also The Herald's, rested upon the word of God credibly testified. "We walk by faith, not by sight" of signs and wonders. "A wicked and adulterous generation demands a sign;" we are not of this sort: but believing Moses' writings, we receive as genuine and authentic the promises he records.

Thus we have seen that the foundation of Christianity is declared to have been divinely laid, and proved to have been so. Moses declares it; and Jehovah's witnessing nation testifies that he is infallible authority in the matter.

When Jesus came to the forty-second generation of Abraham's posterity, the great object of his mission was not to perform signs and wonders; but to deliver a message to Israel from the Eternal Spirit, announcing to them peace through the re-establishment of the kingdom, which was then prostrate before their enemies. The signs and wonders he performed by holy spirit and power were to convince that generation that God approved him, and spoke by him, as he had by Moses. This conviction was thoroughly wrought into the minds of thousands of the nation, both priests and people; and into those also of such multitudes of contemporary Gentiles, that they abandoned their gods, and became Jews by adoption, being circumcised with the circumcision of the Christ, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, when buried with him in baptism—Col. ii. 2. From that day to this, all true believers of the other nations, become Jews when they become Christians; and thus become an element of the Hebrew nation, and therefore WITNESSES OF GOD.

These two classes, then, the believing Jews and Gentiles of the first century, became a witnessing nation, and are styled in the New Testament, THE ECCLESIA, because called out by the gospel-invitation to possess hereafter the kingdom when restored to Israel. This

generation of believers contemporary with Christ and the apostles being thoroughly enlightened and convinced, they became to all subsequent generations, what the ninth generation from Abraham was to them—credible witnesses for Jesus. This Ecclesia was constituted "the pillar and support of the truth," whose mission in its several generations is, not to perform signs and wonders, but "to contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the Saints;" and in so doing to save themselves, and those that hear them. "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also"—2 Tim. ii. 2. This was the arrangement for the future—by teaching the testimony; not by signs and wonders. For the present let this suffice.

EDITOR.

---

### The Dilemma and its Horns.

IN the Expositor of Nov. 15, at the date of this notice, we have read some remarks from the pen of Messrs. Marsh and Nathaniel Field, M D. of Jeffersonville, Ind., under the caption of what he is pleased to term "Inconsistencies of Dr. J. Thomas." In regard to these, Joseph says:

1. That it is inconsistent in us to take the position that faith (unqualifiedly) in the gospel is necessary to qualify a person for baptism, and then decline to say whether or not, that faith must be perfect in degree; or whether all the gospel must be believed before baptism in order to make that ordinance valid.

In the first place, then, under the head of Inconsistency No. 1, we would make the general remark, that there are some intellects so obtuse that they cannot discern when a question is answered, or when a proposition is proved; while there are others who will not see lest their vested interests should suffer, or their popularity be destroyed. There are others who are naturally obstinate and perverse; and would rather hold on to an error, than acknowledge themselves defeated, especially by the most unpopular and "uncharitable" man of their generation. Many other reasons might be cited why, notwithstanding a volume of testimony and argument, they are "of the same opinion still;" but we forbear. It is the policy of such (and certainly not "the best policy," though the policy of expediency) to persist in affirmation without regard to any thing that may be urged to the contrary. If they have been crucified and buried by their opponent's testimonies and reasonings, they give them all the go-by, and with the most imperturbable impudence of face over and over again affirm that these positions have been unheeded! If they edit papers, they take care, as much as in them lies, not to let their readers see what has been written that they may judge for themselves, they will suppress it under divers flimsy pretences; such as, if the "Minutes of a Conference be sent them testifying against the views advocated by brethren Joseph Marsh, G. S., and Nathaniel Field—believing them to be opposed to the plans and harmonious teachings of Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles" which they unquestionably are—they will exclude it from their columns on the ground of "a want of skill in preparing such matter for the press!!— Expos. Dec. 15, pp. 387, 388: as though all the "Minutes of Conferences" appearing there were skilful productions! Perhaps they are, their framers skilfully suppressing whatever may put their editors in the wrong; and so "cooking the reports" as to prevent all things however really pestilent en conleur de rose, that the self-complacency and infallibility of the party may not be disturbed.

But if they do not edit papers, but are simply correspondents, and advocates or admirers of "the sentiments of all Christendom," \* figuring ever and anon in the armor of a partydoxy; and "conferences" are found to testify against their all-christendom speculations, then it is very convenient to "fire up" the furnace of their zeal against Dr. Thomas, or some other unlucky wight, that Christendom – sentimentality thinks proper to proscribe. Swear at the Devil, and though you may be his Grand Vizier, yet if you curse in holy speech and tone, the ignorant and foolish, who are the vast majority of christendom-sentimentalists, will belaud you for a saint. Be sure, however, that your curses be loud and deep; for the more noise you make, the more will the particular devil be despised, and your own sanctity be perfumed! A policy of this roseate hue will serve the present hour capitally. Just cry out in the spirit of the Ephesian craftsmen "inconsistent," "uncharitable," and all other sorts of a man, and you need no more trouble yourself with his testimonies and reasonings than they did with Paul's

\* Dr. Field used the phrase "the sentiments of all Christendom" in his attack upon us some two or three years ago; and considered us highly reprehensible in teaching and acting contrary thereto. But he received a Roland for his Oliver in our dialogue with Dr. Jeffersonville.

In our ecclesiastical experience we have had to do with many such; and by giving them ample scope and room enough to develop themselves, the loudest and most sanctimonious zealots have generally displayed their own rottenness. Is one provoked at not being able to make a tool of us for the promotion of his own unhallowed and petty ambitions? His policy is to divert attention from his own unrighteousness by affecting great zeal against some assumed delinquencies of the "incubus" that inertly weighs upon, or gives the nightmare to, his ungodliness. Does another called a brother, pay his devotions in the secret of his closet to an earthen jug? Does he pour out libations to the deity of his thirsty soul? Does he under the inspiration of the fiery and sparkling patron of all the groggeries, convert himself into a public and private nuisance? —It is astonishing with what readiness he can discern, and with what zeal for "the truth" he can proclaim the injury the good cause suffers from the harshness and severity of Doctor Thomas! Does a man who professes to have obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, and has declared that we "preach the true gospel of Israel's Messiah;" but who lives and moves in Gentilism, and exists upon its contributions for the dissemination of the trashy "sentiments of all Christendom"—does such an one fear the loss of his hire, if we open our mouth boldly against the Apostasy in its principles and practices? Forthwith he tries to persuade us to rebuke sin at a distance; and though he professes to have no more faith in them, or sympathy for them, than we, he exhorts us with pious arguments, scripture quotations, and holy whine, not to be "so hard," "so very bitter and severe." But when he finds he can make no impression upon us, he turns his back upon the truth; is penetrated with holy horror at Dr. Thomas' uncharitableness towards "the sentiments of all Christendom;" takes refuge in a Baptist church, belauds the great revivals of sectarianism as "the most magnificent and most wonderful event of the nineteenth century;" as "a wholesome and blessed movement," as "the great blessing;" as "the Spirit of the Lord moving about the country spreading health and salvation everywhere;" denounces all who despise them as "infidel editors," "the ungodly in a rage," "scorners," and so forth; and starts a periodical for the conversion of the Jews—to what, blessed reader? To a "Hebrew Christianity" that recognizes Jesus as the Christ, and Patron of all the contradictory faiths of Christendom, except those of the Latin and Greek churches!!! Such an "Israelite Indeed" "turns his back" upon us who, as he has said, "preach the true gospel of Israel's Messiah," plunges into the ocean of all Christendom's sentiments, where Messrs. Marsh and Field are floundering like dying fish harpooned of Galilee, and all for the wages of unrighteousness after "the way of Balaam the

son of Bosor!" Such an Israelite Indeed, anything but a guileless Nathaniel, seems to be quite according to the taste and intelligence of The Expositor, where it is commended as "a valuable Jewish journal," which "worthy effort of our Jewish friends" all expositors are exhorted to sustain; "for," says he, "we have a duty in this respect which cannot be evaded without a fearful responsibility!!" But we forbear.

