

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. West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N.J., OCTOBER, 1860
Volume 10—No. 10

On Immortality.

RESPECTED BROTHER: —In my former letter I endeavored to impress on your readers the great importance of having a clear understanding of the nature of the soul of man, since so many errors originate from a false view of its nature. In this my second letter, I will endeavor to expose the fallacies which lie somewhat concealed in the reasonings of Butler on the subject, in whose Analogy is presented the most subtle argument in favor of man's inherent immortality, that can probably be found in any language. To follow me, therefore, it will be necessary for the reader to carefully examine the first chapter of *the analogy*, and the chapter on *personal identity*, by the same author.

The edition to which I will refer in pointing to pages or paragraphs is the one published by Chambers of Edinburgh. To begin then, The bishop starts in pursuit of *probability*, of which he remarks, see preface, "that in matters of speculation, if the result of the examination be that there appears upon the whole any the lowest presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question." This we won't dispute, and hence the question presents itself, On which side appears the greater amount of presumptive evidence? The bishop as his starting-point takes *the experience of the changes which man undergoes in his progress from the womb to the grave*. In part *first* of first chapter, he writes thus: "The states of life in which we ourselves existed formerly, in the womb and in our infancy, are almost as different from our present, in mature age, as it is possible to conceive any two states or degrees of life can be. Therefore, that we are to exist hereafter in a state as different (suppose) from our present, as this is from our former, is but according to the analogy of nature, according to a natural order or appointment of the same kind with what we have already experienced." Again, in chapter second, the object of this analogy is stated in the first sentence, in these words, "that which makes the consideration of it" (a future life) "to be of so great importance to us, is the supposition of our happiness and misery hereafter depending on our actions here." See also, the chapter on personal identity. Now, in "what we have already experienced" *memory* plays an important part. It affords us a consciousness of having lived at some time, it may be, long ago, that is, that individually we are in many respects the same now as then. But when memory fails, or where it does not extend, we cease to be conscious of having lived in a state of which we can call nothing to mind. Consequently, that we are the developments of what we were in foetal and infantile life we believe *not* from memory, but from the testimony of nature—we do not feel conscious that we are so, we have

no remembrance of any thing by which we can identify ourselves as being the same now in any respect as then; *the testimony of nature alone proves this*. What then? Suppose we shut out this testimony from our argument; the "great importance" of the inquiry demands this, as our "hereafter happiness and misery" depend on the testimony of *consciousness* that we were the same agents as we now are. Without this testimony moral action would be effete for either pleasure or pain. Supposing the testimony of nature is shut out then, is there more evidence to prove that we have lived in infantile and foetal life than that we have lived *before* conception? We think *not*. We are not conscious of having lived before conception, but neither are we conscious of having lived in a foetal and infantile state. If it be then, that we *did* live before conception, and there is no sensible evidence to prove the contrary, what effect has that life had upon the present? We are conscious of none. This being so, what effect will this present life have upon the future, there being a like *want* of evidence to prove that we will not live after death? Certainly, we may presume from our own experience of our anti-conception life we will be conscious of none, and therefore, the same objection which Butler prefers against those who in his opinion explain personal identity "so as to render the inquiry concerning a future life of no consequence at all to us the persons who are making it," (*1st paragraph, personal identity*) is in our opinion more appropriate to his own argument. For how stands it? *The testimony of nature alone proves that we DID live in foetal life, that we DID live in infantile life. Consciousness proves that we have lived ever since we can remember*. Butler assumes that because the testimony of nature proves us to have lived in a state of being so different from maturity, there is a probability of our living hereafter in a state as different from the present; hence, there remains the same probability that as the testimony of nature proves what our consciousness cannot prove of our having lived in these states—there remains, we say, the same probability, if not greater, that our life hereafter will *not* partake of a consciousness of having existed previously, that is, in the present, but that we will only believe so in accordance with what evidence the nature that then shall be will afford us. And as the testimony beyond the grave is not available on this side of it, we are led by the same logic to assume, and with as much justice, that we must have also lived antecedent to conception. We have no evidence of this, there being no communication between the life anterior to conception and this, any more than there is betwixt the assumed life posterior to death and the present; but it is probable! very probable!! extremely probable!!! though we are not conscious of it, any more than we are conscious of having lived in infancy and the womb, and yet we are certain of having been in both these states. Now, as the testimony of the present life does not afford us any reason to say that we did live anterior to conception beyond what probability is founded on this analogy of Butler's, the testimony of the *post-mortem* life is alike certain to afford us no reason to say in the future that we lived in the present, except it may be that there are philosophers in the country from which it is said "no traveller returns" who will find us a probability that we did so, equal in value to the one before us. Of what use then, is it to know from such analogies that we shall live hereafter? If this is the immortality which man has, the bishop is welcome to his proofs—Reason and Scripture, knowledge and virtue, are vain.

In these remarks, it will be observed, personal identity is *not* sought to be destroyed. All that we have advanced is the reasonableness of our having lived before conception in the womb, from a probability as legitimate as Butler's, of our having to continue to live after death. What we have shown is, that from this analogy, there is as much probability, nay, that the probability, however small, "though in the lowest degree," is still "greater" that we will *not* be conscious in our *post-mortem* life of our being the same persons as we are now; the probability that *we will be so* conscious, since *we possess the experience at present* of our *not* being conscious of being the same persons now, as in infancy, or before conception, having

no remembrance of anything pertaining to either. Consciousness is not itself personal identity, and is not necessary to it, though we must have it to ascertain our own personal identity. This is a distinction of Butler's own. It is plain then that our argument goes not to destroy personal identity any more than Butler's; but it renders his chapter on that subject as unsatisfactory as he says the explanation of it by others is, which he affects to overthrow.

We take a bladder and crumple it up in our hand, the next moment we distend it. The bladder in these successive moments is changed in appearance, yet still remains the same bladder. In this we have an idea of personal identity under different conditions. We take a seed, and put it in the soil, and after a little find it manifest life. We identify the seed as the same we planted. In the same way we identify the child as the development of the foetus. Both are the same being, and likewise is the full-grown man. But this *sameness*, says Butler, "in the common acceptation of the word, does not appear to have any relation to this of personal identity, because of the perpetual change of parts." Now, how is this conclusion arrived at? It is *not* from consciousness, but from an acquaintance with facts apart from it, as in our identifying a tree as the same we knew many years ago illustrates. We say it is the same from a perception distinct from our knowledge of the facts relating to its continual waste and repair, because supposing ourselves to be ignorant of these facts—as many are—we would still be conscious of the sameness of the tree. Now what we want to come at is this: We are conscious of our personal identity, but not having any knowledge of the facts relating to the development—the waste and repair—of *the person* which is assumed to be apart from our bodies, we say it is the same now as years ago. We do this, let it be observed, from a perception taken from one point of view, but from another point of view based on facts relating to the nature of this soul of man which is assumed to be distinct from his body, were it possible to find such facts, it might prove, as we have much reason to think, to be *not* the same either in its present particles or essence, as it was before or since we can remember, any more than the physical body, the tree, or the seed. A time was when men were—as many are now—as ignorant of such facts concerning the latter, as we are now of such concerning this soul. So a time may come, if it has not come already, when men will be as wise concerning the soul as they now are concerning the body. It remains doubtful, therefore, until we arrive at a knowledge of the soul's development—of the manner thereof—if it be possible that such a process can coexist with a strict philosophical sameness. Though we have not yet acquired the facts which would make up this knowledge, we have no right to assume they do *not* exist, hence we are bound to judge of the tree, or of "what makes the vegetables the same," by the same kind of evidences we judge the soul, namely, by our consciousness alone without reference to any other testimony, or *vice versa*, by the presumptive evidence that the soul, like the body, has its growth, waste, and repair. Like causes produce like effects; therefore, while the law of development is based on a continued change of parts, these parts ever remaining the same in their organic arrangement, their functions must of necessity remain the same, and produce the same effects. This sameness of function then, and the effects therefrom, are identical with the like results of twenty years ago as of yesterday, or of the moment that has just passed, and that without any change of parts, or essence, because impossible, since function is but an operation of parts, *not* the parts themselves, and therefore has *no* parts, *no* substance, *no* essence to change. This illustrates the strict meaning of the word—the philosophical sameness which Butler attributes to the soul of man, and by which he seeks to define his personal identity. But then it remains to be proved, as we have said before, that the soul has this sameness, which, were it, proved to have, would of course define its personal identity, but failing this proof, personal identity is made to rest on the operation of organic arrangement for its manifestation, and man to ascertain it for himself must reflect on this operation. Attraction, cohesion, gravitation, chemical affinity, are all forces in nature, or

properties of matter, which have never changed since the world began. What they were then they are now. The material universe, however, has often changed, and is ever changing. Now, endow this world with consciousness that it, may prove to itself its own personal identity, and what is its answer? Why, it points at once to the operations of nature, and replies, 'I am not changed,' that is, 'my personal identity is not destroyed.' Consequently, "If it be a substance, then consciousness that it is the same world is consciousness that it is the same substance. If it be the property of a substance, still consciousness that it is the same property is as certain a proof that its substance remains the same, as consciousness that it remains the same substance would be, since the same property cannot be transferred from one substance to another" (see paragraph next to last one in chapter on personal identity). This, Butler applies to man. We have applied it to the world as being as true of the one as of the other. The one is conscious, the other is not; but then consciousness is not necessary to personal identity, and hence, because it has none—though we in this instance have supposed it to have—we *cannot conclude* it has no personal identity. The sameness therefore that is required to prove the personal identity of the one is equally necessary to prove the personal identity of the other. Both the samenesses must be strictly philosophical. And so, all that we learn from the consideration of this subject, or rather, all that we learn from the bishop's arguments on this subject, is: Matter is eternal in its substance, in its elements, unchangeable in its forces, and changeable in its forms. Mans soul is matter, and therefore subject to changes. The comparison at different times retrospectively of the same effects, which, as the result of unchangeable forces in organic arrangement, necessarily remain the same in a philosophical sense, while the organs themselves are ever wasting and repairing—this comparison points to the personal identity of which no man can divest himself, which no bishop can overthrow, definite as anything can be in its sameness, but nevertheless, *no* proof of, *no* incentive to, a future life, since depending on organic arrangement it can be interrupted.

