

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 AGES.”—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N.J., MARCH, 1861
Volume 11—No. 3.

On the Nature and Constitution of Man.

BY B. LASIUS.

No part in the wide circle of science is more important and more worthy of consideration than the knowledge of the nature and constitution of man. It is the study of this subject which engaged the attention of thinking men in ancient as well as in modern times; yet, from the diversity of opinion, it is to be inferred that to the majority of men this question remains a problem still, and that the solution is even considered an impossibility.

From the testimony of Herodotus, it appears that the Egyptians were the first who taught the two-fold nature of man. The same doctrine is also the principal one which Pythagoras borrowed from them, according to Ovidius, who makes that philosopher pronounce the following words:

“Morte earent animae, semperque priore relicta,
Sede, novis domibus habitant, vivuntque receptae.”

However, the ancients found it difficult, even after having received the doctrine that man could be separated into two parts, body and soul, to comprehend how it was possible that the latter could exist without a body. It was only at a later period that philosophers broached the opinion, that the soul, after its separation from the body, returned to a common soul of the universe: animam digressam a corpore refundi in animam universi. The Hades of the Egyptians and Greeks contains, therefore, the corporeal shadows of the dead; and so familiar was this conception, that one of the Hebrew prophets used it in a parabolic figure. (Isaiah xiv.)

According to the Egyptian doctrine, therefore, the soul would not remain without a body, but had to enter a new one after having left the former. This transmigration of souls had to be accomplished through all kinds of animals, and was finished after the lapse of 3000 years, as Herodotus relates. But as metempsychosis was considered as a punishment or purgatory, the desire arose to conciliate the judge upon whom the decision in the matter devolved, as well as to retain the soul as long as possible in the body to which it belonged originally, and to preserve the same from decomposition, as is related by Diodorus. For this

latter reason the bodies of the deceased were most carefully embalmed by the Egyptian physicians, and to those only was granted that privilege, who in the terrestrial court of death had been pronounced virtuous and innocent. Of these it was believed, that if they had justified themselves also before Osiris in Hades, they would live a happy life conjoined with him. For this purpose, tools which the deceased had used during life, articles of food, of luxury, or of ornament, were put with the body into the tomb, together with written hymns and prayers addressed to the subterranean deities to serve as passports.

In order to gain the second point, —the justification before Osiris, —prayers were pronounced in the act of interment, the deceased was recommended to the mercy of the judge, and writings which substantiated such expectations were also put into the tomb. If the deceased had found mercy before the eyes of Osiris, and his body had been carefully protected from decay by embalming, his mummy was thought to continue in life like unto that of Osiris, who immediately after his death and interment went into Hades, and performed there the office of judge of the dead.

The fate of those whose conduct during life had been objectionable, was different. To them it was neither allowed to dwell in Hades, nor in their former body, which they had defiled by misdeeds. Therefore their soul was transferred at once into the body of an animal for punishment and correction; with them they had to suffer the same fate; they were hunted, killed, sacrificed, until at last, being cleansed and purified at the expiration of a great number of years, they were allowed to re-enter a new human body. The place designated for a life after death was the "amenthes," *i. e.*, a dark subterranean place, where the souls had to stay until their transmigration into other bodies. There it was also decided, according to their past acts and deeds, if they had deserved to pass through the bodies of the lower animals before they could enter a new human body. A graphic description of the subterranean court, according to the idea of the ancient Egyptians, is given by Lepsius. It contains the enumeration of all persons constituting the Egyptian Hades, and nobody can doubt that the Greek Hades is a complete imitation of it. The Greeks adopted likewise the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, of its subterranean residence, a court of death, etc. Other nations adopted these doctrines from them, with various additions and modifications.

The Pythagoreans and Stoics contended that the soul was the real and essential part of man; they designated the body as a burden, a dark habitation, a place of punishment and correction of the soul or mind.

Plato taught that man consists of three parts, viz., body, soul, and spirit. He admitted also a threefold soul: the angry, the desiring, and the intelligent soul or spirit. The first one he located in the chest, the second beneath the heart, and the last in the head. The intelligent soul he considered to be the essential part of man; it had to govern the other two, and it was, according to his doctrine, a part of the divine essence. It is this latter doctrine which was transmitted to the present time, although its adherents modified it in various ways, as it can be seen in the writings of Paracelsus, Bohme, Luther, Helmont, and others.

It seems that the ancients found it even more difficult to determine the question as to the origin of man, than that as to his nature and constitution. For as they knew not the Pentateuch, or at least did not recognize it, they could not conceive of any theory which had only the appearance of plausibility, and if they began to reason upon such theories, they fell into utter absurdities. It is not necessary to mention the inventions of their poets, who fancied that men were formed out of the stones of Deucalion, or that they grew upon oaks like acorns.

Among the Greek philosophers the idea prevailed, that men as well as the world had always existed. Of Aristotle and his disciples it is known, that they held this doctrine, and the same is probable in regard to Plato, Dicaearchus, Pythagoras, Xenocrates, and Theophrastus. Some philosophers, as Epicurus and Lucretius, ascribed the origin of men to a mere accident, so that by an accidental conglomeration of atoms and an occurrence of irregular births it had happened, that human bodies, in such a form as they now exist, accidentally originated. Others, as Empedocles, presumed that the different members were produced by the earth, piece by piece; that they afterwards grew together, and having been mixed with fire and moisture, they made up a living, perfect man. Democritus of Abdera, thought that men took their origin from water and glue.

It is difficult to comprehend how the first theory could be believed even by those men who set it forth, for they were in other respects not deficient of close observation and logical reasoning. They must have entirely overlooked the fact, that, except under very peculiar, unfavorable circumstances, and in a few localities, there is a steady and uninterrupted increase of population all over the globe; that single families grow to tribes, communities, and even to whole nations, who gradually, and in the course of time, cultivate tracts of land which had ever been deserts, inhabited only by the wild beasts of the forest. If, on the contrary, men had always existed, there could not have been a time recorded by the most ancient tradition when their number was not the same, or even larger, than at present.

The second theory does not reflect any more credit upon its inventors than the first mentioned one; for when we contemplate that man is possessed of a multiplicity of different organs, every one of which subserving a distinct purpose, occupying the very best place to perform its appropriate function, and in harmony with all the other organs, we cannot be in doubt for a moment but that this can neither be the result of accident nor of the productivity of the soil, even when assisted by heat and moisture. But, said they, the earth may have exhausted its high degree of fertility, yet it produces new plants, shrubs, and trees as abundantly as in the remotest time of which we have any knowledge, and no such accident as alluded to ever occurred. Besides, the whole world shows such an immense scene of variety, order, conformation to a definite purpose, and beauty, that by the knowledge to be obtained from our feeble understanding, all language fails in force of describing so many and incomprehensible wonders, all figures are wanting in power to measure, our very thoughts lose their limitation, so that our judgment of the whole ends in an inexpressible but the more eloquent astonishment. Everywhere do we see a chain of effects and causes, of end and means, of regularity in generation and decay, and as nothing could of itself come into that condition wherein it is, it points always to another thing as to its cause, which in its turn makes the same inquiry necessary. So the whole universe must resolve into nothing if there was not a Supreme Being existing apart from this infinite mass of accidental things originally and independently, who sustains all things, and as the cause of their origin secures also their preservation.

There remains now the Mosaic account of the origin of man to be considered. According to the testimony of Moses, the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives; and man became a living soul. Now it is of importance to know what the scriptures define to be a living soul. It is a living natural or animal body, whether of birds, beasts, fish, or man. The phrase living creature is the exact synonym of living soul. The Hebrew words "*nephesh chayiah*," are the signs of the ideas expressed by Moses. *Nephesh* signifies creature, also life, soul, or breathing-frame, from the verb to breathe; *chayiah* is living, the participle of the verb to live. *Nephesh chayiah* is the genus which includes all species of living creatures; namely, *Adam*, man; *beme*, beast of the

field; *chitu*, wild beast; *remesh*, reptile; and *ouph*, fowl, etc. In the common version of the scriptures, it is rendered "living soul;" so that under this form of expression the scriptures speak of "all flesh" which breathes in air, earth, and sea. As man then is a living soul in the sense of his being an animal or living creature—*nephesh chayiah*, *Adam*—he has no other pre-eminence over the creatures God made, than what his peculiar organization confers upon him. Moses makes no distinction between him and them; for he styles them all living souls, breathing the breath of lives. Thus literally rendered, he says, the Elohim said, the waters shall produce abundantly the reptile living soul; and again; "every living soul creeping." In another verse, "let the earth bring forth the living soul after its kind, cattle, and creeping thing and beast of the earth, and lastly, whatsoever Adam called *nephesh chayiah*, the living soul, that was the name thereof. Quadrupeds and men are not only living souls according to the scriptures, but they are vivified by the same spirit. The account reads thus: God said, "I bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is *ruach chayim*, spirit of lives;" and in another place, "they went in to Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, in which is *ruach chayim*, spirit of lives. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing, and every man; all in whose nostrils was *neshemet ruach chayim*, breath of spirit of lives." It is this *ruach elohim*, or instrumentally formative power, which first caused a motion upon the waters, and afterwards disengaged the light, evolved the expanse, aggregated the waters, produced vegetation, manifested the universe, vitalized the breathing-frames of the dry land, expanse, and sea. Thus we read, "if God set his heart against men, he will withdraw to himself *ruachu venrshematu*, *i. e.*, his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to the dust." In another place, "by the *neshemet-el*, or breath of God, frost is given." Speaking of reptiles and beasts, David says, "thou withdrawest *ruachem*, *i. e.*, their spirit, they die; and to their dust they return. Thou sendest forth *ruhech*, *i. e.*, thy spirit; they are created. Whither shall I fly, *meruhech*, from thy spirit?"

Here is then a doctrine which is very different from those which were set forth by the Egyptian and Greek philosophers and their adherents. Man is presented by Moses, not as a being of eternal existence, nor of accidental origin, but as a creature, formed by the Supreme Being from earthy substances in common with the animals over which he is destined to rule. Like them, he is vivified by the *ruach*, or power which was instrumental in the formation of the universe, and by the *neshemet*, or breath, vital air, or atmosphere, which keeps all the breathing creatures from perishing and returning to the dust.

The identity of the elements composing the planet earth, with those which are found to compose man, is now a well-established fact. All of them are obtained from the surrounding world. Since the days of Paracelsus, who taught that only three parts participated in the formation of the human body, viz., salt, sulphur, and quicksilver, science has made considerable progress. Chemistry has succeeded as so far to demonstrate eighteen of the elements in the human body, and it is not improbable, that with further advancement of our knowledge, the reverse of the above proposition will be found true, that all the elements which enter into the composition of the earth, are also constituents of the human body.

The *ruach*, or spirit, is that wonderful imponderable agent which pervades the whole universe in its broadest, or rather illimited extent. It suspends in space the remotest of the stars of the bright galaxy of heaven; it causes the heavenly bodies to perform their diurnal and ellipsoidal movements with regularity and order, and to radiate forth their waves of light in an unceasing flood. Its effects appear in the flash of lightning and peal of thunder; in the tornado, which shivers into fragments the mighty oak of the forest, and in the zephyr, which cools our

cheek in the summer heat. It draws together the atoms of matter which make up the granite rock, the gold, the water, and the air; it causes the iron to attract iron; it enables the delicate roots of the plants to attract from the soil the elements for the elaboration of their nutritive juices, and to make them rise to the highest branches and leaves. It dwells also in the animals and in men, enabling them to inspire the vital air, and to convert food into their own substances. It gives polarity to their brains and nerves, and enables them to manifest the phenomenon of thinking. So a bond of union is established between man and the remotest parts of the universe, while man communicates with his Maker by means of this same dynamical agent. Without it all matter would resolve itself into atoms, and fall back into chaos. Although we do not possess instruments to indicate the presence of this agent which rejoices in the inappropriate name of electricity, in the space external to the planet which we inhabit, and to measure the danger which it there produces, we are justified to conclude that the centrifugal and centripetal force of gravitation are nothing else but the effect of the agent under consideration. While its effects there in moving and keeping in equilibrium ponderous bodies fill our imagination with amazement, the contemplation of the same power in its working on the terrestrial world calls out our far greater admiration. We meet here an unceasing chain of chemical changes, of combination and decomposition, of attraction and repulsion, whereby matter is modelled and remodelled in every conceivable form. To a casual observer, accident seems to be the supreme ruler in all these changes, but when we begin with close attention to compare one group of events with another, and arrange these again under larger divisions, and in this manner pass from details to a general view, we cannot fail to perceive a cooperation of means to a certain definite end, resulting in one harmonious whole, and pointing to one agent, to which all these effects are due.