In short, where honesty is the policy, candor the intellectual characteristic, and consciousness of rectitude and love for its own sake, are the moral features of those with whom we have to do, though we may have inconsistencies, and errors in their opinion, still, there we are greeted with a frank and open face and friendly hand. They rejoice in the much truth they acknowledge we have exhibited to their view; and let the supposed inconsistencies pass as inconsiderable trifles to rectify themselves in due time; or to be more seriously scanned when they shall have comprehended and thoroughly digested the substantial repast already set before them by our means. But lo-kain hahreshahim, "the wicked are not so;" nor those who walk in their counsel; —"the sentiments of all Christendom." They love this counsel; and therefore that hate us, and all who have the courage to speak out boldly their convictions of its unscriptural, antichristian and pestiferous character. This counsel of pious wickedness is their theological existence—the bone-marrow of their impoverished and barren souls. It is their sectarian life; and as their father well knows, "all they have will they give for their life"—Job. ii. 4. No wonder "then, that they ignore the evidence, and belabor the witness. Destroy him, and as they seem to think, the testimony will perish with him. But this is an old ruse de guerre—an old artifice of Satan—that has ever, and will for ever, fail: — "truth crushed to earth will rise again; while error dies amid its worshippers." Dr. Thomas sinned against the Supervisor of a Sect twenty years ago, and has some inconsistencies even now; therefore the immersion of an ignoramus—one piously ignorant of the gospel—is a valid baptism! Blessed and beautiful logic, in what thicket or copse of Paradise hast thou hid thyself! "Common sense!" where art thou? Away on the wings of light to EXPOSITORIA, and visit these men! Save them from one another, and themselves; teach them "the best policy;" and through the testimony, convert them to right reason and the truth!

With such views and premises as these, the reader cannot fail to see, that the praise or blame of our former friends, Joseph and Nathaniel (we do not mean the slave of Potiphar, and the ancient "Israelite Indeed;" but they of Expositoria) are equally indifferent to us. We expect nothing else but sophistry; for nothing else will suit an intellect befuddled by the heterogeneous sentiments of all Christendom. Only think, reader, of heads full of such sentiments; for our own part, we would rather be without a head than possess one so bewildered and bewitched! When the Galatian brethren got only a little crotchet in their "noddles" about circumcision, Paul exclaimed, "O foolish Galatians who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth!" What then, would he have said to Expositorial Joseph and Nathaniel had they been in Galatia with their phrenologies literally crammed (as they must be considering the things contained) with "the sentiments of all Christendom," capped off with world burning and dry-goods ascension robes for an aerial flight in 1843! Until their brains are thoroughly exorcized of the legion of sentiments, and they become clothed in a right mind, we have no hope of their being raised from the Romish catacombs, to live above ground in the free and healthy atmosphere of the truth. While they breathe the atmosphere of death they will only stand forth as sepulchres intensely whitened with the wishy-washy sentiments of Protestantism effete, infidel, bewitched. But it is only whitewash after all, which the dew and the rain-drops of the Spirit's doctrine rightly understood, would obliterate; and leave exposed in all their deformity the lath and plaster monuments of death.

After all we have written upon "faith, perfect in kind, and perfect in degree," not an argument of which have we seen, any notice of from Joseph's expository pen, it would be time and words vainly expended in any further effort "to open his eyes, to turn him from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God." We cannot but regard him as a whited monument of death, "dead in trespasses and sins," who answers to Butler's Hudibras, of whom he sang,

"Convince a man against his will,  
He's of the same opinion still."

We tell friend Joseph once for all, that he does not speak the truth in saying, that we "decline to say whether or not the faith that qualifies for immersion must be perfect in degree in order to make it valid baptism." Every one that reads the Herald with attention knows that he does not speak the truth in so affirming. We have proved that the faith which justifies, and therefore validifies immersion, must be perfect both in kind and in degree. He knows this, or he might have known it, if he do not; for our own statements in extenso are before him elsewhere.

#### INCONSISTENCY No. 2.

2. The second inconsistency docketed against us by friend Joseph, is our judging others as "sinners," "apostates," &c, because under the excitement of 1843 they embraced some erroneous doctrines which since then they have renounced, and confessed their mistake, when at the same time greater sins lie unconfessed at our door.

Here again Joseph is blundering and pitching to and fro in outer darkness. He knows that we have presented him with an argumentative alternative placing him on one of two horns of a dilemma; \* so that whichever supposition he accepts, he judges himself to be "a sinner" or "an apostate;" not we. We have said to friend Joseph thus—If thou didst really believe the gospel of the kingdom before thou wast immersed as a Christ-yan some thirty years ago, then thine immersion was a valid baptism; and thou wast not a Christ-yan, but a Christian.

\* A Dilemma is an argument equally conclusive by contrary suppositions.

But, in 1843, thou didst most zealously embrace the gospel-nullifying and gospel destroying dogmata of

1. The extermination of all nations by fire;
2. The non-restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel, which had been, were then, and to all eternity were destined to be, cast away, God having no further use for them;
3. That all who believed the contrary were "Judaizers;"
4. That the planet earth was to be burned up at the advent of Jesus;
5. That the kingdom of God was the old Eden Paradise restored in a new earth with dominion over nations of lions, tigers, hyenas, hogs, dogs, cats, owls, rats, and bats!!! \*

\* [The reader may perhaps, think that we are joking in making this statement. But no; we are as grave as Jack Ketch at an execution. About 1843 we went to a Millerite meeting at Aurora,

Indiana, where we met a Millerite preacher named C-----n, now a merchant in N Y. City, who divides his religious attendance with George Storrs and Henry Ward Beecher, Arcades Ambo! After the preaching we asked Mr. C. if Christ did not promise power over the nations to the saints? He replied that he did. But said we, if the world be burned up, where will be the nations for them to rule? "Oh," he replied, "they will reign over the animals as Adam and Eve did in Paradise." But, we rejoined once more, where in the Bible, or out of it, do we ever hear of such political organizations of birds and quadrupeds as are implied by the term "nations?" This was an extinguisher of the light within. He left the tent abruptly, and seeing a sheep that had been worried by a dog, but not dead, he called to one of "his brethren in the ministry" for an axe to knock this premillennial subject of the saints upon the head, and so end its misery!]

