

**HERALD**  
**OF THE**  
**KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.**

“*And in their days, even of those kings, the Eloah of the heavens shall set up A KINGDOM that shall not be abolished FOR AGES, 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 THE AGES.*”—DANIEL.

---

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., OCTOBER, 1859  
Volume 9—No. 10

---

**LECTURE ON THE HISTORIC EVIDENCE OF THE AUTHORSHIP AND  
TRANSMISSION OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

BY S. P. TREGELLES, LL. D.  
(Continued from page 202.)

I WILL, now, first consider the evidence which relates to Paul's Epistles, —then that which bears on the authenticity of the Gospels, —then the other books must be considered separately: in this part of the subject a distinction must be made between those books of which Eusebius speaks as universally received, and those which he says were opposed by some.

PAUL'S EPISTLES.

In the latter part of the second century we find testimony to the knowledge and use of thirteen Epistles of Paul, as certain and indubitable as we have that they are now known and used. The fact is alike admitted by friends and foes of Revelation, that the Church then had these Epistles, even as we now have them, and that they attributed them to that Apostle. Proofs of this will be given presently.

Now, the evidence by which letters are authenticated to future ages is often of a peculiar kind: a letter has not only a writer but also a party to whom it is addressed. If I wish to bring forward a letter as an evidence, it is often sufficient if I can show that such letter has been preserved in proper custody; —if the party to whom it professes to be addressed preserves it as genuine, this is a presumption of the strongest kind that it is so: the business of proving that it is *not* so rests with the opposite party.

Thus, those epistles which are addressed to *Churches* may be attested in a manner peculiarly strong, from the fact that such Churches preserved them and read them publicly and habitually.

The collection of Paul's Epistles is sufficiently shown by the manner in which they are mentioned in the Canon in Muraton; —that this reception of those documents was no private

or local peculiarity is manifest from the fact that they were equally used in Alexandria, at Carthage, and in Gaul.

This is proved by the citations of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Irenaeus. This Clement in the latter part of the second century, was the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria: he speaks of Paul's several Epistles by name, and cites them, with the single exception of the short Epistle to Philemon; this too would doubtless have been mentioned had he anywhere given a *list* of the Epistles. \* He speaks of the Gospel collection under the name by which it was often designated, of *Evangelium*, and the collection of Paul's Epistles by name of *Apostolos*, or Apostle, which was early appropriated to them: this name seems to have originated in the circumstance that the collection of Epistles then contained the writings of *one* Apostle.

\* The following are places in Clement of Alexandria, in which he cites the several Epistles: —*Rom.* Paed. p.117. Strom. p. 457; 1 *Cor.* Paed. p. 96; 2 *Cor.* Strom. p. 514; *Gal.* Strom. p. 468; *Ephes.* Paed. p. 88; *Phi.* Paed. p. 107; *Col.* Strom. p. 277; 1 *Thes.* Paed. p. 88 2 *Thes.* Strom. p. 554; 1 *Tim.* Strom. p. 383; 2 *Tim.* Strom. p. 448; *Titus*, Strom. p. 299.

Contemporary with Clement was Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, in Gaul: he gives as explicit a testimony as possibly could be borne to the same collection of Epistles; he mentions each of them, and cites them as familiar writings, with the same exception of the short Epistle to Philemon. #

# The following references show passages in which Irenaeus cites the different Epistles: —*Rom* 1. iii. c. 16, § 3; 1 *Cor.* 1. iv. c. 27, § 3; 2 *Cor.* 1. iii. c. 7, 16. *Gal.* 1. iii. c. 16, § 3; *Ephes.* 1. v. c. 2, § 3; *Phi.* 1. iv. c. 18, § 4; *Col.* 1. iii. c. 14. § 1; 1 *Thes.* 1. v. c. 6, § 1; 2 *Thes.* 1. iii. c. 7, § 2; 1 *Tim.* 1. i. c. 1, § 1; 2 *Tim.* 1. iii. c. 3, § 3; *Titus*, 1. iii. c. 3, § 4.

Tertullian was a presbyter in the north of Africa: he used all the thirteen Epistles to which Paul's name was attached: of that to Philemon he speaks as distinctly as the rest. +

+ Some of Tertullian's citations are pointed out in the following references: —*Rom.* Scorp. c. 13; 1 *Cor.* De Praes. c. 33; 2 *Cor.* De Pudic. c. 13; *Gal.* Adv. Marc. 1. 5; *Ephes.* Adv. Marc. 1. 5; *Phi.* De Res. Carn. c. 23; *Col.* De Praes Haer. c. 7; 1 *Thes.* De Res. Carn. c. 24; 2 *Thes.* De Res Carn c. 24; 1 *Tim.* De Praes Haer. c. 25; 2 *Tim.* Scorp. c. 13; *Titus*, De Praes. c.6; *Phile.* Adv. Marc. 1. 5.

Now, the manner in which these early writers used these Epistles does not merely prove that they themselves knew them, and believed them to be genuine documents, but it does a great deal more, for it shows that Christians in general so received them at the time in question. These writers appeal to the Epistles as familiarly as a modern author or preacher would do; they habitually quote them, as though their authority were as much admitted by other Christians as by themselves.

Now, such a testimony as this carries us of necessity a long way farther back than the mere point of time at which these men *wrote*; it takes us at least to the earliest period of their knowledge as Christians. It shows that even then this collection of writings, bearing the name of the Apostle Paul, was in circulation amongst the Churches both in the East and the West. It shows that this must have been the case, at least in the former part of the second century; that

is, in the days of the many who were then still living, who had belonged to the Church while it was still possessed of apostolic training.

The weight which the diversity of the locations of these writers gives to their evidence, can hardly be over estimated. We have not a trace of such a thing as one part of the Church knowing this collection, and another not possessing it. It was the common possession of the Christians, with which the teachers, and the communities which they taught, were alike acquainted.

And further, it was not the Christian community alone which was acquainted with the collected Epistles of the Apostle Paul. In the second century, one of the most remarkable separatists from the Church, Marcion of Pontus, formed out a religious system for himself: he considered that Paul only fully understood the principles of *true* Christianity, and to his teaching he professed to adhere exclusively. Marcion's leading opinions were an entire rejection of the doctrine of the *incarnation and sufferings of the Son of God, and a rejection of the Old Testament*, as something which was not from the true God. He used as authoritative Scripture one Gospel, which contained the narrative of Luke, with the omission of all that related to the birth, etc., of Christ, and a collection of Paul's Epistles, from which he excluded (as we learn from Tertullian) those to Timothy and Titus: he retained that to Philemon, so that Marcion's knowledge of this short Epistle is so far valuable as an early acknowledgment of its existence, and that it was owned to be Paul's. The time when Marcion began to spread his peculiar opinions, from Pontus to Rome, was about the year 130; so that we have thus a further proof of Paul's Epistles having been collected and used in that form before that time.

I said, that the testimony which connects any particular document with a community to which it was addressed, possesses a peculiar force. In this point of view an appeal of Tertullian has no small value: by this allusion we learn, amongst other things, that Paul's Epistles were read in the second century, in the Christian assemblies, as authoritative Scripture.

He says: —"Come now, thou who desirest better to exercise thy curiosity in that which relates to thy salvation: go through the Apostolic Churches, in which the chairs of the Apostles preside in their places, in which their authentic letters are recited, resounding the voice and representing the face of each one. Is Achaia near thee? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast Thessalonica. If thou canst direct thy course into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near Italy, thou hast Rome, whence authority is ready at hand for us also [at Carthage, where he was writing; the authority is that of the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans]. How happy is that Church on which Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood; where Peter suffered in the same manner as his Lord; where Paul was crowned with the death of John [the Baptist]; where the Apostle John, after he had been cast into the fiery oil and had suffered nothing, was banished to an island! Let us see what it learned, what it taught: it accords with the Churches of Africa also. It knows one God, the Creator of all things, and Christ Jesus, born of the Virgin Mary, the Son of God the Creator, and it knows the resurrection of the flesh: it mingles the law and the prophets with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles."—(*De Praes. Hoer.*, cap. 36.)

This last clause refers to the practice of reading equally in the Christian assemblies the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

It may now sound strange to hear Tertullian connecting what the Church of Rome had learned from the Apostles with that which it taught others: —*now* we see the sad and solemn contrast. Paul taught it the free grace of the gospel—justification through the faith of Christ: —“if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” Does Rome teach this *now*? It was to this Church that Paul addressed the warning to the Gentiles, who had been grafted into the good olive tree: —“if thou continue in his goodness, —otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.” Was there not a solemn prophecy veiled under this conditional threatening?

The testimony of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenaeus, connected as they all were with the apostolic age (especially Irenaeus, as I shall have occasion to show), might suffice, as proving conclusively that, from the Apostles' days and onwards, these Epistles were used and read as Paul's, —that the Churches to which most of them were addressed owned them as such, and that their genuineness was a fact of common knowledge. In *opposition* to this, there is *no evidence* whatever; it is not, in fact, a *balance* of testimony, for all is on one side; if, then, anything be said in opposition, it is only surmise and conjecture: of what weight are they in comparison with proved facts?

If these Epistles were not genuine, *when* could the falsification have taken place? It could not have been later than the early years of the second century; and then we must suppose that either it was a common conspiracy of all Christians to give currency to false Epistles, —a conspiracy in which Italy, Gaul, North Africa, Asia, and Egypt, and further, the heretic Marcion, in part, combined, —or else that the whole sprung from the pen of daring forgers, who not only persuaded all Christian communities that these Epistles proceeded from the Apostle Paul, but who even succeeded in causing seven Churches to believe that they had received Epistles from Paul, which they never had received. Such are some of the difficulties which must be grappled with when conjectural endeavours are made to set aside the force of clear evidence.

But we are able to carry our lines of evidence to some of these Epistles yet farther back.

In the first century of our era lived Clement of Rome: we possess one genuine Epistle which he addressed to the Church at Corinth. The Church of Rome ranks this Clement as the first of her Popes of that name; it is, however, unfortunate that some writers say he was the *second* Pope, others the third, others the fourth, and others the fifth, \*—so doubtful is the alleged papal succession at the very beginning. #

\* The early pontifical lists agree better in the names than in the order; some give the succession, 1, Peter; 2, Linus; 3, Cletus (or Anencletus); 4, Clement: others place Clement between Linus and Cletus; others, again, divide Cletus or Anencletus into two persons (thus introducing a fictitious bishop); while others place Clement immediately after the Apostle Peter. This last opinion is not common in the Church of Rome; it is however, maintained by the R. Cath. Prof. Hefele of Tubingen: see his *Patres Apostolici*, ed. 3, Prolegg. p. xxxvi. “colligimus . . . S. Clementem ipsi. S. Petro successisse.”

# In the beginning there was no "*Bishop of Rome*." Paul's Epistle, was written to "the Saints in Rome called of Jesus Christ," constituting "one body in Christ"—ch. i. 6, 7; xii. 5: and over this body were, not one mortal bishop, but several, having gifts differing according to the grace given to each, "fitting them for prophesying, ministering, teaching, exhorting,

imparting, ruling, and showing mercy—xii. 6, 8. Over all these "*elders*" was "the Chief Shepherd and Bishop," Jesus Christ. —I. Pet. ii. 25; v. 4. — *Editor*.

But leaving the advocates of Rome to settle such knotty points, the fact is indisputable that in the first century Clement addressed the Corinthian Church thus: —

“Why then do we rend and tear in pieces the body of Christ, and raise seditions against our own body? Your schism has perverted many; it has discouraged many; it has caused diffidence in many and grief in us all: and yet your sedition continues still. Take the Epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle into your hands: —what did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel? In truth he wrote to you by the Spirit concerning himself and Cephias and Apollos, because that even then ye had made party-divisions.”—(*Ep. ad Cor. cap. 47.*)

Thus, in the first century, did one, whom after ages have designated as a Pope, write to a contentious Church; he uses no anathematizing threats; he even writes, not in his own name, but in that of "the Church that sojourneth at Rome;" and the authority that he wielded was the Scripture written by Paul. Would that Clement XI., who professed to be the successor of *this* Clement, had been actuated by a similar spirit, instead of fulminating direful anathemas against any who maintain that "the reading of holy Scripture is for all!"—(*Constitution "Unigenitus."*)

This Epistle of Clement seems to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem (see *Hefele*, p. xxxv.); at all events it was in the first century, and not more than from thirty to forty years after that of Paul to the Corinthian Church, so that not a few would, in the ordinary course of things, be still living at that place to whom the rebuke of the Apostle had been addressed.

