

APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE.

EDITED BY

JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book *to the time of the end*; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. * * * Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

VOL. III

ARLINGTON, VA.

1836,

CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
Daniel's Seventy Weeks,	1
Rich Man and Lazarus,	8
Extract from a Letter,	11
The Religious Herald,	12
Progress of the Reformation,	14
The Election of Elders,	16
Baptism a sign and seal of nothing,	21
Origin of the Privileges and Immunities of the Clergy,	22
Protestants and Catholics	23
Dialogue by the Editor,	25
The Ironist,	38
A Literary Curiosity,	38
A Letter from Timothy,	41
Answer,	42
A College--School of the Preachers--Co-operation meet- ing,	45
This cannot be confuted,	46
A few Syllogisms,	46
What kind of a place is Heaven,	47
An Important Query,	48
The Christian Religion,	49
Influence of names,	72
The Hope of Glory,	79
Lacon,	76
State of the English Province of Babylon,	79
Anabaptism--Materialism--Sadduceeism,	83
Reply to Timothy, concluded, by M. Winans,	88
Dialogue by James Henshal',	91
True sayings,	94
Implicit Faith,	94
Our Last Anecdote,	95
The Rich Man and Lazarus continued,	97
Queries,	101
Matter and Manner or Spiritualism as defended by Alexan- der Campbell,	102
Conversation by A. B. Walthall,	107
Visit to Lunenburg,	108
Abstract Spirit by M. Winans,	114
Remarks by Editor,	115
Election of Elders,	116
Reformation in Spain,	116
A Word to the Reader,	117
William and Mary College's Religious House for Eco- nomic Sects,	118
Constitutions Human and Divine--their Sovereignty-- Votes of Majorities,	119

Dr. John Thomas a Factionist,	127
Letter from England,	131
Lexicographia,	137
"Rev." R. Ryland to the Editor,	140
The Reign of Law,	145
Church Discipline,	149
The Editors of the Gospel Advocate,	156
Seeing and hearing without eyes or ears,	158
Dialogue by James Henshall,	158
The Satirist,	162
"The Escutcheons of the Reformation,"	168
Doxologies of the Apocalypse,	169, 193
Observations,	171, 195
Epistle to the Laodiceans,	175
"Plain Dealing" plainly dealt with,	178
Letter by R. Richardson,	180
Letter to the Editor,	182
Baptism Phrenologically Illustrated,	183
The Harbinger on "Materialism,"	186, 270
To the Reader,	189
Letter from ——— ———	190
Illustrations of the Apocalypse,	191
Epistolary Extracts,	212
Prospectus of Vol. iv.,	214
Select Sayings and Maxims,	216
The Origin and Formation of Man,	217
Queries,	226
Plain Dealing,	232
Dialogue by James Henshall,	234
Correspondence,	237
Tithes,	238
Fate of Reformers,	239
Truth,	240
Immortality,	241
The Protestant Bishops of England,	243
Simulacrum,	243
Heresy Explained, No. 1,	244
No-Soul System,	252
Queries,	252
The Body of Moses,	254
Prospectus of the Psalms,	256
Letter from A. Anderson,	260
Momentous Tidings from the East,	262
Most Interesting Letter from Jerusalem,	265
Letter to the King of Egypt,	267
to the Commander of the Egyptian expedition,	268

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

PROPHETIC INTERPRETER

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D. and D.D.

Vol. 3. RICHMOND, Va., MAY 1, 1886. No. 1.

Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—Ephes. ii. 20.

Shut up, O Daniel, the words, and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—Dan. xii. 4, 10.

DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS

PREDICTION.

Dan. ix. 24—27.

v. 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy Holy City, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy: v. 25. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall (ditch) even in troublous times: v. 26. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and sanctuary, and the end thereof shall be with a flood; and to the end of the war desolations are determined: v. 27. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst (i. e. half part) of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate."

FULFILLMENT.

1. This prophecy relates primarily and essentially to the Jews. After it expresses the time determined upon the people of Daniel i. of the captivity, and upon the Holy City, i. e. Jerusalem, the whole of which time was seventy weeks; i. e. that this was the time which God had appointed and determined on the Jews for their being governed by the law of the Mosaic Constitution, which was to expire, as an administration of a temporary economy, after the conclusion of the period.

2. These seventy weeks are weeks of years, and not of days, as there were sabbatical days, namely, the seventh day of the week, of days, so that these seventy weeks are seventy years.

years were divided into weeks of years; and this last kind of weeks is that which is here mentioned: so that every one of the weeks of this prophecy contains seven years, and the whole number of seventy weeks 490 years, at the end whereof this determined time expired.

III. All the above was accomplished at the death of Christ; for then the Mosaic Polity and Worship at Jerusalem, were wholly abolished, and the Christian Dispensation obtained in stead thereof; then the time which was determined upon the Jews for their being exclusively God's peccoliar people, &c. being fully expired, thenceforth began the Kingdom of the Messiah; to which not only the Jews, but men of all nations of the Roman Empire were called, and instead of Jerusalem, as the place where men ought to worship, all other places, were equally holy and lawful in which to offer spiritual and acceptable sacrifice to God. And, therefore, then, the seventy weeks of this prophecy must have their ending: for they were determined and decreed for this purpose; and, therefore, in this they must have their conclusion. And this all the events that are in this prophecy predicted to be brought to pass at the conclusion of these weeks of years, do necessarily prove. In the 24th verse we have six of them, for the accomplishment of which, these seventy weeks are there said to be determined; and, therefore, at their fulfilment these weeks must have their ending. They are these following:

- a. To finish the transgression (*of the Law of Moses;*)
- b. To make an end of sins; i. e. *of sin offerings;*
- c. To make reconciliation (or *expiation*) for iniquity;
- d. To bring in everlasting righteousness; i. e. *perfect remission;*
- e. To seal up (or *complete and fulfil*) the vision and prophecy;
- f. To Anoint the Most Holy, i. e. *with the Holy Spirit at his baptism.*

IV. The end of these weeks being thus fixed at the death of Christ, it necessarily determines us where to fix the beginning of them, i. e. 490 years before. And, therefore, the death of Christ, as most learned men agree, falling in the year of the Julian Period 4746, and in the month Nisan, the first of the Jewish Ecclesiastical year, in the middle of which the Passover was kept,—if we reckon 490 years backward, this will lead us up to the month Nisan in the year of the Julian Period 4256, which was the very year and month in which Ezra had his commission from Artaxerxes Longimanus, King of Persia, for his return to Jerusalem, there to restore the Civil and Ecclesiastical Polity of the Jews; for that year of the Julian Period according to Ptolemy's Canon, was the 7th year of that King's reign, in which the scripture tells us his commission was granted. The *beginning*, therefore, of the Seventy Weeks, or 490 years, of this prophecy, was in the month Nisan of the Jewish year, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, King of Persia, and in the 4256 of the Julian Period, when Ezra had his commission; and the end of them fell in the very same month Nisan, in the 4746 year of the Julian Period, in which very year and very month Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, suffered for sin, and thereby completed the whole work of salvation, there being just seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, from the one to the other.

V. It is evident, from the prophecy itself, that these weeks must have this beginning, i. e. *from the date of the commission granted to Ezra.* For, first, they are pinned down thereto by an express character in the text; and, secondly, they cannot, agreeable to that and other scriptures, and the authentic histories of the times to which they relate, have it any where else.

This express character is "the going forth of) the commandment to

3

restore and build Jerusalem." This is emphasized by the phraseology of its announcement, "Know, therefore, and understand." The character aforesaid, is *figurative*, and not *literal*; namely, for the restoring and building up of the Jewish State, both politically and ecclesiastically, and the resettling of both, according to the Law of Moses. It is common in Scripture, by Jerusalem, to represent the whole polity of the Jews. The restoration of the Jews from the Babylonish Captivity was both *architectural* and *moral*; and the latter was preceded by the former. The architectural restoration of the State related to the building the second Temple, the houses of Jerusalem and the rest of their cities, &c. This commenced in the reign of Cyrus, who, on taking Babylon, in the first year of his reign, decreed the release of the Jews from captivity; who returned to Judea under Zerubbabel, the son of Salathiel, and Josedech, the high priest, to the number of 42,360 persons, with 7337 servants more. The *moral* restoration of the State commenced under the commission granted to Ezra, and was continued and completed under that to Nehemiah. Ezra's commission was very full; for it gave him thorough power to restore the Law of Moses (ch. vii.) and fully re-establish its observance, and to appoint magistrates and judges to govern the people according to it, and to punish all such that should be disobedient thereto, either with death, banishment, imprisonment or confiscation of goods, according as their crimes should be found to deserve. Before his coming to Jerusalem with his commission, the scriptures were in a manner lost, the people in a profound ignorance of the Law, and the worship of God neglected, and every thing else in great disorder and confusion. But, on his coming, he restored the scriptures, instructed the people in the law, brought the worship of God into due order, and proceeded, as long as his commission lasted, to work a full reformation in all things else: on account of all this, he has been esteemed as another Moses, and deservedly reckoned as the second founder of the Jewish State. Hence, the beginning of this moral renovation, is a noble epocha from whence to begin the calculation of these weeks, and entirely coincides with the intent and purpose of this celebrated prophecy, in which they are predicted; for the whole design of it is, to foreshow and set forth the Age of the Restored Jewish State; how long it was to continue, and when to cease and be abolished.

That this figurative interpretation of the words, and none other, must be the true meaning of them, appears from this, that they cannot be understood in a *literal* sense. If it is to be taken in a *literal* sense, there are but two periods from which the decree can be dated, as from a period of architectural restoration. And then the 490 years falls short of the birth of Messiah. In relation to this restoration of the nation, four several decrees were issued. They are these:

a. One granted by Cyrus to Zerubbabel in the first year of his reign, A. C. 536. In this year ended the 70 years of Jeremiah, reckoning from the beginning of the destruction of the Jewish State, in the 4th year of Jehoiakim, to the commencement of the restoration by this decree.

b. Another by Darius Hystaspes, eighteen years after, in the 4th of his reign, A. C. 518. This decree was for the continuance of the labors of the Jews, which had been interrupted by Smerdis the Magian, *de facto* King of Persia, upon the treacherous representations of the Samaritans. The promulgation of this decree was exactly 70 years after the completion of the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, by Nebuchadnezzar's general, in the 11th of Zedekiah, and 19th of the captivity of Jehoiakim. The account, therefore, stands thus

From the beginning to the end of the destruction of the City and Temple, 18 years.

From the beginning of the destruction to that of the rebuilding, 70 years.

From the end of the destruction to the decree for the ending of the rebuilding, 70 years.

c. The third decree by Artaxerxes to Ezra, 78 years after the first, in the 7th of his reign, A. C. 458. This is the date of the commencement of the restoration of the Law.

d. The fourth by the same King to Nehemiah, in the 20th of his reign, A. C. 445; by which the Restoration of the State, both architectural and moral, was thoroughly completed, being 159 years from the investment of Jerusalem by the Babylonians.

Now, if the Seventy Weeks be reckoned from the decree of Cyrus, they will expire 78 years before the death of Messiah; and if from that of Darius Hystaspes, 60 years: it is evident, therefore, that the words of this prophecy "to restore and build Jerusalem" cannot be understood in a literal sense. Neither can the 490 years be dated from the *fourth* decree, by which Nehemiah finished the walls, and set up the gates of the City; for then, the termination of the Seventy Weeks would overshoot the death of Messiah by 13 years. There remains, therefore, but one date, which, as has been observed before, is the 7th of Artaxerxes Longimanus, which is exactly seventy weeks, or 490 years, from the crucifixion of Jesus.

VI. This prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, as a whole, contains *three* parts; the *first* contains events to be accomplished, within 70 weeks in general, and to be fully completed and brought to pass at the end of them; the *second*, events to be accomplished precisely at the end of three particular periods, into which the said general number of 70 weeks is divided; and the *third*, events to be brought to pass after the expiration of the 70 weeks in the times immediately following thereupon.

1. The first part of this prophecy is that which is contained in the 24th verse, and foretells the six events above mentioned, which were to be fulfilled within the said 70 weeks in general, and to be fully completed and brought to pass at the end of them.

2. The second part is contained in the 25th, and in the former parts of the 26th and 27th verses. This divides the general number of 70 weeks into three particular periods, and assigns particular events to be precisely accomplished at the end of each of them. These three particular periods are 7 weeks, 62 weeks, and 1 week, i. e. 49 years, 434 years, and 7 years; and the particular events to be accomplished at the end of each of them are—

a. The restoring and building of the street and ditch of Jerusalem in troublous times;

b. The coming of Messiah;

c. His confirming of the Covenant or Institution of the Kingdom of Heaven, with many of the Jews for one week; his causing sacrifice and oblation to cease in the half of that week, and his being cut off at the end thereof.

Applying then, these particular events to their proper periods, the prophecy will be clearly thus:

That, numbering the said seventy weeks from the going forth of the commandment or decree to restore and build Jerusalem (that is, to restore and establish the Jewish State at Jerusalem) there should be first seven weeks of that number, i. e. 49 years, and then the said State (here figu-

ratively expressed by the streets of the City) should be reformed and restored, and all such good constitutions (here figuratively expressed by the ditch) should be made, and should be necessary, for the fortifying and preserving of the City, that all this should be done in troublous times, and in the presence of opposition from enemies.

That after 62 weeks from the end of the said 7 weeks, the Messiah should come; and that after this, having for the last of the 70 weeks (that is, for the space of seven years) concluded the Covenant with many of the Jews, he should, in the half part of a week (that is, in the latter half part of it) cause the sacrifices and oblations of the Temple to cease, and, in the conclusion of the whole, is, in the precise ending of the said 70 weeks, be cut off, and die accordingly, all this was exactly fulfilled and brought to pass.

Accordingly, within the compass of the said period of seven or 49 years, this event was accomplished, in the full restoring and publishing of the Jewish State in Judah and Jerusalem, after the Babylonish Captivity: for, as we have seen, this was begun by Ezra and afterward carried on and perfected by Nehemiah. And from the beginning of Ezra's enterprize to that last act of this reformation spoken of in Nehemiah xiii. 23, to the end of the chapter, were 49 years, ending on the 15th of the reign of Darius Nothus, A. C. 409. During all this time the work was carrying on; Ezra and Nehemiah experienced great opposition, not only from the Samaritans and other enemies abroad, but also from false brethren and wicked men at home, who hated all reformation, which was the true cause that it was so long doing; and that there were such obstacles in the doing of it, sufficiently verifies the prophecy in its prediction, that it was to be done in troublous times. And it is observable, that, at the same juncture of time when the restoration of the Jewish State ended, there the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament do end also for this last reformation of Nehemiah above referred to, and where the full completion of said restoration is placed, is the last act which is recorded therein.

2. From these 7 weeks, or 49 years, reckoning 62 weeks, or 434 years more (which is the term of the second period) this will lead us down to the coming of the Messiah, who is here predicted to come at the end of said 62 weeks. For the words of the prophecy are "from the going forth of the decree to restore and build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," i. e. there shall be 7 weeks for the completion of the work for which the commandment was given, and from thence 62 weeks more to the coming of the Messiah, that is, to the time of the announcement of his approach. For this coming here predicted must be interpreted, either of his coming at his birth, or of his coming on his ministry. But if we understand of the latter; and here the years predicted will be 476, for the 7th of Artaxerxes, being coincident with the year of the Period 4256, if we reckon from thence 7 weeks, or 49 years, or 434 years, this will bring us down to the year of the Period 4739, being seven years from the death of Artaxerxes, every year in which the "proclamation of the remission of sins" first began. This is the time of the announcement of the approach of the Messiah, the mighty Monarch, expected; and in this sense, and in this manner, the Messiah, by his herald and forerunner, John the Baptist, was proclaimed "three years and a half, and after that in person, for three years and a half."

half more. And these two being put together make up the last week of this prophecy, which began exactly at the ending of said 62 weeks. And, therefore, here this prediction concerning the coming of the Messiah had its completion. Luke tells us, that "the word of God first came to John in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar," Emperor of Rôme. And from the coming of that word to John, and his preaching of it to the Jews, was "the beginning of the glad tidings concerning Jesus as the Christ," (Mark i.) and the first appearance of the coming reign. And this Jesus himself says; for his words are (Luke xvi. 16.) "The Law and the Prophets were *until* John; since that the Kingdom of God is announced." That is, the Jewish economy lasted until the coming of John, and his proclamation of the baptism of reformation for the remission of sins. But from the time of his coming on this ministry or service, the confirmation of the Institution of the coming Kingdom of Messiah, which was near at hand, commenced. And, therefore, the reign of the Monarch of this Kingdom (set up after his resurrection) thus beginning with the preaching of John, there must we necessarily place the first coming of that King, the Messiah, who founded this his Kingdom here *on earth*, both to continue and prevail. And this, has been said, was in the 15th year of Tiberius Cæsar. But here let it be observed, this 15th year of Tiberius could not be the fifteenth year of his reign from the death of Augustus, his predecessor; for then there would have been but four years for the service of John and of Jesus put both together; which would have been too short a time for the doings recorded of them in the gospels. Beside, in so brief a space as must be appointed to the ministry of John in this case, it is unlikely that he could have acquired so great a fame as appears not only by the Testimony, but also from the writings of Josephus, the historian (lib. 18 c. 7,) he had done, not only in Judea and Galilee, but also through all the circumjacent regions before his death. The fifteenth year, therefore, of the reign of Tiberius, in which John began his proclamation, must be reckoned from the time he began jointly with Augustus, and was admitted by him into the copartnership of the empire; and, by a law (which Augustus caused to be proposed and entered by the Consuls) had conferred on him an equal power in the government of the provinces with Augustus himself: for, from that time the public acts went in his name, as well as in that of Augustus, especially in the imperial provinces, of which Syria was one: and, therefore, from that time the years of his reign were reckoned in those provinces. And this occurred, as the most learned Archbishop Usher observes, in the year of the Julian Period 4725; from whence the 15th brings us to the year of the Julian Period 4739, in which the word of God came to John; and the proclamation began at the end of the seven weeks, and the 62 weeks, that is, of the 69 weeks, or 483 years after the going forth of the decree in the 7th of Artaxerxes. Thus was this part of the prophecy exactly fulfilled.

3. From this coming of the Messiah by his Herald began the third period of the 70 weeks, that is, the one week, which is spoken of in the 27th verse, the events whereof as there predicted, are, that "for that week the Messiah should confirm the Covenant with many, and in the half part thereof (for thus the Hebrew *chatzi* ought to be rendered, which signifies *the half part*, and not *the midst*) should cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." And so it came to pass; for during these seven years of his ministry, he did, first by his forerunner, who was sent to announce his approach, and then, by himself, in his personal labors, confirm the institution (called the New Institution. Heb. viii) with many of the

Jews, who became his disciples by submitting themselves to him in the first half part of the said week, i. e. in the last half part of the week, appeared in his own person in the same ministry, and sent before him, he caused the sacrifices and oblations to cease, that is, first by the proclamation of the glad tidings to supersede them; and then lastly, by that great sacrifice which he offered once for all, upon the cross, at the end of which whereby they were all absolutely and finally extinguished. All sacrifices and oblations till then, being only types and figurative representations of this great sacrifice, but as they referred to it, when offered, all others vanished of course; and the virtue and propriety of this one sacrifice has sufficed for all ever since. The whole interval of the last week being the time of the Messiah's personal ministry on earth, as the whole of it was employed in publishing and confirming a new institution, which was to cause the law to cease, so the whole may very properly be said to be employed in causing all those sacrifices and oblations to cease which the old institution enjoined; though the whole was not completed till at the end of this half part, by his death and suffering; for then, at the offering up of this great sacrifice, the virtue and efficacy of all others ceased for ever. v. 26. "After three and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." The word *after* in this text means the whole week after, at the end of which Messiah was cut off by his death on the cross. It cannot mean definitely at the end of two weeks, for then his coming and cutting off must have happened both together at the same time, and consequently, there would have been no intermediate space for the ministry of Christ, which cannot be said.

SYNOPSIS OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

Seventy prophetic weeks are equal to 490 solar years. They began from the issuing of the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus, in the month Nisan, of the seventh year of his reign, and of the year of the Julian Period 4256, A. C. 458.

By virtue of this decree, the restoring and building the Jewish Temple was continued by Ezra, and perfected by Nehemiah, in the 15th year of the reign of Darius Nothus, A. C. 409, after a combined effort of 49 weeks, or 49 years.

In the year of the Julian Period 4739, the week of the Covenant begins. This is the last of the seventy weeks. The covenant is confirmed with many Jews, by the ministry of John and Jesus, who divided the week of years between them; John laboring the first, and Jesus the second half part.

The word of God came to John in the fifteenth year of the week, which is synchronous with the end of the 63 weeks, or 471 years, of the 15th of Darius Nothus.

Messiah cut off by crucifixion at the end of the seventh week of the covenant, as the great sacrifice, by which the efficacy of the typical oblation and sacrifices is finally extinguished.

Seventy weeks of years end in the middle of Nisan, the 15th day of the passover, exactly 490 years to a month, after the giving of the decree to restore and build Jerusalem in the 7th year of the reign of Artaxerxes, of the Julian Period 4746.

III. After what is predicted of these things, the second part of the prophecy which is contained in the 27th chapter, and foretells events to be brought to pass in the said 70 weeks, in the times immediately following the destruction of the city and temple by the people of the prince that was

to come," who with their armies and desolating abominations should invade Judea, as with a flood, and by a terrible and consuming war bring utter ruin and desolation upon it, and all the people of the Jews that should dwell therein, and consummate the same upon them in an absolute destruction. All which accordingly came to pass, and did, in a very signal manner, verify the prophecy in a full completion of every particular. For, these seventy weeks which were determined upon that people, and their holy city being finished, they, having refused to submit to the reign of Him whom they had put to death, were rejected by God, and the Gentiles called in their stead; so that thenceforth, for an appointed time, they were no more his people, nor their city, Jerusalem, holy to him, but both were given up and destined to utter ruin and destruction; which was to even *after* the glad tidings had been published among all the nations of the Roman World. Having, then, rejected the counsel of God against themselves in refusing to become obedient to the faith, the sentence of condemnation was ratified against them; and from that time all second causes operated toward the hastening the execution of it, till at length the Roman armies, the people that were to come, under the command of Titus, their prince, invaded them as with a torrent and begirt Jerusalem with their ensigns, "the abomination of desolation,"* which the Messiah from this prophecy warns his disciples of. For they were idolatrous images, abominated by the Jews, under which those people marched against them, invaded their land, besieged their holy city, and by a most calamitous war, brought utter desolation upon both; which according to the relations of Josephus (who was an historian of their own nation, and present in all the actions of the war) they executed in the most terrible and tragical manner of destruction that was ever brought upon any nation, and consummated it to such a degree upon them, that they have never been able to recover themselves ever since, even to this day, though now 1766 years have passed since these judgements were by the just hand of God thus executed upon them.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

Luke xvi. 16—31.

This story is one of certain parables addressed by Jesus to the Scribes and Pharisees. The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, forming a section of Luke's narrative, contain five parables spoken to, and concerning, this self-righteous, and money-loving class of men. It appears that a great number of publicans and sinners resorted to Jesus to listen to his

* Josephus tells us (lib. 18, c. 7) that when Vitellius, governor of Syria, was going to pass through Judea with a Roman army to make war upon the Arabians, the chief of the Jews met him, and earnestly entreated him to lead his army another way; for they could not bear the sight of those images, which were in the ensigns, under which they marched, they were so abominated by them. These ensigns, therefore, for the sake of those images in them, were abominations to the Jews; and by reason of the desolations which were wrought under them by the Roman armies in conquered countries, they were called desolating abominations, or abominations of desolation; and they were never more so than when under them the Roman armies besieged, took, and destroyed Jerusalem.

instructions. Jesus on his part seems to have
so far as to eat with these persons, whom he
despised. By doing this, he gave offence to the
Pharisees; for they murmured at him, saying, "He
eats with sinners and eats with them." Upon this
to justify himself by appealing to their own con-
tention, to the conduct of their own world, and
thence shows them that *there is greater fruit
from the reformation of one sinner, than of
many who need no reformation; and that this
is the most animating kind.* These truths are all
the fables of the lost sheep, the lost drachma, and the
prodigal son. Thus the fifteenth chapter is concluded,
and he addresses his disciples, in the audience of the
people, warning them against the love of money, and
the impossibility of serving both God and Mammon,
he illustrated by the fable of the unjust steward,
pointed, and cut the money-loving Pharisees.
For, it says, "when the Pharisees, who loved
all these things, they ridiculed him." This is
upon of the Mammonites or money-loving-priests and
who call themselves "ministers of the gospel" and
"Christians" of this day. They proclaim to the world, "The
of the Lord, the people of the Lord are we!" while
at the same time, they are fleecing their flocks, and their flocks
"minding earthly things;" and, like their priests, they
themselves to Mammon, body, soul, and spirit, under
hypocritical pretences. Such may, indeed, think
on God, by adjusting their accounts to their own
between Him and Mammon, but let them be
God will have all their service and devotion or
the idolaters think on this. Jesus well replied to
his observation is admirably adapted to the clergy
flocks of this day—"as for you, you make your
on men for righteous, but God knows you hate
which is admired of men, is abhorred of God."
Jesus then went on to say to them, "you must
the prophets till the coming of John, whose
kingdom of God is announced, and every
"by force." Considerable light is thrown
"every occupant enters it by force."—by
the Lawyers on a former occasion. They
to be the expounders or interpreters of the
you Lawyers shall Jesus said, "I am the
Key of Knowledge; you have not
those who were entering, and some
had carried them out, and shut the door
by their traditions, so that no man can

entering in at the straight gate. Now every one that regarded their traditions and speculations could not possibly enter the kingdom of God, which John and Jesus announced. The moral obstacles in their way were great and strong. Every disciple, therefore, of the Pharisees, Lawyers, and Scribes, who succeeded in occupying the kingdom, had to force his way, to conquer his liberty, and to break through all obstacles opposed to him by the Rabbinical or Jewish Clerical Craft, and so enter the kingdom. Thus, in the days of Jesus, the occupants of the kingdom of heaven entered it by force. What observer of the affairs of men can fail to discern the antitype of all this in the ecclesiastical system of our day? The same things obtain among all the "names and denominations of Christians," as they ignorantly and presumptuously style themselves. If a member of the Baptist Apostacy would occupy the kingdom of heaven he has to force his way through a host of human traditions, and to burst the bonds with which he has been bound by the hirelings of his fraternity. A Catholic, an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, a Methodist, &c. have all to force their way through the antichristian dogmas of their several sects before they can enter or occupy the kingdom of heaven. And this is no easy matter. It requires great firmness and strength of mind; an indifference to all but truth; a firm resolve to seek truth at the hazard of property, reputation, life; and when found, a fearless, independent, and honest obedience. This is the warfare necessary for the occupancy of the kingdom now, as in the days of the ancient Pharisaic-Craft.

Jesus was continuing his conversation in these words, "But sooner shall heaven and earth perish, than one tittle of the law shall fail"—when, it would seem, that some one in the crowd put a question to him on the subject of divorce: to which he replied, "whoever divorces his wife, and takes another, commits adultery; and whoever marries the divorced woman commits adultery."

He then resumes his discourse about the law and the prophets, and proceeds to illustrate by a parable or fable the proposition, that "if the living will not hear Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one should arise from the dead." This is the *design* of the fiction or story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. I repeat, that Jesus designed not to instruct the Jews, or to correct their notions, as to the state of the dead; but to illustrate the aforesaid important truth. He had said—"you, Pharisees, had the law and the prophets till the coming of John, since whose time the kingdom of God is announced, and every occupant enters it by force. But sooner shall heaven and earth perish, than one tittle of the law shall fail;" and now he is going to

show them, that at death their destiny will be fixed, and none will be permitted to return to the earth's surface, or the state of the dead to warn or to assure the living, the money-lovers; that this, indeed, would be useless, for "if the living hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one should arise from the dead"—a truth that was literally verified soon after; for, although Jesus arose from the dead, these proud, rich Pharisees, who regarded not the law and the prophets, which proved his pretensions to the Messiahship, did not, would not believe, though he arose from the dead, and his resurrection was reported to them by competent witnesses, who wrought "notable miracles"—which they admitted to be genuine—in confirmation of their testimony.

But it has been said, nay indeed, it is generally believed, that this parable is an exact description of the state of sinners and saints immediately after death. This was a notion first entertained by the Pagans, then by the Jews after the Macedonian conquest, afterwards by the Romanists, and now by the sects of piebald Protestantism; but never by the Christians of the Apostolic Age.

We shall pursue the consideration of this interesting parable in our next; till then we claim the indulgence of our readers.

EDITOR.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER.

VERY DEAR BROTHER,—The Christian—the Christian in fact, not in name, I mean—habitually, diligently, and prayerfully searches into the word of truth, ardently and reverentially desiring to know the will of God, to the end, that he may do on earth as they do in heaven. It matters not whether he may have lived in the golden time of heavenly purity, or in the time of the going down into the corruptions of Mystic Babylon, or whether he live now in this time of the coming out of Babylon; it is the will of his Heavenly Father, that he wants and labors to know and do. Is he, after having come out of Babylon, convinced that he still holds this error or that? Is he convinced by the word of God, and will he can he, continue therein? Surely the Christian will not cannot. Jesus says "if a man love me he will regard my word." I deem it my duty, beloved Brother, to say that I have been very slow to see the errors of days and nights passed in Babylon: but blessed be God, that I have been all enabled to see them, even by the light of his word. Flesh and blood have sometimes a hard struggle with the soul who lives, not by feelings, but by faith. It has been a popular custom to offer something in families, called a "without regard to the consideration whether the

ing is the only one professing to be a Christian in the domestic assembly. This custom, which comes in conflict with your own practice, is one of the errors of which I have been slow to be convinced: but the light of divine truth is gradually illumining my long-darkened-mind. As long as I could I adhered to this antiapostolic tradition, wishing to accommodate myself to the times as far as it could be done without violating the laws of my King. But cost what it may, the Christian is to do the will of God as fast as he can find it out by the word, without regard to what men may deem expedient, or consistent. Jesus says "When you pray, be not as the hypocrites: who affect to pray standing in the assemblies that men may observe them, &c. But when you pray, retire to your closet; and having shut the door, pray to your Father; and your Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will recompense you." This evidently teaches, that, when there is but one Christian in an assembly, public or private, and he desires to pray, he is to pray not before others, for that would put him on a par with hypocrites, but he is to retire into secrecy and pray before his Heavenly Father only. What God in his word teaches me in reference to one error, viz. to renounce it with humble firmness, I pray and trust I may be taught in reference to all.

