

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., MARCH, 1859  
Volume 9—No. 3.

---

The Mosaic and Nazarene Teaching Concerning God.

No. VIII.

The angelo-elohal cherubic executors of the mandates of the Eternal Power, through his effluence, created our terrestrial system, which is subjected to their administration in all its relations, until A NEW ORDER OF CHERUBIM shall have been manifested to supersede them. Until then, all things pertaining to this present "evil world," *αιων*, or course of things, are under their supervision and control. They cause all things to work together for good to them who love the ETERNAL AIL, and are the called, according to his purpose—Rom. viii. 28. That purpose is the polar star of their administration; so that nothing among the kingdoms and empires of the world is permitted to prosper that would contravene it. "The powers that be" are subordinated to divine power; for "there is no power but of God; the powers that be have been placed under the Theos"—Rom. xiii. 1: that is, no power is permitted to exist contrary to, and independent of, his will. In this sense they are *απο θεου*, "of God;" and that the powers may not run riot in trying to develop their own policy, they are subjected to the guardianship of invisible potentates, which is expressed in Paul's words by the phrase, "have been placed under the Theos." The truth of this is amply illustrated in scripture. Is anything to be accomplished in relation to YAHWEI'S purpose in respect to individuals? He sends three Elohal-Men to Abraham, and two to Lot; Jacob saw an encampment of them at Mahanaim, and wrestled with one, who put his thigh out of joint, and surnamed him Israel at Peniel. He called the place of this contest Peniel, because he had seen *pena* "the faces of" Ail, power; "for," said he, "I have seen Elohim faces to faces, and my soul escaped;" that is, his life was not taken away. It is unnecessary to cite any more instances. The reader's recollection will suggest many.

In relation to national affairs, the Eternal Power employs armies of them. When he gave Israel the law, he descended to the top of Sinai in fire, amid thunders and lightnings and thick darkness. Clouds of Elohim attended sounding trumpets long and loud. Moses spake, and the Elohim answered him by a Voice. The words of that voice were written in a book, called "the Book of the Covenant," and are set forth in Exod. xx. to xxiii. inclusive. When he had dedicated the book with sprinkled blood, Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the Elders of Israel, ascended Sinai, and saw the Mighty Ones of Israel, and did eat and drink. None of these were permitted to approach the top of Sinai but Moses, and Joshua his attendant. All the remaining seventy-two stayed at a lower elevation of the mountain with

the Mighty Ones, or Elohim, eating and drinking, and "worshipping afar off." The order was that "Moses alone shall come near YAHWEH," with his attendant. The reader will perceive the distinction here between the Elohim and YAHWEH. The nobles of the children of Israel came nigh to the Elohim, and saw them; but to YAHWEH they were forbidden to approach, and did not see him. Even Moses, who did come near to the Eternal, did not see his face; for said he, "there shall no man see me and live: thou shall see my back parts, Moses, but my face shall not be seen."—Exod. xxxiii. 20. Paul testified the same thing in 1 Tim. vi. 16, saying, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." The Hebrew nation saw the symbol of YAHWEH's presence on the mountain top—"the glory of Jehovah like devouring fire, "the original Eden-Cherubic glory — but neither they, Moses, nor their nobles, saw the face of the Eternal Substance himself.

Here then are two grand occasions upon which Yahweh visited the earth in his Cherubic Chariot—first, " when he laid the foundations of the earth; when the Stars of the morning sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy;" and secondly, when he descended to Sinai's top and proclaimed the law. These myriads of attending Elohim are "the winds" of his celestial forces "full of eyes," with which, as the Great Charioteer of the universe, He "wheels" through the infinitude of space "as the appearance of the lightning's flash." If the necessity of one of his prophets in the execution of his mission demand the succor of omnipotence, he is near with his cherubic legions—his "twelve legions of angels"—to afford it, as in the case of Elisha at Dothan, who was surrounded by horses and chariots of fire, more than all the cavalry and war-chariots of Syria, despatched to seize him—2 Kings, vi. 17.

The elohal superintendence of the affairs of the "thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers" of the world, is clearly revealed in the book of Daniel. In the fourth chapter of this prophet it is declared that the matter set forth therein was revealed to teach the living that the Highest one is ruler in the kingdom of man, and that He giveth it to him whom he shall please, and sets up over it the lowest of men. Besides this, it shows, that though the ruler or Lord, he does not administer the government alone, but associates with himself others, styled irin "watchers," who are, like himself, kaddishin, "Holy Ones." These Holy Sentinels—such as kept guard in the Garden of Eden over the tree of the two lives—are the rulers, or "lords" and "kings," alluded to by Paul in 1 Tim. vi. 15, and John, in Rev. xvii. 14; xix. 16, in the name that no man knows but He whose it is— "KING OF KINGS, and LORD OF LORDS." The temporary dethronement of Nebuchadnezzar, when he was driven from the society of men, and was compelled to dwell with the beasts of the field, to eat grass as oxen, and to be drenched with the dew of heaven, until seven times, or years, had passed over him—allegorical of the fate that awaits the representative of his image-power in our latter-day future—the dethronement, I say, of this Chaldean potentate was by the decision, of the Sentinels, whose report caused the Holy One to decree the punishment of his pride.

These Holy Ones and Elohal Sentinels associated with the Most High and Holy One—the Eternal Power, Yahweh—in the government of the world, are aggregately styled shemaiyah, "the heavens," in Dan. iv. 26, as "thy kingdom shall be continued to thee from (the time), that thou shalt know that skallitin, THE RULERS, (are) shemaiyah, THE HEAVENS." This class of watchers and holy ones is the heavens to which David refers in Psal. 1., saying, "AIL ELOHIM, YAHWEH, (Power, the Mighties, He who shall be,) spake, and made proclamation to the earth from the rising of the sun to its going down. Out of Zion, the perfection of splendor, ELOHIM (the Mighty Ones are) caused to shine forth. Our Elohim

shall come and not keep silent; a fire before His (Yahweh's) faces (the Elohim) shall devour; and around him it is very tempestuous. He will make proclamation to the Heavens (the Holy Ones and Sentinels, styled in Mat. xxiv. 31, "his Angels with trumpet of great sound"—compare Deut. xxx. 3-10)—from above, and to the earth, in vindicating his people, saying, Gather ye to me my saints, who cut up my meat for eating in a sacrifice. \* Thus he showed THE HEAVENS his righteousness; for Elohim (the Spirit-Powers "born of the Spirit, and therefore Spirit—the Eternal in many) is himself the Judge. Selah!"—i. e. weigh, or consider!

\* This is the literal rendering of the words of the Spirit in David chorthai berithia laizahvach, in the English version expressed by the sentence, "those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." The literal expresses what was done in the institution and confirmation of promises. The promises to be fulfilled were stated; animals were then slain and divided, or "cut up" and separated into two parcels, between which the parties concerned passed. The words of the promise were then sworn to, and the parties of the first and second parts sitting down together, "cut up the meat provided, or eat it" in a sacrifice; not as a priestly offering, but as an immolation by private persons, at their own cost. Thus the victim slain and the promise made and confirmed being elements of the same transaction, came each of them to be styled berith, "an eating," or covenant. In illustration of this exposition, see Gen. xv, 9—18; xxi. 22—32; xxvi. 26—30; xxxi. 43—54.

Among the Elohal Sentinels of the kingdoms are Gabriel and Michael, "lords" and "princes" of the heavens. Gabriel was employed as a messenger of the Eternal Spirit, symbolized in Dan. x. 5-9, to give the prophet skill and understanding—viii. 15-18; ix. 20-23. He communicated to him the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, in which he fixed the time of the covenanting, or "cutting off, of Messiah the Prince;" and it was that same Gabriel (or Man of Power, as his name imports) who appeared to Zachariah, the priest of the course of Abia, and declared to him that his wife Elizabeth, one of the posterity of Aaron, should become the mother of John, who should "go before Yahweh their Elohim" to prepare a people to receive him; and who also afterwards appeared to a virgin of the House of David, and informed her that she should become the mother of *Yah Elohim*, i. e. "He shall be Mighty Ones," (Psal. lxxviii. 19) or as he is named in Jer. xxiii. 6, Yahveh tzidkainu, "He shall be our righteousness; or as the latter occurs in the Greek, *λη-σωνς* which is a corruption of *Yahoshaia*, contracted, *Yeshua*, "He shall be salvation"—"Thou, Mary, shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins;" in which Joseph, her husband, acquiesced.

Now when Gabriel appeared to the old people of Aaron's house, he said, "I am Gabriel, who stand in the presence of AIL"—the Supreme Power of the heavens. Upwards of five hundred and thirty years before, he appeared to Daniel with an answer to his supplication; and on that occasion told him that he had been sent with an answer to his supplications concerning the "desolations" of the Holy Land, and of "the city where Eloah's name was proclaimed;" and that he had come to show (for he was greatly beloved) that he might understand "the word," and comprehend "the vision" set forth before him at Shushan, the palace in Elam, by the river Ulai, as in Ch. viii.

This seems to have ended Gabriel's mission to Daniel; for after delivering to him the prophecy of the restoration of the City and Common wealth from the Chaldean overthrow; and the subsequent appearance and "CUTTING OFF," or covenanting, of the guiltless Messiah; and the after-destruction of the City and Commonwealth again by the Romans, which was to be succeeded by a long desolation—we read no more of Gabriel in the book.

But, though he disappears from the theatre of events till the nine months preceding the birth of YAH ELOHIM, or Jesus, another Revelation appears to Daniel, as described in ch. x.

#### THE MAN OF THE ONE.

In this chapter he records a vision of very remarkable character, which he saw while in company with certain persons, on the bank of Hiddekel or Tigris. The basis of what he saw was ish-echahd, THE MAN OF THE ONE, rendered in the English version, "a certain man." It was not a real man, but "the appearance of a man," (c. x. 18,) or "like the similitude of the sons of Adam"—c. x. 16. Hence, it was a symbolical representation. (A symbol is a form comprehending divers parts. As a whole it is a compendious abstract of something else than itself—much in a condensed form. A symbolical representation is the act of showing by forms or types the real thing intended—it is the shadowy form of a true substance; and in the chapter before us that substance so potentially foreshadowed is Christ personal and corporate.) It was the shadowy representation of "the Man of the One" ETERNAL SPIRIT. It was, therefore, truly "a certain man," not an uncertain one. The son of the old age of Zechariah and Elizabeth "saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a Dove"—John i. 32; and Daniel saw the same Spirit, "like the similitude of the sons of Adam." Now, the description he gives us of this SPIRIT-FORM is, that He was clothed in linen, having also his loins girded with fine gold of Uphaz; His body was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in color to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude." He saw this in Eden, by "the third" of its rivers, "the Hiddekel," where "the Cherubim and the devouring fire" were originally located—Gen. ii. 14; iii. 24. This that he saw there was the same that Moses and the Israelites beheld on Sinai's top; and the effect of the sight on Daniel and his companions was the same as upon them—"all the people in the camp trembled;" so also, though Daniel only saw the vision, "a great quaking fell upon them that were with him, so that they fled to hide themselves;" and as for Daniel when left alone, he says, "there remained no strength in me; for my brightness was changed within me into corruption, and I retained no strength. \* \* \* \* Neither was there breath left in me—Verse 8, 18.

Here then was a symbolic man blazing in glory and power; and representatives of the Eternal Spirit hereafter to be manifested in a NEW ORDER OF ELOHIM—aggregately ONE MAN—the One Man of the One Spirit, whom the true believers shall all come unto \* \* \* A PERFECT MAN—into the measure of the full age of the fullness of the Christ: who is THE HEAD, from whom the whole Body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint (heir) supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of itself in love"—Ephes. iv. 3, 4, 13, 15, 16. Daniel saw the "perfect man"—the Eternal manifested in the glorified flesh of a multitude—symbolically represented in the measure of his full age.