Now, Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians was one of solemn reprehension, and yet that Church held it fast as genuine—a plain proof that it *knew* it to be such: the nature of the case, even if there were no other impossibilities, would preclude the thought of forgery. *The Epistle was an evidence that condemned them, and yet they preserved it.*

We find, too, from a letter of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to the Roman Church in the second century, that the Corinthians publicly read also this Epistle of Clement; so that it, too, receives its attestation from those whose practical conduct it condemned.

It is not my object now to speak directly of the authority and inspiration of the New Testament books; this Epistle, however, attested as it is by strict lines of evidence of the strongest kind, as actually written by Paul to the Corinthian Church, may call for a passing notice from the peculiar nature of its contents. The writer speaks of the miraculous powers in the gift of tongues which he himself possessed; he mentions this as well known by those to whom he wrote; and their reception and preservation of the Epistle is a proof that such was the fact; as, endued with such powers, he claims such authority as to say, "If any man judge himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." He claims authority from God which the Corinthians *knew* to be confirmed by miraculous powers. And further, he speaks of such powers as bestowed on some of the Corinthians themselves, —a plain proof of the reality of the whole statement: to imagine the contrary would not only include the supposition that the writer had lost his reason, but that also his readers at Corinth were *all* similarly afflicted.

It is also worthy of notice how Paul speaks of the leading *facts* of Christianity as matters of common knowledge. His appeal to the then still surviving majority of a company of more than five hundred, who had themselves seen the Lord Jesus after his resurrection, carries with it the greatest force: it presents to us the evidence of a body of persons who knew from their own eyesight the truth of the leading miracle of the gospel.

Clement of Rome does not make it his practice to quote the books of the New Testament expressly, although, as in the present case, it is evident that he was acquainted with them. I will, however, give one sentence of his: he says, —“casting away from ourselves all unrighteousness and wickedness, covetousness, debate, malignity and deceit, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, despitefulness and pride, vain-gloriousness and inanity. For those that commit such things are hated by God, and not only those that commit them, but those also that have pleasure in them.”—(*Ep. 1 ad Cor.* cap. 35.)

It would be a mere waste of words to seek to *prove* that Clement had Rom, i. 29-32 in his mind and memory. Such sequences of words and thoughts cannot be fortuitous. He is writing in the name of the Roman Church, which thus acknowledges the Epistle to the Romans.

I turn from Clement to Polycarp, whom I have already mentioned. This ancient witness of Christ addressed, in the early part of the second century, an Epistle to the Church of Philippi, in which he speaks of the Epistle which Paul had written to them—(cap. iii.). A large part of this letter is such an interweaving of sentences from the New Testament books, as evinces plainly not only the knowledge of them on the part of the writer, but also the perfect familiarity of his mind with them—a familiarity as great as that which we should find in any modern sermon.

The following are specimens: —“The love of money is the beginning of all sorrows: *we brought nothing into this world, neither have we anything to carry out*”—(cap. iv.). In another place he says, “*We must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and each one must give account of himself* ”—(cap. vi). In another passage he says, “*Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?*”—(cap. xi.) Again, “*Be ye angry and sin not, and let not the sun go down upon your wrath*”—(cap. xii.). How distinctly do we see that Polycarp uses the first Epistle to Timothy, that to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, and that to the Ephesians! The use of the last-mentioned book is all the more striking from the sentence of the Old Testament being combined with the same addition. He also in another place refers to the same Epistle, saying,—“knowing that by grace ye are saved, not of works”\*(cap. i.).

\* In speaking of the Epistles, which bear Paul's name, as received in the former part of the second century, it is proper to state that the Epistle which the Church writers received as that to the *Ephesians*, was styled, by Marcion, to the *Laodiceans*. Our copies call it, to the Ephesians; the question, however, is not one of authenticity, but only of name in the address;—both parties were equally agreed that it was written by Paul.

We are thus able to trace the common use of a *collection* of Epistles, bearing Paul's name, to an *early* part of the second century: we can show that no possibility of *mistake* could be admitted in such a case, for the testimony is given alike by many countries; imposture is equally impossible, for that could not be supposed without believing that all Christians everywhere were so possessed with a spirit of falsehood as to put forth holy writings as those

of the Apostle Paul, and that for no imaginable reason, —and that this could be done without any trace of such an imposition being recorded, and without any voice being raised against it, either *in* the Church or amongst the bodies separated from it. No proof is more mathematically certain than that by which the contrary is proved to be absurd or impossible.

The testimonies which bring us back to the time of contemporaries of Paul, as to some of these Epistles, have no small cogency when we compare these Epistles together: they bear so thoroughly the impress of the same mind.

Now, there are no ancient works possessed of greater weight of evidence than these writings before us. We receive Cicero's letters as genuine, and yet no one supposes that we could find *each* one severally mentioned by an ancient writer; the quotations from some are considered as evidence to the collection as such. Here how much stronger is the case! These Epistles are all mentioned severally as existing in the former part of the second century—as being then known as documents of established credit, —not some anonymous productions, but each bearing on its front the certificate of its origin which was then, and had previously been, regarded as authentic. It would be impossible to be more absolutely certain even as to the letters of Romaine or of John Newton.

#### THE FOUR GOSPELS.

I now pass on to the collected Gospels.

There is, to some minds, a difficulty in grasping the events of ages long past as definitely as if they had been of more recent occurrence. Let us then consider the collected Gospels, not as living, in the nineteenth century, on the shore of the English Channel, but as those might do, who, in the second century, dwelt on the banks of the Rhone.

We find there a venerable teacher, Irenaeus, the bishop of the Church at Lyons; from him we may ask for information on this subject. What can he tell us of the collected Gospels which the Christians used?

Irenaeus says that the Gospels were *four*, and he gives most elaborate illustrations to show (as he thinks) that their number could neither be greater nor less. He illustrates his opinion by comparing the four faces of the cherubim with the four Evangelists; and he rests so fully on the Gospels being then known as *a collection*, that he calls the volume "*a fourfold Gospel*." He describes them severally thus: —

"That which is according to John narrates Christ's princely, potential, and glorious generation, saying, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God,' and 'all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.' Wherefore that Gospel is full of all confidence, for his person is such. Now, that which is according to Luke, having a priestly impress, commenced with Zacharias the priest burning incense to God. For now was the fatted calf prepared, which should be slain, because of the finding again of the younger son. Matthew preaches his birth according to man, saying, 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham;' and again, 'Now the birth of Christ was on this wise.' This Gospel, then, is of a human form, on which account, throughout the whole of the Gospel, the meek and lowly *man* is kept up. Mark commenced from the prophetic spirit descending from on high upon men,

saying, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Isaiah the prophet"—(l. ii. c. 11, § 8).

He speaks so repeatedly and habitually of the four Gospels and their authors, that no doubt can exist as to *his* testimony on the subject.

But could this reception of these four Gospels be a mere local peculiarity? —we may, in reply, look from the shore of the Rhone to the land of Irenaeus's early life: his testimony relates, not merely to the West, but also to Asia Minor, for that was the land of his Christian training. We may turn also to Egypt, where Clement of Alexandria gives at the same time an according testimony to the same four Gospels. So, too, we may look at Carthage, where, as we learn from Tertullian, who at this very time had arrived at man's estate, the same Gospels were used as the works of the same authors.

But did this unity, in the reception of the Gospel collection, originate in papal authority? Have we no traces of such claims at dominion over conscience, and may not this have influenced Irenaeus and others? Now, we *have* at this very time a remarkable claim made by the bishop of Rome—a claim, however, which this very Irenaeus, to whom we refer, *resisted*. The differences in the Church, as to the time of celebrating Easter, still continued; and Victor, bishop of Rome, usurped the authority of excluding from the fellowship of the Church the Asiatic bishops and communities that did not accord in judgment with him as to this point.

This caused Irenaeus to write to Victor in terms of earnest remonstrance, so that he clearly shows that as yet no one Church possessed such dominant power over others, as that books of Scripture or anything else could be received on its authority.

We may thus look around us from the shores of the Rhone, and in whatever direction we turn, at the latter part of the second century, we find the Christian communities holding the same Gospels which they considered that they had received from the Apostolic age.

But in what relation did Christian teachers then, such as Irenaeus, stand to the times of the Apostles? Irenaeus himself shall tell us. He says, in addressing Florinus, who had introduced erroneous doctrines, —"Thou didst never receive these doctrines from the elders who preceded us, who themselves had associated with the Apostles. When I was yet a boy, I saw thee in company with Polycarp in Asia Minor; for I remember what took place then better than what happens now. What we heard in childhood grows along with the soul, and becomes one with it, so that I can describe the place where the blessed Polycarp sat and spoke, his going in and out, his manner of life and the form of his person; the discourses which he delivered to the congregation; how he told of his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord; how he reported their sayings, and what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, his miracles and his doctrines. All these things were told by Polycarp in accordance with holy Scripture, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. Through the grace of God, given to me even then, did I listen to these things with eagerness; and wrote them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and by the grace of God, I constantly revive them again fresh before my memory. And I can witness, before God, that if the blessed and apostolic presbyter had heard such things, he would have cried out, stopped his ears, and (according to his custom) have said, ' O my good God! upon what times hast thou brought me, that I must endure this!' And he would have fled away from the place where seated or standing he had heard such discourses."

Such was the simple and definite line of information that connected Irenaeus with the age of the Apostles.

From Justin Martyr we learn something of the sacred books of the Christians, in which the history of our Lord was contained, which were in use amongst them in the former half of the second century.

This early Christian writer was born at Shechem, in Palestine, about (as is supposed) the year 90. After a vain search, for satisfaction, in the schools of philosophy, he became a Christian. In his first Apology, addressed to the emperor, Antoninus Pius, he describes the worship of the Christians; and after having mentioned what was written by "*the Apostles in the Memorials*, which they have made, which are called *Gospels*" he says, that on Sunday the Christians, whether in cities or in country-places, held an united assembly, in which "the Memorials of the Apostles or the Writings of the Prophets are read, as time may permit." \* In another place he describes these Christian writings more exactly; he says, "the Memorials which were drawn up by the Apostles and their companions."

\*[The following is Justin's full description of Christian worship in the second century: —

"On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell in the cities or in the country, and *Memorials of the Apostles* or the Writings of the Prophets are read, as time may permit. Afterwards, when *he who reads* has ended *he who presides* admonishes and exhorts by word, to imitate these good things. Afterwards, we all stand up together and pray; and, as we said before, when we have made an end of prayer, bread is brought, and wine, and water, and *he who presides* offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people add their assent, saying, *Amen*; and those things for which thanks were given are distributed, and are partaken of by each one; and they are sent by the deacons to those who are not present. Those who are well-off, and *who wish it*, contribute, each one according to his own purpose what he wishes, and the collection is deposited with him who presides; and he assists orphans and widows, and those who are in need, through sickness or other cause, and those who are in bonds, and strangers who may be sojourning in the place; and, in fact, he takes care of all who may be in need.

"We all hold this united assembly on Sunday, since it is the first day, in which God turned aside darkness and matter, and made the world; and Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day arose from the dead; for they crucified him the day before Saturday; and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, he was manifested to his apostles and disciples, and taught them things which we have offered, likewise for your attention."]

Now, I wish to direct your attention to the manner in which Justin speaks of the public and habitual reading of the Gospels in the Christian assemblies. He mentions it to the emperor as a fact open to the knowledge of all. Justin's testimony is good enough to prove it; but it rests on a yet stronger ground of evidence, for it *must* have been habitually true if it could be thus mentioned.

Thus, when Melanethon said, in the Augsburg Confession, "The Churches amongst us teach, with general consent, . . . that men cannot be justified before God by their own powers, merits, or works, but that they are justified freely for Christ's sake, through faith," the statement carried with it the guarantee of its truth. Now, Justin was well acquainted with the

Christian communities in many parts: he had sojourned at Ephesus, Alexandria, and Rome; and it is evident that the memorials called Gospels, written by the Apostles and their companions, were thus used in all the Churches of which Justin knew aught. Justin's writings contain repeated citations which substantially accord with our four Gospels; so that these citations might show, that the books which the Church universally used in the days when Irenaeus wrote, were the same that were in the hands of Justin. It is true that Justin cites loosely enough, and that he quotes from the Gospels two things that are not in ours; he cites, however, the Old Testament just as loosely, and refers to the Pentateuch for *two* facts which it does not contain: no one would, therefore, think that *his* Pentateuch was different from ours.