In part II. 1st chapter, Analogy, page 30, the Bishop continues—"If men were assured that the unknown event, death, was not the destruction of our faculties of perception and of action, there would be no apprehension that any other power, or event, unconnected with this of death, would destroy their faculties just at the instant of each creature's death and therefore no doubt but that they would remain after it, which shows the high probability that our living powers will continue after death, unless there be some ground to think that death is their destruction." This "high probability" of course depends wholly on the amount of assurance we have that death is not the destruction of our faculties, and the "ground" we have "to think that death is their destruction, *so as that the same living; being shall be incapable of ever perceiving or acting again at all*" (see note, page 30). But, if there be this destruction—"If there be," says Butler, page 31—it must arise either from *the reason of the thing* or from *the analogy of nature.*" *The reason of the thing* he discards, because, asserts he, "we know not at all what death is in itself, but only some of its effects, such as the dissolution of flesh, skin, and bones." And these effects do in no-wise appear to imply the destruction of a living- agent . . . and as we are wholly ignorant what the "living" powers themselves depend upon . . . their existence may depend upon somewhat in no degree affected by death—upon somewhat out of the reach of this King of Terrors— so that there is nothing more certain than that *the reason of the thing* shows us no connection between death and the destruction of living agents." In this argument we have our ignorance of what *death* is, predicated on our ignorance of what *life* is. We are told we only know some of the effects of death, and that those effects do not appear to imply the destruction of a living agent, because we do not know but what our living powers depend on something beyond the reach of death, which means, we do not know what our life is, since, if *our living* powers depend on something apart from them *they are not our life*, and therefore what that something is—what our life is—we cannot tell, and so cannot

tell neither what death is, since from this argument it does not destroy life. Now, what is life? We point to its various manifestations in the material, vegetable, and animal world, and reply: It is a process of combination, of growth, subject to death, or a process of decomposition, or decay. In the material world, we have in every combination—and it is an impossible matter to say what is not a compound—a specimen of organized matter which, when analyzed, demonstrates its elementary constituents to have affinities—we shall say living powers in themselves—which are as entirely distinct from the; affinity or living power of the subject-matter analyzed as the matter itself is from its elementary constituents. For example, where water, zinc, and sulphuric acid, (or vitriol,) are put together, the following result takes place. The water is decomposed—it may be said analyzed—the hydrogen and oxygen, its elementary constituents disunite, the first is set free occasioning to the mixture from which it ascends into the atmosphere, the effervescence or boiling appearance so observable; the second unites with the zinc and forms oxide of zinc, and these again uniting with the sulphuric acid form what is called the sulphate of oxide of zinc. But the water, what of it? It is *nowhere*: now, *the reason of this* is, that, as water, the oxygen and hydrogen were united by the very affinities, or living powers, that caused them to separate. The oxygen had an affinity—which is in fact a manifestation of its existence, as any living power is the manifestation of any existence—the oxygen, we say, had an affinity for hydrogen in a certain degree, but for zinc in a *greater* degree therefore, when brought into conditional contact with the latter, it separates from the former and unites with the zinc, and the hydrogen, not having any affinity for the zinc, unites with that in nearest approximation to it with which it has an affinity, the air, it may be. In this example, then, of analysis of water, of decomposition, or, in plain terms, death of water, for it must be remembered here, the water experimented on *goes out of existence*—We have a demonstration that the powers of water, its living powers, its manifestations as an existence, depend so far on the living powers of its elements, oxygen and hydrogen, as when these its elements are made to separate, it ceases to exist. The *reason of death* of water therefore shows us that the water's living powers are *within the reach of death*. But supposing we did not know the composition of water—as many do not—and that the experiment here proposed, the rationale of which we therefore could not know, was made before us, the same effect would be manifest. According to Butler “we would only know some of its effects;” decomposition would take place, and the liquid which before was water would turn into poison, into something so entirely distinct from water, as that we neither could drink it nor wash with it: and would we say that “these effects do in no wise appear to imply its destruction as a living agent” in the matter of the world. Did we do so, and we would have as much reason to do so as Butler, in regard to man, how fallacious would such a way of judging be, as the rationale of the example before us demonstrates, but, as we do *not so* judge, we conclude that in man's death, in his decomposition, or analysis, he also ceases to be a living agent in the universe, unless something is proved to the contrary. And though it may appear to some invidious to place man thus on a level with unthinking matter, there appears no reason why he should be excepted from a law that subjects, according to all opinion, the plant, the beast, and every combination, to the same process of destruction. In man's death the elements which compose him do not die, any more than those in the decomposition of any part of the material, vegetable, or universal creation; they exist still, but the plant, the beast, the man, after analysis, exist *nowhere*. Hence, so far from discarding *the reason of death*, we hail it as an unassailable argument in favor of man's mortality. If man should not be put on equality with the beast, in this particular of death, why should the beast be put on a level with the plant, or the plant with simplest of nature's compounds. There exists as much difference between the two last in their remotest distances, as there is between the plant in its highest organization and the beast, or between the beast and the man. And, on the other hand, the distinction between each class in the gradation downward, is of such a kind as to justify no

exception, of one more than the other, from the course of nature, the process of decay ending in death. This process, chemical analysis has defined, and by the same instrument has the process of life been demonstrated. It requires no dispute. To say that life is something distinct from the manifestation of it—something the agent of an action or process, not the process itself, as Butler implies—something that we do not know in itself, is to multiply words without wisdom, to say matter is distinct from form, form from matter, so as each can exist without the other; to say that a horse or an ass, a table or a chair, are not these absolutely, but that the names which designate them are something in themselves, apart from the figures which manifest them, something of which we are not cognizant, and therefore death is a devil, or an angel, or rhinoceros for ought that we know—who grim enemy as he is, and destructive as his character is reported to be—probably slanderously!—is unable to contend with the person called life, of whom also we are as equally ignorant. To reason thus is to set the world around us at variance with common sense. Living, we live, and we know this; dying, we die, and we know this too. But let us think otherwise, and we shall reason ourselves out of our senses. Philosophers have done this before us. Take the ideal view of things, and we will believe that life and its manifestations are but ideas—that we do not live, but only think we do, and that death is but an idea too, feeding on its contemporary idea life, parasitic like as it were. So, when we die, we only *think* we die, i.e., that because while *we live* we only *think* so, and may be wrong, as we do not know really what *life* is in itself; and hence, when *we die* we cannot say, but what we live notwithstanding, for we do not know what death is in itself; very probably each by turns!!

The Bishop proceeds, —“Nor can we find anything in the whole analogy of nature, to afford us even the slightest presumption that animals ever lose their living powers, much less, if it were possible, that they lose them by death as this event removes them from our view, and destroys the sensible proof which we had before their death, of their being possessed of living powers, but does not appear to afford us the least reason to believe that they are then or by that event deprived of them.” This is followed by a reference to man's consciousness—its indivisibility and singleness—that as man possesses this he of course must be single and indivisible too. And that as man can appropriate to himself matter which is no part of him, as he can touch a body at a distance with a stick and know the quality of that body, as though he had done the same by the direct application of his fingers. As he can assist his eyes by a telescope or microscope to perceive the maximum and minimum of matter, as he can assist his voice by a trumpet, and his ears by a horn—as he can thus appropriate matter, use or not use these aids, it is as easy to conceive he may exist out of a body as in one, lay his body aside. Man's consciousness is here made the proof of the argument. It is single and indivisible, and therefore says Butler, “all presumption of death's being the destruction of living beings, must go upon the supposition that they are compounded and so discernible.” This at once suggests the question as to the nature of consciousness and its relation to the nature of man. Referring to our first argument, we there have consciousness shown as unnecessary to personal identity, and, resting on the analogy of Butler, we may further say it is an unnecessary thing to being; life can exist without it. As to our personal identity we are not conscious of having lived in infancy and in the womb, (not to speak of our ante-conception life)—and as to our life we require proof that we had consciousness while in infancy and in the womb, since consciousness is something of which we can be deprived of at any time, and yet live. Consciousness therefore is something acquired, it is not an inherent faculty, and the nature of it, instead of being a gauge of the nature of man's life, is subjected thereto. It is usual to speak of it under two aspects—what it is in itself, i.e., its state, and what it is as revealed in the executive. In observing the nature of man then, we arrive at the nature of consciousness, and decide it single and indivisible only as he is so. We examine his actions as related to his

consciousness, and we find a double set of actions—the one voluntary the other involuntary—the former as belonging to the executive of consciousness, the latter without it and independent of it in either aspect. The state of consciousness we distinguish from the executive, while all voluntary action is of a sort at rest. But in the distinguishing of it we reflect on the executive as a means towards the distinction, and not only that, but as an index also of what it is. In other words, we use the executive to make us conscious of our consciousness, and find this conclusion, that the state of consciousness is a sense, the result of the integral combination of varied organic effort, as any sense is a result of a fraction of that effort. The organs of sense therefore originate it, and from the experience so acquired there is reflected in the executive the control which consciousness in turn possesses over certain organs of the body, even of those from which it originates. There are many organs, however, over which man has no control. These are the heart, the lungs, the stomach, and such like, which perform the functions of nutrition. These are carried on independent of sense, though at the same time we may be conscious of their action. We cannot control them beyond what experience in medicine may have taught us in the promotion of health, and this again is only indirect. When we feel faint, therefore, or hungry, or any appetite whatever, we do not so by means of consciousness, or any ratiocination, but by an affinity natural to the respective organs for what is necessary to their appetites, like as any plant will expose its branches or direct them towards the light from which it may be; somewhat excluded, or shoot forth its rootlets in the direction of water from which it may be inconveniently planted. It does this without consciousness, and so can man in the performance of those functions which belong to the process of nutrition. Not so is it, however, with the organs of voluntary motion. These his consciousness controls in the ratio that experience has taught him. And in the event of the want of consciousness and the want of experience the exercise of these can be traced to the force of habit and other causes, but where this takes place danger is inevitable. Consciousness is clearly something acquired — something that was not in the life of a man, but is so now in his growth and maturity. His experience has promoted its growth, and the control it is sensible of, or the control which he as a conscious being is sensible of over the controllable organs of his body is in the ratio of that experience, and his remembrance of the facts connected with that experience. A child is not conscious of what produces pain or what pleasure until experience teaches him; and the dotard forgets his experience; and therefore it is that both need guardians. Consciousness in both these instances is but a name, its chief characteristic as possessing a sense of control is either but in the bud or almost extinguished. In the process of man's growth then, we perceive the nature of consciousness. We admit he is single, and therefore indivisible; and so is his consciousness single and indivisible too. But this singularity and indivisibility is only as all other units are, one and indivisible in their respective wholes. Every whole is made up of parts. All units within the limits of our comprehension are complex. To demonstrate a simple body is impossible. Absolute indivisibility is beyond our comprehension. In the experiments of the chemists we have sufficient proof of these statements. The elements of the chemist, as Oxygen, Hydrogen, Silver, Gold, &c., are simple and therefore indivisible *only* in so far as his experiments have failed to decompose them, but this is no reason to suppose them absolutely indivisible, as a further advance in science may yet demonstrate them to be compound, like as water and air, previously considered simple, are now shown to be compound. Now, air, water, common gas, and such like, though compound, are still units, single and indivisible as such. They are units inasmuch as they each present their own peculiar qualities which are not to be found in any different combination. Each is a unit of certain compound parts, presenting manifestations which cannot be imitated by any other combination; and when analyzed they are destroyed, and therefore as water, air, and gas, cannot exist in any other conceivable shape. While they exist, they respectively possess indivisibility as an inherent quality. We may divide any

quantity into smaller quantities, but this is a division without destruction, as water is water, air is air, and gas is gas, however infinitesimal in amount; divide any one of the three really, that is, separate its component parts, and we destroy it. Thus do we see that all compounds, while in existence are indivisible units in the manifestations of nature. The plant presents the same argument. As an existence it is indivisible. It may be divided in a sense, but to lop off its branches is to multiply its species, if we choose to suitably plant these branches. It is continually wasting and repairing its existence by the aid of the air it breathes, the soil that feeds it, and the light which imparts its colors. Exclude it from any one of these, and immediately it becomes the subject of analysis. It dies, dissolves, perishes, and as a tree after this, we have no conception of it existing in other circumstances. The proximate elements which go to form it, and those which go to form any other combination, are not of themselves any thing else after they are set free by analysis from what they were previous to synthesis or their combination. Now synthesis is nothing in itself, but the name of a process, namely, the uniting of certain elements under certain conditions, that by which combination is effected, the opposite of analysis. Both indicate processes in the economy of nature, —the one that of combination or life, the other that of decomposition or death. Hence, what follows the one is the existence of a body, and what the other is the destruction of this body, so that what remains of the deceased compound is its elementary constituents, and nothing else by which to give an idea even that such a combination had at once existed. But going on the principles of Butler, we might say that as we do not know what analysis is in itself, (supposing we did not know,) it may be, that the combination may exist in other circumstances for aught that is known to the contrary, as the event of decomposition "removes the object from our view and destroys the sensible proof we had before" its analysis of it being in existence. And we do not see why this should not apply to any form of matter as well as to man to whose decease the Bishop applies it, since every form of matter possesses affinities or *living powers* as the manifestations of existence, as a *living power* is the manifestation of any animal existence.