The "thing" that was revealed to the prophet at the Tigris was also seen of John in Patmos. "I saw," saith he, "in the midst of the Seven Lampstands a thing like (*ὁ οἷον homoion*) to a Son of Man, having been clothed to the foot and girt around the breast, with a golden girdle; also his head and the hairs white, as it were wool white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire; and his feet resembled transparent brass, as if they had been burning in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters; and having in his right hand Seven Stars; and proceeding forth out of his mouth a two-edged broadsword; and his face as the sun shines in his strength." This represents the One body, of which Jesus is the head, prepared "to execute the judgment written." It is that One Body in its post-resurrectional development

invested with omnipotence—the apocalyptic Spirit-Form, symbolical of the Saints glorified in power.

“CLOTHED IN LINEN.”

Daniel informs us that the Spirit-Man he beheld was "clothed with linen;" while John tells us only that he was "clothed to the feet." Now this clothing is significant of the character and office of the persons represented by the symbol. The holy garments of Aaron and his sons were of linen, "to cover their nakedness," that when they ministered in the holy places "they bear not iniquity and die"—Ex. xxviii. 42, 43. Nakedness and iniquity are convertible terms in scripture; as also are "clothed" and righteous or holy. Hence, in Rev. xix. 8, it is said of the Lamb's Wife, that "to her it was given that she should be arrayed in fine linen, pure and bright." Now they that constitute the bride "are called, and chosen, and faithful"—Rev. xvii. 14; "they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth"—xiv. 4; as his horse-guards, "clothed in fine linen, white and pure," which is declared to be "the righteousness of the saints"—xix. 14, 8; who are "redeemed from among men," and made for God "kings and priests to reign on earth." Hence their clothing, which is sacerdotal and royal. The reader will understand, then, that the clothing peculiar to a symbol indicates the class of persons to which it refers. Thus in Rev. xv. 6, "the Seven Angels," or messengers of the Spirit, who consummate the wrath of "the seven last plagues," are symbolical of the saints, including Jesus as their Head or Chief; for they are described as "clothed in pure and bright linen, and girded about the breasts with golden girdles."

"GIRDED WITH FINE GOLD OF UPHAZ."

The linen and the gold are associated both by Daniel and John. The Spirit-Man symbolized to Daniel was "girded with fine gold of Uphaz." This Uphaz is the Ophir of other passages. In prophetic times it was the gold region of the earth, whence the most abundant supplies of the finest gold were obtained. The fittings up of the temple, which in its places and furniture was "the patterns of things in the heavens"—figures of the true heavenly things themselves—were all of gold, or of precious woods overlaid with gold; to wit, the Cherubim, the Ark of the Testimony, the Mercy Seat, the Altar of Incense, the Seven-Branched Lampstand, the Table of Shew Bread, spoons, tongs, censers, hinges, staves, and so forth. And beside all this, the "holy garments for glory and beauty," worn by the High Priest, who officiated in this golden temple, were brilliant with gold and precious stones; such as, the breastplate of righteousness, the ephod, the mitre, or "helmet of salvation," &c. This was chosen as the most precious of all known metals, to represent the most precious of "heavenly things" before the Eternal Spirit—FAITH PERFECTED BY TRIAL, which is "much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be refined by fire," and "without which it is impossible to please God"—Heb. xi. 6; James ii. 22; 1 Peter, i. 7; 2 Peter, i. 1. It is the basis of righteousness unto life eternal; for "we are justified by faith"—the fine linen of righteousness is girded about the saints by the golden girdle of a tried faith. "When God hath tried me," saith Job, "I shall come forth as gold." Thus David, in celebrating the future glory of the New Order of Elohim, consisting of the King and his Brethren, styles the latter "the Queen" in Psalm xiv. 10, saying to his Majesty, "the Queen hath been placed at thy right hand in fine gold of Ophir." He then addresses the Consort of the Great King, who being the Eternal Spirit manifested in David's Son, is both Father and Husband to the Bride ("thy Maker is thine Husband; Yahweh Zabaoth is his name; the Elohim of the whole earth shall he be called"—Isaiah liv. 5)—saying, "Hear, O Daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; and forget thy nation, and the house of thy father; and the King shall greatly desire thy beauty; for He is thy Lord, therefore do thou homage unto Him. So the Daughter of Tyre with tribute, the rich of the people, shall supplicate thy favor. The Daughter of the King is all glorious within; her

clothing is of interweavings of gold; in embroideries she shall be conducted to thee; the Virgins, her companions, following her, shall be brought to thee. They shall be conducted with joyous shouts and exultation; they shall enter in the palace of the King."

Thus David sings of "the Spirit and the Bride," clothed in the holy garments of righteousness and faith for glory and for beauty. They are apocalyptically represented as "a Great City," styled "the Holy City, New Jerusalem, having been prepared as a Bride adorned for her husband"—"a city of pure gold like to transparent crystal;" "the precious sons of Zion," saith the prophet, "are comparable to fine gold," for in their glory they are the spirit-incarnations of a tried and precious faith.

#### "HIS BODY WAS LIKE THE BERYL."

Daniel next informs us concerning the Spirit-Man—"the Man of the One"—that "His body was like the beryl." The "body" here is the "One Body" of which Paul speaks in his epistles; as, "the Ecclesia which is His Body the fulness of him (the Spirit) who perfects all things in all" saints. When the fulness is brought in the body will be complete—Rom. xi. 25; Eph. i. 23; and it will then be "like a beryl." The original word in Daniel for this precious stone is Tarshish. It is said to have been so called because it was brought from Tarshish; but the learned are not agreed as to what particular gem is meant. The Greeks called it βηρυλλος, beryllos; hence the word in the English Version beryl; and Pliny says, it was rarely found elsewhere than in India, the Tarshish of the Bible. The prevailing opinion is that its color is a bluish or sea-green. But the interpretation of the original depends upon the teaching in connection with the word, not upon the color of the gem.

"His body was like a Tarshish." This word occurs in six other places in the original. In the first two it designates one of the three precious stones in the fourth row of the Aaronic breast-plate of righteousness, and answered to the tribe of Dan, which signifies "Judge;" and of Dan's career in the latter days Jacob prophesied, saying, "Dan as one of the tribes of Israel shall avenge his nation. There shall be a Judge, a serpent in the way, an adder in the path, biting the heels of the horse so that his rider shall fall backward. I have laid in wait for thy salvation, O Yahweh!"—Gen. xlix. 16-18; Heb. ii. 7. That is, Jacob who was about to die when he uttered these words, foresaw that he would sleep in the dust until Dan as a lion's whelp should leap from Bashan, Deut. xxxiii. 22); that then, "in the latter days" would be the era of deliverance, when he would himself be saved and all the tribes would do valiantly, and the Judge of Israel would avenge his nation to the overthrow of their oppressors. —Deut. xxxii. 29-43.

Here then is a destroying and conquering power associated with the tarshish or beryl in the breastplate of judgment. It is similarly associated by Ezekiel with the wheels of the Cherubic chariot. He says, "the appearance of the wheels and their works was as the aspect of a tarshish;" and their fellows were full of eyes, and so lofty, "that they were dreadful." And "the Spirit of the Living One was in the wheels." Hence, they are styled in Dan. vii. 9, "The wheels of the Ancient of Days," whose description identifies Him with "the Man of the One," and the apocalyptic "Son of Man"—"His garment white as snow, and the hair of his head as pure wool; his throne flames of fire, his wheels a consuming fire." The eighth foundation gem, (answering to the priestly tribe of Levi,) of the wall of the golden city on which the name of an apostle is engraved, is a tarshish or beryl. We conclude then from these premises, that the tarshish-like body of the Spirit-Man seen by Daniel, is a priestly body or community, in which is incarnated the spirit of the Eternal; and that in the latter days, it will eventuate the

great salvation in concert with the tribes of Israel, as a destroying and conquering power. This God-manifestation "is a consuming fire."

Such is the doctrinal interpretation of tarshish as a representative precious stone. The root from which it is derived is also in harmony with the expositions for tarshish is derived from rahshash, "to break in pieces, to destroy," which is the mission of the STONE Power when the time comes to smite the Babylonian Image upon the feet—Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45.

To be continued.

---

### A Reply to the New Year's Message.

The Conference of brethren assembled on the 25th and 26th ult, at Geneva, Ill., from Aurora, St. Charles, Dundee, Chicago, Geneva, and South Northfield, Ill., and from Beloit, Wis., to the brethren of like precious faith, assembled at Halifax, England, send greeting: —

Believing with the Apostle Paul, that we ought to "consider one another to provoke unto love and good works," and that we ought to exhort one another, and "so much the more as we see the day approaching," we are constrained to offer you our heartfelt thanks for the timely warnings and pointed exhortations contained in your excellent address.

Never was there a time, perhaps, when the Church of God needed more the constant appeals of zealous brethren than the present. It is a time of imminent peril to all in a probationary state. This arises, we conceive, in some measure, from the Laodicean spirit which is so commonly manifested amongst brethren. It is a despicable spirit, and one that is hated of God. Those possessing it at our Lord's advent may rest assured they will be none of his, for he says he will "spue them out of his mouth." They will be cast forth as worthless—not fit for a place in his kingdom, because they heeded not his counsel to be zealous and repent.

It is commonly said there is no effect without a cause. We might then inquire, as to the producing cause of this detestable spirit. We think that our Lord gives it in his address to the Church at Laodicea,—"Thou sayest, I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing." Although but few of us may lay claim to riches, yet most of us are in easy, and some even in affluent circumstances. Again, we have nothing to fear from persecution, but are permitted to worship God in peace and quietude. These gracious benefits, bestowed upon us by our Heavenly Father, tend to produce a state of lukewarmness and indifference, instead of arousing us to a more extended and energetic action in our Master's service. Depend upon it, brethren, as a body, we are "wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked," as regards our eternal interests. This is a grave charge to make concerning the household of faith in this latter day; yet it is not made without due consideration, and a deep-rooted conviction of its truth.

We believe, with Paul, that "it is high time to awake out of sleep, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, THE DAY IS AT HAND; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light."

It appears to us that our great lack is in the every day practice of Christianity. We are too apt to make it a Lord's day business. We ought to reduce our religion more to matter-of-fact than theory, as at present. Our principles ought to be exemplified in our dealings with men and each other. We ought, as brethren, to be "knit together in love;" for our Lord has declared, that it is by this test that all men should know that we are his disciples. We are

exhorted to "be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind" When we meet from day to day we ought to stimulate each other to further and protracted efforts in the Lord's service. Let us henceforth then, "exhort each other daily, while it is called to-day, lest any of us should be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;" for mind you, brethren, we are not "made partakers with Christ" unless we "hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end."

Let us "recompense to no man evil for evil, but provide things honest in the sight of all men, and if it be possible, as much as lies in us, live peaceably with all men." Let us "study to be quiet, and to do our own business, and work with our own hands, that we may walk honestly towards those who are without," and "as we have opportunity let us do good unto all men, but especially unto those of the household of Faith." And brethren, do not let us fail to "follow that which is good, both among ourselves and to all men."

It seems to us, that if we harbored the thought of our great destiny more, it would tend to urge us onward towards the prize of our high calling.

Suppose, for instance, that one of us knew beyond a doubt, that by pursuing a certain course, we should, in less than seven years, attain to the throne of Great Britain, or be Autocrat of all the Russias, and that millions of our fellow-creatures would do us homage in our dignified position, what sacrifices would we not make in order to accomplish the end in view? If such an inducement was held out to men of the world, they would do anything and everything to attain it. And how is it with us, brethren? By simply obeying the commandments of our Lord, which are founded in justice and righteousness, we can obtain a throne in the earth to which that of Great Britain bears no more comparison than does the throne of Naples to it. We shall receive such great power that refractory nations will be dashed to pieces at our hands, and we shall rule the earth with an iron sceptre. Instead of fearing death from the assassin, and dethronement by means of a revolution, we shall sit securely on our thrones possessed of immortal bodies, and our office will continue at least for one thousand years.

What great honor this will be, to confer on men once mortal! Have we not something to induce us to persevere unto the end? Do not let us forget, however, that this is our probationary state. If we desire the throne of a king, we must fit ourselves now for the work that will devolve on us then. We cannot be allowed to govern our fellow-men in the next age, unless we can fully govern ourselves in this. We must have complete control of ourselves in every particular, and not be in bondage to anything.