Now all, or any of these believed is destructive of the gospel of the kingdom in the mind of him who believes them. They destroy the "covenant of promise" to Abraham and David, and make God a liar. In doing this, they abolish the resurrection of the dead, which is one of the promises covenanted to Abraham and his Seed—Christ and all in him. If these items be true, then Christ is not risen, and there is no future resurrection of the saints. There is no use in men saying with the mouth that Christ is risen, and the dead will rise, while they believe in their hearts any or all of these items; for they are as logically destructive of the resurrection as is the dogma of the natural immortality of the soul. Paul's reasoning in 1 Cor. xv. is strictly applicable to a believer in Millerism. In making a bonfire of the covenants, he logically affirms that "there is no resurrection of the dead saints." This charge cannot be got over. Therefore Paul in effect says to all Millerite deniers of their resurrection by implication, "If the dead rise not then Christ is not raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins: and they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." He said this to persons who had been baptized for remission of sins; but he tells them that the baptism was all vain, they were yet in their sins, if their crotchet were received.

Now at the present time friend Joseph professes to believe that Millerism, is all fudge. He, therefore, by this confession condemns Joseph Marsh the Millerite of 1843, as a professor of "humbug." Now this is Joseph cut Joseph; and not Dr. Thomas judging Joseph. We are merely telling the story for the benefit of our contemporaries, and a warning to the generation to come. Well, when Joseph was humbugging himself and the public with Miller's dogmas, which he knew nothing about before he was immersed, was his position still the same, and had he the same religion or faith in 1843 that he had in 1828? He that says his position and faith or religion (for it is the faith that characterizes the religion) at those two different periods were the same, would undertake to prove that the moon was made of green cheese; and with such an one it would be folly to argue.

He was then, the professor of two different religions at those several periods; — which was the true one? He says, in effect, the religion he professed in 1828 or thereabouts. By that confession, then, he logically condemns himself as "an apostate" in 1843. It is not Dr. Thomas that judges him thus; but the identical expository Joseph who substantially proclaims to all the world and his wife, that he himself apostatized from his 1828 religion in falling away to the Millerite root and branch conflagration of the Christianity taught by Moses and Jesus!

Now this is one horn of the dilemma upon which he hangs himself— the Horn of Apostasy. This is a deadly horn we believe; for we can discern no scope for repentance granted in the gospel to apostates from the "One Faith." Neither blood, nor water, nor spirit will obliterate it; much less the wordy confession of the lips. "It is impossible," says Paul, "for those who were ONCE ENLIGHTENED &c., if they shall fall away, to renew them again to

repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." To fall away is for a saint to sell his birthright for some consideration not recognized of God; and for such there is no repentance though he might seek it with tears.

Thus, then, friend Joseph by contending for the validity of his 1828 religion, gibbets himself upon this terrible horn, which is "unto perdition"—Heb. x. 38, 39. But while he thus judges himself, we "charitably" interpose for his deliverance; and suggest that he could not possibly have apostatized in 1843, not having been "enlightened" in 1828. We argue in his defence, that it is not possible that he could have been enlightened then, on the ground of the impossibility of an honest man, (as we supposed he was,) enlightened in and by the gospel of the kingdom, to embrace so bald, palpable, and naked, an imposture as Millerism. An ignorant man might very honestly and sincerely become a Millerite, Mormon, Mohammedan, Jew, Papist, Infidel, or any thing else; but a man once enlightened by God's knowledge—no, never sir, never! Believing Joseph to have been honestly disposed, we cannot admit that he was an apostate; but convince us that he was not honest, but a wicked, crafty, man, and then we will readily admit that he might have been an apostate; but otherwise, not.

We contend, then, on the supposition of his candor, ingenuousness, and honesty of heart and mind, that the dogmas he embraced in 1843, a posteriori prove, that he was totally ignorant of the "One Faith" and the "One Hope of the calling" previous to his immersion in 1828, or whenever it may have been performed. This proved, and it results that the theological gymnastics he exhibited before men and angels in 1843, were not "a drawing back unto perdition;" but the gropings of a blind man feeling for the wall. In this case, he was an honest hearted man sinning grievously through ignorance. This is the other horn of the dilemma upon which he can hang his theological self. There is hope, or deliverance rather, for a man who suspends himself upon this horn; but there is none for him who hangs upon the other. The gospel of the kingdom is for sinners, not for apostates. A friendly hand may cut the rope that hangs a sinner before it is "too late," and save him from death; while the apostate is condemned without reprieve to the "sorer punishment, which shall devour the adversaries"—he is hanged in chains, a spectacle to angels and to men.

But friend Joseph exonerates us from goading him with this horn. He condemns himself as a sinner in 1843; for he tells us that he has renounced and confessed his '43 delinquencies. Well, so far good. He has, in effect, embraced both horns of the dilemma—the Horns of apostasy by contending for a priori enlightenment; and the Horn of Primitive pre-immersional ignorance of the gospel by confession of grievous darkness in 1843!

But though he confesses his darkness, and by consequence, convicts himself of ignorance of the gospel in 1828, and of being therefore, the subject of an immersion that is no better than a Jewish ablution—he does not seem to discern the enormity of his '43 abominations before God. He contemplates them as a sort of peccadilloes, or venial sins, to be forgiven by verbal expiation, or what he calls renunciation and confession. But friend Joseph should remember, or learn rather, that remission of sins by renunciation and confession is not for "sinners" and "apostates" hanging on the horns of the dilemma before us. We see that Paul coincides with him in his self-condemnation. He certifies in effect that Joseph the Millerite of '43 gospel-destroying abominations was in his sins. For several years revolving around '43, did Joseph the Millerite believe and preach the gospel Paul, preached? Even Joseph himself will not now venture to affirm that he did. Now suppose that Paul had appeared to him then he would certainly have said "Joseph, thou preachest another gospel than I preached and the Galatians received, thou art therefore accursed"—Gal. i. 8, 9. But Joseph, as has been proved,

down to '43, and later, never did know, believe, or preach, the gospel Paul preached; therefore the testimony makes him an accursed sinner, not an accursed apostate, to be "anathema maranatha when the Lord comes," if he do not something more than renounce Millerism, and confess that he was a sinner.

January 6, 1859.

(To be continued.)

---

## Analecta Epistolaria.

### Authenticity of the Scriptures.

BRO. THOMAS, —Will you be so good as to write and publish in the Herald an article on the Authenticity and Inspiration of the Scriptures? It is a subject too much neglected. An intelligent lady remarked to me recently, that she had never heard an argument on the subject. Skepticism and infidelity are stalking through our land, and yet "the preachers" say nothing in arrest of the foul blight that so notoriously impedes the progress of the Christian faith; for if men understood and believed the bible, there would be no divisions or isms to contend against.

With kind wishes for your prosperity,

I remain yours,

In hope of Life,

J. M. STONE.

Henderson, Ky., Jan. 16, 1858.

The people, or many of them rather, already know more about the Scriptures than is convenient to the clergy. These prefer to affirm their own authenticity and inspiration, than to convince their flocks of an authority and inspiration superior to their own. Satan has no taste for such enterprises.

EDITOR.

---

### The Gospel of the Kingdom in Texas.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS, —I write, among other things, to give you an item of news, and a little encouragement from the far-off South-western "portion" of God's heritage, comparatively shut out from the clamor of the world and the pollution of politics; secluded from railroads and telegraphs, with the prowling Indian upon our immediate border. A few names have taken Moses and the prophets, —"the things of the Kingdom and the name of Jesus,"—for their foundation and guide; hoping that when "many shall come from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God," this remote region may be counted worthy of a representation.