[To be concluded.]

Bible-Examinerism Reviewed.

AFTER SO long a time, and how long we are unable to tell, our old friend of the editorial community, "the Reverend" George Storrs ycleped, has visited our table in the form of the "Bible Examiner" revived. It is not often that we are reminded that our friend is still above ground; nor are we to him even now indebted for the information that he is still strumming upon the one string of the same old fiddle. The reason is that we belong to a "class of professors" to which he has an awful aversion, because of "the exclusive and denunciatory spirit" by which he deems it to be animated. Of that class he regards us *κατ' ἐξοχην*, as "the Dragon, that old Serpent, the Devil, and Satan;" and might possibly, if in visiting his official sanctum we did not do so *incog.*, (as we once did without being discovered,) throw the ammunition ink-stand of his battery at our head, as his old divine brother Luther is said to have done at the Devil's in Wartzburg four hundred years ago. A paroxysm of orthodox horror, there is reason to think, flashes with tremendous and chilling effect over his organ of charitableness at the mere mention of our name. It is a name which sets that same old fiddle of a single string to scraping forth the most un-Paganini-like discord that ever son of the fiddle-bow split ear-drums or set teeth on edge with. Our name is not sweet music or Orphean melody to his "mortal soul;" but discord harsh and grating; and stirs up his inner man with all the indignation and wrath compatible with his peculiar piety. "Dogmatist" or "that dogmatist," is the word or phrase, in which he embodies his pious horror and indignation at our "exclusive and denunciatory spirit." The very sound of the word is awful; and how we have been able to survive and hold our own after being shot at with such an arrow from the bow of his "Reverence," is wonderful to tell! But so it is. The Bethanian President has killed us, no one knows how often! and the Reverend George Storrs denounces us for a dogmatist of the most

exclusive and denunciatory stamp; and yet we still live and, our enemies behold us (Rev. vi, 12,) with feelings destitute of comfort and agreeableness.

The unlearned reader may perhaps think that there is some terrible and disgraceful charge embodied in this awfully doggish word—doggish in sound, if not in signification. It is rarely used in a complimentary sense, yet it is a very good word in itself, and expresses what all intelligent and honest men ought to be who know the truth. A dogmatist is "a bold advancer of principles;" and one who asserts positively, and teaches magisterially. A dogma is an established principle; and he that asserts it positively is a dogmatist and a dogmatizer. But why does our "divine" make this word a vehicle of discordant indignation when our name is mentioned? Because we hold the doctrine of Christ to be well-defined and established; that we understand it; and do positively assert, and are certain that we can prove the assertion by a fair and candid use of the scriptures, that he who believes the gospel of the kingdom and is immersed shall be saved; and that the editor of *the Examiner*, having not yet understood the gospel, and consequently faithless of it, is "dead in trespasses and sins;" and that, even if he believed the truth, his case is still worse, inasmuch as it is testified that he has never been "born of water." Here is the rub. If we would stultify ourselves and admit that such as he are Christians, we should not be regarded as a dogmatist in an evil sense, in his estimation at least. But this we cannot do and be loyal to the truth. The New Testament is our standard of Christian men and things; and in its pages we find no example of a christian after Pentecost, who had not been buried in real water into the death of Christ. This is incontrovertible; yet he that affirms it is a dogmatist!

But leaving our divine friend to the enjoyment of all the satisfaction he can extract from the contemplation of our dogmatism, we proceed to offer a word or so upon the George Storrs in print before us. He is still examining the Bible, a picture of which enrayed in light, and overhung with an olive-branch, adorns the cover of his periodical. Over the book are the words "*Our Creed*;" and under it, "*Search the Scriptures*." The olive-branch, we presume, is offered to all to whom the "*Bible Examiner*" may come, dogmatists of a certain "class of professors" excepted, with whose sentiments he does not desire in any way to be identified. Our reverend friend would not think of offering it to us, because he knows well that it would not be accepted. The olive basis with all true believers is obedience to the gospel of the kingdom, after the example of the 3,000 on Pentecost, and the Gentiles at the centurion's. When he attains to this, the faithful will all exclaim, "God bless George Storrs! go in peace, and sin no more."

But we fear that at present he is far off from this. He says, "The Holy Bible is our creed." Being a Protestant-Methodist divine, we suppose he means that it is his creed in the Protestant sense. "The Bible, the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," exclaimed Chillingworth one of the fathers of our divine friend's religion. But if he had not said so, no one who understands the Bible would have suspected it; so also any such person reading the "Bible Examiner" would not have thought such a thing if it had not been suggested by the device over the book. But Protestants often say, "You can prove anything from the Bible." We do not believe this saying, however. One thing only can be proved by the right use of it; and that is "*the truth as it is in Jesus*." But granting that any thing can be proved by it, —then we conclude that the Protestant creed is any thing that can be so proved! We have been long convinced of this. The Protestant creed is an assent to any thing most convenient for the nonce. The Bible is its creed in this sense; and, viewed from the Protestant stand-points, is of all books ever imagined the most singular. It is supposed to have as many significations as there are sects, or systems of opinions, in the world-religious, and though each contradicting

other indefinitely it matters not, they are right! The world may be compared to a huge factory in which the clergy are hard at it, (and often times "*Hard up*") spinning, weaving, and grinding up the Bible into fabrics suitable to the several marts in which they trade their wares. The Bible is to them what cotton is to the hypocrites of the Manchester school. These cry out that "slavery is the sum of all villainies," while they oppress their own hirelings with worse than negro bondage, and get lordly rich upon cotton produced by the same "sum of all villainies." So the clergy cry out against sin, and invoke the Bible against it, while they twist, and wrack, and torture it into all forms of hideousness until its identity is lost in the sorcery by which they have their wealth. This is a definition in fact of their sayings, "The Bible is our creed," "The Bible is our religion." Yea, after this fashion it is the Devil's as much as theirs. It is also our reverend friend's creed in the same sense—taking what suits him, rejecting what is inconvenient, and ignoring the greater part as unintelligible!

In the number before us he says, his motto is "*Onward*." We should rejoice at this if it were true. We regret, however, to testify that the specimen in hand evinces the contrary. It demonstrates that our divine friend is positively ignorant of the merest first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Nay, he does not seem to know the meaning of the words he uses. The one string of the cracked fiddle upon which he has been scraping for the past thirteen years, is "*No immortality, nor endless life, except through Jesus Christ alone*." Now taking this to mean what he expresses, it evinces that when our divine contemporary draws his bow and sounds forth the phrase "*nor endless life*" he thinks he has produced a chord different from "*no immortality!*" He does not seem to know that *immortality* and *endless life* are equivalents. This is unpardonable in a man—a divine man—who has been wringing the world's nose for its ignorance and stupidity in respect of immortality for so many years past. It is proof to us that Mr. Storrs himself does not yet know what immortality is. It is evident he thinks it something else than "endless life" from his use of the particle "*nor*" after immortality; as if immortality were one thing, and endless life another; and that neither were obtainable except through Jesus Christ. Christ is life, and therefore immortality; but how he becomes such to Daniel under the law, and to Cornelius under "the faith," our divine friend knoweth not; and never will know, so long as he rejoices in his own prudence.

We suspect that our Advento-Methodistic divine has been misled by our English version of 2 Tim. i. 10, which reads, "Jesus Christ hath brought *life AND immortality* to light through the gospel." This would be excusable in a pupil; but for a "reverend divine"—for one of "the wise and prudent," a denouncer of dogmatists, there is no excuse. Our sagacious friend ought to know that "*immortality*" is not in the text at all. It is not *αθανασία*, but *αφθαρσία*, that is, associated with "life." It takes *life* and *aphtharsia* to constitute *immortality*; which is life manifested through incorruptible substance, and therefore endless. These are brought to light through the gospel of the kingdom; in respect to which our friend is lamentably in the dark.

Nevertheless, far be it from us to say that no good has been done as the result of our divine friend's performances upon his single string. The Lord is said proverbially to draw many a straight line by very crooked instruments. Our reverend contemporary is manifestly one of these. He is capable in the work of demolition. He can pull down; but is utterly incompetent to build upon the foundation of the Deity. He can prove to men and women that they and their babies are distinguished from the beasts that perish only by the peculiarity of their organization; and that if any of them would have "*immortality AND endless life*" they can get *them* through Jesus Christ alone; but beyond this he cannot go. Not that he thinks he can go no further. He imagines that he is "thoroughly furnished;" and able to set the whole

matter squarely before them. But in this supposition we know that our divine friend greatly errs. This is the established conviction of "that dogmatist" to whom his charitableness has not been able to reach; and not the "dogmatist's" only, but the conviction of all who are intelligent in the scriptures, and acquainted with our divine's speculations. We have found men exorcised of the immortal soul demon, yet spasmodically jerking upon the parched and arid strand of Advento-Methodism, like fish gasping for water on the shore. On investigating their case, we found that they had been hooked by our friend's tackle. His hook and gudgeon-bait were in their jaws. They could ridicule immortal-soulism; and speculate upon Louis Napoleon as the eighth head of the beast; and had some vague and confused notions about the personal and speedy advent of the Jesus endorsed by the Laodicean Apostasy: but of apostolic Christianity in its faith, obedience, and spirit, they were as ignorant as the craftiest leader of the blind could wish. These we have had to teach the first principles of the oracles of the Deity. Having got rid of immortal-soulism by our divine friend's instrumentality, to that extent had much rubbish been scavenged from their hearts, and the conviction of the truth facilitated. When this got possession of their understandings and affections, in so doing Christ entered into them, and ejected our divine friend with disgrace. In opening their eyes to see the truth, our friend's theological empiricism was abundantly revealed. They found that to demonstrate error was not necessarily to exhibit the truth. They discovered that our divine friend could reduce men, women, and babes to the level of perishing beasts, but could not exalt them to equality with the angels of God. When he had convinced them that they were no better than a dead dog, he could not demonstrate to them how they might attain to joint-heirship with Israel's future king; so that, failing in this, he left them gasping for life upon the shores of universal confusion and doubt, and really in a worse plight than before: for in this life where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise, if the wisdom acquired fails to show us any good. It is better for a man to believe that he is immortal and that he will go to heaven at death if he is good, than to believe he is like the beasts, but that he may become immortal, and yet leave him in ignorance how the Deity has decreed that that desirable consummation may be attained. We do not care to convince men of error unless we can also convince them of the truth. Men without restraint are wild beasts; better therefore that they be restrained by superstitious dread than not restrained at all. This is the providential arrangement under which the world exists. God knows that in the absence of his power in manifestation, anarchy would be universal, and violence would fill the earth, if mankind were not subjected to their fears. Hence, till the establishment of the dominion of the saints he leaves the masses in subjection to strong delusion ministered by the spirituals of wickedness in the heavenlies. By this agency they are restrained. They fear hell-flames, they fear the Devil, they fear the clergy, and they fear the myrmidons of the law. They fear all these as the ministers of God; and in this sense they fear God. They are afraid of him with a fear that hath torment. They are restrained from perjury, robbery, murder, and adultery, not because they love truth, are naturally honest, humane, and chaste; but because they fear the flaming torments of an endless hell, which it is the special business of their clerical guides, whose mission is to lead them into the ditch of perdition, to enstamp in sulphurous and livid characters upon their minds. We would not withdraw them from this influence if we could. Better that mankind should live in terror of "the Devil and his Angels," than that they should fear neither God, devil, nor man. We labor to pluck brands out of the fire—to bring men to the obedience of the gospel of the kingdom, that in being emancipated from the world's terrors, they may be constrained by the love of Christ which surpasseth the knowledge of the natural man. Our divine friend may possibly purpose the same thing; but unfortunately power is wanting to effect it. He can deliver men from their fear of "an endless hell," but he cannot plant them upon the scriptural basis of joy unspeakable and full of glory. The truth must be known before it can be taught; it must be believed before it can be obeyed; and it must be obeyed before any earthborns, impious or devout, can have any

right to the immortality which comes through Christ alone. All of which our divine friend practically ignores as dogmatism pure and simple, and to be execrated by all who would reign in his esteem!