Have we cultivated a false taste for something that is injurious to our bodies, and thereby affecting the mind? We must leave it off at once.

Have we been guilty at times, of giving vent to our passions? We must subdue them.

Do we let our tongues speak that which is contrary to our reason and better judgment? We must bridle them.

Do we spend our spare time in something which does not profit ourselves or others? Remember, the end of all things is at hand, and time is precious. "Behold, I come quickly," says the Lord.

Do we spend our money for the gratification of our lusts—such as the lust of appetite, the pride of dress, etc.? That which we have is not our own, but the Lord's. We are his stewards, and will have to give an account to him ere long of that which he has entrusted to our care.

Do let us be faithful, then, brethren, and we shall ensure a great reward. Do not be satisfied with a mere entrance into the kingdom, as some have expressed themselves, but aspire to the highest honors and noblest position that will be granted unto the saints in that age. Strive to get as near the King as possible, and, whilst striving, do not forget that it will not be according to our desires, but according to our works, we shall be rewarded.

We believe in the law of progression, and may we not harbor the idea that if we attain a seat in Christ's kingdom higher than hundreds of our fellow-laborers, that this position may be maintained, not only throughout the Millennial age, but the ages of eternity beyond? O, brethren, do not let us be allured by the fleeting pleasures which surround us, but tread the steps our Master trod, and glory awaits us.

When we compare the past and passing events of our history, we are led to the inevitable conclusion that our redemption is nigh, and we therefore lift up our heads in joyful expectation. Some of the most prominent signs of Christ's near approach, we think, are found—

1. In the great favor which has of late years been shown to God's ancient people, Israel, and the events relating to the Holy Land.

2. In the rapid development of the King of the North, preparatory to his great mission in Europe, and his final overthrow on Israel's mountains.

3. In the volcanic state of Italy, and the nations of Europe generally, who are preparing with all speed imaginable for some great uprising and deadly conflict.

4. In the expiration of the 2,300 and 1,290 days, and the near approach of the termination of the 1,260 and 1,335 days of Daniel the prophet.

5. In the unprecedented drying up of the Turkish power as predicted in Rev. xvi., and the appearance of the Frog power for the accomplishment of its mission. Under this sign, we are warned by our Lord of his nearness. "Behold, I come as a thief," he says. "Blesseth is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

Do we heed this solemn warning, brethren; or are we so engrossed with the cares of this life that not a single vibration can be made on our hearts? It ought to thrill us with delight, and cause us to shout aloud for joy. How many of us are there that would hail the appearance of our King tomorrow with those feelings of ecstasy that we sometimes imagine will be felt by the saints at his coming? It is impossible for us to "love his appearing" unless we are prepared to meet him. Without this, we shall dread his coming. If there are any of us in this condition, do not let us delay one moment, but emancipate ourselves at once.

Let us remember with whom we are dealing. If it was with a fellow-mortal, we might be more justifiable in exhibiting the slackness which so many of us are guilty of; but we are dealing with the God of the universe, to whom the nations are but as the drop of a bucket.

How culpable, then, must that man be who never fails to meet his obligations to his fellow-man, but is negligent toward God! Think you he will go unpunished? No. Death and the grave will seize him, and his inheritance amongst the righteous will be forever cut off.

Let us flee, then, from the impending vengeance, and seek after glory, honor, and immortality, and we shall obtain eternal life.

"Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you.

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen."

Signed in behalf of the Conference,

THOMAS WILSON,

Secretary.

Geneva, Ill., Jan., 1859.

---

### A Timothean.

"Thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, Timothy, from a child."—Paul.

At one of our visits to Washington, D. C, we spent a very agreeable day with brother Little, who resides upon his farm, about three miles from the city. The day was spent in talking about the things of the kingdom, asking questions, and answering them. It was quite a holiday; for several of the brethren suspended work and companied with us at the same place. In the course of the day, brother Little introduced his little boy, who was then not six years old, to tell us what he had learned from the Scriptures. He was placed on a chair before us, when brother Little proceeded to question him. The questions were many, and all of them very scripturally answered; besides which he repeated the first and second psalms, and another we have forgotten. We were all very much gratified, both at the child's proficiency, and at brother Little's perseverance and Scriptural intelligence, reflected from his pupil. If all true believers would take the same trouble with their children, we should have many Timothies, and a rising generation that would take care of the truth when we are gone into sheol. Brother Little's son has been taught to think scripturally; so that no clergyman hereafter will be able to spoil him with philosophy and vain deceit. Timothy knew the Scriptures of the prophets from a child, and so might any one else, if due pains were bestowed upon their instruction. If friends Joseph Marsh, Nathaniel Field, and others of their type, had only the Scriptural intelligence of this child of less than six years old, they would never have become Millerites, and would not now be deceiving themselves with fables, vainly supposing they had obeyed the Gospel, when manifestly they knew nothing about the subject as they ought to have known it.

We were so much pleased with the examination, that we requested brother Little to let us have a copy of the questions and answers for publication in the Herald, that our readers might see what could be done with their children by a little pains. A few days since we received the following questions, with the little boy's answers annexed to each. They are a selection which, we hope, will put to shame the ignorance of every clergyman, editor, president, and "evangelist" to whom they may come greeting, and induce them to throw away

their foolishness, and become as the little child, in whom is much wisdom and knowledge in comparison of them.

EDITOR.

Jan. 4, 1859.

---

Questions Scripturally Answered

BY WILLIAM LITTLE,  
AGED SIX YEARS.

Q. Who was it that called Abraham out from his Father's house?

A. Jehovah.

Q. What did Jehovah say to Abraham?

A. He told him to go into a land that he would show him; to walk through the land in the length and the breadth of it.

Q. When Jehovah met with Abraham, what did he say to him?

A. He said he would give that land to him and his children for ever and ever.

Q. Who are Abraham's children?

A. They that believe what Abraham believed.

Q. What did Abraham believe?

A. He believed what Jehovah said.

Q. What did Jehovah say?

A. He said that he should have that land; and in him and his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed.

Q. What did Jehovah do for Abraham because he believed him?

A. He counted his faith unto him for righteousness.

Q. Did Abraham ever have the land?

A. No, not so much as to set his foot on.

Q. Who has the land now?

A. The wicked.

Q. Where is Abraham now?

A. Down in the ground where his Fathers are.

Q. When will Abraham have the land?

A. When the Lord comes.

Q. What will the Lord do for Abraham when he comes?

A. He will take him out of the ground, and give him life again.

Q. What will the Lord do to the wicked who have the land?

A. He will drive them out of the land, and destroy them.

Q. Who is the Lord?

A. Jehovah's Son.

Q. What has Jehovah promised his Son when he comes again?

A. David's Throne.

Q. Where was David's Throne?

A. In Jerusalem.

Q. Is it in Jerusalem now?

A. No, it is overturned and thrown down.

Q. Will it ever be built again?

A. Yes, when the Lord comes he will build again the Tabernacle of David that has fallen down, and set up the ruins thereof.

Q. When will all the nations of the earth be blessed in Abraham and his Seed?

A. When the Lord sits upon David's Throne in Jerusalem reigning over the children of Israel and the nations at large; then all the nations will be blessed in Abraham and his Seed.

Q. What will be the blessing to the nations?

A. A good government.

Q. How will they get this good government?

A. When the Lord is King over all the earth he will judge or rule this world in righteousness and peace. Then the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Then all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom

of the Lord and his Christ. Then will be the time that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess to the glory of God, that he is Lord of all.

Q. What will be the blessings to Abraham's children?

A. They will have eternal life given them; they will be made Kings and Priests unto God; and they will reign with Christ a thousand years upon the earth. They will be made inheritors of God and joint inheritors with Jesus Christ of an everlasting inheritance.

Q. What will be the condition of man then?

A. Man will be at peace with man; he will learn war no more; he can sit in safety under his own vine and fig-tree, and be afraid of no one.

Q. What will become of those war implements man has to kill man with?

A. They will be made into plowshares to plow the land with; and pruning hooks to trim the fruit trees with.

Q. When all the families of the earth are blessed in Abraham and his Seed, will that affect the animal creation?

A. Yes.

Q. How?

A. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together; the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat; they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.

Q. Are all these blessings to come upon the families of the earth through Abraham and his Seed?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is the Seed?

A. The Christ.

Q. Who is the Christ?

A. Tho one that was anointed of the Father.

Q. What was he anointed for?

A. To fill three offices.

Q. What three offices?

A. Prophet, Priest, and King.

Q. How was he anointed?

A. The Holy Spirit came down from the Father in the form of a dove and rested upon him.

Q. Was there any thing said then?

A. Yes; there was a voice heard from the Father, saying, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased."

Q. When was he anointed?

A. At his baptism.

Q. Where was he baptised?

A. In the river Jordan.

Q. Who baptised him?

A. John the baptiser.

Q. Abraham was called out from his Father's house; from what country?

A. From the land that was called Ur.

Q. From among what people?

A. The Chaldees.

Q. Was Abraham's name always Abraham?

A. No, it was Abram.

Q. What was Abraham's wife's name?

A. Sarah.

Q. Did Sarah ever have a son?

A. Yes; one.

Q. What was his name?

A. Isaac.

Q. Did Isaac ever have any sons?

A. Yes; two.

Q. What were their names?

A. Esau and Jacob.

Q. Did Jacob ever have any sons?

A. Yes; twelve.

Q. What were they called?

A. Patriarchs; and from these twelve Patriarch's sprung the twelve tribes of Israel, which constituted a nation, which Jehovah called his First-born Son.

Q. Was that nation ever in bondage?

A. Yes.

Q. Where?

A. In Egypt.

Q. Under what King?

A. King Pharaoh.

Q. How long were they in bondage?

A. Four hundred years.

Q. Were they delivered after that?

A. Yes.

Q. How?

A. Jehovah sent a man down to Egypt to deliver them.

Q. What was his name?

A. Moses.

Q. What was Moses to be to them?

A. Their Lawgiver, Governor or Ruler.

Q. Where was Moses to take them to when he delivered them?

A. To the land of Canaan.

Q. What land was that?

A. The land that Jehovah promised to Abraham.

Q. Where was that land?

A. All that land lying between the river of Egypt and the great river Euphrates.

---

### The Divine Origin of the Bible Denied.

Dr. Thomas. —Several years ago, about the time I commenced reading the Bible, with a view to investigate its claims to be received as an infallible supernatural revelation of God to man, and also the claims of the many warring sects and creeds said to be founded thereon, I subscribed for and read for one year, your periodical. At the end of that time, I felt myself little edified by your efforts, indeed you did not touch the main question—the claims of the Bible—but seemed to be engaged wholly in building up and defending a theory or creed by quotation and a learned exposition of texts. During the present year, I have again had the opportunity—through the kindness of a friend and his solicitude for my eternal welfare—of reading the "Herald," and I am compelled again to say that its reading is, to me, entirely unsatisfactory and unprofitable. What is the cause of this? Is it my fault, or yours? I see you receive many letters, from apparently intelligent persons, expressing great joy and gratitude for the light you have shed upon their minds, and great hope for eternity from your teaching, while with me, the reading of your papers is invariably attended with feelings of dissatisfaction approaching almost to disgust. How is this? I certainly feel a desire to know the truth, and have the same risk as all my fellow men, in receiving or rejecting it. Why then is all your apparent learning and ability wasted upon me? I will proceed to give you a good and sufficient reason. You have not proven your premises! In writing about the bible, I do it quietly, and without trepidation. I have no more fear in stating openly the honest convictions of my judgment upon it, than upon any other subject.

A belief in the bible is necessary before one can accept your teaching or exposition of the "faith once delivered to the saints." Admit your premises—the bible—and then, perhaps, your theory or creed may be as plausible as any one of the many hundred extracted therefrom.