Within a little over a year, there have been immersed in Slano County about twenty-five individuals, upon a profession of faith in the things of the Kingdom; which I believe them to have thoroughly understood before going into the water, as none were encouraged to do so without this knowledge. Twelve of this number had formerly been immersed into the faith of the school at Bethany, Va.; one a preacher of the "three facts," for nearly twenty years—but he has an honest heart. He fought long and valiantly, but the "sword of the spirit," the testimony of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles were too pointed for him. The

last point he yielded was, that it was necessary for him to understand "the things of the Kingdom as well as of the Name," before he could become united to Christ by baptism. He yielded and went down into the water, and was immersed by my father; and is now with my father devoting almost their entire time to the sowing of the "good seed."

The Church have a neat little building in which they endeavor to meet every first day. In the morning a discourse is usually delivered by some one; the afternoon for investigating the Scriptures—the "sure word of prophecy,"—and the administration of the Lord's supper. We number in the county about thirty-five members.

As might probably have been anticipated, the shepherds of the school of Bethany do not like the idea of losing their sheep. When the news went abroad of what we were doing in Slano, a venerable old patriarch who bears the reputation of being a very good, honest, and intelligent man, and, by the by, quite a leader of that denomination in Texas, which is very respectable in numbers and character. This person saw proper to come and see about "this strange doctrine"—these "arrant heresies"—old professors of religion being re-baptised. He was cordially received, assured we were ever ready to measure swords with any. A discussion ensued of a day and a half's duration—we selecting Bro. Clement Oatman to do our part of the speaking. As to the arguments brought to bear against us—the points of objection, "the road travelled," in such cases, you are fully aware of. The case of Philip and the eunuch was the great rallying point. Clement prevailed upon him to admit the validity of the translation by Campbell, McKnight, &c. He brought this to bear upon him with the happiest effect. As you are aware, "the good confession," as it is called, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest—I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God," is entirely omitted as an interpolation. In this instance and in every other, we consider Clement fully and satisfactorily answered him. The same view was taken by the audience, and, I believe, he considered it in this light himself; for he stated after leaving that he had fallen in with the best class of Scripturians he had ever met with, and that "he had got pretty badly whipped." Our prospects are still more flattering. A few are disposed to learn from the simple Word of truth, to reason and to think for themselves; and many of them of the best talent in the country.

With fond remembrance of the many valuable truths learned from you,

I remain yours,

In the glorious hope,

W. A. OATMAN, M. D.

Slano, Texas, Dec. 8, 1858.

---

#### Questions upon Mat. xxiv.

DEAR SIR, —I am still deeply interested in perusing that valuable periodical, known as the "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to come." There is no work issuing from the press coming to our humble dwelling so joyfully hailed as this; because there is no periodical extant containing such a fund of biblical information. Your articles expository of "the Mosaic and Nazarene Teaching concerning God" may well be said to contain "the deep things of God," making this intricate subject plain and harmonious, agreeing with all the inspired writers.

If it would not be too much trouble to you, I would like to have you explain a few points in Mat. xxiv. —What coming and age are referred to in the third verse? Is the same

coming spoken of in verse 30? To what point in the prophetic chain of events does verse 31 belong?

I put these interrogatories because I do not understand them; and believing that you can give me the desired aid. My only aim is to learn the truth.

I am still firmly grounded in the hope of the gospel, anxiously wishing for the redemption of the "purchased possession." I am also firm in the observance of the Seventh Day as the Sabbath, having seen no really sufficient reason for changing my practice, still I would not be dogmatical, or proscriptive. I am anxiously waiting for your article on this subject, earnestly desiring that you may lack in nothing; and that your useful life may be preserved blameless to behold the King in his beauty.

I remain,

Yours in the one hope of the calling

T. H. DUNN.

Hayfield, Pen. December 26th, 1858.

---

### The Questions Answered.

The topic of discourse between the time of Jesus leaving the Temple and his sitting down upon Mount Olivet, was the entire demolition of that magnificent Structure. In other words, Jesus directed their attention to the approaching fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy, that "the City and the Holy (hakkodesh or temple) the people of the Prince coming shall destroy; and the end thereof shall be with an inundation; and to the end of the war desolations are decreed" ch. ix. 26. In Mat. xxiii, he denounced Judah and Benjamin, "because of the perfecting of their rebellion" which would bring upon them the destruction of Jerusalem and its House; and ended by declaring that he would return after the desolation; and that then they would receive him gladly.

In Mark xiii. 32, and Acts i. 7, he declares that he did not himself know the "day and hour" of the desolation; nor "the times and seasons" of the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, equivalent to his coming in power and great glory,

Until guided into all the truth by the reception of Holy Spirit, they did not discern any interval between the desolation, and his coming upon the clouds of the heaven. They even looked for the consummation immediately after the resurrection of Jesus. When they asked the question, therefore, in verse 3, we are not to look for the precision of thought which afterwards appears in the words of Jesus.

In verse 3, the disciples are reported to have said, "tell us when these things shall be, and what the sign of thy presence, and of the end of the Age?" From this, it is clear, that their minds did not contemplate the subject beyond the limits of the epoch of desolation at the end of the Mosaic Aion, rendered "world" in the English Version. Of the postponement of the restoration and apocalypse of Jesus to afford scope for the taking out of a people for the kingdom from among other nations, they had no idea. We need not, therefore, encumber verse 3, with the supposition, that they referred to a twofold advent in their question. They referred only to the sign of Jesus being near at the breaking up of the Mosaic Economy.

"Is the same coming referred to in verse 30?" The answer to this is, no. Verses 27 and 28, speak of the Little Horn of the Goat stamping upon the political carcass of Judah, taking away the Daily Sacrifice, and casting down the temple and the truth to the ground, in their peculiar style. Verse 29 the stars fall from the heaven, because "the Little Horn casts off the stars to the ground," and in consequence, the Jewish State is abolished. But between verses 29 and 30, there is a long interval of time. Between those two verses come in "the times of the Gentiles," during which the Jewish State has no existence; and therefore, nothing is said about it. But in "the time of the end" of this long interval, "the Sign of the Son of Man appears in the heavens," The Sign is one thing, and the Son of Man is another. The Sign may now be seen by those who know how to read the Signs of God. After the Sign is fully manifested, the Son appears with his clouds, and those in Jerusalem will see him, and receive him with acclamations, saying, "Blessed be he that comes in the name of Jehovah;" and the tribes will mourn, and so forth; so that the event of verse 30 is identical with that of chap, xxiii. 39.

"To what point in the prophetic chain of events does verse 31 belong?" To the restoration of the Twelve Tribes after the return of Jesus to Jerusalem. It is parallel with Deut. xxx. 3, —"JEHOVAH thine Elohim (the Eternal Spirit in Jesus and his brethren, the Saints,) will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee (O Israel) and will RETURN and gather thee from all the nations which JEHOVAH thine Elohim (when only manifested in Jesus) hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost of the heavens from thence will JEHOVAH thine Elohim gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and JEHOVAH thine Elohim will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it." It belongs to Isa. xviii. 3; xxvii. 13; lxvi. 19; Zech ix.14; Rev. xiv. 6, 7. It is the antitype of "the Memorial of blowing of Trumpets"—the Trumpet of the Jubilee on the tenth day of the seventh month, proclaiming liberty throughout the land; the return of every true Israelite unto the possession of his Fathers—Lev. xxiii. 24; xxv. 9, 10; Numb. x. 1—10.