And yet some have said, that Justin only used apocryphal Gospels: if so, they must have resembled ours most marvellously, and they must have been attributed to authors who might be similarly described. And besides this, the whole of the Churches must have used the *same* apocryphal Gospels; and this must have been the case in the boyhood of that very Irenaeus, who is so explicit a witness to *our* four Gospels. It certainly would require some degree of credulity to believe that all the Churches everywhere did, between the years 150 and 175, *change* the Gospels which they read publicly every Lord's-day. Had they done this, how could they have received the newly-adopted documents with such reverence as they did? In fact, the identity of Justin's Gospels with those mentioned by Irenaeus, is more strongly evinced by the moral impossibilities implied in the contrary supposition, than it could be in any other way.

We have, however, direct evidence also: for Tatian composed a kind of harmony of the Gospels, which was known by the name of *Dia Tassarion*, i.e., "of the four," from its being an interwoven narrative from four Gospels. We learn from Irenaeus himself, that this Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, and that he fell into doctrinal errors, such as the condemnation of marriage, after his teacher's death. Tatian's Gospels were then evidently identical with those of Justin. We may also notice that the writer of the Canon in Muratori speaks of the Gospels of Luke and John by name, as the *third* and *fourth*; those of Matthew and Mark must undoubtedly have been described in the lost part of this fragment.

If, then, we see that the Churches everywhere used our four Gospels immediately after the apostolic age, and in the lifetime of the tens of thousands of Christians who had been contemporaries of the Apostles, it follows that this was nothing newly or suddenly adopted, but that it sprung even from the time when the apostolic guidance still continued. And what could have caused all Christians everywhere to read in public these four narratives, as the works of the Apostles Matthew and John, and of Mark and Luke, two companions of Apostles, except that they *knew*, as a fact, that these were their real authors?

I have dwelt long on a very plain case, simply because, in the present day, this is the very point of Christian evidence which is specially opposed. It is said that our four Gospels are not historical narratives, but that they came into existence at a later period than the time of the Apostles: that the accounts of Christ were at first *myths*, and that they were gradually embodied in a definite form. By a *myth* they seem to mean the personification of an idea: a *mythic* person would be the supposed character of a fable; —and to this they would bring down all that we know of the life and actions of our Lord. They say, that if we hold the Christ of our apprehension aright, it matters little whether we retain the belief in an *historical* Christ.\*

\*[The process of supposed ratiocination, by which historical facts and persons in Scripture are reduced to mere *myths*, is something of the following kind. It is assumed that man had an

intuitive consciousness of his own want of a deliverer; that this want led to the process of thinking out what sort of a deliverer was suited to the need, and *how* this redeemer should act in order to work out man's salvation: these ideas (it is then assumed) led to the *thought* of the incarnation of a divine person, —to his being *supposed* to have died, and risen, etc.; and then it is assumed that the Gospels sprung into existence at a later period, when these supposed thoughts had assumed a concrete form in the minds of those who had received them. But does man *naturally* know his need of such a salvation as that which God sets forth, through faith, in the blood of Jesus Christ? So far from this being the case, the scheme of Christianity runs directly counter to man's preconceived thoughts. The Cross of Christ was, indeed, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. The *mythic* theory is a present proof how little minds now like the mode of salvation set forth in the New Testament.

It is in vain to endeavour to set aside the existence and acts of historic personages by calling them *myths*. Julius Caesar would make (on the novel theory) a thorough *myth*. The recorded events of his life are so peculiar, —his connection with such varied countries, his actings from Britain to Egypt, might all be pronounced as proofs that he was not an *historic* person; he might thus be easily explained away into the embodiment of the idea of the transition of the Roman state from a republic to an empire, —of the spread of Roman institutions into the West and East, and the institution of Roman civilization into barbarous countries, such as Gaul and Britain. It might be suggested that some British writer gave the *myth* its form; for otherwise, why should his military success in Britain be represented as so incomplete? It might be argued that the accounts of Caesar's death show the whole to be *mythic*; for how else could the Roman senate solemnly confirm all Caesar's acts, and yet proclaim an amnesty for those who had assassinated him? Might not the fact, also, of the name of *Caesar* being used in all succeeding ages as a title, be taken as a proof of the absence of historic reality as to the alleged Julius Caesar?

These points are strong when compared with what the *mythic* theory has to object to the reality of Jesus Christ. What shall be said of a system which owns that man needs a Saviour, and yet deprives him of the historic reality of that Saviour to whom the Scripture testifies!]

It is difficult to analyze such vague thoughts. This, however, I know, that *if* the New Testament possesses one particle of authenticity, then the historical Christ is the person to whom it points. I can apprehend no Christ, no deliverer of guilty man, except that historical person—the Son of God, who became man, to redeem us men by the shedding of his blood, and who has risen again, and now sitteth at the right hand of God, from whence He shall come to be the Judge of living and dead. Our warrant for believing in *this* Christ is the record which we possess in the New Testament.

It is, indeed, marvellous how any imagination can have run so wild, as to think that a *supposed* myth about a *supposed* Christ can have become embodied in four narratives so simple and definite, and that the *real fact* of Christianity can have sprung out of such fancied dreams.

But it is said that, at this distance of time, the greatest uncertainty must of course spread over the scene. Nay, but lapse of time makes *no* difference with regard to *proved facts*: that which is proved to have been known truth eighteen hundred years ago, is known truth still. It is as certain *now* that Julius Caesar invaded Britain, as it was at the Christian era. But we have no occasion to look at these things from a long distance. We can take our stand in the latter part of the second century, and look back from that era to the apostolic age. The

opponents admit that our four Gospels were in general use A. D. 175. They suggest, however, that they came into existence, at least in their present form, between the year 150 and that year; that is to say, by some unknown and unrecorded cause, the Christians were induced everywhere in twenty-five years to adopt our Gospels, and also to *believe* that they had possessed them from the apostolic age. This is mythic and unhistorical with a vengeance.

It presents difficulties enough to be explained. The number of the copies of the Gospels which were in use at the admitted date, A. D. 175, would be, at a very moderate computation, *sixty thousand*, amongst the Christian communities throughout the Roman empire; —and all these copies must have been received and used without any opposing voice being raised!

Standing at the year 175, we might find enough individuals living who still remembered the apostolic age: they had only to look back seventy-five years, —as long as we have to the old American war; —it was not six months ago \* that Dr. Routh, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, was speaking to me, with clear memory, of events which occurred then and before, when he was a student in that University.

\* [That is, when this Lecture was delivered, October, 1851.]

It is thus of importance to trace our Gospels, step by step, backwards through the second century, for thus we show the baselessness of the mythic, unhistoric theory. And now, as to *single Gospels*, we can go yet further in our notices than we can of the collected volume.

At the close of the first century there were living at Ephesus, besides the Apostle John, two others of the immediate disciples of our Lord when on earth, —John the Presbyter, and Aristion. # Now, we know from Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, what John the Presbyter stated concerning the Gospels of Matthew and Mark: of Mark, he says, that he was the interpreter of Peter, and though not a hearer or follower of our Lord himself, he wrote down very carefully what Peter had narrated; so that (he adds) "*he erred in nothing.*" This testimony of an immediate disciple of Christ is deeply interesting. He speaks as clearly of Matthew's Gospel, mentioning that he wrote it in Hebrew.

# [The words of Eusebius (iii. 39) are, "Aristion, and John the Presbyter, the disciples of the Lord." In the "Edinburgh Review," July, 1851, p. 37, *note*, it is said that the words, "the disciples of the Lord," *are probably an interpolation.*" No reason is given why we should so regard them; and in looking at Dr. Burton's critical edition of "Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History," it appears that there is no authority whatever for expunging them. Not only is all external evidence in their favour, but also, if they were omitted, there would be no purpose in mentioning John the Presbyter, and Aristion in the passage, had they not been like Andrew, Peter, and the others, whose names are introduced, themselves immediate disciples of Christ when on earth.]

The endeavor to evade the force of this evidence is made to rest on the singular theory that John the Presbyter, and Papias who records his words, did not mean *our* Gospels of Matthew and Mark, but some other books of which we have no account whatever, which bore the same names! Suppose we were to suggest that the history of Thucydides, which we possess, is not that which the ancients cite as such, but another book bearing the same name. What would be said to this idea?

I have already shown how Polycarp interweaves in his epistle, words and sentences from the Epistles of the Apostle Paul: we find a similar introduction of words which exist in our Gospels. He writes thus: —“The Lord said, Judge not that ye be not judged; forgive and ye shall be forgiven; be merciful that ye may obtain mercy. With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again. And, Blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God”—(cap. 2). In another place, “The Lord said, The spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak”—(cap. 7.)

Clement of Rome, also, in his epistle has this statement: —“The Lord said, Be merciful that ye may obtain mercy; forgive that ye may be forgiven; as ye do so shall it be done to you; as ye give so shall it be given to you; as ye judge so shall ye be judged; . . . with what measure ye mete, therewith shall it be measured to you”—(cap. 13).

These sentences, especially those of Polycarp, appear like references, more or less exact, to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: the only reason for doubting is that these writers might have had some *oral* knowledge of this teaching of our Lord: —they refer, however, to what he said, as if *those to whom they wrote* knew of these things likewise.

Paul in this first Epistle to Timothy, speaks thus: —“The Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn;” and, “*The labourer is worthy of his reward.*” This latter sentence is found only in Luke x. 7; it appears to be linked by the Apostle with the citation from the Law under the common term of Scripture. There is, I believe, in the New Testament no instance of two sentences, joined by the copulative, being introduced with such a phrase as “the Scripture saith,” when the latter is merely an addition. I have no doubt myself that Paul gives us the earliest testimony, and that of an authoritative kind, to the Gospel of Luke, his companion.

Besides the evidence of writers who belonged to the Church, we may (as Irenaeus himself did) appeal to the Gnostic sects, who made more or less use of *our* Gospels. Thus, Marcion's Gospel was a truncated copy of Luke's, from which he extruded what struck him as inconsistent with his notion that our Lord possessed no real humanity; he left however, unamputated quite enough to refute his strange ideas. Indeed, while the different bodies separated from the church showed they were acquainted, in the second century, with all our four Gospels, it is pointed out by Irenaeus that *each* gospel, separately, was upheld by some one particular party—a plain proof of their existence before these bodies quitted the communion of the church.

Celsus, the heathen philosopher, who wrote at length against the Christians and their religion, is an important witness to the early existence and use of our Gospels.

Thus, then, we have distinct historic grounds for holding fast the epistles which bear Paul's name as being his genuine works, and for ascribing the four gospels to the authors whose names' they bear, that is, to use the words of Justin Martyr, to the “Apostles and their companions.”

I have not rested on other evidence, such as that of undesigned coincidence, by which Paley demonstrates so satisfactorily that the Epistle of Paul and the book of Acts are able, genuine works—that they *could not*, in fact be forgeries; this evidence is of a kind extremely cogent.

(*To be continued*)

---

## Analecta Epistolaria.

“Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, that he walk not naked, and they see his shame.”—JESUS, *in Rev.* xvi. 15.

### Italy Weighed in the Balance and Doomed.

*“Her sins have reached unto heaven” Rev- xviii. 5.*

The last article in this department of our paper was on the Italian Question. Since it was in the hands of the printer the battle of Solferino has been fought, and to the astonishment of all the world, an armistice has been proclaimed, and the preliminaries of peace signed by the belligerents at Villafranca. The campaign has been brief, bloody, and pregnant with great results. It lasted about two months, cost the combatants some hundred thousand lives, and not less than a hundred million sterling, and disappointed all their expectations. The king of Sardinia hoped to be king of Italy, but has only obtained the annexation of Lombardy to Piedmont; Louis Napoleon promised to expel the Austrians from the whole country, from the Alps to the Adriatic, but has expelled them from Lombardy alone: the Austrians expected to conquer Sardinia, but have been themselves conquered; the Revolutionists promised themselves the expulsion of the Austrians, the downfall of the Pope, and a free and united Italy; but have realized none of their hopes: the Pope, cardinals, and priests, trembling for their vile and worthless lives, are astonished to find their apprehensions unfulfilled, and their *“Holy Father”* apocalyptically styled *“the False Prophet’s Mouth”* the “Honorary President” of a paper confederation! All this is very remarkable, and as complete an imbroglio as could have been desired by the most inimical to the peace and prosperity of the wicked.