Now, referring to man's sensual life, we find it the result of arrangements the synthesis of which makes him what he is, and the analysis of which necessitates his destruction. All experience shows this. He is like the tree, a unit as it is, and deriving his nourishment from the air he inhales and the food he eats; he cannot be deprived of these without injury, resulting in death. And the organs necessary to his nutrition are so essential that not one of them can be destroyed without the destruction of his life. What other organs he possesses apart from the intellectual are only necessary to the perfection of his being as an animal. By these he walks, handles, sees, and hears, *et cetera*, and as an animal he is only perfect as these are effective. He cannot walk without his limbs, and so of all the other organs. And though he may live, in a sense, independent of his eyes, ears, feet, *et cetera*, he *by this* manifests no higher state of life, *as simply an organic being*, than does the living stump of a tree which has been deprived of both its branches and leaves. In accordance with these premises, then, we affirm that man's consciousness increases and diminishes with the number of organs in his possession, and in the ratio of the effective operation of these. As a sensual being, man therefore cannot be conscious of a power within him to see or hear without his eyes or ears. And as an intellectual being, and never having had the use (supposing) of eyes or ears, he can form no conception of what sight or sound is; and not having this conception, it is absurd to presume that he can be conscious of a power within him to perceive, even though he had the organ given him with which to do so, as it is reasonable to suppose he must first know its use, and next acquire the method of using it. Of what use is a microscope to a man who does not know what it is for? and supposing he does, what does it avail him if he can not suit it to his eyesight? This is further illustrated by the case of a man who was born blind, and whose eyes were cured after he had attained maturity, and ability to give a correct account of the impressions he received

after acquiring his new sense. "It clearly appears he had no correct ideas of distance in the first instance, and we are expressly told that he supposed all objects to touch the eyes until he had *learned* to correct his vision by means of his tangible impressions" (see Bostock's Physiology, 2d edition, page 121, vol. iii.). Now, as man's sensual life is the result of organic arrangement and operation, his consciousness as such must also be an effect from the same, that is, his consciousness can only be perfect as his organs are effective—that as he is awaiting in organs or in their functional vigor, he must also be in the same ratio awaiting in consciousness. Consequently, supposing a man defective in all his senses, suppose him to be born deaf, dumb, and blind, without limbs and hands, without taste and smell — and such a man could live—what amount of consciousness would he have? Any? Without one organ it is plain man is defective in his consciousness as relating to that organ, so therefore about the remainder we need not dispute. And this without affecting its nature as a single and indivisible state in dependence on the organic arrangement of the animal body. It increases and diminishes as the body does, and like the body also dies and becomes extinct. Yes, but it may be said, "the sensible proof" of its existence is only destroyed. Very true; but the "sensible proof" of the body's existence in this way of reasoning, may only be destroyed in like manner; so let like draw to like—they are brothers; twain in one, let them go together; and if it be they live, without any sensible proof of their living, notwithstanding they have given us sensible proof of their death, let our reason die—it is vain.

In our next we will continue our strictures on Butler, and endeavor to forward it sooner than we have done this one.

By this time you will have again returned home to resume the labors of the pen. I hope you have had a successful and satisfactory journey. Wishing you every comfort, I remain your grateful brother in the one Hope of the Gospel,

W. D. JARDINE.

Aberdeen, August 10th, 1860.

Rochester, N. Y., and some of its Religious Vagaries.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.

Respected and Dear Sir: —Thinking you and your readers may be interested in a few thoughts and facts concerning the past and present of Gentile doings, and also the future prospects of "THE FAITH once delivered to the saints," and "now made known for the obedience of all nations" in this goodly city of Rochester, I venture to address you, not promising, however, that either matter or manner will prove interesting; but for the truth's sake, and that facts may be known.

Rochester is a somewhat peculiar city, physically, socially, and "religiously." Situate remote from the seaboard and the great centres of commerce, it lies modestly and retiringly on the banks of the famed Genesee, in view of the blue waters of Ontario, in the centre of a rich agricultural country, possessing an abundant waterpower, and other advantages, which have built up and creditably sustain a city moderate in dimensions, steady in growth, abundant in resources, and in the enjoyment of most of the material blessings of an ever-bountiful Creator, who, in this age of Noachian perversity and blindness, sends his "rain upon the just and the unjust" and causeth the earth to give her increase, and the fruitful fields to bring forth.

In somewhat harmonious keeping with the physical characteristics of "Geneseedom," we find a population of about 50,000 congregated in this, one of the many busy hives of human industry, where the souls and energies of men seem universally to have no higher flight of ambition than the production and hoarding of the goods of this world—the things that perish, whose worship is destruction, and whose end is death! worshippers of mammon and servants of unrighteousness, whose God is their belly—sowing to the wind and reaping the whirlwind!

Rather more than the usual amount of attention has here been given to *popular* education, literature, and the religious sciences, and it may perhaps be said in truth that in few of the cities of the Gentiles do authors, orators lecturers, and "divines," find a better appreciation than in the circles of the Flour City.

Of the number and extent of the orthodox spiritual bazaars much pride is felt, and the enterprising admirers of the sects are not too modest to lay claim to the disputed honors of a "City of Churches."

Among the many "isms" constituting the fruitful progeny of the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth which have found a genial soil here, *Millerism* attained an early and generous growth, though received with little favor by the sister theological systems of the day. Surrounded and indoctrinated by the "spiritualism" of the popular religions of these days, "the Lord's coming" on the 10th day of the 7th month, A D. 1843, seemed to many the *ne plus ultra* of all divine truth; and great was the joy, enthusiastic the feeling, and scathing the denunciations of those who preferred to remain wedded to their peculiar "ism." Undoubtedly many honest and sincere persons embraced "Millerism," who, knowing nothing of the Scriptures of truth, staked their all on the small "wee" drop of abstract truth contained in the *fact* of a *literal* contradistinction to the logical monstrosity of a spiritual return of "the Lord;" or, to speak more definitely, one Jesus, concerning whom they correctly believed or understood nothing!

Gentilism was never more fatally exemplified than in this unfortunate and deluded movement. The ignorance of Mr. Miller, in appointing "the time" of the personal appearing of a Gentile Messiah, who was to turn "upside down," and make "confusion worse confounded" of the teachings of the prophets, whose great mission was to consist in his *making a bonfire of Jehovah's promises*, and the *locality of them, too*, with the false threats of an imaginary hell of sulphur, brimstone, and pitch, —a forked and long tailed Diabolos—appealing to the trembling fears of corrupt flesh and blood, produced just the results which might naturally have been expected. The "time," of course, failing, and the bonfire not being kindled, as per announcement, both "world" and "church" became sceptical of the "10th day of the 7th month," and any literal coming whatever, and the whole subject of prophecy, and the appearing of Jesus, fell into disrepute, and has remained so to this day with the great majority.

If ever blight or curse fell upon men, this Millerite movement was one, for not only has it made revelation appear ridiculous in the eyes of a cavilling world, but has confirmed the ecclesiastical daughters of Babylon more than ever in their system of "mystery" with which they befog every plain doctrine of Holy Writ. Let the most careful approach be made to the sectarian citadels, and one is continually and everywhere met with the hue and cry, "Millerism, Millerism!" " Ah! that's Millerism!" which in the majority of cases is *sufficient* reason for rejecting the most plain and obvious teachings of the Jehovah Spirit.

The leaders of this movement, in due course of time, were determined to furnish still further proof, if any were needed, of the deleterious effects of that wine which the people of the earth have received at the hands of the adulteress. Not content with making popular theology more confident and determined than ever in its perversions of Jehovah's revealed word, and the world more unbelieving and scoffing than before, "Millerism" must needs furnish a more damning proof of its apostate nature, in the corruption, hypocrisy, and selfishness of its leaders. Poor, deluded, but honest Mr. Miller, had departed—" '43" a failure—" '44" ditto—the danger became imminent, in the absence of some continual stimulant, of a disintegration of the "one body" of honest, but ignorant people which Millerism had called out of the so-called "churches." Foreseeing this difficulty, the leaders, while concocting and devising various expedients, after Mr. Miller's death, soon displayed a longing and affectionate regard for the filthy lucre of this world, which has been characteristic of them to this day. These "leaders" were possessed of a much greater degree of elasticity of conscience than their faithful flocks. To be sure, the people were advised to put their "all" into the common treasury; but this did not prevent their "elders" and "pastors" from publishing papers, with valuable *pecuniary* subscription lists, in their *own name*, while *professedly* in that of the *body*. To be sure, "the Lord" was certainly coming, —he was even "*at the door*,"—this or that "conference" might be the *last*; but that did not alter the pressing necessities of the aforesaid leaders to build, furnish, and equip comfortable, and sometimes costly houses and grounds, "horse and carriage," and many other little trifles which might be supposed to be accompaniments of the poor fishermen of Jesus Christ, for their *short* and *temporary* sojourn before meeting "the Lord" in the air!! To be sure, it was inculcated in their press and pulpit, that "the body" was composed of the "poor of this world, rich in faith;" but still it was not at all certain that ministerial services could be expected, or paper received, without "cash in advance," and something furnished to the leaders for our "worthy poor," to be dispensed under their disinterested auspices! If the reader desire particulars in these things, let him consult the public and private doings of the Millerite leaders, Messrs. Himes, Marsh, Storrs, White, &c.