But what is the Bible? You teach your theory of faith by its authority. I receive truth as the only authority. You teach that truth in, and obedience to, the doctrines of the bible—as you understand them—alone confers immortality upon the soul. I believe the soul immortal, with or without the bible, or else creation is a failure. In short, I understand you to teach the bible to be an infallible supernatural revelation of God to man—that it alone teaches the true theology—that it is the only rule of faith and practice—that a rejection or ignorance of its doctrines condemns man to utter annihilation, while the reception of and obedience to them confers a blessed immortality—that it contains the last will and testament of God to man, and that the writers of this last will and testament are infallible. I deny all this. I believe the bible to contain the thoughts and opinions of fallible men—that it is composed in great part of "Chaldean fable and Persian tales," mixed up with historical traditions—that its theology is mostly mythological—that it contradicts itself, nature and reason, beginning the first book, Genesis, with an account of creation, by relating a myth; and closing the last book "Revelations" with the recital of a fantastic and unprofitable vision.

You see now the issue between us. My reasons for my belief are multitudinous. You also must have a "reason for the faith that is in you." I want to know your reason. You come before the world a "teacher in Zion." You are my teacher—others admit you to be their teacher, but before I allow you to condemn me with "texts," to treat that condemnation with the least respect you must first establish the bible to be of Divine origin. You see the work I make out for you. I demand a clear account of this bible—who wrote it—when—where—in what language, and who has kept it since and during its existence. How do you settle the question of canon? How prove its inspiration? How maintain its infallibility? I hope, you will not retreat from your vocation of a teacher, but manfully come to the rescue—to the "help of the Lord against the mighty," not to the help of the true God who lives in and controls the universe, but to the help of the God of the bible—that repentant, wrathful, angry vengeful God—against the mighty and annihilating assaults of the civilization of the nineteenth century!

With this you will find my name in full, and address, for your personal satisfaction.

I cannot close this without stating the only condition upon which I will remain a reader of the "Herald," which is, that you apply yourself at once vigorously to the task I have assigned you, and allow me to call your attention to points of your work, as occasion may seem to require and as you proceed, and give this and other articles I may write, of a reasonable length, upon the subject an insertion in the "Herald." I seek no angry debate but only calm investigation, free from improper ridicule and disagreeable personalities, and no subject is too sacred for this. But I shall feel no particular astonishment if you decline the whole matter, for the "Herald" is your own property which you have a perfect right to use for your own purposes, controlling its columns as you see fit; besides, I seek for the truth, while I say it with proper respect—the Herald is published to sustain sectarian dogmas. One other condition—that you use exclusively the English language, as I am an unlearned farmer, and if I can't get religion through the language spoken by the people of this glorious republic, I will decline going to your "Kingdom."

Very Respectfully

S. W. L.

HENDERSON, Ky., 1858.

---

### The Bible Vindicated against the Thinking of the Flesh.

We fully and cordially admit, that a belief in the Bible is necessary before any one can accept our teaching, or exposition of "the faith once delivered to the saints." No one can confer upon our teaching a higher commendation than this. An intelligent belief of the bible incapacitates a man from being an honest adherent of the sentiments of all Christendom. The more ignorant of the bible the better for a man desiring to become a Papist, Sectarian, Mohammedan or Modern Jew; but to become "an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile," he must "be taught of God," whose teaching is confined to the scriptures of the prophets and apostles.

We do not talk about conferring "immortality upon the soul;" but affirm with Paul, that "this corruptible (and theologians and philosophers do not admit that what they term "soul" is corruptible and mortal) shall put on incorruptibility, and this mortal shall put on immortality;" so that whatever is corruptible and mortal of man, that is the thing the bible teaches is to become incorruptible and immortal at the resurrection.

Our correspondent who rejects the Bible, says that he believes "the soul" immortal. We do not know what he calls "the soul;" whatever it may be, it is certainly not that thing referred to by Paul; for our correspondent's "soul" is already immortal, as he thinks: while that before Paul's mind is not so, but to put on immortality at the resurrection.

Mr. L. "believes the soul immortal with or without the bible." We venture to affirm, that he can find no testimony in the scriptures for any such belief; that "without the bible" all the testimony in "the Book of Nature" (the bible of unbelief, which unbelievers know as little how to read aright, as they do the prophets and apostles,) is to prove the absolute mortality of man." The "Book of Nature" is silent as the grave upon the subject of immortality; and presents us in all the varieties of its living creatures not one that is exempt from death and corruption. Seeing then, that neither the Bible nor "the Book of Nature" supplies any testimony to the existence of an "immortal soul" in mortal man, Mr. L. cannot "believe" it; for "no testimony, no faith." Therefore, he can only think there is—certainty he has none.

"Creation," he says, "is a failure" if there be no immortal soul in man. We cannot see why it should be so. By "creation," we presume he means, the creation of the human race. The "failure" depends upon the purpose for which the race of man was created. Apart from the bible, Mr. L. nor any one else, can tell why it was created. The Book of Nature does not inform us. From this bible of the infidel or deist, we can get no response as to the questions—

"What are we? And whence came we? What shall be  
Our ultimate existence? What's our present?  
Are questions answerless and yet incessant."—

answerless, indeed, by any other teaching than the Bible's. Mr. L. then, nor Lord Byron, nor any others of that school of the flesh, not knowing what "ultimate existence," if any, is intended for the race of man, cannot tell whether the utter extinction of flesh and blood from life would be a failure, or in exact accordance with the purpose of God. Mr. L., imagines some kind of destiny for man predicated upon the assigned existence within us of something immortal; and of course, reasonably enough concludes, that said imagined destiny would be circumvented if its foundation be destroyed. But the destiny is a mere imagination, if it be the popular conceit; and a posteriori we may reason, that the foundation is imaginary also. Rejecting the bible. Mr. L. has no right to purloin ideas from its pages, were he so disposed; and apart from these, he can tell us nothing about destiny; nor of the fitness of man under any modification, for any other state than this.

After enumerating certain parts of our teaching, Mr. L., says, "I deny all this." Nothing easier than to utter these words. His denial is no proof that the points are untrue. A child might exclaim, "I deny it all," but what would that amount to? Only to presumption. Mr. L., has adduced no proof, and can produce none, from history, nor from the Book of Nature, the only sources he can draw from, that the Bible is composed in great part of "Chaldean fable and Persian tales;" that "its theology is mostly mythological;" that "it contradicts itself," and all that sort of thing. All this is mere assertion, which like mere denial, proves nothing. It is admitted that the "Bible contains" some "thoughts and opinions of fallible men," yea, and of wicked men too. Thus, the builders of Babel were of opinion that there would be another flood, and thought to save themselves from it, and make for themselves a glorious name on the earth, by erecting a tower whose top should reach heaven. It contains the thought of a fool, who said in his heart, "there is no God;" and many other thoughts and opinions of mistaken, foolish, and wicked men, it contains to their everlasting shame and contempt before God and

men in the coming world. The prophets and apostles were all fallible men, as they testify of themselves. But fallible men can become unerring witnesses, and most accurate teachers; and can be so infallible in their intellectual operations, as to calculate in advance with the greatest accuracy astronomical times and seasons for future ages. But the prophets and apostles had a principle of infallibility within them, that philosophers know nothing about—this was holy spirit, which Jesus told the apostles he would send them, which should bring all things to their remembrance, and guide them into all the truth. With this inspiration they were equal to all the exigencies of the situation. Mr. L. can only deny this. He cannot establish the contrary.

Mr. L. says that his "reasons for his belief are multitudinous." That may be. There is no end to the reasons, or "oppositions of science falsely so called," from the teeming brain of flesh and blood against the teaching of God. The less it knows and comprehends, the more reasons it has against things that are too high for it. But faith is not the belief of reasons. A man may have volumes of reasons, but not a single reliable testimony to adduce; so that the reasons having no foundation in evidence credibly testified and confirmed, are mere opinions, and therefore of no account in an argument. Paul reasoned, but his reasonings were based upon divine testimony; and the object of his reasonings was to show the meaning of the testimony, to the exclusion of every other interpretation or gloss. Mr. L. has no testimony of any value to work upon. His own phrenological faculties, sentiments, and feelings, unenlightened by "the truth," which he rejects as "Chaldean fable and Persian tales;" and the twaddle of some infidel antiquaries, and travellers in the East (the most gullible of mankind generally) with as little understanding of the Bible, and as full of natural enmity to it, as His Malignant Majesty, King SIN, who is "The Devil," could possibly desire; —these are the basis of the λογισμοί logismoi imaginations or "reasonings, and every high thing that exalts itself against God's knowledge" revealed in the scriptures. We do not ask Mr. L. for one of his reasons based upon such a foundation. By consulting our own natural man, we can get all the reasons of that class. The Bible undertakes to crucify our natural affections, and lusts; an effort by which they are stirred in rebellion against its author and precepts. Every lust has its "reason" for rejecting the Bible; nor is there a single natural propensity, sentiment, or faculty, that has a single reason for regarding it with favor. We ask Mr. L., for one reliable contemporary testimony that Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Jesus, and the apostles, were impostors. Where did Moses get his "Chaldean fables and Persian tales" from? Might they not have been Egyptian, seeing that he was learned in all their wisdom; and if so why did he legislate against all practices and opinions, Gentile and Egyptian! If Daniel and his companions' faith were Chaldean and Persian, why did Nebuchadnezzar cast three of them into a furnace; and Darius consign Daniel to the lions? How does he know that the Mosaic account of the creation is a myth? Does he understand that account? If he do, let him explain it to the clergy and geologists; for they none of them understand it. Does he understand the Revelation of John? If he do not, is it not presumption for him to denounce it as "the recital of a fantastic and unprofitable vision?"

Mr. L. says, he wants to know our reason for faith or hope apart from the Bible. Without this we have neither faith nor hope; and should be just as blind as our New York "awful Gardiner," who got his religion by a shock of his nerves while driving his dray! If Mr. L. had read Elpis Israel, Anatolia, and the eight volumes of the Herald, and digest what he reads, he would not now have to say, "I want to know your reason." He wants us to establish in his mind the divine original of the Bible. This we confess, is beyond our power to do. "Paul may plant, and Apollos water; but God gives the increase." The first step for Mr. L. to take is to study the book, so as to understand it. If he say that he cannot understand it, then let him in the spirit of failure, which ought to be humility, seek instruction as to its meaning: but if he be

happy enough to attain to the knowledge and understanding of the Bible, he will then ask no more sceptical questions about its "divine origin," but will, doubtless, become very much incensed and mortified at himself, and will probably, exclaim in the spirit of enlightenment, "Oh, fool that I was, to condemn what I did not understand!"—*dam nant quod non intelligunt*—a violation of all right reason and propriety.

Mr. L. wants to know "Who wrote the Bible?" "When was it written?" "Where was it written?" "In what language was it written?" And "who has kept it since and during its existence?" If he knew what is in the Bible, all these questions would have been superfluous. Moses and Joshua wrote the first six books of the Old Testament; that is, they were written under their supervision by the historiographers of the state, of which they were the chiefs. The historical books were all written by the same class of official persons. The Psalms were composed by David, Asaph, and other nameless persons. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, by Solomon. The name of the writer of the book of Job is lost. It has been ascribed to Moses; be that as it may, it was doubtless written by a patriarchal man. Isaiah, wrote the book that goes by his name. So Jeremiah his, and the Lamentations over the Fall of Jerusalem. So also of Ezekiel, and the rest of the prophets, they wrote the books that are known by their names.

As to "when was the Bible written? —it may be answered, at different times during sixteen hundred years, by the men of the noblest dispositions of the Hebrew Nation. Moses and Joshua were contemporaries, being king and prime minister together forty years, and witnesses of all they testify. They wrote at the time "the world began" and about things "before the world began" and afterwards; that is *ἄπ' αἰῶνος*, *ap aionos*, and *κρο χρονῶν αἰωνίῳν*, *pro chronon aionion*; the former expression having reference to the beginning of the Mosaic Aion or Course of things; and the latter, to the period preceding that beginning.

The historical books were compiled from the national archives at different times after the occurrence of the events narrated. The psalms belong principally to the reign of David about a thousand years before the birth of Jesus.