In our article alluded to above we said, *“As to Italian independence, that is a mere cry. There will be no such thing. The present is all delusive, and the excited hopes of all nationalities will be in the end defeated”*—p. 215. We did not state this as an *opinion*, but as an assured conviction demonstrable from Scripture. Italy cannot be free, independent and happy, because she is drunk with Romanism. So long as she worships idols, and her spiritual guides are blasphemers, liars, adulterers, and murderers, she must be tormented. “There is no peace for the wicked, saith Jehovah.” Romanism is the crime of Italy as well as its leprosy; and of this she cannot be relieved till the Lord come and the Saints arise to “execute the judgment written” upon the Roman “Devil and his Angels.”

Italy cannot be free, independent, and happy, because she is a great criminal. Italy is symbolized in Rev. xvi. 4, by “rivers and fountains of waters,” of which it is said in verse 6, *“they have shed the blood of saints and prophets.”* Italy in church and state is drunk with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Witnesses of Jesus.”—Rev. xvii. 6; therefore her “rivers and fountains” are turned into blood—*“and they became blood.”* The Scriptures say, “precious in the eyes of Jehovah is the death of his saints;” he will therefore certainly avenge them. Hence Italy, in church and state, the blood-stained murderess of the saints, must be punished of God before she can be free, independent, and blessed. It was the mission of Napoleon I. to give her blood to drink, and to fill her kingdom with darkness. And well he executed the work. His campaigns in Italy accomplished it. As the agent of the third angel power, he “poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood,” and, says John, “I heard the angel of the waters say, “Thou art righteous, O Lord, *who art, and wast, and SHALT BE*, because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of

saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy . . . Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments."

As the agent also of the fifth angel power, he descended "upon the *throne* of the beast, ROME;" "and the Beast's kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds." They repented not. The "darkness" was removed by the treaty of Vienna in 1815, by which the papacy was restored. But the Pope and his satanic synagogue of priests have not learned wisdom by the castigation they received; they forgot their pains and their sores, and have not repented of their deeds. All the world is in motion, but they are at a deadlock. There is no improvement at Rome; and all that partakes of its spirit waxes worse and worse: it is "the habitation of demons, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." It is Sodom, and cannot be reformed; therefore the punishment of Sodom awaits it. The Roman hierarchy has not repented, and never will repent of its adulteries, idolatry and murders. The recent massacre of unarmed men and helpless women and children by the Pope's mercenaries at Perugia, and their robberies there, are evidential of the unchanged diabolism of popery. The Pope sent his Swiss assassins to destroy his own children at Perugia, and when their bloody work was done, he thanked them for the service, and made their colonel a general. How unlike Jesus, whose representative the impostor pretends to be! He told Peter to put up his sword, and healed the ear of Malchus he had excised. He came to save men's lives, not to destroy them; and commanded Peter—"The first Pope"—as he is absurdly styled by papists—not to slay; "for," said he, "all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Pius IX. tells the world that he is Peter's successor, and under the orders of Jesus Christ; why, then, does he not obey orders; and instead of cutting off men's ears and destroying their lives with savage barbarity, open their ears, and heal them of the miseries under which they groan? But this is not his mission. Being an impostor and hypocrite, he assumes a character to which he has no scriptural claim. If he be Peter's successor at all, it is only in his attitude of Satan, whom he commanded to get behind him, as an offence to him; and a savorer of the things which be of men, and not of God. Such is the Pope; the Petrine Satan's successor, the great enemy of God and men. His throne is maintained by the sword of the Papal Kings: and therefore by the sword of God he and they are doomed to perish. But the end is not immediately, though happily not very far off.

The judgments poured out upon the Papacy— the Germano-Papal dominion—through the French under General Bonaparte, was only an installation of punishment—a simple foretaste of coming terror. It was a beginning of sorrow. It is not, however, the mission of "the dark and mysterious man," Napoleon III., to consummate the woe. He has too much respect for Pope Satan, and too much fear of his priests, to give them according to their deserts. His mission is to embroil their affairs in seeking to establish his theories. His policy is evidently not to abolish the pontifical kingdom, but to reform it; to abolish its abuses so far as to satisfy such of the middle classes of the Papal States as are sincere Romanists. This is what he terms the legitimate interests of satisfied nationalities; that is, his idea of what they ought to be satisfied with. But such a legitimate satisfaction will not satisfy Satan and his priests, who are unreformable; nor the revolutionists, who desire to get rid of pontifical government altogether. Louis Napoleon can therefore satisfy neither party; and therefore his policy can only embroil, and favor the development of a revolutionary conflict with the pontifical power.

Louis Napoleon's mission as far as developed is more one of policy than of conquest. *L'empire est toujours la paix* is consequently a principle always turning up when least expected. *The empire is always peace* though war's alarms are thundering on every side. He is

therefore the Napoleon of peace—always professing peace, and determined to have it, if it cost France £50,000,000 and 50,000 lives to obtain it! He is the incarnation of the peace and safety cry. He cried peace when elected emperor, and to secure it joined England in a two years' war against Russia. England cried out for continued war, but he commanded peace, and made it. Is he not therefore a man of peace! He was for peace and disarmament, and in a week after mustered near one hundred and fifty thousand soldiers on the plains of Lombardy to compel the Austrians to be at peace with their neighbors. He destroyed them by thousands, and all in the interests of peace; and when all the world was talking of war, and preparing to mingle in the strife, he cried peace; and though successful, doubtless, to his own astonishment, made overtures of peace to his imperial brother Francis Joseph, which were accepted. Could the Quaker politicians of England have been more peaceable under the circumstances? He made peace when all were for war, preparing for it, or predicting its long continuance. "No man could say where it would end," none remembered that the Napoleonic empire was always peace; and therefore none thought it would end in peace. But peace did come, and *it astonished the world*. But why be astonished? Because we are living in an epoch of astonishments, and it would be affectation to be otherwise than astonished. It is impossible to say how many more surprises we may witness before the Lord comes, because they are not *particularized* in the record; we are only informed there, that the Demon-Frog spirits shall work *wonders σημεια — remarkable events*. The events of the epoch are remarkable. They differ from the ordinary current of public affairs. They stand out as something startling and unexpected, which characterize the time as peculiar. The Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet open their mouths and speak under the inspiration of the Peace Prophet of the Frog nation. But that which comes out of them is "*unclean*" like the policy that works upon them. Louis Napoleon's professions are not to be depended on; for he cannot depend upon himself. He has no doubt learned this by his last adventure. Granting his sincerity, his power and will are not omnipotent. He wills, but he cannot fully develop his will, and therefore he deceives, unintentionally perhaps; still he deceives, and the world will not palliate or excuse the deception. Whatever he may intend, the result is the same. The world is deceived; therefore it distrusts, arms in defence, and at length comes to blows with the empire which is always peace.

Can any man be more moderate in success than Louis Napoleon? At the head of a victorious army does he not exhibit the Christian virtue of moderation, and does he not, as the Scripture exhorts, "Let his moderation be known unto all?" Beaten and demoralized though they were, instead of annihilating them, does he not like a good Samaritan, speak peace and comfort to the Austrians, the patrons of the Pope and all his abominations, and the savage destroyers of down-trodden Italy and Hungary? Nor does this display of moderation end here; he loves his enemy to the sacrifice of his friends, and becomes the good friend of the assassin of Italy. Can anything be more uncharitable than to suspect such a pink of moderation and self-denial? Having got Austria off his hands, England fears he may make a dash at her to avenge the defeat of Waterloo! Such a suspicion evinces an inadequate appreciation of his moderation in victory, and his professions of peace. To leave her without excuse, he has ordered the reduction of his army and navy to their peace establishment. It is to be hoped, however, that England will not be deceived by this. Within a week of the invasion of Lombardy, he said that the forces of France were upon their peace footing; and that therefore there was no scope for disarmament upon the part of France. His peace establishment is therefore in keeping with the peace of Napoleonism, which is "*always peace*" even in the midst of war. No neighbor can calculate upon his movements, for he is not under his own control. He is a tool in the hand of God; and the work he has to do is to make the reign of peace impossible. His policy troubles the whole habitable and will continue to do so. It

creates questions affecting Turkey, Austria, and the Pontifical Kingdom, which throw everything into confusion; and which the parties interested cannot settle without appeal to arms; and these appeals failing, as we have seen, only aggravate the malady and produce entanglements more complicated than before. Nevertheless, it works out the divine purpose, which is declared to be, "*the gathering of the Kings of the earth and of the whole habitable to the war of that great day of God Almighty.*" Rev. xvi., 14. To this end the nations are drifting. It is a consummation they cannot avoid. Things began to move in this direction in 1848; and no policy devisable by any of the governments can arrest them in their onward course to the adjudication of that great and terrible day. Now, the question is Austria and the Pontifical Kingdom; and soon it will be Turkey and the Holy Land; questions pregnant enough with disturbing elements to keep the powers in alternation between peace and war until the Lord comes to awake his warriors from the dust, that with Him they may "*avenge the land,*" and tread the Italian wine-press by the space of 1600 stadia, or about 200 miles. Rev. xiv., 20: — the width of the States of the Church, or territory of the Pontifical kingdom from the confines of Naples to those of the Duchy of Modena and Lombardy conjoined; also the breadth of the country from Ravenna upon the Adriatic to the Tiber at its opening into the Mediterranean sea.

But what is the situation laid open to the world by recent events? Before the war the Austrian military *prestige* was imposing even upon the French. Austria overawed all the populations of Italy, so that beyond the walls of Rome French influence was of no account. Such a situation as this made the coronation of Louis Napoleon by the Pope as emperor of the West and successor of Charlemagne, all but impossible. The Pope in the midst of an Austrianized Italy, and married to Austria by *Concordat*, with an Austrian cabinet also, could not be induced to crown a Bonaparte, proscribed by the treaty of Vienna which had restored the Papacy. Louis Napoleon, whose programme does not differ materially from his uncle's, if he would be legitimized among Catholic dynasties after his uncle's fashion, was bound to humble or break the Austrian power in Italy as a first step to his coronation. He has humbled, but not broken it. So long as it holds Venetia, Austria is in juxta-position with the Pontifical kingdom, being separated only by the Po. For the time being, the real master of Italy is Louis Napoleon. This position he will continue to hold so long as the Austrian archdukes are excluded from Parma, Modena and Tuscany; and should they be annexed to Sardinia, it would make no difference; for Sardinia however extended is virtually French. Thus the arena is now sufficiently cleared of the Austrians, and the Pope is really Louis Napoleon's captive. What doth hinder that he should be crowned to the prejudice of the ancient rights of Austria? Nothing but the obstinacy of the Pope, and the strong, unbroken influence of Austria in the papal councils. Popes are very perverse, and do not like to consecrate emperors who patronize such men as Garibaldi, Kossuth and Victor Emanuel. Louis Napoleon has shown himself to be a revolutionist; and the "Holy Father" regards a revolutionist as the devil into whose hands he does not desire to fall before his time. He will doubtless, therefore, temporize in pure papal fashion, in hope that something may turn up to bring the Austrians back to Lombardy and the Duchies with increased force. He has seen Austria humbled before, and yet recover herself. After action comes reaction. The death of Louis Napoleon would change the situation altogether; or a revolution might dethrone him; or a coalition of powers might aim at the same result; and in that event deliverance might come. But while the Pope might be speculating on accidents, Louis Napoleon might seek to quicken his perceptions and decisions by revolutionary pressure. Be this as it may, the situation is at present exceedingly revolutionary in its aspect. If Louis Napoleon keep Austria from crossing the Po, and leave the populations of Lombardy, Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and the Legations, to place themselves under what government they please, we shall doubtless soon hear a cry of distress from the Vatican; for

the papacy left to the mercy of the peoples would soon be abolished. Something remarkable is preparing. Either the revolution will exalt itself in Rome and Italy against the Pope's synagogue, or Louis Napoleon will be undutiful to "his holiness," and cause him to appeal to the kings of the earth for deliverance.