But let us hear from our reverend friend himself. As a poor blind dogmatist we humbly and respectfully inquire, "How are we to obtain 'immortality AND endless life' through Christ? "*Come to him*" saith he; "*be united to him* as the branch to the vine; *live upon him* by faith, and you are a 'new creature;' a 'spiritual nature' is developed; the man is begotten by the Spirit, and now has spiritual senses, which he had not before; he now sees spiritual objects; knows and loves God, which he did not before, however much his intellect might have been convinced there was a God. * * * A spiritual discernment the natural man hath not, and cannot have *till he has a spiritual nature imparted* which can only be done by a union with Christ." Yes, "come to him;" but how? "Be united to him;" true, but how is the union to be effected? "As the branch to the vine;" and how is that? Are we to grow on Christ as branches upon trees; and if so, how is our twig inserted into the stem so as to become a part of the tree? "Live upon him by faith;" yes, but how are we poor dead dogs to become alive, what are we to believe? "A spiritual nature is developed;" but how? "The man is begotten by the Spirit;" by what means? "A spiritual nature is imparted;" how? "By union with Christ!" Thus our divine friend travels in a circle. He begins by telling us we must be united to Christ, and ends by telling us the same thing; but leaves us in total darkness as to how the union is to be effected. His proposition is, that *a spiritual nature can only be imparted by union with Christ*; but with all his divine verbiage, how that union is to be effected he cannot explain!

THE BIBLE EXAMINER ON INFANTISM EXAMINED.

On page 321 of the number before us, the editor has an article on "*Infant Salvation*;"—some persons, he says, have been charging him with the denial of the salvation of infants. But he rebuts the accusation as false, if not malicious. "Must infants," he inquires, "perish because they *cannot* believe? An exclusive water-immersionist says, they cannot be baptised because 'believers only are entitled to that ordinance.' Must they, also, necessarily perish because not believers? Let who will take such a position, the editor of this Magazine does not take it, nor believe it; he regards it as a blasphemous position." He says there is no declaration against infant salvation in the Bible; and thinks there are strong indications that the Redeemer will give to some of them, at least, a part in the kingdom of heaven.

Our divine friend's argument in this is, that *it is blasphemy to affirm the perdition of beings because they cannot believe; and that therefore they will certainly become immortal by resurrection*. Now his position is that men are as the beasts that perish. Granted. If men be beasts, are they born beasts, or do they turn into beasts when infancy is passed? Is a rattlesnake not a rattlesnake because it is only an infant snake? Then infants are beasts as well as men; the only difference being that the former are little beasts, and their parents great ones. Our divine friend's infants, then, are little beasts who cannot believe. Now concerning these he inquires, "Must little beasts perish because they cannot believe?" We would go further, and ask, *Should any beast perish because it cannot believe?* Or, should one beast be saved because it is little; and another be damned because it is great? Ought such a difference to be made between a biped six feet high and one only a foot; or between a mouse and an elephant? We, though nothing but a dogmatist in our divine friend's estimation, do nevertheless think, that "immortality *and* endless life" ought not to be predicated of one beast in preference to another, because of their dissimilarity in size and their disparity in years. Nor can we see why our divine friend should award immortality to some, and not to all little beasts. Surely all

human infants are equal before the Lord! And yet our divine will only immortalize "some of them, at least!" This is certainly a piece of favoritism we were not prepared for from a Methodist free-gracer. Had he been one of old Johnny Calvin's elect, we should not have been surprised; seeing that they pave hell with infants' skulls! But so it is, and we cannot help it.

Well, here is our divine friend publishing consolation to "philoprogenitiveness" at a sacrifice of "the truth as it is in Jesus." He affirms that *inability to believe is no disqualification for immortality*. This principle makes immortality accessible to beasts of all sizes, and of every age and species. He asserts that some infants who cannot believe will be immortalized; which is tantamount to saying, that *immortality is attainable through Jesus Christ without faith, without obedience, without tribulation, and without character!* Now, if this be true of a multitude of infants, born of the lust of the flesh, and of all temptation inexperienced, why should not all adults become immortal too? Our divine's position reduces the wisdom and benevolence, of God to folly and cruelty. This life is a sore struggle with evil and temptation; so sore that there are but few that enter into life eternal. If they had died in infancy they might have been saved; but, having increased in size and years, they are crushed with the cares, appetites, and temptations of life, and then blotted out of existence. Such is our divine's notion—a mere fiction of the flesh; a sophism too absurd for a serious refutation.

But what are these infants for whose precious sakes our astute divine friend nullifies the first principles of the oracles of God, and makes his word of none effect! They are the incarnations of the amativeness of flesh and blood. This definition which is wholly and indisputably true, embraces also and equally the young of all animals. Now, our divine friend denies that the human incarnations of the lust of the flesh have immortal souls; and affirms consequently, that there is no particle of the Divine Essence in them. This is true; but in view of this fact, in view of his having reduced them thereby to equality with, or rather to the low level of the beasts, differing only from the beasts as one beast differs from another in organization: and of his having sent them to *sheol* without knowledge, without faith, without consciousness of having been in this evil world at all, without character good, bad, or indifferent; in view of all this, and seeing that the only manifestation of life their organizations ever developed was exclusively instinctive, such as swallowing, screaming, or sleeping—wholly and solely animal; will our divine and reverend and philosophical friend be pleased to inform his admiring patrons upon what principle in "heaven beyond the skies" or beneath them, he confers "immortality *and* endless life" upon the incarnations of human lust to the exclusion of infant lambs, sinless puppies, and all the "little innocents" of the monkey race? This question reminds us, that his great master, John Wesley, did entertain the notion that "every creature," that is, all quadrupeds and bipeds, would rise to "immortality *and* endless life;" and so be "delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Now, if this be Methodist orthodoxy—that all dead dogs, cats, hogs, *et id genus omne*, are to be immortalized, we see no valid reason why dead infants, those for instance that God commanded Israel to slay, those that were swallowed up with Korah, and those "sweet little cherubs" belonging to Babylon's daughter which afforded so much happiness to the Medes and Persians in their dashing them to pieces upon the stones (Ps. cxxxvii. 9:)—we see no reason why these "little angels," these "sinless innocents" once so dear to their mammas, should not "come again from the land of the enemy!"

The logic of our divine friend, in demonstration of this result, is certainly very profound and clerically conclusive. It is this: "Jesus Christ quickeneth whom he will." Admitted. "The adult who believes in him has everlasting life, and he will raise him up in the

last day." Admitted, if "believes in him" is understood in Christ's sense of the words, otherwise not. If in addition to this, he "will quicken" all infants into life eternal at the last day, who shall say he cannot, or will not? May he not do what he will with his own?" *If IF, IF—quod erat demonstrandum!!!* But "if, in addition to this" he won't, what then? Our divine logician argues that because Jesus will immortalize adults, *believers* in the resurrection, he will therefore immortalize all, or some, infant-*unbelievers* also. This is great! But, saith he, "who shall say he cannot?" Dogmatist as we may be, we would not so speak; yet we would venture to add, "who shall say Christ cannot immortalize John Wesley's quadrupeds?" Is the admitted ability of Christ to do what he pleases, any argument that he will do anything or everything that comes into the crazy brains of the old man of the flesh? But our divine friend is not satisfied with daring all the world to deny what every one admits; he is so bold and courageous in the cause, that he adds, "who shall say that he *will not*? May he not do what he will with his own? Shall it be said by presumptuous man, that He who has all power in heaven and in earth in his hands cannot, if "*he will*" put His spirit in "little children," and raise them up to life eternal? If it be said, there is no promise of it in the Bible; it may be answered, "there is no declaration against it there." But all this proves nothing, because it proves too much. Who shall say *he will not* raise John Wesley's dead beasts? May he not do what he likes with his own? Are not the cattle upon a thousand hills His who made them? Shall it be said by presumptuous man, that he cannot if he will "put his spirit into the little children of Johnny Wesley's pet beasts, and raise them up to life eternal? Was not the team that horsed Elijah's chariot "spirit," and may they not once have laid dead in the knacker's yard, and been cut up and boiled into dog's meat; and afterwards been delivered into the glorious liberty of galloping through the empyrean? Shall it be said by presumptuous man that this was not done; and that the Omnipotent *cannot* and *will not* repeat the marvel? If it be said, there is no promise of it in the Bible; it may be answered, there is no declaration against it there! In this easy and facetious way, we presume to "dogmatize" our reverend friend's divinity into its peculiar and native absurdity. His theosophy is too ridiculous for a grave refutation; therefore all we can do with it is to fry it in his own pan.

But we have not quite done with our divine and marvellously enlightened teacher of babes, and guide of the blind. He asks, with a boldness threateningly fatal to the unlucky dogmatist who cannot say "*no*"—"Has not Christ a right to do what he likes with his own?" Certainly he has. But then this admission does not prove that dead incarnations of human amateness are scripturally comprehended in "*his own*." He does not lay claim to the devil's own, which is the world that does not, will not, and cannot believe, past, present, and to come. Christ's own are defined in the address of Jesus to the Father in John xvii. They are styled "the men which thou gavest me *out of the world*, who have kept thy word." "I pray not," said he, "for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine, and thine are mine. I have given them thy word. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is the truth. For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word. I give to them eternal life." These are Christ's own—*intelligent persons who believe into Jesus, and are kept from the evil in the world, through the apostolic word*. He claims no others as his own, and prays for no others. Christ does not lay claim to our divine friend, because he does not believe into him through the apostle's word, and is not sanctified by the truth. His sanctification is that sort of holiness common to him and the pope, and those little Babylonish innocents, he says Christ *can raise if he will* by putting his spirit into them. Christ's own and the devil's own are classes of humanity whose characteristics are altogether diverse and opposed. The devil takes the flesh with all its ignorance, superstition, and sin; and Christ the spirit with all its intelligence, obedience, and truth. "*The flesh profits nothing*." Infant nor suckling, ox nor ass,

have any claim to immortality because they are flesh, or because they are or have been related to flesh. Immortality is predicated upon doing the commandments of the Deity. A right to the Tree of Life, and to enter into the City, is based on this exclusively; and any theory that gives this right or privilege upon any other basis, or affirms a principle that nullifies it, is nothing but "the thinking of the flesh," which characterizes the devil's own. Christ's own is that glorious company of men and women sanctified by the truth, who will have attained to immortality and the kingdom through the much tribulation of the present evil world. There is not one will shine in that galaxy of intelligences, who has not walked in the obedience of faith according to the word. The thief will be in Paradise, but whether he will be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life there, or be driven out as Adam was, no man can tell, for it is not yet revealed. Resting upon his case is mere presumption; and he that would be satisfied with such an example, is not fit for the kingdom of God.