As might be expected, in order to keep the "precious flock" together and prevent spiritual starvation, something must be done by way of substitution for the strong stimulant of Mr. Miller, whose calculations, based on Scripture summersetts and New England eclipses, had utterly failed—and certainly it could not be expected that the benevolent "spiritual fathers" would abandon the kindly flock which had yielded them such liberal and easily acquired returns.

Here commenced a new phase in the history of Millerism. Each of the doctors in this "school of Babylonian divinity" had his own peculiar prescription; and as each was more or less confident, and interested in the result, a corresponding pertinacity was soon perceptible in the administration of the much needed panacea.

Soon Millerism followed in the wake of the older progeny of Roman harlotry, and divisions and cliques were the result. This may be seen at the present time. Millerism in the Eastern States retains most of its original features; even the "time" expedient is *occasionally* resorted to, to encourage the faithful waiting ones. This portion of the flock are not one whit in advance of their brethren of "'43." Error, ignorance of Scripture, a vast amount of abstract spirit, fluid, or as our Methodist friends would say, "the power," and fanaticism generally, are characteristic of *this* portion of the Millerite flock, chiefly represented by the *Advent Herald*, and the *World's Crisis* both published and owned in Boston, Mass., by the poor fishermen, Grant and Himes.

Another section of this world-reforming body is represented by the *Bible Examiner*, Geo. Storrs, proprietor and editor, whose high and exalted mission consists in teaching "no immortality out of" a Christ, whom it is neither necessary nor expedient to understand anything about. He has much to say about life—eternal life—but *denies the one faith of the Gospel*, and the anointed King *through* which that "life" is to be obtained, and obstinately opposes every thing but his own dogma, that Jesus of Nazareth was anointed to be a Gentile life-giver, *irrespective* of the promises of God made to the ancient worthies, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles. This is the only one of the shepherds, we believe, who is not pecuniarily a gainer by sacrifices for the "precious cause."

Another section of Millerism is represented by the *Advent Review*, publisher and proprietor, one James White, whose peculiar mission is to reform and save by the agency of the old Jewish Sabbath, and such other commandments as may be revealed to his lady, Mrs. E. White, who is supposed by this portion of the faithful to receive revelations from a Gentile God, in *vision*. These are a very peculiar set of people. They may be known by their much prayers in the market places, sanctimonious looks, and great zeal in keeping the seventh day, to the neglect of much weightier matters of the law. Mr. White's head-quarters are at Battle Creek, Michigan, where he is preparing to meet the Lord in a very snug little property, which is constantly undergoing little improvements for the occasion.

The most intelligent and honest of the sub-divisions of Millerism, is that represented by the *Prophetic Expositor*, published in this city by Joseph Marsh, with whom, and his dishonest and sophistical course the last few years, the readers of the *Herald* are somewhat acquainted. By continual reading of some of the more celebrated English authors and writers on sacred prophecy, and the frequent and earnest testimony to the truth by one of its most able and consistent teachers in this city, the editor, several years ago, was induced to give up many of the most nonsensical and absurd crotchets of Millerism, and enter upon a more consistent method of interpreting scripture. This may be seen in a pamphlet published by him at this time, denominated "The Age to Come,"—which, though full of doctrinal and grammatical blunders, was a great advance on the previous positions of the editor. The author, though entirely ignorant that the Gospel of the Kingdom was identical with the sum and substance of *the Gospel*, nevertheless brought out, for the first time by Millerite authority, the doctrine of the restitution of all things—the Millennial reign of Jesus for 1000 years—the restoration of Israel to their land: and about this time contended earnestly also, both in his paper and out of it, for the literal principle of interpretation which he is now so prone to violate. This position of the *Expositor* caused many honest minds to search the Scriptures for themselves, and has been instrumental in bringing many who are intelligent and honest to the obedience of the one faith; for, notwithstanding the cart had been placed before the horse, and abstract truth taught as such before either J. M. or his readers understood the gospel itself, yet the power of truth is such that these things would have righted themselves had friend Marsh remained honest in his desire to grow in knowledge of the truth. In the dissemination of correct views of prophecy, the *Expositor* was in the main indebted to English writers and to the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*, from whom Marsh early copied and patterned. To them, and the early and consistent advocate of the one faith in this city, whom the Expositorial chief often had "the privilege" to hear, Joseph Marsh is mainly indebted to his knowledge of truth. This is proved by the fact, that however well arranged and forcible his writings, in some instances may have been, they invariably present internal evidence of the copyist. But this was not the fault of the editor; naturally illiterate, contracted, and animal in his cast of mind, it was perhaps his best course to avail himself copiously of the labors of others, and help of assistants to mould them into desirable shape. With apparent honesty and desire for the knowledge of truth and truth

alone, the *Harbinger* (subsequently the *Expositor*) came rapidly forward as a correct exponent of the Bible; and I wonder not, dear brother, that in your labors with J. Marsh on baptism, you were loath to give up the belief that one who had so nearly come up to the requirements of truth should ultimately fall short. But such has proved to be the case; and it is sad to think that Joseph Marsh now stands on record, *convicted by his own testimony*, as an apostate from the faith of the Gospel: and for all such there remaineth no more offering!

By reference to the *Harbinger* from 1850 to 1855, especially 1853, the reader will see any amount of testimony to prove these positions. These printed records show that Joseph Marsh steadily progressed in the knowledge of the truth, and thus instructed his readers, and both seemed to advance with all the speed desirable consistent with intelligence, till about the year 1853, we find him openly expressing his faith in the Gospel of the Kingdom, and teaching the same as the only justifying faith whereby men must be saved; and baptism as the obedience of that faith!!! Nothing can be more positive and to the point than his teachings on this subject, and profuse are his praises of Dr. Thomas—copious his extracts from the *Herald of the Kingdom*—strong his reprobation of the Millerite positions of his Advent brethren, Storrs, Grant, Himes, &c. But it is a matter of rejoicing that some intelligent—in fact the most intelligent of the readers of the *Harbinger* and *Expositor*, having once had their minds enlightened, are not disposed to follow their former teacher, and deny the faith. Yet a large number, influenced by the affected charity, special pleading, and false issues and representations of the *Expositor* in later years—are still in the dark, and are grovelling in Marsh's perversions of truth. Fearing the loss of subscribers and other pecuniary influence in the application of the Gospel of the Kingdom to his flock, and seeing an already manifested opposition to the truth in his followers—as for instance, J. B. Cook and other active evangelizers of Expositorial theology—J. M. became alarmed, and at once found it convenient to make a halt on the narrow road to life; and, through a cross cut, repass to the old broad road to destruction, which he has since been travelling with remarkable diligence. Besides, as our Expositorial friend lately expressed himself, “Dr. Thomas was undertaking to be a leader,” and though Joseph was indebted for much of his new light to the Dr. in question, still it was not desirable to the *Expositor* editor that this indebtedness should be in any way manifest. Hence, we find in the *Harbinger* for 1853 to the present time, a mass of contradictory positions, all bearing the impress of quibble and equivocation. In order that Mr. Marsh's apostasy may be made manifest, I propose to give you a few extracts from his writings, from which it will be seen that he professes to hold, and does actually teach, *THREE distinct Gospels at one and the same time!* In order that the reader may perceive the contradictory nature of these positions, I have placed the extracts in juxtaposition.

To prove his three positions on the Gospel.

Position 1. The Gospel the good news of the Kingdom. *Harbinger*, vol. 4, No. 32. Jan. 22, 1853, pages 252, 260. 268. 276, 284, 285. 374, 380, 388, 389. *Harb.* 1853, pages 92, 100, 108. *Expositor*, vol. 26, 1855-56, pages 22, 103, 663. *Exp.* vol. 27. 1856-57, pages 380, 447; vol. 30, pages 17, 19, 20.

Position 2. The Gospel. Jesus is Son of God. *Exp* vol. 26. 1855-56, pages 464, 491, 520; vol. 27, 1856-57, pages 184, 213, 301, 327; vol. 28, pages 355, 521.

Position 3. The Gospel is Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ. *Exp.* vol. 1855-56, pages 155, 157. *Exp.* vol. 27. 1856-57, pages 18, 547, 575 (three quotations here). *Exp.* vol. 28. pages 523, 528. *Exp.* vol. 29, pages 19, 131, 493, 550, 577, 603.

Thus it will be seen that the plea of ignorance cannot be urged in Joseph Marsh's case: he had intelligently believed the faith of the gospel, and as deliberately now denounces the same; and is, consequently, reprobate concerning the faith, an apostate of the worst kind, and as such is under the inevitable judgment of Jehovah!

Not content with the machinery of his paper, in opposing the truth, he has been indefatigable in the same work among those with whom he has been associated in this city. Not satisfied with presenting his views on sufferance, he has endeavored to force them on his hearers, *nolens volens*, until endurance became unbearable, and the meetings of the "Church of God," so called, in Rochester, were suspended. In this work of opposition to the truth, the writer regretfully confesses that he took part, and for a while seconded the mischievous work of the Expositorial editor—not from any sympathy with the theories of J. M., for the writer confesses to too much sagacity to be imposed on by such threadbare nonsense as three-fact gospelism, but from a common opposition to the truth as revealed in Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles—the dark and heathenish idea of substitution still held sway, with other Gentile imaginations, in the mind of the writer, to the exclusion of the true faith.

The battle waxed warmer and warmer; the traditionary influence and mythical importance of the "Church of God in Rochester," of such vast importance to Expositorial interests, was not to be lost without, a desperate effort—and certainly it was no fault of Joseph Marsh that that venerable institution now consists entire and alone in the undivided individuality of the editor of the *Expositor* himself! The greatness of the Ephesian Diana had surely departed, and its strength but a thing of nought. The Gospel of the Kingdom in Rochester has ever had an able and consistent advocate in brother James McMillan, to whose unwavering and uncompromising presentation of truth may be attributed much of its success in combating and defeating the dark enmities of Satan, and the establishment of several in the faith.

As printer of the *Harbinger* and *Expositor* for nearly ten years, and much of that time contributing to its columns, the writer became interested in the discussion between Messrs. Marsh and Stevenson, and had his attention arrested by portions of direct and positive testimony brought forward, to demonstrate that the only scriptural qualifications for Christian baptism, are a belief in the gospel, that is, the gospel of the *kingdom* and the name of the anointed Jesus, and reformation of life. Being always sincerely desirous of truth, investigation immediately followed; the result of which has been, that the thinkings of the flesh have given way to those of the spirit, and the rags of Gentile righteousness are supplanted by the glorious wedding garment of the Lamb. This was a conclusion arrived at after a long and patient investigation, as your correspondent determined to search the scriptures like the Bereans of old, and see if these things were so. Soon it became evident to my hitherto blinded vision, that the gospel which I had erroneously supposed to be merely a message of Eternal Life, through the substitutional blood of a crucified Savior, in the Gentile acceptance of the expression—was none other than the *gospel of the kingdom of God*. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness and all things shall be added to you" necessitated an examination into the previous instruction of the disciples, on the supposition that they were *baptized*. Whether baptized or not at that time, the previous instruction could have been none other than the teaching of John the Baptizer. "Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand." Looking further, I discovered that no other subject than the kingdom and its associates formed the subject of gospel teaching, and was constrained to the belief that the gospel presented for belief and obedience was neither more nor less than the good news of the kingdom of God,

revealed in the prophets, covenanted to Abraham and David; that Jesus, the despised Nazarene was he of whom the prophets did testify, when speaking of the glory which should follow.