Bro. J. M. Jeter, of Brunswick, formerly a Baptist Clergyman, has purified himself from the corruptions of the Baptist Apostacy, by obeying the truth as it is in Jesus. Brother A. B. Walthal has also been re-immersed, that he might obey the gospel, originally made known by the Apostles, and of which he declares he was entirely ignorant at his first immersion. On Lord's Day, at the Paineville Meeting House, in the presence of a good assembly, he made a plain, but strikingly perspicuous statement, concerning the difference between the human system he had obeyed twenty years ago, and the gospel he had that morning obeyed.

May the Lord bless you for the Redeemer's sake, Amen!

ALBERT ANDERSON.

THE RELIGIOUS HERALD.

For some weeks past this organ of the Baptist Apostacy in Richmond has been doling out some stale crudities against me, and what it is pleased to term Campbellism; and Reformers. Now, as I am neither a Campbellite nor a "Reformer," all that it says concerning these I pass by as entirely foreign to my affairs. I leave Campbellites and Reformers to settle their concerns with Mr. Herald; while I attend to my own. I answer to no other name but Christian; and it is only as corrupters of the religion of Jesus, and setters up of human tradition in the place of the true doctrine

that I oppose the hirelings of all sections of the Apostles Messrs. Baptist Priests, Herald, & Co. among the number I plead for the restoration of the ancient faith and practice for a walk and conduct in those who sustain the name Christian which shall adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things. I do not plead for any man's opinions, nor for a party. I am not blind to the defects of Reformers; and my writings bear witness for me, that I am impartial. Yes, I repeat it, impartial even to the injury of my temporal affairs; for many money-loving and worldly minded reformers who have smarted under my verbal and written reproofs have not failed to exercise their influence to my disadvantage; but poor deluded men, their efforts, like those of their Brother Herald, are too insignificant to do me or the cause I plead much harm. They are too impotent to excite fear; pity is all their due.

The first thing I have to give a passing notice is a piece in the Herald of the 25th March. The subject is, strictures on the anecdote about Mr. Broaddus. The article occupies one column and a half; and is a beautiful illustration of the saying "like priest like people." The document is signed by four persons, one of whom, I believe, is Andrew's nephew. A fifth was appointed with the committee to draw it up in behalf of the Separatists, but he did not sign it; because he, Mr. McDaniel, was absent from the neighborhood. I suspect had he been present he would not have affixed his signature to it; for he happens to have been one of those from whom the facts came. The committee admit the facts stated in the anecdote, but they object to the way in which they were presented. This is natural enough. Others, near Sparta, of Andrew's flock, say the anecdote is strictly true; besides the document in the Herald shows that it is. The Herald did not republish the anecdote; it would have been remarkable if its Editor could have been guilty of impartiality. It is not his custom to give his readers both sides of a question; hence it is only a certain class of prejudiced people, who read his weekly magazine of traditions and tales that pay any regard to his assertions. The rest of society are not hoodwinked, knows how to put a due estimate on his sayings and doings of himself and his contributors.

The committee admit, as we have said, the truth of the anecdote, and have moreover added still more pungent to the anecdote by declaring to the world that Andrew actually retained by the small sum of thirty dollars what he received before he intimated his intention of leaving. Oh! these money-loving priests, who call themselves ministers of the gospel—yes, Tim O'Brien, who calls himself "a minister of the gospel"—how they love the filthy lucre for which they sell the souls of their flock! Is the child or husband of the

of the orphan to be deposited in the chambers of silence? They must have a fee for a funeral speech! Is a flock destitute of a shepherd? The filthy lucre must be "guaranteed" to them, or "no pay no preach!" Immaculate priest! and among you, O immaculate St. Andrew of Sparta! When ye stand at the bar of Him whom God has appointed to judge the living and the dead, what defence will ye make for merchandizing in the people's eternal weal for your own private emolument? I leave you to your coming remorse.

As to the manner in which I presented the facts, it is not likely that either Andrew or his flock would approve it. This was to be expected as a matter of course. Let me observe to those well-meaning people, that in exposing the unscriptural practices of the Baptist Apostacy, I shall consult neither priests nor *their* people, as to the manner in which it shall be done. I shall adopt that style that will put their malpractices in the most striking colors. At the end of the committee's manifesto, Andrew comes forth *in propria persona*, with a sort of postscript, in which he calls the relation of his evil doings in the anecdote "my abuse" of his saintship! He calls it calumniating him; as if telling the *acknowledged* truth about a parson of the Apostacy was abuse and calumny! But Andrew writes his postscript in a fit of holy ire, for modern saints get very wrathful sometimes; we will not, therefore, be too hard upon him this time, with the hope that he will mend his ungodly manners. We pass on then to another subject.

The next thing that concerns me personally is the following notification published in the Herald of 1st April.

"PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION.

"RE-BAPTIZING.

"We understand that Mrs Dr. Thomas was recently re-baptized for the remission of sins. Mrs. T. had been previously baptized on a profession of her faith, as we understand, by Mr. Burnett, the Reformer. Recently her mind had become disquieted as to the validity of her baptism—being confined to her room, and yet anxious to have the ordinance re-administered, a bathing tub was procured, carried into the room, filled with warm water, and Mrs. T. immersed for the remission of her sins, by Mr. Joseph Woodson, one of the members of Sycamore Church. Mr. Campbell objects to this amendment of his new theory—but who shall decide when doctors disagree!"

With one exception, and that an unimportant one, this statement is remarkably accurate. The information passed almost direct from the family in which I live to the Herald office. It was conveyed by false friends, calling themselves "reformers," without having reformed an atom of their ungodliness and world-mindedness, to the camp of the aliens. Neither I, "Mrs. Dr. Thomas," nor Mr. J. Woodson have the least objection to its publicity. Our maxim is, truth and honesty never fear the

light. The document justifies the whole transaction. The short-sighted reporter was ignorant of the power of the language. He says that Mrs. T. was "baptized on a piece of *her* faith." Did the possibility of "*his* faith" not "*her* faith" never occur to him? Now I would like to know, in ignorance, that it is not a masculine or feminine faith, but the subject matter of the faith, that saves the soul from the bondage of sin. "*Her* faith" was in the water as washing away sin when she was immersed the first time. Her attention had been awakened, by a diligent reading of the scriptures, to the consciousness of the premises of her first immersion; she saw clearly that it is through the blood of Christ that believers have redemption, even the forgiveness of sins; and upon reviewing the past she found that the virtue of that blood was not part of "*her* faith." Now as the doctrine of baptism (not mere immersion) for the remission of sins is clearly taught by the Apostles, she desired to be baptized into Christ, on a belief of the truth that the blood of Jesus—the blood of the New Institution; also for many—was shed for the remission of sins. Her desire was complied with, and Mr. J. Woodson did the act. It may be asked "why did he do it?" It was Mrs. T.'s request; first, that I might have as little to do with the matter as possible; and secondly, as an evidence that she did not consider a preacher or ordained person as necessary, or as conferring any sanctity on an institution, which derives all its holiness and purifying qualities from the sin-cleansing-blood of Jesus. The water was not warm. The temperature was, indeed, raised, but not even so high as it is in summer. This was done, that the shock might not be too great, as she is suffering under phthisis; and therefore, would not have had power enough to throw off the accumulated blood from the lungs. The sapient Editor of the Herald inquires, "who shall decide when doctors disagree?" We will tell him—*Let the disciples judge for themselves, according to the scriptures, without any regard to the opinions of the said doctors, or such opponents as the Herald and the friends of the Apostacy.*

We have just received the following note from the King and Queen:

"BROTHER THOMAS,—From some cause or other your Herald appears to be fond of giving information of things as I have not seen in his paper any account of a person in our neighborhood, I think it will be well to let you know many months since, "The Rev." P. Moore, a member of the church, after her being a member of the church, became a member of the church in the year 1852. Persons who live in close communion with the church, throw stones. Will the Editor of the Herald continue to take notice on his "re-baptizing" notification?"

proclamation. It will be more than past experience will permit me to hope; but it is no more than justice demands. As for the reporters of Mrs. T.'s re-immersion, they had better employ themselves in learning to practice godliness more, and in playing the traitor and hypocrite less. I divine who they are on better promises than they are aware; and will take this opportunity of telling them, that though they call themselves "reformers," they have not failed to disgrace the sacred cause for which we plead, by their levity, world-mindedness and formality. They are ingrained members of the Baptist Apostacy; and of that corrupt section of Babylon they are alone worthy. May they return to their mother with all diligence; for they have proved themselves to be thoroughly unreformable!

EDITOR.

THE ELECTION OF ELDERS.

There is something radically defective in the relations subsisting between the Elders and congregations of modern times. Such passages as the following have no practical meaning in these days:—"Obey your rulers, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as those who must give an account: that they may do it with joy, and not with mourning; for that would be unprofitable for you." Heb. xiii. 17. From observation, and the testimony of others, I am convinced, that there do not exist on this continent, Elders, to whom the Apostle Paul would say, were he now alive, as he said to the Rulers of the Church at Ephesus, "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock over which the Holy Spirit has constituted you overseers." The Elders of modern churches are not constituted by the Holy Spirit; they are nothing more, even the very best of them, than mere incarnations of the votes of majorities. Now in saying this, I cannot be accused of censoriousness or other improper feeling towards this class of persons; because, in making the above observation, I involve myself; for a majority has conferred on me the name without the power of acquitting myself of the responsibilities the Holy Spirit has attached to the office. I repeat, that I, like the rest of my brethren in name, am nothing more than a mere incarnation of the vote of a majority of persons calling themselves "Reformers"—a name by the bye which I disclaim with as much aversion as I do that of Campbellite. Christian is the only title I acknowledge. The disorders which take place in modern churches, I believe, are to be attributed, first, to ignorance of the word of God; secondly, to a want of respect, and implicit obedience to the word of truth as far as known; thirdly, an ignorance of the rights and privileges of the Ruler and the Ruled, or the Elders and Disciples. A large part of the system of voting upon all subjects including those of faith, piety, and morality.

I will venture an assertion, and leave it to my readers to verify by the scriptures and see if it be not as I affirm—that in the *New Testament there is no instance to be found in which the disciples at large elected and ordained the Elders or Rulers of the Churches.* This may startle those who are for doing everything by votes of majorities; but “to the law and the testimony if we speak not according to these it is because there is no light in us.” If the votes of majorities constituted the Rulers of the Primitive Churches, in what sense could Paul say to the Ephesian Elders that the Holy Spirit had made them overseers? But it may be asked, if the majority are not to make their Elders, how can they be appointed?

We would premise, in the first place, that there is much wisdom in the disciples generally not being permitted to vote in their Rulers. First, it prevented electioneering; and secondly, it deprived corrupt majorities of the power of putting into office men who would wink at their corruptions, and relax the discipline of the church for the accommodation of their vices. So long as the Apostles and Inspired or Spiritual Men remained in the Church these things were entirely prevented. The Elders of a congregation, in those days, so long as they remained faithful, could by a due administration of the laws of the Kingdom purge the church even from a corrupt majority, which would have been impossible had the discipline of the churches been carried on by voting. The disciples generally had nothing at all to do with the executive; all they had to do was to “obey them that had the rule over them, and submit themselves.”

But to revert to the question, how are Elders to be constituted by the Holy Spirit in these days? In reply to this, I would observe, that if Elders are constituted according to apostolic or primitive precedents, which precedents were sanctioned by God, they are constituted by the Holy Spirit. But before these precedents can be followed, it is absolutely necessary that the church for whom the Elders are to be provided should have been “built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus himself the foundation corner stone;” and that it should be founded on the same foundation at the time of its proceeding to action. Its members must reverence the word of God with implicit obedience. A recommendation of an apostle must have as much weight and authority with them as the most important law of the State. A thus saith the Lord, or a thus it is written, must be an end of all controversy. The word, and that word must be the standard of appeal. With such a congregation as these principles there will be no difficulty. They will obey the word of his Apostles in all things. It will only be necessary to say what is required, for them to do it.

The Apostles were Elders. Peter says that he is an Elder, and John also styles himself an Elder in his second epistle.

then. If then, Peter and John were Elders, all the Apostles were so too; and Matthias among the number. I will take the election of Matthias as the precedent for the election of Elders for a church of Jesus Christ. I choose this precedent the rather as the whole one hundred and twenty appear to have been concerned in the matter to a certain extent—to an extent, beyond which the disciples have no right to go in these days.

Well then, Matthias was constituted an Apostle and Elder by divine appointment, in the following way. The account is as follows. A place in the Apostleship being vacated by the apostacy of Judas, it had been decreed necessary nine hundred years before, by the Holy Spirit,⁶ who spoke by the mouth of David, that one should be appointed to fill up the vacancy. Peter stood up and stated the qualifications necessary in the candidates for office. They were qualifications common to the Eleven; for Peter could not consistently require that in another which he and his companions did not possess. The requirement was that the candidate should be one who had continued with the Apostles all the time the Lord Jesus was conversant among them, commencing from his baptism by John until the day of his assumption. This shows that all the Eleven were witnesses of the events at the baptism of Jesus. This by the way. They accordingly set up *two* men answering this description. Mark, they set up two men, though they wanted but one. Now let it be observed, that they did not elect one by a vote of the majority. Had they done this the elected would have been the Apostle of the one hundred and twenty, and not of the Lord Jesus. All they did was to nominate two men answering to the qualifications laid down. They left it to divine appointment to determine which of the two was to be the Apostle. Having set them up, they then prayed to the Lord to shew which of the two he had chosen. And then they cast lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, who thus became the successor to Judas.

Now let it be remembered that the lot was divinely appointed. Its use was notorious to the whole nation; for it was employed to determine a most important event. I refer to the institution of the scape goat. On this occasion, two goats were presented to the priest. But observe, that Jehovah did not permit him to make his choice of the one for sacrifice and the other for escape. It was Jehovah that was to make the choice. He did not do it by an audible voice every year; but he instituted the lot once for all. When, therefore, the goats were chosen according to the divine law, they were as much chosen by the Lord as if he had said audibly every year "that goat is for sacrifice, and that for the scape goat." The practice was briefly as follows. The two goats were placed, the one on the right hand of the priest, the other on his left. Two labels were prepared. On the one was written "for the scape goat;" on the other "for the Lord."

These were put into an urn; before him. They were drawn out by the priest, one by one, and cast upon the ground. The priest then put in both his hands, and took out a lot with each hand. If the right hand lot had in it the name of the Lord, then the goat on his right hand was sacrificed, and the lot on his left was carried into the wilderness, with the sins of the people previously imposed on his head by the confession of the priest.

Now in applying this to the case of Joseph and Matthias, this was doubtless the practice. Two labels or lots were prepared. Upon the one would be written "for apostle," the other would be blank. Having been put into some receptacle and shaken, each candidate would draw; and he that drew forth the lot inscribed "for apostle" would be the Lord's choice; because chosen by an ordinance of divine institution. "And the lot fell upon Matthias and he was numbered with the Eleven Apostles."

Such is the precedent; now for its application to the election of Elders in these days. Suppose the necessities of a Church of Jesus Christ require *three* Elders. Let the disciples look out among themselves (not in a theological seminary) *six* men of an attested character, answering to the description, or qualifications laid down by the Holy Spirit in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus. Having found them, let them set them up, and pray to the Lord, who knows the hearts of all men, to show which of these brethren he had chosen to take the oversight of the flock of God. Having done this, let six labels be prepared, upon three of which, let there be written *for elder*; the other three to be blanks. The whole should then be put into a receiver and well shaken. Then let each brother draw forth a lot. The three who draw the written lots would be the Elders by divine appointment; the others would fall back into the congregation not at all depreciated in the estimation of the brethren.

Elders constituted upon this principle would derive their authority from the scriptures of truth, not from majorities, or the most part ignorant of the word of God, or knowing it only in part, rather to act on the principle of expediency, than according to the commands of the Apostles. Some majorities make them elders in order to prevent them from speaking much of exhortation; others make them elders, because they are good speakers in that capacity; some constitute them elders, because they are old men, with no other qualifications, others because they are rich and have much influence. Thus the principle of divine appointment is set aside, that the policy of men may be followed. But a church of Jesus Christ, that reverences the word of God, will scorn to act on such unworthy principles. Let the Rulers according to scripture be chosen, and let the people be taught to "obey them" as the word of the Lord commands.

EGYPT.

A French physician, named M. Clot, went to Egypt, several years since, to practice medicine. Being a skilful man, having solid learning and great prudence, he acquired soon in that country a high reputation. He founded at Cairo a *school of medicine*, in which he instructed Egyptian youth, and he obtained even of Mohammedan priests permission to *dissect dead bodies*, a thing forbidden by the laws, and revolting to the feelings of Orientals. The name of M. Clot was soon known to Mehemet-Ali, Pacha of Egypt. This chief, who knows how to appreciate every species of talent, and who employs all possible means to civilize Egypt, called M. Clot near his person, and gave him the title of his first physician. Some time after, having had opportunity to be satisfied with his conduct and his surgical operations, he raised him to the dignity of *bey*, one of the first marks of distinction in Turkey. The rumor was then spread that M. Clot had been forced to *change his religion*, and abandon Christianity for Mohammedanism, before being named bey by the pacha. This false accusation having come to the knowledge of M. Clot, he has denied it positively in a letter published in some French journals; and it is in this letter that we find authentic proofs that liberty of worship has been established by the pacha.

Before the administration of Mehemet-Ali, a barbarous intolerance prevailed in that country; "Christians" and Jews possessed no rights, and enjoyed no security. Their persons and their goods were at the mercy of every Mohammedan, and the least *cadi* of a village could, with impunity, rob them, imprison them, or cause them to be put to death. They were not permitted to mount a horse or a mule; they were allowed only to ride on asses. When any unfortunate "Christian" or Jew, thus humbly mounted, happened to pass before a mosque, or to meet in the street a Mohammedan chief, he was obliged to dismount from his ass and to put foot to the ground. He was forbidden to wear garments of any other color than *black*. There was no justice for him before the tribunals: when he plead against a Mohammedan the judge condemned him, however good his cause. In a word, "Christians" and Jews were exposed to all sorts of vexation and oppression, as is the case in almost all the rest of Turkey.

But since Mehemet-Ali has been pacha of Egypt, he has made a radical change in these matters. He has established a perfect equality among all religions. He has admitted "Christians" and Jews to sit in the tribunals of commerce, and he would have done the same in respect to other tribunals, if it had not been expressly forbidden by the Mohammedan religion. He has given his confidence and principal offices to men of merit, without regard to their religious faith. Thus the minister of commerce, the director-general of the finances, the first physician of the pacha, and several other chief officers, are "Christians." Among the receivers, paymasters, and persons employed in all the various offices of government, are to be found "Christians" and Jews. The director-general of the arsenal of Alexandria, and many captains of vessels and other naval officers, are also "Christians."

This is not all. Not only does the pacha of Egypt place "Christians" in high civil and military offices, but he allows them also the free exercise of religious worship even in public places! "Often," says M. Clot, "we see in the streets of Alexandria and Cairo, Catholic priests clothed in their sacerdotal habits, walking in funeral trains, bearing the sacrament and making public processions with the utmost liberty."

Mehemet-Ali has allowed the founding of several large and even *convents*; he thinks every one should have a right to shut up in a cloister, and make yowls of ecstasies, if he chooses.

Another fact which illustrates the great tolerance of Egypt, is that he assembles every year in the island of Roda, west of Old Cairo, at the period of the increase of the waters of the Nile, priests and doctors of all sects, in order that they may offer their prayers to the Most High to obtain from Him the blessing which fertilizes Egypt. Here may be seen the Mohammedan on the side of the Catholic priest, and the *copt* by the side of the *rabi*; all worships are assembled, all voices invoke the goodness of the Lord, and supplicate him to increase the waters of the Nile.

The pacha of Egypt said lately to several European consuls, "When the war is ended, we will go together and make our pilgrimage to Jerusalem." And when the victorious troops of Mehemet-Ali entered this unhappy city, the pacha immediately abolished the taxes and other exactions which had been imposed on the monks and pilgrims who sort from Europe to Jerusalem to visit the tomb of Jesus Christ; and this illustrious city remains in the hands of Mehemet-Ali, without doubt it will be much more easy and agreeable for "Christians" to do their steps to the holy places where the Lord was born, suffered, rose again and ascended into heaven. Already a celebrated Frenchman, *M. Alphonso de la Martine*, has availed himself of the liberty which is now permitted to visit Jerusalem, and he has written recently from the foot of Mount Libanus to inform his friends in France that he was well received, and that he pursued his journey without being disturbed in any manner by the Mohammedan rulers.

These are remarkable facts, and will rejoice the friends of religious liberty. It is gratifying to think that the principles of tolerance are in practice among a people still barbarous in many respects; and the fact is well calculated to shame those civilized nations, and especially those professed "Christians" who have not yet adopted the principles of religious liberty. How strange, that they should permit a country like Egypt, and a despot like Mehemet-Ali to be so much in advance, and yet the facts are positive, and all Europeans who reside or travel in these oriental regions agree in testifying to their truth!—*New York Observer*.

BAPTISM A SIGN AND SEAL OF NOTHING.

Jamestown, Ohio, August 17, 1836.

BELOVED BROTHER THOMAS,—Permit me to preach a short sermon from your *text*, which is published in the beginning of Vol. II. No. 4, of the *Apostolic Advocate*, which reads thus—"One of the most remarkable characteristics of a false religion is the use of signs without the thing signified."

But before I begin, allow me to add as a part of my *text*, that the use of seals to BLANKS is equally characteristic of a false or foolish religion.

We have religions, in this our day, of various names, but they all have the *sign and seal of remission of sins*; and if you ask any of them, whether sinners are saved by baptism or not, they answer no. They say, and all agree, that baptism is not for the remission of sins, and that

baptism for remission is "Campbellism." To me, this resembles the *sign* and *seal* of *nothing*, or of a *blank*. Which is the fact in regard to the major part of these *sign* and *seal* folks. Their *sign* and *seal* both, are applied by them to *babes*, who are perfect *blanks* as it respects religion, having no knowledge of God, or of Jesus Christ.

If this *sign* and *seal* business be not a *form* without *substance* or *power*, I know not where we will find such a thing.

What! a *sign* of remission, and a *seal* of remission, and no remission at all in the ordinance. This must be a *ghost* indeed, for it has no *substance* in it, and yet it is *visible*.

I have repeated the *text* so often in the sermon that it will not be forgotten if I should deviate from custom, by omitting it in the conclusion. But lest some frail memories may forget, I will just say in the sequel that *baptism*, as used by all who oppose this reformation, is a *sign* and *seal* of *nothing*.

As ever, yours,

M. WINANS.

Origin of the Privileges and Immunities of the Clergy.

There is a common notion among the priests of all denominations that they are entitled to certain privileges which the people at large have no right to. It will be seen from the following document, extracted from Eusebius, page 432, that they derived their immunities originally, not from God or his word, but from Constantine, the Emperor of the Roman World, and an unbaptized universal bishop till within three days of his death. It would have been well for poor mankind and the peace of the world had they been compelled to refrain from interfering with the affairs of governments; but thanks to the infidels and atheists of America their craft is broken here, and their tender mercies which are cruelty, set aside.

"Copy of an Epistle in which the Emperor commands that the prelates of Churches should be exempt from performing service in political matters."

"Health to thee, most esteemed Anulinus. As it appears from many circumstances, that when the religion was despised, in which the highest reverence of the heavenly majesty is observed, that our public affairs were beset with great dangers, and that this religion, when legally adopted and observed, afforded the greatest prosperity to the Roman name, and distinguished felicity to all men, as it has been granted by the divine beneficence, we have resolved that those men who gave their services with becoming sanctity, and the observance of this law, to the performance of divine worship, should receive the recompense of their labors, oh most esteemed Anulinus; wherefore it is my will that these men,

within the province, entrusted to thee in the Catholic Church over which Cæcilianus presides, who give their voice in favour of this holy religion, and whom they commonly call Christians, shall be held totally free, and exempt from all public duties to the end, that they may not by any error or sacrilegious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote themselves to their proper law without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it appears the greatest good will be conferred on the State. Farewell, most esteemed and beloved Anulinus."

"PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS."

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle:

SIR,—Though quite agreeing with yourself, that a political journal is not precisely the arena wherein to discuss polemical questions, yet permit me, with much deference and respect to submit that, although the bandied terms "Catholic" and "Protestant" are the current phraseology of Christianity, no two words can, by any possibility, be more inappropriate; for, whilst the former term indisputably assumes too much, the latter unquestionably assumes too little; or rather, *nothing at all*. Christianity being positive, abstract, and eternal; Protestantism, by being negative, relative, and of yesterday, cannot be the same thing. The term "Protestant" is essentially defensive; the very efficiency of Christianity consists in being spiritually aggressive. Christianity is absolute; Protestantism involves secession. Saxony, Brandenburg, Hesse, and Luxemburg, though they seceded from, and abnegated the Roman hierarchy, did not *thereby* become Christians. To identify Christianity with the mere political act of "protesting" against the edict of Spire, is an obvious anticlimax. Every modification of Christianity being professedly founded on *positive* criteria, cannot be expressed by terms which imply not abstract principles. Mere *negative* nomenclature is always pernicious, it being possible to define what we *are*, by merely announcing what we are *not*; this is fatal to all entity. And the puissance of etymology is fearfully defianced by classing with entity the annihilating negatives "Protestant Dissenter."

I am, sir, yours with respect,

Robert B. ...

2, Parliament street, December 1st.

RECEIPTS

FOR VOL. II.—*Herz Pastors, H. Va. W. Davis, J. Davis, W. H. Loyal, the Post Master, C. J. Phillips, J. A. Watson, Mrs. B. J. M. Davis, H. Davis, E. M. Wolf, Louisa Court House, Va. N. S. Hill, ...*

mond, Va. J. J. Jackson, N. McCurdy, H. Bragg, J. Woodson, E. Smith, G. R. Myers, R. Ligon, D. Baker, J. McKillop, E. Hubbard, F. W. Quarles; Mr. McCray, A. King, J. King, W. Glean, Mrs. Page; *Little Plymouth, King & Queen, Va.* E. G. Fausderoy; *King William Court House, Va.* R. Hill, D. Quarles, W. Newman; *Aron, L. O. F. B. Young, Oak Level, E. Va.* Capt. P. Smith; *York Town, Va.* J. Belvin, J. Curtis, L. Moreland, W. Gilliam, S. Shields, M. Curtis, R. C. Wynne, T. Wynne, W. H. Wynne, M. M. Burt, M. Garrett, J. S. Gilliam, E. B. Moreland; *Sony Point, Albemarle, Va.* J. Goaz; *Bloomfield, Ky.* H. Edwards, P. Wilson, W. Coombs, B. Mason; *Rochester, N. Y.* M. Thurston, E. Ferguson; *Norfolk, Va.* J. Hathaway \$1 50; *Hagerstown, Md.* McCoy, Rentzel, Newcomer, Bohrer, Renner \$2, all by L. Bell; *Dunsville, Va.* J. Fisher, *Dover Mills, Goochland, Va.* W. Edwards, L. Ellis; *Sandy River Church, Prince Edward, Va.* Capt. H. Vaughan; *Montague's, E. Va.* J. C. Clopton; *Bowler's, E. Va.* R. J. Muse; *Oxford, E. O.* Miss Beeler, W. B. Bonney, H. Birdsail, W. Williams, H. Osborn, J. Collins; *Nashville, D. Tenn.* W. P. Berry for J. W. Clay, J. P. Sledge, J. Berry, J. W. Craig, W. P. Anderson, A. Carrington, D. B. Hill, P. Robinson, D. Dunnaway, B. S. Weller, S. Ewing, D. Huddleston, W. J. Turbeville, W. A. Eichbaum; *Paris, Ky.* E. Elbott, Mrs. Eades; *Simpson's, F. Va.* H. Smith; *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Paterson, J. D. Porter, S. Cressman, D. Colville, J. Harpham, W. Duffie; *Uwchlan, C. Pa.* J. Brinholtz; *Stevensville, King & Queen, Va.* J. Duval, J. Edwards, J. C. Roy; *Stancatoles, N. York.* C. J. Burnet; *Clarence, E. N. Y.* A. Ransom, C. Williams, Mrs. Hershell; *Petersburg, Va.* Mr. Poindexter; *Pleasant Grove, L. Va.* Mrs. Glenn.

For Vol. I.—*Fredericksburg, Va.* W. Richardson; *Richmond, Va.* Mrs. Winfrey; *Charlottesville, Va.* W. Summerson, W. W. Tompkins \$2, W. Henly; *Bloomfield, Ky.* W. Coombs; *Simpson's, F. Va.* H. Smith.—For Vol. III. in our next.

TERMS.

THE ADVOCATE is published at ONE DOLLAR per annum, payable in advance, on the receipt of the first number. If not paid within three months ONE DOLLAR and FIFTY CENTS. Postage to be paid by subscribers.