The article on the Sabbath has already appeared.

EDITOR.

---

### A Barren Place.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS, —I received the two last numbers of the Herald, (in one) of November and December, which are truly welcome in this intellectually barren place.

I am still alone in "Israel's Hope" here, and not any signs of it soon being otherwise. I have given out to read "Elpis Israel," the Herald, and several little works on the Kingdom, and have had a little private discussion with a few I am acquainted with; but the people here have no interest for anything apart from money-making; and the very few who look a little beneath the surface of pulpit oratory, have not faith enough to throw off the mental shackles of the clergy, and stand alone for the truth.

I have yet trust in Him who causeth all things to work together for good to those who put their trust in Him—that He will open up a way, and make my path plainer, in respect of yet meeting together with those—the chief end of whose life is, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearance of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Hoping to hear from you, —a few lines, —when at leisure, and wishing you health and strength for continued usefulness in the cause of Him who will shortly come as a thief in the night,

I remain yours,  
In this fellowship until that day,  
JOHN ROBERTS.

Ottawa City. Canada West,  
Dec. 19, 1858.

---

The Clergy Enraged against the Gospel.

RESPECTED SIR, —The Gospel trumpet has lately been sounded in the great Babylonish city of Hamilton, for the first time (I believe) in public. At three different times, in September, I delivered seventeen lectures in the Temperance Hall. At the first five the audience was not large, but appeared to be very intelligent. Every lecture afterwards seemed to increase the audience, until the hall was filled to overflowing. This gave the clericals a deal of trouble, for those who had heard were asking their "ministers" so many questions. Several ministers at different times attended, some, however, not showing their faces inside. They acted the part of the dumb dogs of Isaiah, —or, if they did bark, it was not in my hearing. But they had men of the "baser sort" to represent them; for it appears that when truth is proclaimed, the clericals can join with "rowdies" to try to put it down. Truth is one of the worst things they have to contend with, any form of error they will allow, —but truth they cannot. It acts like a bomb-shell in exploding their corruptions, and puts the broad-cloth in danger. Not that they care about "the precious souls" that may leave them, but the pay; for they are all looking for their gain from their own quarter. Hence, in word and action, they say of one that would proclaim the truth, "Away with him—not the truth, but Romanism, Episcopalianism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, any ism, but not the truth!" They, being the rulers of the darkness of this age, hate to hear that there is another being, one Jesus, that is to rule the world in righteousness—for they know that if this be the case, they will be abolished and their occupation of deceiving the multitude will be gone. A colporteur or missionary, three or four times, after I had concluded the lecture, endeavored to throw dust in the people's eyes, but the audience saw that he was better acquainted with peddling books, for in fact he could not tell what the Scriptures did teach. The last lecture that I delivered there, about a dozen of these professedly pious ones made a great noise; their holy spirit was so much raised, that they were for putting out the lights. One of the professed disciples of Jesus commanded the door to be shut, and that I should be kept in until morning, to be questioned by those that knew as much about the Scriptures as they do about "perpetual motion." However, they could not carry their ends, for a gentleman being well acquainted with the law, (he being of that order,) who had heard the lectures, and who had stood up for me on several occasions, arose, and demanded the opening of the door, which these pious savages did not like to hear. This gentleman told the audience before, that they ought to be thankful for the light which the lectures had shed forth on the Scriptures. A state of great excitement was raised; two-thirds of the audience appeared favorable to "the things of the Kingdom, (which were set forth in the lectures) and were much displeased with the proceedings of these pietists. However, I baptized two intelligent believers in "the things of the Kingdom, and the name of Jesus as the Christ."

After this, I went to a place called Greensville, about three miles from Dundas, by the request of Bro. Foster, who resides there (late of Port Perry). He had been endeavoring to set the things of the Kingdom before them. I delivered three lectures there. The last I delivered, a young student from the college, at Dundas, was sent to know if I would meet one Mr. Magougale, the head of their college, before a private committee. I asked him what he meant by "a private committee;" whether it was fourteen on his side, and ten on mine? I said, "no;

but I would meet him in public, and let the people judge." Those attending the meeting were all favorable to a public debate. Accordingly, the young collegian agreed that his Lord and Master should meet me in public debate. The next morning, passing through Dundas, on my road to Hamilton, I saw his reverence in company with the young student, I suppose talking over the lecture the night before. After some debate, he agreed to take me up in a public discussion.

I agreed to send him the propositions for discussion, which I did when I returned to Hamilton. The propositions are these: —

RESPECTED SIR, —Right glad was I to find that you are willing to enter the field as a controversialist on these two points, or propositions:

First then, you say that you are prepared to prove, that man has an "immortal soul" capable of existing without the body; and that this conscious entity passes into a state of rewards or punishments at death;

Second, that you are prepared to prove, that the kingdom of God, as foretold by Moses and the prophets, and preached by Christ and the apostles, is not a kingdom to be established on this earth, at the appearance of Christ the second time.

Upon these propositions I am willing to meet you in debate, at any given time, six days after this challenge is accepted. The only standard of appeal to settle the controversy to be the Word of God, that present version called King James's, with its marginal readings.

Awaiting your reply, I remain sir,

Yours, respectfully,

J. WILLIAMS.

Hamilton, C. W.

But his reverence has not fulfilled his promise, as yet. On my return to Hamilton, I intended to deliver some more lectures; but I found that the serpent had been so crafty as to prevent me from being heard, by closing the Temperance Hall against me. But the great curse of this world is the "blind guides;" they are not willing to enter themselves into the glorious hope, and those that are willing, they hinder. Truly, it requires "honest hearts;" for they have to contend against timid friends, and the religious world, to the loss of business, and the loss of reputation; and this is hard for flesh and blood.

But the truth must be sounded forth, whether men will hear or forbear. Here and there some honest hearts will receive it. But it is difficult to stand against this crooked and perverse generation, which is in battle array against the truth. The man who would proclaim it is considered an enemy; therefore they use every means to turn him out of their peaceable camps. Hence he that proclaims the truth is considered a "pestilent fellow," a disturber of the peace, a breaker up of their various peaceable encampments, a scatterer of division. But to return to the subject again. A friend who had heard the lectures offered the use of the old Parochial School-house, which he had taken for a term of five years. Accordingly I got the bills printed to announce the Course of Lectures; but these pious ones threatened to burn his place down, if he allowed me to lecture there! This had its desired effect in preventing me. I left Hamilton, hoping that ere long another effectual door of utterance may be opened, as

there are a great many who are desirous of hearing more of these glorious truths. Hoping that you may be still preserved, and strengthened to fight valiantly for the truth,

I remain, yours in the One Hope,

J. WILLIAMS.

Toronto, C. W., Jan. 3, 1859.