But alas for our divine friend and his vagaries! We see clearly that the root of the matter is not in him. The world, past, present, and to come, is still a hidden mystery to him. He is so bewitched with his own fiddling, that he is quite insensible to the music of the spheres. He sees not "that the world to come" is based on spirit, not on flesh. This conception is beyond his genius. He would establish it upon flesh without regard to faith and obedience, which he nullifies by immortalizing the faithless and the characterless. He is afraid boldly to assume the truth, and abide by all consequences. He knows that it is written, "Without faith it is impossible to please the Deity;" but he will not accept it. He denies it in affirming that he will confer immortality on faithless babes. In asserting this tradition he says in effect, "Paul, you are a liar and deceiver in so saying; it is possible to please God without faith, for he is pleased with "little children" who cannot believe; and will put his Spirit into them that they may live forever. It is blasphemous, the position you assume." Alas, poor Paul! he fares as badly at the hands of our divine friend as Peter, whom he charges with acting "without divine authority," in commanding Cornelius and his friends to be baptized!

No, dear reader, the world to come is not based upon flesh, but *upon spirit*—upon knowledge, faith, obedience, character; the basis of which is constituted of the ideas of the Deity revealed in the word. These ideas understood and believed become spirit in a man, working in him to will and to do. They become "the law of the spirit of life," as opposed to "the law of sin and death," which is "the law of nature." This law impels us to do what we feel like doing, and is blind to the other law. He that thinks in harmony with God, and obeys the law of nature only so far as God permits, and conforms to his positive institutions, is a righteous man. He is a character; a divinely generated character; a character, the nucleus of which was the first truth scripturally comprehended. The immortal of the future world is based upon, or rooted in, this character. The man may die and be dust four thousand years, it matters not; his character is written in the remembrance of God; and when he is re-fashioned from the dust, his sensorium will be so exactly similar to what it was, that being set into living action by spirit, all things will be brought to remembrance thereby. The resurrected will then be able to give an account of himself; and if approved, will be immortalized; but if not, will be condemned to the second death. Thus immortality is based upon character developed by the truth: and such only are the immortals required for the purpose of God. He intends to conquer the nations and rule them by such in righteousness, for a thousand years, to his own glory. There is no place in this purpose for friend Storr's piccaninnies. There will be babies enough in the world when this glorious work begins, without raising an additional crop out of the earth. There will be vastly more in the world than will be profitable for the Master's use. Hence sword and pestilence will sweep them as the sword of Israel on the judgment of the

Canaanites. Rachel has wept for her children, but Jezebel will wail with the howl of irremediable despair.

Feb. 14, 1861.

EDITOR.

"Hebrew Christianity."

"The way of transgressors is hard."—*Proverbs*

Our attention has been recently called to a periodical entitled "*The Israelite Indeed*." It is a small 8vo of twenty-four pages of long primer, "*edited and published by an association of Hebrew Christians*," all of whom are hidden in the obscurity of "the unknown," except one who announces himself on the title-page as "*G. R. Lederer, Editor*." From these premises, then, we may fairly assume that Mr. Lederer and the "association of Hebrew Christians" are the same. It is true that the association is affirmed of a plurality; but there is no real difficulty in this. Mr. Lederer is constituted of "body, soul, and spirit, the whole person"—the body, for the world that now is, with all its loaves and fishes; the soul, for the dust in disembodied rest from editorial and missionary labors; and the spirit, for bliss among the clouds, upon which with "sister spirits" thick as gnats, it may sing "glory hallelujah!" We do not say that these are Mr. Lederer's own particular notions; but they are those, or not very unlike those, of the "Dear Brethren and Friends," whom he styles "Christians;" and the parsons he calls brothers, in his notices and "Macedonian Cry" for their dollars to prevent the fulfilment of the prediction of "Nathanael's" demise.

The triune Mr. Lederer, then, we may assume, is the "association of Hebrew Christians" which shouts forth "from Tenth street, New York," saying, "Christians! shall the cause of Christ suffer for want of your dollar? Christians! once more we cry, 'Help us!' "—that is, Mr. Lederer and the printer, in whom "the cause of Christ" is made *flesh*.

Having identified the "association," that it consists of a Hebrew body, a Hebrew soul, and a Hebrew spirit, —three Hebrew Christian entities in one Hebrew Christian man, —we proceed to inquire what sort of Christianity it is this association of Hebrew Christians rejoices in. In this inquiry, then, we remark, that as the editor of "The Israelite Indeed" is both type and substance of the Christianity, we cannot so certainly and satisfactorily arrive at a true idea of the thing as by viewing it as it is illustrated in his practice. This is absolutely necessary, because he presumes to identify "the good cause," or the "cause of Christ," as he expresses it, with himself and his printing speculation, a specimen of which is now before us. If his is the cause of Christ, the cause we are engaged in is the cause of the devil and Satan. The causes are totally different, and between them there is no middle or neutral ground. If Mr. Lederer is serving the Jesus whom Paul preached, and not his own lusts, we accept the alternative, that we are not co-working with him in the same cause. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the issue between Mr. Lederer and ourselves should be definitely and definitively known.

But the reader may inquire, why so necessary that our relative position towards Mr. Lederer should be accurately defined, rather than ours towards H. W. Beecher, or any other of the same species? We reply, that there can be no confounding of the cause we advocate with that of the clergy. The clergy are neither Christians nor apostates, though chiefs of the apostasy. The clergy do not know what the gospel is; hence they can neither believe nor obey it; and not having obeyed it, they cannot *fall away* or apostatize from it. They are simply LAODICEANS, whose predecessors in the days of Constantine "the Great," as they term him, the Spirit spued out of his mouth. Rev. iii. 16. Mr. Lederer, though paid and patronized by the

Laodiceans, we regard in a far worse condition than his employers. We refer him to 2 Pet. ii. 21, where it is written of certain whose class is not yet extinct, "it had been better for them not to have known *the way of righteousness*, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it has happened unto them according to the true proverb. The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."

This is our indictment against the peculiar Hebrew Christianity before us, of which the Modern Israelite Indeed is both shadow and substance. Its body, soul, and spirit was Jew-born, and for many years a rejector of the claims of Jesus to be Son of David, Son of the Deity, and King of Israel. For some reason or other, however, he came to admit his claims, to turn his back upon the traditions of the rabbis, and to embrace some form or other of Bohemian or Hungarian Protestantism. So far as admitting the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship was concerned, this was well; but as to turning Protestant, he might just as well have remained a member of the synagogue of the Jews, seeing that the Protestant church is but the "synagogue of the Satan" in the more modern phase of "the Mystery of Iniquity." Rev. ii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 7. Modern Judaism and Protestantism are but two phases of one and the same thing. The "carnal mind," or *Φρονημα της σαρκος*, *the thinking of the flesh*, unenlightened by the teaching of the law and the testimony, is the parent of them both. They are both fleshly absurdities, as far from the law and the gospel as the poles asunder. The Protestant abomination is an evil; nevertheless, out of the evil good has been educed: death and destruction are evils, yet out of these even much good has accrued to the family of man. Protestantism is a more rational form of error than Modern Judaism, Mohammedanism, or Popery. These are odious and pestiferous tyrannies; while under Protestant institutions there is scope for fee-simple proprietorship in one's own soul.

The foundation and origin, then, of the Hebrew Christianity of this Modern Israelite Indeed was *modern Judaism protestantized*. Friend Lederer, like all other Jews, with only here and there an exception, mistook this for Bible Christianity. He imagined that in becoming a Protestant he had become a Christian, and in this "strong delusion" continued until some time after he had become acquainted with us. He was embedded in the mire of Protestantism for several years, and found no one able to put him in "*the way of righteousness*" by which he might be washed from the mire and dirt with which his inner man was blinded and begrimed. When he arrived in England, some Baptists there, as he informed us, tried to persuade him to be washed, or, according to their formula, to be baptized, or immersed. But they could never succeed; nor indeed if they had would it have availed him any thing, seeing that he did not understand "the truth as it is in Jesus," and, consequently, could not believe it. He would have been an immersed Hebrew Protestant, or a Modern Baptist, nothing more. Still, it would have been better for him to have been this, than to occupy the relation to the truth he does now. A man had better be a poor blind Mohammedan, than a traitor to the truth for any present advantage whatsoever.

When our Hebrew Protestant friend arrived in New York city, somehow or other he came to be appointed a city missionary at so much per annum. His mission, we believe, was to distribute tracts among the Jews, to persuade them, we suppose, that Jesus was their Messiah; and that, confessing this, they might become Protestants as they happened to be led by the missionary that proselyted them; and obtain the salvation of their "precious immortal souls in kingdoms beyond the skies." We do not think that he was "set apart" by the imposition of the hands of any "divines," like our friend Storrs when transformed from a layman into a Methodist "divine." If we are correct upon this point, there was no more

divinity in him than he had picked up by the wayside. He was primed with a certain amount of Rabbinism, could read the Hebrew Bible, professed faith in the Jesus of Protestantism, and could talk piously; but had never become an ordained preacher and administrator of ordinances. He was, therefore, only a missionary friar, but of what order of brethren we do not now remember, if we ever knew.

While engaged in the unprofitable craft of mesmerizing Hebrew immortalities into a profession of Protestantism—unprofitable to all but the missionary, and to such Israelites of easy virtue who would as soon live by Gentilism as by any other trade; while thus engaged, our missionary in his wanderings found his way into our meetings at Knickerbocker Hall. There he heard the gospel of the kingdom and name of Jesus Christ for the first time; and there also he began to learn all he knows about Bible-Christianity worth mentioning. Since he has "gone out from us" even, he has said, that "we were the only one in New York that preached the truth." There is much in this admission highly condemnatory of him who makes it. But let this pass for the present. The effect of our teaching upon Mr. Lederer and a companion Israelite, who has proved himself under trial a worthy man, was to bring them to a public confession, and to the obedience of faith in immersion. We cannot tell whether Mr. Lederer received what he then professed to believe was the truth in simplicity of heart or not. We had convinced him of the necessity of being "washed" as a part of the righteousness to be fulfilled; so that, if he confessed the truth with an honest and good heart, which is known only to God and himself, he became what Peter terms "a washed hog," otherwise not; for an effectual washing by immersion depends upon an honest and affectionate belief of the truth.

We were greatly pleased at the accession of these two Israelitish brethren to our community, and sincerely hoped that they would both prove to be "Israelites indeed, in whom there would be no guile." We believe this is true of the one who has never proclaimed himself in word or print to be such; and we wish we could say as much of Mr. Lederer, who has been for nearly four years past proclaiming to the public his *Israelite-indeed-ship* in double great primer condensed. We entertained fond hopes, which, in his case, were doomed only to disappointment. We hoped that, being now, as we trusted, enlightened in "the way of righteousness," he would be useful in bringing his fellow-countrymen to some extent under the instruction that had enlightened him. Nor did we interfere with his missionary operations among them. He had before been a sham missionary; but since he had come to know the truth, he might now have become, as we hoped he would, a missionary indeed. He might convince the Jews of the Messiahship of Jesus, and have shown them that the way to life was neither by Rome, Wittenburg, nor Geneva, but by "Jerusalem, the mother of us all." This, however, required more courage than to be a soldier under Kossuth's administration. Any animal man of the lion and tiger species of humanity would do for this; but to stand up for the Christianity of the Bible, which repudiates the Romish and Protestant superstitions as much as it does modern Judaism, at the risk of being turned adrift by the Laodiceans that paid him for his services, required more faith and moral courage than our unhappy brother could command. We say *unhappy*; for unhappy indeed is he who, when he shall appear before "the Great White Throne," shall have to testify against himself, that he turned his back upon the truth, and went over to the enemy to preserve a stipend; and so sold his birthright, like Esau, for a mess of pottage.