Subscriptions must commence with the beginning of a volume; and cannot be accepted for a less period than one year.

* * Equity requires that when a subscriber discontinues the paper he will pay up his subscription; or still continue to take it.

ALL LETTERS ARE REQUESTED TO BE POST PAID.

NOTICE.

Having been the subject of an acute attack of erysipelas, which has confined me to a sick bed for two weeks, I have not been able to attend to certain correspondents, whose letters have been duly received. I am still very weak from the severity of the disease and the loss of blood. They must attribute my neglect of them to this which is the sole cause. Their communications shall be considered hereafter.

HUTTON.

THE
APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE,
AND
PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D. *not D. D.*

VOL. 3. RICHMOND, Va., JUNE 1, 1898. No. 5

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words, and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. * * * Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

DIALOGUE

BETWEEN THREE FRIENDS ON MEN AND THINGS.

In that portion of the human race rendered accountable at the great day, by being placed under the Dispensations of God, DEATH is nothing more than the interruption or suspension of that corporeal or organic action called LIFE;—in the inferior animals, it is its final extinction.

Philo. Good morrow! friend Alethes; it is with pleasure I meet you again after so long an absence. What tidings do you bring from your country?

Alethes. My absence has been indeed long; but as for tidings, I have none of importance to communicate. I thank you for the pleasure you express at seeing me again. I reciprocate your kindness, and trust that the blessing of God will rest upon you, and upon all the faithful followers of our Lord Jesus Christ!

Philo. I thank you Alethes!—Pray what is that you hold in your hand?

Alethes. It is the April number of the Harbinger, which I have just obtained from the Post Office.

Philo. Does it contain any thing of interest?

Alethes. Yes indeed; the Editor, you know, is always worthy of being read.

Philo. Read the Table of Contents, if you please. (*Alethes reads.*) There friend Alethes, stop! Turn now to the conversation at Thomas Goodall's. Read it if you please. (*Alethes reads it through deliberately, and Philo pays profound attention.*) Who is he whose writings are to be the subject matter of conversation there?

Alethes. Mr. Payne calls him his "English friend." I judge that he refers to an individual who edits a paper in Richmond, and that he is more strengthened in this opinion, because I have some recollection of having heard the quotation, which appears to have concerned Goodall's aged nerves so violently, cited as coming from a man who was that he is from England.

Philo. Then you do not read Mr. Payne's friend's writings?

Alethes. No, as yet I have not. But the manner in which the Harbinger has recently noticed several of his articles has excited my curiosity. I like to read both sides of a question; and to read a man's defence of his own sentiments; which, I confess, the Harbinger has not enabled me to do in relation to this "shrewd gentleman's" writings, as it calls him. I intend to take his paper, and judge for myself.

Philo. I coincide with you in this matter. The whole conversation appears to be a very one-sided-view of the subject; written in a style calculated to catch the multitude. For my own part I cannot learn the views of this half-Christian half-sceptic, as he is represented, from the Editor's exhibition. He reminds me of the textuaries, who dislocate a sentence from its connexions and declaim for an hour or so upon it, like men beating the air, when they are done no more is known of the author's meaning; or views than when they began weaving their theological web. So it is with this conversation in relation to me, I am still ignorant of this "learned" and "grave preacher's" views.

Alethes. The same thought has occurred to me. When reading the article, I could not help being amused at Mrs. Reed's simplicity in identifying a popular tradition with the hope of a Christian; as if the fact of a Christian adopting an *opinion*, as his hope, in common with Romanists, and Protestants, constituted it so holy or sacred, that it was to be treated only with the reverence due to truth!

Philo. Yes, and did you observe the sentiment of Mr. Payne and Father Goodal, that levity on such a theme is not becoming a Christian. and that "ridicule is no test of truth," and yet this conversation is conceived in a vein of levity and ridicule upon the obnoxious writer throughout? It may be "expedient," but it is not consistent.

Alethes. How vague must be the views of Mrs. Reed on one of the most definite institutions among men—I mean the Christian as exhibited on the pages of the New Testament! She talks, with the chit-chat of a novice indeed, of "the spirits of the martyrs and the bold ghosts of the reformers" looking down from "the abodes of bliss on the wonderful success which has crowned their labors!" Who are these martyrs, and who these reformers? Cranmer, Archbishop of a semi-popish-church, a friend and adviser of a murderous and adulterous King, and an instigator of the martyrdom of others—he is one of these martyrs: and John Calvin, the destroyer of Servetus, and Father of Calvinistic Protestantism is one of these reformers! The politico-Ecclesiastical defection from Rome's spiritual dominion, called Protestantism, has brought to the world the blessing of civil liberty; and was *one* of the causes of the diffusion of knowledge. Protestantism may be considered in two aspects—first, as emerging from Romanism; and secondly, as merging into infidelity. Romish Protestantism was little less intolerant, where it had the power, than the Harlot Mother of which it was born; Infidel Protestantism is more tolerant, because of its growing indifference to all forms of faith. It is under Infidel Protestantism that the rights of men have been established, and knowledge most rapidly diffused. Romish Protestantism like Mohammedan and Modern Judaism, has had its martyrs; men who have fallen, as soldiers do in battle, in defence of the cause they have embraced. And what was this cause—was it the Religion of Jesus as established by the Apostles? No; it was a system of religious opinions in opposition to the dogmas of Rome; and for those opinions, thousands suffered death on the field of battle under Protestant Leaders, and some suffered without resistance. I would not undervalue the sacrifices of

these men by any means; my remarks are intended to show that the tyranny for opinion can never be tantamount to the "obedience of faith." Protestants may deem it so, but the doctrine is no where to be found in the scriptures of truth. Granting, for argument sake, that ghosts in blue look down upon men, this goes no way to prove that reformers of popes and martyrs in the cause are there. The christianity of those reformers and martyrs is mere matter of opinion; it cannot be sustained by the New Testament. Protestant sectarianism which derives its birth from their labors, and those who favor this pighead Protestantism, may canonize them, but revelation shows that this politico-religious system is neither more nor less than one of the Horns of the Beast whose two horns were those of a lamb, but it spake with the mouth of a dragon. A man call him a reformer, martyr, or what you please, must, under the Christian Dispensation, obey the gospel as Paul and the primitive Christians did before ever they can enter the abodes of bliss wherever they may be.

Philo. Mrs. Reed's opinion is not more foundationless than Mr. Wickliffe's interpretation of the opening of the fifth seal. "The souls of the dead from under the altar, crying with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood upon them that dwell upon the earth?"—is adduced to prove that "the spirits of the just" take a deep interest in all the affairs of Christians on earth. Now, it appears to me, although this is mystified by "orthodoxy," that there is no mystery in it at all. The whole passage is a speaking hieroglyphic, in which the blood of the witnesses for the truth, as it is in Jesus, not as it is in Romish Protestantism, as I think you rightly term it,—is *personified* and made to speak the sentiment in the passage. The declaration of the Lord God to Cain, I think, gives the text its proper rendering—"What hast thou done?" said the Almighty, "the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." So it may fairly be expressed in this place—the blood of the slain cried with a loud voice, &c.—for there was a great multitude of them. *Blood crying for vengeance* has nothing at all to do with spirits in the abodes of bliss, looking down upon Christians on earth. The blood is very consistently with the mechanism of the Apocalypse said to cry "from under the altar." The whole of this Book, as far as it relates to the Christian Church, with the judgements that are to issue from God against their enemies, &c. is constructed on the scheme represented in the Temple. The altar therefore, of incense in the Holy Place was a very proper place to deposit the blood of those "who were slaughtered on account of the word of God, and the testimony which they hold;" and from thence to cause its prayers or cries for vengeance to ascend as incense to God. I say a very proper place; because, it was for the word that the blood of the faithful was shed; and they only had access to the Holy Place, or congregation of the First Born from the dead, before their death. After their white robes were given them, which are symbols of their righteousness and purity, they are told, to "rest a while, till" the remainder of their brethren were slain. They are represented as in a state of quiescence which was to continue only for a certain time. Now, "orthodoxy" represents the citizens of its "heaven" as in a state of activity, going hither and thither, as angels, and singing the praises of God from the top of their voices. But the holy scripture, if it makes them rest in the Holy Place, represents them as calling for vengeance, and in a state of quietude. The songs of the symbolic blood of the slain, sung in the Most Holy Place, to which, at the end of the

the altar, they are represented as having gained access. Mr. Wickliffe talks about "dead saints taking interest in the living!" This is truly popish. But we must not forget that Mr. W. personates the Rector of Lutterworth in this family circle, who was a Romish Priest though a proteater against many of the things he practiced himself! * * * * * But here comes Tomaso, perhaps he can assist us in our review of this conversation at Father Goodall's.

Tomaso. Good morrow, brethren! May I inquire the subject matter of the discourse in which you seem so earnestly engaged?

Alethes. We have been commenting upon a conversation in the last number of the Harbinger. I suppose you have read it; for I know you are a reader both of it, and of the Advocate published at Richmond? Are you acquainted with their respective editors?

Tomaso. Yes, I have a personal knowledge of them both. He of the Harbinger is a very excellent man; of fascinating manners, and most esteemed by those who know him best.

Philo. Can you tell us the reason there is so much difference on many subjects between your two friends?

Tomaso. With the greatest ease in the world and no offence to either. The history of the men's lives solves the whole mystery if there be any. My friend of the Harbinger, you must know, is by birth an Irishman, and by education a Scotch Presbyterian. He was educated in a University in Scotland, the land itself of ghosts and witches, in all the mysticism of that gloomy sect. Hence he imbibed all their traditions, with which his mental constitution became thoroughly imbued. He is most accurately instructed in the "divinity" of John Owen, and other mystics; and I have heard him lament the time he lost while transcribing the scholasticisms of these Rabbis. Now, what I much admire in him is, the successful effort he has made in forcing his way through so many obstacles in order that he might occupy the Kingdom of Heaven. He has clearly set forth to the men of this age what is the true worship of God, and what the means he has appointed for the remission of sins. These things he has clearly proven. But, as he has himself remarked, I think, concerning others, "he still smells of the old cask." He has not succeeded in emancipating himself from all his popular divinity; hence every now and then, but more frequently of late, you find him standing up as the champion of human tradition, without indeed knowing it. He seems to manifest an undue sympathy with the sects of the Anti-Christian World; so that, I have reason to believe, he is rising in their estimation; at least, in these parts. Notwithstanding this, he is a man of great merit, and devotion to the truth as far as he knows it; and, therefore, deserves our unfeigned gratitude for what he has done and may yet do. As for my other friend of the Advocate, he has never been, cursed shall I say? with the poison of a theological education. His early years were spent in a private boarding school in England, and from his seventeenth to his twenty-fifth year among physic bottles, lecture rooms, and dead bodies. He knows, and he counts it his happiness, nothing about the writings of popular divines; nor did he ever trouble himself much about "divinity" of any kind, till about three years and a half ago, when he obeyed the gospel of our Divine Master. Since that time he has addicted himself to the incessant study of the scriptures. Not having had his mind perverted by human tradition, it just takes whatever impression the word may make upon it; like a blank sheet the impression of the printer's types. This is the true cause of the difference between them—the teacher of the one is the word of God alone; the teacher

of the other is compounded of popular divines and the masses. I need not marvel then that they come to such different conclusions.

Alethes. What is your judgment concerning this conversation of Thomas Goodall's?

Tomaso. In the general, I think, that my friend of the Harbinger has not done his reputation, as a reasoner, justice. He has descended to gossip; instead of conversing, as a man of his superior attainments, ought to have done, in an enlightened and dignified manner. He appears to me, to have written for the unthinking multitude, rather than for those who think for themselves, and who can be swayed only by scripture reasoning. In this design, no doubt, he will succeed. Indeed he might have saved himself the trouble of writing at all, for he has their credulous assent to begin with. My friend of the Advocate has a very unequal battle to fight; and nothing but the sheer force of truth will enable him to overcome. He has not only a powerful opponent to contend with, whose hints are laws to hundreds, (though this must be said it is contrary to his wish that it should be so; nevertheless such is the fact to a great extent, within the range of my acquaintance and that of others)—but he has the prejudices of all Christendom, Mohammedans, and Pagandom against him. The Romanist, to whom the Holy Scriptures are denied by his ghostly advisers, will condemn him; the Protestant, who contends that "the Bible alone is his religion," and yet scarcely studies a chapter in twelve months, will condemn him; the Mohammedan, who believes in the instantaneous translation of the "spirit" to Paradise, will condemn him; the worshippers of wood and stone, who have a Paradise of their own peculiar formation to which their spirits immediately depart on the extinction of life, will condemn him; the poor Indian of the forest, whose spirit goes, with the velocity of lightning, to a community of warriors, and to the fair hunting fields of his elysial abode, would tomahawk him, were he to question the sudden transfer of his ghost from the prairies and wilds of earth to the country of deer in heaven—and thus he would prove to him in a summary manner, that he was not only unfit to be "admitted into Christian company," but that he was unworthy of the society of the wildest Seminole. I say all these my friend has to contend against, and all these *enlightened* religionists, my excellent friend of the Harbinger, has to shout Amen at his back! Were I a caricaturist, I would sketch a "stripling" with a sling and stone on the one part; and I would have a giant with a double edged Spanish blade, encased in iron, having a huge crusader's lance in rest; and followed, at full charge, with a rout of Italians, Hollanders, Turks, Chinese, and Indians—honorable representatives of their respective faiths. You may easily guess what sort of a chance my stripling would have. You may infer my general opinion of the article from these remarks. I am not alone in these sentiments. But I will proceed to particularize. I pass over the classification of my friend with "the Paines and Youngs, and all that herd." I am persuaded his faith, for argument's sake, is nothing by a comparison with that of my other friend of the Harbinger, the object to the latter making his opinions of the contents of the Bible the standard of "admission into Christian company;" the rule of truth, or the measure by which to determine whether a doctrine is in accordance with the blasphemers of the Saviour of the true believers. In the case of the Thief on the Cross, because my friend of the Harbinger told us in his paper that he will make this the subject of a future number. I also pass over the case of the Rich Man and Lazarus, because my friend

commenced the examination of it. This only I would notice in relation to Lazarus in this place. *Mr. Wickliffe* says that "Lazarus died; but angels bore his spirit away to Abraham's bosom." This is a false quotation. *Jeaus* said—"It happened that the poor man died, and was conveyed, by angels, to Abraham's bosom." He said not a word about "his spirit" being borne by angels; it was Lazarus, not his spirit, pneuma, or breath. This is the way orthodox quotes the scriptures. It sees nothing in a text, but its own nostrums. He says that "there is a judgement immediately after death." That a man's destiny is fixed at death is unquestionable. But what, my friends, do you think is the proof adduced to prove this "immediately?" The descent of the Spirit on Pentecost by which it is affirmed Jesus was judged and declared righteous—though for myself, I was foolish enough to think, that he was "justified by the Spirit" (1 Tim. iii. 16) when "the Spirit raised up Jesus from the dead" (Rom. viii. 11) "for our justification as well as his own. But to return to this "immediate judgement." An event that happened *fifty days* after the death of Jesus, is adduced to prove his immediate judgement! Another proof is taken from Heb. ix. 27, where Paul says, "After death, judgement!" Now, brethren, is this proof to your minds? Does the fact of one thing being done *after* another demonstrate that it was done *immediately*? William I. conquered Harold in 1066, and after this Charles I. was beheaded. Shall we say that the latter event took place immediately after the former? To do so would be to falsify history, which declares that Charles was beheaded in 1649—583 years after. When Paul says "after death, judgement," we have as much reason to believe from the insulated passage or rather text, that "the judgement" would be 2,000 or 3,000 years after, as immediately. So much for Mr. Wickliffe on "immediate judgement."

Alethes The light in which you place the advocates of the pro and con. comes home to my mind with great force. It is indeed, as you say; the believers in an instantaneous translation of what they call the "immortal soul" to heaven, are—with few exceptions, your friend of Bethany, one of these of course,—the unthinking world; who know as much of the history of the inhabitants of the moon as they do of those Sacred Writings, which they insultingly call "a dead letter." They are consistent however; for they declare that they do not mean what they say. The Harbinger repudiates this dogma, but unfortunately, in this instance, at least, it makes the scriptures speak its own sentiments and the world's, not the truth as revealed by the Holy Spirit.

Philo. The immortality of the soul! Pray, Tomaso, shew me where this is taught in the scriptures of truth. The multitude believe it; but I never yet had much faith in the soundness of the opinions of even the majority, much less of all the world. As far as I am informed they have never been right yet on religious faith and practice.

Tomaso. I suppose you will except Noah's family after the flood? As to the immortality of the soul, in the popular sense of that phrase, it is no where taught in the Bible. It is a dogma of the Pagan philosophers, especially of Plato. It was adopted by Origen, and other corrupters of the Christian Church, as a revealed truth. The notion having been previously instilled into the minds of the Pagans by their priests and philosophers, when they became nominally Christian, they found the dogma in the Catholic Church in a new dress. They took it for granted that it was all true, and so perpetuated it from generation to generation until the Reformation of Popery, or rather the breaking up of Popery in certain countries into new and adverse forms, called in the aggregate

Protestant Sectarism. The sects forming this new ecclesiastical system adopted this tradition of their Mother Pagan-Christianism, *allegorizing* it: and thus we find it among us at the present day, the almost universal belief of the Christian and Anti-Christian Worlds. To such an extent has the poison of pagan philosophy diffused itself! The doctrine of the Bible, on the contrary, is THE CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY OF MAN. This is easy to be understood by those whose minds have not been poisoned by human tradition; and who are content to learn the religion of the Holy Spirit, as he has taught it in the Word.

Alethes. But what say you to the case of Moses? Mr. Wickliffe says he rests his argument for the proof of separate states upon this as though there were no other.

Tomaso. Let us see what Mr. Wickliffe makes of the case. Well then, he informs us that Moses descended to Mount Tabor and ascended from it in his *heavenly mansion*. This he repeats, in effect telling us that it was not Moses—either corruptible or incorruptible—but something between—a semi-incorruptible Moses, as it were;—that it was not “the man Moses,” in the sense of a man having flesh and bones, though freed from the corruptible principle, which all pathologists agree is the blood—that it was not such a person, but only an indefinable something “of Moses;” not a whole Moses, but only a part of him! With the profoundest respect for Mr. Wickliffe’s sagacity, yet, seeing that he has outrun the testimony of scripture, methinks that he must have had a special communication from heaven—a revelation from above of the kind so common in these days of Protestant special operations! Now I am led to judge thus from the fact, that he tells us what is no where told in the scriptures—that it was only an apparition upon Mount Tabor—“the ghost of Moses dwelling in his celestial tabernacle!”

Alethes. But, perhaps, he constructs this notion out of certain expressions of Peter and Paul. You know Peter talks of “putting off this tabernacle;”—and Paul speaks of “the earthly house of this our tabernacle;” and of being “invested with our heavenly mansion.” And in another place he uses the phrase “spirits of the just made perfect.” Now, out of these texts I think he may manufacture “a ghost in a heavenly mansion.”

Tomaso. No doubt, he may conjure up a ghost from these sayings with perfect ease, and to the entire satisfaction of the multitude; who judge according to the sound, not by the meaning of words in a sentence. All the magic necessary, is to interpret the passages according to the dogmas of the world’s priests. By this process of spiritual alchymy, “the ghost of Moses dwelling in his celestial tabernacle” may be readily evolved from the components aforesaid. Peter’s saying refers merely to his natural death. Now, when this event was about to happen to him, he might truly express himself as “putting off this tabernacle;” for he would never appear alive again with a mortal body under the present temporal constitution of human affairs. Paul says that “this mortal (body not a soul or ghost) shall put on immortality;”—“he who raised up Cephas from the dead, will make even your mortal bodies alive, by the power of his Spirit.” The mortal body is to be made alive and incorruptible, not through *Jehovah’s Spirit*; not by the fancied re-union of the ghost to a mortal body. When Peter rises from the dead, he will be in a mortal tabernacle—the name of the temporal or worldly house being applied to the tenant—that is, himself shall be made alive, and will hear the voice of his master calling him, and the rest of his brethren will come forth from the grave to enjoy life in an immortal state.

mansion, which he calls "a new heavens and earth, in which dwelleth righteousness;"—he will stand upon the earth again, a monument of God's grace more durable than brass, in the same body, that is, the same man, that he was when he stood before the Sanhedrim, only with this difference—that he will be no more subject to corruption, but freed, by being deprived of the corruptible principle, from all liability to decay or death. But I have said, he meant nothing more by this expression than his natural death. This is obvious, for in the 15th v. c. i. Ep. 2, he calls the putting off his tabernacle—"his decease." When he says "as long as I am in this tabernacle" he means, *as long as I am alive in this temporal state*. Now with these explanations read the 13th, 14th, 15th vs. and there will be found no mystery at all; and not the least allusion to ghosts.

Now, as to Paul's expressions, I would observe briefly, that they form a part of a train of argument extending from the 7th to the 15th v. of 2 Cor. c. iv. v. His main point is this, that believing he speaks; "knowing that he who raised up the Lord Jesus, will raise us up also by Jesus, and will present us ("earthen vessels," Paul and Timothy,) with you" (Corinthians.) Now, the knowledge of this truth, was matter of great consolation to them both, while they were "pressed on every side, but not straitened; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not utterly forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." But for all this, they did not faint, for though their "outward man" or body was impaired by these sufferings, their "inward man" or fortitude was renewed every day, by the contemplation of the great truth before recited, even their resurrection from the dead "by Jesus," with all the glory attendant upon that event; which he calls "an eternal weight of glory, great beyond expression" He concludes the fifth chapter by telling us, that he and Timothy were not aiming at the visible things of this present state, as the men of the world do, namely, at the honor, civil, military, and political fame, sordid wealth, and gross pleasures of time; but at the things unseen, which belong to the world or state to come, of which he speaks in Heb ii The reason of this was, that the present arrangement of things is merely provisional or temporal; that which is to obtain after the resurrection, in relation to those who have part in the first resurrection, is to endure perpetually or to be eternal.

These temporal and eternal things he designates in the next chapter, by other names. The *temporal* things he calls "*the earthly house of this our tabernacle*," not these our tabernacles—that is, *the provisional abode of Christians while subject to mortality and afflictions*:—the *eternal* things, on the contrary, being the antitheses to the temporal, he terms, a "heavenly mansion"—"a house not made with hands" as the cities, towns, and mansions of the living who must die, that is, the eternal abode of those Christians, who, while in the tabernacle or body of Christ on earth—the Church, under its temporal constitution as related to the *times of the Gentiles*—"persevere in well doing" to the end. Now, in the earthly house "we groan, being burdened"—that is, we have trouble and are persecuted. Living in the church or body of Christ here, the Apostle calls, being "at home in the body but absent from the Lord;" and he tells, what is very clear, that in this dwelling, tabernacle, or holy place on earth, "we walk by faith and not by sight," as we shall do, when we enter our "heavenly mansion" by a resurrection, from the dead. There we shall walk by sight and not by faith. Being in our heavenly mansion, he terms, as it really will be; for the Lord will be there "on the throne of David his father"—being "present with the Lord." Now, in view of the "eternal

weight of glory" which will obtain, when all enemies are put under the feet of Jesus, he desires to leave this troublesome provisional existence and order of things, knowing that the next thing of which he will be conscious, although he may sleep in hades for two thousand years, will be that he is "at home"—so that he will find, that where Jesus is, he is also. While a man is dead he is naked, having no habitation among the living; hence his introduction to the heavenly mansion is termed an *investment*. We are "divested" of our "earthly house," and "invested" with our celestial. The intermediate state is a condition of nakedness. "We desire not to be divested," says Paul, "but invested; that (in order or to the end that) mortality may be swallowed up of (or by) life" (eternal.) Now here *divestment and mortality* are the opposites of *investment and life*. How is life to swallow up mortality? *By Him who raised up the Lord Jesus, raising us up by Jesus, at the resurrection of the just* (c. v. v. 14.) Now, in view of this resurrection, &c. Paul concludes the passage I have indicated, with this exhortation to Christians—"The love of Christ constrains us, having judged thus—that if one has died for all, certainly all have died; and that he has died for all, that *they who live* (that is, the true believers) *should no longer live to themselves, but to him who has died and rose again for them.*" c. v. v. 15.

Alethes. I thank you for this exposition, Tomaso; I see nothing in the passages that teach the dogma of the investiture of ghosts with heavenly mansions!—But proceed.

Tomaso. Mr. Wickliffe can see nothing in the alleged death and burial of Moses, but the ordinary event that happens to all mankind, the exceptions alone excepted. He affirms positively that Moses died and was buried in the ordinary way. He says, he is certain that the "heavenly mansion" in which Moses is said to have appeared, was not his "glorified body." Of this he is confident; although the scripture makes no such affirmation, yet of this *he* is certain. He positively and without authority declares what the heavenly mansion is not, but he does not condescend to enlighten our darkness as to what it is. This is truly orthodox. He first assumes that it was "the ghost of Moses" and then he tries to prove it by attempting to show that the alleged "heavenly mansion" was not a glorified body. He says—"We are certain it was not because this happened before Jesus died, rose, and was glorified; and there could be no resurrection before the Resurrection and the Life." If the death and burial of Moses be entirely unfigurative, and exactly corresponding to the death and burial of common men, there will be some little difficulty in combatting this alleged proof. But, if it shall, on investigation, be found, that the "death and burial" of Moses was in reality a translation, differing only in manner from that of Elijah and Enoch, Mr. Wickliffe's position vanishes like a phantasma or as one of the favorite ghosts.

Philo. I beg pardon for interrupting you;—did you notice poor Reed's exclamation upon this "show of wisdom?"—"It is good for us to be here!" says she. "I will forgive the faults of this author for that he has occasioned." Alas, poor woman! she appears to be dumb in the midst of all Mr. Wickliffe's light, as to what the scripture tells us was said to Jesus, "it is good for us to stay here;" but I suppose that Peter, said this, not knowing what she said.

Tomaso. Probably she is an old lady, who must be content to believe herself of the restraint imposed upon her, for she is certainly not spoken since the beginning; and you know the manner of the world in which a certain interesting portion of our race must exist.

more important for us to examine the scriptures than to lose time by attending to Mrs. Reed's exclamations.

The circumstances of the alleged death of Moses, are contained in Deut. xxxiv. From certain capital marks in the text it is clear that this chapter was not written by Moses. In the first verse it says, that Moses having ascended from the plains of Moab to the top of Pisgah, one of the peaks of Nebo, opposite to Jericho, that the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan. And all Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah, to the utmost, or Mediterranean sea. This shows that the chapter was written after these tribes had effected a settlement in Canaan. Again, Moses could not be its writer, for it contains a notification of his alleged death and burial. It must have been written by some one who lived remote from the days of Moses; this is evinced by two expressions in the text—"no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day;" and, v. 10, "there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." These texts both imply distance of time from the era in which the events recorded transpired. Verse 10, shews that Joshua was not the writer, for no opportunity had occurred, for the appearance of a prophet, between the alleged death of Moses and his own. The chapter, from these considerations, does not appear to have been written by a contemporary of Moses. It is probable, that it was compiled by Ezra, who finished the book called by his name, about 1,000 years after the disappearance of Moses. Of the identical writer, however, we cannot speak with certainty.

Among the designs of the scribe, who appended this chapter to the writings of Moses, was that of recording the fact, that the personal Mediatorship of Moses, his connexion with the House of Israel as their leader, in brief, that his career in relation to the things of the Israelitic Age, terminated "in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor." Whoever this scribe or writer was, to him God either did not vouchsafe a particular account of the event, or, if he were acquainted with it, to a certain extent, he did not think proper to put it on record distinctly. He, therefore, appears to have recorded this dissolution of the connexion between Moses and Israel, in *dubious* language. That the language is dubious is obvious; for he does not say, that he died and was buried; but that "he (the Lord) buried him in a valley." Now, such an expression as this was never applied to the ordinary burial of any one before or since. The language, therefore, is remarkable; and covers something, which may, I think, be unveiled. Did no more light shine upon the case of Moses than is contained in the Old Testament we should be able to arrive at no certainty as to his destiny. We are indebted to the New Testament for extrication from doubt. The most remarkable passage in these writings is that in Jude, who says, concerning this event, "Michael, the Archangel, when contending with the Devil (he disputed about the Body, not the soul or spirit, of Moses) did not attempt to bring against him a reviling accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke you.'" Was this revealed to Jude by the Holy Spirit, or did he merely adopt the opinion of the Jewish Nation on the disappearance of Moses, by way of illustrating the subject on which he was writing? I am unable to determine. On the supposition that it was revealed to him, I cannot help inquiring whether it was a contest worthy of an Archangel to dispute with the Devil for the possession of a dead body, which modern sagacity says was buried in the ground and went to corruption? Mr. Wickliffe says, that Michael took this dead body in charge. Has Michael had this mortal and corruptible body in his cus-

today ever since the year 1451 before Christ? If the idea is borrowed from Jude from his countrymen, then it shows that they did not believe that Moses' was an ordinary death and burial. But, supposition aside, what can be meant by Michael and the Devil disputing which should possess the body of Moses? I would premise, that the Lord is often said to do personally what he does by his agents—the angels. In the 19th Exod. it says “the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai” when he gave the Law to Moses; but Stephen says it was an “Angel that spoke to him” on Mount Sinai; and again he tells the Rulers of the Jews, that they had “received the Law through ranks of messengers or angels.” Now, in conformity with this, I understand by the Lord talking with Moses on Pisgah, that Michael, the Angel of the Lord, said to him what is therein (Deut. xxxiv.) recorded. As to the Devil, it was customary with the Jews, when a person was punished with disease or death to say, that he was “delivered over to Satan;” because of the Devil having been the means by which sin, disease, and death were introduced into our world. Now, in this sense the Devil may be said to possess all the bodies that die. To bring “a reviling accusation against him” for all the evil he (Satan) has caused would not heal the breach; this, Michael very well knew, hence he “rebuked” him, and so extricated the body of Moses from his power—or from the power of that law of death, to which all men are subject, and of the enactment of which he was the remote cause—by translating him from the globe we inhabit to some other. Jude’s phraseology can in no sense be applied to persons who die in the common way. Michael, the great prince, the Messiah, will stand up for his saints at the end of the 1335 days, when he will deliver all their bodies from the custody of Satan, to speak figuratively; after which the law of death will no more bind them in chains of darkness to hades: but, till then, Michael has no contention with Satan on the subject. He has conquered death in his own person; the times are fixed; his contest is with his enemies whose generations are passing down to the regions of silence.