---

## Ecclesiastical.

### "Part Thomasite."

Mr. EDITOR: —From what I see and hear, there seems to be some confusion and misunderstanding about what my wife and I should have said about Mr. Orvis being part Thomasite at one time. The facts are substantially these, to the best of my recollection. Orvis and I were conducting a meeting of days, at Corinth, Powhattan. One evening, in the private circle, at Brother Elliott's, Orvis and I got into a dispute about post mortem punishment. I took, what is called, the orthodox view of the matter. He opposed it, and the next day said, in the pulpit, "that eternal life meant eternal existence, and eternal death was its opposite." I contradicted him publicly, and told him privately, that if he advocated that doctrine here, the brethren would non-fellowship him. Some time after this, I heard that he was in Essex, seeking a location, and had denied having advocated "destructionism" in Powhattan. After this, I saw Isaac Spenser, an elder of Corinth church. He said he was sorry that Orvis had ever visited their neighborhood, for the Thomasite members of the church had become more bold and troublesome, and mentioned Samuel Harris and Deacon Winfrey. At the next cooperation meeting, in a Mr. Anderson's house, in Richmond, I took Mr. Wear, an elder of Essex church, and Mr. Elliott, at whose house the controversy took place, to themselves, and Elliott confirmed what I had stated. When Orvis and Mr. Macgruder agreed to debate some points of difference, my wife said to Dr. Tibbs, Orvis is half Thomasite himself, why is he debating? She says she had reference to what Orvis had said in Powhattan in conversation with me, for she was up there with me at the time, and heard the debatings, which were about "destructionism," not about the "kingdom." This statement will, I hope, prevent further misunderstanding, and show that Br. Anderson made an innocent mistake.

Yours, respectfully, yet in haste,

N. SHORT.

### Remarks.

WE may suppose that "Thomasite" used in the above as a designation for a certain class of believers, is applied to them on the ground of their holding to the teaching of the beloved apostle "John;" and of their being incredulous, like the apostle "Thomas," of any thing affirmed which is not demonstrable by testimony that cannot be gainsayed. Although Paul disapproves of Christ's Brethren being designated by any name than the Lord's; still, if men will give us another, it is better to bear the name of an apostle of God than to be called by the barbaric names of Britons, Scots, Gauls, Teutons, and Swiss; such as Wesley, Campbell, Calvin, Luther, and so forth.

From what we know of the "Thomasites," we never supposed that Mr. O. had scriptural intelligence enough to be one of them. He may have uttered something like what

they teach upon a point or two; but nothing more than this. The following "extract No. 1," indeed, has something of the true note about it; but then, "extract No. 2," destroys the music of the piece.

#### EXTRACT NO. 1.

"When the disciples of Christ," says Mr. O., "after his resurrection from the dead, asked him, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom again to Israel?" (i.e. the literal temporal dominion of the Jews) he replied, " It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." From this we learn that the kingdom is to be restored to Israel; but that the time of its restoration is not made known—is kept in the Father's own power. So, too, in reference to the Second Advent of Christ and the final judgment of the world, Jesus says, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, &c. That such a day will come there can be no doubt, &c."—Christ. Union, vol. iii. No. 4, p. 95.

#### EXTRACT No. 2.

"Whether there will be any Millennium or not," says he, "I am clearly of the opinion that there will be no such era after the Second Advent of Jesus; that Jesus will come again personally to this earth, is clearly taught in the New Testament scriptures.

"I see no possible chance for a personal reign of Christ on earth for 1000 years subsequent to his advent."—Christ. Union, vol. vi. No. 3.

It seems to be all "chance," "sight," and "opinion" with Mr. O. "I see no possible chance," says he. He evidently walks by sight and opinion; not by faith, as all true brethren of the apostles John and Thomas do. To such a "Thomasism" we fear Mr. O. will never attain. We may, however, hope the best, while we cannot but fear the worse.

---

#### The Church in Real Danger.

THE worst enemy of the Established Church is the Established Church itself. No more formidable weapons of offence are forged against her than the weapons which she herself furnishes. It is all very well for Churchmen to raise the cry of Dissent, Romanism and Atheism being in combination to undermine the Church of England edifice, to sever the connexion between Church and State, and to deprive the established clergy of the respect and affection of the people. There is no need for Dissenter, Roman Catholic, or No-religionists to put themselves in the least out of the way to effect the very worst purpose the very worst enemy can meditate towards the Established Church. The abuses and scandals that are so prevalent and coming so rapidly into the light of day, are doing the work of destruction quickly and surely. Take the newest scandal brought before the House of Lords by Lord St. Leonards, a few days before the closing of Parliament. His learned lordship had previously presented a petition from the inhabitants of Camberwell, which complained that the parish had been left to the care of a couple of ill-paid curates for nine years, because the living was under sequestration for the debts of the vicar. The following appears to be an outline of this disreputable, but by no means uncommon, case: —About ten years ago the living was bought by the Rev. Mr. Williams for £15,000, subject to the large unpaid debts of the former vicar. The purchase-money, £15,000, by some oversight to which we have not the clue, was not forthcoming, consequently there remained a charge on the living, which is worth about £2,300, of a no less sum than £30,000. Very soon after the new vicar was inducted into the living the revenues were sequestrated, as it is phrased, for the accumulated debts; the vicar

became non est, and for about nine years the Christian inhabitants of one of the wealthiest parishes in London have been obliged to suffer the humiliation of belonging to a parish where such doings are possible, and where the religious services cannot be performed by their proper clergyman. We do not think it any hardship that the parish is relieved of such a vicar, but we do think it monstrous that the parishioners have no summary means at command to put an end to such a crying scandal. As long as the accumulated liabilities are undischarged the inhabitants of Camberwell cannot expect to see their clergyman, but must be content to put up with the ghostly consolation which a couple of curates at £2 weekly a piece can afford to give them for the money. It is calculated that in about twenty years the income of the living will have paid off the debts. Now one would suppose that this sequestration was a matter not suffered to travel out of the parish, and kept, for decency's sake, as private as possible. But it appears that the Bishop of Winchester, in whose diocese the living of Camberwell is situated, is cognizant of all the facts, has lent his sanction to the sequestration, and has appointed curates to do the duty of the clerical fugitive. Whatever odium attaches to the spiritual condition of Camberwell and the disgraceful arrangements must, we humbly conceive, be shared between the bishop and the incumbent. However the practice of sequestration may have grown into a custom, the principle of sequestration reflects indelible disgrace on the Church of England, and warrants the strongest measures of its worst enemies. But this resort to sequestration by jolly clericals who have overrun the constable, who have spent the revenues of their rectories, possibly in "riotous living" and mundane debaucheries, appears to be very common and on the increase. In the list we believe will be found St. Olave's, Southwark, Newington, Wandsworth, Hackney, Tormarton, Melton Mowbray, and others. Now as to these livings are attached large incomes, the more shame to the occupants that they have been unable to make the expenses of their style of living square with their receipts.

To our thinking, it is almost criminal to sequester the receipts of a benefice, and apply them to the payment of private debts. The revenue is presumed to be wanted to pay a clergyman for duties attached to the "cure of souls," not to be squandered in high living or debauchery. The statement of Lord St. Leonards attracted attention from lay lords, but very little from right reverend prelates. Although it was known the discussion was fixed for a particular day, not a single bishop was on the bench. But Lord St. Leonards is not the man to let a matter of such vital importance drop. The matter was again brought under the notice of the House, and then the Archbishop of Canterbury, finding it was impossible to blink the scandal, intimated that the bishops had taken the question into consideration, and that it was expected they would frame some bill to meet such cases, but it was impossible to bring in the bill that session. And from what has transpired, there is reason to believe that the bishops will be disposed to deal tenderly indeed with their bankrupt and self-denying brethren—that they will decline to strike at the root of the evil by turning the clergyman out of a benefice the duties of which he is unable to discharge, but they will make some further provision out of the revenues of the living for additional curates. The bishops have ere now been advised to "set their house in order." Let them take care they do not give cause for renewing that cry by their refusal to do what justice, honesty, and the interests of religion require to be done in this matter.

