

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., NOVEMBER, 1859
Volume 9—No. 11

**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 225.)

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

IN passing on to the remaining books, I begin with the Acts of the Apostles. This book was, in the second century, known and received as the work of Luke, as much as his Gospel. I need only refer to Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, * as witnesses against whose testimony no exception can be made. The Canon in Muratori is also a valuable document as to this book. I need not enlarge on this, for the testimony is sufficient to carry us to the time of those who belonged to the Apostolic age.

* Iren 1. iii. c. 14, § 1; Clem. Strom. p. 588 ; Tert. De Jejun, c. 10, etc., etc, etc.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

In speaking of the Epistles to which Paul's *name* is prefixed, that to the Hebrews was of course excluded. The difficulty, as to *this* Epistle, is not on the points of antiquity and authority, but entirely as to authorship. In the early centuries it was but little known in the West, and thus in the Canon in Muratoria it is not mentioned. In the East, however, it was well known and received, and *there* it was ascribed to the Apostle Paul. Clement of Alexandria is a sufficient witness on this point. [Strom. 645; see also in Euseb. H. E. l. vi. 13, 14.] The North African Church likewise knew of this Epistle at an early period, for Tertullian quotes it, ascribing it, however, to *Barnabas*. [De Pudic. c. 20.] All the early accounts would show that it was considered to come from what might be called *the school of Paul*, whether *written* by himself or not. Though the West had comparatively little knowledge of this Epistle in the second century, yet it must have been known there, in the first century, as an approved document; for Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, *interweaves* large portions of the Epistle before us. It has been said that "allusions prove nothing;" however, in such a case as this they prove a great deal. This Epistle claims *authority* on the part of the writer; he, therefore, who could approvingly introduce extracts from it into another work, so far

sanctions that authority, and this Clement of Rome has done. * We are able, therefore, to say that *in* the Apostolic age it was received as an authoritative document. In the former part of the second century, Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i.) says, that Christ is called an *Apostle*—a term which indicates his acquaintance with this Epistle, and his acknowledgment of its authority. The difficulty connected with its authorship being directly ascribed to Paul, is principally found in the omission of his name at the beginning, and the difference of style throughout. Thus, some of those who ascribed it in a general sense to Paul, thought that the ideas were his, but that the language was that of another; in fact, that it bore the same relation to Paul as Luke's Gospel does to him, and Mark's to Peter. Thus Origen, who quotes this Epistle as Paul's, says, that of the actual *writer*, "God only knoweth." # Ancient testimony is abundantly strong as to the authority of this book; it generally ascribes it to Paul—and this is quite sufficient for us to receive it with all confidence, and to consider it as Pauline in the same general sense.

* It would fill several pages to give the reiterated passages in which Clement interweaves the words and order of thoughts of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Cited in Euseb. Hist. Ecc. 1. vi. 25.

GENERAL EPISTLES.

FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

The General Epistles were not formed into a collected volume at an early period; they were only known and used individually. Hence, we cannot be surprised that some of them were much better known than others. Two only of these writings stand in Eusebius's catalogue of books universally acknowledged.

The first Epistle of Peter need not detain us long; Polycarp uses it as freely and fully as a modern preacher might do. * Papias, in the same age, cited testimonies from it, as we learn from Eusebius (1. iii. 39). Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus quote it *by name*, in the second century, as also does Tertullian; # he only, however, cites it in one passage, instead of making the continual use of it that he does of the Gospels and Paul's Epistles. This is natural enough, as this writing was only a separate volume, and not part of the collections already formed.

* The following is the first passage of Polycarp in which he interweaves the words of 1 Peter, and this may serve as a specimen of the rest: "In whom though ye see Him not, ye believe; and believing ye rejoice with joy unutterable and full of glory."—(Cap. i.)

Iren. 1. iv. c. 9, § 2; Clem. Alex. Strom, p. 493; Tert. Scorp. c. 12, 14.

FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

The first Epistle of John was also used by Polycarp and Papias, + and by the writers of the second century, Irenaeus, Clement and Tertullian § by name, as is also the case in the Canon in Muratori.

+ [Papias in Euseb. H.E. 1. iii. 39; Polyc. cap. 7, For every one that confesseth not that Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is Antichrist."]

§ [Iren. l. iii. c. 16, § 3, etc.; Clem. Paedog. p. 257, etc.; Tert. Scorp. c. 12, etc.]

BOOKS OPPOSED BY SOME.

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The Epistle of James is the first book that we have to consider, of those described by Eusebius as *opposed by some*.

We are not (as I have said already) to feel surprise that Epistles not addressed to a particular Church should be for a time comparatively unknown; this would especially be what we might expect as to an Epistle to those from amongst the Israelitish nation who had believed in Christ.

The first who makes *express* mention of this Epistle by name is Origen, in the former part of the third century: he quotes it as the Epistle attributed to James. Hence it is *probable* that Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria, knew of this Epistle: this supposition is confirmed by a statement of Cassiodorus, a writer of the sixth century, that Clement gave a summary of this Epistle (together with others) in a work of his which is now lost; it has, however, been doubted whether the name of *James*, in the passage of Cassiodorus, is not put in by mistake for *Jude*. Irenaeus says of Abraham, that "*he was called the friend of God*"—(l. iii. c. 16, § 2). This looks like an acquaintance with this Epistle. A strong testimony to this writing is given by the old Syriac version of the New Testament, in which, although the other books "opposed by some" are absent, this Epistle is contained. In the fourth century we see, from Jerome, that the authenticity of this Epistle was very plainly asserted, and the Epistle was then, as now, ascribed to the Apostle James, the son of Alphaeus. This is just what we might expect: a writing, little known at first, obtains a more general circulation, and the knowledge of the writing and its reception go almost together. The contents entirely befit the antiquity which the writing claims: no *evidence* could be given for rejecting it; it differs in its whole nature from the foolish and spurious writings put forth in the name of this James, and thus its gradual reception is to be accounted for from its having, from early times, been known by some to be genuine (as shown by the Syriac version), and this knowledge having afterwards spread more widely.

SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

The second Epistle of Peter was but little known in early times;—it professes (ch. iii. 1) to be addressed to the same persons as the first had been. *Cappadocia* is one of the countries mentioned in the salutation of the former;—this then must be supposed to have been best known in that and the surrounding regions. Accordingly, from Cappadocia we get the earliest decisive testimony. In the middle of the third century, Firmilianus, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, writes to Cyprian, accusing the Bishop of Rome of "abusing the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, who in their *Epistles* have execrated heretics, and admonished us to avoid them." The mention of Peter can only carry our minds to *this* Epistle. We learn from Origen that it was known at this time as a writing about which there were doubts; he knew of no evidence against it, and the doubts then entertained are well balanced by Firmilianus's distinct testimony, springing from that very region to which we might especially look for evidence. This Epistle is not mentioned by Tertullian—a fact at which we need not wonder, since he only quotes the first Epistle of Peter, although universally owned, *once*. Eusebius tells us that Clement of Alexandria commented on the General Epistles, both those

which were universally owned, and those which are opposed by some; hence, it has been reasonably concluded that he knew *this* Epistle. This writing certainly is utterly unlike the forged documents, in the name of Peter, which were put forth in the second century: it belongs, at least, to an age anterior to that of Firmilianus and Origen, and thus we approach the Apostolic period. Now, Clement of Rome has a passage which seems to allude to part of this Epistle: he says, —"On account of hospitality and godliness, Lot was delivered from Sodom, when all the neighbouring country was condemned with fire and brimstone. The Lord made it manifest that He doth not forsake those who trust in Him; but those who turn to other ways, He appoints to punishment and suffering"—(cap. xi.) The connection of *words* and *thoughts* appears to show that 2 Pet. ii. 6-9 * was in the writer's mind. In the time after Eusebius, but little doubt was expressed as to this Epistle, although the points of difference in the *style* were perceived. As to this, let it be observed that the subject continually *forms the style*; no one would write a hortatory or didactic address in the same style as a stern rebuke. I may add that this Epistle is much more like Peter, as preaching in the Acts, than is the first.

* ["Turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an example unto those that after should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot. . . . The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."]

It must be observed that the express testimony of Firmilianus, coming as it does from Cappadocia itself, has the utmost importance in connection with this writing. If we have no proof of its having been as widely diffused as other books of the New Testament, all we have to ask is, whether we have *sufficient* testimony as to its existence and authorship. Internally it claims to be written by Peter, and this claim is confirmed by the Christians of that very region in whose custody it *ought* to have been found.

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

The second Epistle of John has as much evidence as so short a writing would be likely to possess; it is expressly mentioned and cited by Irenaeus (l. iii. c. 16, § 8), whose links of connection with that Apostle have been already stated; it is also mentioned and quoted by Clement of Alexandria. *The third* Epistle of John is mentioned by Origen, together with the second, as writings about which judgments might perhaps be divided. Dionysius of Alexandria, however, in part his contemporary, speaks undoubtingly of both. —(*In Useb. H. E.* l. vii. 25.)

The Canon in Muratori owns at least *one* of these Epistles; in my opinion, *both*. From the mode in which Jerome speaks of these Epistles, we may conclude that the doubt was not as to their being really sacred writings, but as to which *John* was the author, —John the Apostle, or John the Presbyter, — a doubt which is fully met by Irenaeus and the writer of the fragmentary canon.

EPISTLE OF JUDE.

We find quite sufficient early testimony to the Epistle of Jude, for it is mentioned in Muratori's Canon, by Clement of Alexandria (*Poed.* p. 239), and by Tertullian (*De Cultu Foem.* i. 3.) We are able, therefore, at once to repudiate the doubts expressed by some in the beginning of the fourth century, because of earlier evidence, which ascribes this Epistle to Jude, the brother of James.

THE APOCALYPSE.

Eusebius speaks of the book of Revelation in a very peculiar manner—perhaps a book universally received, perhaps one altogether spurious.

Not so, however, did the second century judge. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, near Laodicea, the contemporary of the Apostle John, received and used this book. —(*Andreas, in Apoc.*)

Justin Martyr, before the middle of the second century, held his contention with Trypho, the Jew, at Ephesus, where John had been living thirty or thirty-five years before. He says that the Revelation had been given to "John, one of the twelve Apostles of Christ." Irenaeus, so closely connected as he had been with the immediate disciples of John, gives a similar testimony: he even tells us *when* John saw the Revelation, almost, he says, in his own days, about the end of the reign of Domitian (l. v. c. 30, § 3). As to the true reading of a passage, he refers to the information which he had received from those who had known John face to face. Melito, bishop of Sardis, in the second century, wrote a book on the Revelation of John. —(*Euseb. l. iv. 26.*) All this evidence is more or less connected with the very region of the seven churches in Asia, to whom the book was addressed.

In Egypt we have the testimony of Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*, pp. 207, 667), and, after him, of Origen; in North Africa we have Tertullian (*De Proes*, c. 33), and, at a little later time, we have (at Rome probably) Hippolytus. —(*Opp. p. 18.*) There was thus the united testimony of the East and West.

Caius, a Roman presbyter of the end of the second century, is said (*Euseb. l. iii. 28*) to have rejected this book; but this could have no weight against such evidence. Dionysius of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, in opposing the doctrine of the millennial reign of Christ (*Euseb. l. vii. 24*), chose to ascribe this book to John the Presbyter, and not to the Apostle, but still he elsewhere uses it as an authority. —(*Euseb. l. vii. 10.*) The growing opposition to Millenarianism led to an acquiescence in the view which regarded this book as non-apostolic; hence, probably, the peculiar language employed by Eusebius. Of course we shall adhere to the contemporary evidence, which ascribes this book to the beloved disciple, instead of following mere arbitrary conjectures.

Indeed, it may be observed, that there is perhaps no book of the New Testament for which we have such clear, ample and numerous testimonies in the second century as we have in favour of the Apocalypse. And the more closely the witnesses were themselves connected with the Apostle John (as was the case with Irenaeus), the more full and explicit is their testimony. That doubts should prevail in after ages, must have originated either in ignorance of the earlier testimony, or else from some supposed intuition as to what an Apostle *ought* to have written. The objections raised on the ground of internal *style*, etc. can weigh nothing against the actual evidence. It is in vain to argue, *a priori*, that John *could* not have written this book, when we have the evidence of several competent witnesses that he *did* write it.