But notwithstanding all these considerations we should have had no certainty that Moses was translated, had not three of the New Testament Historians brought him forward under the true circumstances of his then present existence. As for David, we are certain he is not in heaven, but moulders in the earth; for Peter says that he (David) had not ascended to heaven; but as for Moses we are equally sure that he is. The facts are before us, and the simple language in which they are recorded; so that plain men of plain understandings cannot mistake, unless indeed they are perverted.

Jesus, with Peter, James, and John ascended a high mountain together. While on the top he was transfigured in their presence. His face shined as the sun. His garments became glittering, and were, like snow, of such a whiteness as no fuller on earth could imitate. Now, Mark says “two men of a glorious aspect, Moses and Elijah, conversed with him, and spoke of the departure, which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem;” he does not say “one man and the ghost of another, or of his father;” but “two men.” Every unsophisticated mind knows that there are no “ghosts” under any form. Luke says, that Peter, James, and John “saw his glory, and the two men, who stood with him;” Mark says that “it was the ghost of Moses with which Elijah conversed at the death and resurrection of Jesus;” but the scriptures are plain, “Moses and Elijah conversed with Jesus.” All the accounts of the transfiguration are very clear in their narrative of the facts, and that the three Apostles “saw” the two men; and Peter declared

to this event, that they had "not followed cunningly devised fables; but were eye-witnesses of his grandeur, when they heard the voice from heaven, being with him on the holy mountain." The whole was real; no apparitions or ghosts to mystify the scene. They saw the grandeur of Jesus, who was truly great on that occasion. Although the two men, Moses and Elijah, were of glorious aspect; he was more glorious: for, in addition to the splendor with which he was clothed, Jehovah announced again to these future pillars of the Church, that this most glorious personage they beheld, was his "Beloved Son," whom they were in future to "hear," for the glory and authority of the Israelitic Institution, of which Moses was the Mediator, and Elijah the Restorer, were passing away. It is no where hinted in the writings of Peter, James, or John that "it was the ghost of Moses dwelling in his celestial tabernacle." But what is the heavenly mansion of a ghost if a glorified body is not? Can popular divinity help us out of this difficulty?

Mr. Wickliffe says "there could be no resurrection before the Resurrection and the Life." This is contrary to Scripture. There were several resurrections before that of Jesus, though it is probable, they all died again. Of this we are informed only inferentially. Samuel rose again; the Shunamite's son was restored to life; the dead man, who was laid in Elisha's sepulchre, as soon as he touched the Prophet's bones came to life again. If any argument might be drawn from this, it would go to prove that there is more spirit in bones than believers in dead men's ghosts are aware of; and that it really was Elisha himself in the sepulchre. But upon this I will not insist. In the New Testament, Jairus' daughter, the son of the widow of Nain, and Lazarus were all raised from the dead.

Philo. I should like Mr. Wickliffe to answer this question—If, as he says of Moses in effect, that the ghost of a man, as soon as he dies, goes instantaneously to "the abodes of bliss," what did the messenger of God mean when he said to Daniel—"Go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the (1335) days?" I should like to see how he would gloss this over!

Alethes. Let us hear what a Jew, who was contemporary with the Apostles, and an adherent of the Law, says concerning the case of Moses. We may be sure he will not speak in the language of the popular theology of our day.

"Now," says Josephus (lib. iv. c. viii. p. 97,) "as he (Moses) went thence to the place where he was to vanish out of their sight, they (the Israelites) all followed after him weeping, but Moses beckoned with his hand to those remote from him, and bade them stay behind in quiet, while he exhorted those who were near him that they would not render his departure so lamentable. Now as soon as they were come to the mountain called "Abarim" (which is a very high mountain situate over against Jericho, and one that affords to such as are upon it a prospect of the greatest part of the excellent land of Canaan) he dismissed the senate: and as he was coming to embrace Eleazer and Joshua, and was still discoursing with them, a cloud stood over him on the sudden, and he disappeared in a certain valley, although it is written in the holy books that he died, which was done out of fear, lest they should venture to say, that because of his extraordinary virtue, he went to God."

Philo. I confess you have made it clear to my mind, that the case of Moses was that of a translation and not an ordinary death. Mr. Wickliffe's argument, therefore, founded on the resurrection of Jesus amounts to nothing. It is undeniable that Elijah was translated; and to me, the

circumstance of Moses appearing on Tabor in his company, and speaking of them both as two men, making no difference between them, is convincing that the only real discrepancy in their cases is *not* in the manner, and not to the fact, of their translation. Moses' translation unobserved by human eye, and, therefore, was not recorded explicitly; whereas, Elijah's was witnessed by Elisha, and, therefore, the circumstances became publicly known. The departure of Moses had all the force of a death in relation to the Institution of which he was the Mediator, and to the congregation of Israel. And as to bury is to conceal, cover from view, put out of sight, &c. I see no good reason why the phrase "he (the Lord) buried him in a valley in the land of Moab" should not be understood as signifying, that the Lord took him in some way; or translated him unobserved at that place. I consider the whole affair a translation; and the fact of his re-appearance on the mountain as a man, proves it. I agree with Mr. Wickliffe, that "the first born" if the phrase means, indeed, the first that came from a sepulchre not to return again; may refer to his pre-eminence—from the dead was to be Jesus. Now, Moses could not be born from among the dead, if he was never deposited in their chamber.

Alethes. Mr. Payne is but a lame defender of your Richmond friend Tomaso! He does not seem to understand the matter at all. I would advise him, as well as the rest of the company, to make themselves better acquainted with both sides of the question before they set up for critics, or presumed to be so lavish of their unfledged opinions. Mr. Payne says, absurdly enough, that the Advocate "distinctly affirms that soul, body, and spirit, *all* go down to the grave, and sleep there to the resurrection." This, I undertake to say, must be a most unfounded assertion; for, as I understand him, it is man's *inanimate* material that goes to the grave; to say that he went there body, soul, and spirit, would be to affirm that men are buried alive! There are but two conditions in which a man can be, in relation to this matter—*either dead or alive*. . . And this is what he seems to contend for. Am I right, Tomaso?

Tomaso You are; and as to the rest, I must say, I incline very much to the same judgement. The spirit of the family circle is to seize hold of the most vulnerable sentence, and by an unfavorable construction, to prejudice all to whom their sentiments may come. The proper course for these good folks to have adopted would have been to let the author of the obnoxious articles speak for himself. They have plenty of room in the vehicle of their opinions. They have devoted ample space to criticize, satirise, and to hold him up to public reprobation; the least, therefore, they could have done in equity would have been first to have inserted his replies to Mr. Flippo in full; and then to have made comment upon them. If they could not do this, they ought then to have said nothing at all. If they proceed in the way they have begun they will lead their hearers to judge an unrighteous judgement concerning the matter at Richmond. My motto is *let justice be done though the heavens fall*.

Philo. These family friends should remember that some of our acquaintances think for themselves, and can put a just estimate on words and things.

Alethes. Yes, my Philo, and *truth before party* ought to be ever impressed on our minds. We are to prove *all things* and to hold fast that which is good. Names may be authority with some, but there is no proof in them: when truth, therefore, is to be sought, authority ought not to be *who* says it, but *what* is said. Let them remember this.

Tomaso. Agreed! Let us hope, that though my two friends differ as to what is truth in this instance, they will both improve in all topics upon which they may come in contact for the good of all, both in their knowledge thereof, mutual forbearance, and good feeling. Wise men love truth for herself, nor do they esteem each other less because the one or the other may be mistaken. Of fools there is no hope. Farewell till we meet again. EDITOR.

THE IRONIST.

I, with an air, dissemble quite,
And with a pungent spirit write;
One thing declare, another mean,
And thus men's errors oft unscreen.

A person speaks too pointedly when he speaks too much to the point.

A discourse is very severe, very harsh, and very bitter, when it is very true.

"To do harm" is to speak the truth plainly, without regard to consequences.

If a matter surpass one's own conception, or the limits of one's own knowledge, to reveal our own superior penetration, and to ward off the suspicion of our own ignorance, we must impeach it as *speculative* and *untaught*; and so shall we bring it into disrepute with the unthinking commonalty, and secure the mead of their praise to our own wisdom.

If an opponent's arguments be inconvenient or unacceptable, and you would parry, without denying, them and so weaken their impression, attribute their seeming force to ultraism, a sanguine and ardent temperament, a proneness in human nature to extremes, to youth, or to a want of experience, and you will detract from them at least fifty per cent.; for these *ad captandum* considerations, weigh more with the popular mind than demonstrations as conclusive as Sir Isaac Newton's.

They are, for the most part, "*great men*," who echo the sentiments, and astound the faculties of *little men*.

If we judge of modern prayers by their length, breadth, confusedness, frequent repetitions, loudness, and fervency, they are certainly more pious, wiser, and more acceptable to God, than either those of Jesus or his Apostles. And, on the contrary, if we judge by the entire absence of prayer on the part of great numbers of professors, assuredly God is pleased best by no acknowledgement of his sovereignty at all.

A question is untaught when U and I have never been taught it by the wise men of *our* Goshen! EDITOR.

"A LITERARY CURIOSITY."

MY DEAR ANDREW,—The above is the caption of an article from your pen, as I am *credibly* informed, which appeared in the Herald of April 29th. It contains what you would call a *cri-*

tique on the 51st Psalm, as thrown into metre by me, signed by the very modest signature of "Crito." You hear this announcement, and your face becomes flushed with indignation? Yet it is true; and "Crito" is the veritable St. Andrew of Sparta! This you cannot deny. Well then, Andrew Broaddus Crito, i. e. Andrew Broaddus the critic, since you cannot successfully conceal yourself, and like a Seminole, attack your opponents from behind a bush, a tree or other hiding place, let me advise you in future to come out manfully and sign your own name to what you write. I can easily excuse your cowardice; for, I doubt not, that by this time, your name having been so long associated with the defence of human tradition and establishments spiritually rotten, you are thoroughly ashamed to see it in print. But Andrew, the principle is the same—to criticize men and things under a feigned signature in the manner you and others do those, who fear not to march under their true colours—is like the attack of an assassin who fires at his victim from behind a bush. When I read the article, I divined that you were the "divine" who was concealed under the name of Crito; I am now sure upon good testimony, and as I said before, you cannot deny it. Shall I tell you why I suspected you?—It was this—you have recently sold to a bookseller in this city the copyright of a new compilation of traditions in rhyme, called the "Virginia Selection of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs," composed by "Watts, Wesley, Cowper, Montgomery, and Kirk White," &c. all members of the Apostacy at large! Now I thought you were very likely to be the champion of your own craft—that, I mean, of the Hymn-Book-Makers. This was natural, for there was no telling to what extent I might prejudice the sale of your "spiritual" ware; and *self defence* my Andrew, you know, is the first law of nature at all times; at least so say the militant professors of the day.

I trust, Andrew, you are a "total abstinence" man; but I confess to you, that after reading your note to your Bro. Sands, I have my doubts. Are "sense" and "mellifluous sounds" synonymous with you? Can you find no "mellifluous, nervous, and majestic" ideas in the *prose* Psalms of David? The *fifty-first* is neither my composition nor my translation. Dare you ridicule the "mellifluous, nervous, and majestic sense" of the Holy Spirit?—As to the translation, you are incompetent to judge of that. Now the Psalm, as in the Advocate, is almost literally as translated from the Hebrew into distichs by Mr. G. B. Norton. I pretend neither to poetry of language nor of arrangement there. All I have done, or attempted to do, was to break the distichs up into verses of four metrical lines containing in them eight syllables in each line, which is long enough for them to be read as a good reader would read prose. It should not suit your ear, nor that of the multitude, to be so strange. You are all accustomed to sing some of the

all sing any thing that comes to hand without thinking;—lies and truths all jumbled together, with rhyme enough, but without reason. If David's compositions were adopted as the psalmody of congregations, there would be an end to all your revivals; as soon as the people begin to sing sense instead of nonsense in dignified melody, not like the lullaby-baby-tunes of the day, there is an end to all your fanaticism. You know this Andrew, and therefore, true to your character of Hymn-Book Maker to the Baptist Apostacy you start up to ridicule the attempt to introduce the Psalms as the psalmody of the Church.

Your Selection is well suited to the spiritual intelligence of the Virginia Baptists. As their worship is altogether will-worship, they may as well sing the traditions of men as any thing else; and perhaps better; for they would only desecrate the Songs of Holy Spirit written by David. Now, reflect on the impiety of a Church of Christ singing your songs—songs composed, not by inspiration, but by Rabbi Watts an Independent, Master Wesley a Methodist, Cowper, a half cracked Episcopalian, Kirk White a Presbyterian, &c.; to these may be added, for aught I know, "the Dying Christian" by Pope a Romanist, and others by Andrew Broaddus a Baptist! What a meddly. Not a Christian among them. Poets and rhymesters of every section of the Apostacy laid under contribution for a psalmody for the Church of Christ. Hear it! Apostles and Prophets, and all ye who sang the songs of Zion to beguile your toils, to celebrate your triumphs, to express your hopes, or to worship the King of Israel—the Great Jehovah!—Tell it not to them, who shall hereafter sing the song of Moses and the Lamb; publish it not in the coming age, that the Church of Christ, the Lamb's wife, sang the traditions of the Great Apostacy!

You do not like *ryhme* and *rhythm* being placed in such near relationship as I have them. Well, my Crito, do you think there can be much difference between them, seeing that they both come from the same Greek noun—*ρhythmos*, *rhythmos* a rule! In a certain sense rhyme is not rhythm though rhythm may be rhyme. But sustained by this derivation, the *reforming poet*, as you term me, though I never yet pretended to be a poet,—my poetical pretensions are a fiction of your own creation—he will smile, I say, at your insinuation. In compiling the Hymn-Book of which you are just delivered, I doubt not, you have acquired by the habit of repeating the rhymes, an inveterate *ningum jingum flingum* sort of cadenza in your head, which prevents you reading the 51st Psalm according to the sense and punctuation instead of the sound. Indeed, the Poineer says, as the Herald quotes it, "most preachers educated or uneducated men, are miserably poor readers;" now this is very true and I dare say fits your case exactly; I wonder not therefore, that my metrical 51st should appear to you all you say of it.)

But, Andrew, were you afraid to let me speak for myself?—If

you were not, why did you publish the psalm without the argument at its head, and the notes at its foot? I am not surprised, that you should trumpet forth your ignorance of the meaning of these divine odes by three notes of astonishment after "person," at the end of your lucubration. I should have been more astonished had you coincided with me in my application of what you suppose to be merely expressive of penitence for David's own sins, to the Messiah's priestly confession of the sin of the world for which he suffered as the sin-offering. Could David say, without lying to the searcher of hearts, "against thee, thee only, have I sinned?" How truly may it be said of the Messiah, that he was born in iniquity when he was born of a mortal woman:—had he been born of a pure immortal being, he would not have been conceived in sin; and had he not been born under the circumstances celebrated in this ode, he could not have confessed and expiated the sins of the world. But, says the Master, throw not your pearls before swine, nor give things holy unto dogs; not, my friend, that I would call you either swine or dog; but I fear your mind is too darkened by prejudice and human tradition to discern any thing in the psalms diverse from the opinions of "popular divines" or the dogmata of your sect. That you may be delivered from such thralldom is the worst wish of your friend,

THE EDITOR.

To "Rev." Andrew Broaddus.

North Garden, Feb. 25, 1836.

DR. JOHN THOMAS:

Dear Sir,—Though not a member of the same Church with you, I shall venture to ask a few questions for information, and as it is a subject equally interesting to others, I shall seek an insertion in your paper and request an answer through the same medium.

I am "a Baptist," and though I differ with you on various subjects, yet I have been long desirous of asking your reflections on certain points. Till now I have been kept from writing to you by the exceedingly harsh and censorious manner in which you have dealt with us "poor Baptists!" This consideration has frightened off from your ranks many who were it not for this might have been led away! But of this I am not disposed to complain; for candor compels me to say that with my peculiar views of your system, whatever tends to drive from your ranks is deemed by me a *Providential interposition*, to give the *destroying mare*. You will excuse the above, and candidly speak my sentiments. I do not however wish to be understood as insinuating that you are insincere; on the other hand, I believe you honest. There is a species of views which sometimes unsettles my own mind, and which I know them to be void of scriptural support. That I shall be able to establish in some future essay.

For the present, I shall broach a subject accompanied by a few questions. The subject I propose is this: "The work of the holy spirit in the salvation of sinners." If I understand your sentiments on this doctrine; you deny any other spiritual influence in the conversion of men, than the motives, arguments, &c. embodied in the words of the Holy Spirit as found on the pages of the Old and New Testaments. Do I rightly represent you? Supposing this to be your view, I respectfully propose the following questions. Is the written word sufficient to convince and subdue the carnal mind? Does not the depravity of the human heart argue its insufficiency? Does not the whole history of conversions recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, argue the necessity of *divine interposition* (other than the word) in order to the conversion of men? How will you explain the following texts?—I can only refer you and your readers to them, hoping they will look them out and fully consider them. John, the 6th ch. 44 v.—Acts 14, 15.—Rom. 8, 7.—1 Cor. 2, 14—1 Cor. 12, 3. Now I wish a distinct notice paid to each of the passages referred to above. If you can prove to me that they do not teach the doctrine which I contend, then am I prepared to suspect the correctness of all other passages now viewed by me as plainly teaching the necessity of the *personal and immediate work* of the Holy Ghost in the salvation of sinners. But it does seem to me that the arguments and considerations growing out of the above questions and passages of Holy Writ are sufficient to establish my position in the mind of every enlightened and unbiassed man. Permit me to say that although I feel fully assured of the correctness of my views on this subject and of the erroneousness of yours, that I am nevertheless open to conviction. Neither prejudice, self-conceit, or the fear of Ecclesiastical powers shall ever seal my ears that I shall not hear, or silence my inquiries that I shall not learn. I am very well aware, Sir, that many who agree with me in sentiment are yet afraid to encounter the "Reformers." Not so with me, I have nothing to fear, nothing to lose; neither reputation, salary or friends—I am willing to risk all for the truth.

TIMOTHY.

TO TIMOTHY.

DEAR SIR,—What a pity that my "harsh and censorious manner" should have frightened you and your brethren of the Baptist confraternity! What a calamity that "this consideration" should have prevented them from becoming "Campbellites" or "Reformers!" You very much remind me of certain persons among the disciples of Jesus, who told them that "unless they eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood they had not life in them," who, having heard it, said, "this is *hard doctrine*; who can understand it?" This consideration was the cause that, "from this time many of his disciples withdrew, and

accompanied him no longer." And of those Scribes, Pharisees and Lawyers too, whom he "frightened off from his rank" when he denounced them in so "exceedingly harsh and censorious a manner" as he did upon frequent occasions: I have indeed, severely handled your *priests* and *principles*. I have endeavored to put them in their true light that you, the people might open your eyes to the presumptuous incompetency of the former, and to the contradictory, erroneous, and in many instances, absurd character of the latter. I have tried your *priests* (for, in effect, they pretend to *mediate* between you and God) by the word of God which has found them wanting. The Master, whose willing slave I am, tells me to "beware of false teachers," and gives me a rule by which I may know them. "By their fruits you shall discover them." I have compared their fruits or actions with those developed in the lives of the *true* teachers left on record in the New Testament. I find they are entirely different—as dissimilar as good and evil. I find they are like the Scribes and Pharisees who sat in Moses' seat, who said but did not—binding heavy and intolerable burdens on the shoulders of other men. Read the 23d of Matthew and you have their characters to the life. As there was a Nicodemus among a host of Pharisees, so there may be upright ones among your priests. There are exceptions to every rule. These things I have found; and prompted by a love of liberty (not of licentiousness) and a love to my neighbor, I have warned my readers to "beware of false teachers, who come in the garb of sheep while inwardly they are ravening wolves." And for this you and your fellows instead of thanking me heartily, complain of my harshness and censoriousness! How ungrateful you are! Well, this is the way the people reward their benefactors; so I suppose we must be content.

As to the *principles* of your sect these I have handled severely. Admitted; and truly they deserve no quarter. Jesus and his Apostles are my dearest friends, whom having not seen I love. Any principles I meet with that tend to the subversion of their doctrine I attack by all lawful means. Some principles, if such they can be called, are below reason; and deserve only to be reduced to an absurdity by the shortest cut. No doubt you think these short cuts harsh and censorious. But remember, my dear sir, the fable of the man and his ass; I know I cannot write to please every one, much less those whose principles are the subject of dissection; therefore, enlightening and understanding by the word of truth as I best can, I write to please myself. Six classes of persons will not approve my politics; first, those whose principles or traditions are opposed; secondly, the disciples of expediency; thirdly, the unthinking; fourthly, those who are in doubt as to the validity of the scriptures; fifthly, those who are ignorant of the scriptures; and sixthly, professors who are in league with the world.

brought to the test of the principles they profess. All these will hue and cry with you how harsh and censorious he is!

But, Mr. Timothy, how inconsistent you are. You condemn my harshness and censoriousness, and yet you are so harsh and censorious as to call "my system," as you term it, a "destroying snare;" an escape from which must be attributed to a "providential interpretation." Now, if God has interposed to deliver or save the Baptist people from my snare, it is presumable that "my system" is "the snare of the Devil." O, my Timothy, how uncharitable—how harsh and censorious you are. *Inferentially* to denominate "my system" Devilish! Now, with all your censure, I think it would puzzle you to tell me what "my system" is? I have no religious system of my own. God has developed a magnificent scheme of things in the Bible; this I believe and teach according to the best of my understanding; and beyond this, you know, we cannot go. However, I "excuse" you as you request.

"The subject you propose for inquiry is "the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of sinners." Do you know what is meant by this phrase? It is one of sectarian coinage, current in all the provinces of Babylon. What period of the Christian Dispensation does it refer to? Do you want to know how sinners attained to a belief of the truth in the days of miracles; or how they attain to it in these days? You ought to have stated this; for the circumstances of the two periods differ essentially. I will tell you what the Holy Spirit had to do when the Apostles had to make known the glad tidings to a Persian audience. He had to enable the Apostles to speak in the Persian language; he had to suggest to them what they should say; and he had to enable them to work miracles to confirm what they said as a message from heaven. By enabling the Apostles to do these things he enabled the Persian hearers to believe the truth. But mark well, that the "physical operation," as Baptists and others term it, affected the tongues and brains of the Apostles, not of their hearers. Unless the Holy Spirit had confirmed what the Apostles said, the Persians could not have believed their word; for, no man, in his senses, would believe the *assertions* of a stranger, as to the resurrection from the dead of an unknown person, by submitting to whose commands immortality might be obtained, unless God should confirm his assertions by some indisputable exercise of his omnipotence, commonly called a *miracle*. In those days the Old Testament was unknown to the Gentiles at large, and the New Testament, which exhibits the fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets in relation to Jesus, was not compiled; so that the *written word* was not *then* the instrument for convincing the minds of men of sin, righteousness, and judgement to come. Wisdom and knowledge were imparted then to certain called *spiritual men* by *suggestion*, not for their private benefit alone, but for the advantage of all, the brethren,

called also private persons; it was given in answer to prayer with the imposition of hands; but often in answer to prayer alone. If you bear this in mind, it will enable you to understand much of the New Testament.

You ask this question—"Is the written word sufficient to convince and subdue the carnal mind. In maintaining the contrary, "you err not knowing the scriptures." Paul and David will answer this question in my stead. I coincide with them in all they say. *All scripture given by inspiration of God is indeed profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*—"The law (doctrine) of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure making wise the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the eyes." Ps. xix. 7. Let me now ask you a question—*If the scripture can teach, reprove, correct, instruct in righteousness, make perfect, thoroughly furnish to all good works, restore the soul, make wise the simple, rejoice the heart, and enlighten the eyes—is it necessary for the Holy Spirit to do more in preparing a man for salvation from his sins?* Not having room to spare, I cannot go more into detail at this time.

EDITOR.

A College—School of the Preachers—Co-operation Meeting.

In the last number of the Harbinger two brethren announce, that there will be a meeting at Louisville, Kentucky, on September 28th, to be composed of delegates from the congregations in the West; for the purpose of concocting a scheme by which a college may be reared in the vicinity of that or some other town, for the education of youth in the several departments of History and Natural Philosophy.

There is also in existence a "School of the Preachers." This perhaps would be an advantageous appendage to the College. Only consider how important it is that the teachers should know more than the people taught. It might be very convenient, therefore, to give them the benefit of a college education; and then upon this foundation of "gold, silver and precious stones" to build a superstructure of polite and monism. How remarkable the fitness of things! First the college, next the church, and then the school. Educate the boy, convert him, and then make him an eloquent preacher. No one need fear that he will act the clergyman afterwards! Human nature is much more refined and far more humble than it was in days of old!

There is likewise another institution of infinite merit, called a "Co-operation Meeting." I. e. an Association, under a different name. Its General Meeting is composed of delegates or messengers from thirteen churches. Its administration

General Meeting to another are conducted by a *committee* of thirteen, of which any three constitute a *quorum*. It has a Treasurer, and a Corresponding Secretary. Thus organized it fulfils all the functions that a Church of Christ alone has a right to do in relation to its evangelists. We would suggest the probable expediency of placing both the College and the School for Preachers as well as the Evangelists of the Church under the superintending and fostering care of this Co-operating Institution!

The Apostacy of ancient times grew up imperceptibly like a blade of grass or the forest tree. Things deemed expedient by the wise and learned, and harmless by the multitude were tolerated by believers, then patronized, and at last perverted to the building up of an ecclesiastical system that has ruined the world. One of the greatest evils that ever scourged the Church of Christ was the College at Alexandria in Egypt. It inundated it with a flood of vain philosophy—a mixture of Platonism and truth—from the poisonous effects of which we are still suffering. We exhort the brethren to vigilance. The excellent persons who have given birth to these schemes among us are no doubt actuated by the purest desire of benefiting their contemporaries, and posterity. This is laudable; but who can say that these infant ecclesiastical institutions shall not hereafter be perverted by ambitious men to their own sinister ends? Let us watch then with a jealous eye these inceptive measures to a new Sectarian Establishment.

EDITOR.

THIS CANNOT BE CONFUTED.

A man must *know* what the gospel is before he can believe it;—he must *believe* it before he can obey it; and he must *obey* it before it can *save* him from his sins.

A FEW SYLLOGISMS.

1. A genuine faith is the belief of the written testimony of God;

Vast numbers of professors have neither *heard* nor *read* this testimony, because their spiritual guides do not teach or lay it before them, nor do they read it for themselves, seeing that they all esteem it a “dead letter,” a sealed book, and inadequate to the “conversion” of men;

Therefore, being ignorant of it, their “faith” is not genuine, because not the belief of the written testimony of God.

2. Belief of the written testimony of God is necessary to baptism;

But great numbers of the Baptist people have not this belief;

Therefore, though immersed, as brother Campbell truly

says, their "immersion is no better than a Jewish ablu-
—they are not baptized.

3. Men must believe and be baptized to be saved or
doned;

Some believe, but refuse to be baptized;
Therefore, they will not be saved or pardoned.

4. Men must be pardoned here on earth, upon God's abso-
lute conditions, before they can enter heaven;

But the many refuse these conditions, by substituting their
own;

Therefore, the many will not enter Heaven or the King-
dom of Glory.

5. Men must be born of water and the Spirit in order to
enter the kingdom of God;

But many refuse to be born of water;

Therefore, many, though begotten of the Spirit's testi-
mony to a belief of the truth but will not obey it, will never
enter the Kingdom of God.

EDITH

From the Journal and Luminary.

WHAT KIND OF A PLACE IS HEAVEN?

If we were to judge of the nature of a Moslem's heaven, from his conduct in life, we should rightly suppose that sensuality would be the spring of all his expected joys. If we were to form an idea of a Christian's heaven by the same rule, what kind of a place would it be? And since the church is the light of the world, and the only living, active depository of heavenly principles, may we not justly look upon it, as an index to the pursuits and enjoyments of its members in a future state! Heaven, then, (being the consummation of their most ardent desires on earth) will be a place where each one shall have as much money as he wants. Now, and then one, to be sure, will have freedom from sin, and holiness of heart, as the objects for which his soul longed: "What shall I eat?" And "what shall I drink?" Will be the interesting inquiries which shall pass through the unnumbered throng. Some indeed, from choice will be content with "angel's food," and to drink of the "new wine," which the "Prince shall give them." They shall be clothed in white robes; but most of them shall be cambric or satin, instead of righteousness.

It will be a place where God shall be worshipped, not as they can spare time—once in seven days at least. When they meet for worship, all will come who can conveniently. As nearness to God was never their ruling desire, they will probably not have their "solemn assembly" before the throne, nor before it, "but some where, where they will sit up or kneel down, give a correct sound to musical instruments,

have a precious time in sleep without being interrupted by the "light of God's countenance," or the rebuke of his eye. Some indeed will always be seen at the foot of the "great white throne," singing with melody in their hearts a new song which they had partially learned on earth. Heaven will be a place open to theological discussion. While some will rejoice to learn Him who was meek and lowly, and will delight to talk of the Saviour's love, others will be earnestly engaged in making others see, and think, and act, just as they do on the minor points of divine truth. "If ye do his will, then shall ye know of the doctrine," is not the way in which they decide doubtful disputation.