"The gospel," "gospel of the kingdom," and "great salvation" are identical. Hence a faith which does not embrace the kingdom, is insufficient and of no value. Jesus preached but *one* subject as the burden of the gospel proclamation. —Matt. iv. 12, 17, 18; Mark i. 15; Luke iv. 43, ix. 2, 6; Matt. iii. 12; Luke iv. 16, 21; Matt. xix. 28; Luke ;xxii. 28, 30; Rom. i. 15. To quote your own words:

"The Bible reveals no other salvation than this—a deliverance of the righteous from "the pit in which there is no water" by a resurrection from the dead; a transformation of the living saints who may be contemporary with the second advent; a restoration of the kingdom again to Israel under the New Covenant; and a redemption of the nations from the social, civil, and spiritual evils which now press so heavily upon them. This is the only salvation of which the gospel treats. It meets the necessities of the world. Humanity needs no other, and therefore none else has been provided. When the salvation has triumphed, it will be the accomplished fact of a thousand years, during which "The ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Him. For the kingdom is for Jehovah; and he the Governor among the nations."

The kingdom and its glory is the good news and hope of the gospel—the great prize set before us by which we are saved; and any system of Christianity in which it is absent, is destitute of the foundation and with its supporters, must surely perish. But he, which believeth this gospel and is immersed, shall be saved.

This glorious kingdom and its Anointed Ruler form the great centre of Old and New Testaments. It is the hope of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the anti-typical end of the ceremonial of Moses; the grand object of the law, the sum and substance of the covenants of promise, the sure mercies of David, the anti-typic Solomon in grandeur, the burden of Jesus and the Apostles. Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee, and Jesus began to preach, and to say, "Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand." And Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the *Gospel of the kingdom*. "Seeing that my foundation had been one of sand, I determined to abandon it, and have put on the name of the Holy Ones by immersion.

Early in my investigation, I took occasion to refer difficulties in the Scripture to Mr. Marsh for solution, if possible, but although seeing men as trees walking, I had no difficulty by the power of truth in sending his portions to the four winds. This soon caused the fleshy instincts of the old Adam to gain their natural prominence, and I was soon informed that if I embraced "Thomasism" it would be "impossible for us both to continue under one roof." And on one occasion was informed as the only answer that I could get to my Scripture evidence that Christ invariably in his public ministry preached the gospel of the kingdom—was that I was not Christ! These and similar threats were of little consequence, only as showing the true nature of the model of Christian charity which the expository editor is supposed by many to personify. The result has been, however, that the editor has sought a faithful ally—one not tainted with Thomasism—who knowing the gospel, has not the courage to obey it; and so the Expositor is now printed by T. G. Newman, of Seneca Falls, whose sympathies with Crisism, Millerism, and Methodism, cause him to shrink from the results of an honest advocacy of

truth, and he is now vying with Job in rendering the Expositor a good specimen of "the good religion" of the times.

Recently brother Mark Allens has visited us and given a course of lectures on the things pertaining to the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ, very much to the disgust of Messrs. Cook and Marsh, who, Herod und Pilate like, are determined to prevent the truth from obtaining a foothold in this city, if they can prevent it. But they are both powerless for mischief. Bro. Aliens' discourses were eminently practical and well chosen, and produced an effect in the hearts of some. Five, upon a confession of faith in the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name Jesus, have been immersed into the name of the Holy Ones. Messrs. J. Marsh, and J. B. Cook, after a recent faint attempt to upset the Faith here, through the agency of Geo. Storrs, have pretty much left the field, and there is now a prospect that Millerism and its blighting influences are departed from our midst.

It would have been much pleasanter to have written differently of Joseph Marsh—but his persistent efforts to misrepresent the gospel and calumniate its advocates, and a stern regard to the cause which Jehovah has committed to our hands—demands that he should be thoroughly exposed. It is to be hoped that he and others may see the error of their ways, and learn that Jehovah requires an honest heart in his children, and will not tolerate the spirit of self and dissimulation, which some vainly imagine may reign supreme in the hearts of those who profess to be the custodians of Divine truth.

Trusting that the sincere children of the, kingdom may soon be made known and justified in the kingdom of Jehovah's Anointed One.

I remain, with Christian respect and esteem, yours in the hope of the kingdom of God,
AUGUSTUS SINTZENICK.
Rochester, N. Y., Aug. 20th, 1860.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Letter from A. Anderson.

Dear Brother Thomas: —On the 19th of July I took leave of my sojourning place in Goochland, for the purpose of visiting Lunenburg. At the Junction we were met by our brother, Thomas Hamlin, and conveyed to his house. On the fourth Lord's day in July, I had at Concord in Lunenburg a house well filled with sons and daughters of our fallen race; I called their attention to a passage of Holy Scripture in the 3d of Romans. I endeavored to show them that the children of men as such are. according to the Apostle's teaching, entirely wanting in wisdom, in knowledge, in righteousness; in all things that constitute acceptability of character in the sight of God. I endeavored also to show them, that God in Christ Jesus, as presented in the Holy Scriptures, offers us graciously all things that pertain to life and godliness. I endeavored particularly to show them God's kingdom and righteousness. Their attention was called with much earnestness, to the consideration that, at present, we are without immortality, incorruptibility, eternal life: without any continuing city, wanting as to any permanent home, any endowing riches, or honor, or glory; wanting altogether as mere children of the flesh; but God mercifully offers on certain conditions, the hope of all good things. Above all, as we have at present no government worth the name, he offers, us the hope of the kingdom, to be established on the earth, and to be administered in righteousness by the Messiah and his saints. This is an outline of the discourse at Concord.

After the discourse, we attended to the Institution of the bread and the wine, in memory of the sufferings of our Redeemer. By request, I attended to it, according to the mode adopted by our brothers and sisters in Norfolk; this was deemed best under the circumstances. We endeavored to show the importance of self-examination, and in order to make individual responsibility as manifest as possible, the disciples were invited after thanks, to walk up to the table, and to take and eat, one at a time.

At Shady Grove, on the next Lord's day, some who partook at Concord, did not partake; why, I am not able to say with certainty. At Shady Grove, some that did meet in the beginning of their organization, have for some time, not been meeting. Brethren James Love, and J. R. Hardy, and Philip Wallace, and some sisters, continue to meet, notwithstanding opposition. I have been acquainted with these three brethren for years, and think them worthy disciples, influenced by the belief and love of the truth. They clearly understand that the truth has had a mighty struggle in this sin state, for more than five thousand years. They believe that Patriarchs and Prophets and Apostles struggled and suffered for the truth; above all, that Jesus the Son of God himself came into the world to bear witness to the truth, and that he suffered for its sake, even to the death of the cross. They believe that those who suffer for it, and with it, shall also triumph with it when the Lord comes. We believe that its suffering time of even six thousand years is not worthy to be compared with its triumph of glory, which is to be eternal.

I humbly trust. Brother Thomas, that you will visit Shady Grove, for the sake of this little, maltreated flock, and that the Lord will, through you as a faithful advocate of his truth, greatly strengthen the hearts and hands of these worthy brothers and sisters. I think they are fully determined to persevere in building up the cause of truth, and one another, in it. I hope to be at Shady Grove to-morrow and the next day, according to appointment. I sympathize with them, on account of difficulties attempted to be thrown into their way. I earnestly pray for them, that they may be preserved to the kingdom, for which they are fighting the fight of faith.

Brethren are very anxious for you to hold a three days' meeting at Liberty Seats in our neighborhood. Be pleased to do so if you can, — I will join you in it; some are interested, I think, about the truth. With assurances of increasing esteem and love for yourself and yours, I remain, as ever, yours truly, in the animating hope of the near *apokalupsis* of our Lord from heaven,

A. ANDERSON.

August 3d, 1860.

Miscellanea.

"The Truth as it is in Jesus."

AT a time like the present, when men's minds are deeply stirred about the things that pertain to their religious interests, it is of the highest importance that there should be a clear understanding of what properly constitutes a Revival of Religion. Living, as we do, in a Protestant age and country, with high ideas of freedom from the doctrinal errors and corrupt practices of a whole millennium of apostasy, it becomes us to look well to our own foundations, to "examine ourselves whether we be in the faith," lest, counting too much on the reformation of the sixteenth century, we should be found still clinging to the "traditions of the elders," instead of the pure word of the living God, as preached by Jesus and his apostles.

Availing ourselves, then, of the fundamental element of Protestantism—the right of private judgment in matters of religion—let us, in the spirit of the noble Bereans, who scrupled not to test even the words of an apostle by an appeal to the Scriptures, proceed to inquire what those Scriptures authorize us to desiderate as ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS in any Revival of the Religion of Jesus. "Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above:) or who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). But what saith it? THE WORD IS NIGH THEE, even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is, THE WORD OF FAITH WHICH WE PREACH; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The word is nigh us. The Scriptures in our own tongue are in our hands, even in our mouths and hearts. This is a high privilege, and cannot be too highly prized. But, alas! how many are in the position of the accomplished Ethiopian chamberlain, who, with the fifty-third of Isaiah on his tongue, if not in his heart, was constrained to ask "I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet thus? of himself, or of some other man?" With minds as simple and hearts as ready, may the readers of this tract be as successful in coming to a knowledge of the truth as the childlike Ethiopian. "To the law and to the testimony," then, let us make our appeal. What is a Revival of Religion, according to the Scriptures?

It is humbly submitted that the only answer which should satisfy an inquiring mind bent on knowing the truth, is—THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES. Not the ideas of the nineteenth or any century since the apostles fell asleep, but the "one faith," "the truth as it is in Jesus." Whatever may be the measure of truth possessed by any portion of "the professing church," it is surely no disparagement to any party to take the doctrine of the Great Teacher himself, and those who had the advantage of his personal instruction, with the subsequent enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit, rather than any form of faith which may have obtained at any time since the apostolic age. This, moreover, is the course enjoined by the apostles. When certain men had crept in unawares, and threatened to corrupt the infant church about thirty-three years after the ascension of Christ, we find Jude exhorting to "earnestly contend for the FAITH ONCE DELIVERED to the saints."

Taking up the inquiry as to the faith and practice of the first disciples at this point, it becomes necessary to ascertain what was the faith once delivered to the saints. In other words, what was publicly preached as the GOSPEL OF SALVATION by Jesus and his Apostles.