RESULTS OF EVIDENCE.

I have now discussed all the books of the New Testament, and to this I may add, that if I were to investigate other remains of antiquity, we could rarely find one-tenth part of the evidence for works undoubtedly genuine; and even this evidence is often only found after intervals much greater than that from the Apostolic age to the end of the second century.

Historic evidence embraces a much wider range than that of eye-witnesses. Thus we do not, in the slightest degree, doubt the facts which Bede mentions in his history as occurring a century and a half, or two centuries, before the time when he wrote. We conclude that he made due inquiries of those who could inform him of what had taken place before his time. A person who takes pains may learn much orally, on good authority, as to past events. I can well remember the interest with which, when a child, I listened to accounts of the Scotch Rebellion, in 1745, under Prince Charles Edward Stewart; and these things were told me not on report, but by an eye-witness. Things thus learned (as Irenaeus says) grow with us; so that the whole of that rebellion would have been a history in my mind, even if I had never read a word on the subject. This is wholly different from hearsay report; and, observe, that this period of 106 years is as great as that between the Apostolic age and the time when Origen had arrived at man's estate. A very few lives may continue testimony for a much longer period. In the Popedom of Sixtus V. (1585-90,) was born Giovanni-Battista Altieri. When very old he became Pope, in 1670, under the name of Clement X.; he died in 1676. Now, in March, 1846, I visited at Rome the convent of Santa Francesca Romana; the abbess of this convent was a princess of the Altieri family, then aged almost 100. This abbess had known several in her own family, very aged of course when she was young, who had been acquainted with their kinsman, Clement X. In conversing with the old abbess of these things, it seemed as if I was transported back two centuries and more. Here were links of connection which carried me back into the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Two hundred and fifty years carry us from the time of St. Paul to that of Eusebius, —the extreme interval over which our inquiries have been extended.

Has not, then, the requirement of the rule of evidence laid down by Augustine been fully met? We can show that a successional series of writers, from the age immediately subsequent to that of the Apostles, have mentioned or used (and in general extensively) the books of the New Testament. And if, with regard to some, such as the Epistle of James and the second Epistle of Peter, the indications are less frequent, we have only to inquire whether they are not sufficient. As to the books in general, the evidence is so cumulative that nothing more attested is presented to our notice.

I have *indicated* the evidence on many points without stating it at length; this has only been, however, the case when the facts are unquestioned. I have omitted vast masses of evidence as to many of the books, not because it is not both good and valuable, but because a few unquestionable witnesses sufficed to prove the points. I have also passed by many statements which are often brought forward as evidence, because of some difficulty or doubt which may attach itself to these testimonies. An advocate may easily invalidate the force of his case, by adding weak or doubtful evidence to that which is beyond exception. Cavils may be raised against that which is weak, which will undermine, in the thoughts of others, that which is strong. Harm has often been done to Christian evidence by referring to writers for that which their works do not contain, except by doubtful interpretations.

Here, then, we have plain historic reasons for accepting the twenty-seven books of the New Testament, as the genuine works of eight persons, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude. But will this evidence apply to *these* books alone? I asked, Why do we receive the Acts of the Apostles, and reject the Acts of Paul and Thecla? I have answered the former part of the inquiry; I will now briefly reply to the second; —Because the Acts of Paul and Thecla, though written by an Asiatic presbyter, who had known Paul, was never received by contemporary Christians, and those of the age immediately subsequent, as an authentic history: and further, as we learn from Tertullian and Jerome, the author of the book was excluded by the Apostle John from his office of presbyter, for having written it. *

* This strange book, "The Acts of Paul and Thecla," is one of the earliest of the apocryphal writings of Christians (or nominal Christians) which has come down to us. It has probably, been altered by additions and missions, but substantially it appears to be the original work of the first century. It has hitherto been known only in the very corrupt text published by Grabe; Prof. Tischendorf has just edited it, far more correctly, from three MSS. in the Bibliothoeque du Roi at Paris, in his "Aria Apostolorum Apocrypha."

And as to other early writings, though we may find, occasionally, one or two who use them and cite them, yet this is the rare exception; it is as much a matter of individual opinion, as it is when we now find a Protestant who believes in the divine authority of some book of the Apocrypha.

But if this be the evidence in favour of the New Testament books, what is that which can be brought to meet it? Should we not hear *both* sides? THERE IS NO COUNTER EVIDENCE WHATSOEVER. Surmises and hinted doubts are *all* that can be brought to meet the united testimony of the early Christian Church, scattered in many regions, yet testifying to the transmission of the same books. But might not this common testimony be only a *tradition*? If tradition be used in an indefinite sense, then I say, certainly not. For this testimony goes back so far as to exclude the lapse of time needful to give birth to indefinite tradition. And, besides, the tradition of something to be propagated by mere oral report, is wholly different from the account which is received relative to a monument inscribed with a record, or a book which claims (as do Paul's Epistles) to be written by any well known individual. The received account then becomes a sort of public consent to the recorded inscription, whatever it be.

Those who seek to invalidate evidence by means of surmises, represent ordinary minds as incapable of nicely balancing such points. They say that without certain habits of study and mental training we cannot do this. But is the allegation true? Can it be applied generally? Certainly we so act as if we thought that minds in general are capable of appreciating evidence, when placed before them intelligibly. We do not seek for profound scholars, or men of most acute intellect, as if the *facts* in question in judicial inquiries could only be determined by such. And though we sometimes find a brainless juryman, incapable of comprehending evidence, yet this does not prevent our considering that men in general are competent to weigh testimony to *facts*. Mental training and experience of a particular kind are certainly necessary to enable any one so to investigate facts, and to arrange the evidence on which they rest, as to present them intelligibly before others, but this is done so for the very purpose of putting them in possession of the evidence which enables them to grasp the *facts* as such.

It has been said that the investigation of Christian evidences is on the whole unsatisfactory, because the point to which it is intended to lead the inquiry is known beforehand. This objection is very much in accordance with the habit of mind which loves a considerable degree of uncertainty, and which wishes to make the first elements of truth a mere field for speculation.

But if this objection be good, will it not apply to other subjects also? For instance, in mathematical studies we know very well as soon as a theorem is enunciated *what the point is* which the teacher intends to prove. We are not instructed how to demonstrate that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, in order that this should afterwards be in our minds a debatable question, but we learn the demonstration that this may henceforth be held as an established and unquestionable fact. Just so is it as to the evidence for the records of our religion. We do not prove the genuineness of the New Testament books on any grounds of mere *opinion*, so that what seems established to-day may be overturned to-morrow, but we demonstrate it by evidence, which loses no part of its value by lapse of time, any more than time can weaken the force of a mathematical demonstration.

EVIDENCE FROM THE CHANNELS OF TRANSMISSION.

If we wish to find the records of a corporate body, we should seek for them in the custody of that corporation itself: if found there, the records may speak for themselves as to the authority which may attach to them. And thus it is with regard to the Scriptures; the Old Testament was given to the Jews, and they have transmitted it to us; the New Testament was given to the Christian community, and they have delivered it on even to our days; and the early writers of the Church have given us sufficient attestation that the books which we have are the same which they had from the beginning. Thus do we receive the Scriptures from what might formally be considered the *proper custody*, even if the early specific evidence had been less strong.

I was present, about twenty years ago, at an investigation, in which a corporate body found it needful to produce the charter which gave them a certain extent of jurisdiction. A document was produced; —on examination it was seen that it was not the original charter, but it was (as it professed to be) a transcript which had been made 550 years before. This transcript had been» admitted in the reign of James II. as *secondary* evidence of what the contents of the original charter had been. But when the document was read, it showed that the corporation, who brought it forward, had habitually acted in contravention of almost all its provisions. They had enforced dues and tolls in defiance of its limitations. Its production thus condemned them so thoroughly, that they could never again establish their claims to these tolls. No one, certainly, could, after this, suspect that the document—mere transcript as it was—was anything contrived by the corporation: its genuineness was proved even by the testimony which it bore against those who brought it forward.

Thus has it been with regard to the Old Testament and the Jews, and the New Testament and the Church. Each is a witness against the collective body which has transmitted it. In each case we have not the original documents, but only transcripts; and in each the transmission is confirmed by the contents of the documents. Just as the production of the charter, to which I referred, condemned the corporation which relied on it, so does the Old Testament condemn the Jews, and the New Testament the practical and doctrinal condition for ages, of the Churches that transmitted it. They affirm its divine authority; and the

testimony which it bears against them is such, that we cannot suppose it possible that they would assert this on any ground but those of believing this to be the truth.

In bringing forward witnesses to the authorship and transmission of the New Testament books, I confined myself to the earlier centuries: if this period gives us satisfactory evidence, we need only inquire further *how* these books have been transmitted from the fourth century and onward.

And here let me remark, that many a document is presented to us without any array of extrinsic evidence. A MS. is found which shows that the book has some antiquity. The internal character of the book agrees with the age of the alleged author, and perhaps the whole scope shows that it is an ancient production. Thus, a MS. written in the middle ages, and now preserved in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris, has been published this year [1851] at Oxford: I know the MS. well; and when M. Emmanuel Miller, of Paris, was copying it for the press, I examined with him several of the passages. Now, the work contained in this MS. belongs *undoubtedly* to the early part of the third century of our era; critics are not agreed as to the author, but the events to which allusion is made, and the heretical doctrines attacked, are rightly considered to be sufficient evidence as to when the author lived. And so, too, many, ancient records may be brought to light which we feel that we can confidently use as historical data. Of what value, otherwise, would be the Assyrian records discovered of late at Nineveh? The circumstances of the discovery and transmission are judged to be a sufficient warrant in this case, as well as in that of the Arundelian Marbles, and in other instances.

The transmission of the New Testament books to our times, has been accompanied by circumstances of a far more confirming character. Ancient books have come down to us through M.SS. either in the language in which they were originally written, or in translations, or in both. The latter case is true of the New Testament. There now exist MSS. in the original Greek of the New Testament Books, of every age, from the fourth century inclusive, to the time when they were printed. This is the fullest guarantee to us that these are the identical books to which the chain of witnesses, that I adduced, bears testimony. The MSS., also, are of importance in the evidence that they bear in favour of those books which Eusebius describes as *doubted by some*; —for we find no MS. containing a collection of Epistles in which those are rejected which some then controverted. But besides MSS. we have versions: —of these, some, such as the Syriac and old Latin, were made (as is almost certain) in the second century, while in or before the fourth century, there were formed Egyptian versions in the two dialects of upper and lower Egypt, as well as a Gothic translation, and a new one into Latin. Others, such as the Æthiopic and Armenian, were made in a period immediately subsequent. Of the Gothic version we possess but a part; and of the rest all, except the old Syriac, are witnesses for *all* our New Testament books.

There is not such a mass of transmissional evidence in favour of any classical work. The existing MSS. of Herodotus and Thucydides are modern enough when compared with some of those of the New Testament.

Thus *every country*, into the language of which the New Testament books were translated in early times, is a witness to us of their transmission.

(*To be continued.*)

The Gospel not Preached by the Clergy.

THE succession of parables in Matt, xiii., etc., is given by the Lord Jesus for the single purpose of teaching true and correct ideas concerning the Kingdom of the Heavens, or the Kingdom of God. But, first, we must know what is meant by the words the Kingdom of the Heavens, or the Kingdom of God, before we can profit from these parables which set forth its resemblances.