As few people are more diligent in business, (I dont say fervent in spirit, serving the Lord) than church members while on earth, heaven will doubtless be a place of great activity, industry, and enterprize. And as they are to live forever, how they will heap up gold and silver and add house to house—avarice also, growing stronger and stronger with increased possession, how they will love their riches and delight themselves in abundance of wealth! Now sir, if I have been correct in supposing that the desires of Christians in a future state will differ only in degree, not in nature, do you think that those who dont belong to the church would have any objection to the society or employment of heaven?

NOTICE.

That this number might not be occupied entirely with the subjects of the foregoing dialogue, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is deferred. Also Brother J. Henshall's dialogue.

AN IMPORTANT QUERY.

"BROTHER THOMAS,—May it not be well to ask all your readers, how long it has been since they first heard the Ancient or Apostolic Gospel? The 'Reformers' are contending warmly by their Evangelists for the Gospel proclaimed on Pentecost: may it not be well to ask them, if *they* have ever obeyed it? and, if they have not, by what authority do they enjoy the forgiveness of their sins? Why so much about Ancient Gospel, as different from Modern Gospel, if we, if all do not obey it? Jesus gave to his Apostles the power of remitting sins, but he gave this power in *the* GOSPEL, for 'the Gospel is the power of God to salvation to every believer' of that one, Ancient, and Apostolic Gospel." A. A.

If brethren afar off desire to be informed of the state of the church in this city, we reply, that it never was more healthy, though a little diminished in bulk.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

AND

PROPHETIC INTERPRETER

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D. and D.D.

VOL. 3. RICHMOND, Va., JULY 1, 1836.

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words, and seal the book to the times of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. * Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall not be so; and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall stand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION,

AS REVEALED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the third month after the Exodus from Egypt, Jehovah spake unto Moses in these words—"Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." *Exod. xix. 5, 6.* To this the people replied, "All that the Lord hath said, we will do." Thus, it was covenanted or agreed between Jehovah and the house of Israel, that He should be their King, and they his obedient subjects. This covenant formed the basis of that economy, commonly known as the Mosaic; because it was appointed by the hand of Moses, the mediator thereof. Had Israel not agreed to obey, they would have been rejected as a peculiar treasure, above all people; their continuance in obedience, was the condition of all their temporal prosperity. Many, however, were their provocations; great the long-suffering and forbearance of Jehovah; but their rebellion at length attained its height. The land which he dwelt was defiled; because they transgressed the commandments of the ordinance, and broke the covenant. In consequence of which they were punished with the sword and captivity in Babylon. After seventy years they were restored to their own land; but never, of their temporal prosperity under the Mosaic dispensation, meridian of the Holy City and Temple, which was determined to its going down. Four hundred and ninety years, according to 458th before the birth of Jesus, determined for its destruction.

circumstances of the rebellious house of Jacob as the peculiar treasure of Jehovah; and numbered the days of this ancient institution. The last seven years of this period, Jehovah appointed for the confirmation of another covenant, which was to take the place of the Mosaic institution, (Dan. ix. 27.) which by this time having decayed and become old, being about 1500 years of age, was ready to vanish away. Heb. viii. 13.—Jehovah also foretold to the Jews by Jeremiah, that the time would come when he would make a New Institution with the house of Israel, but different from that which he made with their fathers, when he brought them out of Egypt. Jer. xxxi. 31, 34. This New Institution was founded upon a different basis to that of the Old. The latter, we have seen, was based on a mutual compact between Jehovah and Israel; but the former is founded on the promise made to Abraham 480 years before the old covenant or the law was given from Sinai. Luke i. 67. 79; Gal. iii. 17.

The confirmation of this New Institution—*new* in its development, but old in its origination—devolved on John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth. These two important personages occupied seven years in confirming the covenant with many of the Jews. The former was engaged for upwards of three years and a half in 'bringing back many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God'—in reconciling fathers to their children, and by the wisdom of the righteous, rendering the disobedient, a people well disposed for the Lord, and in preparing his way, by giving the knowledge of salvation, through the baptism of reformation for the remission of their sins. Luke i. ii. iii. to v. 5. Jesus occupied the rest of the seven years in confirming his pretensions to the Messiahship by miracles; and in instructing twelve of his disciples in the secrets of the New Institution, so that they might be qualified to set it up in the world after his departure. This Jesus is the prophet to whom we are to hearken, (Deut. 18. 18.) and concerning whom Jehovah declared from the cloud—*This is my son, the beloved; in whom I delight: HEAR HIM.* Matth. xvii. 5. When the ministry of Jesus ended, that of the twelve began, having an interval only of fifty days between them. To this interval, and to other things connected with it, we would now direct the attention of the reader.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTLES.

Jesus, though sinless himself, was put to death for the offences of the world: On the third day he was raised from the dead by the spirit or power of God: After his resurrection he appeared to many persons at different times, and in divers places, during forty days. He submitted himself to their inspection, so that they might be thoroughly assured that it was the same Jesus whom the Jews had put to death, by a crucifixion. Among these persons were the Apostles, whom he had chosen to be the witnesses of the things pertaining to his life, death, resurrection, ascension and doctrine. Before he was removed

from this planet, he assembled them together, and gave them full power to remit sins, to teach, and to give laws to the people, saying—*All authority is given to me in heaven and on earth*; in virtue of which he ordered them to “*Go and teach all nations*,” in the following manner,—*by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, TEACHING THEM TO OBSERVE ALL THE THINGS WHICH I HAVE COMMANDED YOU.*—Matt. xxv. 19, 20.

“*Whatever village or city you enter*,” said Jesus, on a future occasion, to these same Apostles, inquire what person of worth dwells there, and abide with him until you leave the place. *Wheresoever they will not receive you, nor regard your words, departing from that house or city, shake the dust off your feet.* Indeed, I say to you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrah will be more tolerable on the day of (its political) judgment, than the condition of that city. When they deliver you up (to councils,) be not anxious how, or what you shall speak: *for what you shall speak, shall be suggested to you in that moment.* For it shall not be you that shall speak; but the Spirit of my Father, who shall speak by you. What I tell you in the dark, publish in the light; and what is whispered in your ears (see 1 Sam. 9. 15. on this phrase,) proclaim from the house tops. *HE THAT RECEIVES YOU, RECEIVES ME; and he who receives me, receives Him who sent me.*—Matt. x.

To Peter, one of the Apostles, he said—*I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: whatever you bind on the earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on the earth, shall be loosed in heaven.*—Matt. xvi. 19.—and to them all he said,—“As the Father has sent me, so send I you. After these words he breathed on them, and said to them, receive the Holy Spirit. *Whose sins soever you remit, they are remitted to them; and whose sins soever you retain, they are retained.*” John xx. 22. Again, he said—“*Whatsoever you shall ask in my name, I will do.*”—ch. xiv. 14.

From this testimony, it is clear, that they were the Apostles, not of men, neither by man; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.—Gal. i. 1. What they taught was, the very same which they received of Jesus, the great Apostle of God, the Apostleship and authority of Jesus being admitted, the authority of the Apostles cannot be disowned. Hence then, the claims of the Apostles themselves to the obedience of the faithful are equal to those entitled to respect with those of the Lord himself. In brief, we learn from the scriptures adduced, that in respect of authority there is no difference between the inspired teachers, the Apostles, and the testimony of their divine Master. The following quotations deserve the greatest attention.

“*Though you have ten thousand teachers, you have not many fathers; for to Christ, Jesus, the Son of the FATHER, I have begotten you; therefore, I beseech you, as I have*

TORS OF ME. I have sent to you Timothy, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, for this purpose; *that he put you in mind of my ways, which are in Christ, EVEN AS I TEACH EVERY WHERE IN EVERY CONGREGATION.* Now some are puffed up, as if I were not coming to you. But I will come to you soon, if the Lord will, and shall know, not the speech of them who are puffed up, but the power. **FOR THE REIGN OF GOD IS NOT IN WORD, BUT IN POWER.** What do you incline? Shall I come to you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?" 1 Cor. iv. 15, 21. This is the language of one having great authority. Again, "as God has distributed to every one, and as the Lord has called every one, so let him walk; and so, in all the congregations, I ORDAIN. Ch. vii. 17. *Become imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ—hold fast the traditions as I delivered them to you—I received of the Lord, what also I delivered to you—the other things I will set in order when I come.*" Chap. xi. "God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, has shined into our hearts, to give *the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* **WE HAVE THIS TREASURE in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of God, and not of us.** 2 Epis. ch. iv. 6, 7.—*God has given to us (apostles,) the ministry of the reconciliation—we, therefore, execute the office of AMBASSADORS for Christ, as of God beseeching you by us; we pray you, in behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.* 2 Ep. ch. v. 18, 20. Being absent, I write these things; that, when present, I may not act sharply, according to the power which the Lord has given me for edification, and not for destruction. 2 Ep. ch. xiii. 10.

"Yourselves know, brethren, our entrance among you, that it was not in vain. For although we had before suffered, and were shamefully handled, as you know, at Phillippi, we were bold through our God to speak to you the gospel of God, amidst a great combat. (See Acts xvi.) Besides, our exhortation was not from error, nor from impurity, nor with guile. But as we were approved of God, to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, *not as pleasing men, but God, who tries our hearts.* For neither did we, at any time, use flattering words, or a *pretext for covetousness; God is witness.* Neither sought we honor from men, neither from you, nor from others. *We might have acted with authority, as Apostles of Christ; but we were gentle amongst you, as a nurse cherishes her children: so, having a strong affection for you, we were all pleased to have imparted to you, not only the gospel of God, but our own lives also; because you were become dear to us.* For you remember, brethren, *our labor and toil, that laboring night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you, we preached to you the gospel of God.* 1 Thess. ii. 1, 9. "We beseech and exhort you, by (the authority of) the Lord Jesus, that as you have received from us, how you ought to walk, and please God,

you would abound more therein. "For you know what *commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus Christ*. To salvation God called you, *by our gospel*, that you should obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well do you then, stand firm, and hold fast the traditions which you have been taught, whether by our word or letter." 2 Ep. ch. ii. 14. We have confidence in the Lord concerning you that you both do, and *will do, the things which we command you*. Ch. iii. 5. Now, *if any one do not obey our commandments in this letter, point out that man, and keep no company with him, that he may be ashamed.* v. 14. "He who despises me despises not man, but God, who certainly has given his Spirit—the Holy Spirit, to us." 1 Thess. iv. 8.

Be mindful of the words before spoken by the Holy Prophets, and of the commandments of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour. 2 Pet. 3, 2. The commandments of the Apostles, being *the things* Jesus ordered them to teach the believers, this passage applies equally to the commandments of the Apostles, as of their Lord;—"By this we know that you have known him, (Jesus,) *if we keep his commandments.* He who says, *I have known him; and does not keep his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.*" 1 Jno. ii. 3. "WE, (Apostles,) ARE OF GOD: HE WHO KNOWS GOD, HEARKENS TO US; HE WHO IS NOT OF GOD, HEARKENS NOT TO US. *By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*" 1 Jno. iv. 6.

But, most of these passages the clergy have applied to themselves. Now, concerning the individuals of whom this order of men is composed, the Apostle says, "For such are false Apostles, deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into Apostles of Christ. And no wonder; for Satan himself transforms himself into a messenger of light. (Of truth.) Therefore, it is no great wonder, if his ministers also transform themselves as ministers of righteousness. Whose end shall be according to their works. 2 Cor. xi. 15. These are therefore, not to be obeyed; nor in the least to be regarded by the faithful.

THE FAITH.

This phrase occurs about twenty-seven times in the New Testament. In Acts vi. 7, we are told that, *a great number of priests were obedient to THE FAITH.* The Faith is something to be obeyed, and must, therefore, consist of something. This we find it does; for the scripture, speaking of the Law, the Law being exhibited, irrespective of the Law, the Law is though attested both by the law and the gospel. The Law is faith in Jesus Christ, for all, and upon all. The Law says, "where, then, is boasting? It is excluded. By what Law? Of works? No; but by the Law of Faith." Rom. 27. Paul says, he received the Apostles' teaching, and was obedient to the Faith.

ence of faith among all nations. Ch. 1, 5. THE Faith then, contains a law to be obeyed; and this new law is termed the Law of Faith, in opposition or contrast to, the law of Moses, called also the law of works.

Now, the law of works went forth from Sinai; but the law of Faith was published from Jerusalem. These are historical facts, and therefore, incontestable. The latter was to be proclaimed in the name of the Messiah, "BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM." Luke xxiv. 47. The law itself, as we have seen, was decreed by Jesus, and by him entrusted to the Apostles for publication. The language in which it was conveyed to the Apostles, has been recorded differently by the sacred writers, as to the form; though the same as to the substance or meaning. See Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.—Mark xvi. 16.—Luke xxiv. 47. And the Apostles, &c. have taken the same liberty of speech in proclaiming it to the world. See Acts ii. 38; v. 42; iii. 19, 20. Luke records it sometimes as an authoritative injunction, and sometimes in the form of a narrative of facts. As an instance of the latter, see Acts viii. 12, 13; v. 26—39; x. 43—48; xvi. 30—34; xviii. 8, 9; xxii. 16. According to Luke, Jesus delivered himself to them as follows: *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Messiah to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that REFORMATION and the REMISSION OF SINS, should be proclaimed in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* Ch. xxiv. 46.

Reformation then, was to be commanded—authoritatively proclaimed—every where; accompanied with the gracious offer of salvation, pardon, or the remission of sins. The Apostles, we have seen, were the heavenly messengers; Jerusalem was the city at which they were to commence the proclamation of the Law of the Faith; and the day on which they received power to execute the commands of the King, was the time they were to begin their arduous and perilous enterprise. This was the Day of Pentecost; fifty days after the crucifixion, and seven after the assumption of Jesus.—The law was announced on this, and a subsequent day, in these terms:—

1. *Reform, and be baptized each of you (believers,) in the name of Jesus Christ.*

2. *Reform, and be converted.*

These are equivalent to the phrases—"Go and convert the nations, baptizing them;"—and, *believe and be baptized.*—From this it is clear that, to become obedient to the faith, as the priests, mentioned by Luke, did, is to believe the testimony of God concerning Jesus, and be baptized in his name.

Great is the inducement to obedience held forth in the proclamation, to rebellious men. It is no less than the re-

mission of sins, that is, a complete deliverance from the punishment due to sins, even of the deepest dye. This is called redemption through the blood of Jesus. Ephes. i. 7. It is of course retrospective; but comprehending every sin that a man commits, down to the time of his first act of obedience, which is, *immersion in water into the faith.* *The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sins.* This is **BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS**; to do this, is to become obedient to *the faith*. This is to purify our lives by obeying *the truth*. 1 Pet. i. 22. This is the purification of our sins, 2 Pet. i. 9. This is to have the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience and the body washed with pure water. Heb. x. 22. This is the "word of the truth of the gospel or glad tidings; this is its obedience, and *nothing else*."

OF THE CHURCH.

The word in the scriptures translated "church" is the noun *ecclesia*. It signifies a congregation or assembly of persons convened for any purpose whatever. A congregation or assembly, or church, is called an *ecclesia*, because it is *called out* from the multitude. The nature of an *ecclesia* is determined by some word prefixed to it; thus there are literary, philosophical, political and religious *ecclesias*, assemblies, congregations or churches. *The Christian Church* comprehends all who have become obedient to *the faith* of what nation soever;—a Christian Church is an assembly of persons separated, and called out of the world by *the gospel*, which is God's call to obedience. *The Christian Church*, then, is composed of many lesser assemblies, and these are made up of *one kind* of persons—namely, of those who have been *immersed into Christ on a belief of the truth*. A genuine Church of Christ acknowledges but *one Body, one Spirit, one Hope; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism; and one God and Father of all, who is over all, and with all, and in all* (the obedient believers.) Ephes. iv. 5, 6. *The Body* is *the Church*, of which Christ is the Head;—*the Spirit* is the Spirit of Jehovah, called also the Holy Spirit, by which God in ancient times spoke often, and in various ways to the fathers of Israel, through the prophets; and to his children through his Son, and the Apostles: (Heb. i. 1.) *the Hope* is the Holy Institution or oath, which God swore to Abraham. (Gen. xii. 2, 3, xvii; Luke 1, 68, 75;) and it contains the promise of eternal life, and "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and unfading, prepared for us, that it may be manifested at the revelation of Jesus Christ—the seed of Abraham." (1 Pet. i. 4.) *the Lord* is Jesus, who was crucified, and lives again, that he might reign with the Father, the living. (Rom. xiv. 9.) *the Faith* is the *faith* already described; *the Baptism* is the *baptism* already described.

ried in water on the belief of the truth. (Rom. vi. 1, 7;) the *one God and Father* is the Life-enlightening Word, by whom all things were made. John i. 1, 4.

OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

This is composed of persons, facts, and truth. The *persons* are Jesus, the Apostles, and Prophets; the *facts*, the death, the burial, and resurrection of Jesus; the *truth*, the doctrine or divine teaching, founded upon the facts. Speaking of the "HOLY TEMPLE OF THE LORD," that is, the *Church*, the scripture says, it is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation-corner stone" Eph. ii. 20;—that is, upon the foundation which they, as skilful architects, have laid concerning the Messiahship of Jesus:—"You (the Church at Corinth,) are God's building (or Temple.) As a skilful architect, I (Paul,) have laid the foundation. Other foundation no one can lay, except what is laid, which is Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. iii. 10. This is the stone, which the Jewish builders rejected, that has now become the chief of the corner. Ps. 118: 22; Acts iv. 11. As the chief corner stone of a building binds the angle thereof together, so Jesus, the chief corner stone of the living Temple of God, binds and unites the Jews and Gentiles together, who, as "living stones," compose this *habitation of God by the Spirit*. Eph. ii. 11, 22. This is the Rock or stone, upon which Jesus told Peter his Church should be built. Matt. xvi. 13, 18.

The *facts* and the *truth* are not one and the same. They are, however, inseparable. The facts are the *basis* of the truth. Reject the facts and the truth falls. It is a fact, that the blood of Jesus was shed; it is a truth that his blood cleanses from all sins, but, let it be denied that his blood was shed, and it will be utterly impossible to attribute remission to such a cause. A fact cannot be obeyed, though it may be believed. To obey a fact would be to obey obedience. The scripture says, *you have purified your souls by obeying the truth*, (not by believing or obeying facts,) *through the Spirit*, that is, by or through the testimony and miraculous demonstrations of the Spirit. 1 Pet. i. 22.

OF THE SUPERSTRUCTURE.

We have seen that the components of the Christian Edifice are obedient believers in Christ. These persons are termed by the scripture "living stones, built up a spiritual temple; a *holy* priesthood; an elect race, a *royal* priesthood, a *holy* nation, a purchased people." 1 Pet. ii. But the question to be determined here is, how do these persons attain to such an illustrious character?

In reply to this, the scripture says, 'by being *washed* from their sins in the blood of Jesus Christ,' who has thus, by the *sprinkling* of his royal and sacerdotal blood, made them

"kings and priests to his God and Father." **Key:** To be *washed in his blood*, is to be buried in water on the ground, in testimony of the truth, that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all unrighteousness. This is to *obey the truth*. To be *sprinkled with his blood*, is to *believe* with the heart the truth concerning the blood of Jesus. He that is *washed in*, and *sprinkled with*, the blood of Christ, is "born of water and the spirit." John iii. 5;—"washed, sanctified, and justified, by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the spirit of God." 1 Cor. vi;—has been baptized through the bath of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Tit. iii. 5;—has had his "heart sprinkled" from an evil conscience, and his body washed with pure water. Heb. x. 22;—has been "cleansed with a bath of water, by the word." Eph. v. 27;—has been "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism." Col. ii. 11;—has believed and been baptized. Mark xvi. 16;—he has believed to justification and confessed to salvation. Rom. x. 10;—he has reformed and been converted. Acts iii. 19;—he is elect according to the predetermination of God the Father, by sanctification of the Spirit, in order to obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. i. 1, 2;—he is part and parcel of the Holy Temple of the Lord, and has attained to the illustrious character of a Holy and a Royal Priest.

The Church of Christ existed previously to the Day of Pentecost. It was composed of one hundred and twenty persons, who were the organic nucleus of the Church at Jerusalem—a little flock, which was soon to increase to a great multitude. These are called the Disciples. Acts 1, 15; this continued to be the title of the believers, until, at Antioch they were called by a new name. This name was *Christian*—the most honorable of the names of men. Acts xi. 26. It is a most appropriate title for the true believers—for many of them as have been immersed into Christ, have put on Christ. Gal. iii. 27. What more fit, then, but that he who has put on Christ, should be called a *Christian*. The believer of the truth, who has been immersed into Christ, is the only character who is entitled to the name.

We have said that the Body of Christ existed before the Day of Pentecost. We have seen that this was the case. The doors, however, of admission into the Church, were not thrown open to the Jews at large until the Day of Pentecost. Peter unlocked them with *one* of the keys committed to his custody. The manner in which he executed this duty may be learned from Acts ii. Having explained the fulfilment of *Isaiah's* prophecy, he convinced them of sin, and of the truth of Jesus; and then, at their request, told them that they might be justified. Those of them who received his word

with readiness, were baptized; and in this way, that very day, there were added to the one hundred and twenty, about three thousand persons. v. 41. In this manner, then, the Israelites and others, became "living stones," and were, by skilful architects, (the Apostles,) built up a spiritual superstructure or temple, in which, by manifest tokens of his power, God resided.

OF THE SPIRITUAL SACRIFICES, OR WORSHIP OF THE LIVING TEMPLE, OR CHURCH OF CHRIST.

A sacrifice is any act or thing made holy; to sacrifice is to offer the consecrated to God. God alone can set apart and make holy. An act or thing, then, to be made holy to God, must be according his appointment; and whatever is done according to divine ordination, God does. "The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for such are the worshippers whom the Father requires. God is spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 23. To worship is to honor, and to honor God is to do what he requires. Honor emanating from the will of men, is "will-worship," and therefore, unacceptable to God. Spiritual worship according to truth, is the honor He requires. The worship appointed by the spirit, through the Apostles, is the spiritual worship; and is composed of certain acts set forth in the scriptures of truth. These acts, then, are appointments of the spirit; and therefore, spiritual sacrifices. To offer these, is the property of the faithful—the holy and royal priesthood of God. For, says the scripture,—"you are a *holy* priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*; most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ. --- You are a *royal* priesthood, that you should declare the *perfections of him*, who has called you from darkness into his marvellous light: who formerly, (as Gentiles,) were not a people, but now are a people of God. 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. All genuine believers, who have become obedient to the faith, are the priests of God—they are his clergy or heritage, and none else. The officers of churches are for the purpose of maintaining order, and attending to their temporal concerns.

The *practices* of the congregations in Judea, afford us the means of knowing what constituted the worship of the Church of Christ. These congregations were the examples followed by the Churches among the Gentiles. For, it is written, "you, brethren (of Thessalonica,) became imitators of the congregations of God, which are in Judea in Christ Jesus." 1 Thess. ii. 14. The approved practices of these Churches, are equivalent to Apostolic precepts expressly recorded. By whom were they taught these practices? By the Apostles unquestionably; for, at the beginning, they were the only teachers of the New Religion. The Apostles, then, taught

the Churches how to worship God acceptably. If they taught them must have been the *Acts*, since they were commanded to teach by the Spirit; and these spiritual sacrifices constitute the "spiritual sacrifices, most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ."

Concerning the practices of the 3120 disciples who composed the first Church in Judea, Luke informs us, "they unremittently attended to the teaching of the Apostles, to the contribution, and to the breaking of the loaf, and to the prayers." *Acts* ii. 42. All these things were those they constantly attended to, as the means by which the Apostles taught them to do acceptable worship to God, and to receive the blessings of the New Institution.

TIME OF ASSEMBLING.

The scripture commands the Christians "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together." *Heb.* x. 25. But nowhere, in the form of precept, specifies the time. That this is true, no one thinks of denying, that the first day of the week, or the Lord's Day, is the *divinely appointed* day on which the first Churches in Judea were taught to assemble together, to offer spiritual sacrifices, most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ. *Because the first Churches did so* is the only answer that can be given to the enquiry—why do you meet on this day? Nor can a better, or more substantial reason, be given; for considerations already submitted. This reply is satisfactory to all christendom. It is most scriptural and valid; and applies equally to the weekly observance of the things, mentioned in *Acts* ii. 42.

Well then, because the Apostolic congregations in Judea met on the Lord's Day, or the Sunday of the Gentiles, for the specific purpose of worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth, all Churches, both true and false, have continued to meet on the same day for eighteen hundred years. Before the Day of Pentecost, the Lord met frequently with the Apostles on this day; which may be considered as very appropriately styled *his day*, seeing that he rose from the dead, and so frequently with them, ascended to heaven, and sent down the Holy Spirit on this first day of the week.

Furthermore, the scripture says, in language which indicates the familiarity of the occurrence, "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them." *Acts* xx. 7.

OF THE ORDER OF WORSHIP.

The *acts* of worship, or spiritual sacrifices, are already enumerated. They are attention to the teaching of the Apostles—the contribution—the breaking of the loaf—the prayers. The *order* in which they ought to be performed we conceive, is precisely that in which they were performed in *Acts* ii. 42. That is, when the Christians assembled together,

themselves together, they should *first* read, and compare the scriptures with themselves; *secondly*, contribute; *thirdly*, break the loaf; and *fourthly*, offer prayer. The manner in which these spiritual acts or exercises should be observed, will, perhaps, illustrate the propriety of this suggestion.

In attending to the recorded *teaching* of the Apostles, the opportunity is afforded of mutual *exhortation*, founded upon their word. A sufficient time having been occupied in this way, *each* of the disciples might *lay somewhat by itself*, according as he may have prospered, *putting it into the treasury* of the congregation. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Having *contributed*, the institution of the loaf and wine, may be next observed. In attending to *the breaking of the loaf*, we should follow the example set before us in its origination. By referring to Matthew, we find Jesus and his disciples at table together, in familiar, but respectful discourse, on the subject of his betrayal, and approaching death. As they were eating the passover, Jesus took the loaf; he then *gave thanks* and broke it, and gave it to them to eat. He next took the cup, and again gave thanks, and gave it them to drink. They then celebrated the occasion by *singing the hymn*. Chap. xxvi. 20, 30. This, we conceive, is the proper time to introduce the singing of the congregation, whose time will be well employed in this spiritual exercise; provided the disciples sing *the truth* with the understanding as well as the voice. Then lastly, come the prayers, with which the worship should conclude.

OF THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES.

After the Apostles had made disciples of the people by baptizing them into Christ, they were to teach *them* all other things pertaining to the true doctrine; that they might know how to conduct themselves in their new character of children of God, and brethren of the Lord Jesus Christ. This teaching is recorded in the New Testament scriptures. In the primitive age, it was communicated orally or by word of mouth, to some of the Churches, to others by messengers, and to others again by letters. If any thing, we have the advantage over these Churches; for the substance of their instructions is plainly set forth in a single volume, so that we can at any time recur to it, with the greatest facility. There we shall find that they taught *customs*, which the citizens of the Roman Empire deemed *unlawful* to be received or observed. Acts xvi. 21. This is a sufficient answer to those, who defend certain practices condemned by the scriptures, on the plea that they are to obey every ordinance of man, although it may seem to be discountenanced by the word: such as, going to law, swearing, bearing arms, resisting injuries, &c. all which, though approved by men, are disappro-

bated by God. 1 Cor. vi. 1; James v. 12; Matt. xviii. 36; 2 Tim. 2, 24; 2 Cor. x. 4; Matt. v. 39.

In attending to the teaching, we are to regard all the Apostles and not so much who the Apostle is that speaks. The Apostles were merely the agents by whom God spoke to men, and become partisans of one or more apostles, therefore, a sect of Paul or Peter, cannot but be offensive to Him, whatever sects they were. 1 Cor. 1, 12. The Christians know no leaders or teachers, so as to become servants of any, for one is their leader or master, even Christ. Matt. xxiii. All sectarian distinctions, therefore, are condemned by the Holy Spirit; hence, he has nothing at all to do in making converts to the sects of the Anti-christian world.

The teaching of the Apostles, not only instructs us in the worship of God, but in our duty to our neighbour. The principle laid down is, that *we are to do to others, as we would they should do to us*. This principle is of universal application. Would we be defamed? Then we should not defame; would we, if parents, be disobeyed?—then we should not disobey our own;—would we that one should be ungrateful to us?—then we should not be ungrateful;—would we that men should break their promises to us?—then we should not break our bargains with them;—would we not be oppressed? then we should not oppress, but render to our dependents what is just and equal; for we also have a master in heaven. In short, if we were to act upon this principle, discord would cease; and the earth would become the abode of unanimity and peace.

The teaching of the Apostles is designed to correct bad habits, and to guard the disciples against the practice of every evil thing. "Brethren," says one of them, "I beseech you that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. Be not conformed to the world. I command every one not to think more highly of himself than he ought; but think, so as to be wise. Let love be without hypocrisy; abhor that which cleave to good. In brotherly love, be kindly disposed to one another. In honor prefer one another. In care for each other, be not slothful. Be fervent in spirit when serving the Lord. Rejoice in hope. Be patient under persecution. Be instant in prayer. Communicate to the necessities of the saints. Be hospitable to strangers. Bless them that persecute you: bless and curse not. Do not covet after things that are seen (offices or honors;) but associate with men that are so. Be not wise in your own conceits. To him that is an enemy, avenge yourselves. Therefore, if your enemy hunger, give him food, if he thirst, give him drink. Overcome evil with good. O my brethren, let us love one another."