Notice first, here, that the only gospel publicly preached by Jesus himself, was what is styled "THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD," or more briefly—"THE KINGDOM OF GOD." Thus he said—"I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent." Luke iv. 43. "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; Repent ye and believe the gospel." Mark i. 14, 15. This was the burden of Jesus' preaching to Israel: Repent, or change your minds, and believe the gospel, or good news, concerning the Kingdom of God; for that kingdom is at hand. A crisis in the course of events has come; the Divine power, after a season of withdrawal, is again put forth—much will depend on the reception my message gets at the hands of the nation as such; in any event see you to your own salvation—Repent ye and believe the gospel. Such was the preaching of Jesus.

The preaching of the apostles during the Lord's ministry was precisely the same as that of their Master. "He called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. And he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God, and

to heal the sick. And they went through the towns preaching the gospel and healing everywhere." Luke ix. This "WORD OF THE KINGDOM" was the good seed which, received into honest and good hearts, brought forth good fruit. Matt. xiii. 19. Hence the solemn declaration of Jesus—"Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, shall not enter therein." Mark x. 15.

But some might be disposed to ask here, Did not Jesus and the apostles at this time publicly preach acceptance through the blood of the cross? Was not the death of Jesus, as a sacrifice for sin, preached then as well as afterwards? Strange as it may seem, such was not the case. It was not even preached that Jesus was the Messiah. After Peter had made the confession—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus charged his disciples that "they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." And the evangelist proceeds to say—"From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed and raised again the third day. Then Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee Lord; this shall not be unto thee." Mat. xvi. 10, 20-22. This was after the apostles had been two years engaged in preaching the gospel of salvation.

These things are cited to show that during the personal ministry of Jesus the gospel of salvation was limited to "the things concerning the Kingdom of God," and was preached by the apostles while they were slow of heart to believe that the Christ should suffer, and expressly forbidden to announce that Jesus was the Messiah.

It becomes necessary to inquire here as to the nature of the Kingdom of God which we have thus seen to be the grand subject of gospel preaching by Jesus and the apostles. And first, our Lord, shortly before the conclusion of his ministry, taught that the Kingdom of God should not be established until his return from the right hand of God to the earth. "He spake a parable because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because that they thought that THE KINGDOM OF GOD SHOULD IMMEDIATELY APPEAR. He said, therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, occupy till I come. . . . And it came to pass that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him," &c. Those who had been faithful were rewarded, while those who had neglected their duty were punished. Thus the setting up of the Kingdom of God is contemporary with the distribution of rewards and punishments at the return of Christ from heaven. And so Paul—"I charge thee (Timothy) therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead AT HIS APPEARING AND HIS KINGDOM." 2 Tim. iv. 1. Another distinct testimony to this point by Jesus himself, is conclusive: "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. xix. 28. If it be asked, when shall the Son of man sit on the throne of his glory? let Jesus answer—"When the Son of man shall COME IN HIS GLORY, and all the holy angels, with him, THEN SHALL HE SIT UPON THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY." Matt. xxv. 31. That this is the time when MESSIAH'S KINGDOM shall be established is plain from another testimony from the mouth of the Great Teacher—"Ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in MY KINGDOM, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xx. 29, 30. These testimonies are submitted as evidence to show that the Kingdom of God preached by Jesus and his apostles was a kingdom to be set up when the Son of man should come from heaven to reward his faithful followers and punish

the wicked. But besides showing this important truth, they plainly teach another of great importance, namely, that the establishment of the Kingdom of God is intimately connected with the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel. Twice does our Lord solemnly promise to the twelve apostles that they should sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. This will further appear on the consideration of one or two other testimonies. In the passage from Luke xxii., above cited, Jesus says—"I appoint unto you a kingdom, AS MY FATHER HATH APPOINTED UNTO ME." Now, what kingdom has the Father appointed unto Jesus? Listen to the words of the angel to Mary—"He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke i. 32, 33. It is reasonable to suppose that his language was intended to be understood by Mary: if so, what other meaning can we conceive her to put upon it, than that which it was most obviously intended to express, namely, that her Son was to be the promised Messiah, or anointed King of Israel; that in him should be fulfilled those glorious promises made to the nation, and contained in the writings of the prophets. Mary, doubtless, knew that it was declared of the last king who sat on David's throne—"Remove the diadem, take off the crown I will overturn it until he come whose right it is, and I will give it him." Ezek. xxi. 26, 27; and that "the Lord had sworn in truth unto David, saying, Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." Taking the announcement of the angel in this its obvious and natural sense, we find that it accords exactly with all the promises of Messiah's kingdom given in the Old Testament. Let one example suffice—"I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Dan. vii. 13, 14.

It is plain from these testimonies that the gospel of salvation preached by Jesus and the apostles consisted of things concerning the kingdom of God—Israel's theocracy restored, with all nations brought under the sway of God's anointed King, when he shall have come with the clouds of heaven, and taken unto him his great power to reign.

Shortly before the close of his ministry, Jesus said to his disciples—"THIS GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." Matt. xxiv. 14. And in his commission to the apostles immediately before his ascension—"Go ye into all the world, and preach THE GOSPEL to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15, 16. The reference to the commission in Luke's gospel shows that, in proclaiming this gospel of the kingdom, repentance and remission of sins should be preached in the name of Jesus—that is, Jesus, who had been crucified, buried, and raised from the dead, as a sacrifice for the sins of the world, was no other than he whom God had appointed heir of all things—the Messiah—who should be Jehovah's servant to raise up all the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, who should be for a light to the Gentiles, that he might be Jehovah's salvation unto the end of the earth." In glancing briefly at the manner in which the apostles fulfilled their mission, we shall see that this was the drift of all their preaching. Take Peter's address on the day of Pentecost. Its aim was to prove from the Old Testament that the Messiah should die, be buried, and have an early resurrection; and that David, seeing that before, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would RAISE UP CHRIST TO SIT ON HIS (DAVID'S) THRONE—spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, &c. ["His soul not left in hell," is equivalent to His dead body not left invisible—i.e., in the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea.—EDITOR HERALD.] This, followed by the testimony of the apostles,

"that this Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses," convinced the Jews of the validity of the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah, and drew from them the inquiry—Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter does not say, as some allege, that Jesus ascended to heaven, there to sit on the throne of his father David. He simply says that God had promised to raise up Christ TO SIT on David's throne; but that in the meantime he was, according to the prediction in Psalm cx., exalted to the right hand of God, UNTIL his enemies should be made his footstool. In like manner as it was said of David; "I took thee from the sheep-cote TO BE ruler over my people" —while fifteen years elapsed between the anointing of David as king and his exercising regal authority on the throne of Israel. Besides, Jesus distinctly recognizes the distinction between the throne of Jehovah, where he now sits, and the throne which he is to occupy in company with his disciples—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in MY THRONE, even as I also *overcame and am set down* # with my Father in HIS THRONE." Rev. iii. 21. And so the second address of Peter (Acts iii. 19-21)—"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus the Christ, who before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must RECEIVE UNTIL the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." It should be observed here, that there is no charging of the Jews with erroneous ideas of the main characteristic of the Messiahship—the regal—but rather homologating and teaching this in its true relation to the sacrificial and priestly. Notice this distinctly in the preaching of Philip: "Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached CHRIST unto them." "And when they believed Philip preaching the THINGS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD and the NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, they were baptized, both men and women. Acts viii 5,12. Philip preached Christ by preaching the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Messiah. At Ephesus Paul went into the synagogue and spoke boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading THE THINGS CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF GOD." Acts xix. 9. And in his parting address to the elders of the church of Ephesus, he reminds them of the subject of his preaching in these words: "Testifying repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus the MESSIAH. . . . And now behold I know that ye all, among whom I have gone PREACHING THE KINGDOM OF GOD, shall see my face no more." Acts xx. 21, 25. In his letter to the Ephesians, Paul terms this "the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." Eph. i. 13. In Paul's defence before Agrippa, he said—"I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." Acts xxvi. 6, 7. Paul's hope was identical with that of the twelve tribes of Israel, with this in addition, that he looked for its being realized through Jesus in fulfilling his mission as the Christ. * To the Jews in Rome his testimony was the same: "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this, chain." And as before, we find him "preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." Acts xxviii. 20, 31.

[*Ἐνίκησα και εκαθισα* are both aorists, and should be rendered here by the indefinite present; as, "It overcome and sit down. — EDITOR HERALD.]

* [The hope of Israel as a nation was founded on the promise that God made to Abraham, that he would give him the land of Canaan for a PERSONAL POSSESSION. Gen. xiii. 15,17; Acts viii. 5; Heb.xi. 8. This promise was not fulfilled during the life-time of Abraham; hence its fulfilment is only postponed. But this promise of the land was also made to Abraham's seed, which, according to Paul, is the Messiah. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one seed, which is Christ"

Gal. iii. 16. This was no other than the Divine grant of the territory upon which the Divine Kingdom or Theocracy was to be established. And it is in connection with the administration of this Kingdom in its Messianic phase that that other promise will be realized—"In thee (Abraham) shall all nations be blessed." This was the gospel preached to Abraham. Gal. iii. 8. The twelve tribes held this as the national hope, but they had "heard that, out of the law, that Christ abideth for ever," and were consequently blind to the fact that it was also written that the Christ should die and be raised from the dead, and remain for a time at the right hand of God. This was the point of difference between Paul and the Jews; hence his question before Agrippa—"Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" The resurrection of Jesus was the pledge of the resurrection to eternal life of all the faithful. Hence "Paul suffered the loss of all things, that he might know Christ and the power of his resurrection, if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of (or from among) the dead."—Phil. iii. 11.]

It is evident from the testimonies adduced that the gospel as preached by the apostles after Pentecost was distinctly two-fold—first, THE THINGS OF THE KINGDOM; and second, THE THINGS OF THE NAME OF JESUS: the former being the prophetic outline of the main feature of the Messiah's office—the re-establishment and administration of the Theocracy; and the latter the announcement that the rejected and crucified, but resurrected and exalted Jesus of Nazareth, was the very personage who should in due time accomplish this great work. Hence we find this two-fold character of the gospel condensed into such propositions as—"Jesus is the Christ;" "Christ crucified;" "Jesus Christ and him crucified;" "Christ died for our sins," &c., which are sufficiently intelligible to one who knows what the term CHRIST imports, but as meaningless as "*χριστός απέθανεν νπερ των άμηρτιών ημών*" would be to a merely English scholar.

Such is an attempt to ascertain what was the FAITH of the first disciples. It may only be necessary to observe that it is "WITH THE HEART man believeth unto righteousness"—with a sincere, CORDIAL, HEARTY faith in the message which God in his mercy has sent. This "faith worketh by love," producing the "obedience of faith"—that patient continuance in well doing by which the true disciple seeks for glory honor, and immortality in the Kingdom of God; for "hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath PROMISED to them that love Him?" Hence he is enjoined to add to his faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity; "wherefore the rather, brethren," adds the apostle, "give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fall, for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus the Christ."