John the Baptist came proclaiming "The Kingdom of the Heavens is at hand," or has approached. And when the Evangelists would describe *in one word* what was the substance of their preaching, they called it "the Gospel," or "good news of the Kingdom." Now, to one reflecting upon this, the constant theme of the Baptizer John, and of the Lord, and of his Apostles, it is not only clear that *the matter of the gospel*, the word of preaching, the substance of faith, the object of hope, *is the Kingdom of God*, which, also, is the only future thing that we pray for in "the Lord's Prayer,"—*Thy Kingdom come*, adding this commentary or exposition, "thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;" and therefore in the very first blush of the thing it is manifest, that every preacher should be occupied in proclaiming to every man the Kingdom of the Heavens which is to come, whatever may be his opinion concerning the same. We are not to be abused or derided for preaching a Kingdom, but *they who do not preach a Kingdom are to be accused of not preaching the gospel of our Lord and his Apostles.*

But besides this, another thing is manifest from this style in which the Baptizer John and the Lord Jesus began their ministry, namely, that the term "Kingdom of the Heavens" signifies something with which the Jews were perfectly familiar. For had not this been the case, what would have been the meaning to them of preaching it "at hand?" Of preaching a thing *at hand*, concerning which they knew, and therefore cared, nothing at all? For example, if a preacher were now to stand up and preach that the conclusion of the *meteoric cycle* were "at hand," that the *annus magnus* was nearly closed, or any other event in time, to which the hearers attached no ideas, and consequently, no hopes, or fears, would he be called a wise man, or a fool? Certainly a fool; for every one will answer and say, What is the *annus magnus* to me? What concern is the *meteoric cycle* of mine? It were not like a message of God upon which to send Messiah, and Messiah's forerunner, to proclaim a thing to which the people were utterly strange. But if, on the other hand, the preacher were to stand up and say in the midst of them all, "The judgment of the living is at hand; the outpouring of the Seventh Vial has approached"—then, indeed, you would feel it to be a most grave and mighty message with which he was burdened, because you may have already a distinct apprehension and a deep feeling of that which the words convey. Forasmuch, then, as the Jewish people, to whom these tidings from Jehovah were sent, must have well understood the meaning of the expressions in which they were couched, the question arises, And what did they understand thereby?

To this pertinent inquiry we answer, that they understood what God had taught them by the prophets concerning a Kingdom which was to be established in Palestine—in the land promised to Abraham and his Seed, the token of which promise was in their circumcised flesh. That Kingdom, which being everywhere mentioned in Scripture, is particularly set forth in its succession by Daniel, as about to follow the four successive, and yet, "in the end," contemporary systems of nations, under which the Jews, as the Ecclesia of God, were to be brought in bondage. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a Kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the Kingdom shall not be left to other people,

but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever"—Dan. ii. 44. And again, he says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold, One like the Son of Man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given to him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that ALL peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." And in verse 27 of this ch. vii., it is testified that "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heavens* shall be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High Ones, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

Here, then, is the fountain from which the Jews drank in their expectations. There is a fifth kingdom coming in succession after four other *systems of kingdoms*, which is called the kingdom of God, the kingdom of the Most High Ones—*elyonin*—the Eternal Spirit or Ancient of Days, and the Son of Man through whom He manifests himself—the kingdom of Jehovah and of his Anointed. Those four previous kingdoms had come, and three of them, as having dominion over Palestine, had passed away; and the Jews in that and other lands were enduring the tyranny of the fourth, and had endured it for two hundred years, a longer period than any of the preceding three; and they were in daily expectation of that fifth kingdom of God, of, Messiah, of the Most High Ones, or of the Heavens, in which they were to hold the government under God, over all the nations of the earth.

Now this is—and nothing else is or can be—the thing which our Lord means in his discourses by "the kingdom of the heavens;" for this, and this alone, is what the Jews understood, and had been taught to understand by that expression, the kingdom of the heavens. Jesus did not come to abolish, or make void, the law and the prophets; verily, not to destroy, but to fulfil them; not to alter their faith; that is, not to give them new objects of belief, but to correct any erroneous notions and conceptions which they entertained concerning that kingdom upon the earth, which is, and ever has been, and ever will be, until it is established, the object of the affectionate and zealous expectation of all true believers.

In the parable of the Sower, the Lord Jesus has set forth the true doctrine concerning preaching, and under the emblem of seed sown in four diverse kinds of soil. The seed sown he styles, "*the Word of the Kingdom*:" and his parables in general, he terms, "*the Mysteries of the Kingdom*." The parable of the Sower contains no more than the teaching concerning the reception which the Gospel of the Kingdom should receive from men. It has to do only with *the Seed-Time*, with the labours of the Sower, which is going forward, and has been going forward, since the Son of Man began the labour in his own field; and will continue until the Son of Man comes seated on the cloud with the crown upon his head, and the sharp sickle in his hand to reap the harvest field. But, alas, how little soil is there now strong enough for the germination and fructification of the Word of the Kingdom! We utterly despair of making this blinded, self-conceited generation of pious infidels to discern the truth; and it is mainly, if not exclusively, from amongst those who make no profession, that the flock of Christ is now to be developed. The "religious world" treats the subject of the coming of the Son of Man with derision, unbelief, and hostility. But he is coming to destroy the clergy and break their confederacy of unbelief; to slay the great enemy of the chosen, which is Antichrist in all his forms; and to deliver his saints, who have cried day and night for vengeance upon the adversary; from his oppression, whether that oppression be the oppression of the world upon the living, or the oppression of the grave upon the dead. It is his chosen ones who cry to him day and night for vengeance; and it is they only who have the promise of this deliverance; and

those only who are on tiptoe readiness to obey the summons that receive the escape from the fiery deluge. Let the gainsayers gainsay, and let the deniers deny to the uttermost that the Lord is coming in person to judge the Antichristian Church, constituted of Romanists, and Sectarrians of every "Name and Denomination" of blasphemy, —it is the voice of God's word, and it cannot be broken. If the clergy would quench in death every voice which declares it, then the thunders from heaven above, and the lightnings flashing from pole to pole, and the earthquake's shock from beneath, would make men hear it, aye, and believe it, too, but like the demons of old time, to believe and tremble. Therefore let men take heed whom, how, and what they hear.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Position Defined.

WE have received the following letter from a brother in Texas, accompanying the copy of an article furnished for publication in a Campbellite periodical called "*The Gospel Advocate*." We do not know whether it found place therein, inasmuch as its conductors and proprietors, according to Campbellite editorial courtesy, have long since ceased to exchange with us. *Apropos* of these gentlemen we may remark, that we sent them the HERALD because they first sent the *Gospel Advocate* to us. Not very long after Mr. Fanning thought proper to make us the subject of an article in his pages. To this we replied correcting mis-statements, and reminding him of an article published in the *Herald of the Future Age* in 1844, addressed to him, the arguments and testimonies in which he has not, and can never answer. But the only response to this was the discontinuance of his "Gospel Advocate," though he still continues to receive the HERALD. This we have sent him in commiseration for his blindness in hope that it might make him conscientious in a good sense; and open the eyes of his understanding that he might see. But hitherto we have failed even to provoke him to courtesy. Our patience is almost expended; so that if the editorial liberality is to continue all on one side, we shall cease to trouble ourselves in throwing "*pearls before*" him, and offering "*things holy*" for his consideration. He may not care to receive the HERALD; but certain it is, that he cannot care less than we to receive *The Advocate*; yet, as a matter of courtesy, we are willing to give a *quid* without a *quo*—a something for nothing.

Before dismissing the subject of editorial politeness, we may remark concerning that other editor, at Bethany, that we sent him the HERALD from 1844 to 1855, nine volumes, beside presenting him a copy of *Elpis Israel*, which he condemned without reading; in exchange for which he sent us nothing: BUT NOW that a friend in Virginia has sent him two dollars, and for these ordered his *Millennial Harbinger* to be mailed to us here, we receive it regularly. It is probable we might get the *Gospel Advocate* too upon like terms; but, though one or two dollars are a mere trifle, the price is too much for the unscriptural and superficial verbiage they contain; still, as we have said, we would give something for nothing, if we could do them any good, —or just to see the pitfalls and sloughs in which the incarnations of Campbellism are bemired. We perceive these leaders are in a hopeless case. They are making no progress; but rather retrograding into the original "depths of the Satan" from which they professedly emerged. —But to the letter of our Texan correspondent, He says:

"*Dear Brother:* —About two weeks ago, I received from my brother, Dr. Oatman, the January number of the "Gospel Advocate," published at Nashville, Tennessee, by Fanning and Lipscomb, with a letter directing my attention to the article therein, entitled, "*Dr. Thomas'*

late visit to Tennessee," with a request that I would respond to the invitation to "define." I have attempted to do so. But we all concluded that to define only without noticing some of the *personal* abuse heaped upon you (which personalities are coupled in the article alluded to with the invitation to define) would show a want of dignity unbecoming a Christian and a gentleman. Hence, I have taken some notice of his personal abuse of you, on account of which we think the editors, "for reasons of State," may not altogether be willing to publish.

I send you a copy of my respectful "communication" enclosed with this; and would say, that it is the wish of all they call your "admirers" here, as well as in Bastrop county, that you would give the same a place in the HERALD, hoping that good may result thereby.

The good cause is still progressing hereabouts, notwithstanding the opposition "the faction" meets with from the so-called "Disciples" and their brethren "the Sects." Another "three-fact gospeller" near us has sent word to my father, or Bro. Larrimore, to come unto his neighborhood and re-immure him. Others are inquiring, *What is the Gospel?*

Yours in the One Hope,

HARDIN OATMAN.

Llano Co., Texas;
April 13, 1859.

The following is the article alluded to in bro. Oatman's letter, defining the knowledge acquired, and straightening out the story of our faith.

To the Editors of the Gospel Advocate: —

In the article, "Dr. Thomas' second visit to Tennessee," on page 22 of the January number of your periodical, you say: "that while the Dr. and his admirers have boasted for years of their advances, 'discoveries,' and progress, we have not found one of them who can define the new acquisition of knowledge, or can tell a straight story with regard to what he thinks it is. If there is any one competent to define their position, as different from the disciples of Christ, our columns are open for respectful statements."

To begin: We boast only of our persecutions; for, verily, we are "hated of all men." The press, everywhere, is closed against us. The people are warned against us from pulpit and sanctum, all over this broad land. Hence, we are read and listened to by few, understood by fewer, and misrepresented by nearly all. The cry, everywhere, is "crazyman!" We are hunted down for what we do *not* teach and practice. But we only boast that, in our hard warfare with "the world, the flesh, and the Devil," we are counted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake. We pray Jehovah to forgive you all, for you know not what you oppose, having not—we fear—made yourselves acquainted with the "sure word of prophecy." Now that your wars with the "Sects" are over, (which leaves you with ample territory conquered,) you may settle down in your "land of Shinar," and erect your "tower whose top shall reach unto heaven,"—by which you may "get a name;" but the prophetic hand of Jehovah will brand it with "*mystery!*" Too soon your language will be confounded, and you will go the way of all the earth. We will not remain even in the suburbs. Our motto is "to the law and to the testimony." Policy and expediency are out of the question with us. This course brings us but small numbers; but we do know that the true followers of the Lamb have always formed a contemptible minority.

I feel that I am *not* "competent to define" to the extent required. But, having been one of the "wayward admirers" of the "crazy-man," for twenty years, and wishing to see some of the differences between us set forth, I have concluded to make a few "respectful statements." But a difficulty meets me at the outset. Who are comprehended in the word "disciples?" Does the word embrace those only who after having heard and believed the gospel, as recorded by "Matthew, Mark, Luke and John," were immersed for the remission of sins? I trow not. Let us examine a few cases.

Case 1st. An individual at a camp-meeting, amid storms, of "*the Holy Ghost and fire sent down from heaven*" "gets religion"—a kind of religion which makes him dance as though impelled by the genius of Sancti Viti—is immersed by a preacher of easy *virtue*, who protests all the time against the *mode*. This individual knocks at the door for church-membership. Is he rejected as "a thief and a robber" for wishing to "climb up some other way?" Nay, verily; the door creaks upon its hinges, and he enters, as one of the lost sheep, now found, amid loud hosannas.

Case 2nd. A person, after days, weeks, months or years' "seeking," gets "religion," under the influence of those cold, gloomy doctrines which emanated from Geneva, and is immersed because he has "got religion;" and because it is his *duty* so to do. He, too, is received.