Whatever may turn up, one thing is certain, that it will tend to a crisis threatening the extinction of the Pontifical Kingdom in Italy. It is not easy to say what steps will lead to the crisis. Of the crisis itself there is no doubt; for it is written, "*The Ten Horns upon the Beast shall hate the Harlot, and shall make her desolate, and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.*"—Rev. xvii. 16. The Ten Kingdoms of the Roman Europe are to do this. But at present they are not seen to move in this direction. Hence, *that which is to move them has yet to be developed.* Louis Napoleon has opened the way for it, and the coming congress or conference will contribute to its further manifestation. When the motive power is *talked into being* it will take possession of their hearts, and cause them to combine to carry the policy into effect. The future conduct of the Italian Harlot will cause the kings to hate her. What that conduct will be does not yet appear; but we look upon the situation opened up by Napoleon with great interest to observe it. Doubtless the Pope and his advisers will be a great obstacle in the way of pacification; which will be a source of great irritation; for the vengeance of the powers will be intense. Rome will be occupied by a strong force, to make a combination of the ten powers necessary for its ejection. If England and her allies were to get possession of the city in connection with the revolutionists, we can easily conceive how the Catholic kings would hate the city in their hands. At present, there is no further indication of such a thing than the known sympathy of Lord John Russell for oppressed Italy, and the declared contempt of Lord Palmerston for the papal government as the worst upon earth, which it unquestionably is. The near future is far more interesting than the past. *The peace is a suspension of arms affording scope for the development of a new political phasis.* We could not see any thing in Scripture answering to the expulsion of Austria with a free and independent Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic: nor can we recognize there an Italian Confederation of petty States under the honorary presidency of the Pope. *These political devices do not answer to the apocalyptic symbols.* If they should appear, it could only be temporarily, like the unrecognized Roman Republic in 1849; and that as the means of superinducing the catastrophe of Rev. xvii. 10. But the peace suddenly made facilitates our conception of how this catastrophe may be superinduced. We see Austria humbled, but not broken; chafing under the humiliation, and doubtless watching her opportunity of retrieving the fortune of the day. We see the Pope and the priests Austrian in all their sympathies. We see the revolutionists and king of Sardinia hating the Italian Jezebel and her Austrian paramour. We see Louis Napoleon, the greatest power of the Continent, distrusted and disliked, and regarded as the disturber of the established order; a "moderate reformer" of the papal church and state, holding "the balance of power" between revolution and the governments, and ready to cast his sword into that scale which he thinks most conducive to the interests of France; that is, of himself and family. We see him too powerful in the estimation of England, Prussia, Germany, and Austria. All these things all observers can see as the conflicting elements of the situation created by the campaign in Italy, so suddenly suspended by his autocratic will. Here then is matter for the world-wide renewal of the conflict; not simply for the expulsion of Austria from the Alps to the Adriatic, and the independence of Italy, but for the abolition of the Pontifical Kingdom on the one hand, and for the putting down of Revolution and the restoration of the balance of power in the overthrow of Louis Napoleon, on the other. The development, however, of such a condition of things has its stages. All will not come at once. Yesterday, Louis Napoleon was in council with Kossuth and Garibaldi, and through them with "*the Revolution;*" to-day, he is in council

with the Emperor of Austria, one of their bitterest foes. It is evident, therefore, that there is no telling for twenty-four successive hours on which side he may be found. We may know this, that where he supposes his present interests are, there he will be till the situation changes. Hence, to-morrow he may be cooperating with Austria in restoring the Grand Dukes, and in subjecting the Legations to the temporal authority of the Pope, and the day after to-morrow he may be fighting to kick them all pell-mell into the Adriatic. There is no calculating upon his movements, for he is "a mysterious and irresponsible man:" he may head the revolution to-day; and to-morrow, be fighting against it strengthened by England, then his implacable foe.

But, we rather believe that he will secretly strengthen and develop the revolutionary element, for the purpose of keeping Austria in check. This policy is evidently most in harmony with his interests, which are decidedly not in accordance with those of Austria. When Austria's sense of this is sufficiently acute, it is probable that both she and the Pope will stir up war again in Italy; a war in which England, Prussia and Germany may be induced to join; not from love for the Papacy, but from distrust and hatred of Louis Napoleon. It will not have been the first time that Protestant England has sacrificed blood and treasure in defence of the Pope. The British Government will fight for any thing in support of "the balance of power," which in the mouth of an English statesman signifies, *the ascendancy of Britain upon the sea*. The twin sisters, Trade and Commerce, who rule the destinies of the British Empire, care nothing about the moral principles of the powers with which they have to do. So that they can sell their wares to advantage, and enlarge their traffic, they do not care whether God is honored or insulted by their customers; nay, they will even join in their bald ribaldry and license if it will only increase the profits of the till. This is the secret of the present quaker outcry for peace and neutrality. Trade and Commerce are quaker infidels, who only speak on the right side when the spirit of avarice moves in that direction. If it would increase the sale of cottons in the States of the Church they would fight for the Pope with a right good will; but if a free and independent Italy would be more profitable to Manchester, Birmingham, and Nottingham, then for that, they would burn gunpowder while a shot remained in Woolwich Arsenal. Hence, the Protestantism of England is no barrier to the defence of Rome and the Pope, by that "*model Christian woman*" as A. Campbell of Bethany styles Queen Victoria, "the Head of the Church and Defender of the Faith." Greater marvels than this will yet be seen.

Distrust of Louis Napoleon seems to be even now opening a breach between France and England. France, which has no colonies to serve and defend, has made and is making, contrary to treaty stipulations, prodigious efforts to develop her navy into a power surpassing all rivalry. This of necessity places her in opposition to England, whose *role* is that "*Britannia rules the waves.*" It appears to us, then, that the extraordinary efforts of Louis Napoleon to create a navy superior to England's is a legitimate *casus belli* between the countries. The existence of the British Empire, "upon which the sun never sets," depends upon the naval superiority of England; and if this be lost by the creation of a superior French marine, always capable of still greater augmentation by union with Russia, England's rival in the East, it becomes only a question of time, opportunity, and convenience with her Continental rivals, when they shall "overflow and pass over" the envied isle of *Albion perfide*. The true policy of Britain would seem to be, to precipitate a conflict with France as soon as she can possibly get ready. Her safety consists in the destruction of the French and Russian navies. She will have to do this, sooner or later; and the longer she delays it after she is ready, the greater and more difficult the work to be performed. We have no apprehensions for the result. England has to meet the world in arms upon the mountains of Israel; and she will not fall till then, and that not by the power of her rivals, but by the power of Michael the Great Prince. We expect,

therefore that when war breaks out between France and England, it will be the beginning of the end with Louis Napoleon, as it was with his uncle before him. When England draws the sword against him, Daniel's Little Horn with its Eyes and Mouth, will be ready enough to join her; and we believe the conflict will ultimate in his dethronement and the restoration of the Bourbons. We believe this, because France in her normal state (her present being exceptional) is one of the Ten Horns—apocalyptically "*The Tenth of the City*"<sup>11</sup> *το ὀκτατόν της πόλεως*. "The Ten Horns are to *give their power and strength to THE BEAST,*" the Eighth Head of the Roman dominion; and are to "*hate the Harlot, and make her desolate.*" The Napoleon Power cannot be at once the Frog-Power, a Tenth Horn, and the Beast. The Napoleon-Power is evidently the first, or Frog-Power, whose existence in France puts the Tenth Horn, or *France Regal*, in abeyance. Hence, for France, *as a horn*, to give her strength, power, and kingdom to the Beast, that which keeps the horn-kingdom in abeyance must be taken out of the way; in other words, the Frog-Power, or democracy imperialized in Napoleon, must be suppressed by his dethronement that the Bourbon Horn may reappear. War with England will open the way for this, and also promote another result, namely, *the bringing of Russia into position as the "Gogue of the land of the Magogue."*

The dethronement of Napoleon, then, after his revolutionary work is done, we believe, will precede the *proximate* solution of the Italian question; the ultimate being left for Jesus and the Saints. When he is abolished, and Russia is in position, the Ten Horn-Kingdoms will cooperate in the conquest of Italy, and final extinction of the revolution there, then probably strengthened by England and her allies, whoever they may be. This accomplished as prophecy seems to require, the papacy will be emancipated from all revolutionary and protestant incumbrances and restraints; and she will sing like a harlot in prosperity, "saying in her heart, *I sit queen, and am no widow, and sorrow shall by no means see*"— *και πένθος ον μη Ιδω*— Rev. xviii. 7. This language implies the sovereignty of the Roman Hierarchy, its alliance with the State, and upon such a basis as to promise a long continued and uninterrupted prosperity. The believer, however, knows that then her eternal overthrow is at the very doors.

But we have said, that Italy in church and state is a great criminal. This is well known to all who are acquainted with the history of the Albigenses, who were mercilessly exterminated by the Italian governments at the instigation of the popes. Hume, in his history of England, says that Innocent, the third pope of that name, published a crusade against them, because they neglected the rites of the papal church, "and opposed the power and influence of the clergy. And those sectaries," says he, "though the most innocent and inoffensive of mankind, were exterminated with all the circumstances of extreme violence and barbarity." Reinier, an inquisitor belonging to the papal church, who lived during the 13th century, testifies, that "in all the cities of Lombardy, and in Provence, and in other kingdoms and nations, there were more schools of heretics than of theologians, and more auditors. They disputed publicly, and summoned the people to those solemn disputations, besides preaching in the markets, the fields, and the houses," &c. He adds, "I have been frequently present at the inquisition and examination of the heretics; and their schools are reckoned, in the diocese of Pavia alone, to amount to forty-one. The author of the Belgian Chronicle, from Caesarius, A.D. 1208, says that the doctrine of the Albigenses prevailed to that degree, "that it had infested as much as a thousand cities; and if it had not been repressed by the swords of the faithful, I think that it would have corrupted the whole of Europe."

Innocent III., who ascended the pontifical throne in 1192, determined to quench it in the blood of all dissenters from this church, which they justly denominated "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots," spoken of in the Apocalypse. He decreed that no terms should

be kept with them; that they should be crushed, their race exterminated, and Christendom struck with terror to deter men from forsaking the Italian church as by law established. As incapable of temporising as he was of pity, the pope formed his plans without delay, and the beautiful and prosperous region of Albigensia, was delivered to the fury of countless hordes of papal fanatics; its cities were ruined; its population consumed by the sword; its commerce destroyed; and the lamp of divine knowledge, which had shown so resplendently throughout the whole wing of the Great Eagle, totally extinguished.

The instructions given to the papal emissaries were of the most sanguinary complexion. Instead of making converts of the heretics, their orders were to burn the leaders, disperse the flocks, and confiscate the property of all who dared to think differently from the church of Rome. These orders were fully executed. The civil power was stirred up against them by the intrigues, threatenings, and flatteries of the priests; so that "*the beast made war against them, and conquered them, and killed them.*" Rev. 11: 7. We cannot now enter into details. Examples of the murderous onslaught of the Italian Harlot are found in the smoking ruins of Beziers, in which 60,000 men, women, and children were destroyed by fire and sword, A. D. 1209; in the 450 fugitives from Carcasone who were hanged and burned alive; in the 150 men and women burned in the castle of Minerva, July, 1210; and in the butcheries in Calabria in June, 1560. The page of history teems with the conflagrations and deeds of blood perpetrated by the execrable ecclesiastics and rulers of Italy. But, though we cannot now go into details, an idea may be formed of the process by which Rome has become, as the Scripture saith, "*drunk with blood,*" from the following letter written by a papist, and dated June 11, 1560. It was addressed to Ascanio Caracciolo, on the very day of the butchery, by one of his friends or domestics, and soon after found its way into print: —

"*Most Illustrious Sir!* —Having written you from time to time what has been doing here in the affair of heresy, I have now to inform you of the dreadful justice which began to be executed on these Lutherans (*Lutherans* was at this time a common nickname for the Waldenses—a mere term of obloquy and reproach.) early this morning, being the 11th June. And to tell you the truth, I can compare it to nothing so fitly as to the slaughter of so many sheep. They were all shut up in one house, as in a sheep-fold. The executioner went, and bringing out one of them, covered his face with a napkin, led him out to a field near the house, and having made him kneel down, cut his throat with a knife. Then taking off the bloody napkin, he went and brought out another, whom he put to death after the same manner. In this way, the whole number, amounting to eighty-eight men, were butchered. I leave you to figure to yourself the lamentable spectacle, for I can scarcely refrain from tears while I write; nor was there any person who, after witnessing the execution of one, could stand to look on a second. The meekness and patience with which they went to martyrdom and death were incredible. Some of them, at their death, professed themselves of the same faith with us, but the greater part died in their cursed obstinacy. All the old men met their death with cheerfulness, but the young exhibited symptoms of fear. I shudder while I think of the executioner with the bloody knife in his teeth, the dripping napkin in his hand, and his arms besmeared with gore, going to the house and taking out one after another, just as a butcher does his sheep which he means to kill. According to orders, wagons were already come to carry away the dead bodies, which are appointed to be quartered, and hung upon the public roads from one end of Calabria to the other. Unless His Holiness, and the Viceroy of Naples, command the Marquis of Brutiane, the governor of this province, to stay his hand and leave off, he will go on to put others to the torture, and multiply the executions, until he has destroyed the whole. Even to-day a decree has passed, that a hundred grown-up women shall be put to the question (a process of the inquisition) and afterwards executed, so that there may

be a complete mixture, and we may be able to say, in well-sounding phrase, that so many persons were punished, partly men and partly women. This is all that I have to say of this act of justice. It is now eight o'clock, and I shall presently hear accounts of what was said by these obstinate people as they were led to execution. Some have testified such obstinacy and stubbornness as to refuse to look on a crucifix, or confess to a priest, and they are to be burnt alive. The heretics taken in Calabria amount to 1600, all of whom are condemned, but only 88 have as yet been put to death. This people came originally from the valley of Angrogne, near Savoy, and in Calabria are called Ultramontane. Four other places in the kingdom of Naples are inhabited by the same race, but I do not think that they behave ill, for they are a simple, unlettered people, entirely occupied with the spade and plough, and, I am told, show themselves sufficiently religious at the hour of death."