For he who loves another, has fulfilled the law. Love works no evil to one's neighbour; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law. Walk about decently as in the day, not in revelings, (public feasts and festivities, and private carousings, called "*parties*,") and drunkenness, not in strife and envy. But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provisions for the lusts of the flesh. Rom. xii. xiii. These are but a specimen of the teaching or doctrine of the Apostles. What a happy world would this be, if all men would unremittingly attend to these things! The evil which God creates is a punishment on men for their crimes. If mankind would cease to do wrong, they would cease to be punished; and, in that event, the earthquake and the storm; the sword, pestilence and famine, which are the artillery of heaven against our race, would cease to desolate the world. All sorrow and sighing would be done away; and Paradise would be restored. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished; and it is the climax promised by the Lord our God.

OF EXHORTATION.

This is a very important institution when properly attended to. It was practised on the Sabbath Day in the Jewish synagogues. Among the Jews, it afforded many opportunities for our Lord and his Apostles to teach the people the word of the truth of the gospel. Matt. iv. 23; Luke iv. 6. In exhorting the members of the synagogues, Jesus, being neither a priest of the law nor a Levite, acted as a private person.—Paul, also, a private person, was a great frequenter of the synagogues, where he likewise reasoned with the Jews out of the scriptures, concerning the Messiah, in acceptance of the invitation, that if he had a word of exhortation to the people, he was to say on. This was done AFTER the reading of the law and the prophets. Acts xiii. 14. Hence to exhort brethren among the Jews, did not require a man to be an officer of the Church. It would be unnecessary to mention this, were it not, that the primitive churches, under apostolical direction, manifestly borrowed some things from the worship of the synagogue, especially in reading the scriptures, and exhortation. Mutual exhortation in the Churches of Christ in Judea on the *Lord's Day*, would not be accounted strange, seeing that it was practised in the synagogue on the *Sabbath Day*.

The first Churches do not appear to have had rulers appointed over them immediately they were formed. Though it is not likely that they were long destitute of them. Exhorting one another in their assemblies, it is thought, must have been one special means by which they obtained them; on the ground, that if the Churches, in Crete for instance, had not been in the habit of exhorting one another, it could not have been known who among them possessed an apti-

tude for teaching. However this may be, there is no doubt, but that it would be highly advantageous to do so in this way.

The duty of exhortation is enjoined by the Apostle, as is written,—“*Exhort* one another daily, while ye are all day, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.” Heb. iii. 13. “Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as you see the day approaching.” 25. “*Exhort* one another with these words,” which we find 1 Thess. iv. 13, 18. “*Exhort* yourselves together, and edify one another.” v. 11. To exhort is to prophesy, which means, to speak to edification, exhortation, and comfort. 1 Cor. xiv. 3. “He that prophesies, edifies the Church.” The spiritual men among the first christians, were instructed to give themselves to this duty,—“seek that ye may excel in the edifying of the congregation.” v. 12. And, when the Church was assembled together in one place, all that could do it, were at liberty to engage in it. vs. 23, 24;—and it is expressly said, “Ye all may prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.” vi. 31.

OF THE CONTRIBUTION.

The Temple of Jerusalem had a treasury; and so has the Living Temple of Christ—the Church. Men and women, even the poorest of the people, contributed to the former; and it is equally the honor, privilege, and duty of God’s holy and royal priesthood, to give of their penury or abundance to that of the Church of Christ. The liberality of some of the primitive congregations was very great, and highly commended by the Apostle. In view of the judgment coming on Jerusalem and Judea, the Hebrew Christians converted their possessions into money, and committed it to the care of the Apostles for the benefit of the whole community. Acts ii. 45; iv. 37. These contributions to the treasury, were administered to the necessities of the needy every day by the Apostles; who, finding the ministration too burdensome, appointed seven men as deacons, over the matter, while they attended to prayer and the ministry of the word. Ch. vi. 1. The treasury of the Church is responsible for the support of all widows above the age of sixty, whose character was approved. 1 Tim. v. 3, 10. If, however, they have other means of support, they have no claim, that the congregation be burdened. v. 15. “Let the elders who preside, be diligent, especially those who are worthy of double honor; especially those who are diligent in the word and teaching. For the scripture saith, ‘The laborer is worthy of his wages;’ v. 18—but these brethren ought to be as the words of the Lord Jesus, that he was much happier to give than to receive.” The apostles were much happier to imitate Paul, by ministering to the

necessities, with their own hands, than to follow the example of those who refuse to preach, unless the flock will guarantee to them in advance, a salary of a thousand per annum.— Acts xx. 31, 31. 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.

The primitive Christians contributed to the necessities of one another, though of different Churches. Thus, the congregations of Macedonia, even of their extreme poverty, contributed liberally to the poor saints of Judea. 2 Cor. viii. They also supplied the wants of the Apostles, the Evangelists, &c., who, being poor, could not provide for themselves. Phill. iv. 15. "I have," says Paul, "preached to you the gospel freely. I robbed other congregations, taking wages of them to do you service; for being present with you, and in want, we were burdensome to no one; but what I wanted, the brethren from Macedonia supplied. 2 Cor. xi. 8, 9. It must be obvious to the most obtuse, that the Mosaic Institution could not be superseded, and Paganism overthrown by a few poor men, unless their wants—such as their daily support and travelling expenses—were supplied; widows and orphans could not have been provided for by kind speeches; nor could the afflicted and distressed be relieved by a "be ye clothed or be ye comforted." Hence, the treasury of the Lord was an indispensable appendage to a Church of the Living God. What an honor for the rich of their abundance, and the poor of their penury, to be permitted by divine appointment to contribute to such worthy and honorable purposes.— This was truly the *fellowship* of ministering to the saints. (2 Cor. viii. 4;) and to this the ancient Churches unremittingly attended every first day of the week. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 4.

OF THE BREAKING OF THE LOAF.

As we have said, the primitive christians met every First Day of the week, to offer spiritual sacrifices to God through Jesus Christ; that these spiritual sacrifices were appointed by the Apostles; and that among them, the Breaking of the Loaf held a conspicuous place. Hence, it is certain, that the ancient believers met every first, or Lord's day, to break the loaf, as well as to pray, to sing, to read, to exhort, and to contribute. And because they did so, the true Christians of this age, do so now.

The spiritual sacrifice, called the Breaking of the Loaf, is based upon the death of Jesus, in connexion with the invaluable truth that his blood that was poured forth, was shed for the remission of sins. Its observance was enjoined on the Apostles. "Do this," said Jesus, "in commemoration of me;" Luke xxii. 19; and not upon them only, for Paul commands the believers to do so too. "I received from the Lord," says he, "What also I delivered to you" Corinthians. See 1 Cor. xi. 23. It is to be observed by all the faithful, in remembrance of Jesus, for a *limited period*—until the pass-

over be accomplished in the Kingdom of God—*until* the product of the wine new in the Kingdom of God—*until* God be come—or as Paul says, “*until* he (Jesus come).” Luke xxiii. 14, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 26. These *untils* all refer to the same period of time, namely, when the companions of Jesus (the Apostles,) shall eat and drink at his table, in his Kingdom, and shall sit on thrones, judging the *twelve* tribes of (the *restored*) Israel. Luke 22. 29. Hence this institution is commemorative and prophetic. It refers to the death and triumph of the Founder of the Christian Religion, to the sacrifice which preceded his departure, and to his return, as a conquering hero; when the *existing* kingdoms shall have their dominion taken away, and the saints of the Most High, with the Son of David, at their head, shall possess the government of the terrestrial world for a thousand years. Dan. vii. 9, 27; Rev. v. 10; xi. 15, 17; xx. 4.

“Having given thanks, he took bread, and broke it.” For what did Jesus give thanks previous to his breaking the loaf? It may be observed here, that while attending to the passover, Jesus discoursed at length with his Apostles, and seems to have concluded his discourse by lifting up his eyes to heaven, saying, “Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee,” &c. This prayer and discourse, with the connecting circumstances, are recorded in John xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, xvii. The subjects of the petition was his own glorification; the preservation of his Apostles; their union, and the union of all that should believe on him through their teaching, that the world might believe and know, that the Father had sent him. This prayer was very appropriate when offered in connexion with his departure; and the participation of the bread and wine by the Apostles, which represented their common union with the blood and body of Christ, their Lord. Mark terms the giving of thanks—“the blessing;” hence Paul, calls it “*The cup of blessing, which,*” says he, “we bless; is it not the joint participation of the blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not the joint participation of the body of Christ? Because, there is one loaf, we, the many, are one body: for we all participate of the one loaf.” 1 Cor. x. 15. *Giving thanks*, then, in this connexion, is *blessing* God on account of that union and communion effected by the blood and body of Jesus, which were split and broken for the redemption of all who should believe on Him, through the Apostle’s teaching. These are the things for which Jesus blessed God; and for which we should do likewise.

THE HYMN.

“And having sung (*ψυμνοῦντες* hymnecantes,) they went out to the Mount of Olives.” Mark xiv. 26. What was it that Jesus and his Apostles sang upon this occasion? It could not have been from any of the modern psalmodies, for none of them existed at that day. The Psalms of David were the only melodies used in the celebration of Jesus, the most glorious name by the Jewish nation. What they sung, we have been selected from these *prophetic* songs. And what we may expect, but that they would select such as were appropriate to the death and resurrection of the true Paschal Lamb, than about which “That our blessed Lord,” says a distinguished scholar, “has written more of Psalms, as he did other books of scripture, and which we have already seen; this stamps it with the highest authority; and his Disciples used it as a book of devotion.” We know that Jesus sang the Hallel at his last supper, which we know to consist of Psalms 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118; and that they were sung by the

Church, from the earliest times in devotional exercises, especially in praising God, we have the most ample proof."

It is the universal consent of Jewish antiquity, that these six psalms composed the hymn sung by the Israelites upon this occasion. The Jews termed them the *Hallel*, from *halleh-yah*, the first word in Psalm 113, which signifies *praise ye Jehovah*. These six psalms were always sung at every Paschal Feast. *Why do we call this the Great Hallel?* inquires the Jewish author of the tract *Pesachim*. Ans. "Because in it these five things are contained: 1. The Exodus from Egypt. 2. The dividing of the Red Sea. 3. The promulgation of the Law. 4. The Resurrection from the Dead. And 5. The suffering of the Messiah."

"Through him (Jesus,) therefore, let us offer up continually, the sacrifice of praise to God; namely, the fruit of our lips, confessing to his name." Heb. xiii. 15. And as none of the hymn books of our day had an existence in the primitive age, nor for centuries after, and seeing that we contend for obedience to the precepts of the Apostles, and imitation of the practice of the first congregations in Judea, let us be consistent, and with them, store our minds richly with the word or testimony of or concerning the Christ; and "with all wisdom, teach and admonish each other by psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," as they have been transmitted to us in the prophetic writings; "singing with gratitude in our hearts to the Lord." Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19, 20 "Give thanks unto the Lord, call upon his name, make known his deeds among the people. Sing unto him, sing psalms unto him, talk ye of all his wondrous works. 1 Chron. xvi. 8, 9. "Sing unto Jehovah a new song! His praise in the assembly of the just!" Ps. 149, 1.

THE PRAYERS

"And they continued steadfastly in the prayers of the Apostles"—These prayers to which the primitive believers attended, are well termed *the prayers of the Apostles*. John taught his disciples how to pray; Jesus also taught the Apostles; and the Apostles likewise taught all of theirs, both Jews and Greeks. The necessity of Apostolic teaching on the subject of prayer is obvious, from the consideration, that the Jews being accustomed to pray to Jehovah according to the institutions of Moses, and the Gentiles according to the rites of Polytheism, were utterly at fault when translated into the state of sons of the Lord Almighty. His Jewish children could no longer acceptably approach him as Jehovah, through the sacrifice of animals. Being *adopted*, they stood in a new relation to God. He now condescended to become their *Father*; they therefore, became his sons, and brethren to his First Born—the Lord Jesus Christ. They then were taught to pray by the Holy Spirit through the Apostles, to the Father through the Son. This was consistent.—They had been baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or of Jehovah revealed to them as the Father or begetter of all things visible and invisible;—as the Saviour of all believers, in the person of the Son, from the punishment due to sin; and as the Holy Spirit or director into all the truth. Hence they prayed to the Father, *through* the Son, *by* the Holy Spirit. There is no instance in the New Testament of believers praying *to* the Son, or *to* the Holy Spirit. Men prayed to God, to Jehovah, to the Father, but not to the Son and Holy Spirit. The Son is the Great Mediator, *through* whom, and the Holy Spirit, the Great Teacher, *by* whom men worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

There is nothing more or less "solemn" in prayer, than in the other spiritual exercises of which the worship of God is composed. Being all offered to the same God, they must all be attended to with equal gravity

and devotion. Superstition has reduced religion to "prayer," and the scriptures hold all the holy ordinances of God in contempt. "When you pray," says the Holy Spirit, "be not as hypocrites, who affect to pray standing in the assemblies, in the corners of the streets, that men may observe them. In secret, when they have received their reward. But you, when you pray, go into your closet; and having shut the door, pray to your Father, and your Father to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will reward you. And in prayer, use not a multiplicity of words as the Pharisees, who think that using many words will give them acceptance. But God them not, for your Father knows what things you want before you ask him." Matt. vi. 5, 8. "Pray for them who arraign and persecute you; that you may be the children of your Father in heaven, who makes his sun arise on bad and good, and sends rain on just and unjust." Luke v. 44. "And when you pray, forgive, if you have matter of complaint against any; that your Father who is in heaven, may also forgive your trespasses. But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven, forgive your trespasses." Mark xi. 25.

"We know not," says Paul, "what we should pray for, as we ought." Rom. 8, 26. This he terms, as it really is, an infirmity; but there is this consolation, that *the Spirit helps our infirmities*. How did it help the infirmities of the *primitive* believers? By interceding for them in indelible desires, or as it is expressed in the text, "in sighs that cannot be uttered." The Spirit by the Apostles, and by direct suggestion, instructed the believers how to pray as they ought, according to the will of God; thus making intercession for them. Now He, who searches the heart, knew the mind of the Holy Spirit, and so accepted them. The following familiar example may illustrate this passage of scripture. A little child, who wishes to obtain something of its father, comes to him with the desire, but from diffidence or some other cause, fails distinctly and intelligibly to impress what is still latent within him. A friend, who knows what he wants before he asks, steps in and intercedes for him. The father, who knows the mind of the friend in this case, grants his desire, to the great delight of the little child; who, hereafter never fails to obtain the intercession of his friend, whose suggestions he has proved to be so effectual.

But how does the Holy Spirit help the infirmities of the true believers of this day? By teaching them how they ought to pray. And how does he teach them? By the Apostolic writings, that is, by the New Testament. All men are ignorant as to how they ought to pray antecedently to their acquaintance with the New Testament. If a Christian would pray acceptably, it must be in conformity with the instructions in this Book on the subject of prayer. This ignorance is the great defect with which the professors of this age are afflicted; hence, the long and vain repetitions—the much, loud, and noisy speaking of "prayers" in public, mass-book prayers; "common prayers" or solemn prayers, &c. &c.; all of which are non-conformity with the intercessions of the Holy Spirit, and to his instructions in the scriptures.

Now on petitioning, "I exhort, first of all," says the Apostle, "that your supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgiving be made without ceasing (ranks or orders of) men; for Kings, and all who are in authority."

•Had Jesus lived in this age, he would certainly have rebuked the *Methodists and Protestant Sectarists* for they do now exactly what the Phariseans did then.

this reason, "that we may" under their government, "lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." "I will, that the (Christian) men, in every place or wherever they pray, lift up *holy* hands without wrath or disputings" 1 Tim. ii. "I will pray with the Spirit," says Paul; i. e. I will pray according to the suggestions of the Spirit or with the spiritual gift of prayer; or, as applicable to our age, according to the written instructions of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. Lastly, prayer must be offered according to the will of God, or it will not be answered. To ask for what God has already given us, or to pray to be enabled to do, or for him to do, what we are able to do for ourselves, or what he has commanded us—is anti-scriptural and absurd. God is not to be mocked; we must take care then, to pray, with an understanding enlightened in the will of God, by the holy writings of the Spirit.

OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CONGREGATION.

In every well regulated community, there are the governors and the governed. It is not to be supposed, that the governors are above the laws, or that they make them; this is the function of a legislature. It is for governors to see that the laws are *constitutionally* administered: both the rulers and the ruled, are or ought to be subordinate to the statutes and ordinances of the realm. "As the Christian Church is a holy communion, and the unrighteous have no part in the kingdom of God, the faithful observance of discipline is absolutely essential to its true character.* Some think that it is an assumption of authority to exercise Church discipline. They will do well to think whether it is not an assumption of authority, to set aside the King's laws, and receive or retain in Christian Churches those, whom the Master will not have there! An unscriptural severity of discipline, is indeed an assumption of authority, of serious evil consequence. An unscriptural laxity is the same. We have no laws to make. We have only to obey those which we find in the inspired statutes. If in this case any complain, their complaint is against the King."

The government or discipline of the Church of Christ cannot be maintained, except through the agency of men. This agency, from the nature of things, must be limited; for a congregation of persons, made up of old and new converts, of the learned and unlearned in the scriptures, of the luke-warm and warm hearted, &c., cannot righteously and intelligently administer it. A corrupt or ignorant majority of them, could at any time set the King and his laws at defiance, to the chagrin of the few who might understand and love the truth in theory and practice.—Hence a *presbytery* and *diaconate* were appointed in all the Churches by the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles. The former was placed over the *spiritual*, the latter, over the *temporal* affairs of the congregation.—The presbytery was composed of several persons; and so was the diaconate. The number would of course, be limited by the wants of the Church. The Christians who composed the presbytery were called the *spiritual men*, that is, those who had received spiritual gifts. The *diaconate* of the Church, was formed of the deacons in the aggregate.—These also were spiritual men, full of faith, of the Holy Spirit, and of power by which they wrought many miracles, and great signs among the people. They also preached the gospel with great success, and baptized the believers. Acts vi; viii. 5—8. To these spiritual men the

* "Some misunderstand our Lord's words 'Let both grow together until the harvest'—Mat. xiii. 30. by not observing his own explanation, 'the field is the world,' not the church."

Holy Spirit speaks in these words by Paul:—"I charge you, that ye do not think more highly of himself than he ought to think [of his gifts;] but to think modestly, as God has distributed to every one of us a portion of faith," i. e. a spiritual gift. "For as the body is one, though it be many members, but all the members have not the same office; so we, though many, are one body under Christ, and individually members of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace given to us,—if (the gift of) prophecy, act according to the measure of your faith; if a ministerial office, (act) in that office; if one be a teacher, let him teach; and the exhorter (let him attend to) exhortation. Let him that distributes, act with disinterestedness; him that presides, (let him do so) with assiduity; him that shows mercy, with cheerfulness." Rom. 12. 3—8.

The spiritual men, or officers of the Church, were qualified for the duties they had to perform by the reception of the gifts of the spirit in that age, the gospel and its requirements needed confirmation; therefore they were endued with power from on high to work miracles, &c. for that purpose. That confirmation being amply and authentically proved in the scriptures, is not required now; hence the power to confer the working miracles has ceased. They were qualified to teach, to give the rule, &c. by the spirit coming upon them; but since the sacred writings have been completed, this "physical operation," is no longer necessary; so that now, he that would teach, exhort, &c., may be sufficiently qualified by the study of the Old and New Testaments. The Holy Spirit is as much the instructor of the faithful now as in the days of the Apostles, the only difference is the manner in which he teaches—in the beginning, he taught by suggestion;—but now, by the written word. A spiritual man, then, in the 19th century is a christian, in whom the word of Christ, which is the testimony of the Holy Spirit, dwells richly in all wisdom; hence the degree of a man's spirituality will be in proportion to his knowledge, belief, and practice of the truth.

OF THE ELDERS.

These are persons of whom the presbytery is composed. The term *Elder* is generic, containing several kinds, such as Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, Bishops, &c. They are necessary to the order, though not indispensable to the worship of a congregation. See Acts xiv. 19, 23. In every Church of Christ, there is a plurality. Hence Paul, writes "to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who are in Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." There is no such thing in the New Testament, as a Church with one man, and he a clergyman at its head. "I left you in Crete in order that you might ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed you: if any be blameless—for a bishop (or overseer,) must be blameless," &c. Titus i. 5, 7. "The elders which are among you, I exhort, feed the flock of God, which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being Lords over God's heritage; but being examples to the flock." 1 Pet. v. 1, 3. "A Bishop then must be sober, vigilant, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, gentle, patient—not covetous; one that rules well his own house—not a stranger to his duty, &c. "Moreover, he must have a good report from them which are without," &c. As to the respect due to their authority, the disciples are exhorted to "obey them that have the rule over them; and submit yourselves; for they watch for their souls, as they who must give an account thereof." Heb. xiii. 17. And it is written, "Let the Elders that rule in the Church be esteemed worthy of double honor, especially those who labour in the word."

teaching. For the scripture says, "you shall not muzzle the ox that treads out the corn. And the laborer is worthy of his reward." 1 Tim. 1, 5, 7. The bishops or elder's office, extends to but one Church. This is evident from the fact, that they ordained them elders "in every Church;" and "in every city." That there was but one Church in a city, is evident from the Apostolic addresses to the Church, not Churches at Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, &c. There is not a single precept or example, authorizing the appointment of a Bishop over a plurality of Churches.

As to the mode of their appointment, they were, it would seem, unanimously elected or selected, from among the brethren according to certain ordinary qualifications; and then extraordinarily qualified by spiritual gifts, in answer to prayer, accompanied with the imposition of the hands of inspired men. Of course these means are not now available. Good sense, however, dictates their appointment as nearly as possible, in conformity with Apostolic usage. This may be deduced from their precepts or example, or from both.

OF THE DEACONS.

These were not persons appointed to office because they were rich; but of "good report, full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom." Their especial care was the welfare of the poor of the congregation. The deacons must be "grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre, holding the secret of the faith in a pure conscience." They must "first be proved, then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless." There is a peculiar blessing connected with the faithful discharge of the duties of this office. "For they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith, which is in Christ Jesus."

OF OFFENCES.

These are of two kinds, namely *private* and *public* offences. A private offence is the trespass of one brother against another. The design of discipline in this case, is to prevent, if possible, the offence becoming public; so that the misunderstanding may be healed without troubling the congregation with it. If we would do to others, as we would they should do to us, no cases of this kind would happen. Differences of opinion ought to be no cause of offence to anyone. "Receive him who is weak in the faith, (not weak in faith, but in the faith,) without regard to differences of opinion." Rom. xiv. 1. Actions alone develop motives; with unrevealed intentions we have nothing to do. We can only suspect these; and for the most part suspicions are ill-founded. If then a brother has sinned against us by *doing* to us what he would not have another do to him, the King commands that we "go and tell him his fault between you and him alone; if he shall hear you, you have gained your brother. But if he will not hear you, then take with you one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the congregation; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to you as a heathen man and a publican." Matt. xviii. 15, 17. The testimony of two or three witnesses, and not a vote, establishes the case. How is it to be told to the Church? Through the constituted authorities. And how is the Church to speak that the offender may hear it? Through the same authorities who are the mouth of the Body—the Church. If our brother is not gained by the first prescribed act, we are still to keep the matter secret, and take "one or two more." If he hear them, the matter ends there, and is not to be communicated to any other person. If this fail, "tell it to the Church." If he neglect to hear the Church, our fellowship

with him as a Christian is to cease. Yet we are not to lose the obligation of endeavouring to restore the wretched wanderer to the fold of God. From the decision of the Church, our Lord allows appeal to any council, association, or other tribunal of similar authority. "Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may be warned." 1 Timothy, v. 20. "It is obvious that the holiness and Christian holy character of his Church require, in case of public offences, the discipline, whatever it may be, should be public. No means, however, than the offence. In all cases where offences are public, or known, public discipline is necessary." The Apostle instructed the Corinthian Church, to put away the incestuous offender when they gathered together, which must certainly be understood as being at their stated meeting on the first day of the week, from which we learn by 1 Cor. xiv. 23, that unbelievers were not excluded. We have a natural authority for preventing any persons from observing this ordinance. It would be putting our most important light under a bushel. Christian Churches are to manifest to all, that they have no fellowship with the fruitful works of darkness. Whatever means may be used in investigating the case, and preparing it for a decision, the execution of discipline, whether rebuke or confession, or exclusion be requisite, ought to be as public as any other ordinance of the Kingdom. Then will the holiness of God's house be manifested to all.

The scriptures inculcate the duty of forgiving, and receiving into our fellowship, all brethren who show a sincere repentance by a reformation of life. In relation to private offences, the King requires his subjects to forgive one another seventy times seven or indefinitely, and assures us, that if we do not, from the heart, forgive our brethren their trespasses, neither will our heavenly Father forgive us.

OF CHRISTIAN DUTY.

The duty of a Christian is to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind; and to love his neighbour as himself. "On these two commandments the whole law and the prophets depend." "If you love me," said Jesus the Apostle of the Father, "keep my commandments;" and again, "you are my friends, if you do whatever I command you;" and, says John, "he that says he knows God and keeps not his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in that man;" and, says Paul, "love is the fulfilling of the law."—The only way then to prove to God and man, that we love them is, to obey God in all things, and to "work no evil to one's neighbour." If a man say, he loves the Father and the Son; that he is one of the friends of Jesus, and that he is acquainted with God, as he is made known by the Son, and yet does not obey their precepts, he is a liar, however respectable he may be in the eyes of his fellow-mortals, and his "part will be in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Love, then, and obedience go hand in hand; they are inseparable, and cannot exist the one without the other. The Christian must present his body a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is his reasonable service. He must not be conformed to the follies, fashions, principles, and actions of the world, "but transformed by the renewal of his mind." He must abhor evil, and adhere closely to good; he should be full of hope, patient in affliction, steadfastly persevering in prayer; he should bless them who persecute him; bless and curse not; and return evil for evil; but overcome evil with good. Let him render to all their dues; owing no man any thing, unless to love one another as himself; us, then, put off the works of darkness, and let us put on the works of light.

Let us walk about decently in the day, not in (public or private) drunkenness and drunkenness; not in uncleanness and lasciviousness, not in anger and envy. But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no pretence for the lusts of the flesh. *Rom. xii. xiii.*

Such, then, is the outline of the theory and practice for which we, as Christians contend earnestly, both by the press, the mouth, and the life. True to that religion, which all candid and dispassionate enquirers will find in the New Testament; it is the only true one, all others existing being nothing else than counterfeits, cunningly devised and as miserably executed. EDITOR.

IMPORTANCE OF NAMES.—The artful and designing in all ages of the world, seem to have been fully sensible of the magic of names. If the object was to establish some ecclesiastical or sectarian creed, whereby the founder might promote his present interest and transmit his name to future generations, the oracles of idol gods, among the heathen, and the Holy Scriptures among Christians, were relied upon. But if the design was to accomplish some great political measure, such as the revolution of an empire, men of noble birth, of personal renown, must be enlisted in the project, or at least their names must be used. These are historic truths that every man of information will attest.

Such is the structure of the human mind, that on all occasions, we find ourselves, weighing the credibility of the witness, instead of examining the probabilities of their testimony.

NOTICES.

The Small Pox being in the neighbourhood of Smyrna, King and Queen, the meeting that was to take place at that meeting-house, will be transferred to Acquinton, King William. It will be held at the last named place, beginning on Friday, before the fourth Lord's Day in July. Also at Antioch, Caroline county, there will be held a meeting, to commence on the Saturday, before the first Lord's Day, in August.

This number of the Advocate, being occupied by one article, which it was desirable should appear as a whole, many letters from esteemed correspondents, for and against the things we teach, necessarily stand over to a future opportunity. We also beg the indulgence of our friends as to their private communications. We are beset on every side, so that we could find employment for many extra hands; as well as many additional pages. Our time is much occupied. They shall not be forgotten. Recipis in our next.

Some of our subscribers complain that they do not get their papers from the post offices, among which they name, *Miller's, Essex, Va.* We can only say, that we transmit them faithfully every month with our own hands. We have also to complain, that money they send us is abstracted, and their letters destroyed. EDITOR.

JAMES C. WALKER, PRINTER,

Street leading to Mayo's bridge, Richmond, Va. where Books, Pamphlets, Handbills, Blanks, Cards, and Job Printing of every description is neatly, correctly, and expeditiously executed.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

AND

PROPHETIC INTERPRETERS

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D. not D. D.

VOL. I. RICHMOND, Va., AUGUST 1, 1836. No. 1

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words, and seal the book for the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

THE HOPE OF GLORY.