But it has pleased God to prescribe the first act of obedience with which the believer shall begin his new life. In his commission Jesus charged his apostles—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *baptizing* them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;" or, in the words of Mark—"Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth AND IS BAPTIZED shall be saved." This is the unrevoked fiat of the Son of God. And Paul's testimony is to the same effect—"We are all the children of God by faith [*Δια της πιστεως εν through the faith in*, not out of, Christ Jesus. —EDITOR HERALD.] in Christ Jesus; FOR as many as have been BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST have put on Christ." But now baptized into Christ? As the Israelites were baptized into Moses—"All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto (*into*, same word as in Gal. iii. 27) Moses IN the cloud and IN the sea." Believers of the

gospel are baptized into Christ IN water. And we find that the first believers yielded prompt obedience to the divine command. "They that gladly believed Peter's word were baptized." "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women."

We have thus briefly glanced at some prominent features of the faith and practice of the first disciples, and the question may fairly be asked—Is anything worthy of the name of Revival which ignores these plainly taught first elements of the religion of Jesus? True, by applying a principle of interpretation which has obtained in the Roman Catholic church since the days of Constantine, and which passed unreformed into the Protestant church at the time of the Reformation, the words of prophets and apostles, and even of Jesus himself, may be made to mean anything the fancy of the commentator may suggest. But is not the natural and obvious meaning which the plain reading would indicate, the more likely to be the true one? The most momentous interests are suspended on our understanding of the words of Jesus. His own declaration is—"He that REJECTETH ME, AND RECEIVETH NOT MY WORDS, hath one that judgeth him: THE WORD THAT I HAVE SPOKEN, the same shall judge him in the last day." John xii. 48. But how can we receive the words of Jesus unless we have a simple mode of ascertaining their meaning? "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind"—"To his own master he standeth or falleth," not to any system of interpretation, however time-honored and popular. "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to WHOLESOME (unadulterated) WORDS, EVEN THE WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, and to the doctrine (or teaching) which is according to godliness: he is proud, KNOWING NOTHING, but doting about questions and strifes of words."

Reader study the words of Jesus. Ascertain for yourself what he publicly preached as the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and what he commanded for the obedience of faith, and hasten to yield allegiance. Do not deceive yourself with the idea of love to Christ in the absence of faith and obedience; for His solemn decree is—"he that HATH my commandments, and KEEPETH them, he it is that loveth me." "Blessed are they that DO his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Edinburgh, Scotland.

Elements of the Gospel.

1. What must I do to be saved?

Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.

2. What must I believe about Jesus in order to be saved?

In the first place you must believe what Jesus preached.

3. What did He preach?

He preached the Gospel.

4. What is Gospel?

It means good news, or glad tidings.

5. What glad tidings did he preach?

He preached the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God.

6. What is the Kingdom of God?

The Kingdom of God is a reign, or government, which God promised to establish upon the earth, according to the word of His holy Prophets.

7. Where are these promises plainly stated?

In Dan. ii. it is said that in the days of certain kings, "shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." In Jer. xxxiii. "A king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is His name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness."

8. Is the kingdom which Jesus preached, the same kingdom or royal dominion which these prophets preached?

The very same, as will be seen from His sermon at Nazareth (Luke iv.).

9. What glad tidings did He preach more than the Prophets?

He preached that the royal dignity had approached, and called upon the people of Israel to repent on that account.

10. What did he say when he preached the Gospel?

He said "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel," (Mark i.).

11. Did He send his disciples to preach the same Gospel?

He sent the twelve Apostles to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, charging them thus—And as ye go, preach, saying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" (Matt. x. 7.)

12. Why is Kingdom of God and Kingdom of Heaven used by Jesus and his apostles to mean the same thing?

Because the Kingdom of God, when it shall come, will be heavenly indeed (Rev. xxi.).

13. Was the Kingdom which God established in the land of Canaan not heavenly?

No. It shadowed forth, but did not embody heavenly things (Heb. viii. and x.).

14. Is God's Heavenly Kingdom to be established also in the land of Canaan?

Yes. "Jehovah shall reign in Mount Zion from henceforth even for ever" (Micah iv.). "Jehovah of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously" (Isaiah xxiv.).

15. Who are the Ancients who shall stand before Jehovah of Hosts, when He shall appear in his glory?

Those to whom Paul refers by the title "elders," of whom he mentions Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, and Jacob, who all obtained good witness from God, on account of Faith, who died, not having received the promises; but having seen them afar off, they embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and sojourners on the earth, seeking a future—a better country—a heavenly country; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city (Heb. xi.).

16. Did Abraham not receive the promises before he died?

No. He did not receive the things promised. For when he petitioned God to assure him that he would inherit the land of Canaan, God made a covenant with him that same day, to give him the land occupied by the seven nations named in the covenant, in whose hands it was to remain over 400 years; while Abraham was to die and be buried long before their term expired (Gen. xv.): therefore Abraham must come forth from the cave of Machpelah, to take possession of the land which God, who cannot lie, sware to give to him, and as sure as God has sworn, as surely will Abraham obtain the heavenly country, the city having the foundations, for which he looked.

17. Are there any clear statements naming the country and people, as well as the cities, over which the Lord is to reign?

Yes. "The Lord shall inherit Judah, His portion in the Holy Land, and shall choose Jerusalem again" (Zech. ii.). "The place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my Holy Name shall they no more defile" (Ezek. xliii.).

18. Is there no possibility of Abraham receiving an inheritance in Heaven itself, which the land of Canaan may have only shadowed forth?

There is no promise in all the Scriptures to Abraham, nor any of the sons of men, of an inheritance in Heaven; besides, to promise the land on which he trod, and then give him any other, would not become a covenant-keeping God.

19. Where is the Heavenly character of the Kingdom indicated?

The Heavenly character of the Kingdom, or reign of God, according to Paul, is righteousness, peace, and joy in a Holy Spirit (Romans xiv.), and well accords with that beautiful song, "Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad, let the sea roar and the fulness thereof, let the field be joyful and all that is therein, then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before Jehovah, for He cometh, for He cometh to judge the earth: He shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with His truth." (Ps. xcvi.). Righteousness and judgment will be the stability of His throne, and the people being placed under the new covenant to be made with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, having their sins

forgiven, and God's law written on their hearts (Jer. xxxi.), will be all righteous every one of them (Is. lx.). The presence of the Lord in the midst of a righteous people and the "curse of the ground removed"(Jer. lxiv. and Is. lv.); surely it will be a heavenly country.

20. If we give credit to the things of the Kingdom of God as preached by Jesus, and by all these Prophets, will that be sufficient for our salvation?

No. We answered, question second, that "you must believe" in the *first place* "what Jesus preached;" and now we say, in the second place, you must believe what His Apostles preached after He rose from the dead.

21. What did His Apostles preach after the resurrection?

They preached to the house of Israel, that Jesus of Nazareth, whom they crucified, is indeed the Christ. They proved it by bearing witness to His resurrection, and proclaimed repentance and remission of sins through His name.

22. What is the meaning of Christ?

It is a title belonging only to such as are anointed to occupy the office of prophet, priest, or king.

23. How had the title come into use?

From the ancient practice of anointing such as are destined to fill these offices.

24. Is the practice of anointing priests not as ancient as that of kings?

It may be more ancient, but there is no evidence of any priest who ever lived having that title conferred upon him, save Melchizedec.

25. Why is the word Christ not in all the ancient scriptures?

The Hebrews used the word Messiah instead, and our English translators always rendered it *anointed*, except in Dan. ix., where the Hebrew word is retained.

26. Should we then understand the word "anointed" always to mean Christ when we find it in the Scriptures?

Yes: and as the second Psalm has it. "The rulers take counsel together against Jehovah, and against His Anointed," which is, in the fourth of Acts—"The rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against His Christ."

27. Are we then to understand plainly that the name Christ was given to Saul and David, the first kings of Israel?

Yes. Samuel, who was sent of God to anoint Saul (1 Sam. x.), gives him the name in Gilgal, before all Israel, "The Lord is witness against you, and His Christ is witness this day" (1 Samuel xii.). And David assumes the title "Great deliverance giveth He to His king and

showeth mercy to His Christ, to David, and to his seed for evermore" (Ps. xviii.). These are specimens of the name Christ, or Messiah, being applied to these kings.

28. Were any of the governors who ruled in Judea, from the captivity in Babylon to the birth of Jesus, ever called Messiah or Christ?

The governors of Judea, during that period, until the accession of Herod the Great, were selected from the sons of Aaron, and though some of these pontiffs afterwards assumed the title of king, wore the diadem, and refused any longer to be tributaries, yet none of them ever dared to assume the title of Christ; and even Herod himself demanded of the chief priests and scribes where the Christ should be born—thus showing that he laid no claim to such a title.

29. Had the name Christ ceased to be used by the people of Israel, after the captivity of Zedekiah?

They ceased to apply it to any living monarch, but it was used and applied to one Personage, to be born of the seed of David; and the whole nation looked for the long cherished hope, that God would raise up the Christ to sit on David's throne when Jerusalem should become the praise of all the earth; such was their hope at the birth of Jesus, and hence the Scribes answered Herod according to the unerring word of God (Micah v.), that Christ should be born in Bethlehem, "For out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel" (Matt. ii.).

30. Why was Herod so anxious about Christ?

Herod having been made king of Judea, at Rome, through the influence of Marc Antony, in the room of his brother-in-law Antony, in the room of his brother-in-law Aristobulus, was always jealous of any real or supposed rival; and when the Magi came to him inquiring "Where is He that is born king of the Jews" (Matt. ii.), he demanded of the Scribes where the Christ should be born, so that he might destroy the infant heir to the throne of David—thus showing that both Herod and the Scribes understood Christ to be the king of the Jews.

31. Who gave the first intimation that Jesus should be the Christ?

The angel who announced His birth said, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i.).

32. Where is the promise to David to give his throne and kingdom to his seed?

In the message of Nathan the Prophet—"And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom; He shall build me an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever; I will be his father, and he shall be my son" (2 Sam. vii.). And again, "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David, his seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me" (Ps. lxxxix.).

33. Were these prophecies not fulfilled in Solomon?

No. They were not fulfilled, as will be seen in Solomon's psalm, which contains the last requests of David, the son of Jesse—"For Solomon. Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the king's son. He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. His name shall endure for ever; His name shall be continued as long as the sun, and men shall be blessed in Him, and all nations shall call Him blessed" (lxxii.). Solomon, with all his glory, never was worthy of such a name.

34. Did the people not believe that Jesus was the Christ during His ministry?

There were some who believed. Andrew, the first day he had been with Jesus, came to Simon his brother, and said—"We have found the Messiah, which is interpreted the Christ;" and Philip, having followed Jesus when he was desired, met Nathanael, and said, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the Prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth." Nathanael at last confesses Him thus—"Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel" (John i.). And many of the people of Sychar said—"We know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world" (John iv.). And when many of the disciples forsook Jesus, He asked the; twelve—"Will ye also go away?" to which they responded,—"Lord, to whom shall we go; thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe, and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (John vii.). And Martha said—"Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, who should come into the world"(John xi.). The children also cried in the temple. "Hosanna to the Son of David" (Matt, xxi.): while the cry of those preceding and following Jesus to the city was "Hosanna, blessed be the kingdom of our father David." (Mark xi.). Those meeting Him also cried. "Hosanna, blessed is the King of Israel, that cometh in the name of the Lord" (John xii.). "And many even of the chief rulers believed on Him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess Him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue" (John xii.).