This letter speaks volumes, and renders all comment unnecessary. Its statements are corroborated by a Neapolitan writer of that age, who, having given some account of the Waldenses in Calabria, is pleased to say: "Some had their throats cut, others were sawn through the middle, and others thrown from the top of a high cliff; all were cruelly, but deservedly put to death! It was strange to hear of their obstinacy, for while the father saw his son put to death, and the son his father, they not only gave no symptoms of grief, but said joyfully they would be angels of God; so much had the Devil, to whom they had given themselves up as a prey, deceived them."

About thirty-seven years after this, Charles Emanuel commanded all his subjects of the Marquisate of Saluces to live "in obedience to their Mother, the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church;" and in 1601, published an edict of perpetual exile against all who did not renounce their religion and go to mass. The result was that more than five hundred families were driven into exile. About fifty years after this, that is, in January 25, 1655, a public document appeared, well known as "*The Order of Gastaldo*." It was published against all Piedmontese dissenters from the Roman Church, by Andrew Gastaldo, "Conservator-General of the holy faith," ordering them to become papists, or to leave Piedmont with their families within three days, under pain of death and confiscation of houses and goods. Thousands of families were compelled to abandon their homes in the very depth of winter, in a country where the snow is visible on the tops of the mountains in all the months of the year. But these things were only the beginning of sorrows to this afflicted people. For no sooner had they quitted their houses than a banditti broke into them, pillaging and plundering whatever they had left behind. They next proceeded to raze their habitations to the ground, to cut down the trees, and to turn the country into a desolate wilderness. In April, 1655, by the instigation and contrivance of the Roman clergy, 6000 men were placed in ambush, and fell suddenly upon the inhabitants of S. Giovanni and La Torre. This force was soon augmented by multitudes from all parts of Piedmont, who, hearing that the heretics were given up as a prey for the spoiler, fell upon them with impetuous fury. After a fruitless effort to defend themselves, the inhabitants were compelled to flee for their lives. The murderers having seized the fort of Marburg, the fugitives were hemmed in on every side, and nothing remained for them but massacre. In one place they mercilessly tortured 150 women and children, chopping off the heads of some, and dashing out the brains of others against the rocks: and in regard to those whom they took prisoners from fifteen years old and upwards, who refused to go to mass, they hanged some, and nailed others to the trees by the feet, with their heads downwards. In these desolations, those who were once the richest were reduced to the necessity of begging their bread; and in short, there was no mercy for any of them within the dominions of Victor Emanuel's predecessors of the 17th century.

This sacrifice of hecatombs of victims upon the ensanguined altars of the Italian Prophetess aroused the indignation of all the anti-papal governments of Europe. His Highness Oliver Cromwell, the Lord Protector of England, was greatly incensed. He sent a letter to the Court of Turin expressive of his deep sorrow and compassion by his ambassador Sir Samuel Morland, who, in presenting it, painted in strong colors the accounts that had reached England describing "the houses on fire, which," said he, "are yet smoking—the mangled carcasses, and the ground defiled with blood—virgins violated, and after being treated with brutal outrage, left to breathe out their last—men a hundred years old, helpless through age and bedridden, burned in their beds—infants dashed against the rocks," and so forth. "Were all the tyrants," says he, "of all times and barbarous and inhuman. The very angels are seized with horror at them! Men are amazed! Heaven itself seems to be astonished with the cries of dying men, and the very earth to blush, being discolored with the gore of so many innocent persons."

At this crisis, the poet Milton filled the office of Latin Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Never was there a more decided enemy to persecution on account of religion than he. The sufferings of the unhappy victims of popish ferocity touched his heart, and drew from his pen the following beautiful lines.

#### ON THE MASSACRE IN PIEDMONT

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughter'd saints, whose bones  
Lie scatter'd on the Alpine mountains cold;  
Ev'n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,  
When all our fathers worshipt stocks and stones—

"Forget not! In thy book record their groans  
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold  
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese—that roll'd  
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans  
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they  
To heaven. Their martyr'd blood and ashes sow  
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway  
The Triple Tyrant; that from these may grow  
A hundred fold, who having learn'd thy way  
Early, may fly the Babylonian woe."

Yes, "the Triple Tyrant," as Milton styles the tiara-crowned chief of the pontifical kingdom, still sways his blasting influence over all the Italian fields, though happily less absolutely than in the poet's day. Nevertheless, though not so powerful, the spirit of the tyranny is unmitigated. He is still ready for robbery, murder, and adultery before the noonday sun, when by these crimes he thinks he can fasten his hated rule upon the defenceless and the weak. Witness his recent violence at Perugia. Popery is always the same—always hypocritical, bestial, and ferocious. Italy is diseased, and full of wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores. There is no soundness in her from the crown of her head to the sole of her feet. Her fingers are dripping with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus; and the knife of slaughter is still between her teeth! History with trumpet tongue proclaims her criminality to all the nations. Will providence make free and independent so blood-stained a wretch as she? Shall liberty be given to her, who is drunk with righteous blood; and drunk with the wine of fornication contained in the golden cup of the Roman Jezebel, which is full of abominations and filthiness? Shall she be free who has enslaved the

nations with chains of superstition; and thrust deep into the lowest dungeons, and subterranean caverns of the Inquisition, all she could seize who dare to rebuke her crimes, and to read and speak the word of life? Impossible! The supposition would be to affirm, that there is no retribution for the wicked, nor a God that judgeth in the earth. Italy must drink of the wrath of God, which is to be poured out without mixture of mercy into the cup of his indignation; for she worships the beast and his image, and the mark of his name is upon her forehead, and in her hand. She hath led into captivity, into captivity therefore she must go; she hath killed with the sword, with the sword therefore she must be slain—Rev. xiv. 10, 11; xiii. 10. This is the sentence that rests upon her. A seeming dispersion of the storm-clouds of her heaven is therefore only a change of their position, on which they mass themselves for a more towering and blackened tempest. The present is but the lull of the hurricane which precedes the roaring blast that uproots the giants of the forest, and lays towers in the dust. When Napoleon falls and Sardinia is plucked up by the roots, and the Mother of Harlots sits queen of the nations, let us, brethren, not weep over the disappointed hopes of Italy, and the triumph of hypocrisy. These must needs be. But rather let us rejoice, knowing that the intenseness of the night, and the gross darkness of the peoples, is the indication of the dawn; when Zion shall arise and shine, because her light is come and the glory of Jehovah has risen upon her. Isai. lx. 1.

Aug. 25, 1869.

EDITOR.

## Miscellanea.

### How the Devils Religion is Obtained; or Faith in Kind and in Degree.

*Dear Brother:* — I have for some time thought of writing to you; but have hesitated lest you might deem me an intruder, having no personal acquaintance with you. But with your sentiments as an expounder of the Bible. I have for a long time been familiar; and I can say in truth, I have been highly gratified, and very much enlightened by the products of your pen; and have furthermore used my influence to the extent of my power, to promote the circulation of your very valuable periodical; and am still doing so, and shall continue to do so, as long as you fearlessly and uncompromisingly advocate the "One Faith," in contradistinction to the many conflicting faiths, so piously advocated in our world.

Long prayers condemned by Jesus, long faces, and groaning religion are all the fashion in the present hour. What a lamentable condition the so called "religious world" is in! Modern gospel, modern conversion, and modern religions, are as dissimilar to ancient gospel, religion, and conversion as black is to white. Indeed, there is no gospel, ancient or modern, needed at this day to convict or convert sinners. All that is needed now is, *first*, a good warm room; *second*, a good set of prayers, or prayers, a good set of singers, thank-the-lorders, ameners and groaners; and a good anxious seat; and the work they call "the Lord's Work," is began. A better name for it would be "Bedlam broke loose;" for the "work" is characterized by howling, wailing, screeching, screaming, groaning, crying, laughing, stamping of feet, slapping of hands, pounding the backs and shoulders of the "penitent," calling on God to send down fire, fire, fire; to come a little nearer, to give them another touch, to get to himself a great name in this place; they tell God what he has promised, and call upon Him to "stick to it." They tell the sinner, before whose mind there is no testimony, to believe on Jesus; to give their hearts to God, to exercise faith, to look to Calvary, and see his bleeding side, and so forth. At length the subjects of their operations begin to be impressed; one begins to groan, another to cry, and the third is struck down with the power. The operators seeing this, shout out "the Lord is here! The Holy Ghost is doing his work; we know it, because we feel it!" But

there must be a change both in will and in acts. How is this to be effected? By singing; therefore incontinently it is cried, "Arise, brethren, and sing! Sing with the Spirit, brethren!

"Arise my soul, arise, shake off thy guilty fears,  
A bleeding sacrifice in my behalf appears."

The spiritual doctors now begin to visit their patients. They ask the sinner, "Brother, how do you feel?" He replies "I don't know that I feel any different." "Don't you," says the medicine-man, "want religion?" O yes! "Then give your heart to God, and continue to pray." Another says, "Brother, tell how you feel." "O, I feel bad, because I don't feel worse." "Thank the Lord," says the parson; "pray on, brother, and you'll get through." He then turns to another, and says, "Sister, tell us how you feel; do you think you feel any better?" "Yes," she replies; "I feel my load is removed; I think God for Christ's sake has spoken peace to my poor never-dying soul. I *feel* a hope in me that I would not give for worlds like this." She begins to shout, and others follow; another "feels a hope," another, and another; and so the fire begins to spread, and all begin to shout, and one universal pow-wow is the result.

They have "got religion," or religion, such as it is, has got them. After this religious spree is over, the next thing is to get the converts into the church. "The pastor" then inquires, "Do you feel it your duty to be baptized?" "No, I never *felt* it my duty yet." "Well," rejoins the accommodating divine, "just as you *feel*, brother; we do not believe it to be a saving ordinance; but you will give us your name, won't you?" "Oh yes, if you please." "Thank the Lord, one more added." The inquiry proceeds. A number want to be baptized, and come down to the water. The clerical ignoramus begins his work. "My dear brother," says he, "do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" "Yes." "Thank the Lord," he exclaims, "for the good confession. How do you wish to be baptized? —by sprinkling, pouring or immersion?"—"Sprinkling if you please sir." "Thank the Lord" says Balaam, "that's just as good as immersion. Now another!" To this he says, "brother do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" "Yes." "Thank the Lord; how do you wish to be baptized?" "By pouring." "Thank the Lord, that's just as good as sprinkling. Now another!" "Sister," says the Divine, "do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" "Yes Sir." "Thank the Lord for the good confession, how do you wish to be baptized?" "By immersion, sir." "Thank the Lord that is just as good as sprinkling or pouring; but *we think* it to be very indecent, and absolutely ridiculous for females to be immersed in this age of refinement. But just as you *feel*." Thus all are accommodated; a quietus is put upon all their consciences, by an appropriate dose from his clerical pill-bags! This is termed "faith in kind," but "not in degree," by modern lovers of what they call "Christian union."