Isaiah wrote under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and descendants of David. These reigns over a period of 113 years, the first being 52 and the last 29. It is not stated in what year of the first reign Isaiah began to write. He was alive in the 14th of Hezekiah; but how soon after that he died, is not stated. This was 125 years, 6 months, and 10 days, before the destruction of Jerusalem by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar; and about 731 years, 6 months, and 10 days from the birth of Jesus. Hosea, Amos, and Micah, were contemporary with Isaiah.

Jeremiah began to write 85 years after the 14th of Hezekiah. He was contemporary with Zephaniah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Joel and Habakkuk, were before the Chaldean invasion; Obadiah before the conquest of Edom; and Jonah, wrote in the reign of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, king of Israel, in the twenty-seventh of whose reign Uzziah, began to rule over Judah. Hence, Jonah preceded Isaiah, by a few years only. Nahum, wrote before the destruction of Nineveh; and Malachi after the conquest of Edom, and before that of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Seventy years having elapsed after this event, Zerubbabel, the Tirshatha or Governor, of the Jews, Joshua the son of Jozedec, the High Priest, and 42,358 others of Judah and Benjamin, returned to Palestine, by virtue of the decree of Cyrus in the first year of his reign. These built the altar, and laid the foundation of the temple, the completion of which was prevented by the intrigues of the Samaritans, until

the second year of the reign of Darius, the Persian, B.C. 515. Then the prophets Haggai, and Zechariah, the last of the prophets till John the Baptist, prophesied to the Jews of matters, many of which have been amplified considerably in detail, in the Apocalypse, styled by Mr. L., who does not pretend to understand it, "the recital of a fantastic and unprofitable vision!"

Forty-eight years after the decree of Darius, another decree was issued in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, addressed to Ezra the seventeenth from Aaron, "a ready scribe in the Law of Moses," authorizing him to beautify the temple of Jehovah, and to appoint magistrates and judges, who might judge all the people west of the Euphrates; and to teach them to know the laws of Israel's God. This Ezra compiled the narrative contained in that book of the Bible which is known by his name.

Thirteen years after this, yet another decree was published in the twentieth year of the same reign. This was addressed to Nehemiah, Cupbearer to the King of Persia, authorizing him as Tirshatha, to build the Broad Wall of Jerusalem, and to set up the gates thereof. The book of Nehemiah, was either written by this Tirshatha or by his colleague Ezra, the state recorder of the day; but most possibly by himself, relating the transactions under his administration.

Thus we have shown by whom, and when the various portions of the Old Testament were compiled. They were the public documents of the very ancient and most famous of all the nations of the earth—the HEBREW; a people flourishing for ages before Mr. L's, dollar-worshipping nation had an existence, or his country was known to have a place above the waters of the deep.

But besides these, he wants to know where the Bible was written? The five books of Moses were written in that vast howling wilderness, whose rocks to this day, are covered with inscriptions chiselled by the sojourning Israelites. Job was probably written in the land of Uz; and Esther, at Shushan in Persia, in the reign of Ahasuerus, who caused the edict of Cyrus for rebuilding the temple to be suspended; and Ezekiel and Daniel being of the captivity, wrote their prophecies in the land of their exile; Ezekiel, by the river Chebar; and Daniel, partly in Babylon, and partly at Shushan. All the rest was written in Palestine; and if Job, were compiled by Moses, as is supposed, all the Old Testament was written, or compiled by Jews.

As to the language in which it was written, the Old Testament was all written in Hebrew, except from Dan. ii. 4 to vii. 28; and from Ezra iv. 8 to vii. 26; and Jer. x. 11—which were written in Chaldee.

In answer to the question, who has kept these documents since and during their existence? —we inquire, who ought to have kept them but the nation to whom they belong? Do the British keep the archives of the United States; or France, those of the Moscovites? Every nation keeps its own records; and therefore, Israel has been to this day the keepers of theirs. In whatever part of the earth you may find yourself, if there be there a synagogue of the Jews, you will there find, if not all, more or less of their national records, carefully and jealously preserved in the form of parchment rolls of manuscript. "To them," the Jews, said Paul, "were committed the oracles of God."

Mr. L. hopes we will not retreat from what he has marked out for us to do; but manfully come to the help of the God of the Bible against the mighty! We are not in the custom of retreating; and of surrender, we know nothing. But were such a spirit of fear within

us, we must at least catch a glimpse of the face of "the Mighty" before we can think of scampering in retreat. For "the Civilization of the Nineteenth Century," in its religious or infidel bearings, we have the profoundest contempt. Its infidelity may scare the hireling soul-merchants of the Apostasy; but for us it has no terrors. The parents of contemporary infidelity are ignorance, and the natural enmity of the human heart against what is pure, righteous, holy, good. We commend Mr. L., in addition to what is here written upon his communication, to study what we have penned in reply to Dr. Ogle's letter; and Tregelles "Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament," to be published in our columns. This author will save the editor of the Herald time and labor. Before Mr. L. adds to the manuscript already before us, we suggest the propriety of his studying the Bible, and thoroughly digesting what is and will be said for his instruction. The reader will be able to judge who seeks for the truth, and who to sustain sectarian dogmas—Mr. L. or we! It is rather curious that we should be charged with the latter enterprize, seeing that all Romish and Protestant sectarians unitedly agree in condemning us; and we as uncompromisingly repudiate their whole system of faith and practice, or as Dr. Field expresses it, "the sentiments of all Christendom."

We are willing to spend and be spent in the arduous work of teaching the "unlearned farmers," and in enlightening the ignorant, who are disposed to learn; but as to debating with them, that is a very different affair. If we knew nothing about raising tobacco or cotton (and we don't profess to be skilled in either crop) Mr. L. would think it great presumption in us to debate with him—denying his theory and practice of farming, and in the plenitude of our ignorance, affirming an opposite system, and arguing from our feelings and opinions, that it was the true one! The mind of an unlearned or uninstructed man is a mere blank with respect to that in which he is not learned. How can such an one discuss the merits of such a book as we have shown the Bible to be—unlearned in its contents, unlearned in the history of its times, and unlearned in the languages in which it was written? As Mr. L. knows only "the language of this glorious Republic"—a language which had no more existence than "this glorious republic" itself in Bible times—he lacks a very important qualification for the critical examination of its text. He says, "the Bible contradicts itself;" but how does he know that? Does the Bible, in "the language of this glorious republic," contradict the Bible in the language of the infinitely more glorious kingdom of God? or, does the Bible in Hebrew or Chaldee, contradict the Bible in these ancient tongues? Will he, knowing only "the language of this glorious republic," prove to us which it is? Does not the "unlearned farmer" know that the Bible was not written in English; and that when it was translated into "the language of this glorious republic" that said language had not attained maturity; and that many words were then used in senses that are now obsolete; while other words of the language of the more glorious kingdom were transferred, and not translated into the language which alone the "unlearned farmer" Kentuckially understands? How, then, are we to obviate these difficulties if we are confined "exclusively" to United States English?

But, while we repudiate such an "unlearned" and impracticable condition, we by no means intend to insinuate that our "unlearned farmer" "can't get religion through the language spoken by the people of this glorious republic;" all we say is, that, lacking this qualification, he pronounces himself, by the confession of the ignorance that is in him, disqualified for a critical debatant against the Bible and the Bible's God. Our "unlearned farmer" may "get religion" through spoken or written English, if he will put himself in the position indicated for "the unlearned" by Jesus Christ himself. This Great Teacher of the truth said to the unlearned fishermen of Galilee, "Except ye be changed, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of the heavens." The context shows that he meant that they should become

humble as little children—Matt. xviii. 3, 4. Little children, if they be not of the precocious class familiarly styled "Young America," "Young England," or "Young Ireland," are modest, inquiring, teachable; having the diffidence of a conscious ignorance, which desires to be enlightened. Little children go to their teachers (and the "unlearned farmer" says we are his teacher) as inquirers after truth, not as debaters, giving the lie to all their school books, and rejecting everything they do not understand, and denouncing it, if not in accordance with their feelings and previous suppositions. Mr. L. has, indeed, made one step towards the truth, and that not an unimportant one, in confessing that he is "unlearned," or one that knows nothing about the subject. This is the first step to knowledge—to know that we know nothing. The next is, that feeling our ignorance, we should inquire, not dispute. He says that we are his teacher; we prefer that he should go to a better teacher, —to one by whom we have ourselves been taught—to the Bible, which can teach him more than, perhaps, he can learn in half a century: and the better he becomes acquainted with this teacher, the less will he be disposed to vilify it and to blaspheme its Author. Though it is admitted that the English version is defective, it is nevertheless sufficiently accurate to teach an unlearned farmer or mechanic what he must believe and do "to enter the kingdom of the heavens," in other words, to be saved. Thus, he may "get religion through the language of this glorious republic," and teach others what he has got, and confound all learned dunces who do not know what is taught in plain English; nevertheless, for criticism he will never be qualified unless he study the originals, and learn to use them aright in the elaboration of the truth, which none, however proficient, are able to do, who are ignorant of the truth revealed.

In conclusion, we would respectfully remark, that Mr. L. is not yet of the right spirit for entrance into what he styles, "our kingdom." The spirit that qualifies for this, is the spirit generated by the knowledge of the truth affectionately believed. He is incapable of developing this spirit, because the word of the truth of the gospel of the kingdom is not in him. He has defined the spirit of which he is possessed the spirit of unlearnedness; for, in relation to the subject before us he says, "I am an unlearned farmer." This spirit originates in ignorance of the truth, and is therefore styled by the apostle "the Spirit of Error" and "our kingdom" has no room for people possessed of this spirit. The highest glory of the people demonized by this evil spirit, is some worldly kingdom, or "republic," of King Sin's dominion. Hence, the great Britons glory in Victoria's empire, upon which shines an unsetting sun; while Mr. L. grows ecstatic when he thinks of "this glorious republic," which, like Jonah's gourd, came up in a night and withers before the morning. But the flesh glories in its own agencies, as if they were eternal. The unlearned glory in the wisdom, and wealth, and power of flesh and blood, which is as grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of the field; the grass withers, and the flower fades; because the spirit of Yahweh bloweth upon it; surely the peoples are grass. He bringeth the princes to nothing; He maketh the judges of the earth as vanity. They shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble; but the word of our Elohim shall stand to the Age.—Isai. xl. 6, 7, 8, 23, 24; "and this is the word which is evangelized to you"—1 Pet. i. 25.

Such is Mr. L's., glorying and the glorying of all the "patriots"—they glory in princes, judges, kingdoms and republics, which are to be brought to nothing, to be as vanity, and to be swept away as stubble by the whirlwind of Yahweh's indignation. All whose admiration and devotion is for such vanities are unfit for "our kingdom." They walk in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart; who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness."—Eph. iv. 17. But we hope that Mr. L. has not sunk to these depths of Satan. We would rather attribute his erraticism to the absence of information; and to the infidelizing influence of the

bible-nullifying speculations of the pulpit orators of the Apostasy, commonly called "the clergy;" who while they profess to believe the bible, and to teach its precepts, by their practice prove that they have no more real faith in it than Mr. L.: we would rather attribute his unbelief to these influences, than to a hopeless perversion of heart and brains. Be this, however as it may, before "our kingdom" will recognize him as one of its "heirs," the demon-spirit of republicanism must be superseded in his affection by the Kingdom of the Heavens, which is destined to break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms and republics; and to rule over all the nations of the earth.

Men, unrighteous and ignorant of the truth, can have no part in "our kingdom," which is promised only to "the rich in faith." If Mr. L. "decline going to" this kingdom, we are sorry for him; the loss however, will be all his own. The King does not force men to accept his invitation against their will; but of this we are sure that if Mr. L. only understood and believed, he would readily try to sink "this glorious republic," and all its tongues into the abyss, if by so doing he could secure only the situation of a doorkeeper in some mansion of the kingdom he now so lightly esteems.

Jan. 4, 1859.

EDITOR.