One cause of the apathy, and indeed, criminal lukewarmness, so prevalent among professors of the Christian Faith, is attributable to their ignorance of the nature of that hope, which the Scriptures term "The Hope of Glory;" and which an Apostle says is "great beyond expression." The mere knowledge of what this hope consists in would not remove the defect; the things known must be believed, and then, we are sure, that the hope of the gospel will act as a powerful incentive to righteousness, holiness, and purity of life. A belief of the past without a hope for the future is not sufficient to induce a man to "renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil" for "the reproach of Christ." A belief of the past gives full assurance; a well-defined hope for the future imparts energy to the weak, perseverance to the vacillating, self-denial to the covetous, joy to the desponding, patience to the impetuous,—and to the conqueror, in its fruition, an eternal deliverance from death. How admirably adapted to man as he is, is God's scheme of redemption! Man is the creature of faith, of fear, of love, and of hope; and here we see God addressing himself to man's faculty of believing, of fearing, of loving, and of hoping. Truly, the institutions of the Bible were made for man, and adapted to his moral and intellectual capacities. Our wisdom, then, is to study man, as an intellectual animal, and in so doing we shall be acquainted with one of the noblest works of God. God's description of his works, and the works themselves, will always be found to correspond. Hence, when God speaks of man, he describes him to be what we find him to be in life and in death; and when he speaks to him, he speaks to his

his faculties, as one man communes with another, in language that can be understood. Does he want to gain his *faith* or confidence? He confirms his word by the manifestation of his power. Does he desire to secure his *obedience*? He points to the goodness and mercy he has heaped upon him. Would he restrain him from *disobedience*? He appeals to his fears by the most awful threatenings. Would he persuade him to a continuance in doing his high behests? He stimulates his mind to hope and excites therein a longing after glory great beyond expression. And all this he does by the promises, and threatenings contained in the *written* word. To this then we should go if we would add to our faith those excellent things enumerated in 2 Peter i. 6. "But he who has not these things, is blind, shutting his eyes, having become forgetful of the purification of his old sins;" if, indeed, he ever were purified.

The following is a familiar illustration of a cause of the lukewarmness of the professors of this Laodicean Age. A. B. invites C. D. to go from a certain city *on foot* to a mart of commerce some three or four thousand miles off in order to transact some affairs. As an inducement, he promises to pay his expenses and to reward him liberally. A. B. is the friend of C. D., and C. D. believes him to be a man of truth. C. D. sets out. After travelling for some days he becomes dispirited from the difficulties and the fatigues of the way. He remembers A. B.'s promise of reward, which, however, being indefinite is therefore vague and uncertain, and consequently fails to renew his inward man. He reasons on the possibility, that, although it may be a reward in the estimation of A. B. it might fail of being an adequate compensation for all the labor, fatigue, and prostration he must necessarily suffer in so tedious and dangerous a journey. Upon a view of the whole, he concludes to return, and to make the best of what he has, rather than risk his present enjoyments in the hope of obtaining some speculative good, of which he has no tangible assurance beyond the affirmation of A. B. A. B. supposing him to be far advanced on his way, to his surprize meets him in the streets of the city busy in the pursuit of trade. "Why!" says A. B. "how is this!—Did you not agree to go to such a place for such a consideration?" "O yes," rejoins C. D. "but the consideration you presented was so indefinite, and I was so dispirited and solitary in the way, that I concluded to give up the enterprise and return." "Well," says A. B. "will you try again if I define the recompense?" "Let's hear?" ejaculates C. D. "First then," continues A. B. "I will provide for the ease and comfort of your family in your absence; secondly, I will pay all your travelling expenses; and then on your return, I will give you a plantation of inexhaustible fertility and fifty

thousand dollars in gold eagles." The citizens, who passing by, started with surprize at the sudden transport animated jesticulations of C. D. He seemed like a bewitched, so great was the excitation produced in him at the announcement of A. B. He scarcely replied, but hurrying A. B. along with him, he returned to notify his family of his intended absence, forsook all his urban affairs, and pursued the recompense with the most intense perseverance. Nothing successfully impeded his progress. Though in dangers from rivers, in dangers from robbers, in dangers in the wilderness; in labor and toil; in hunger and thirst; in cold and imperilled in various other ways, he overcame them all, because of the prize of his great fortune set before him in the promises of A. B. who, faithful to his word, put him in possession of the inheritance on his return.

Now, C. D. in his first and second enterprize is a type of two classes of professors. The first, like him, would have no objection whatever to the reward, but having no definite conceptions of it, they address themselves to the pursuits of this present evil age with all their powers, and trust to their problematical arrival at Heaven for a discovery of all its attributes. But such are, for the most part, carnally-minded religionists; neither hot nor cold. What can they expect then, but repudiation by Him, whose proffered and distinctly revealed blessings, they interest themselves so little to comprehend? The second class, on the other hand, fill up their relative duties with Christian punctuality; and esteem it their meat and drink to *know* and to *do* the will of God; and to discover as much of that "incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading inheritance" as the inestimable revelation of their heavenly Father has made known.

It has been objected by some, that it is no use talking or writing about Heaven, or the Hope of Glory, for nobody can know any thing about it, say they, till he gets there. But this objection emanates from ignorance of the word of God and popular delusion. A person might as well say that he could know nothing as to the where, the conveniences, or the limits of an estate or inheritance until he came into possession; although accurately defined in the will and testament of the legator. The spirit of the objection is calculated to quash all Christian enterprize. A vast deal more may be known from the scriptures of the past, the present, and the future, than has yet entered into the philosophy of the "divines," the schoolmen, or the most "orthodox" commentators of this and past ages. The first step to knowledge is to know that we know comparatively nothing, and to pronounce as unknowable, things to which our attention never been turned. The foolish conceit of this Age

knowledge is to be attained by some short cut without the labor of application. It squares the dimensions of the truth by its own ignorance, instead of its ignorance by the scripture rule. Hence every little master and miss—every “new-hatched unfledged” religionist pronounces with the dogmatism of a Trentine councillor on the length, breadth, and thickness of a good Christian; and of the latitude and longitude of scripture investigation. But regardless of the sentence of a judiciary composed of such persons, we shall proceed, in the spirit of inquiry, from time to time, to disentangle, if possible, the Hope of Glory—the Christian’s great recompense of reward—from the nostrums of Antichrist; and to define a few facts and truths in relation to it, upon which, we confess, it is our delight to dwell.

EDITOR.

LACON.

When the Sectarists first decide on the doctrine they approve, and then choose such pastors as they know will preach no other; they act as wisely as a patient, who should send for a physician and then prescribe to him what medicines he ought to advise.

Some well meaning persons, tremble for their salvation, because they have never gone through that valley of tears and of sorrow, which they have been taught to consider as an ordeal that must be passed through, before they can arrive at regeneration; to satisfy such minds, it may be observed, that *the slightest sorrow for sin is sufficient*, if it produce amendment, and that the greatest is insufficient, if it do not. Therefore, by their own fruits let them prove themselves; for some soils will take the good seed, without being watered by tears or harrowed up by affliction.

The depravity of human nature is a favorite topic with the priests, but they will not brook that the laity should descant upon it: in this respect they may be compared to those husbands who freely abuse their own wives, but are ready to shoot any other man who does so.

Those who bequeath themselves a pompous or expensive funeral, are at just so much expense to inform the world of something that had better been concealed; namely, *that their vanity had survived themselves*.

Natural good is so intimately connected with moral good, and natural evil with moral evil, that I am as certain as if I heard a voice from heaven proclaim it, *that God is on the side of virtue*.

Some have wondered, that disputes about opinions about so often end in personalities; but the fact is, that such disputes begin with personalities, *for our opinions are a part of ourselves.*

If a man be sincerely wedded to Truth, he must make up his mind to find her a portionless virgin, and he must take her for herself alone. The contract must be to love, cherish, and obey her, not only until death, but beyond it: for this is an union that must survive not only Death, but Time, the conqueror of Death. The adorer of Truth, therefore, is above all present things—Firm in the midst of temptation, and frank in the midst of treachery, he will be attacked by those who have prejudices, *simply because he is without them*, decried as a bad bargain by all who want to purchase, *because he alone is not to be bought*, and abused by all parties, *because he is the advocate of none*; like the dolphin, which is always painted more crooked than a ram's horn, although every naturalist knows that it is the straightest fish that swims.

In the superstitious ritual of the Church of Rome, the Pope has not the poor merit of inventing that mummery by which he reigns. The Roman Church proposes to have a Christian object of adoration, but she worships him with Pagan forms. She retains the ancient custom of building temples with a position to the east. And what are her statues, her incense, her pictures, her image worship, her holy water, her processions, her prodigies, and her legerdemain, but religious customs, which have survived the policy of Imperial Rome, but which caused that metropolis, when she became Pontifical, to receive Popery as an *ally*, not to submit to it as a sovereign.

Truth can hardly be expected to adapt herself to the crooked policy, and wily sinuosities of worldly affairs; for truth, like light, travels only in straight lines.

The upright, if he suffer calumny to move him, fears the tongue of man more than the eye of God.

He that knowingly defends the wrong side of a question, pays a very bad compliment to all his hearers; it is not English this; falsehood, supported by my talents, is stronger than truth supported by yours.

Slander cannot make the subjects of it either better or worse, it may represent us in a false light, or place a likeness of us in a bad one, but we are the same: not so the slanderer;

for calumny always makes the calumniator worse, but the calumniated—never.

Light, whether it be material or moral, is the best reformer; for it prevents those disorders which other remedies sometimes cure, but sometimes confirm.

Man, if he compare himself with all that he can see, is at the zenith of power; but if he compare himself with all that he can conceive, he is at the nadir of weakness.

The three great Apostles of practical Atheism that make converts without persecuting, and retain them without preaching, are Wealth, Health, and Power.

He that will not reason is a bigot, he that cannot reason is a fool, and he that dares not reason is a slave.

An era is fast approaching, when no writer will be read by the great majority, save and except those who can effect that for bales of manuscript, that the hydrostatic screw performs for bales of cotton, by condensing that matter into a period, that before occupied a page; celebrity will be awarded to no pen that cannot imitate the pugilist, in three essentials; *that of hitting hard, and sharp, and at short distances.*

“*Quieta ne moveata*”—Disturb not what is quiet—is a sound maxim for a rotten cause. But there is a noble maxim from a higher source, which enjoins us to try all things, but to hold fast that which is good.

The praise of the *envious* is far less creditable than their *censure*; they praise only that which they can surpass, but that which surpasses them—they censure.

There are two things which ought to teach us to think but meanly of human glory; the very best men have had their calumniators, the very worst their panegyrists.

If Satan ever laughs, it must be at Hypocrites; they are the greatest dupes he has; they serve him better than any others, and receive no wages; nay, what is still more extraordinary, they submit to greater mortifications to go to Hell, than the sincerest Christian to go to Heaven.

He that will often put *eternity* and the *world* before him, and who will dare to look steadfastly at both of them, will find that as he contemplates them, the former will grow greater, and the latter less.

We should have all our communications with men, ~~in~~ the presence of God; and with God as in the presence of men.

Were a plain unlettered man, but endowed with common sense, and a certain quantum of observation and reflection, to read over attentively the Four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, without note or comment, I hugely doubt whether it would enter into his ears to hear, his eyes to see, or his heart to conceive, the purport of many ideas signified by words ending in *ism*, which nevertheless have cost Christendom rivers of ink, and oceans of blood.

There are two things in which all the sects agree, the hatred with which they pursue the errors of others, and the love with which they cling to their own.

When the million applaud you, seriously ask yourself what harm you have done; when they censure you, what good.

Always suspect a man who affects great softness of manner, an unruffled evenness of temper, and an enunciation studied, slow, and deliberate. These things are all unnatural, and bespeak a degree of mental discipline into which he that has no purposes of craft (especially priestcraft) or design to answer, cannot submit to drill himself. The most successful knaves are usually of this description, as smooth as razors dipped in oil and as sharp. They affect the innocence of the dove, which they have not, in order to hide the cunning of the serpent, which they have.

STATE OF THE ENGLISH PROVINCE OF BABYLON.

The Christian Advocate is the name of a weekly paper in London. For its independence, and uncompromising hostility to SECTARIANISM, it is hated with the most cordial hatred by the supporters of this antichristian hydra. It unmasks with impartiality the evil doings of all from Romanism, the parent of abominations, down to Irvingism, the most absurd of all *isms*, not even excepting Shakerism and Mormonism. We have received the 320th number. From a perusal of its contents we are convinced, that the complete disruption of the chartered and unchartered religions of England is in hand. The combined agitation of infidels and dissenters, effecting the appropriation of Episcopal property in England to the education of the people; the compulsory commutation of tithes in England—that is, making the land owner instead of the tenant responsible to the rapacious parson for the payment, which is reduced from 25 to 40 per cent, according to circumstances; so that an indolent priesthood instead of receiving £100 per priest, will have no more than £75, and in

other cases only £60 per centum; which, if their worth be estimated by the value of their services, is just so much more than they deserve. Added to this, they are so successfully attacking the Chartered Sect, that much time cannot elapse before they effect a complete separation of Church and State. Methodism is in extreme trouble. The people and the Preachers who form the Conference (with their adherents) are the belligerents. It seems that the latter have passed certain "minutes" considered by the people as subversive of Methodist liberty. These minutes, which are an improvement or addition to John Wesley's Methodism, constitute with the stock on which they are engrafted, "*Methodism as it is.*" The bulk of the flocks do not like this *ism*, and are therefore, loud in their demands for "*Methodism as it was.*" As *clubs* are the fashion of the day in England, the Methodist people have established religious associations for the protection of their rights against the invasion of their power-loving priests, which correspond with a central club called "*The London Wesleyan Methodist Association.*" Expulsion from the Methodist Society is enacted by the Preachers on the most frivolous pretensions. A Mr. Ballard was expelled because he belonged to this Association, and a Mr. Peckett was thrust out of the office of the Methodist ministry for reading the Christian Advocate! To such a climax of frenzy has this modification of Protestantism arrived, that in the words of the Christian Advocate, "the Rev. Jacob Stanley, who seems resolved to be the antitype of the aspiring spider so famous in history, devoted the afternoon of Sunday week, to a lecture on the legislative and administrative excellences of "*Methodism as it is;*" and accordingly we read (and this happened, be it remembered, in a Methodist chapel and on the Lord's day) that so-and-so "was responded to with loud applause, mingled with strong symptoms of disapprobation!"

The Quakers are likewise in distress. The integrity of their society is broken in England and Ireland as well as in this country. Hicksism has desolated them there as well as here. Nor is this all. Others, even of their "ministers," are protesting against the system, and seceding from their ranks. The Baptists are falling into factions, and bid fair to become very speedily as corrupt, though not so fanatical, as their brethren on this side the Atlantic. Irvingism is adding to the confusion which is rapidly disorganizing the whole fabric of English Protestantism; a consummation devoutly to be wished both here and there.

At present the English are not prepared to receive and practice the Apostolic Gospel. Political and religious agitators are preparing the nation; but it is not yet prepared. Organic changes in the Monarchy; reforms in the several

departments of the State; continental affairs, &c. are exciting, and absorb the attention of the people too much to permit them to listen to Jesus and his Apostles instead of Daniel O'Connell, and the host of politico-religious priests and demagogues, both Tory, Whig, and Radical, who do and abet or oppose him in his attacks upon things, lay and ecclesiastical as they are. Affairs with England, morally, are much as they were with America at the Revolution, though on a grander scale; when Providence interposed to break the strong arm that upheld the crazy Episcopal religion, tithes, &c. against the wishes of the people and the rights of men. Had not the Church, as it is called, been divorced from the State, the gospel could not have been made known in this country, to an attentive people, with the liberty it now enjoys. Here is the arena of preparation for the Lamb's wife. Many of our brethren, we suspect, imagine that "the Ancient Gospel" is gaining the attention of the English through the medium of the London Millennial Harbinger. But, whoever shall read the articles of which that publication is made up cannot but be convinced that it be not yet introduced to that country it never will by means of its venerable and talented editor. He is, indeed, exceedingly unpopular, because he has protested against the Apostacy there. This is natural enough; but, as a correspondent on the spot, having good opportunities of judging, informs us, "it is clear that he has been pulling down the apostacy with one hand and building it up with the other." This he evidently continues to do. No, the Church and State must be divorced; the shaking sects must be broken; taxes on knowledge must be abolished; the town halls must be open to all parties, the pecuniary burdens of the people must be remitted, so that their minds may be tranquilized, a high way prepared, and political and ecclesiastical obstacles removed to the proclamation of the good news from heaven; and by the time all this is effected, the consummation of the times of the Gentiles will have arrived, and then we be to them who "know not God and have not obeyed the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ!"

We would not be understood as saying that amid all the political and sectarian discord no light is elicited by which men may discern truth from error. Controversy on any subject, like the collision of flint and steel, is sure to enlighten. The Bible is extensively circulated; and though men have not yet discovered the true gospel, it has taught them that sectarianism is not Christianity, and least of all the religion of the stained Church of England. The Christian Advocate supplies numerous instances of this; and shows that the Word of God as the only rule of faith and practice.

becoming of more familiar occurrence every day among the persecuted of the sects. The following extract from the trial of a Mr. Ballard by the advocates of "Methodism as it is" will illustrate this:

"*Mr. Ballard* (to the Chairman of the Methodist Leader's Meeting) and by way of objection to a Mr. Reddall, who was panegyricizing 'Methodism as it is;') I understood Mr. Brown was to prefer the charge against me; at present I have to do with him and not Mr. Reddall. I shall pay no regard to any thing he may say until I have replied to the charge. I call upon Mr. Brown to establish the charge.

Mr. Brown. I have preferred the charge.

Mr. Ballard. Am I to understand this as *your* charge?

Mr. Brown. I prefer the charge.

Mr. Ballard. I know that; but is it your *own*, or do you only *introduce* it? The charge is in Mr. Thornton's writing, and not in yours.

Mr. Brown. Then I will introduce it as my charge.

Mr. Ballard. Admitting this to be your charge, you have neglected your duty as a Christian; you ought to have taken the advice of the Saviour, Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17; you ought to have seen me, and endeavored to convince me of my error: if you had failed you ought to have brought one or two more with you; and if I did not hear them, then you should have brought the matter before the Church.

Mr. Brown. If I did not see you, others did.

Mr. Ballard. That is no excuse for you: as you bring the charge it was your duty to see me before-hand. Your work is before you; I call on you to prove the charge.

Mr. Brown. You know you have joined the Association.

Mr. Ballard. My knowledge is not your proving the charge.

Mr. Brown. You have said that you had joined the Association.

Mr. Ballard. But not to you, sir.

Mr. Taylor (the Chairman.) You told me.

Mr. Ballard. I admit it."

"The morality of modern Methodism" says the Christian Advocate, "is as degenerate and corrupt as its discipline is despotic and unjust. The one has sunk below the righteousness of the *second* table, in proportion as the other has swung itself above the authority of the *first*. Man must be degraded, when God is dethroned. The *leaven* of the sanctimonious Pharisee leads us at last to the licentiousness of the free and easy Sadducee. It must not be thought that these hideous hypocrites and shameless sensualists are merely the names of parties that once figured on the page of holy history. They are rather to be regarded as the stereotyped representatives of the proud and the profane of all times, and

of all persuasions—nay, more, as the two polar points of the moral world, whether the world within of a man's own individual character, or the world without, as it is constituted by laws and usages, which supersede the sanctions, and thus subvert the morals, of the word of the only living and true God.

"If a Methodist won't swear, he will both lie and cheat. It is somewhere about the practical estimate of his distinctive morality; so far, at least, as that morality has been formed and continues to be directed, by the principles of his sect. The homely saying here recorded has more general truth in it than many will be prepared to allow; not more, however, than the average experience of the Society will fully warrant and corroborate. It evidently refers to the setting up an untrue standard of right and wrong among a people, the very foot-stones of whose constitution stand upon the traditions of men. The name of Wesley is greater than the name of Christ. To say or do any thing said to be anti-Wesleyan, or extra-confidential is, therefore, the offence *læsæ majestatis*—treason against the idea of the State. In the solemn mockery and supreme mummery of the chief priestly martyrs, it is the sin against the high and holy conclave that cannot be forgiven, bearing upon its guilty head, as far as empty man can mimic the awful thunderings of the Eternal, the denunciations that belong to the sin against the Holy Ghost."

So says the London Christian Advocate. We leave it to our readers to determine how far Methodism as it is in England corresponds with Methodism as it is in America; for our own part, we are convinced that if Methodism, and indeed all other isms, were what *they ought to be* in both hemispheres, they would forever cease to be. *Sed hac Hæc-*
EDITOR.

ANABAPTISM—MATERIALISM—SADDUCEEISM.

In the Christian Reformer I find certain Rules for the Editors of Religious Periodicals. Their author is a well-beloved brother, whose initials are "A. C." He also is an Editor, and will therefore, doubtless be the incarnation of his own rules. At least we should expect so. Rule I says: "*Introduce nothing into your pages that is not of obvious practical utility.*" How far this rule works both ways, we shall press him in for an illustration by and by. Our beloved brother of the "Reformer" adds an eighth, which in my opinion is not the least valuable of the other seven. It serves to be printed in capitals, so here it is: **OF THESE COLUMNS FREELY TO BOTH FRIENDS AND OPPONENTS OF EACH SIDE HAVE AN EQUAL CHANCE AND A FAIR SHARE.** For this I would add a ninth for the benefit of all.

attack one who differs from you, unless you intend to concede to him the right of defending himself, in his own language, before the same audience. If these nine rules be strictly attended to by the Editors among ourselves, we shall without doubt get along as straight as a string; though we may indeed differ upon very many topics.

Rule.

Introduce nothing into your pages that is not of obvious practical utility.

Illustrations.

"But it is contended that some among us lean to the doctrine in question. There may be some, for aught I know, who entertain sentiments which their opponents call by this name. But does this prove that our own sentiments are Unitarian?*****As well might they charge us with the doctrine of *Anabaptism* or *Materialism*, because one of our brethren has avowed these sentiments. And I must be permitted to express my regret that it is so. I am sorry, truly sorry, that any one who can wield as able a pen as our brother of the A—— A—— will turn away from the good work of pulling down the Babel of Sectarianism and building up the temple of the Most High, to any speculations."— *Mill. Harb.* vol. vii. p. 20.

2. Again—"Under the present head (*Church*) I might, I am aware, dilate considerably and expatiate upon some grand divisions of the church into church *militant*, church *triumphant*, and church *patient*, which last expression the papists use of the church in purgatory. However, I am not sure that you would agree to these divisions, more especially the last, as I think you do not believe in purgatory at all. And I may add that those who do believe in it need not be afraid of it now, for our beloved brother, Doctor T—— has lately given some views which I think are calculated to remove both the torment of fear and the fear of torment; for if they should not be wholly relieved from their alarm by re-immersion for the remission of sins, he has by means of opinions effectually barricaded all the avenues to the unseen world, whether by the *pons ast-norum* or through the air on angels' wings and can by an extra dose of heterodoxy (an old fashioned antidote for orthodoxy) make all who are nervous or uneasy, sleep so sound, that they shall not even dream of purgatory. But I am doubtful whether you would like church *dormant* any more than church *patient*; and in the mean time, lest I should cause you to imagine either doctrine true, and put you to sleep, or "torment you before the time" by too long a letter, I will close for the present."— *Ibid.* vol. vii. p. 327.

3. Again, the Ed. M. H. tells his readers in commenting upon an extract from the letter of "a man of business," that it is "more worthy of being embalmed than ever was the body of an Egyptian king." This extract is said to be composed of certain "apposite and practical reflections;" they are the following:—"I have read your conversation at Father Goodall's, and approve it. I am no Sadducee: I believe in both angel and spirit. I think that God is the Father of the spirits of his saints, and earth the mother of their bodies; I am therefore agreed to give to my mother earth all she can rightfully claim—namely, all that is corruptible; and having done so, I stand ready to be clothed upon with my house from heaven—namely, my spiritual body; and in the mean time I have no idea of remaining torpid or asleep; I am content to go to Paradise, or Abraham's bosom. I am willing to be with Christ wherever he

is; if in the *grave*, why, well. But we know that he is not there; therefore I feel a deep repugnance against being *collected* in the *grave*. If the *grave* has charms for any one, I can assure you it has none for me. I wish not to be reserved in chains of darkness. I wish to live, and I feel confident that while Christ lives those who trust in him shall live also. I have no idea of dying—Jesus has died for me, and therefore, death has no claims upon my life.”—*Mill. Herb.* vol. vii. p. 297.

I leave the reader to judge if the practical utility of these extracts is obvious; or the least worthy of being embalmed! The dead body of a king is worth nothing, save to the anatomist or to feed worms; which, in my estimation, is about the value of these business-like reflections.

It will be seen, from these “obviously practical, useful, and appropriate reflections,” that the Harbinger represents me to its readers (without affording them an opportunity of judging for themselves, or doing me the justice of self defence) as a heretic of the deepest dye. If I believe, and teach the things insinuated against me in the foregoing documents, the brethren, who edit and write for that able work, are culpable and truant to the cause of truth in fellowshipping me as their *beloved brother*. I am accused of Anabaptism; of Materialism; of having turned away to speculation; of having ceased from the good work of pulling down the Apostacy; of forsaking the building up of the temple of the Most High; of teaching re-immersion for the remission of sins; of barricading the avenues to the unseen world; of being a Sadducee; of affirming that the grave is the only Paradise; and I know not what else besides. I need not say to those who read the Advocate unbiassedly, or who hear me speak, that these insinuations are founded only in the distempered views of my dissentient friends. When I obeyed the gospel, I knew nothing of the “Reformation,” or the topics of controversy between it and its numerous opponents. Having been thoroughly disgusted with Sectarianism in England, I determined to maintain my independence of all religious sects in America: and in this resolution I find myself this day. Christ, and not the Reformation, is my Lord. The Spirit of liberty, based upon the law of faith, is the Spirit of Christ; and this spirit all the sons of God are privileged to possess, and having it, to breathe. I claim the right of exercising this privilege, as well as my contemporaries, and I require of them that they should do to me as *once* they loudly required others to do to them. If I have turned away from the faith, as some of the insinuations charge me, I am amenable to the law of Christ, and to the congregation in this city. I ought not to be represented to the brethren at large as guilty until proved so; and this proof can be received only as matter of fact, and not as matter of opinion. Having *purified my soul* [life] *by obeying the truth*, I assumed the truth as my sole instructor. By *the truth* I understand the Holy Spirit speaking in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets. All other writings are subordinate to these. None are infallible save the Scriptures. The opinions of the world, that is of mankind, whether readers, writers, or Editors, are none of them so sacred, but they may be examined and discarded or retained, as *evidence* may determine. For some time, I thought this was the golden attribute of the Reformation: but I confess myself deceived. I find that liberty is granted to discuss every thing under certain conditions; which in truth nullify the privilege, or rather *take it toto*. You may discuss all topics, *except some*; and these are *speculative*, if they happen not to have come within the range of *practical* view. A thing is speculative in a bad sense, when it happens to *paralyze* the integrity of my opinions! You may “prove *all* things, and keep that which is good.”

you may not "hold fast that which is good" unless we say so! You may have more light than all men, but not more than we! The zig-zag of our belief is to be the bound of your liberty! You may do and say what you please, only don't condemn us. This is the spurious liberty with which Christ did not make his people free; I fear it is the liberty of this reformation to a considerable extent. The treatment I have experienced from various sources satisfies me that this is true. I once thought that the errorist was to be silenced by argument; Paul acted thus: but so do not my brethren. The Harbinger seems to act as though it thought that its opinion was the authority by which all controversies among us were to be resolved; and subscribers to our periodicals who succumb to this, deign not to convince us of error, but summarily attempt to put us down by withdrawing their subscriptions. This is the argument of force, not the force of argument. One instance of this we put on record; another occurred in which we received a letter notifying the discontinuance of twenty-seven subscribers, and assigning as the cause, the agitation of the "sleeping question," i. e. the state of the dead. Now, if I loved my subscribers' money better than what I believe to be the truth, I should be afraid even to allude to that or any other unpopular subject lest I should lose a subscriber. Have I found the key to Rule I? Would it be of "practical utility" to silence the Advocate? If it would, certainly the most "obvious" way would be to do as the Harbinger is doing—prejudice the minds of its readers so that they shall be deterred from yielding it their support. This would be a short way; and save the trouble of much argumentation. But I can assure my brethren, none of these things move me. The sleeping question, as it is called, is not disproved by the loss of twenty-seven subscribers, nor can the Advocate be silenced by authority. Our subscription is increasing; our paper is read with avidity; and, if we succeed in our proposed arrangements, we shall go on more vigorously and securely than heretofore. While I regret that justice to myself and to truth requires me to speak thus of some of the brethren, it affords me pleasure to bear testimony to the free and noble spirit of liberty breathed by other brethren, who are for free inquiry on every subject relating to the destiny of man; come good, come evil from the church or world. Many of these brethren were once Baptists, and have not been re-immersed. They prefer eccentric truth to consistent error and expediency. May it be my happiness to have my lot always cast with brethren of such principle.

The writer of the first illustration of rule I, signs himself "*Fair-Play*;" of the second, "R. Richardson;" and of the third, "Samuel Church."—Now to all these permit me to say, 'brethren, you condemn what you do not understand; you have not given yourselves sufficiently to the examination of the questions, and therefore I object to you all as incompetent to try, much less to condemn me. *In your opinion*, I am all that you say I am; but then, beloved, you are not infallible—your opinions are not the standard of the faith. You lament very tristfully over my heresy, and one of you lampoons me as the prescriber of an old fashioned antidote for orthodoxy. But, brethren, while you proscribe me as heretical, remember that *you* are not deemed orthodox. If you charge me with anabaptism, and with teaching re-immersion for the remission of sins, forget not that others charge you with Campbellism, and the prescribing of water for the washing away of sin. If the latter be not true, neither is the former; if you deny that, I deny this. Now you expect your denial to be of weight with your opponents; have not I also a right to expect the same of you, seeing that I am your "beloved brother;" and I

presume you are too honest to fellowship one in whose words you have no confidence. Anabaptism, in its true philological and doctrinal import, is impossible. If by the word you mean nothing more than *immersion*, then indeed I am an Anabaptist to a certain extent. There was in the days of Paul, so I believe it is now to a vast degree among religionists, that "all men have not faith." *Facts show the truth of this.* They neither read nor hear the word or testimony read; if faith there be the belief of testimony—faith they have none. Immersion is an institution for believers only; if unbelievers are immersed, the immersion will do them no good; for the gospel is the power of God for salvation to those who believe, and to none else. A belief of the gospel is the one thing needful to an immersion into Christ. I maintain, in the face of a frowning world, that an immersed unbeliever must believe the gospel and be immersed again in order to put on Christ; and that the first immersion of such person, by whomsoever performed, is not a Christian Immersion, and therefore not worth a stiver. The second immersion is his baptism; the first is a mere unmeaning ceremony. Great numbers of immersed unbelievers who have, and who have not, subsequently believed, are among us; and crowds of the latter are among the baptists. If it be asked—why say any thing upon the subject?—I reply for the same reason, that you profess such zeal for "converting the world." "For the love of souls," you say; I answer, for the same cause I agitate this topic.