Now for "faith in degree." By and by the doctrine, or faith of the Lord's coming in 1843 is proclaimed. What is he coming for? It is said, to burn up the world, kill all sinners, make a new world, immortalize the saints, and to reign over them. This work being finished, the saints have nothing to do but to sit upon a white cloud, and sing hallelujah to all eternity. Thousands received this teaching, believed it, acted in accordance with their "faith in kind," and walked up to *the degree of faith* they had received; and they say, that the Lord blessed them, for they were happy in believing it.

By and by again, faith enlarges, and they believe that the Lord is coming in 1854. Now the faith is increased from the item that Jesus Christ is the Son of God to the additional correction that he is coming in '54! And thousands are converted and baptized into this degree of faith as "present truth," or "meat in due season." But now, some of the most active and

conspicuous characters in these days, have "bolted the track," and deny that faith which they then so zealously advocated. If we interrogate them, saying, "Did you believe you had an immortal soul to be eternally happy or miserable at death?" They say, "yes." Did you believe that your immortal soul would go immediately to heaven or hell at death without resurrection? Did you believe that the inheritance of the saints was located above the stars?" To these queries they answer, "yes;" and deny that they believe them now. "Did you believe in the promises of God covenanted by him to Abraham concerning the land of Canaan as his inheritance and that of his seed; and in the promises to David concerning a seed, and a throne to continue on earth as long as the sun and moon endure?" Did you believe that the seed spoken of was Christ, and that God raised up Christ to fulfil his promises to David in placing Christ upon his throne, according to Acts ii. 30? Was your hope of the same material Paul declares his to be made of in Acts xxvi. 6-7? Did you believe that Christ died as a slaughtered lamb, according to the prophets? That God raised up Christ his Son to fulfil the promise made by the angel to Mary, as recorded in Luke i.? Did you believe in the gospel of the kingdom of God as promised in the prophets, and preached by Jesus and the Apostles. Did you believe in the name of the anointed Jesus for the remission of sins as he declared by Peter in Acts ii., and by Paul in Gal. iii. 26-28? Did you believe in all and singular of these when you had your "faith in kind, but not in degree?" To all these questions you answer in the negative! Then, I ask, what under the canopy of the heavens did you believe that you call gospel? "Why," say you, "I believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God; Philip's test for baptism!" "O fools and slow of heart to believe all the prophets," and Jesus, have spoken; or rather, too stubborn are ye to obey that mould of doctrine delivered to you in the scriptures. Sayest thou, "my clerical and editorial dignity would fall; my former experience and faith would go to the moles and to the bats; and then lastly, though not least of all to be considered, I should be deemed too proscriptive in faith, too intolerant, too uncharitable? Besides, if by my conformity to this way I practically affirm that I am right, should I not thereby condemn all the dear pious Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Mormons, Millerites, and Hindoos, who all do the best they can according to the light they have?" What have we to do with consequences? The wholesome words of the Lord Jesus are, "he that believeth not shall be condemned;" and the word saith, that all will be destroyed that change the truth of God into a lie; and all who hold the truth of God in unrighteousness. God has given the rule of righteousness, and it is our business to work by it. What right have we to throw the mantle of charity over all the honest, conscientious vagaries and fooleries of this age of apostasy and superstition? It is not honoring God to let our charity extend where his word forbids it. No, no. To honour God is to reverence and obey his word. Let God be true though the heavens fall.

Go on, brother, in your laudable undertaking; and may heaven's richest blessing attend you. The victory will soon be won, and if faithful, we shall share some humble place in his glorious kingdom when Jesus comes. Amen.

L. H. CHASE.

Adrian, Michigan, June 27, 1859.

---

### **Remarks on the Resurrection.**

A brother in Wisconsin writes, "We have had an addition of a Baptist preacher who has been such for twenty-five years. The HERALD has brought him to the truth by being read with the bible in hand. His name is A. W. Button of West Northfield, Illinois. He was at the Geneva meeting of the brethren which we all enjoyed much. He has, of course, thrown off the title of "Reverend;" and when asked if we could hear from him, he said, he came to hear and learn; that he had had a hard struggle, but had been overpowered by the truth." This is good news from far. We congratulate brother Button on the victory he has gained over the

prejudices of education and the pride of life. Having secured this position, may he, as we doubt not he will, patiently continue in well-doing, and at last obtain the crown of life and glory in the kingdom of God.

The subjoined correspondence, which we republish from the *Banner*, passed between bro. Button and Dr. Bragdon of Evanston University, who is a presiding elder of Methodism, one of the grand-daughters of Old Mother Babylon. Bro. Wilson, the editor of the *Banner* remarks:

"It may be as well to state for the information of the reader, that a few days ago we were at West Northfield, and immersed the writer of the following letter, and his wife. Bro. Button has been a preacher amongst the Baptists for the last twenty-five years, but upon a close and thorough examination of the Scriptures he has come to the conclusion that he has been propagating *error* for *truth*, though ignorantly, and therefore has nobly made a stand for "the Faith once delivered to the saints." This determination of his is likely to bring down upon his head whole vials of clerical wrath. Whilst on our way to the river, Mr. Button handed us a letter, just received from Dr. Bragdon, acknowledging the receipt of his communication.

The Doctor, full of the dignity and self-importance inspired by his clerical office, disdains to answer that or any other letter from a man who has apostatized from the faith of his fathers. He laments that he should have been so misled as to join himself to "materialistic infidels," and to advocate sentiments so adverse to sound reason and revelation. And he further intimates, that unless he turn from the error of his ways, he will not *descend* to confer with such a character, but esteem him as beneath his notice. He also says that Bro. Button has mistaken his ground, and misquoted his words; and therefore has been fighting a man of *straw*. He states his words to have been something in this form—"Without the resurrection of Christ the Christian religion would not be worth a straw." Granting this to be what was said on the occasion referred to, it makes but little difference, for the Apostle Paul makes the resurrection of the dead depend upon the raising up of Christ. First, Christ the first-fruits, then those who are Christ's. Would the Dr. have us believe that he denies the resurrection of the dead saints, or that it does not necessarily follow upon the resurrection of Christ? Surely he is not so far gone in mysticism or spiritualism, as to say, that the resurrection takes place at death—that *death* is but a gate to *life!* —as thousands teach and believe, and as indicated by the position he takes.

The Dr. has a bad cause in hand. When we heard him speak, last fall, on the "Nature of the Soul," it was evident he was like the Sadducees of old, who "erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." Filled with the idea, that the immortality of the soul and the intermediate state stand out as prominent doctrines of the Scriptures, he affects to despise as *infidelity* any reasoning or testimony to the contrary. He pities the weakness and credulity of those individuals who reject his unscriptural dogmas, and declines, with Pharisaic pride, to have any dealings with such infidels. Where is the meekness or the condescension of Christ in such a man? Rather than seek a lost or straying sheep, he would abandon it to perish. He forgets what the Apostle James says, "That he who turns a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." If Dr. Bragdon, or those of like faith, think we have wandered from "the right ways of the Lord," let them by kindness, by love, by persuasion, by reason, by scripture, endeavour to turn our wandering feet into the way of truth, considering themselves, lest they also be tempted, and fall from their steadfastness. But not so; we invariably find our opponents actuated by another spirit. They will not reason with us out of the Scriptures. They had rather—old serpent-like—traduce our

characters, and thus endeavour to destroy our influence; than enter into a patient, humble investigation of what the Scriptures teach. Such men betray their origin and connections. They are, as Jesus said of the Jews, of their father the devil; and his works they do. The spirit of their father, as manifested in the Roman hierarchy, pervades the whole class; a proscription of the right of private judgment, and the Word of God. We would recommend all such to the following words of Jesus: —"This is the ground of condemnation, that the light has come into the world, and men have preferred the darkness to light, because their deeds were evil. For whoever does evil hates the light, and shuns it, lest his deeds should be detected. But he who obeys the truth comes to the light, that it may be manifest that his actions are agreeable to God."—John iii. 19-21.

### The Correspondence.

The following are the letters which have been published by the brethren in pamphlet, and circulated in the immediate vicinity of the university, and amongst the friends of Mr. Bragdon, for their enlightenment:

West Northfield, Cook Co., Ill.,  
May 17th, 1859.

REV. MR. BRAGDON: —

Dear Sir, —I hope you will pardon me, a stranger to you personally, for introducing myself to your notice in this way. I was one of your auditors at the time you addressed the people at the schoolhouse, in this place, on the 8th inst. You at that time expressed yourself very freely on some points in relation to which you and several of your hearers may be supposed to differ, honestly enough; and declared your fears, that our friends were *baptized for perdition*. But that may be allowed to pass, as far as we are concerned, with the hope, however, that your fears in the end will prove to have been entirely groundless. But there was one declaration, which you made at the time, which some of us were rather surprised to hear; and to which I would like to call your attention. It was this, viz., "The Christian religion *would not be worth a straw* without a resurrection of the dead!"

You referred for the proof of what you stated, to 1 Cor. xv. Now, I think, it must appear to all men of the least discernment, that the chapter in question abundantly and most clearly and decidedly sustains your declaration. Paul declares, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, *they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished*." The hope of Christianity would be confined to this life entirely; and would make apostolic Christians, at least, "of all men most miserable," and well might be called worthless. Labour, peril, and suffering, all go for nothing; if the dead rise not, there is no future for man. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," \* or in other words, adopt the principles and practice of the Epicureans; it is all there is left for us. The dead are perished!

\* See Dr. Adam Clark's Commentary on this passage. The Dr. says "this is a legitimate conclusion from the apostolic reasoning."

We here see the use to which the inspired teacher applies the word *perish* in the chapter before us. It can not be mistaken. But the word *death*, or to die, is used in a very different sense by the apostle in the same chapter. Some in that Church who denied the resurrection would cavil and say, —"How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." Any agriculturist knows the difference between the words *perish* and *die* as used here. If the seed body perish through

the prevalence of wet, or cold, after being committed to the soil, nothing ever comes of it. There is no future harvest; —it is *perished*. But if it perish not, yet it must die, or "it abideth alone." The process of death of the seed body takes place, and decay is far advanced, before the germ springs forth. After which a body, another than that sown, and much more magnificent, arises out of the earth, and exposes its leaves and head to the glory of the sun's light. "So also is the resurrection of the dead." Now just compare the word "perish" as used here, with the same word as used by our Lord. "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never *perish*." "Whosoever believeth on him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life." For he declares, he *will raise such up, at the last day.*"

Now I will attend more particularly to the cause of our surprise. You stated, as before mentioned, "The Christian religion *would not be worth a straw* without a resurrection of the dead." Now, sir, if the dead saints are at the present time in life; if their souls have been glorified with Christ in heaven, from the moment of their death, it is utterly incomprehensible, how Christianity can be worthless without a resurrection. "You asserted that they did not remain, some of whom have been dead thousands of years, in an unconscious state." The Clergy frequently declare in their discourses, that the saints and martyrs are now wearing their crowns even without their bodies. How then can the "Christian religion not be worth a straw," even should the resurrection fail entirely. If without a resurrection of their bodies, they are now in possession of the eternal weight of glory, might they not continue in that possession for millions of years, even forever and ever, though their bodies were destined to remain eternally in the earth. Sir, if this be so, it is altogether inconceivable how the resurrection, or a failure of the resurrection, could affect them in the least, either by adding to, or diminishing their perfect bliss.

I can conceive no other way of escape from a position which looks so, much like absurdity, than to abandon your ground and the apostle's reasoning entirely, or give up the unscriptural dogma, of a state for souls intermediate between death and the resurrection. If you choose the latter, you will find an abundance of support, in both the New and Old Testaments. You will find that the apostolic Christians were taught in all the Epistles, to hope for, and expect every thing promised them at the coming of Christ, the second time, and the simultaneous event of the resurrection; but nothing before. Even "the heavenly house," as set forth in the 2 Cor. v. referred to the resurrected body, which they so confidently expected, — "That mortality might be swallowed up of life." They did not expect to be "present with the Lord" naked, or with naked souls, but clothed anew. For they knew that each must stand in the glorious presence, in his proper person, with a body, that each might "receive in body, the things done, whether good or bad," as may be seen from the 10th verse. And in Rom. viii. 20, you will find that there creature was made subject to vanity (decay) in hope; and 23d verse, they "groan within themselves, awaiting their adoption, to wit, *the redemption of their body.*" The heathen, under Paul's teaching, turned from dumb idols to serve the living God, and "to *wait for his Son from heaven,*" 1 Thess. i. 10. Our Lord also taught the benevolent and the good, to expect their recompense *at the resurrection of the just*, not before. And finally, the proofs in support of this truth, are altogether too numerous to mention even a tithe of them here. The sacred writings teem with them, both in the Old and New Testaments, in rich abundance.