---

### Historical Reminiscences.

Now, had Paul seen Joseph and Nathaniel the Millerites in 1843, hard at work destroying the covenants made with Abraham and David, abolishing the resurrection, and by consequence (notwithstanding their ignorant clamor about Jesus coming in March '43, and the Millerite saints going up in newly fabricated silk, satin, linen, or calico ascension-dresses, to meet him in the atmosphere), making the advent of Jesus impossible; proclaiming Moses and the prophets, the Eternal and Paul to be liars before heaven and earth, in passionately affirming that Israel was finally cast away (see Isaiah xli. 9; Jer. xxxiii. 24-26; Rom. xi. 1,2); giving the right hand of fellowship to every sort of a sinner, dipped, poured or sprinkled, who endorsed their fanaticism; reducing the Pentecostian proclamation to a fable; and so forth, and so forth; for there is no end to the destructive results of their foolishness—suppose Paul had found these Gentile expositors at this their unhallowed work, will any Bible-illuminated believer "having the spirit of a sound word," say that Paul would have acknowledged them as Christians; or as sinners, simply told them to renounce and confess, that they might become Christians on earth? ! The supposition is preposterous; Paul would certainly have addressed them as he did the Areopagites, Epicureans, and Stoics of Athens, saying, "the times of this ignorance God winks at, but now he commands all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day (of 1000 years) in the which he will judge (or rule) the habitable in righteousness by that man whom he hath appointed, whereof he hath offered assurance unto all that he hath raised him from the dead." The repentance that Paul urged men to be the subjects of was, an enlightened and loving obedience in the Name of Jesus Christ, into which name none could enter save by immersion thereinto. To command men "to repent" was therefore equivalent to commanding them to "be baptized in the name of Jesus for remission of sins," because of the coming day of Christ's dominion over the inhabited earth, which he is to rule in righteousness—not to burn up with a Millerite conflagration.

No; remission of sins by forsaking them and confessing them is the high privilege of saints overtaken in a fault, but not apostate. "Sinners of the Gentiles," such as Millerites and the like, must confess faith in the things of the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, and become the subjects of repentance and the remission of sins in that name by baptism, before they can attain to the privilege of saints. The saints are a very different sort of

people to the pious sinners of our day, puffed up like a distended bladder with the absurd "sentiments of all Christendom;" and ready to explode into deafening glorification of any wild speculation of the flesh. The saints are "renewed by exact knowledge"—επιγνωσις. They do not believe and obey the Gospel, and then after a few years, instead of having increased in faith and knowledge, ignore every principle of the Gospel of the kingdom and glory of God; and with a hop, skip, and a jump, bound into the abyss of outer and nether Gentile darkness, roaring and shouting "glory hallelujah" in the horrible subterranean depths of Millerite impiety and blasphemies. After Bedlamizing in these dens of iniquity, transgression and sin, anathematizing the true Gospel as carnal Judaism, the saints, exhausted by the excitement and furor, do not begin to quarrel among themselves for pre-eminence—St. Himes against St. Joseph, and St. Joseph against St. Himes, and St. Storrs, and St. Cook; and St. Nathaniel looking on to lend a hand in the pious struggle for the New Papacy of '43! The saints do not cut up such Hibernian "shindies" as these; and then when St. Joseph, and St. Cook, and St. Nathaniel find St. Himes and St. Storrs, and other crotchety saints of Blue Law Connecticut, too strong, or too tactical for them, seek out some new position where they can elaborate a party for themselves. The saints do not, like St. Cook versus St. Joseph, and St. Joseph versus St. Cook, pitch into one another to see which shall be the Diotrefes of the new position. The saints do not purloin the truth elaborated by others while they were in outer darkness, appropriate it without acknowledgment, and pretend they were enlightened in it and obeyed it thirty years ago! The saints are straightforward, bold, and honorable in their policy: they neither fear nor imitate "the Devil and his angels;" they do not rush out of light into darkness, and creep out of darkness into the faintest sort of glimmer, and pretend that, with the abatement of a few peccadilloes, they were always in the light; they are guiltless of this self-deception; but being once enlightened they continue in the light, rejoicing in it; increasing therein, steadfast to the end.

Such, then, is the attitude in which friends Joseph and Nathaniel, of Expositoria, have placed themselves; and are also placed, not by us, but by their own admissions, by testimony and reason, and by the history of their case. We have nothing to say of them as men apart from their spiritual pretensions. Our personal acquaintance with them disposes us to regard them with favor and respect. From what we thus know of them we seriously wish we could conscientiously fraternize with them as Christians, and cooperate with them in turning men from darkness to light. But this cannot be until they have obeyed the truth. This is the basis of our alliances; apart from this, in our ecclesiasticism, "we know no man after the flesh." Hitherto we have exercised great forbearance towards them and the men after their type. We have treated them playfully, so as to keep them in good humor, while we told them "very hard," "uncharitable," and "severe" things, under the hope that they were honestly inquiring after the truth; and when they should be convinced of it, they would gladly and thankfully obey it. We have never regarded them in the light of teachers of the Word, but as the blind to be enlightened. They are too much of Gentiles in mode of thinking, ideas, and absence of divine information, to be teachers of the blind in the science of Hebrew Revelation. Campbellism, Millerism, Christyanism, Storrism, and such like, are schools of the flesh, in which this science is not to be acquired. Joseph and Nathaniel are just such disciples as these schools cast upon the waters. If they would become teachers they must purge themselves from these; become harder students of the Word than hitherto, that "their profiting may appear;" be teachable; learn to reason correctly; believe, and lovingly obey. When they have attained to this point, and become babes in Christ, let them feed upon "the un-adulterated milk of the Word, that they may grow thereby;" and when they have become young men, or "strong with the Word of God abiding in them," so as that they "have overcome the wicked one" in his sectarian temptations without, and his impulses within, and of their own evil nature, they will

have a scriptural basis to work upon in pulling down the strongholds of Christendom, and building up "the precious cause."

In the days of our ignorance of the Gospel of the Kingdom we were in denominational fraternity with Nathaniel Field, M. D.; but with Joseph Marsh, as a Christyan, Millerite, or ought else, we have had no ecclesiastical relation. In March, 1847, we left friend Nathaniel in fellowship with all the sentiments (though in the following September he renounced "the Reformation" of A. C.); for at that time we publicly renounced all fellowship with "Christendom," and its names and denominations, one and all. Friend Joseph was then floundering in Millerism, and contending with "the saints" above named, and against the items of what he called "carnal Judaism," wherever they chanced to show themselves. Upon this subject, brethren Joseph Pierce and McMillan, both of Rochester, and members with Mr. Marsh, can tell a tale showing the awful darkness that beclouded his mind.

While he was in this condition, that is, in Sept. 1847, we wrote to him from Buffalo, N. Y., saying, "perceiving from the Advent Harbinger that you are a man of progress, that is to say, one who believes that it is possible, and even probable, that there is more truth in the Word of God than you may have yet discovered, I have concluded that, upon the principle of 'hearing all things, and holding fast to that which is good,' you would not only have no objection, but desire to hear if any light was with me more than you have already seen, I have already thought it would be well, therefore, to let you know that I would, if agreeable, speak in Rochester on the Gospel, or Glad Tidings of the Kingdom of God. If this meet your approbation and that of the friends, please drop me a line upon the subject, and informing me at what place I shall make my appearance." Being invited after this, we submitted things which they said "interested them more than they expected," and into which they said they would examine. In our note upon this at the time we say, "We trust they will; for our Advent friends will find that they have, as yet, only placed their foot upon the threshold of Truth's edifice, preparatory to entering in. They have occupied themselves too exclusively upon the moment when; let them examine more minutely into the things which; so that when time fails them, they may not be taken unawares by events which must surely come to pass before the Lord comes. This will be soon, but not so soon as they imagine. Time, however, will prove all things, and convince them that what we have shown them is truth."—H. F. Age, Sep. 19, 1847.

After this, we sent him the Herald, and in June, 1848, we went to England. Two years and a-half after, we relanded in New York, and upon inquiring after Joseph, found that he had progressed. He has been in the receipt of all our writings to the present time, and we have been to Rochester expounding the Word. He has been gradually approaching our position, assumed for the first time in March, 1847, when we put off "all the sentiments," and put on Christ in baptism. He got so far as to be ashamed of the name "Adventist," and to propose a union of his periodical with the Herald of the ' Kingdom! He no longer liked to be called an Adventist, and has therefore changed his paper's title from "Advent Harbinger" to "Prophetic Expositor." But, as to uniting our periodicals, we begged to be excused, and told him they would be more useful apart: that there were many well-meaning people that liked to see themselves in print, and to tell their feelings, and to talk about their views of things, and so forth; that his Harbinger had plenty of room for such; besides that, Joseph and ourselves, when we came to the question of what constituted a true and valid immersion, might be found differing in the columns of the united papers; which would have a bad appearance before the readers. He did not, however, think there would be any difficulty about that. But we did, and preferred a separate operation; at the same time telling him, that he might republish what, and

as much as he pleased from our pages. This he has done very copiously in the past, till he began to discover that the policy was not conducive to the peace of evil consciences. Very little is seen now in his pages from the Herald. Every now and then he draws his bow and shoots an arrow at us, regardless of the quiver whence it comes. Any old feathered shaft will do, provided it is tipped with a little poison. Twang goes the bow, and off the bolt; and then we are stirred up to his rebuke.

Well, then, here are Joseph and Nathaniel, said now to be believers of the Gospel as advocated in the Herald; though of this, we confess we have our doubts; at all events, we have no evidence of it. A man may have a theoretical understanding of the Gospel, but not a hearty belief in it. He may also understand it, and at the same time add on to it "the sentiments of all Christendom," for the sake of getting on more easily with it. But a true spiritual or scriptural understanding, such cannot have. The Gospel will enter into partnership with none and nothing that neutralizes it. They have got within hail of the obedience of faith, and there they stand, twisting, writhing, grimacing, straining at a gnat, and swallowing camels by shiploads.

Having dressed off our friends J. and N., we come now, in conclusion, to say a few words upon what they term our "greater sins unconfessed"—greater, dear reader, than destroying the Gospel, and making God a liar, as we have shown them to have done.

Now, these greater unconfessed sins are really nothing more than charges trumped up by Dr. Field, in the spirit of malevolence and chagrin, to answer the same purpose among the patrons of the Expositor that they were formerly employed to effect among the Campbellites—the annihilation of our good name, in default of their ability to annihilate our arguments and position, by which the Josephs and Nathaniels are condemned. But the effort in the hands of the Campbellites signally failed, for we were never in better moral and material standing than now; and the renewed effort will as signally fail, to the confusion and shame of these expository enemies of the truth.

The Doctor's accusations (for they are not our sins, but his false charges) are based upon a document published by President Campbell and ourselves in the Millennial Harbinger and the Apostolic Advocate in 1838, just 20 years ago. The probability is, that very few of our present subscribers are acquainted with the matter; we will therefore give them a brief outline of the affair, and they will then know what faith to put in the Josephs and Nathaniels of the Rochester encampment, which is now manifesting itself after the model of the Bethanians.

We proceed then to remark, that in 1834, while residing in Richmond, Va., we started two questions in this country, which may be presented in the form of the following propositions, namely, that—

1. No person destitute of the "One Faith" previous to his immersion is the subject of the "One Baptism."
2. The animal man is in no sense immortal.

These two propositions greatly disturbed the peace of Campbellism, styled by its friends and admirers, "This Reformation." When we started the questions, it was more in the spirit of inquiry than of perfect conviction; and it is also probable that, if we had not been violently opposed, and bitterly persecuted, the matter would have dropped, and we and many

others would have, unhappily, been Campbellites to this day. But it was ordered otherwise; and we are now rejoicing in the truth, and utterly fearless of all our enemies can say or do.

The first question, which is self-evident to every one intelligent in the scriptures, is destructive to the Christianity of every ignoramus, or uninstructed pretender. It was as destructive of our own immersion as of all other Campbellites; for although we all talked much about "the Ancient Gospel," we none of us really knew what it was, taking the Campbellite statement of the gospel for the definition of the "One Faith " originally delivered to the saints. Hence, "the faith" became an object of particular interest, and the subject of considerable discussion. This was mortifying to the preachers, especially those who had slipped in by a mere verbal confession, who did not like things current in the camp to be questioned.