It was in the early part of 1855 that our self-styled "Israelite Indeed," and the Israelite whom we believe to be really such, applied for, and received, immersion. The reader is referred to the March number of that year for a notice of the case, under the caption of "Aaron and Christ." For a few months matters progressed without any particular ground of

disquietude as to Mr. Lederer's loyalty to the truth. From conversation with him we knew that he had no more real respect for the sects of Protestantism than ourselves. This was his private opinion, which, however, did not square with his public demonstrations. We hoped, however, as he came to increase in knowledge, he would increase in faith and courage; and be able to take a bold stand with his countrymen for the truth he had confessed, and, as we hoped, obeyed. We were anxious to see him occupied in some honest way of living; considering that, if he had turned into a pedlar of small wares, he would be more honestly and respectably engaged than as a hireling of the Laodiceans. But his tendencies proved to be downward and grovelling. Obedience to the gospel had given him an exalted position before the Deity, which he failed duly to appreciate. It had placed him among the Sons of God—the Elohim of Israel—the future consociate rulers of the world with Jesus; but of this "high vocation" he was unmindful, not being willing to hazard any thing for the glory to be revealed.

It is probable that when he united with us he was not aware how *ultra* we were—how far *beyond* the vulgar religious notions of the day. Yet, if he did not know, it was his own fault; for he had often heard us urge upon our hearers and readers, that the so-called "orthodoxy" of the day is not Christianity. If his mind be not changed, we think we may safely say, that he *knows* it is not. We do not believe he is ignorant upon this point; and therefore we regard his case as desperate. He addresses the Laodiceans as "dear brethren" and "Christians;" while, on the premises he occupied with us, he believes them to be neither. We call this hypocrisy; but he denominates it "Hebrew Christianity;" and himself, as represented by his periodical, an "Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!"

A few months after he united with us he cooperated with some Laodicean Jews of the Satan's synagogue to get up an exclusively Jewish Association, which would have formed a sort of church distinct from "all the sectarian formula of the present day." Had this succeeded, "the middle wall of partition" would have been reared again. We were sorry to see Mr. Lederer in such company, and for such a purpose. A Christian has no business to be cooperating with, sectarian reverends in the promotion of any religious enterprise whatever. Whatever they touch is defiled, and all their schemes defiling. Mr. Lederer already belonged to a "Hebrew Association," in being united with us. We are "Hebrews of the Hebrews" by adoption, through Jesus the King of the Jews. We are citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel, though Gentiles by the accident of birth. Had he been loyal to this polity and to its King, he would not have sought association "with them who say they are Jews, and are not, but liars of the synagogue of the Satan."—Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9. He knew that we had "set aside all the sectarian formula of the present day;" and as he has confessed even since he apostatized to the enemy, we only held and taught the truth in New York city. He ought, therefore, loyally to have accepted our association already formed to hand, as a substitute for every other that could have been devised; but no, he preferred association with mere Jews outwardly, who Gentilized in all the superstitions of the heathen round about. See *Herald*, vol. v. p. 128.

The following quotation from an address published in the *Herald*, vol. v. p. 206, will show the current of Mr. Lederer's thoughts while a member with us. There are several weak points in said address, but the following is plain and to the point:

"Jesus the Messiah of Israel and Lord will soon appear again on earth in power and great glory to judge and rule over all in justice and in righteousness.

"And this, my beloved brethren, is our hope, that the same Jesus who died on the cross for our sins, and arose from the dead for our justification, and ascended to the right hand of

the Majesty in heaven, will descend again upon the earth to renew the fallen tabernacle, the overturned throne of his father David, to reign in the midst of the again gathered, again favored people, Israel, in Jerusalem, the capital of that land of which we Jews are the legitimate heirs, * according to God's own promises.

* On the supposition that they be of faith. —*Editor Herald.*

"That hope of Israel has been preached by our blessed Messiah himself, as well as by all his apostles; and for the sake of that hope Paul was summoned before the tribunal of Caesar. It is true that that most important part of the gospel of Jesus Christ—the glad tidings of the restoration of Israel as a nation in Palestine under the personal government of their king, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of David, has been long ago forgotten entirely. Our Gentile friends, in spiritualizing the Word of God, have deprived Israel of their hopes, and interpreted all those precious promises given exclusively to Israel, for a spiritual Israel. They have fitted all to "the Church," though it accords with the testimony no better than "the fist upon the eye." Yet, notwithstanding the already mentioned circumstances, and also, that until this very time there is a great multitude of pious ministers and doctors who are continually spiritualising away the inheritance of Jacob, and evaporating the hope of Israel, we, we Jews, who, by the grace of God, have become the co-heirs with the Lord Jesus—we Jews know that all the promises of God are yea and amen. The God of Israel is faithful, and will carry out his purposes in the due time.

"My dear brethren, glorious things are in store for us who are of Israel; but if we would have a share in Israel's kingdom—if we would be partakers with Christ our King—we must then walk in the light of the gospel; we must believe what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, taught; and we must also do according to the commandments of Jesus! We must be obedient to our glorious King, and we must show to the world the fruits of our faith—kindness, benevolence, and meekness towards every man, and truth, sincerity, and faithfulness in all our doings. Yet the sweetest and most costly fruit of faith is love—loving kindness toward all, especially to the brethren.

"But, my dear friends, you must not misunderstand me, as if I would imply that we have any prerogatives over and above our adopted brethren of the Gentiles. No, by no means. All they who become true Israelites by adoption are the children of Abraham, like ourselves; because before God 'there is no respect of persons'—there is no difference between Jew or Greek, slave or free; all are equally guilty, and *can only be saved on the same terms*, by Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah. Yet this I would say, that there are testimonies in the Word of God, speaking of promises in particular to Israel, the literal Israel, consisting of flesh and blood, *not of gas*, that must be also fulfilled in the literal, and not in all spiritual Israel."

Now, in this extract Mr. Lederer affirms—

1. That Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah;
2. That he will return to the earth in power and great glory;
3. That he will come to re-establish the tabernacle and throne of David his father;
4. That he will reign in Jerusalem in the midst of Israel over them and all other nations;
5. That Jews, who are such by the grace of God, are his co-heirs, and will reign with him in righteousness;

6. That this same Jesus died for their sins, was raised from among the dead for their justification, and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in heaven, where he is now for an appointed time;
7. That the teaching contained in these six items was set forth by Jesus and all the Apostles;
8. That if any Jew or Gentile would be saved, or share with the Christ in Israel's Kingdom, they must believe what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, taught; do according to the commandments of Jesus, and walk in the light of the gospel—Jew and Gentile can be saved only upon the same terms.
9. That Gentile spiritualizers (the clergy) have entirely ignored the most important part of the gospel of Jesus Christ, or the restoration of Israel as a nation in Palestine under the personal government of their king; and,
10. That the clergy spiritualize away, and evaporate the hope of Israel, and the inheritance of Jacob.

All this is true and indisputable; but unfortunately much of it is made ineffectual by Mr. Lederer's practice. How can we regard him as honest and sincere, in view of items 8, 9, and 10? Does he "walk in the light of the gospel" in cutting himself off from his brethren, in turning his back upon them; in embracing the spiritualizers of the Laodiceans, who have destroyed the gospel in ignoring its most important part, as his "dear brethren" and Christians? Does he walk in the light of the gospel in recognizing them as Christians, who, he knows well, neither believe, nor know, nor care what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, taught; and which he says they must believe if they would be saved? Does he walk in the light of the gospel in fellowshipping pious Laodiceans, whose doctrine is that of the Nikolaitans which the Spirit says he hates; and who do not according to the commands of Jesus? Does he walk honestly and in gospel light in recognizing all sorts of sprinkled spirituals of wickedness in high places as baptized believers in Christ, seeing that he condemned his former self in coming to our community to be immersed, that he might "fulfil all righteousness" after the type of Aaron and the example of Jesus Christ? Is he not rather a traitor to the truth? Is he not reenacting the part of Judas, who sold the incarnated truth to his enemies for thirty pieces of silver? The anointing spirit said, "I am the truth." What essential difference is there between Judas betraying "the truth," and Mr. L.'s betraying it for what he can get? Is not that man a traitor, who says we are the only one in New York city that teaches the truth; and nevertheless, goes and joins a Laodicean immersed community, as we are informed Mr. L. has done, where the truth is not and would not be suffered in its "sacred desk;" and, in what he untruly calls a "Macedonian cry," exclaims to Protestant sectarians of all sorts, "Dear *brethren* and friends, we are in great need of your helping hand, and we pray you, for the Lord's sake, help us!" *Christians!* shall the cause of Christ suffer for the want of your dollar? Shall the only Hebrew Christian Magazine in this country cease to exist for want of your patronage?" Precious "brethren," precious "Christians," precious "cause of Christ" are these, in the estimation of one who has no more real respect for the things so designated than we.

But why does our self-styled "Israelite indeed" profess one thing and practise another? This is a question, we believe, not difficult to answer. While he is indebted to us for the knowledge of the truth as far as he understands its system correctly, he tries to make us the responsible cause of his treachery. This is the usual policy of traitors. When they wish to do evil under a cloak, they unite with fleshly, pious adversaries in their hue and cry against the advocates of the truth most obnoxious in their advocacy to the hypocrisy and pietism of the flesh; or they pretend great zeal for some virtue they have the least possible affection for, or

delight in. In this course, they get credit for what they are not entitled to, and hide their real purpose. Jesus was the alleged cause of the apostasy of those disciples "who walked no more with him." They attributed it to the hardness of his sayings. He was not charitable enough for them. He called pious men "hypocrites" and "serpents," and consigned them in his teaching to "the damnation of hell;" and allowed that only a very few could be saved. Paul was abandoned for the same cause. They treated him as an enemy because he told them the truth. Paul and Jesus were no compromisers; but knowing what the truth was, and is, and ever will be, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, they taught it though the teaching brought with it the direst consequences to all their friends and brethren. Some who passed for these had no objection to the salvation preached, but they did not like the persecution and temporal hazards they had to incur on its account. They had no objection to the theory in all its exclusiveness and severity, and were willing privately to confess that it was all true; and that the scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers were all a set of hypocrites, who made long prayers for a pretence, and devoured widows' houses for the satiation of their own greediness; but then they disapproved of saying this publicly, seeing that these persons had the respect of the people; and that, as some of them lived by their patronage at so many shekels a year, it might cause them to lose their stipends if it became known that they belonged to an association holding such ultra and unsocial views as these. They therefore counselled prudence, which they called "love" and "charity:" they celebrated these in their own peculiar sense, as the sum of all virtues; not that they loved their neighbors more than the apostles did; but they loved their own dear selves better than the truth. They could philosophically behold their friends in the bondage of tradition, in subjection to designing knaves, who were the blind leading the blind into perdition, and privately admitted the certainty of their condemnation if not awakened from their dream of security, and not utter a word to convince them of what they really believed to be their true condition, on the plea that it would "do harm." This they called *charity*; and he that did not operate upon this mean and dastardly principle, they denounced as "*uncharitable*" and not to be endured. Not that they considered it would "do harm" to the victims of delusion; because, if such a one came to obey the truth through said uncharitable instrumentality, they would pretend to rejoice greatly and perhaps truly, if he was only, convinced and immersed in a quiet and private way, and would keep his convictions to himself. This would do no harm; but to prove that Satan in passing for an Angel of Light was nothing else than Satan, such a demonstration would "do harm," seeing that all the loaves and fishes of the Laodicean Apostasy are in his gift. If a missionary to the Jews were paid by him several hundred shekels of silver per annum to proselyte them to the Laodicean Jesus, and Satan were to hear that said missionary was converting them to the Jesus Paul preached, and belonged to a society whose members were none of them ignorant of his devices; and did not hesitate to enlighten all they could, and to emancipate them from his snares, he might discharge such a missionary, and tell him to go preach for the love of the truth he believed, but without the shekels. Now this would "do harm," not to the truth, but to the cash account of the party concerned; and if the missionary loved his own ease and position conferred officially by Satan better than the truth, or was afraid to hold on to this and trust in God and his honest efforts in a secular way of life, it would put him in a great fright. Such a Christian would be panic-stricken; and if he belonged to our ecclesia in New York, he would cease to meet with us, exclaim against Dr. Thomas for his uncharitableness, take refuge in a Baptist conventicle, and proclaim himself to the world as an "Israelite indeed," the only true exponent of Hebrew Christianity!