Case 3d. A nice Miss Melinda, at a great city "tabernacle," hears a sermon preached from the text, "and in hell he lifted up his eyes," becomes "convicted," goes to the "anxious seat," kneels upon a velvet cushion, "gets religion" in a comfortable way, and is baptized in a nice marble font, the water being raised to an agreeable temperature. She too is received upon a bare *assent* to the doctrines of "the reformation;" so were both the others.

Case 4th. A person hears and believes the gospel, as taught in "Matthew, Mark, Luke and John," as *the whole gospel*, and is immersed for the remission of sins. I am happy to say that those of this last class compose the largest number of the "disciples." Now, aside from Trinitarians and Anti-Trinitarians, with those who say they are "*neither*;" aside from Calvinists and Arminians; from those who believe the doctrine of final "perseverance of the saints," and those who believe the doctrines of "falling from grace," "total depravity," and "free will;" with all the other *isms* and etceteras which make up "the one body" "reformation," including those who nullify those awful words, "*He that believeth not shall be damned!*" which of the four cases above, I ask—not wishing to wound the feelings of any—embrace the "disciples?" It seems to me that, in order to "define" satisfactorily to all, it will be proper to take a bird's-eye view of the origin of this "miserable faction." Well: about 29 years ago, (I believe) John Thomas, M.D., heard and believed the gospel according to "Matthew, Mark, Luke and John," and was immersed for the remission of sins. In order that he might learn things "useful," he was placed under the tutelage of A.C. The "disciples" "sheltered and fed him." It was not long, however, before he (*carrying out the principles of "the reformation"*) taught that all those in the fraternity, who had not heard and believed the gospel, before baptism, and had not been baptized for the remission of sins, ought to be re-immersed. Sad consequence! "The church" is in danger of dissolution! If this *stringent* principle is carried out, all those enlisted from the "sects," with A.C. at their head, will leave in a body; and the new recruits will be left as sheep without a shepherd, or "supervisor." What is to be done? Be re-baptized! What! *re*-baptized? Contrary to all experience for old professors to be re-baptized. Shall we discuss this *new* doctrine in public? Discuss a doctrine that will break up the church! Suicide! * * * The cry of *mad dog!* Is raised, throughout the length and breadth of

the land, by the "disciples," (the press and the pulpit leading off,) against "*no-soulism*," and "*destructionism*," while the main subject, *re-immersion*, is left in the *shade*—as a matter of *expediency*, I am sorry to say, I believe. So much for the origin of the "faction." Its subsequent history few know much about, except, so far as may be learned from the following, and a few other kindred accounts: That Dr. Thomas says many "ill-natured things;" has a "low ambition;" "heaps abuse upon A.C." and the "disciples generally," who "taught him all that he knows that is useful;" besides have "*sheltered and fed him*." That his "*bad temper* keeps him out of the pale of the kingdom!" But that the "disciples" have *mercifully* (!) interfered, or "he would have been driven about the country as a crazy-man," to whom "no one now shows the least countenance." Such, I am sorry to say, seems to me to be a sample of the tactics pursued towards Dr. Thomas, for twenty years. I beg leave to remind you of the dozen, or dozens of articles, which have appeared from time to time, in the "Millennial Harbinger," against Dr. T.; in nearly all of which Mr. Alexander Campbell has attacked the *personal* only; and with a malignity which, it seems to me, has hardly ever been equalled by protestant against protestant, in this or any other land—the case of Calvin against Servetus hardly excepted. The press and pulpit everywhere have echoed; the people have echoed from hill to dale, from mountain to plain.

The poor cur which no one will *shelter*, and to which no kindly cook will throw a piece of bread from the kitchen window, but which everybody lashes with his great whip, with the cry of "mad dog!" is taught by experience to see an enemy in the person of every one whom he meets, when he snaps and snarls at all. So with Dr. T. He has been hunted down, for twenty years, with the cry of "*madman*," "crazy-man," with scarcely ever a kindly word, or kindly treatment, from any one, until he says many seemingly "ill-natured things" *in self-defence*. I respectfully suggest that you all change your tactics in relation to this long abused man. That instead of the *personal*, you enlighten the people in relation to the *doctrinal* of Dr. Thomas, so long left in the shade. All over this nation the people are beginning to ask, who is this Dr. Thomas, against whose *person*, for twenty years, the thunders of pulpit and press have been hurled with such dread determination to annihilate? Who is this "crazy-man" who still holds up his head defiantly? But I will now "define."

We believe that the scriptures teach, that he who, after having heard the gospel, believes the same, and is immersed into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, *for the remission of sins*, receives the pardon of all past sins; is inducted into the body of Christ; and becomes, by adoption, "the seed of Abraham," and an heir of the "promised inheritance;" and, should he not sin and fall, as did the children of Israel, in the wilderness, his "vile body" will be "changed" by his "mortal" putting on "immortality," in the resurrection state; and will have an inheritance in the Kingdom of God, to be set up, on *earth*, by the Lord Messiah, after his second advent; in which Kingdom the "immortals" will reign with Messiah, as kings and priests, for one thousand years.

That the gospel consists of the promises made to Abraham concerning the "seed" and the "inheritance," with the promises of the great King, and Kingdom of Heaven, as recorded by Moses, by David, in the Psalms, and by nearly all the prophets; and was preached by John the Baptist, by Messiah, by the Twelve and the Seventy, all of whom preached, the "Kingdom of Heaven is at hand"—these promises (to be literally fulfilled), with the birth, life, sacrifice, resurrection, ascension, and promise to come again, of the Lord Messiah, as taught on *Pentecost* (when, for the first time, the *whole* gospel "concerning the Kingdom of God, and name of Jesus, was preached); taught at the "beautiful gate;" taught at the house of Cornelius; by Philip at Samaria; and by Paul, "two whole years," at Rome; constitute the "one gospel."

That in fulfilment of the promises, the Messiah, (born "King of the Jews," and anointed as such at his baptism; "a prophet like unto" Moses, to Judah and Benjamin, while on earth; a high priest at the right hand of the Father, since his ascension,) will, under the sounding of the Seventh Trumpet, be revealed from Heaven, when he will break the nations "in pieces, as a potter's vessel;" "will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen down," and "upon the throne of his father David," situated "upon Mount Zion," as *his capitoline hill*; "in Jerusalem," as his great metropolis; in the land called "the inheritance," as his royal Kingdom; with the earth as his territory annexed: with the twelve tribes of Israel restored for his home-born subjects; and "the ransomed" "from the power of the grave," as his kings and priests, with him, —He will "rule the nations with a rod of iron," for one thousand years; will "reign among his ancients gloriously!"

That as all the prophecies in Old and New Testament have been fulfilled *literally*, so we believe that those which remain unaccomplished, will transpire literally. Hence, we recognize no Mount Zion but that "in Jerusalem;" no Jerusalem, but "the City of the Great King," situated in old Canaan; no Canaan but that embraced in the land, ("the inheritance") promised to Abraham and "his seed;" no "Kingdom" but that to be set up on earth, and to include the earth, in the manner above stated; no King but the Lord Messiah, son and heir of "the inheritance," promised to Abraham; "Son of David," and heir to his throne; "Son of God," and "heir of the world, of which he is to be the Great King! Amen."

The doctrine of the "immortality of the soul," we find first taught in a crude state by Homer, who learnt it, perhaps, from the Egyptian priests: these latter, probably, learned it from the Brahmins. We only know that the Grecian Bard learned it not from Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Nathan, David, Solomon, for they did not teach it. From Homer to Plato this doctrine was taught by the Orators, Poets and Philosophers of Greece. Still in a crude state, Plato reduced the crude doctrine to a system, on account of which he obtained the soubriquet of "Divine," which he retains to this day. From Plato to Constantine, this doctrine was *pagan orthodoxy* with the Greeks, and throughout the Roman Empire. It was foisted into "the church" during the first centuries, along with ten thousand other errors and abominations, imported, like it, from paganism, and which filled up the measure of the "mystery of iniquity," and has ever since been entertained by all, from the "Woman on the scarlet-colored beast," down to the youngest daughter of "mystery," who have deemed it, and who still deem it, "a wholesome doctrine, very full of comfort." As this dogma is nowhere—we repeat it with respect for the feelings of all—*no* where to be found in the Holy Bible, we deem it an effect of the strong delusion, sent on an apostate world, that they might "be damned" who "had pleasure in unrighteousness."

We do not believe that hell is such a place as that described in *Paradise Lost*, improved in the Course of Time—where the wicked are to be cast for endless torture. Neither do we recognize the purgatory of the Papists, nor "the intermediate state." We know of no other penalty for the wicked, than "everlasting destruction," when "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven," to take "vengeance" on the living ungodly, and the "second death" at the end of the one thousand years' reign on earth—which "destruction" and "death," we believe will be final. The doctrine concerning "Pluto, King of Hell," which is the "Satan" of Milton, who, after being "cast out of Heaven," fell, "nine days and nights," into the midst of Hell; whose congenial climate is the *torrid*, whose native element is *brimstone*; of form and mien dreadful, as appears in *Pilgrim's Progress*; the terror and the dread of all men in nearly all ages, Pagan, Catholic and Protestant, we disbelieve. But the doctrine in relation to the

Satan that tempted Eve, afflicted Job; stood up and tempted David; tempted the Lord Messiah, by offering him all the kingdoms of the world if he would fall down and worship him—"the prince of the power of the air," (political)—"the *spirit* that works in the children of disobedience;" whose end is, that he be cast alive, into the lake of fire and brimstone, whence "the smoke of his torment ascendeth up forever and ever." This doctrine (of the Bible) we believe; though we "*fear not him.*"

The doctrine of the migration of the soul from the body we can hardly treat seriously. Of this doctrine, so intimately connected with the "immortality of the soul," "hell," and "the devil," as believed by nearly all "Christendom," we can only say that, we do not believe that when a man dies, his "immortal soul" instantly

"Mounts and soars away

To the bright realms of endless day,"

goes to the "intermediate state," or "sinks beneath his frowns to hell," from whence it will return to the earth "when Gabriel's awful trumpet shall sound," when "soul and body reunite," when "amid the "Comet's blaze, sinners raise," and with the living, good and evil, will immediately stand at the judgment seat of Christ, whence the wicked are condemned, and "dragged by devils down to hell," while the righteous ascend and reascend, and "kingdoms gain beyond the skies," there to remain forever in a state of intensified bliss. Such dogmas, it seems to me, are the mere dreams and mental illusions of men "crazy" in regard to the one faith and the one hope; and might be deemed harmless did they not nullify the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God to be set up on *earth*, when shall be heard the triumphant words: "The *Kingdoms* of this *world* have become the *Kingdoms* of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign (on earth) forever and forever!" To us the Scriptures teach: no life between death, and the resurrection of the body by the spirit of God; no immortality but through the resurrection; no "mounting" or "soaring," except to be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air," to descend with him when he "cometh, and ten thousand Saints with him." "Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

We believe the fearful fact that "the fulness of the Gentiles" will be their fulness in *iniquity*—to which they seem to be fast tending. So that, when the Son of man cometh, the earth will be "defiled under the inhabitants thereof," and He will hardly "*find faith on the earth!*" Also, that the time is at the very door, when "He shall come as a thief in the night." Hence, we "look for him," and pray, —Lord Jesus, come quickly! Nay, we hope that our last breath may sigh forth these words: Lord Jesus, come quickly! Amen.

The above is a brief outline of some of our views. We leave it to all to say how far we differ from the "disciples." We are ready, at all times, in public and private, to give a reason for the faith that is in us; and will be happy to unite with any, of a Berean Spirit, in searching the scriptures, to see whether these things are so or not. Wishing that we may all come to a knowledge of the truth,

I subscribe myself Yours,

HARDIN OATMAN.

Llano Co., Texas;
April 10, 1859.

An Error or Two Corrected.