The second proposition is also self-evident to those who know the truth, and it was not long before we came to be certain of its verity. From 1835 to the present time we have never wavered in our conviction; nor have we ever agreed not to discuss it; nor have we ever affirmed that it was of no practical benefit—so that in Dr. Field affirming the contrary, he has declared that which is not true.

"Certain things," however, not expressed in the proposition, presented themselves to our mind in the discussion of it. If the animal man is in no sense immortal, then, said I, babes are not "little immortals," and they do not go to heaven at death. Then, further, the scriptures say that "without faith no one can please God;" and again, "except any one be born of the water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God;" upon what principle, then, can babes rise from the dead, and how can they become "little angels" in heaven? We denied the apotheosis of babes, and affirmed their abode in the dust of death, as the final and best disposition of them on departing this life.

Other "certain things" we agitated, concerning the immortality of man and the resurrection of the dead. Man not being immortal in any sense, idiots and pagans do not go to "hell" at death, any more than the rest of the wicked; and, as God does not reap where he has not sown, infants, idiots, and pagans are not raised from the dead to burn in eternal torments; nor are there "infants in hell a span long;" nor is that place paved with the skull bones of non-elect infants, as gloomy Calvinism has taught.

Upon the agitation of these "certain things," a great hubbub was stirred up among the dry bones. The preachers, particularly offended at the first proposition, which they could not set aside, seized upon "certain things" as a perfect godsend for our destruction. As the religions of the day are all mere embodiments of the principles of the flesh, the craftsmen stirred up the women against us, and came out as the special champions of their philoprogenitiveness! They told them that we taught that they would never meet their dear little infants in heaven; that they were all lost, and that sort of thing. This made the female occiput dislike us very particularly, and closed their ears against us to a considerable extent. Now, when the women get a twist, the men have no peace till they have their way. The craftsmen knew this, so we incurred the opprobrium of nearly all.

This state of things continued about three years. Our opponents had stirred up President Campbell against us, upon the "certain things" more than upon the propositions direct. He agreed with us upon the first, but objected to its discussion lest it should make us unpopular. As to the second, he artfully affirmed that we denied the resurrection of the dead,

because we denied the resurrection of all the dead—infants, idiots, and pagans! Such was his craft.

(To be concluded in our next.)

---

## Theiopolitical.

Behold as a thief I come; blessed is he that watcheth. —JESUS.

### Review of Events.

THE following, which cannot fail of interesting the readers of the Herald, is condensed from the Manchester Daily Examiner, a paper published in England, and kindly forwarded to us by some anonymous friend. We have not room for comments. The reader will see that the political situation is anything but comforting to the Powers which, "under God," burden themselves with the direction of human affairs. Things are working admirably for the development of our programme exhibited in our title page to Anatolia. The Frog Power, which wrought duly at Constantinople, is now diligently fulfilling its mission, as we have frequently argued it would, at the capitals of the Beast and False Prophet— Vienna and Rome. A few words from its IMPERIAL MOUTH has caused a depreciation of the funds to the amount of sixty millions sterling, and created a war panic throughout Continental Europe. But this belongs to 1859. The opening of the second stage of the end cannot, we believe, be otherwise than at the door. The following is the review:

"Politically, the year 1858 broke upon Europe without sunshine, but also without clouds. People had not yet ceased to listen to the echoes of hostilities on the banks of the Danube and the Tchernaya—hostilities far too recent and severe to be quickly forgotten; they were in the agonies of a commercial crisis, which, for the time, absorbed all their sympathies, while their diplomatists found sufficient scope for dangerous activities in finishing the web of protocols, riverine commissions, and territorial arrangements which the Paris conference left standing in the loom. Owing to these causes, a quiet, perhaps somewhat grim and smoky, pervaded the region of politics, and speculative minds might interpret it, according to their bent, either as the prelude to a long interval of repose, or as a treacherous summer's night, which stills the fury of the battle and the tumult of the camp, only to prepare for a deadlier struggle on the morrow.

It would savor of pedantry to say that history—viewed, of course, only on its human side, in the last resort, is merely a question of dynamics; but this, or some equivalent assertion, forces itself upon us when we endeavor to group together and generalize those political phenomena which fix by their magnitude the attention of the world. Condescending to the common jargon, we speak of policy, nationality, or the balance of power, with such attendant mystifications as conferences, protocols and treaties. These only serve to veil the one fact which produces all the rest—force, the action of the strong upon the weak, the helplessness which tempts aggression, and the ambition which seizes the proffered opportunity. Hypocrisy glosses over this fact with a varnish of morality, but morality has nothing to do with it except as material for special pleading, whereby the wrong which great potentates are bent upon perpetrating is made to appear the right. In this great drama, which is incessantly acting before our eyes, we can seldom give our absolute sympathies to either side. The weak do not always claim our pity, because their weakness springs from past injustice and the neglect of nature's laws; while the greatest potentates, guided by no principle capable of producing unity of action, but determined by selfish and paltry motives, are eager only to

countermine one another. The diplomacy of Europe, though, in rare moments of disinterested inspiration, or when expediency, in an open and naked guise, coincides with justice, capable of doing great things, too often covers schemes which would be called conspiracy and brigandage in any judicial tribunal under heaven. For the last half-dozen years, what we call European politics would be fitly represented by the picture of a carcass surrounded by vultures, the greedy birds of prey sometimes glutting themselves in voracious concert, but more frequently flying at one another, as two or more happen to take a fancy to the same limb. Such was the Russian war; such were the intrigues that followed, and which, combined with similar movements nearer home, though not the most obtrusive, were the most significant features of the year which has just ended.

In order to comprehend the foreign politics of 1858, we must turn our attention, in the first place, to the more important

#### EVENTS IN FRANCE.

It has now, for four centuries, been the lot of this great nation, whether as a monarchy, a republic, or an empire, to play a principal part in the affairs of Europe. We are apt to regard its present commanding position as the result of some dishonest stroke of policy. This is an error. The French are inherently a great nation; they are rendered so by the size of their population, by the compactness of their territories, by the abundance of their national resources, and by the vivid sense of nationality which distinguishes them. But these circumstances, which Englishmen, unapproachable on their own domain, have no right to envy, always give immense importance to the domestic condition of France, and the warlike or pacific disposition of its rulers. At the present moment, the weakness of Austria, and the confusion which prevails in the European provinces of Turkey, invite a fray, and the continuance of peace depends upon the Emperor Napoleon more than upon any other man living, while the probability that his foreign policy hinges upon his domestic exigencies elevates the internal affairs of France to a position of European importance. At the beginning of the past year they wore a hopeful aspect. We began to cherish the belief that the Emperor would succeed in harmonising his dynastic claims with the wants and aspirations of his people. This pleasing dream has been sadly shattered. First came the diabolical attempt of Orsini and his associates to assassinate the Emperor and Empress. Public opinion throughout Europe instantly denounced the villainy. The newspapers of England were unanimous in expressing their joy at the Emperor's escape, and disclaimed, on behalf of freedom, the remotest sanction of the idea that murder can ever benefit mankind. Events thus bestowed upon the Emperor an opportunity of increasing the splendor, and, perhaps, the security of his throne, but it was thrown away. Yielding, not unnaturally, or perhaps unpardonably, to the excitement of the moment, the deed of a solitary conspirator was made the pretext for imposing fresh restrictions on the liberty of the subject, and for assuming an offensive attitude towards neighboring States. Belgium and Switzerland parried the blow, but in England it was returned with interest. At the bidding of Count Persigny, Lord Palmerston framed his bill for amending the laws relating to conspiracy to murder, and in three weeks Lord Palmerston ceased to be Prime Minister. With a promptitude which deserves a courteous recognition, the imperial government lost no time in retreating from its false position, but a world of mischief was already done. It remained incredible that the Emperor could quite forget the check which our self-respect had forced upon him. It was believed that the Anglo-French alliance had received another serious blow. True, it was only an impression, but impressions are facts, always real, and often dangerous. Then came that singular episode, the Queen's visit to Cherbourg. How was this to be accepted? As a proof of friendship, or as a menace in the guise of courtesy? Unhappily, the Queen did not go alone, and those who went with her did not;

hold their tongues when they came back. Mr. Roebuck spoke disparagingly of French women, French sailors, and French customs. The Paris newspapers took up the challenge; and, in the heat of the conflict which followed, it seemed not unlikely that Cherbourg would disgorge invading fleets to avenge the insults heaped on Normandy bonnets and Paris pectops by English platform orators. Another unhappy blunder has capped the calamities of the year. The appearance of M. de Montalembert's celebrated pamphlet, and the prosecution of its author, are events too recent for fresh comment. It is universally acknowledged that the prosecution was ill-advised, and that the government has sustained a damaging defeat. The world now knows with inconvenient accuracy how far opinion has free utterance in France, and a private individual has shown that there are still limits which tyranny dares not overstep. As the friends of universal freedom, such events have for us an interest of their own, but they acquire a commanding interest by their possible bearing on the foreign policy of France. The Emperor reigns by prestige. Will the prestige which has been lost in one direction be counterbalanced by a prestige gained in another? An immense army, maintained at the full complement, is ready for action. The weakness of Austria holds out to ambition a tempting prize. Sardinia is in the hunter's leash. Sinister rumors are abroad. War or peace? So far 1858; we must leave its story to 1859.

#### ENGLAND'S FOREIGN POLICY.

The nature of the circumstances which led to the overthrow of Lord Palmerston's administration in February, devolved a delicate task upon his successors. Fortunately for Lord Malmesbury's domestic reputation, he had not to contend with brilliant contrasts. The "spirited foreign policy," which in other days had involved us in petty disputes with almost every nation on the globe, had tamed itself down into a sycophantic copyism of France. "My imperial Friend at the Tuileries" was the great gentleman; and the noble proprietor of Broadlands, the veteran statesman of England, aspired only to adjust his buckles. The people of England, desirous of cultivating the most amicable relations with France, but hating subserviency, had often felt their confidence sorely tried, when the Conspiracy Bill inspired them with an indignation that knew no bounds, and Palmerstonianism perished in its flames. Owing to these causes, Lord Malmesbury had an easy task at home. He might easily do better than his predecessor, but he could hardly manage to do worse. Grateful for their deliverance from a policy to which the personal predilections of the apologist of the coup d'etat stood first, and dignity and principle always occupied subordinate places, the people were ready to appreciate any honest attempt to discharge the duties of the Foreign Office in a spirit of self-respectful moderation, on national and not personal grounds. Lord Malmesbury's chief difficulty was with France. He had to conciliate a disappointed ally, and yet to refuse the very concessions which had been demanded as the price of the alliance. Thanks to the skill and courtesy which Lord Malmesbury threw into the negotiations, and also, it were unfair not to admit, to the excellent temper and returning moderation of the Emperor, the difficulty was successfully overcome. A couple of despatches settled the business, and in a marvellously short space of time it was announced that the relations of the two countries were never on a more satisfactory footing. Instead of a declaration of war, there came an invitation to the Cherbourg festivities, and about the time when Napoleon was to have been, like another Caesar, wading through the surf at the head of his legions in an invasion of these islands, Queen Victoria was entertained as a guest on French soil. So far we had lost nothing by the assertion of our parliamentary independence. Malmesbury had succeeded where Palmerston had failed. Another legacy of Lord Palmerston's government was disposed of with success. We refer to the release of the two Englishmen taken on board the *Cagliari*. Ever since the middle of 1857 our countrymen had been unjustly confined and cruelly treated by the King of

Naples. Their capture was proved to have been illegal, and there was an utter absence of evidence tending to implicate them in the scheme of the Genoa conspirators; yet for seven months Lord Palmerston allowed them to lie in prison, replying to the indignant interpellations addressed to him in the House of Commons with bland deprecation and simpering apologies. Lord Malmesbury soon took the matter in hand. In concert with the Piedmontese government, a note was addressed to that of Naples, demanding the immediate release of the ship and crew, together with an indemnity for the two engineers, or a reference of the question to the arbitration of one of the second-rate powers. This energetic conduct was decisive. Before the reception of the Piedmontese note, the King of Naples signified his assent to the demands of Great Britain, leaving to us the gratification of restoring the Cagliari and its crew to Piedmont. On other transactions for which the Foreign Office is responsible, public opinion has pronounced a less favorable verdict. The bombardment of Jeddah was a blunder and a crime. While professedly anxious to maintain the authority of Turkey, we usurped the rights of the Sultan, and humbled him among his own subjects by making war on one of the principal cities of the empire on pretence of punishing assassins, and that at the very moment when, at our own request, an imperial commission was on its way to institute a judicial inquiry. If Turkey had been strong enough to resent the insult, we should have had a war on our hands; as it was, we got off with an apology.