If, therefore, the Christian hope is worth nothing, not even "a straw," (as you have asserted, and to the proof of which, you so appropriately cited your hearers, and as we most assuredly believe on scripture testimony;) without a resurrection of the dead, then there can be nothing for Christians, or for others, till the resurrection. There is no getting away from this

conclusion. All we claim and contend for will naturally follow this admission of yours, and may be easily proved from the divine record. Now, sir, we will leave it for your own good judgment to decide, whether a man coming out to abuse and malign us, before your people and the public, at the same time making the above admission, does not convict himself of a great inconsistency, not to say absurdity. How can a man do otherwise, in so doing, than stultify himself. These few observations are respectfully submitted to your candid consideration.

I am, Sir, Yours with respect,

A. W. BUTTON.

---

**Reply of Dr. Bragdon, with a Rejoinder by Mr. Button.**

Evanston. Ill., June 9th, 1859.

A. W. BUTTON—

Sir, Yours of the 17th ult. is before me. I should deem it utterly unworthy of any reply, but to correct a few seeming misapprehensions, on your part.

1. The exact phrase you put in my mouth, I never used—My subject was, "Christ the foundation of man's salvation."—And my remark was, that, "without the resurrection of Christ the Christian system would have been worthless"—and so say now, and challenge you to disprove it. So, my dear sir, your man of straw is of your own making, and consequently, your wonderful dilemma your own doom.

2. Your modest charge presented me, also, claims a remark—"Coming out to abuse and malign you before your people." \* Then, preaching the Gospel, is to "abuse and malign you." O how deeply fallen you must be! You do not believe, I suppose, in the possibility of falling from grace? Yet, you now, unlike the apostle Paul, are trying to destroy the faith you once preached, and have the audacity even to quote apostolic writings to do it; and thus, intentionally and wickedly, I fear, pervert the truth of God—joining yourself with materialistic infidelity the better to accomplish your purpose. I knew not, sir, that either yourself, or any of your kith or kin were present to hear me the day to which you allude, and so should have acted without a motive, in the work you assign me. I did not even suppose that your very rare immaculateness would now condescend to mingle with those you, at present, so much "hate"—namely, the Ministers and Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, to you, were once so dearly beloved in the Lord! And is it too much to suppose, even in the judgment of charity, that your only object in so doing is, like that of the Wolf—"To *scatter, tare and slay.*"

\* [The Dr. is evidently laboring under a mistake, as I did not use the pronoun *us* in the singular number as applying to myself. —A. W. B.]

3. As to having any religious controversy with you in your present position, I cannot descend to it. A man that has publicly confessed, if I am rightly informed, to having preached for months or years, what he did not believe, is too great a hypocrite for any honest and honorable person to associate with, safely. Embracing as you now do also a most miserable theory—if theory it can be called—which sets at defiance every principle of natural, mental, and moral philosophy, and all safe and rational rules for the interpretation of scripture—perverting the plainest portions of those divine Oracles, it were but madness to reason with such a man.

I have much respect and esteem for your brother, late of West Aurora, to whom your apostasy must be a great affliction.

When you shall cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord, and return to the faith of your fathers, I shall be glad to meet you on common Christian grounds, for the investigation of any subject calculated to promote our faith in Christ—our love to God—and our glorious hope in the complete and final triumphs of the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven. May you soon return. Till then, adieu. Respectfully Yours,

C. P. BRAGDON.

#### REJOINDER.

DR. BRAGDON—Sir:

Your reply of June 9th has been received. I regret that you deny the "exact phrase," which you say I put in your mouth, and am left to suppose that your memory is at fault. But if it is granted that your version of the case is the correct one, it is difficult to discover any benefit that would accrue to you from the change.

You referred to 1 Cor. xv. to prove, that without a resurrection, "hope would be confined to this life." If you had only stated, that "without the resurrection of Christ the Christian system would be worthless," you surely need not have gone to that chapter to prove it. That proposition needs no proof; it is self-evident. No man need labor to prove that a non-resurrected Christ could save any one. Such would be but a dead Saviour. It was his resurrection that gave joy to the hearts of the desponding disciples at Jerusalem, for then they knew he lived. But if Christ must arise from the dead, according to the scriptures, in order to be a Saviour, it is clear, logical, and scriptural, that the dead ones must arise in order to be saved. This the Apostle makes fully apparent in the chapter alluded to.

The obvious design of the argument in this chapter was to refute those in the Church at Corinth, who said, "there is no resurrection of the dead; or what was the same thing, differently expressed, "that the resurrection was past already." This seems to be the inference they had drawn, (and not without reason,) from the heresy they had imbibed from false teachers and false apostles, who, teaching the pagan dogma that all men possess immortal souls, to the life and existence of which the body was not essential, could see no appropriateness in a resurrection. The soul being secure in happiness after death they could not comprehend the necessity, propriety, or usefulness of a resurrection of the material body. And indeed, it was natural, that they should endeavour to reason or explain away what looked to them unnecessary, and even absurd. But their premises were false, for Paul teaches that where there is no *resurrection, there is no future life*; and this future life, by a resurrection, he declares to be the *result*, solely and entirely, of the resurrection of Christ; to which he had testified according to the scriptures, and which they had admitted and believed. This will be apparent if we consider the several points of his reasoning: —

1. He premises his argument by referring to some .of the first things he had formerly preached to them; an important one of which was, that Christ had risen from the dead.

2. That this was one of the things they had received, and wherein they stood, or they had believed in vain.

3. "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead," which you have admitted and believed on testimony, "how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

4. The consequences that must inevitably follow this pernicious heresy. It destroys the whole fabric of their hopes of salvation; for if the dead rise not, Christ is not raised; and "your faith is vain;" you are yet in your sins."

5. The consequences to those that had "fallen asleep in Christ," or died in the faith of his resurrection: —they are perished. And those who are baptized for the dead, why are they baptized for the hope of a resurrection of the dead, if the dead are not to rise? Other consequences also are noticed; such as, the uselessness of peril, labor, etc.

6. That though they held the resurrection of Christ, yet hope in him would be confined only to this life, if they were not to rise from the dead; making it certain that there is no *future life* without a resurrection. Hence the propriety of his irresistible conclusion, the force of which is acknowledged by Dr. Adam Clark, in his Commentary on the passage, —"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!" But can this conclusion be legitimate, or true, if man possesses a soul that can exist without the body, as well or better, because more free in a disembodied state? What becomes of the immortal soul, if without a resurrection death is the last of man for ever? One of two things must be true; either the Apostle, who wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, must be wrong entirely, or those who hold the Pythagorean dogma concerning souls, must be so. These Corinthian professors appear to have thought as the multitudes do now, that Christ had died; and rose again for their justification; and that their souls or spirits would be saved in consequence. They could understand well enough, that without the resurrection of *Christ* the Christian system would be worthless;" but they do not appear to have had the least idea, that without a *resurrection of the dead in Christ*, the Christian religion would not be of any account whatever. So it is now: hence many are led to deny a literal resurrection. They expect their disenthralled spirits will soar away to a spiritual kingdom in the skies, or beyond, at death; very likely to praise God, and sing for ever in glory, without any organs of speech or voice. Or possibly, like the Hindoos, they anticipated spending their time, in the bliss of floating eternally in ether. How different the truthful and simple doctrine of Paul, and the rest of the Apostles. Paul teaches in this chapter, —"Christ the first-fruits" from the dead, as the sure pledge and promise of a future harvest or gathering to salvation; "afterwards they that are his, at his coming." No fruits till Christ was raised, as the *first-fruits*; and no further fruits till they that are *his at his coming* are raised. With him, the resurrection was every thing desirable to attain unto, Phil. iii. 11, for then, and only then, will be salvation. Here I rest the matter.

A brief notice of the reply you thought proper to make to my first communication shall suffice. And permit me to ask, are ministers of religion, of whom you claim to be one, to frown down all opposition in such a supercilious manner? Are they not to be approached with the freedom of an opponent, without giving what seems so much like mortal offence? I may take it for granted, sir, that a man must be hard pushed, who in such an emergency, can think of nothing better to talk about than "Wickedness," "Audacity," "Materialistic Infidelity," "Hate," "Hypocrisy," "Rare Immaculateness," "Deeply Fallen," "Madness," "Apostasy," and "Miserable System." Such things may be very witty, but they are seldom very serviceable. And rest assured, sir, they will never firmly support a barren theology. Nor will they, I

imagine, be found promotive of "love to God," or of "the mutual faith" of yourself and that of any one else; though they may possibly tend to promote a sham piety.

As to the "religion of my fathers," which you say I have forsaken, and to which you seem to express a wish, so benevolently, that I may soon return; I assure you, sir, that I have forsaken only, what appears to me, impossible to prove from the sacred scriptures; a thing which my fathers would have had honesty and decision enough to do, had they at any time been convinced that any part of their faith was unscriptural.

Your "judgment of charity" is altogether too wolfish! I can see nothing of the lamb in it.

In relation to what you have been pleased to style "a most miserable theory," I have only to say, that many who appear very intelligent in other things, denounce the Bible itself, as a book containing nothing but a most *miserable theory*; yet you will agree with me that all such are in great error; and it may be possible that your decision be no nearer the truth. To err is human. Learning and talents afford no special security against fallibility. Nor are majorities always in the right. Truth is as often found, as experience shows, with the humble minority. I have no desire for a "religious controversy" with you, which you have given me notice you cannot *descend* to; and especially as you intimate that it must lead to madness on your part. The specimen in your letter, of what might be expected from you, I take to be a sufficient corroboration of it.

I could wish that you had not descended so low, as to retail, what I can call by no better name, a piece of second-hand gossip about my hypocrisy; which truth compels me to deny in toto. The confession you thus trump up with so much apparent relish, I have never yet made. If you can afford to resort to such means in maintaining your cause, I think there is little to fear from your strokes; for much of the impurity of such weapons must cleave to the hand that wields them. May it be your destiny, sir, yet to find "*the truth as it is in Jesus.*" In its defence your talents will find a far easier and a far more noble employment, than in the defence of hoary error.

Yours, Respectfully,

A. W. BUTTON.

---

### **"Every Creature."**

WE not unfrequently hear it preached by those who style themselves "ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ," that the commission to the Apostles, "Go preach the Gospel to every creature," extends also to them, and that when they, with the mighty machinery they have at work, finish—that is, preach it to every creature, the commission will have been complied with, and all will have been brought by their instrumentality under the terms of the gospel. Now, there are said to be more than 1150 millions of human beings on the globe, and scarcely 90 millions of Protestants; and out of that small number, how much genuine piety can be individualized? One in ten? Then 9 against 1150 is a great disproportion to overcome. Can Protestantism, distracted, divided, and uninspired as it is, do more against such a disproportion than the Messiah and Apostles, united, inspired, and with the power of working miracles, did against those they encountered in their day, who converted not one single city?

Paul says, Col. 1-23, "The gospel *was preached* to every creature under heaven." In what way are we to understand that had been accomplished in his day?

The words *pas ktisis* in Mark 15-16, and Col. 1-23, mean all creation as well as every creature; and that rendering seems to me to agree better with the words as Matt, expresses it, "all nations," and also with the facts as they occurred. For when the Messiah first called the twelve, he said, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into a city of the Samaritans enter not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The Gentiles, a part of all creation, were then left out. But when the Jews rejected the Messiah, and crucified him, the apostles were commissioned, not with restrictions as to a part of creation, as before, to leave some out, but to preach the gospel to every creature—that is, to Gentile as well as Jew; which seems to harmonize with Paul's expression, when he says in preaching this gospel to every creature, he was the minister—that is, to the Gentiles, or minister of the gospel which embraced every creature. —See Acts 26, 16-17; Rom. 15-16.

R. K. BOWLES.

June 1st, 1859.

---