IN the above, Bro. Oatman speaking of the editor of the Herald, says, that "about 29 years ago he heard and believed the gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; and

was immersed for remission of sins." In stating this, our brother has been unintentionally incorrect. Twenty – nine years ago we had not left England. We emigrated from that country in May 1832, and were "immersed for remission of sins" by Mr. Walter Scott, the inventor of Campbellism, in the following October; so that said immersion happened 27 years ago.

But, at that date we had not heard and believed the gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as he supposes. If we had, we should have heard and believed the Gospel of the Kingdom. All we thought we knew as "*ancient gospel*" we learned from the then clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States in Cincinnati, now unhappily an infidel-spiritualist; and Mr. Walter Scott, the inventor, as we have said, though not the patentee, of Campbellism, —and now as wild as a theological "March Hare," if the book recently published by him be accepted in evidence *de lunatico inquirendo*. These being *the fonts et origines* of our information, we heard and believed only what they could teach us, which all amounted to this, *belief in the divine sonship of Jesus; and immersion for remission of sins*. They said, if we believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God; and were immersed for remission of sins, believing that immersion, on such a basis, was for remission, we believed and obeyed the ancient gospel. Being too ignorant of the scriptures to controvert it, we assented to it; and in obedience to their traditions were immersed for remission of sins, which we now see we did not get. As they did not know of such a gospel as "the gospel of the kingdom of God," (of which they are faithless and perhaps ignorant to this day) we did not hear "the gospel" from them; and having no understanding of it, we did not believe it; and therefore could not obey it in immersion. For this cause we were reimmersed in 1847, having previously come to an understanding of "*the Word of the Kingdom,*" and "*the Revelation of the Mystery,*" by the study of the prophets and apostles. Then our transgression was forgiven, our sin *covered*, and our iniquity no more imputed, because we believed "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ;" and upon this basis were immersed into him, that we might be *clothed* with him as with a garment of righteousness, clean and white. We were immersed for this covering, that by it our sins might be hidden and revealed no more. Without faith in the above "things," we could not have had "access" to the covering; for justification comes through faith in them; not through dipping in water in ignorance thereof.

Another mistake is that we were "placed under the tutelage of A. Campbell, that we might learn things "useful." We were never so placed by any one, either individual or communal. Nor did we ever have a desire to be so placed, if we had known of any to place us under tutelage. We were always opposed to standing before "the religious public," and sought to avoid it; but have been forced by circumstances to occupy the position in which we find ourselves. Our tutelage had been of a different sort to any thing within the competency of A.C, and we had no desire for indoctrination into the mysteries of Scotch metaphysics or theology in which he had been trained, and by which his reason had been sophisticated and grievously perverted. Our studies had been anatomical, physiological, pathological, chemical, philological, historical, and so forth; and when our interest was awakened in things eternal while sailing on the deep, we desired only to know and understand the truth whatever it might be, and not human theories and opinions. A false estimate has been placed upon Mr. Campbell, and for a while, wholly ignorant of the word, we were entangled by it. We esteemed him more highly than he deserved, being then unable to measure him by the Spirit's standard in the word; but never were we guilty of the folly of desiring or consenting to be placed under his tutelage in order to learn things "useful." He could not have taught us anything useful. What he could teach would only have tended to exclude the light from our mind, as his teaching does from the minds of all who surrender themselves to it. Happily for

us he tried to destroy us—to make us an object of hatred and contempt in which laudable enterprise he succeeded marvellously well. We are now "hated of all men" who know not the truth, through his influence and that of his satellites. They have erected a barrier of prejudice high as the walls of Babylon by which their "disciples" are effectually kept within the fold. Still they cannot entirely exclude the truth. It is not only fermenting in Texas, but in the Empire City too. Notwithstanding the bad odor with which they have incensed our name in clouds of fog, one and another comes to discover the imposition their Campbellite editors and preachers have practised upon them. Recently in this city the Campbellite spirit has been infuriated. Their hireling, a Bethany student, has been defeated and put to shame in the presence of his own members by one of the "weaker vessels." Nothing is easier than to do this; for in nothing are they less skilled than in "rightly dividing the word of truth." "Reformation" in this city has settled down into the hire of a college youth at twelve hundred dollars a year, to preach immersion for remission of sins, the union of all "Christians," and—

"Heaven a happy place on high,
A glorious city in the sky,
Where all may go, e'en such as I!"

Though the reader may be surprised at this and question that it can have made such shipwreck of all its original principles, it is nevertheless true. The "reformation" here is but the shadow of a name, and utterly destitute of all power for any other than purely sectarian purposes. The truth is not among them. This it is not difficult to prove. Hence, death reigns, and the air is stagnant. The pall of Bethany enshrouds them, and corruption has progressed. This, we believe, is too far advanced to be stayed. The body must perish, for it is the spirit of the world in all its pride of life incarnate. It may possibly contain a few redeemable atoms; but the difficulty is to get at them to do them good. The sleep of death is not easily disturbed.

As to the hard speeches they bandy against us they have long since ceased to be regarded as anything else than pitiable and absurd. We smile at them as the mere sound and fury of the impotent. Nearly twenty-five years of hardness have made us invulnerable. Our faith quenches all their darts, and our trusty sword, more than "Toledo trusty," hews them into mince meat. Armed with its sharp two-edges, we can divide asunder the soul and spirit of Campbellism, and separate its joints and marrow. The "disciples" of Bethany feel the operation, winch like the amputation of a limb, is not very agreeable to the patient. Hence their absurd and foolish speeches against us. They cannot refute our arguments, and therefore their outcry, and personal attacks. This is the devil's policy all the world over. He knows the rottenness of his cause, how that it will not stand examination in the crucible of scripture; the wily creature therefore raises a hue and cry against the examiner to divert attention from the subject. But this will not always serve. He has cried "wolf" so often that the thinking public begin to discover the cheat; and though he pretends to be a saint, "the devil a saint is he." This begins to be seen; so that our confidence increases, and is assured that in due season, if we faint not, the devil will get his due.

EDITOR.

Sept. 1, 1859.

The Pope's Government.

His Temporal Dominions—Organization of the States of the Church—The Revenues and Resources of the Government—The Pope's Body-Guard and Army—The College of Cardinals—Their Number and How Appointed—Rights of Catholic Sovereigns in Relation

Thereto—The Pope's Government Really an Ecclesiastical Oligarchy—The Two Factions of the Cardinals—History of the Election of the Popes—Successful Struggle of the Church for the Election by Cardinals—The Veto of the Catholic Powers of Europe on Particular Nominees—Curious Mode of Election, and Peculiar Ceremonies attending it.

THE territories comprised in the Papal States number upwards of three millions of inhabitants, or about one-third of the whole Italian population. As the readers of the HERALD have seen from former articles, they have been acquired at various periods by inheritance or bequest, by cession and by conquest: First, the lands and tenements granted by Constantine; then the Duchy of Rome, with a large portion of the exarchate of Ravenna, conferred by Pepin and Charlemagne in the eighth century; next, the Duchy of Benevento, ceded by the German Emperor Henry II. to Leo IX., and in the twelfth century the allodial possessions of the Countess Matilda passed by bequest to the church, including what is now known as the "Patrimony of St. Peter." On the return of the Popes to Rome from Avignon in France, after an exile of seventy-three years, and on the subsequent subjection of the petty princes of Romagna and Umbria, other important possessions gradually fell into their hands. In the fifteenth century they obtained the principality of Pontecorvo in the kingdom of Naples, and about the same period Perugia and several other towns acknowledged the sovereignty of the "successors of St. Peter," and the conquests of Pope Julius II. added to the dominions of the Holy See the important provinces of Romagna and Bologna. Ancona was occupied by the Papal troops in 1532; Ferrara was seized in 1597; the Duke of Urbino abdicated in favor of the Church in 1626, and a few years after the Papal territory received its last addition in the fiefs of Castro and Ronciglione, wrested by Innocent X. from the Farnese family.

Such were the temporal possessions of the Pope till the French Revolution and the wars of Bonaparte in Italy. The final defeat of the French Emperor by the Allies restored the Pope to Rome, and Rome and his temporal dominions to the Pope, in 1814, except that part of the province of Ferrara situated on the left bank of the Po, which Austria retained, together with the right of occupying the *places* of the city of Ferrara and Commachio. The Pope, through Cardinal Consalvi, protested against the latter measure at the Congress of Vienna, where his restoration was settled. But no attention was ever paid to the Pope's protest. The occupation of the city, as well as the citadel of Ferrara by Austria, in 1847, on the ground that the word "place" in the treaty applied to the entire city, roused a spirit of nationality and insurrection against Austria, which was momentarily appeased by the surrender of both city and citadel to the Pope, which, however, were afterwards occupied, as well as the greater part of the territory of the Church, by an Austrian army.

The States of the Church are divided into twenty provinces. The first is the Comarca of Rome, including within its jurisdiction the capital and the Agro Romano. The other nineteen are divided into two classes, Legations and Delegations. The Legations are governed by Cardinals, and the Delegation, for the most part, by Prelates, with the title of Monsignore. The office of Prelate is peculiar to the Papal States. He is not a bishop, nor necessarily an ecclesiastic, but must continue in celibacy when in office. This office is the stepping stone to preferment in the higher offices of State. There are six Legations—Bologna, Ferrara, Forli, Ravenna, Urbino, (with Pesaro) and Velletri. There are thirteen delegations or provinces, among which are Ancona, Perugia, Civita Vecchia and Benevento. The Legations and Delegations are divided into districts, the latter into governorships, and these again into communes. The government is a sort of theocracy—an elective absolute politico-religious monarchy—chosen by the College of Cardinals.

The municipal government of Rome is entrusted to the Senator, an office of high antiquity, and generally of one of the great patrician families, and the Conservatori, with a municipal body of forty councillors, selected by the Pope. Their functions are purely municipal, in the most contracted sense, neither exercising magisterial duties nor interfering with the police. The revenues of the city amount to about \$800,000 annually, of which two-thirds are seized by the government, leaving the municipality with very inadequate means. Hence Rome, as regards righting, cleansing and paving, is in a worse condition than almost any other city in Europe.

The revenue of the Papal States is about twelve millions of dollars. The expense of collection amounts to twenty-five per cent, on the receipts.

The States of the Church are divided into three military divisions—Rome, Bologna and Ancona. The army is under the direction of a Minister of War, of late a military man. The Swiss Body-Guard of the Pope comprises 126 foot soldiers, who carry the ancient halbert and wear the singular costume said to have been devised by Michael Angelo. The Pope's "Noble Guard" is a mounted corps of eighty noblemen. The whole Papal military force, consisting chiefly of Swiss, numbers about 15,000 foot and 1,600 horse, exclusive of the *gendarmerie* (or national guard) placed under the direction of the police. The navy consists of a solitary gun-brig, some small craft, and two or three steamers.

The education of the lower classes is less attended to than in any other country in Italy except Naples. There are few countries in Europe which enjoy more natural advantages of soil and climate than the States of the Church, but their resources, owing to misgovernment, remain undeveloped.

The College of Cardinals numbers seventy when it is complete—that being the limit fixed by Sextus V., in allusion to the seventy disciples sent out by Christ to preach the Gospel over the world. Of these six are cardinal bishops of the six suburban dioceses, fifty are cardinal priests, who have all titles from parish churches in Rome, and fourteen are cardinal deacons, who have their titles from churches in Rome of less note. The cardinals are created by the Pope when there are vacancies; sometimes he names one or two at a time, but generally he defers the appointments till there are ten or twelve vacancies, when the Catholic kings and emperors of Europe have a right to present one candidate each, and if there be not some very great objection they are all appointed. The cardinals are commonly promoted from among such clergymen as have borne offices in the Roman Court; some are taken from the orders of monks; eminent ecclesiastics of other countries are likewise honored with this dignity, like Cardinal Wiseman, of England, and formerly Cardinal Wolsey, Cardinal Richelieu and Cardinal Pole. Sons of Catholic sovereigns have frequently been members of "the Sacred College." Their distinctive dress is scarlet, to signify that they ought to be ready to shed their blood for the faith and church when the defence and honor of either require it. They wear a scarlet cap and hat; the cap is given to them by the Pope, if they are at Rome, and is sent to them if they are absent; but the hat is never given except by the Pope's own hand. These cardinals have heretofore formed the Pope's standing council, or consistory, for the management of the public affairs of the Church and State. The Emperor of the French in 1849 required the Pope to change the government of the State to a lay, instead of an ecclesiastical government, and the old system or Hierarchy Congregazioni has been abolished, except for ecclesiastical purposes; but the Pope has not yet fully secularized the government. At present only one-half are laymen, though laymen are eligible to all the offices except that of Secretary of State. Formerly the cardinals were divided into different congregations, for the more easy

despatch of business, and some of their number had the principal offices in the Pontifical Court, as that of Cardinal, Vicar, Penitentiary, Chancellor, Chamberlain, Prefect of the Signature of Justice, Prefect of Memorials, and Secretary of State. All the political ministers of the Pope were chosen from among the cardinals, who have the title of "Eminence" and "Most Eminent."