But to return to our Macedonian crier. The reader can turn at his leisure to our article on "*Christianity the True Judaism*," in Vol. vii. No. 9. He will there see an account of a meeting got up by Messrs. Lederer and Epstein, styling themselves "Christian Jews," for discussion with non-Christian Jews, on Christianity. If Mr. Lederer had been loyal to the

truth, he would not have consented to be associated with Mr. Epstein as a Christian Jew, being nothing else but a Congregationalist Protestant. But let this pass. At the first meeting they found an unmanageable opponent in Dr. de Lara, who was too strong for Protestant Congregational Christianity. Mr. Lederer perceiving this, brought us into the arena, where, of course, we stood to defend Bible-Christianity against infidelity and modern Judaism; and to vindicate it from all responsibility for Romish and Protestant Laodiceanism, which all sorts of Jews of the synagogue of Satan term Christianity. This was doing more than was wished or expected. But that mattered not. We did not go there to be the echo of the timid policy of time-servers; but to defend the truth without regard to consequences. In doing this, we showed that the popular religion was only an apostasy from the truth, and not the truth itself; and that Jews and Gentiles had yet to learn what Christianity was, before the former could assail or the latter defend it. This line of argument made our "Christian Jews" tremble for the craft. There were clergy there whose "orders" we identified with Paul's "seducing spirits," much to the alarm and indignation of our "Israelite Indeed," who privately protested against their being called "apostates." But, as before explained, we did not so style them, although the chiefs of the apostasy. He was afraid it would be known by them that he belonged to our society, and held responsible for our doctrine; and as a consequence be reported to his employers, and by them cashiered. Under this apprehension they amended their rules, by which we were of necessity silenced as narrated. From that day to this we have only seen Mr. L. once, passing in the street. He has gone over to the enemy, whom he serves for what he can get.

Such, then, is the "Hebrew Christianity" illustrated and defended by the "Israelite Indeed." Had its editor remained obscure in private life our policy would have been to sorrow for the dead, the "twice dead," and to be careful not to unbury him. This is the fate to which we leave private irreclaimables as far as we are personally concerned. To confer notoriety upon such is to give them power for evil, which we are careful not to do. We fight such by letting them alone—by leaving them to their own native insignificance and imbecility. But this course is inapplicable to Mr. L. He has become a public man; and has set himself up as a champion of Hebrew Christianity; and in so doing invited all the world to investigate his claims. We thought he had long since become editorially defunct; but, on our attention being called to his periodical, we found him still alive, though evidently convulsed, and crying for help out of "the depths of the Satan as they teach." Considering the relation he formerly sustained to our society, we thought it our duty to bestow upon him this notice; and in so doing to rend away the veil that prevents his Christianity from appearing in its native deformity, that some of the simple may be preserved from its imposition. A Christianity such as he now advocates can benefit neither Jew nor Gentile. He knows that a sprinkled Jew or Gentile is not a Christian. Under this conviction he came himself to be immersed; yet he calls all that come to his mill "Dear brethren" and "Christians!" He once knew "the way of righteousness," but he has ceased to walk in it. He was washed, but like the creature of Peter's proverb, he prefers to wallow in the mire, or to lick the vomit ejected from the Spirit's mouth for mere temporal advantage and behoof.

EDITOR.

Feb 23, 1861.

"The Faith" at Messiah's Apocalypse.

THE time of the coming of the Son of man is to be a time of exceeding small faith, insomuch that he makes it a question whether he shall find "the faith" upon the earth. That there will be an elect people, we know. There will be a people looking for, and by their prayers hastening the coming of the Son of man: but they will be a poor, despised remnant

who, like Lot and Noah, shall testify to the saving of their own lives, and to the condemnation of the apostate and anti-Christian aggregation of "Names of blasphemy" which fills the world. Those things which the gospel speaks, it speaks to those who are under its dispensation. It is "the church," not the heathen world, which is described in such terms as are proper to express the state of Sodom, and the world before the flood. How different is this account of the state of "the church" from that which they are daily looking for. They are looking for a great increase of the faith, a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit, a great conversion of the world!!! They pretend they see the signs of it all around them, and to be daily waiting for a wonderful day of grace, a millennium of holiness, without one act of judgment to prepare the way of it; as if there were no tares to be burned up; no bad fish to be separated, and cast into the furnace. The nature of the kingdom, and the very existence of it as a purpose of God, is gathered from those scriptures which speak of the condition of the world after the Son of man is come, and this coming is described to be with judgment upon a secure and faithless church. But this generation says "No!" And why? Because they are lulled asleep into a fatal security, and are given up, as Paul predicted, to "believe a lie." But, say they again, the coming of the Lord cannot be near at hand, because there is still much faith upon the earth; there never was a time, they say, when there was such a spread of religion in all ranks and classes of the community: and it is the favorite theory of some of them, that religion has been gradually increasing in the world unto this day, and has never been for a moment retrograde. These things would appear incredible if we had not had them stated by the leaders of the "religious world" themselves. Now to all this we answer, What proof would you desire that a wife's affection had fallen away from her husband, and that her faithfulness had also perished, than that she never desired his presence, nor hoped for his coming again to her anymore? Can there be good faith in Christ, the Saviour and Husband of the true church, when a church pretending to be that church desires not his coming, and, when it is spoken of to her, disbelieves, derides, or howls with violent indignation? Can there be any faith, or any love from a wife to her husband long separated, whom she wishes not to see again? Whence arises this instinctive revulsion against any discourse of the Lord's coming? Whence this aversion to the whole subject? Whence this unwillingness to examine the documents? Whence this hatred and derision of those who do? It is not as if they had studied the subject, and been rooted and grounded in another opinion concerning it: they are indifferent to it altogether. This is a sure proof how little faith there is in Christ. Moreover, ask them what they do believe? They will tell you, that they believe he died for sinners. But ask further, Did he die for your sins? They reply, they *hope* so. But do you *believe* so? It is not about your *hopes*, but about your *faith*, we inquire. Either no answer at all, or a doubting one. Are they at peace with their God, or do they stand in doubt? They stand in doubt. What then, have they believed? Nothing that can be seen, even in that personal reference to which they exclusively devote themselves. Have they peace of conscience, or joy in the Holy Spirit? Do they believe with Abraham that they are heirs of the world as the consequence of obeying the truth as it is in Jesus? Are they striving, like Paul, that if by any means they may attain to the resurrection of the dead? They have not even heard of a resurrection from among the dwellers in the dust, unto which it is any difficulty or any prerogative to attain. What then, we ask, is the faith of this throng they call "the church?" We ask this: for we can find nothing but a mixture of *opinion* and *doubt*. Men are surely *convinced* of nothing. But opinion is not faith, nor is doubt faith; nor is the belief of Christ's birth, life, and death, faith: which Paul defines to be "The substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen." So that it is manifest that this day is a day of very little faith, when nothing is believed concerning the future. Now, when nothing is believed concerning our own personal benefit in Christ, but is left in doubt; when nothing is believed concerning the ordinances; every doctrine is held only according as it can be demonstrated to the intellect, and discipline observed only as its usefulness can be seen, or the sanction of

public opinion obtained for it; where the hope of the Lord's coming is put off to an indefinite distance; the mention of his kingdom reverently wrapped up in the deepest obscurity, — verily, verily, if the Son of man were to come this day, would he find faith upon the earth?

Beware of Whited Sepulchres.

“WOE unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye key up the kingdom of the heavens against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye those that are entering to go in.” These men resisted the preaching of Jesus, whom the common people heard gladly, as he went about teaching in the synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom. But the scribes and Pharisees, who were the ecclesiastical rulers, withstood him at all hands, waylaid him, perverted the people with their vain traditions, and in every other way did their utmost endeavors to prevent the people from receiving the Gospel of the Kingdom. So that it was like storming a city for any one to obtain an entrance; the opposition and the strife were so great, that it is written, “From the days of John until now the kingdom of the heavens is sought with great zeal, and the ardent take it by force”—Matt. xi. 12. To this obstinate resistance, and effectual also, which the men of name, and influence, and reputed piety, offered to the preachers, and to the preaching of the kingdom, our Lord refers in the words quoted.

Now, how perfectly parallel is this with the conduct of the scribes and Pharisees of our own times. The ecclesiastics, however divided among themselves they may be, are well agreed in this, to oppose with all their might us who preach the gospel of the kingdom; and for themselves they utterly throw the subject away from them as an abominable thing; and the people who hear it gladly, they resist and repudiate, and with all their might, hinder from believing. In the absence, of right knowledge on the subject, and of sound argument, they much misrepresent, falsify, and by all modes of injustice seek to depreciate us with the people. Let the people take heed lest they prevail. To a great extent they are prevailing, and as those Pharisees brought Jerusalem low by hindering her from knowing the day of her visitation, so the clergy will prostrate the people by preventing them from knowing the day of their visitation. We apprehend they will be effectually deceived by such hypocrisy; for hypocrisy it is for any man to take upon himself to judge and condemn that whereof he is ignorant. Now observe how these same men are shown to be hypocrites, in that very thing upon which they pride themselves. They pride themselves upon what they call their spiritual mindedness; and they accuse us of preaching an outward and temporal kingdom merely. Now God, to prove how false they are in their pretensions to spiritual-mindedness, has raised up men who preach fully and freely unto every sinner, justification by faith, and the consolations of the divine testimony, and straightway they have flamed against these men as violently as against us: so that the assurance of faith, the peace and joy in believing, are as much the objects of their impertinent and ignorant attacks as are the coming and Kingdom of the Lord. Beware of such calumniators of the truth. This is the day of your visitation; take heed unto it lest it be hid from your eyes.

This opposition to the Kingdom of God, and to the preaching of it, prevails so much in men, otherwise pious and honorable, because they love the honor which comes from men, and not the honor which comes from God only. They love the uppermost places in the feast: and the most honorable seats in the synagogues. They are wedded to some “names,” or “denominations,” and cannot bear to hear of the abolition of these things. They would have the house patched up, but this cannot be; for it is a ruin, and ready to fall. They would rather not endure the scoffings and violent oppositions directed against this subject. But we would

have men to stand up stoutly to it, like men storming a walled city, and take it by force, through the opposition of fathers and mothers, and brothers and sisters, at the risk or loss of life also.

A Wild and Frantic Speculation.

IN the days of Jesus, the spiritual guides and rulers of the people hungered and thirsted greatly after precious gifts, and they did not scruple to set aside the most binding of natural obligations, and the most solemn of divine commandments, in order to gain their end, as our Lord expressly charges upon them in Mark vii. 9.