Comment on the circumstances we have referred to is superfluous. The Camberwell affair tells its own story, will shortly work an effectual cure, and that, too, in a direction little dreamt of by the dozing bench of political bishops. —London Leader.

---

### Confessionals.

A CONTROVERSY is pending in England which deserves attention in this country, for the reason that a portion of our people in variably insist on copying the English in their oddities rather than their virtues.

Many years have elapsed since Tractarianism, otherwise called Puseyism, first made its appearance in Great Britain. The theory of Dr. Pusey and his followers was that, at the time of the Reformation, the Anglican Church, in its anxiety to widen the breach between itself and Rome, had abandoned many practices which might profitably have been preserved; and that the interests of true religion would be subserved by a revival of these practices. The revival which was projected by the Puseyites referred chiefly to matters of form—the costume of priests, the tone in which divine service should be recited, the fashion in which altars should be dressed, the observation of saints' days, the revival of week day service, etc., etc. Their idea appeared to be that the Church of England might fairly avail itself of the attractiveness of forms to seduce men to enlist under the banner of religion. They sought to render divine worship artistically attractive. They were met by vehement opposition. They were denounced throughout the length and breadth of England by the most influential presses and the most popular men. As a natural consequence, opposition attracted proselytism; the Puseyites, denounced by the people, gained favor among the privileged classes. Puseyism was a success, in a word. Fashionable people draped their altars and their priests; candle-sticks illumined the face of the minister as he sang the Liturgy; poor little babies were denied interment save in consecrated ground, and fashionables dated their letters on the "Eve of St. Barnabas" or on "Saint Cecilia's Day."

The success of the movement has led to attempts to introduce further innovations. At least one English bishop and clergy throughout Great Britain have resolutely endeavored to establish confessionals. In one instance a poor woman, on the verge of her confinement, was visited by a minister, who put questions to her such as no decent woman could answer without shame. Other clergymen have encouraged voluntary confession from their hearers; and young ladies, with the morbid appetite which so often characterizes the sex, have eagerly embraced the opportunity of whispering their secrets into a male and privileged ear. The consequence has been a storm of which no one can foresee the end.

A portion of the Episcopal Church in this country has always been more English than American. At least one of the leading Episcopal organs in the United States has been always strongly predisposed in favor of the Tractarian cause. Many Episcopal ministers have eagerly embraced every Puseyite innovation as soon as it made its appearance in Great Britain.

It is reasonable to expect that the new theory of confession should obtain equal favor at the hands of our Tractarians. In a little while, if the novelty fights its way in England, we may expect to see confession-boxes in some of our leading Episcopal churches. Ladies of every class—married as well as single—may expect to be summoned to give an account of their inmost thoughts to a priest. They may even expect to be occasionally questioned on subjects on which no modest woman ever allows her mind to dwell.

This is not a sectarian journal, and we have no concern with sectarian quarrels. It is our province to chronicle things as they are—occasionally registering our protest or recording our applause. But, as chroniclers, we will venture to say that if our Episcopalians undertake to follow the English in their last innovation, and to establish the confessional as an American

institution, they will run a greater risk than they imagine. The American people, it may be safely asserted, will not readily submit to have their wives and daughters cross-questioned by priests on matters which they do not confess to their closest relations. And the clergy may depend upon it that the confessional will not become an established institution in the United States without storms which can do no good to the cause of sound religion. —Harper's Weekly.

---

## Miscellanea.

### The Fruits of Ignorance.

The peasantry about Kilkenny have begun to destroy machinery. This is an improvement from murdering men to breaking their instruments. The Irish have now reached the stage which the English occupied half a century ago; and we rejoice at their progress. They have come to be sensible of the value of labor, and they resent the use of machinery because they suppose, erroneously, that it reduces the rate of wages. The English laborers made exactly the same mistake half a century ago, but now the veriest clodhoppers amongst them know that the use of machinery increases produce, increases employment, and increases the rate of wages. The Bury and Norwich Post supplies a useful illustration of the present state of opinion in the agricultural districts, which for these very reasons is in favor of machinery. It was only ignorance, therefore, of the effects of machinery, which made the English destroy it half a century ago, and it is only ignorance of the effects of machinery which makes the backward Irish destroy it at present. Both did wrong in the eyes of others; in their own eyes, both did what they thought was right. It is good philosophy to say that there are not two causes for the same effect; and as ignorance is the source of the wrong done by Irish laborers, and was the source of the wrong done by English laborers, it is not straining logic too far to infer that ignorance is the source of all the wrong that ever is or ever has been done in the world.

Mr. Roebuck enunciated a similar conclusion at Tynemouth, and we beg to quote a portion of his eloquent remarks: —

There are pleasures derived from knowledge which are not merely the intellectual pleasures I am speaking of. There are moral pleasures. For, depend upon it, no man can be really a good man who is an ignorant man. Now, that is a bold thing to say, but, depend upon it, it is true. I have no doubt that Hildebrand and St. Dominic fancied they were doing good when they were destroying human beings. I have no doubt the wretched King of Naples fancies he is doing good when he is treating his unfortunate subjects with all the horrors with which he does treat them. Why is this? Because virtue is made up of two things—you must wish to do good, and you must know how to do it. It is not enough to wish and intend good things, you ought to know what things are good. The Spaniards have an old proverb, which I will just quote, though it begins with a word which is not generally mentioned to ears polite, "Hell is paved with good intentions." The greater part of mankind intend well, but they don't know how to do well. They persecute, they are intolerant, they turn round upon their fellowman because he differs from them on some simple matter about which they are both equally ignorant. They pinch his unfortunate flesh with red-hot irons because he differs from them. Knowledge, and knowledge alone, will do away with this; and as men become learned, and appreciate the value of knowledge, they will learn to be tolerant, and thus they will know that the human mind, fully and fairly employed—many minds being employed on the same object—arrives at different conclusions, and if honestly arrived at, they ought not to be

persecuted. Therefore, I say, that a really good man cannot be made out of an ignorant man. He may intend well; he may have all the wishes to be a good man, but he has not the intelligence; he does not know what is good; he will be a persecutor; he will be a bigot; he will be a bad man, although intending to be a good one.

We must always, therefore, give rulers credit for good intentions, and always believe that it is merely ignorance which has made them, as it makes the Irish peasant, very often excessively mischievous or destructive. The same may be said of most criminals. They intend less to do wrong than merely to serve some purpose of their own. When they steal, they falsely suppose that it is easier to steal from others than to gain wealth by honest labor. This is a palpable mistake. Were they right, theft would be the rule of our lives. The exertions to steal, and the exertions to resist theft, necessarily diminish the sum of wealth which might exist, and the share of each one, including the thief, would be so much the larger were he not to steal.