The greater part of the cardinals are insignificant and passive, mere instruments in the hands of the leaders, who are divided into two factions, the one consisting of those who had held office in the time of the last Pope, the other of those who had been raised into consequence by his immediate predecessor; for as Popes are generally elected in advanced life, their partisans survive them a long time, and acquire by experience and management an influence quite equal to that which belongs to the recent possessors of authority. A third interest in the conclaves of the cardinals, and often the most considerable of any, is that of the foreign cardinals, who represent the views of the Catholic States to which they respectively belong. Since the middle of the sixteenth century the Catholic Powers have commonly insisted on the election of a Pope being made on the principle of the balance of power; and France, Spain and Portugal have always claimed and exercised the power of interposing with an absolute veto against any individual nomination. It is enough to exclude any candidate that the representative of any of these Powers shall announce: *Il mio Re non Vuole*: which, translated, means, "My sovereign is opposed." Austria substantially enjoys the same right, though it is not formally recognized. Since the time of Adrian VI., who was obtruded by Charles V., all the Popes have been Italians. It is now the settled policy of the cardinals, both that the Pope be a native of Italy and that he be chosen from their own number. The Italian cardinals are resolute in not giving themselves a foreign master, and the provinces, or "States of the church," as they are called, each wishing a preference for itself, compromise the matter by electing some Italian instead of a foreigner. The only other general principle seems to be that the choice shall fall on one with talent enough to save the office from degradation and abuse, but not of that commanding genius that would defy control or disdain assistance. Constitutionally the Pope is a very absolute sovereign, but in practice he is generally only the head of an oligarchy.

The name Pope comes from the Greek word *papa*, father. In the East this appellation is given to all Christian priests; and in the West bishops were called by it in ancient times; but for many centuries it has been appropriated to the Bishop of Rome, whom Roman Catholics regard as the common father of all Christians, the successor of St. Peter, who, they say, was the first Bishop of Rome, and suffered martyrdom there. They believe that Christ appointed St. Peter over all other bishops and clergy, and that he intended this dignity should descend by succession to the Bishops of Rome to the end of time.

The cardinals have for several ages been the sole electors of the Pope. In the early ages the Gothic and Grecian princes, and after them the German Emperors, exercised authority in the election, and the importance of this prerogative increased with the temporal estate and spiritual jurisdiction of the Romish Church. The clergy of the Roman see recommended one of the candidates to the cardinals, who generally confirmed their choice, and the choice was ratified or rejected by the Roman people. But the election was imperfect, nor could the Pontiff be consecrated till the Emperor had graciously signified his approbation and consent. The Imperial Commissioner examined on the spot the form and freedom of the proceedings; nor was it till after a previous scrutiny into the qualifications of the candidate that he accepted an oath of fidelity from the new Pope, and confirmed the donations which had successively enriched the patrimony of St. Peter. In the frequent schisms the rival claims were submitted to

the Emperor, who punished the guilty. The Emperor Otho imposed an obligation on the clergy to prefer the candidate most acceptable to his Majesty, and future Emperors did not give them even that privilege, but presented to the Pontificate their own favorites, as they did to all the bishoprics. These acts were excused by the alleged vices of popular election. The competitor who was excluded appealed to the passions or avarice of the multitude, and the Vatican and the Lateran were often stained with blood. Such was the fatal consequence of uniting Church and State, and mixing up the spiritual with temporal power and aggrandizement. "The Roman Pontiffs of the ninth and tenth centuries," says Gibbon, "were insulted, imprisoned and murdered by their tyrants; and such was their indigence after the loss and usurpation of the ecclesiastical patrimonies, that they could neither support the State of a prince nor exercise the charity of a priest. The influence of two sister prostitutes, Marozia and Theodora, was founded on their wealth and beauty, their political and amorous intrigues; the most strenuous of their lovers were rewarded with the Roman mitre, and their reign may have suggested to the darker ages the fable of a female Pope (Joan). The bastard son, the grandson and the great grandson of Marozia—a rare genealogy—were seated in the chair of St. Peter, and it was at the age of nineteen years that the second of these became the head of the Latin church. His youth and manhood were of a suitable complexion, and the nation of pilgrims could bear testimony to the charges that were urged against him in a Roman synod, and in the presence of Otho the Great. As John XII. had renounced the dress and the decencies of his profession, the soldier may not perhaps be dishonored by the wine which he drank, the blood that he spilled, the flames he kindled, or the licentious pursuits of gaming and hunting. His open sinning might have been the consequences of distress. But we read with some surprise that the worthy grandson of Marozia lived in public adultery with the matrons of Rome; that the Lateran palace was turned into a school for prostitution, and that his rapes of virgins and widows had deterred the female pilgrims from visiting the tomb of St. Peter, lest, in the devout act, they should be violated by his successor. After a long series of scandal the Apostolic See was reformed and exalted by the austerity and zeal of Gregory VII." Gibbon, in support of this narrative, cites Roman Catholic authorities, such as Muratori, St. Marc, Baronius and others. Protestants have dwelt with malicious pleasure on these historical facts; but worse crimes can be imputed to the Reformers and the royal heads of the Protestant religions after the reformation. The immorality of Luther, as regards women and in other respects, was notorious. It is on record that he gave the Landgrave of Hesse a license to have two wives together. As for Henry VIII., the supreme head of the Protestant Church in England, he "never spared man in his anger or woman in his lust," and, according to Dr. Bayley, in his "Life of Bishop Fisher," Henry, in marrying Anna Boleyn, married his own daughter, whom he afterwards beheaded, as well as several other wives, his tool, Archbishop Cranmer, giving him divorces at will, said Archbishop himself having been detected in importing a Dutch wife in a box, with holes bored in it to give her air, at a time when celibacy was the law of the English church. The lechery and amorous intrigues of another head of the Protestant church, another sovereign of the Reformation, "the Virgin Queen" of England, Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, are too well known to require detail. Her cold-blooded murder of Mary Queen of Scots is not disputed by any historian. So that in point of morality the founders of the Protestant Reformation and the heads of the Protestant churches have nothing to boast over the heads of the Catholic church in the Middle Ages.

It was not till the eleventh century that a reformation among the latter was effected, and Hildebrand (Gregory VII.) succeeded after a struggle of many years in fixing in the College of Cardinals the freedom and independence of the election of the Popes, and forever abolished the right or usurpation of the Emperors and the Roman people.

On the death of a Pope his pontifical seal is immediately broken by the Chamberlain, and all public business is interrupted that can be delayed; messengers are despatched to all the Catholic sovereigns to acquaint them of the event, that they may take what measures they think proper, and that the cardinals in their dominions, if any, may hasten to the election of a new Pope. The Cardinal Chamberlain has, during the vacancy of the Holy See, great authority; he coins money with his own arms on it; lodges in the Pope's apartments, and is attended by the body-guard. He and the first cardinal, the first cardinal priest, and the first cardinal deacon, have during that time the government almost entirely in their hands.

The body of the deceased Pope is carried to St. Peter's, where funeral service is performed with great pomp for nine days. In the meantime all necessary preparations are made for the election, and the place where the cardinals assemble for that purpose is called the Conclave, and is fitted up in that part of the Vatican Palace which is nearest to St. Peter's Church. Here are formed, by partitions of wood, a number of cells or chambers, equal to the number of cardinals, with a small distance between each two, and a broad gallery before them. A number is put on every cell, and small papers with corresponding numbers are put into a box, every cardinal draws one of these papers, which determines in what cell he is to lodge. The cells are lined with cloth, and there is a part of each one separated for the cardinals or their attendants, of whom two are allowed to each, and three to a Cardinal Prince. The attendants are persons of some rank, and generally of great confidence; but they must carry in the meals of the cardinals, serve them at table, and perform all the offices of a menial servant. Two physicians, two surgeons, an apothecary, and some other necessary officers are chosen for the Conclave.

On the tenth day after the Pope's death, the cardinals who are then at Rome, and in a competent state of health, meet in the chapel of St. Peter's which is called the Gregorian chapel, where a sermon on the choice of a Pope is preached to them, and mass is said for invoking the grace of the Holy Ghost. Then the cardinals proceed to the conclave in procession, two by two, and take up their abode. When all is properly settled the conclave is shut up, having boxed wheels, or places of communication in convenient quarters. Strong guards are placed all around. When any foreign cardinal arrives after the enclosure, the conclave is opened for his admission. In the beginning every cardinal signs a paper containing an obligation that if he shall be elected he will not alienate any part of the Pontifical dominions, and that he will not be too liberal with his relations.

Two-thirds of the cardinals present must vote for the same person. As this is not often easily accomplished, the cardinals sometimes remain whole months in the conclave, for they never leave it till the election is completed. They meet in the chapel twice every day for the purpose of giving their votes. The election may be effected in three ways—by scrutiny, by accession, or by acclamation. Scrutiny is the ordinary method, and is this; every cardinal writes his own name on the inner part of a piece of paper, and this is folded up and sealed. On the second fold of the same paper the name of the person for whom he votes is written, not in his own handwriting, but by one of his attendants. On the outer side of the paper is written a sentence at random, which the voter takes care to remember. Every cardinal, on entering into the chapel, goes to the altar and puts his paper into a large chalice.

When all are convened, two cardinals number the votes, and if there be more or less than the number of cardinals present, the voting must be repeated. When this is not the case, the cardinal appointed for the purpose reads the outer sentence, and the name of the cardinal he votes for under it; so that each voter hearing his own sentence, and the name of his

candidate joined with it, knows that there is no mistake. The names of all the candidates voted for are taken down in writing, with the number of votes for each; and when it appears that any one has two-thirds of the number present in his favor, the election is over; but when this does not happen, the voting papers are all immediately burned, without opening the inner part.

When several trials of coming to a conclusion by this method of scrutiny have been made in vain, recourse is had to what is called accession. By this, when a cardinal perceives that when one or very few votes are wanting to any candidate for whom he has not voted at that time, he must say that he "accedes" to him who has the nearest number of votes requisite; and if his vote makes up the two-thirds, or if he is followed by a sufficient number of "acceders" the election is accomplished.

Lastly, a Pope is sometimes elected by acclamation, and that is when a cardinal calculates with good probability that he will be joined by a number sufficient, he cries out in the open chapel that such a person shall be Pope. If he is properly supported the election becomes unanimous; those who would, perhaps, oppose it, foreseeing that their opposition would be fruitless and rather hurtful to themselves.

When the election is over it is immediately announced from the balcony in the front of St. Peter's; homage is paid to the new Pontiff, and couriers are sent off with the news to all parts of Christendom. The Pope appoints a day for his coronation at St. Peter's, and for his taking possession of the patriarchal church of St. John Lateran, all which is performed with great solemnity. He is crowned with the triple crown, which is attached to a mitre. His residence is at Rome, where he has two splendid palaces—the Vatican and the Quirinal—and he is obliged to wear a particular kind of dress, to which belongs the ring of St. Peter. He is addressed by the title of "Holiness" and "Holy Father." The Popes change their names on being elected—for instance, the present Pope's name was Ferreti before his election. He called himself Pio Nono—Pius Ninth. This change of name is said, by Platina, to have originated in 687, with Pope Sergius, whose name before his election was the rather disagreeable one of "Swine snout." Another authority refers it to Pope John XII. and the year 956, and represents it as an imitation of Saints Peter and Paul, whose original names were Simon and Saul.