Now that which gave this extraordinary stimulus to the desire of gifts, to the hunger and thirst of golden ornaments to the temple, was that for a long season of years they had been adorning the temple, and enriching it, until it had become the wonder of the world. The sums of money expended in the time of Herod, who was king of the Jews when Jesus was born, are not to be reckoned up, and they were levied of the people by a system of deception and delusion; by giving to these acts of pecuniary bounty a value and an importance, which neither the obligations of nature, nor the commandments of God, nor the ordinances of religion, could stand against. This false morality and false religion, the Scribes and Pharisees had brought to such perfection, that the people seem to have given with great liberality, as we are taught by an incident in the life of the Lord Jesus, recorded in Mark xii. 41: also that the moral guilt attached to these gifts, was a chief cause of the downfall of the temple and Jerusalem, is manifest from Luke xxi. 5. It seems to be a constant progressive corruption to communicate itself in the love of gathering and hoarding money, and making everything sacred in religion, venerable in government, and dutiful in the relations of life, to bow unto this the lowest and basest passion of the human mind.

If we cast up in our memory the instances of God's judgments upon kingdoms, as for example, the judgment of Croesus by Cyrus, of Darius by Alexander, of India by the Sultans, we shall ever find that the judgment is brought upon them in the midst of great wealth; and if we make the same account of the destructions of temples, as of Apollo at Delphi, of Diana at Ephesus, we shall find that immense treasures were amassed in them at the time. And so it was with the temple of God at Jerusalem, in the which our Lord warned them. The same has been often observed of the Papacy, that the building of St Peter's, —“the temple of the god of guardians,” at Rome, together with the luxury of the "Lord God, Leo X.," as they styled him, was the proximate cause of the Lutheran rebellion, by driving on at such a rate all manner of exactions and imposts under religious pretences, as brought the papal system into shame and contempt, and made the kingdoms weary to bear it. They forgot, if indeed they ever knew, the sacredness and spirituality of every Christian ordinance, and sold it openly for money to the highest bidder.

Now the same thing is maturing in Protestantism everywhere. An object, the wildest, the maddest, the most frantic, and most opposite to God's word, which ever deluded the minds of men; to wit, the conversion of the whole world, has been started within these sixty years, and to the attainment of this end, it is openly avowed that money is the great desideratum. It has been proclaimed and published for the information of all, that the Lord had expressly forbidden money as a requisite to, or condition of, the apostolical missionary to the heathen. But it was rejected with scorn, bitter sarcasms, and cruel insinuations; and since that time the pursuit of money, as the chief; or rather the only means (for it is nearer the truth to say only, than chief,) of attaining this mighty impracticable object, has been going on with hotter haste

and diligence until this day. Every means is taken that human sagacity can desire to increase the contributions of the people; so that in many places, the laws both of God and man have been made void, under the sense of duty to the "benevolent institutions of the day."

If in these same societies, where a subscription of twenty-five dollars is announced with thunders of rapturous applause, you were to announce the benevolent purpose of God to establish a glorious kingdom upon the ruins of all names and denominations, which he will give to those poor who are rich in faith, at a time when he will send the rich empty away; you would receive the sneers, and haply, the hisses, of the assembled philanthropy and piety of the house. If this be not forgetting the temple for the gold of the temple; if this be not undervaluing the altar for the gilt that is upon the altar, we know not what can be. There is in the working of the great religious system extant, a vanity, an ostentation, an avarice, an idolatry of gold and silver, which is as great now as ever was the abomination of the Pharisaical system in Judea, or the mendicant system in old Rome. But the time is at hand when there will not be one stone of the system left upon another. It is a grand folly for these ecclesiastics and their disciples to think they can convert the world, whose iniquity God is shewing only by their rejection of his gospel, for which in due time, he will come to judge them. And this great stalking error, which is propagated by ten thousand methods, has introduced all sorts of misconceptions, accommodations, means, and actions, which, without it would not be tolerated. But the object is so grand and brilliant, that men are dazzled, as were the Jews, when they looked at the goodly stones and dazzling splendor of the temple. Its very brightness blinds them!

Ecclesiastical Affairs.

A Few Last Words.

ON this sixth day of March, 1861, we opened and read for the first time, a document entitled "Reply to Miss Hayes' Vindication." Though in possession of it before this date, we could not abstract our attention from certain literary necessities connected with *Eureka* and the *Herald*, to attend to it. We have always, as Miss Hayes and others well know, been reluctant to have any active concern in the matter; first, because when people fall out by the way, we would rather they would settle their own difficulties; and secondly, we had reason to apprehend that our motives would be misconstrued. We did not wish to be judge, jury, or witness, in the case, and therefore, if our friend at Adaline offered to take us to Geneva free of expense to look into the affair, we refused.

And so it has turned out. Our motives have been misconstrued. The editor of the *Banner* charges us with denouncing him and his brethren on, *ex parte* testimony. This is a mistake. He alludes to testimony *ex parte* Wilson by Mr. Whitehead, which he says we did not receive. There was much other testimony from the same party sent to Newark, and some to us. Why did we not believe this? Because none of it altered the fact, that the money was in jeopardy, and in our judgement, only nominally secured. Miss Hayes affirms one thing, her opponents another, who was to be believed by us afar off? We looked to what seemed to be the palpable facts in the case, independently of the sayings of one side or the other. Still, though urged to speak, we remained long silent in hope.

On our return from Illinois we went to Virginia. We think it was there we first saw Miss Hayes' excommunication in the *Banner*. Brethren there reprobated it exceedingly, and urged us to notice it; and even offered to write their condemnation of it, and of other things

they disapproved, and to send it to the *Herald* for publication, subject to any alteration we might think proper. The *Banner* by giving currency to crotchets about Joseph being the father of Jesus, tobacco, abolition, pork, and so forth, had disaffected their minds toward it. They saw growing up around it the machinery of a sect, which they did not approve. Whether they were wrong or right in this is not now the question. We allude to them, to show that the *Banner's* unpopularity with the brethren is referable not to us, but *to its own course*. * As far as we know the mind of the brethren, they do not want the Gospel of the Kingdom sectarianized, or identified in any way with collaterals. Still they do not dictate. If others differ from them they can use their own liberty. The world is wide with ample room for the development of both views.

* We saw a copy of the *Banner* in Norfolk, Virginia, with its abolitionism scored through; and the brother signified his determination to have no more to do with it. They wanted no such questions mixed up with the Gospel of the Kingdom.

On our return we found letters from the region of trouble that seemed ready to fall upon us, if we did not speak for Miss Hayes, who had taken refuge in the Home of the Friendless. Under all this pressure we opened our columns. Her case seemed to be desperate. Her money was gone, and she was living on charity. This appeared to be the broad fact in the case, which no talk could set aside. Now what appeared to be justice in the premises? We think, that those who had undoubting confidence in the borrower, should have come forward spontaneously, and have made her safe. Was this justice? This is what they have done (leaving out the spontaneity,) and it is regarded as a just and conscientious settlement; therefore we may say, it would have been justice. But, *was this justice done before the Herald uttered its voice?* The answer is simply and emphatically, "No!"

Now we should not trouble our readers with the matter any further, but for the document before us, which we are asked to circulate—*with all its perversions respecting ourselves*: not that we care very particularly about them, only that it would entail upon us the necessity of refuting them, which would only put others in the wrong without affording any gratification to us or our readers.

The document consists of two pages and a half, of the report of a committee appointed to enquire into the charges made by the party aggrieved. Then follow nine pages called "B. Wilson's Reply" and endorsed by Mr. Innes. After this are nearly four pages of replies from Messrs. Joseph, Thomas, and G. D. Wilson, and H. B. Pierce; then a reply of "The Church" signed by the same, with the substitution of J. & B. Wilsons for G. D. Wilson; and lastly, the reply of "The Committee of Three," or the same who signed the excommunication; with a postscript. In all twenty pages.

The whole of this, we conceive, is reducible to very few items.

1. That there was *no conspiracy* between Messrs. B. Wilson and P. Innes, to swindle Miss Hayes;
2. That there is no evidence of any *intention* on the part of either of them to swindle her;
3. That *it appeared* to the sub-committee that the mortgage on the Hall at the time of the transfer was adequate security;
4. That B. Wilson had money in his possession at the time of the loan, that he was about to return to Mr. Innes, but which he does not consider a debt;

5. That *since the voice uttered from the Herald*, five brethren have become responsible to Miss Hayes for the \$1,500 among whom is B. Wilson; to be paid in two years with legal interest;
6. That Thomas Wilson denies being secretary to the Wide Awakes;
7. That G. D. Wilson admits the statement about the New Jerusalem;
8. That H. B. Peirce also admits and tries to justify his Lincoln Wide-Awakeship; and retaliates upon one of the signers of the "protest" that he was "*fifer*" to the club;
9. That the "protesters" are a company of black sheep; and
10. That the excommunication was right.

These are the salient points of the case, stripped of all superfluous talk of which there has manifestly been very much on both sides, but little creditable to either. In proof of this, the "shameful scene," and "scene of uproar" at which all parties are testified to have figured, is sufficient attestation, p. 3, col. 1. We see no proof that either party is immaculate; and we will charitably presume that the *intentions* of all have been better than their manifestations. The five brethren have done well in proving their confidence in bro. Innes, by making themselves responsible to Miss Hayes; but they, or some other confidential friends, would have done much better if they had acted spontaneously. If they had done what they have now done before our columns were opened, there would have been no occasion for us to speak, and the "extra" would have been unnecessary. We trust this will be the last of it; and that the by-gones may be by-gones, and remembrance had only of the excellent and true. EDITOR.
March 6, 1861.

* * *

If the reader wish to see the evidence in support of the foregoing items, he can make application to B. Wilson, Geneva, Illinois; who will, no doubt, furnish him an extra *gratis*, and without delay.

Since writing the previous "*Last Words*," we have received a communication respecting foreign, or "conference" intervention in their church affairs, from Mr. O. Baird, of St. Charles. The letter consists of about six pages and a half. He says, "The present trouble here with that Geneva church, has been one heart-sickening thing; and I wish that I were out from under its influence. The spirit that they have set forth in their vindication against you and others, is beneath the notice of every true hearted Christian. I have written you somewhat about it, which I intended to send to you before now. I thought to take no notice of them, but to let them go their own way, for they will have it.

"I protest again, against the action of this committee. And the reader can see where the onesideness is in them. *Who chose them to act as arbitrators with one party to the exclusion, and without the knowledge of the other?* Taking upon them the responsibility to make assertions without our knowledge which they had no right to make. For where a party of men sit to investigate certain difficulties in harmony with one, and without the knowledge, or consent of the other, any one that will do it, is taking upon them what is not right or just; in one sense you might term it fraud. Now if said committee had been members of this church, *and knew all the proceedings of the church*, then I should not have objected to the sitting, provided that both parties could have had access to the selection of them. Why did they not summon us there to learn the truth of this matter? This convention was not called to settle the difficulties of churches. It convened for the purpose of coming together in brotherly love, for the happy enjoyment of one another. They, therefore had no right to make any selection of persons to investigate the affairs of this church, without all of the members being present. Let

existing evils be corrected in view of the condition of the church for the last years—discords and contentions about questions which have nothing to do with the faith and hope of Israel."

Under all circumstances, we have thought it right to let Mr. Baird say so much. As far as we know, he stands as well with his fellow-citizens as any other in the land of trouble. We are aware that very hard speeches are in circulation against us. But knowing they are undeserved, we leave it to time to cure all that sort of thing. We have already lived down harder sayings, and at a time when we were less able to bear them. In a letter recently received, Miss Hayes says, "on reading their reply against me, *I* saw the falsehoods so palpably that I thought they must appear equally so to others; but perhaps they may not; and therefore, I feel that the cause of truth calls for a reply to it; and also that in justice to yourself and Mr. McDonald, I ought to try to correct their wicked and false statements. True it is a great undertaking, they are so many; but will do it, if you think as I do upon the subject." But we say no, let the matter drop. The end is gained—salvation from temporal ruin. We will accept our fee with all possible meekness and endurance—abusive misconstruction of our intent.