If we add to these the disputes to be referred to hereafter—with the United States, respecting the right of search—we have exhausted the overt acts of the year. Everybody, however, knows full well, that in foreign politics the events which make the biggest noise are often surpassed in significance by others of which we hear nothing but the faintest and vaguest sounds. The anxieties which finish up the year, and which have already produced certain effects on the Paris Bourse, do not arise from the events we have narrated, except as they may have been symptomatic of currents underneath. Comparing the "political situation" at the beginning and the end of the year, it is impossible not to detect an indefinite but important change. The Anglo-French alliance is no longer the sheet-anchor of our foreign policy. Rightly or wrongly, we are shifting round on an opposite tack, and are looking up resources in other quarters. Perhaps the most precise measure of this change is to be found in the more intimate footing on which we stand with Austria. Our traditional policy is to play Austria against France. Whenever the presumed intention of the cabinet of Paris inspires alarm, we hasten at once to establish a good understanding with Vienna. For the same reason, a disposition may be discerned to put ourselves right with Russia, and within the last few days the principal organ of Lord Derby's government has endeavored to point out that our alliance with France by no means interdicts a friendly relationship with St. Petersburg. To these amicable overtures, considered in themselves, we have not the slightest objection, but as instruments of intrigue, as indications of nascent alliances for ulterior ends, they are to be regarded with jealous suspicion. Englishmen will never be found wanting when their independence or their honor is invaded, but they will do well to guard with the most sedulous caution against being involved in wars which are got up for dynastic purposes, and which, however specious the pretence on which they are commenced, rarely fail to cheat the hopes of freedom.

#### RUSSIA AND THE NORTH.

The past year has witnessed several occurrences in the north of Europe which, apart from their domestic importance, are not without interest in connection with the general progress of events. A vast revolution has been commenced in Russia in the enfranchisement of the serfs. Whether the Emperor will be strong enough to carry out this just and enlightened

policy in the face of a serious opposition from the great landed proprietors, is a question on which it would be premature to decide. It is said that troops are being concentrated in the neighborhood of the Austrian frontier, and that the Emperor of the French looks for the co-operation of Russia in his presumed designs against the Italian possessions of Austria. For ourselves, we place but slender reliance on such rumors. There is no identity of interests between Russia and France. The dynastic exigencies of Napoleon do not coincide with the political requirements of those domestic reforms on which the Emperor Alexander has set his heart. We can easily divine the origin of the rumors to an opposite effect, but we can also the extreme improbability of their being true. While Russia is taking the first steps in civilization—the elevation of its serfs to personal liberty, Prussia is taking another, a good deal more advanced, but in the same direction, in giving to its intelligent population a more active share in the functions of government and legislation. The constitution which the citizens of Berlin wrung by insurrection from the frightened court, has turned from a dead letter into a political reality. The internal changes in the Prussian monarchy have already produced effects outside. The assumptions of Austria must be accommodated to the growth of its great Germanic rival. Every increase of Prussia's political strength is an increase of the political weight of Germany, and a new barrier to ambitious tendencies beyond the Rhine.

#### COMPLICATIONS.

Perched, each on its own eyrie, stand the "great powers," the eagles of dominion, looking abroad for carrion. Nor is the prospect hopeless. The political world is seldom without two or three dead carcasses, lying ready to tempt carnivorous appetites. The weak States are not always the little ones. The Swiss Republic, strong behind its barricade of mountains, but stronger in its wisdom, moderation, and valor, has successfully maintained its independence for nearly six centuries; while great empires, gotten by injustice, and established on the overthrow of national rights, hold their existence at the mercy of accidents. In some cases, this weakness springs from the recency of the conquest. The subject people have never accommodated themselves to their fetters, and are ready at any moment to fling them off. In others, the gradual decay of the conquering state has permitted the germs of ancient nationality, trampled down, but not killed, to spring up afresh, and the enslaved have silently become too powerful for their enslavers. Nobody can expect that such an appeal will be voluntarily listened to by those potentates who are able to despise it, nor, in the present state of international anarchy, resulting from the want of an administrative organization supported by the people, can we hope to see it enforced.

#### SERVIA AND THE EAST.

The past year has brought no change for the better in the domestic condition of Turkey, which means THE POLITICAL RELATIONS OF EASTERN EUROPE. We got through the preliminary arrangements relating to the organization of the Danubian Principalities without war, but we shall probably discover very soon that Moldo-Wallachia has not, therefore, ceased to be a bone of contention. The diplomatists assembled at Paris in their wisdom devised, under the name of a constitution, one of the most intricate pieces of political machinery extant, so full of delicate and impossible movements, that it will be a marvel of the rarest kind if a year ever pass by without some dispute between the Suzerain Sultan and his independent, but fettered subjects. A squabble of this sort is already announced. The crowning peculiarity of the arrangement is, that no such misunderstanding can take place without empowering the great powers to act as adjudicators. The Sultan consents to hold this part of his empire as a vassal to those who have assumed the title of

protectors; and ten to one but every time he quarrels with the Moldo-Wallachians, his protectors will quarrel with one another—thus settling strife by strife perennially. But the Principalities are, for the moment, forgotten in the more serious disturbances which have taken place. At the beginning of the year Montenegro was in rebellion. The hardy mountaineers, partly goaded to resistance by the exactions of the Turks, and partly impelled by a desire to take advantage of the Sultan's weakness to establish their independence and extend their narrow territories to the Adriatic, rose as one man under their bishop-prince, and defeated the Turks in several sanguinary encounters.

Thus another opportunity was furnished for displaying the discordant policy of the protecting powers. Austria, supported by England, was anxious to put down the revolt by force of arms; while France and Russia interfered to prevent the Turks from sending reinforcements by sea, which would probably have ended in the entire subjugation of the Montenegrins. It was finally agreed that an armistice should be proclaimed between the belligerents, and that the territorial questions in dispute should be settled by a commission. This plan has been carried out, and for the present the mountaineers have settled down into surly quiet. While these events were transpiring in Montenegro, it was rumored that dangerous symptoms of disaffection were spreading through the contiguous provinces, particularly in Servia. The apprehended crisis has occurred, and is at this moment one of the most menacing perils to the peace of Europe. The Servians are a simple and hardy race, living quietly on their farms and homesteads, but tenacious of ancient rights and customs, and jealously sensitive on the score of religion and nationality. After quietly submitting to their Turkish conquerors for many centuries, they rose in arms about half a century ago, under the leadership of Kara George, who, originally a shepherd, became a brave commander, and ultimately the recognised Prince of Servia. The Servians, becoming dissatisfied with his government, expelled him, and elected Milosch Obrenovitch in his stead, who, in turn rendering himself unpopular by his tyrannical policy, was supplanted by Alexander, the son of Kara George. This is the prince who has just been solemnly deposed, and Milosch, now advanced in years, has been invited to reassume the administration of affairs. Considering that the reigning prince must always be recognised by the Porte, these frequent changes reveal pretty plainly the Servian taste for independence. Austria is startled by something so very like revolution close to her own frontier, and has assembled troops for the purpose of occupying Belgrade, if the Turks should require assistance. Russia and France view the matter with different eyes, true to their policy of protecting the Christian states in their acquired liberties. Practically, the matter stands thus: If you enter Servia, somebody else will cross the Alps. Short of this, the only remedy will be the appointment of another commission. It will probably occur to many that since such emergencies happen so often, it would be the best plan to appoint one commission once for all to govern the Turkish Empire.

#### ITALY

This "classic land" is once more said to be on the eve of some great revolution, which is to drive out one set of foreigners by bringing in another. Two sets of causes are at work in producing this apprehended result. On the one hand, a legion of unhappy circumstances conspire to produce a widespread and perfectly justifiable feeling of discontent. The finest portions of Italy are ruled by foreign powers, with whom the people have not the remotest sympathy. As happened a thousand years ago, heavy Germans, from beyond the Alps, trample down the people with arbitrary decrees and fiscal exactions. The gay and sensitive Italian is guarded by a butcher with big hands and an ugly knife in his belt. The tyranny of these foreigners extends over one-half the Peninsula, and fraternises with the despotism which broods over the rest. But foreign domination is not the only evil of which the Italians

complain. Their native princes, Bomba for example, are, with one exception, as bad as the foreigners; and the most ancient dynasty of all, the dynasty of St. Peter, is probably the worst. Give us, cry the patriots, a free and united Italy, and their cry has reason in it. If this were the whole story, Italy need not be a carcase to be preyed upon, and Europe need give itself no anxiety as to its fate. Italian patriotism would settle everything. Unluckily the Austrians and the French—the old Germans and Gauls—stand ready to fight over it. Sardinia, though a native power, is not less selfish; and as the Duke of Milan, to increase his own influence in Italy, invited over the legions of Charles VIII., so Sardinia is eager to seize Lombardy by the help of Napoleon. The defeats of 1848 still rankle in the bosom of Sardinia; the confiscations of property in Lombardy belonging to Sardinian subjects, and the unvarying hostility of the press on both sides, have kept open the quarrel which now promises to end in an open rupture. The threatening language recently ascribed, it would seem, on authentic grounds, to King Victor Emanuel, and the curt sentences only a week since by Napoleon to Baron Hubner, the Austrian Ambassador at Paris, are accepted, we must wait to see whether rightly or not, as menaces of an approaching war. There is not the slightest doubt that if Napoleon resolves upon going to war he will defend that course by many specious reasons. We, for our part, have had enough of that sort of reasoning. We have learned to distrust the hollow vows which the armed invader piously presents at the shrine of freedom, as if hypocrisy and mendacity could consecrate ambition, and blind the eyes of earth or heaven. A French invasion means French tyranny, and one tyranny is too much like another to justify the shedding of torrents of blood in effecting the exchange. So far for the present; the year upon which we have now entered must be left to tell us whether these auguries will become facts.

#### EUROPE IN ASIA.

The prodigious force, both material and moral, which civilization has concentrated in these parts of the world, is strikingly demonstrated by the circumstance that, while Europe is thus wasting its energies in domestic discord, it has sufficient left to work out gigantic changes in the condition of the East. The relations of Europe with that distant portion of the globe exhibit on a grand scale phenomena precisely similar to those which we have noticed at home. Strength invading weakness, the big man falling foul of the little man, and bringing him to terms by dint of larger brain and harder muscle.

#### ENGLAND'S INDIA BILL.

The India bill remains the most notable production of the session. In reality it effected little. Part of the old board found seats in the new council, and the remaining seats were filled up by men of kindred sympathies. The power of retaining office for life endows the new council with considerable independence, while the centering of all responsibility in the Secretary of State for India, is intended to bring it under the effective control of the House of Commons. These remarks would have applied with equal appropriateness to the old Leadenhall-street Board and, in point of fact, the only important change effected by the bill, is the nominal transfer of the government of India from the company to the crown, a change which, nevertheless, considering the influence of mere names, is by no means to be undervalued. The Queen appears in Hindustan in the light of a new ruler; an amnesty comes with the best grace from her hands; and the natives have already expressed their agreeable surprise that she should have consented to take up the public debts of the late government.

This being so, the title in Ezekiel xxxviii. 13, is still descriptive of the British power, only that the said India bill gives more prominence to the "Young Lions thereof" than they had before.

EDITOR.