It is very probable that there will soon be an election of a new Pope, for though the reigning Pontiff is not very old, he is very feeble in body and mind, and his government is entirely managed by Cardinal Antonelli, who appears to be the impersonation of tyranny. In the event of the death of Pius IX., another sort of man—one who understands the spirit of the age and recognizes the necessity of reform and progress—will probably sway the counsels of Rome, if the Emperor of the French, backed by the public opinion of Europe and the United States, does not compel the immediate removal of the Cardinal and a very different kind of policy even for the remnant of the present Pope's lifetime. —*N. Y. Herald.*

Miscellanea.

Heavy Binden-Binders.

THE binding of heavy burdens on men's shoulders, grievous to be borne, is the characteristic of that ecclesiasticism which preaches to the people a multitude of works and observances, and requiring of them a load of duties, instead of preaching to them the faith as the only ground and root of justification. Now, how universally this prevails in the churches,

it requires some explanation and reflection to perceive. For the very distinction taken by "the Evangelicals" is, that they preach justification by faith alone. And so they do in words; but observe how it turns out in fact. They will not allow the poor sinner to take immediate assurance of his salvation; but expect of him a probation of doubt and uncertainty, of difficulty and perplexity, before they will permit him to have confidence before God, which is as truly a doctrine of works as if they were to require alms and offerings to the church. The people who listen to such discourse as permits not assurance of faith from the very first and onwards, are put upon the rack and torture of inward uncertainty and fear, and led to count, and rest upon, the number of their inward spiritualities, as much as the others are led to count, and rest upon, the number of their outward moralities: and the state of the Church of Christendom, at this time, between these two sects, of Scribes on the one hand, and Pharisees on the other, is quite deplorable. And when a man rises up to give the people liberty from such bondage, and to preach constant and immediate comfort and liberty through the belief of the gospel of the kingdom, and the obedience it commands, straightway they are offended! And who is the most offended? Not the Scribes who preach the law outright, but the Pharisees who do the same under this fallacious pietism and spirituality.

The Vatican Manuscript

THE Vatican Manuscript, the most famous codex of the original Scriptures of the New Testament, will shortly be made available to scholars at a reasonable price. The London correspondent of the *Christian Watchman* says: "The Vatican Manuscript, edited by Cardinal Mai, contains not only the New Testament, but also the Septuagint version of the Old Testament Scriptures, and is comprised in five folio volumes. The first four contain the Old and the fifth the New Testament, and the only means of obtaining the Roman edition is by purchasing the entire work, at the cost of about \$50. The Codex Vaticanus of the New Testament will soon be printed in London, verbatim from the Roman edition recently published, at the price of only twelve shillings per copy. This Manuscript is believed to be the most ancient in existence, and modern Biblical critics assign its date to the middle of the fourth century. Its history is involved in impenetrable obscurity, but early in the sixteenth century was generally known throughout Europe as the most venerable manuscript of the New Testament. It has always been jealously guarded, and its contents concealed from vulgar gaze. When Dr. Bentley contemplated an edition of the Greek Testament in 1721, he visited Rome, hoping to obtain permission to collate the Codex Vaticanus, but was denied access to the manuscript. In 1843 Cardinal Mai showed Professor Tischendorf the printed text now recently published. More than thirty years since the writer was favored with a view of this ancient manuscript. It is written on thin vellum, and the letters are all capitals."

The Vatican Codex, says the *Boston Journal*, generally believed to be the most ancient copy of the Greek Scriptures in existence, has been published at Rome in 5 vols., 4to. It is not known when or by whom it was carried to that city. Under Napoleon it was taken to Paris, and since its return to the Vatican, it has been regarded with absurd jealousy. This hostility to scholastic research has not indeed been confined to this manuscript, but has been shown with respect to other literary treasures as well, every possible discouragement being thrown in the way of the student, except the actual and permanent closing of the library. This has been supposed in certain cases, as in that of Niebuhr, for instance, to have been increased by the petty meanness of Cardinal Mai, who did not wish to be anticipated or surpassed in his own line of classical study. Yet although the existence of such a feeling on the part of the priest seems to have been proved, it was after all only a part and parcel of that exclusive spirit shown from the first by the Roman hierarchy, as a class, it having perpetually striven to

confine to its own body the best wisdom of the ages which have gone by, and the best possibilities of those which are to come. Tischendorf and Tregelles were not permitted to copy any portion of its Codex, but were graciously allowed to look at certain passages. It does not contain any portion of the Epistle to the Hebrews after the fourteenth verse of the ninth chapter. The Pastoral Epistles and Apocalypse are also wanting. These have been supplied in the printed work from MSS. of the eighth and tenth centuries. The Roman edition costs about forty-five dollars. An English reprint of the New Testament at small price, has been received in America.

Important Biblical Discovery.

THE London *Athenaeum* says that professor Tischendorf, who had been sent by the Russian Government on a journey of scientific exploration, in a letter from Cairo, dated 15th of March, states to the Minister of Saxony, Herr Von Falkenstein, that he has succeeded in making some valuable discoveries relative to the Bible. The most important of these *discoveries* is a manuscript of the Holy Scriptures, from the fourth century, consequently as old as the famous manuscript of the Vatican, which has hitherto, in all commentaries, maintained the first rank. This it will have to share in future with the newly discovered manuscript, if Herr Tischendorf be not mistaken. In 346 beautiful fine parchment leaves of such size that only two can have been made from one skin, it contains the greatest part of the Prophets, the Psalms, the Book of Job, the Book of Jesus, Siarch, the Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, and several of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament; but then the whole of the New Testament is complete. Another valuable discovery of Tischendorf's is described as an undoubted and complete manuscript of the Epistle of Barnabas, and of the Shepherd of Hermas, both belonging to the second century of the Christian era, and originally standing in the esteem of the Scriptural Epistles. Tischendorf hopes, from the munificence of the Russian government, that he will be enabled to give immediate publication to these three manuscripts.

Jerusalem trodden down by the Gentiles.

JERUSALEM was taken by Titus A.D. 70, when 1,100,000 Jews perished, and 97,000 were carried away captive.

A.D. 132, it was taken by Barchochab, who rebelled against the Romans, and claiming to be the Messiah, had 300,000 followers, and committed great slaughter.

In the year 135 it was re-taken by the Emperor Adrian, who destroyed 50 castles, 800 cities, and slew 530,000 Jews.

Constantine built many churches in Jerusalem, and favored it highly.

Julian favored the Jews, and commenced to rebuild the Temple, setting 10,000 men at work to clear Mount Moriah, intending to make it a rival of Mount Calvary; but his projects failed by special interposition of God, the workmen being driven from the foundation by balls of fire issuing therefrom and soon after, he died.

Chosroes, king of Persia, in the year 614, aided by 24,000 Jews, sacked the city, killing 90,000 Christians.

Heraclius recovered it by treaty, after defeating the king of Persia, year 628, and it remained under Roman and Christian control till the rise of the Arabian impostures.

In 637 it was taken by the Kalif Omar, who by treaty allowed the Christians a right to the holy sepulchre, and built the splendid Mosque of Omar on Mount Moriah, on the site of Solomon's Temple.

Achmet, a Turk, took it in 868.

The Kalif of Bagdad took it in 906.

Hakem of Egypt took it and burnt the church of the holy sepulchre, 1009.

Soon after, Mohammed Isched, a Seljukian Turk, conquered it.

Ortok took it in the same century.

Malek Shah next, 1076.

The successors of Ortok recovered it soon after.

The Fatimites of Egypt soon after recovered it, and burnt the Church of the holy sepulchre, which was soon rebuilt.

The Crusaders took it in 1099, slew 70,000 Mohammedans, and elected Baldwin king.

In 1187, Saladin, the Turkish sultan of Egypt, took it.

In 1192, Richard of England defeated Saladin in several great battles, with immense slaughter, and by treaty recovered the freedom of Jerusalem for the Christians.

Melek Moadin of Damascus demolished the city's walls in 1219.

In 1229, Frederick II, Emperor of Germany, with an array of 40,000, entered Jerusalem in triumph, and by treaty secured it to the Christians.

Toleration was secured for the Mohammedans in the mosque of Omar, and for the Christians in the church of El-Aksa. But this treaty was soon violated by the Turks; for David of Kerac destroyed the city and slew the most of the people; and when the Earl of Cornwall arrived, the Christians were in great oppression; but by his energy they were reinstated, by treaty, in the enjoyment of their rights, 1243.

The Sultans of the Carismians took it in 1244.

It was recovered in 1247.

It was surrendered to Bibars of Egypt, a Mameluke conqueror of Antioch, at which time he slew 40,000 and carried away captive 100,000. He besieged Acre with an army of 200,000, sacked it, and ended the kingdom of the Crusaders in Palestine.

Jerusalem was taken in 1382 by the Tartars, and yielded to Tamerlane about 1400. It soon fell under the Mamelukes of Egypt, and the Othmans took it in 1517, under Selim I. The present walls were built by his successor, Solymon the Magnificent, in 1542. The church of the holy sepulchre was burnt in 1808, and the present one built in 1810.

In 1832, Mehemet Ali took possession of it without war, but in 1834 it revolted, in the general insurrection of Palestine, but was soon brought into subjection. In 1842 he was deprived of all his Syrian possessions, and since that it has been under the Sultan of Turkey, —Russia, France and England having rights in it.

Almost all nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, have trodden Jerusalem under foot. How true the great prophecy of Christ!

The Thank-Offering Increased.

DR. THOMAS. —DEAR BROTHER: —At the time that the church in Edinburgh sent you a thank offering, the brethren in Paisley were applied to; but we were not then in a position to do what we wished in the matter, in consequence of a number of the brethren being out of employment; and of their desire to subscribe it was agreed to let it stand over until more propitious times. We have now made up the small sum of £3 10 6, which we desire you will accept as an expression of our *love and gratitude*; in what we are indebted unto you as being the means under our Heavenly Father of opening the eyes of our understandings to see the glorious light of the glad tidings of the kingdom of God.

The brethren here join with me in the desire, that, if it were possible, you could visit Britain once more for the purpose of proclaiming the truth. Much good might be done; but as your time is so much taken up, you may find it difficult to get away; as to the ways and means, I think that could be managed.

With best wishes for your welfare, and that you may be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord,

I remain, dear brother,
Yours in the one hope,

J. B. NEWLANDS

PAISLEY, SCOTLAND,
July 28, 1859.

Honoured by the Gift.