35. Did Jesus, during His mission to the house of Israel, give any countenance to the notion that Christ is a kingly title?

Yes. When the chief priests accused Him before Pilate, He was charged with saying that "He Himself is Christ, a king;" and Pilate asked Him, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" He replied, "Thou sayest it" (Luke xxiii.). Unto the question, "Art thou king, then?" He replied, "Thou sayest that; I am king: to this end was I born" (John xviii.). And the inscription on His cross, ordained by Pilate, was "JESUS OF NAZARETH, KING OF THE JEWS" (John xix.). And Paul refers to this saying—"He witnessed the good confession before Pontius Pilate" (I Tim. vi.).

36. Why does Jesus say to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world?"

Because His kingdom will not be established "till the prince of this world is judged" (John xvi.). And of His Apostles he said, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John xvii.). His kingdom will be in the world to come, when there will be "new heavens and new earth, where righteousness will dwell" (2 Peter iii.).

37. Why did the twelve Apostles cease to preach the kingdom of God after the day of Pentecost?

They had previously preached the kingdom of God in all the cities of Israel, and did not require to repeat it to them; but when they went where the kingdom had not been preached, they never failed to make it known.

38. Did Paul, then, in going among the dispersed Jews and the Gentiles, preach the kingdom of God, as well as the name of Jesus Christ?

Yes. In Damascus, after his conversion, "he went straightway into the synagogue, and preached Jesus, that He is the Son of God," and he confounded the Jews there, "proving this is the very Christ" (Acts ix.). And at the synagogue of Thessalonica, "for three Sabbath days he reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that the Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I preach to you, is Christ" (Acts xvii.). And to the Jews at Athens he preached "Jesus and the resurrection." But when brought before Gentiles in the court of Mar's Hill, he effectually preached the kingdom of God, declaring that the God that made the world "had appointed a day in which He shall judge the world in righteousness, by a Man whom He hath ordained, having offered faith to all men in that He raised Him from the dead" (Acts xvii.).

39. How is this preaching of the kingdom, by Paul, in harmony with that preached to Israel, "repent for the kingdom of God is at hand"?

They are in perfect harmony; and as the Israelites are commanded to repent, because the royal dignity of the Deity had approached, so the Athenians are commanded to repent, because the said king had been raised to rule the world in a certain future day. Thus showing likewise that the kingdom of God comes at the day of judgment—"the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii.). The day of His appearing and kingdom (2 Tim. iv.). And for which Peter says "the Judge is ready" (1 Peter iv.). Waiting till He who said "Sit thou on my right hand" (Psa. cx.), shall also say, "Arise, O God, judge the earth, for thou shalt inherit all nations" (Psa. lxxxii).

40. Can men not be saved at the present day, without believing and confessing that Jesus is the Christ?

No man can have any hope of salvation, unless he conform to the requirements of Jesus, to whom all authority in heaven and earth is given; and the rock on which he said, I will build my Church, referred expressly to the confession made by Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi.), must then be confessed by every one who becomes a member of His church or body. And John gives it great importance, when he says, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through his name" (John xx.); and again, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." (1 John v.).

41. Might it not be sufficient to confess like the Ethiopian, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Sun of God"?

It is *not* sufficient; such a confession might be made by persons who know little more about Christ than that it is the surname of Jesus.

42. Is the confession of the Ethiopian then really a forgery?

The whole of the 37th verse of Acts viii. which contains these words, is marked as spurious by some of the most eminent critics, and it is thrown out of the Greek text of "Bagster's Critical New Testament." It is, therefore, indispensable to believe and confess what the Lord requires, without adding or paring one single word.

43. If one believe the word of the Kingdom, and acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ of God, will that give warrant to conclude that he is safe?

No. There must be an acknowledgment of the Lordship as well as the Messiahship of Jesus, in order to be saved.

44. What is the meaning of the title Lord?

The word originally meant proprietor, or master: its correlative is slave, or servant: but the dignity of the title which belongs to Jesus, is understood by the extent of His proprietorship. Hence Peter says, "He is Lord of all" (Acts x.); and Paul says, "For to this end Christ both died and revived, that He might be Lord, both of the dead and living" (Rom. xiv.).

45. Does not every body admit that Jesus is Lord?

That may be; but His own words are, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven" (Matt. vii.).

46. By what means, then, can the admission of His Lordship be acceptably made?

The admission is made by confessing with the mouth, that Jesus is the Lord, and by formally entering into His service.

47. How is such an engagement ratified?

The engagement is signed and sealed in the baptism of the person thus engaging.

48. How can an engagement be ratified without the signature of both parties?

It cannot be; but baptism being instituted by the Lord Jesus Himself, He has signified His agreement by the commission to His Apostles in these words, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned" (Mark xvi.).

49. Why has baptism been called a sacrament?

The only reason we can give, is that in early times the confession made by the person baptized was somewhat akin to the oath of allegiance administered to soldiers, and there are words which occur in corresponding passages to show that swearing and confessing to the name of the Lord are very nearly related, as will be seen by the following—"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and none else: I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear" (Isa. xlv.); which Paul expressly

quotes to prove that "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, to give account to God," (Rom. xiv.). And Paul here uses the word *confess*, for that which is in Isaiah *swear*; and quoting the same passage again, "God hath, highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and every tongue confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father" (Phil. ii.). And again, when treating on Christ being the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, he shows that the righteousness, or justification, speaks through the word of the faith which he preached, "that if thou (the believer of the promises) shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. x.).

50. Why do you alter the words of Paul, "every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father" in Phil. ii.?

Because the full meaning is not evident in our English version; for it should read thus—"Every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God" *—a confession important in regard to the present position of Jesus, as the Minister of the holy things in the true tabernacle—the Great High Priest within the veil, where the glory of God is manifest, and whence the rays of that glory came forth on the heads of the Apostles on Pentecost, (Acts ii.). The glory which Stephen beheld when he said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God" (Acts vii.).

* I have followed the translation of De Saci, which in this verse is in accordance with the original, and have omitted the word *Father*, on the authority of Beza. Indeed, every alteration is made with the greatest care, and on the best authorities.

51. What advantages have those who are baptized into Christ?

They have all the blessings attached to His name, repentance and remission of sins, and heirship to eternal life in the kingdom of God; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, . . . and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. iii.).

52. Do not all men have the benefit of the name of Jesus in order to remission of sins?

No. The name of Jesus is indeed offered to all men according to the command He gave His Apostles before He ascended into heaven, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem (Luke xxiv.); so that His name is offered in the preaching according to the word which He gave to Ananias concerning Saul of Tarsus—"Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel to bear my name before Gentiles, and kings, and sons of Israel" (Acts ix.). And Paul himself says he received "Grace and Apostleship for obedience of faith among all nations for His name" (Rom. i.). And Peter says, "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv.). Thus, remission of sins is preached in, or by, or through, the name of Jesus; and it is accepted or received in obedience to the faith which the Apostles preached—the saving—the justifying—the sanctifying name of Jesus thus proclaimed—thus borne by the heaven-appointed preacher—is accepted by the humble-minded hearer through baptism, and by no other means, so that the name of Jesus can benefit

those, and those only, who lay hold on it for salvation as it is offered in the Gospel of the Apostles of Christ.

53. Are there any instances of the name of Jesus being invoked at baptism?

Yes. Paul rehearses his conversion before the multitude in Jerusalem, and gives the words of Ananias—"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins; calling on the name of the Lord."

54. Is baptism useless unless the recipient believes the things of the Kingdom of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus, with audible confession or invocation of that name?

It would indeed thus be useless, "For without faith it is impossible to please God;" and unless we confess the Lord Jesus as He bids us, we have no promise that He will confess us before His Father when He shall come in His Glory.

Glasgow, Scotland.

Ancient Legislation in Virginia.

WE are not aware that Virginia originally had a complete code of "Blue Laws," but the old settlers must have had some queer notions about legislation. For example, the divulger of false news or rumors was subject to a fine of two thousand pounds of tobacco. An act was passed in 1662, for the spiritual profit of "schismatical persons," who, "either out of averseness to the orthodox established religion, or out of the new fangled conceits of their own heretical inventions, refused to have their children baptized." It provided that every person, who, when it was within his power, refused to carry his child to a lawful minister to have it baptized, should be "amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco, half to the parish, half to the informer." Tobacco has been applied to many uses, but to none more remarkable than the enforcing of orthodoxy and Paedo baptism. There was another act of the same date, we believe, which savored little of the gallantry on which modern Virginians plume themselves. The preamble sets forth that "many babbling women slander and scandalize their neighbors, for which their poor husbands are often involved in chargeable and vexatious suits."—The act provided that "in actions of slander, occasioned by the wife, after judgment passed for damages, the woman shall be punished by *ducking*." If the damage were greater than five hundred pounds of tobacco, she was to have the benefit of a *ducking* for each five hundred pounds adjudged against the husband, if he should refuse to pay the tobacco. Under such a law, the presumption is, that the land enjoyed quite a rest from "babbling," during the colder months of the year. In summer the penalty would be rather a pleasure. Had women enjoyed the right of suffrage, the law would doubtless have been so framed as to apply to *male* babblers. Our ancestors thought legislation could accomplish everything—it could make men dress with propriety, behave genteelly, and believe most orthodoxly. We laugh at their absurdities; but our children will perhaps be no less astonished at ours. —*Boston Star*.

Doctrine Defined by "a Divine!"

The Rev. H. W. BEECHER, having stated that religious doctrine was only the "skin of truth set up and stuffed," one of his brethren quotes for his edification the words of St. Paul on this wise: "Till I come give attendance to reading, and to the *skin of truth set up and stuffed*."

The theological shallowness of "sensation preachers" is unsurpassed by any other species of the divine genus. H. W. Beecher is certainly prince of all princes symbolized by Barnum; nevertheless, admirably adapted to the function of a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, so captivating to the rude and uncultivated brains of a frivolous and superficial generation. Of whatever stuffing Beecher may be the filling, his hide is certainly not even "the skin of truth:" for there is neither the form nor comeliness of the truth in his speech. He neither holds "the form of sound words," nor speaks "as the oracles of God;" and is therefore a mere bag of wind and vanity.

EDITOR.

Truth.

TRUTH is always consistent with itself, and needs nothing to help it out; it is always near at hand, and sits upon our lips, and is ready to drop out before we are aware; whereas a lie is troublesome, and sets a man's invention upon the rack; and one trick needs a great many more to make it good.

"Watch!"

THE two poles of the politico-electrical battery, are Rome and Jerusalem. *In this decomposition* is evolving currents which will conflagrate when the circle is closed at the Lord's apocalypse. Let the reader keep his eyes open; for present affairs are ominous in Palestine and Italy.

EDITOR.