The first Napoleon did not mean to de-popularize himself, to destroy his throne, and restore the Bourbons, by his successive wars and his final attack on Russia. He did great wrong to France, to Europe, and himself, from sheer and deplorable ignorance, exactly like that of the Irish peasantry. His vast power, like their extreme poverty, prevented him getting an accurate knowledge of facts. The present Napoleon does not mean to make the French poor and discontented by his wasteful, despotic, and restrictive system; he designs to secure his throne and his dynasty, but lookers-on, satisfied that he is ignorant of the consequences of what he is doing, know that he is only preparing the way for another revolution. Louis Philippe did not mean to dethrone himself by fortifying Paris, but his system of government, of which this was a consequence, led to that inevitable conclusion. Lord Palmerston did not intend to turn himself out of office and break up the Liberal party when he assented to the French view of Englishmen's duties, but he effected it. What will be the consequences of our actions is known to us only within the immediate and limited sphere of our own vision. The remote consequences, which are as inevitable as those we immediately will, are unknown to all. We know, for example, that what we write will be printed, but what effect it will produce in others we cannot possibly foresee. Some know more of these remote consequences than others, and they are sagacious and successful in proportion; though probably well-being, contentment, and happiness, are, on the whole, more the result of following submissively and blindly some well-accredited principles, than of acting from attempts to ascertain what will ensue in the distant future.

We all desire to avoid evil, and try to avoid it. None intentionally do wrong—we all desire to do right and achieve good for ourselves, or what we suppose will be good; nevertheless, there is an immense quantity of wrong done and evil suffered, which are entirely the consequences, like the destruction of machinery by the Irish peasantry, of ignorance. To secure well-being, therefore, we must possess a knowledge of the effects of our own conduct as well as of the motion of the planets, of the geological formation of the earth, and of the structure of insects. How we are to get this indispensable knowledge nobody can tell, for nobody is in possession of it. The Legislature does not possess it, or it would never make laws which produce evil. The clergy do not possess it—they are notoriously ignorant of the ways of the world, of existing facts, and cannot teach what they do not know. It is only to be gathered by experience, and just as the English laborers have learned, within the last fifty years, to form right views of the effects of machinery, so, in time, similar necessary knowledge will come to all. It is not to be attained by education. Teachers, each in his sphere, are as little acquainted with it as their pupils. All that the State can do to promote the acquisition is to

allow men to learn. Our experience of the effects of machinery may be told to the Irish; probably, as far as it can be, it has been told; but it has not given them knowledge. For one man's experience to become a part of another man's life, a common medium of communication is necessary. To understand language, which is such a medium, many previous associations are necessary, and till these have been formed words are mere sounds. The uneducated Irish, and the uneducated multitude generally, have not formed these associations, and are, consequently, not capable of learning from the experience of others.

Their own experience is a sure teacher, and from seeing railways and railway carriages, they learn all about them as easily as the educated classes. It is impossible to travel by rail and not perceive that the rude multitude who use only third-class carriages are as well acquainted with all the mysteries of railway travelling, novel though it be, as travellers by first-class carriages. The men and women who, half ashamed of their coarse or untidy dresses, or uncouth behaviour, can scarcely be persuaded to enter a drawing-room or a church, share with glee all the advantages of the rail with their betters, and at once adapt themselves to its exigencies. To personal experience they show themselves docile pupils. What happens as to rails, happens in every part of existence. Everywhere people are learning great truths by personal experience, and not by the medium of words from professed teachers. The men who lead society are continually making discoveries; they are not taught them by other men. No teaching has prepared society for the rail and the telegraph, and their consequences; they are not yet known, and can only be learned as they are developed. Of late years, both the State and the Church have become very diligent in teaching the people, to which they seem to have been driven rather by what the multitude had learned and was learning by personal experience, than by what the multitude was ignorant of. The knowledge or the multitude rather alarmed than pleased the leaders in State and Church. By personal experience the people will continue to learn much more than the State and the Church can teach them; and it seems doubtful—as what they have learned in past times has been different from the knowledge these incorporations would wish to inculcate—whether what they will learn hereafter will be agreeable to them. The teaching of the material world through our senses is very different from the teaching of the Church and State. The former, however, cannot be avoided, and is the paramount means of correcting the ignorance of Irish laborers and members of Parliament, both of whom, undesignedly from ignorance, do a great deal of wrong. —London Leader.

---

#### Cause of English National Degeneracy

"A large number of gentlemen in black," says the London Leader, "declare that the cause of English national degeneracy is 'spiritual destitution;' the public," say they, "are in the most frightful state of destitution—that is, they have no adequate supply of us." There is not enough church; there is only standing-room in the metropolis for thirty-seven per cent, of the population, and that is pre-occupied on the main by the well-to-do classes. Nor is there any money to pay for proper ministrations amongst the poor. A fund must be raised to the extent of £3,000,000, in order to pay the apostles! "But shall we wait to hope for the improvement of our population from 'more' morality when we have not settled what is moral and what is not,—the moral of one set of teachers being precisely the sin from which others warn us?"

---

#### Jewish Affairs.

In Constantinople, the Jewish population may be generally divided into great sections—the Spanish and Polish-German Jews. The Spanish-speaking section socially partake of the

nature of other Orientals in their tendency to be little affected by the lapse of time. No one can deny that this tendency has, humanly speaking, an indirect influence on the state and religion of a people. The Polish-German Jews, on the other hand, have undergone important changes; and, considering that the influx from many countries continues, their position becomes, in the eyes of the missionary, more and more interesting. Many who, some fifteen years ago, gained their livelihood by shoe-blackening are now respectable fathers of families, in possession of wealth, and with that aptitude for improvement so peculiar to the nation, have attained to a considerable degree of refinement. Again, 15 or 20 years ago, the German-speaking Jews were in a state of social and religious disorganization. The Turks took them for foreigners, and the foreign Powers disowned them. Their Spanish brethren considered them as infidels and apostates. They had neither Rabbi, synagogue, nor religious institution. Now, however, things are different; many are formed into something like religious communities, with a rabbi at their head, and have regular places of worship. —N. Y. Times.

---

### Twenty Dollars Reward.

I will pay the above reward to any Sabbath School Scholar who will find me passages in Scripture in support of the following

#### FAVORITE THEMES Of the So-Called Christian World.

1st. A passage which states that any man has or ever had an immortal soul, or that Christ or his Apostles ever preached a Gospel to save immortal souls, or a promise of reward to an immortal soul, or that a man is in any wise conscious between death and the resurrection.

2d. A passage which states that the Kingdom which Christ and his Apostles preached is to be anywhere in the skies.

3d. And a commandment or precedent by Christ or his Apostles for Infant Sprinkling.

ROBERT HARRISON.

Owen Sound, Can. W.; Oct. 1858.

---

### Pagan Testimony.

The miracle of the standing still of the sun in the days of Joshua, recorded in his book, was credited also by the Gentiles, as is testified by a pagan writer of great antiquity, called "the father of history" by the world. "In those days, they say," are the words of Herodotus, (Euterpe, 142,) "the sun rose, four times out of his usual custom; where he now sets, there he rose twice; and where he now rises, there he twice set." Herodotus was born 434 years before Christ. The pagans made a note of the phenomenon, but it does not appear that they were aware of the occasion. To revelation are we alone indebted for the explanation.

EDITOR.

---