The receipt of the "small sum" transmitted by Bro. Newlands in behalf of the brethren in Paisley, affords us very considerable satisfaction. Ten times the amount from sinners of the Gentiles unenlightened in the truth, would have failed to produce the pleasure we experience in the receipt of this same "small sum." The donors are poor operatives, who have spontaneously taxed their own poverty to strengthen the hands of one contending for the truth "against all" in a far-off land, because they love him and are grateful to him for the benefit he has conferred upon them in instrumentally opening the eyes of their understandings to see the glorious light of the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God. This is certainly very gratifying. We know what the poor have to contend with in Britain; and we know what human nature is, untamed and undeified by the truth; it is hateful, jealous, ungrateful, and malicious; in short,

as Paul says, "*in it dwelleth no good thing.*" Now, from this same evil nature common to us all, depressed and irritated by the anxieties and conflicts of poverty, "*love and gratitude*" have been evolved—evolved towards God and man! Its understanding has been opened, the light of truth has shone in, and hence the change. We are glad to hear that we have been instrumental in so good a work; and that our service has been appreciated as worthy of thanks and commendation. If the Thessalonian brethren will be Paul's joy and crown of rejoicing on the presence of the Lord, because he opened the eyes of their understandings; surely we may likewise say the same, of the brethren at Paisley, and such as they—that they "are our glory and joy"—1 Thes. ii. 19, 20. We can assure them that Queen Victoria is unable to do us equal honour with the poor brethren of Paisley and elsewhere. She can bestow spurious titles of honour upon sin's flesh; but she is not exalted and of high dignity enough as a fountain of honour to confer real honour upon the kings and priests of God. These are "the poor in this world, rich in faith, and *heirs* of the kingdom promised them of God." It is the highest honour at this present to be instrumental in the development of such from Adam's race; and no honour coming from men is greater or equal to the expression of the "love and gratitude" of God's kings, be it accompanied with a sum ever so small, or commensurate with their poverty in the fullness of its depth. The poor are just the people to be loving and grateful when their eyes are opened. Even their deep and heavy poverty now becomes light in the contemplation of the "eternal weight of glory" to be inherited when they shall have endured a few more years of toil and hardship. Death frees them from it all; and after death the resurrection to life, and honour, and glory, and power, and riches, and blessing in the kingdom of God. Surely, he is the friend and benefactor of all such who open their eyes to see how rich a feast of fat things is offered and attainable by believers without respect of persons. Such was Paul to the Galatians, who received him as a messenger of God; and had it been possible, would have plucked out their eyes, and have given them to him, so highly did they esteem, the instrument and matter of their enlightenment. But Paul did not find all believers equally loving and grateful. They received the light, but rejected and despised the instrument; and instead of treating him with "love and gratitude," regarded him with envy, jealousy, and suspicion. They pretended to be deeply and inexpressibly indebted to God; but viewed Paul as a mere "instrument" to be used as occasion might require, or convenience dictate. Paul's experience is the experience of all co-workers in his calling. Human nature is the same, and the truth is the same; but times and circumstances differ. By these the power of the truth is enfeebled—they choke the word of the kingdom: but the good seed still finds a few honest and good hearts to vegetate in, who in their "love and gratitude" to God, do not forget, or despise, or envy, the instrument of his working.

In regard to visiting Britain once more, we would say, that we have not abandoned the idea of so doing. When we have finished writing our exposition of the Apocalypse; and can get a few months' MSS. in advance for the HERALD, we shall see what we can do in that direction, in the meantime, let the brethren there do what, they can in extending the circulation of the HERALD. Where our writings are most read, there we shall be best understood when treating orally of "the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ."

EDITOR.

APOCALYPTIC SYMBOLISM OF THE GREAT ITALIAN HARLOT,
AND THE
LATIN GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE BY WHICH SHE IS SUSTAINED.

IN Rev. xvii, the apostle saith, "And there came one of the seven messengers having the seven libation-bowls, and he spake with me, saying to me, 'Here! I will show to thee the JUDGMENT OF THE GREAT HARLOT who sitteth upon the many waters; with whom the kings of the earth have committed lewdness, and they who inhabit the earth have been intoxicated with the wine of her prostitution.'

"And he bore me off in spirit into a WILDERNESS: and I saw a WOMAN sitting upon a SCARLET BEAST, full of NAMES OF BLASPHEMY, having SEVEN HEADS and TEN HORNS.

"And the woman who had been arrayed with purple and scarlet, and bedizzened with gold and precious stone and pearls, had a GOLDEN GOBLET in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her prostitution: and upon her forehead a title had been written, 'MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF THE HARLOTS AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

"And I saw the woman intoxicated with the blood of the HOLY ONES, and with the blood of the WITNESSES OF JESUS: and beholding her, I wondered with great astonishment—" *vers.* 1-6.

APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE SYMBOLISM.

"AND the messenger said to me," John, "Wherefore didst thou wonder? I will tell thee the HIDDEN MEANING of the woman, and of the beast which supports her, having the seven heads and the ten horns.

"The BEAST which thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the abyss, and go away into perdition: and they who dwell upon the earth (whose names have not been written in the Book of the Life, from the foundation of things constituted— *κ,οσμς*) will behold with reverence while they see the beast that was, and is not, although it is.

"The sense having wisdom is as follows: The SEVEN HEADS are seven hills, where the woman is sitting upon them, they are also seven royalties: the five have fallen, and the one is, the other is not yet come; and when he may have come, it is necessary that he continue a brief space.

"And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the EIGHTH, and is of the seven, and GOETH AWAY INTO PERDITION.

"And the TEN HORNS which thou sawest are Ten Royalties which have not yet received dominion, but they receive authority as sovereignties for one hour with the beast. These have one counsel, and shall deliver over their power and authority to the beast. These shall make war with the LAMB, and the Lamb shall conquer them, because he is LORD OF LORDS AND KING OF KINGS: and they with him are called and chosen and faithful."

And he saith to me, "The WATERS which thou sawest where the harlot sitteth are peoples and multitudes, and nations and tongues.

"And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate THE HARLOT, and having been made desolate they shall make her also naked, and shall devour her fleshy

parts, and shall burn her down with fire. For the DEITY hath put into their hearts to fulfil his purpose, even to fulfil one purpose, and to yield their dominion to the beast until the things spoken of the DEITY be accomplished.

“And the WOMAN which thou sawest is that great city having dominion over the rulers of the earth, —” *verses 7-18.*

THE JUDGMENT OF THE ITALIAN HARLOT.

"And after these things I saw a messenger descending out of the heaven, having great authority; and the earth was illuminated from his glory. And he cried out in power with a loud voice, saying, 'Fallen, fallen, Babylon the Great, for it hath become a habitation of demons, and a den of every unclean spirit, and a hold of every impure and detested bird: for all the nations have drunk of the wine of the raging lust of her lewdness, and the rulers of the earth have committed lewdness with her, and the merchants of the earth have become rich by virtue of her voluptuousness.'

And I heard another voice out of the heaven, saying, “Depart ye out of her my people, that ye may have no copartnership in her sins, and that ye may not receive of her plagues: for the sins have followed her until the heaven, * and the Deity hath remembered her iniquities. Render to her even as she hath rendered to you, and double to her twofold according to her deeds: in the goblet in which she hath mingled, mix for her twofold. As much as she hath glorified herself and waxed wanton, so much torment and sorrow give her; for in her heart she saith, ‘I sit queen, and am no widow, and no sorrow shall I see.’ On account of this her plagues shall come IN ONE DAY, death and sorrow and famine: and she shall be burned with fire; for a MIGHTY LORD is the DEITY who judgeth her.

** Until the time of the heaven's manifestation.*

And the rulers of the earth, who have committed lewdness and waxed wanton with her, shall bewail her, and weep over her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning, having stood afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, 'Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! For in one hour thy judgment came.

And the merchants of the earth shall lament and sorrow over her, because no one buyeth their merchandize any more: lading of gold, and of silver, and of precious stone, and of pearl, and of fine linen, and of purple, and of silk, and of scarlet: and every odorous wood, and every utensil of ivory, and all furniture of most precious wood, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble; and cinnamon, and incense, and unction, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and cattle, and sheep, and of horses, and of chariots, and of bodies, and souls of men.

And the fruit of the lust of thy soul has departed from thee, and all sumptuous and splendid things have departed from thee, and thou shalt not find them any more at all.

The merchants of these things being enriched by her, shall stand afar off for the fear of her torment, bewailing and sorrowing, and saying, 'Alas, alas, that great city, which had been clothed with fine linen and purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stone and pearls! for in one hour so much wealth has been desolated. And every ship master, and every company upon the ships, and sailors, and as many as work upon the sea, stood afar off, and cried, beholding the smoke of her burning, saying, ' What *city is* like to that great city? And

they cast dust upon their heads, and cried wailing and sorrowing, saying, Alas, alas, that great city, by which all having ships on the sea were enriched from her costliness; for in one hour she hath been desolated.

Rejoice over her, O HEAVEN, even ye the holy apostles and the prophets, for the Deity hath avenged your condemnation by her.

And one mighty messenger raised up a stone like a great millstone, and cast *it* into the sea, saying, 'Thus with violence shall Babylon that great city be dashed down, and be found no more at all. And the sound of harpers and of musicians, of flutists and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no artist of whatever craft shall be found any more at all in thee; and the sound of the millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of a lamp shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great ones of the earth; for by thy sorcery all the nations were deceived.

And in her blood of prophets and of holy ones was found, and of all that had been slain upon the earth. —*Chap, xviii.*

New Translation by the Editor.

From the Gospel Banner.

Messiah, the Prince.

ALTERED FROM DR. HUIE.

CHRISTIAN.

Oh! son of Israel, wherefore sorrowest thou?

JEW.

Because my people's shame is on me now,
We were the Almighty's joy in ancient days,
And brightly did our hallowed altars blaze,
And as our spicy flames, and fumes ascended,
Our gladsome songs with harp and timbrel blended,
The nations came beneath our shade to rest,
Besought our favors, and pronounced us blest,
But He has cast us forth—a withered stem,
And sapped the walls of His Jerusalem!

CHRISTIAN.

Truly a cause to cry in lamentation,
Ye have been chastened more than any nation,
What had ye done, the Great One's wrath to prove,
Whose name is Faithful, and whose nature Love?

JEW

Oh! We had sinned and wandered past belief,
Not strange our wounds, nor undeserved our grief,
Thick as the dews on Heaven's favored hill,
God's bounties came, His gifts pursued us still.
He fed us, as the shepherd feeds his flock,
With bread from heaven, and water from the rock,
Yet were our sins each morn, each evening new.
We broke His statutes, and His prophets slew.

CHRISTIAN.

Yet turn thou, Mourner! He is still the same.
Not swift to vengeance, nor in haste to blame,
Tho' great your guilt, His goodness far exceeds,
And like a cloud will hide your darkest deeds,
Seek but the way, through which His mercies flow,
Thy sins of scarlet He will make as snow.

JEW.

Yes. There is a time, tho' yet alas! Concealed,
When our desire, my Prince, shall stand revealed.
Let the Messiah come, our woes shall cease,
And all our sufferings end in joy and peace.

CHRISTIAN.

I know He will bring blessings, when he stands
On Olivet, to smite your Foe. Then will all lands
Call you once more the Blessed; but, then know,
That He has been, whose coming you look to.

JEW.

When did he come? thro' many an anxious year,
I've watched to see the Conqueror appear,
Before whose presence all our foes shall fly,
And whose compassion will our sorrows dry.
But his bright advent, by our seers foreshown,
Has never yet on this lone earth been known.

CHRISTIAN.

Truly, thou sayest that, his *bright coming* ne'er
Hath happened yet. But think! thy poet-seer,
Isaiah, spake of him as lowly born,
Unclad with glory, —and rejected, —torn
By pangs of death thro' your iniquity,
Bearing the pain of your tranquillity,
With powers of sin, Thou knowest whom I mean,

Messiah yours! was once the Nazarene.

JEW.

Oh! name Him not. It baffles my belief
That he, that abject one, that child of grief,
Who, but for others, oft had wanted bread,
And had, at times, no shelter for his head,
That he could be the King we long to see,
Or that his Star could rise in Galilee.
No! He, who comes His mighty arm to bare,
To burst our fetters, and our walls repair,
Must be both Abraham's son, and David's Heir.

CHRISTIAN.

And he was both, —that Jesus you despise,
Your own true King, tho' nothing in your eyes,
In him did meet a thousand prophecies, —
Of David's line and born in David's town,
A virgin's son—the, Plant of high renown;
A man of woes, yet armed with might so dread,
He stilled the tempest, and He raised the dead:
He healed the sick, empowered the dumb to talk,
Restored the maim'd, and bade the cripple walk;
And more than all, to make your kingdom sure,
Proclaimed its glorious gospel to the poor.

JEW.

“To make it sure!”—I understand thee not.

CHRISTIAN.

Listen and learn then. To that most favor'd spot
Which had his presence oft, he comes again,
All girt with majesty; and in his train
Shall myriad saints appear, with him to reign
O'er Israel, and the Gentile nations, —these are they
Who have believed in him, whilst this was far away,
Princes they are, tho' now they live unknown.
That glorious age, which ye so much desire,
They have made certain of, for they aspire
To immortality and honor, through the Faith
Which Abraham had—which triumphs over death.