March 7, 1861.

EDITOR.

Analecta Epistolaria.

A True Testimony.

DR. THOMAS, —*Dear Brother:* —I can scarce give a reason for never addressing you before, but the reason, if I have any, is due in part to a natural reluctance which I have felt to intrude myself upon your time and attention. I have made myself acquainted with you in a very quiet way, which has given you no extra trouble, though the advantage has been all on my side, as would have been the case, doubtless, had the acquaintance been made in any other way. I have read attentively several volumes of the *Herald of the Kingdom*, etc., and others of your works, and among them the fourth volume of the *Apostolic Advocate*, so that I may say I have been acquainted with you since 1837. In the last named work, as well as in the others, I have found much to admire, and much in which I now rejoice. Your sincerity, decision, and loyalty to the truth, in those early days of inquiry and investigation, are, no doubt, the qualifications which, through divine providence and protection, secured you from the seductions of error. Why, my dear brother, were you allowed to pursue, in spite of the universal prevalence and power of ignorance and deviation, the way that led to the development of the faith of apostles and prophets—a faith so simple and easy, and yet so hard to find? so plainly revealed, yet so hard to see? which lies on the surface, and yet must be dug for and searched after? The time had arrived, in God's plan, in which some instrumentality must arise to unfold his truth, for so many centuries almost lost to the world. He never lacks means or agents to accomplish his work, and therefore, as God did not design that the light of truth should always be concealed, as "under a bushel," the entanglements of Campbellism were not competent to hold you. Sectarianism could not bind you, though it has bound thousands of intellectual Sampsons. Why did not God make use of A. Campbell to open his sealed book? He who was, to all appearance, in the road to the true gospel of the kingdom once. Once it is evident he was an earnest seeker after truth. Did he refuse to take it after he came within reach of it? So it seems.

But your condition portended, to appearance, nothing but defeat and disaster. Your friends who knew and prized the truth, few, weak, in some instances, and vacillating; your

opponents many and powerful, with that singular and temporising genius, A. Campbell, at their head. But that weapon in your hand, of truer temper than any old *Damascus* blade, which you wielded so persistently and stoutly, proved too much for them all—more than they could stand. It proved to be "the sword of the spirit," and it "put to flight the armies of the aliens." The truth, as revealed by divine inspiration, apprehended and held by a simple and reliant faith, and faithfully used, is a most formidable and invincible weapon indeed. And this weapon, faithfully used by you, rendered you, though in humble attitude, more than a match for the magisterial bearing and subtle sophistry of the power-loving A. Campbell. And for this work, which God has wrought by you, though you have not been able to operate, "through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the spirit of God," (Rom. xv. 19,) many are moved to thanksgivings to God, and to esteem you highly for your work's sake. The Apostles received the ministry of the New Covenant, and were able expounders thereof, (2 Cor. iii. 6,) but confess that their ability or sufficiency was of God, (ver. 5,) who revealed direct to them the principles and provisions of the covenant, whose spirit ministry they had received, (ver. 8; iv. 1,) and uttered to the men of their time those things in which the holy Spirit taught, and which conveyed the ideas of the Spirit's ministration (1 Cor. ii. 13.) Hence Paul could say, "We know." (2 Cor. iv. 14, v. 1.) They could say, "We are always confident, *knowing*, etc." (ver. 6, 8.) Dear brother, you have but followed Apostles in what they *knew*, and as you have followed them, you *know* what you could not have known, had not they preceded you, and written what they *knew*, and had not the ministration of the Spirit been committed to them, they could not have "believed and therefore spoken," for the "mystery," the "hidden mystery which God ordained before the world unto" the saints' "glory" (1 Cor. ii. 7) is "the *unsearchable* riches of Christ." (Eph. iii. 8.) Excuse me for mentioning these things, known so long and so well to you. The ministry of the Spirit given to the Apostles, by which they were made "able ministers of the new Covenant," included their inspiration, and that inspiration which in them uttered the truths of the new Covenant, as we find them written, affords the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God." It has been your inspiration. It is ours. It is the inspiration of "as many as are led by the Spirit of God." But other spirits have had dominion over us. Yes, and "other lords," as the prophet confesses for Israel. (Isaiah xxvi. 13.) And another gospel blinded us, so that we believed not. Paul's gospel was "hid" to us. (2 Cor. iv. 3.) We were both hoodwinked and kidnapped. We had eyes but we saw not, ears but heard not. But thank God, we had some reason and judgment left, some discretion and prudence, enough, at least, when certain things were presented, claiming support from holy writ, to set our wits and judgment at work to compare, to judge, to discriminate, to search, and a little decision and firmness, sufficient to make the needed sacrifice. And now, you, the very report of whose fame was once odious, because "everywhere spoken against," we, I, hail as a brother beloved, a teacher in Christ.

May God help us to follow you, but only as you follow Christ. We have seen too much of human frailty to suppose that perfection can be found in any man. The sun, even, that enlightens the entire earth, through all time, has its dark spots, and the most beautifully polished steel may be easily defaced by the corrosion of dark spots of rust. Therefore, while we love, and must always deeply respect those by whose labours we have been blessed, and to whom for this cause we are debtors, while we obey the "new commandment" of Jesus Christ, which is, that we "love one another," and give honor, not grudgingly, to whom honor is due; we may not, nevertheless, "glory in men."

"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away," and then it will no more be necessary that we should exercise that kind of charity towards each other described in 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7, the imperfections, which now demand its

vigorous exercise, then being removed. Till then may we be patient, and love as brethren, and imitate the Lord Jesus, who loved the true Church, and gave himself for it. Dear brother, no man will understand these allusions better than you. Let me not be esteemed as over bold or officious in making them.

I am, dear brother, yours in that "lively hope," which is, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,

A. W. BUTTON.

*West Northfield, Cook Co., Ill.,
Feb 12, 1861.*

The Gospel Believed.

Dear Sir: —I arrived in Canada from Scotland three years ago last fall. While in that country, I received the *Herald* for some years, but having more money than judgment, I did not appreciate it as I do now. I have read the old numbers I possess often, and am now convinced that the promises made to Abraham shall be fulfilled; for as yet they have not according to Heb. xi. 8, the whole of which chapter, indeed, proves that it is upon a principle of faith and obedience that the promises are to be obtained.

I am also convinced that the Old Testament scriptures are the testimony for Christ. I believe also, that the New Testament scriptures are the testimony for Jesus that he is that Christ, or the Seed that is to possess the gate of his enemies promised to Abraham. And when Jesus preached "the gospel of the kingdom" before his crucifixion, it must have been that kingdom spoken of by Daniel, and all the rest of the prophets, for there is no other future everlasting kingdom spoken of.

I am certain I must believe this gospel of the kingdom, as well as a crucified and risen Jesus; for without the gospel of the kingdom, I have never been able to see what was in store for me beyond the grave in simply believing that Jesus was crucified, buried, and rose again. Truly, they say "you will inherit eternal life;" but where, I have never been satisfactorily informed by such, and am sure never can.

Dear Sir, I am very ignorant and unlearned, but can it be much wondered at? I have never enjoyed the society of a single believer in the gospel; or ever heard a lecture on the gospel of the kingdom beyond the perusal of your writings and the Bible; and am surrounded by stubborn, unscrupulous, opponents. I regret exceedingly not having the privilege of the society of some faithful believer, in order that I might be baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins, that I might henceforth walk in newness of life. I have a brother-in-law in Quebec much in the same position as I am myself in spiritual matters. We have frequent communications upon the subject, and are both alike anxious.

Fearing that I have encroached upon your valuable time, I subscribe myself very truly yours in the behalf of the gospel of the kingdom.

*Canada West, }
Feb. 18, 1861. }*

ROBERT BUIST.

If our friend will communicate with Mr. J. Coombe, Druggist, corner of Richmond and Yonge streets, Toronto, he will obtain all the information his case may require. EDITOR.

LORD BACON says "the end of science is to fill society with arts and useful inventions."

It may be affirmed that the end of religion is to fill society with divine principles and righteousness.

Envy.

"Who is able to stand before envy?"— Prov. xxvii. 4.

"ENVY is an evil affection of the heart, which makes men grieve and fret at the good and prosperity of others. Joseph was envied of his brethren, because his father loved him. The Jews envied Paul and Barnabas because they preached Christ. Envy at the good of others, and malice, wishing them evil, is a deep pollution of spirit. This absolutely alienates men from the nature and life of God; for the Deity is good, and doth good. It is contrary to natural conscience, and turns a man into a devil. This vice is immediately attended with its punishment. The envious man is his own tormentor. Envy slayeth the silly one. Envy is the rottenness of the bones. Besides, this stops the descent of divine blessings, and turns the petitions of the envious into imprecations against themselves."—*Selected.*

Rome, not Jerusalem, for the Pope.

A correspondent of the Liverpool *Mercury*, writing from Rome, states that French officers have latterly been very busy in obtaining information respecting Jerusalem and the state of things in that quarter. He adds that they had been taking measurements in several localities, particularly the ground that lies about the Mosque of Omar on Mount Moriah. From Jerusalem they had gone on to Hebron, Gaza, and other points, for the like purpose. It was also currently reported that a body of French troops was shortly to come to Jerusalem, while another would be stationed at Jaffa, and a third on Mount Carmel. At Beyrout, he says, the French officers openly affirmed that their government had no intention of withdrawing the force sent out, but were about to employ them shortly on a new and very different errand to that for which they ostensibly came. The French were also actively employed in making a road from the Holy City to Damascus, along which they were erecting houses at certain intervals. It is said that such a scheme as this intelligence shows to be in course of development, points to the realizing of *Pio Nono's favorite plan of removing the seat of the Papacy to Jerusalem.*

Pythagoras.

THIS philosopher nourished about five hundred and fifty years before Christ. He travelled extensively, and spent twenty-five years in Egypt in quest of knowledge. He opened a school at Croton, in Italy, which was much frequented by Grecian and Italian youths. He was the first man that called himself a philosopher, and gave currency to the name. He inculcated on his pupils the austerities of the Egyptian priests. He obliged them all to put their property into a common stock, and thus to have all things common. He used the three sorts of style adopted by the Egyptians in teaching their mysteries: the simple, the hieroglyphical, and the symbolical. He preferred the last. He first called the world *Kosmos* from its order and beauty; and became famous for his skill in geometry, astronomy, and arithmetic.

He taught that all mankind lived in some pre-existing state, and that for the sins committed by them in that state, some of their souls were sent into human bodies, and others into brutes, to be punished for, and to be purged from their former sins. Viewing the whole brutal creation to be animated by human souls, he held it unlawful to kill any animal, and to eat animal food. In order to purge themselves from sins committed in a pre-existing state, he taught his disciples to practise long fastings, and other severities, to subdue their bodily appetites, and to subordinate all desires to the soul. These were the peculiarities of his fleshly system.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED

EUREKA,

AN

EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

[470 pages, 8vo.]

WHILE the mail is conveying this number of the *Herald* to its destination, EUREKA will be also wending its way to its expectant friends. We have written to SECESSIONDOM to be informed if it will be possible to transmit the copies subscribed for through that territory, under the postage stamps of the ORIGINAL UNCLE SAM? Having received no answer, we conclude that letters are intercepted. We perceive from the papers, that there is a new postal law in the "Southern Confederacy" which disturbs everything. We do not, therefore, know if the *Herald* arrives. This uncertainty causes us to pause, being in doubt what to do. Will our friends in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, tell us what to do with theirs?

March 16, 1861.

EDITOR.