To say a man is a Materialist is to pronounce him as worthy of death at once in the estimation of some wise people. To give him a name, that few know the meaning of, is an ingenious device to prejudice the world against him. I affirm, that I have never read a single page of a book, *except the Bible*, on the subjects called Materialism. I once assented to the traditions of men on the spirit, the soul, the state, and the destiny of the dead; simply because I was nurtured in these absurdities: but the truth has made me free, and I believe with the Apostles, that the dead are truly dead asleep, and will so remain until THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE shall call them forth from their graves to enjoy life or to suffer punishment. Is this doctrine "calculated to remove the fear of torment;" is this blocking up "the avenues to the unseen world," Bro. Richardson?

My time is as much devoted as ever to the pulling down of Babel and to the building up of the temple of the Most High. Many can bear testimony that I labor more than any in these parts at this very work. I have neglected my own affairs to a considerable extent since I submitted to the government of Jesus Christ, that I might attend to those very things. But I expect no thanks from the many; my reward is reserved in heaven. God is the judge.—It is not true that I am turned to speculation in a bad sense. It is the church and the world that are speculating about ghosts and airy heavens; I am endeavoring to bring them back from these aerial conceits to the grave and substantial matters (*materialism*, if you will have it so) taught by the Holy Spirit in the Bible.

It is utterly false that I propagate in any way "re-immersion for the remission of sins."—On the contrary, I teach that a man may be immersed fifty times, but that unless he believe in the blood of Jesus shed for the remission of sins, his sins are still unremitted. We are justified by faith in his blood, not by immersion in water, though we are not justified unless immersed. The water and the blood joined in baptism are both indispensable to salvation both present and to come. And he that teaches otherwise, in my judgment, is the word of God of none effect by his traditions.

I am not a Sadducee as Samuel Church insinuates. I believe that the dead will come from their graves either to live forever, or to suffer a most fearful punishment, which will *ultimate* in eternal death. I believe that there are indefinite millions of people besides those who inhabit this planet; who are called the sons of God and the morning stars; and *angels* when employed as messengers. I believe in spirits, who tormented the possessed; because the fact is recorded, but I cannot define them. I believe that God is the Father of the spirits of the Saints, i. e. the Begetter in them of holy dispositions that they, the saints, may live eternally—and that the earth is a very Eve to all living. But I differ from him that what is corruptible alone belongs to the earth. The body of Jesus in its natural descent was derived from the dust of the ground. So were the bodies of Enoch and Elijah. Now, these three personages never saw corruption; the earth, therefore, "can rightfully claim" incorruptible as well as corruptible things. Hence the earth has a claim upon Jesus; and He will return with all the incorruptible bodies that have left her, to satisfy her claim. Whether Brother Church has an idea, or not, of remaining "torpid or asleep" in the grave; or "a deep repugnance" to its confinement, he will just have to submit to what God has appointed. He cannot be where Christ is until Christ's return. None but the High Priest enters bodily within the veil at present, as Bro. C. will find out by and by. I don't contend for a rest in the grave, because "the grave has charms" for me; this idea was once revolting to me; but as I find God has so arranged it, I submit to it with pleasure, knowing it is but for a time. Bro. C. has "no idea of dying"—well well, perhaps, he is to be translated; or evaporated into the circumambient ether; Jesus has died for him, he says, and therefore death has no claims upon his life!" Well, reader, if you should happen to behold the "mortal remains" of Samuel Church perhaps the subject of incipient putrefaction or a tabernacle for worms, you are by no means to suppose he is dead, for he had "no idea of dying." No, no, he lives; and as you will see from the *living* worms that crawl from his sunken orbs, "death has no claims" on him!"—But, perhaps, as our beloved brother has embalmed the "apposite and practical reflections" of Brother Church in his Mill. Harb. he may embalm his mortality also, and prevent so apposite and practical a reflection upon his own reflections.

Words are used in more senses than one; and the proper meaning is determined by the context. This applies to the word *Paradise*. I never said, as I am misrepresented, that Paradise had but one meaning, and that the grave. It is used but three times in Scripture. The context of these three passages shows that they all have reference more or less remotely, to one *subject*. In the passage in Luke it has a *remote* reference to the kingdom to be restored to Israel under the reign of Jesus; *immediately* to the state of the dead with whom the thief should be numbered that day when he should cease to live—namely, among them who had "died in faith not having received the promises concerning the kingdom of Messiah." Heb. xi. 13. If it meant the grave only, then the wicked would also be in Paradise, i. e. gain admission into the kingdom hereafter; which none but an Universalist would affirm.

That uninterrupted harmony may prevail, and preside over our greatest differences is the unfeigned aspiration of the
EDITOR.

REPLY TO TIMOTHY.—(Concluded from p. 45.)

The Editor to the Reader wishes health:

We are happy in being able to finish our reply to this cor-

respondent in the words of our brother Winans. He is an acute and sententious writer and competent to discuss profitably the things pertaining to the doctrine of Christ. With in the envelope of the subjoined reply he writes to this effect:—"If it were not that your vehicle is too small to admit passengers, who live so remote, I should like to take a passage with your correspondent, 'Timothy' *alias* 'a Baptist.' His frankness pleases me, and you should not speak harshly to him; for he has honored you with a place in God's 'providential interposition,' and has admitted that you are one of the means used for salvation. By your "exceedingly harsh and censorious manner" you have been made the instrument of salvation by which the Baptists have been saved from 'the destroying snare.' "

I should like very much to travel with this man through the Acts of the Apostles in search of an answer to the question—"Does not the whole history of conversions recorded in the Acts argue the necessity of 'Divine interposition' (other than the word) in order to the conversion of men?" To this question I would answer, *yes!* It required miracles as well as the word. And if God has at any time used any other means than his word and his *works* (miracles) to convince and convert men, I should be pleased to hear your correspondent name these *other means* one by one.

But he has mistaken the giving of the Holy Spirit to such as were already converted for the means used for conversion—"Because you are sons" says the Apostle, "God has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts," &c.—and "Except you have the spirit of Christ you are none of his." These expressions "Timothy" appropriates to unconverted men; whereas Paul appropriates them to converted men. This is the difference between modern Timothies and Paul; although the ancient Timothy did not thus differ from him because he learned the things he taught from Paul, but this modern one has learned his views from the modern Apostles."

We do indeed regret the smallness of our paper on more accounts than one. We have a great many *old* apostolic traditions to lay before our readers—*new* indeed, and "untaught questions" to many—but old as the revelation of God to man; the communications of many esteemed brethren that would be read with interest; queries, &c. which owing to this cause cannot appear or be attended to within a reasonable period: but with the aid of a few of our faithful brethren in these parts we hope to be able to remove the impediment that lies in the way of brother Winans and others as well as of ourselves. But to his reply:

James Town, Ohio, June 12, 1844.

BROTHER THOMAS,—Your correspondent "Timothy" sets out with the proposition that *Divine interposition* other

than the Word of God, is necessary in order to the conversion of men—and then asks you to read the following passages in proof of his allegata:

1 John vi. 44. "No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him." What a pity that Timothy had not read the next verse to see *how* the Father drew men to Jesus. "It is written in the prophets, they shall be all taught of God, *Every man, therefore, that hath HEARD and hath LEARNED of the Father cometh unto me.*"

The Father drew such as HEARD. Heard what? The Word spoken by the prophets surely. For Jesus gave the reason of their unbelief in the preceding chapter, verses 37, 38, and 39. He there tells them to search the Scriptures for they testified of him, &c. This passage proves that those who *heard the Word* of God were the ones whom the Father drew to Jesus, and those who had not the Word abiding in them refused to come to him. So that Timothy's first proof goes against his allegata.

Now for the next, see Acts xiv. 15. Surely Timothy made a mistake when he called this witness. This passage testifies that *by the Word* these idolators were restrained from sacrificing to Paul and Barnabas, and that the *Word* was preached to them to *turn* them from these vanities unto the living God.

Here again the witness called, goes against the allegata.

Now we will turn to Rom. viii. 7—"Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be." What "Timothy" summoned this passage for, I am at a loss to divine.

There is not a hint that the carnal mind was operated upon by the *personal and immediate work* of the Holy Ghost to be found in the passage. It is positively declared that the carnal mind cannot be subjected to the Law of God. But Timothy wants this passage to read, "The carnal mind cannot be subjected to the law of God, *except by the personal and immediate work of the Holy Ghost.*" But Paul made no such exception. Therefore the passage refuses to give testimony in the case.

Next we will call up 1 Cor. ii. 14—"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God," &c.

In this passage Paul was shewing that none of the princes of this world knew the hidden wisdom of God, however learned they might be. That which was hidden or unrevealed was not known by any of these princes, (natural men) else they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory, &c. But after God revealed them to the Apostles by his spirit, and they preached them to these princes (natural men) they were no longer hidden, but could then be known by any one who would listen to the Apostles.

Here again the witness called knows nothing of the matter. Now we are ready for the testimony of the last witness summoned. 1 Cor. xii. 3—"Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, and no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost."

In this passage Paul is shewing the use of spiritual gifts. How that none could say that Jesus is Lord, but by these gifts. The reason is obvious none had ever been in Heaven where he was crowned Lord of All, therefore none could testify of that which they did not know. But the Holy Spirit was there and He could testify to the fact, which he did to those spiritual men, but not for the purpose of converting them, for they were already converted, but for the purpose of qualifying them to convert others, *by what they spoke*. For this purpose He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the work of the ministry, till all came to the unity of the faith, and acquired the knowledge of the Son of God, &c. Having now examined all the witnesses summoned by "Timothy" we find that some testify against his position, and others know nothing of the matter. This last witness does not say one word about *conversion*—he is speaking of another matter entirely.

I now say to "Timothy" that he cannot find a single case named by Luke in his letter to "THEOPHILUS" where any one is said to be converted by the *personal and immediate work* of the Holy Ghost.

Excuse haste and bad writing.

M. WINANS.

DIALOGUE WITH FATHER GOODAL.

BY JAMES HENSHALL.

Secundus Good evening Father Goodal; how is your health?

Father Goodal. Thank you brother, I am as well as I can expect for a man of my years. I am seldom free from aches and pains, the general attendants of old age.

Secundus Your locks bespeak a long struggle with many winters. In consequence of your age and experience your sentiments are generally respected by the reformers, and therefore, I am come to spend this evening with you, to talk with you about the "conversation" a select company of you held the other day at your son Thomas'.

Father Goodal. The object of your visit pleases me, for I was much interested with that conversation, although when the subject was first started by Mrs. Reed I was fearful it would be an unprofitable conversation. I suppose you have heard what the subject was.

Secundus. I saw it reported by one of the company, and I came thinking that Mr. Wickliffe and your son Thomas were entirely personal in their remarks on our brother Editor, whose views they were combating.

Father Goodal. Upon reflection I consider they were rather

their remarks on the brother, but I do not think they were at all too severe on the notions of that author. Such chimeras deserve no better treatment.

Secundus. Pray is Mr. Wickliffe a reformer?

Father Goodal. O yes, he is a staunch reformer.

Secundus. Astonishing—I should have considered him an orthodox Presbyterian.

Father Goodal. No indeed, he is a most talented man, and one who clearly understands the principles of our reformation. He was educated among the Presbyterians; but upon the first preaching of the "Ancient Gospel" he came out from among them.

Secundus. I suppose he thinks that the reformation consists in a few first principles, and as soon as these are learned, investigation stops. I know a great many spongy reformers like this, who are willing to admit of a reformation in faith and manners, but not in *hope*; a subject indeed by far too much neglected.

Father Goodal. Well brother I go for reformation all round, and will listen to you patiently while you state wherein the reformation is necessary. I should be pleased first to hear your objections to our "conversation."

Secundus. I shall begin with the remarks of Mrs. Reed. She calls "the spirits living after death," "the hope of a Christian," and, as is common to the weakness of her sex, adds, "of a dying Christian," as if she was so tender towards dying people's hopes in comparison with living ones. I consider she is guilty of, what I call, reformation quackery when she says,—"God forbid that I should laugh at any thing so sacred as the hope of a Christian, of a dying Christian, although it should be a hope as ill-founded as some would have Paul's hope of being present with the Lord so soon as he was absent from the body.

Father Goodal. I confess I can see no quackery in all this, your sight must be keener than mine if you can discover it.

Secundus. Is it not one of the characteristics of this reformation to call things by their proper names?

Father Goodal. Undoubtedly it is, we have always contended that Bible things must be called by Bible names; that a departure from this rule has introduced the unmeaning jargon of the schools; and rendered the Bible unintelligible.

Secundus. So I think, and that the terms faith, hope, knowledge, opinion, and feeling were used by the sacred writers to express quite different states of the mind.

Father Goodal. We have always understood it in this manner.

Secundus. Is it not a species of quackery to call that hope which Paul calls knowledge? By what authority does Mrs. Reed talk of "Paul's hope of being present with the Lord so soon as he was absent from the body?"

Father Goodal. She referred to 2 Cor. v. 6, where Paul says, "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord," and although Paul does not call it his hope, yet it is strongly implied.

Secundus. Implied indeed; do we reformers lean facts by implication? With due deference to your age and experience, and to the magical authority of orthodoxy, I do not think the passage is well understood.

Father Goodal. I would like to hear how you understand it, for I confess I never suspected the common opinion on that passage, always deeming it a correct one.

Secundus. The Apostle begins the 4th chapter by speaking of the administration of the gospel by himself, and fellow Apostles, and concludes by speaking of the effects and consequences to themselves by using the pronoun *we*. Hence he says, "*We* (the Apostles) which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake." "So then death worketh in us (Apostles) but life in you" (Corinthians.) And so far from Paul's losing the hope Mrs. Reed speaks of, he says, "*Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us up also by Jesus, and shall present us with you.*" Then he says, "For we *know* (not hope) that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, *eternal in the heavens,*" (not for a time in paradise.) Here by the "earthly house," he evidently means his *mortal body* (in connexion with earthly temporalities) and by "the building of God" the "spiritual body (in connexion with eternal realities by the inheritance) which God has prepared and will bestow on the faithful."

Father Goodal. To all this I have no objection, but you have not yet met the difficulty.

Secundus. I was going to ask you if you consider Christians as absent from the Lord, as long as they are in the body.

Father Goodal. O yes, certainly, and as soon as we die we (i. e. our souls) go to paradise.

Secundus. Query, Father Goodal, is the Lord in paradise? (i. e. the state of the departed)

Father Goodal. No, he is in heaven itself, whither he entered with his own blood, where he is our High Priest.

Secundus. The High Priest went into the most holy place alone, under the Mosaic dispensation, did he not?

Father Goodal. Yes, alone, and what do you conclude from this?

Secundus. It follows then, that if the souls of the departed go to paradise, and not to heaven, that as the Lord is not in paradise but in heaven, upon your own principles, that we are as absent from the Lord in paradise as in the body. And if the most holy place was a type of heaven and the High Priest of Jesus, it follows, that while he officiates as High Priest above, none can go to him in the heavenly holy place.

Father Goodal. I have not so strong an attachment to old notions as to oppose you as long as you reason fairly and scripturally. I am anxious now, since you have begotten in my mind a doubt as to the popular view, that you tell me what you think the Apostle means.

Secundus. We are said to be "in Christ," Rom. xii. 5—"into Christ"—"into his death," chapter vi. 3. Again, we live a new life in Christ, and the Apostle says, "For whether we live we live to the Lord, and whether we die we die to the Lord; whether we live therefore or die we are the Lord's." Are we not then as much the Lord's when alive, as dead? Again it is written, "Blessed are the dead who die *in the Lord.*" How then can we be absent from him if we live and die in him?

Father Goodal. But you must perceive that the production of difficulties against an opinion is not to be taken alone as proof that the opinion is wrong. Paul does say "Whilst we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord."

Secundus. I am aware of this, but when a farmer wants to pull a noxious weed from his field he is careful to tear up every root and branch. So I wish to remove all difficulties out of my way, that we may have only the "ancient gospel," but, the ancient hope of Christians is a stranger is one from home; a pilgrim is a wanderer; and a traveller is one who is on a journey from one place to another. † Christians are

sometimes called strangers, travellers, and pilgrims. But if we were *at home* in the body we should have no occasion to travel to the "heavenly country," (for we walk by faith not by sight.) Thus while we walk by faith as strangers and pilgrims here, we are absent from the body and present with the Lord, and he with us in his kingdom. As it is written, "Wheresoever two or three are gathered in my name there am I in the midst of them." And while we "walk by faith," and are thus present with the Lord, we labor to be acceptable to him. All having to appear before his judgment seat. Thus Father Goodal, I have endeavored to clear up one passage from the mist of orthodoxy, and when I call again, the thief on the cross, &c. will be attended to.

TRUE SAYINGS.

Fools believe things when they are told; wise men believe them when they are proved.

Almost all men believe the Scriptures are true; few believe the truth contained in the Scriptures.

Multitudes plead the Scriptures to support their conduct; few there are which the Scriptures justify in their conduct.

Many are pleased when they see other people's failings; few are pleased to have their failings seen and described by others.

Many people think themselves right, barely because they have ever thought so; and that others are wrong, because they differ from them.

Many are willing to live, who are not willing others should live to make their lives a greater blessing.

IMPLICIT FAITH.

Implicit faith has sometimes been ludicrously styled *fides carbonaria*, from the noted story of one, who, examining an ignorant collier on his religious principles, asked him what it was that he believed. He answered, "I believe what the church believes." The other rejoined, "What then does the church believe?" He readily replied, "the church believes what I believe." The other desirous, if possible, to bring him to particulars, once more resumed his inquiry, "Tell me then I pray you, what it is which you and the church both believe?" The only answer the collier could give was, "Why, truly, sir, the church and I both believe the same thing." This is implicit faith in perfection, and in the estimation of some doctors, is the sum of necessary and saving faith in Christ.

An anonymous writer has defined "Faith" to be the prostration of reason before the throne of revelation. This impious definition proves him to have been a fool. Had he said, that popular faith was the prostration of reason before the throne of superstition he would have been right.

OUR LAST ANECDOTE.

In the Religious Herald of July 15, is an exculpatory from a Mr. McDaniel. It was occasioned by this passage in the Advocate concerning him—"I suspect had he been sent, he would not have affixed his signature, (to the report of the Committee) for he happens to be one of those from whom the facts come." He denies ever having had any communication to me either written or verbal; directly or indirectly. Now the readers of the Advocate know that I have charged him with having done so. He admits that he has conversed with many on the subject of St. Andrew and the Salemites. Now it was from one of them with whom I conversed that I had the information; and therefore it might truly be said, that the facts came from him as one among others.

Again he says, I have never "communicated to any person living, any thing in relation to the course pursued by the pastor or the church, with a view or thought of its being used to the injury of either, nor have I made any other than a true statement of the case." We have never impugned Mr. McDaniel's motives; we know nothing of his intentions; we give him credit, therefore, to the full extent he desires under this head. And that he told the many with whom he conversed the truth, we doubt not; or we should not have published the anecdote, had we not been assured by Francis V. Sutton, one of the many, that he was a man of veracity. But we will not press Mr. McDaniel too hard; for we know the position he holds between *ortho* and *hetero*-doxy; not that he is friendly to us, for I believe he is much opposed; but that he is an independent and candid person, who will testify against his own party if the truth requires.

We would add one word touching his "pastor." St. Andrew, who is very sore upon the subject of the Anecdote, and well he may, for it is true, a little ago came out in the Herald proclaiming to the Baptist world (I quote from memory, not having the paper by me) that he would as soon scuffle with a chimney sweeper as with me, and would certainly if we came in contact take the wind of me. Now reader mark the discrepancy between St. Andrew's theory and practice! Under the disguise of an anonymous signature (*Crito*) he "scuffles" with me about the Psalms, calling me the "reforming poet," &c.; this the Baptist world did not know till I told them; and *subsequently* over his proper name he tells them, in effect, that he would as soon condescend to scuffle with a sweep as have any thing at all to do with me. So much for the concord of the words and actions of the immaculate St. Andrew of Sparta!

RECEIPTS

For Vol. 3.—Hicksford, G. Va. R. Madsen, M. Peterson, Richmond, Va. B. Henly, A. Gentry, L. Waller, C. Pittrell, W. Carter \$2, E. Juan, J. Bootwright, T. Kennard \$2, R. Smith \$2, W. B. Clark, J. H. Walker, H. Dogged, J. R. Ratcliffe, Mrs. W. Freeman, J. Woodson, A. Clark, A. Frazer, Mrs. Winfrey, E. Carter \$10, J. Bosher Mrs. Elliot; *Charlottesville, Va.* W. Summerson, Mr. Philips, J. W. Goss \$8 for self, T. Scoff, R. Hollins, T. Bullard, E. Thompson, J. Twyman, R. Grigaby, J. Goss—R. B. Mills; *Chilesburg, Caroline, Va.* T. Jones; *Norfolk, Va.* J. Hathaway; *Newton, E. Va.* Mrs. Munday; *Taylorville, H. Va.* T. D. Taylor; *Wulkinsville, G. Va.* T. Meridith; *Paris, Ky.* W. Bodenhamer; *Nashville, Tenn.* W. P. Anderson, S. Atkinson, M. Usery, T. Scott, A. Thompson, F. McGavock, S. Bradford, R. Page, T. Osborne, J. Chickring, A. Demoss, J. Cloyd, B. Pritchett, T. Browne, W. G. Harding, S. B. Davidson, J. H. Smith, L. Joslin, T. Woodward, R. H. Alison, W. Henery, J. D. March, J. F. Harkrider, T. Fanning, J. Demoss, W. Williams, W. Newson, W. P. Bowers, J. N. Esselman, J. Berry, A. Carrington, D. Dunaway, T. A. Alison; *Shannon Hill, G. Va.* N. Groom; *Simpson's, Va.* H. Smith; *Stephensville, J.* Draper, T. Walker \$2, J. C. Roy, R. I. Pendleton, J. Du Val, L. Edwards, M. Hill, W. B. Todd, E. Newman, J. Draper—all by P. B. Pendleton and for himself; *Villeboro', C. Va.* A. Anderson; *Thompson's, L. Va.* R. Hollins, A. Bagby; *Miller's, E. Va.* W. S. Croxton; *Kingston, Mass.* T. Adams; *Leighton, L. Ala.* E. H. Towns; *Church Hill, H. Va.* T. E. Jeter; *Jetersville, A. Va.* T. E. Jeter \$3, Dr Jackson; *Savannah, Ga.* A. Gallaway, C. Dasher, J. Helviensten, Capt Turner, S. B. Williams, A. Dasher, J. Gardner, Mr. Pendergrass, S. C. Dunning, Mrs. Love, Mrs. Arms, Mrs. Adams, M. Swigover \$1 over; *Roanoke, S. Geo.* J. Wissunbaker; *Pittsburg, Va.* T. D. Estep \$20, on account, *Christiansburg, M. Va.* C. Ballance, A. Snow; *Petersburg, Va.* W. Walker J. T. Brown, W. Squires, C. Clarke; *Cuckooville, Louisa, Va.* W. B. Sims. *Louisa Courthouse, Va.* W. D. Hunter; *Double Bridges, L. Va.* J. J. Jordan; *Brydie's Store, Va.* C. Brydie; *Laurel Hill, Va.* E. A. Pool; *Scottsville, Alb. Va.* J. Tyler, R. L. Coleman, E. P. Burnett, B. F. Trice. *Dorer Mills, G. Va.* M. W. Webber; *Baltimore, Md.* J. E. French, W. P. Lemon, R. Lemon, H. Bell, S. Sands, C. Farquharson, W. Carman, G. Austin, E. N. Sweeny, A. Thompson, R. Wilson, J. G. Henshall. *Dunnsville, Va.* J. Henshall; *Parnerville, A. Va.* J. A. Jeter, A. B. Walthal \$20; *Boiler's, E. Va.* E. M. Ware \$10. *Ervington, S. C.* J. D. Erwin, J. B. Powell, W. R. Erwin, U. M. Robert, N. H. Roads, W. Hewlett; *Witmer's, W. Md.* E. Renner, D. Clevidence; *Throopville, C.* N. Y. C. W. Clapp, C. Allen, M. Converss, J. A. Andrew, J. Andrew, J. Clapp.

NOTICE.

The meeting at Antioch, Caroline, Va. will be on the Saturday before the *second*, instead of the first Lord's day, as notified in our last number.

Mr. R. Ryland's "erratum;" "Non-Nemo;" "F." and other Receipts in our next.

Printed by J. C. WALKER, at his Book and Job Printing Office, corner of F and 12th streets, immediately opposite the Post Office, where all kinds of Job Printing will be neatly and promptly executed.

APOSTOLICAL

PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. A.

VOL. 3. RICHMOND, Va., SEPT. 1838.

Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Fathers, himself being the foundation corner stone.—Ephes. ii. 20.

Shut up, O Daniel, the words, and seal the book, till the time that many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. The righteous shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall not be so; and none of the wicked shall understand; but they shall stand.—Dan. xii. 4, 10.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS

(Continued from page 11.)

As we have said, some regard this parable as the result of certain incidents which happened. The Papists, some Protestants, and some Christians, are of this opinion. Monsieur Chateaubriand, a French traveller, and a devout Catholic, says, that the monks in Jerusalem show strange places, the place where Dives lived, and Lazarus laid when he was sick, and that he licked his sores. If I mistake not, it was on the hill of the *Via Dolorosa* along which Jesus is said to have proceeded from the prætorium to Mount Calvary! Such is the notion of those who yield credence without testimony, according to the traditions of men—a belief that forbids a scrutiny and disdains a reason.

To the enlightened, we need scarcely observe, that this portion of scripture is nothing more than a parable, a simile.

* A scripture parable is a similitude taken from natural things and received opinions in order to instruct us in things spiritual, i. e. in things pertaining to the Holy Spirit's teaching. According to Dr. Lardner, a parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a *fictional* event, applied by way of simile to the illustration of some important truth. By the Greeks, allegories were called *apologoi*, and by the Romans fables; and the writings of *Æsop*, or those who claimed an imitation of him, have acquired the greatest celebrity. Nor did the Saviour himself disdain to adopt the same method of instruction. In these fables it is doubtful whether they excel most in wisdom and instruction, or in sweetness, elegance, and perspicuity. Every parable may be divided into three parts: 1. The sensible similitude in which consists the body of the parable; 2. Its spiritual sense or thing signified; 3. The *application*, or the use to which it tends. For the right explanation and application of a parable, see

rade, or illustration. As parables have all two senses, the literal or external, and the mystical or external and hidden sense, the literal sense must be first explained. Here then, we have a supposition, that there was a rich man, whether in Jerusalem or elsewhere is not said, who was splendidly apparelled, and feasted sumptuously every day. This type of the rich men of the Jewish nation is contrasted by a poor man of wretched condition, the type of those they despised as sinners. The poor Lazarus died, and was unostentatiously buried; the rich man also died, and as his order make much parade over their dead, it is especially declared that he "was buried." The scene is now changed, and the reader is introduced to the shades of death where certain circumstances are supposed to occur. He finds the condition of the rich and poor man reversed; for, although the rich man entered the grave with all the pomp of oriental obsequies, he is discovered in hades in a state of torment; whereas Lazarus, who made his exit from the living unobserved and unlamented, is revealed as enjoying the friendship of Abraham in comfort and peace. The rich man is represented as a suppliant for the favors of him, who, when alive, had laid at his gate covered with sores, and glad to eat even the crumbs that fell from his table. What a contrast! The rich are to be spoiled of every thing, and the poor are to possess the kingdom (Mat. v. 3.) His petition is rejected, not by Lazarus, for that might seem revengeful, but by Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, and the natural ancestor of them both. Abraham reminds him of the justice of their condition. That temporal good had been his choice, and he had had it; it was now his turn to receive evil: and that Lazarus had suffered in time, it was his turn, therefore to, experience joy. Besides, his cry for pity could not be answered if he were so disposed. For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom there; the destiny of all is fixed; no crossing the bounds of the two states, to practice the mercies and charities of life—the huge gulph of destiny was between them. Perceiving there was no hope for himself, the rich man did not wholly despair of moving Abraham to pity the condition of his father's house; the members of which were pursuing the same career as he had done, and which he knew

general scope and design must be ascertained. This may be done from the clear declaration prefixed or subjoined to it; but where no declaration is prefixed or subjoined, its scope must be collected from a consideration of the subject matter, context, or the occasion on account of which the parable was delivered. But in that of Dives, or the Rich Man and Lazarus, Jesus has declared its scope by *subjoining* the declaration, which is, *if the living hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one should arise from the dead.*

would infallibly involve them, in the same catastrophe as him. But here again his prayer was unsuccessful, and the means of escape from perdition were withdrawn. No miracle would be wrought for their reformation, and it would be useless. As Jews, God had appointed nothing necessary for eternal life and godliness, unless they not avail themselves of what was within their reach, would they be benefitted though Lazarus should arise from the dead. They have Moses and the Prophets, and hear them; and if they believe not their writings, how can they believe his words, seeing that both Lazarus and the Prophets would but testify the same thing. This is the circumstance of the second scene.

The spiritual sense or thing especially signified by all that was addressed to the Pharisees, who loved money, and wore purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day, was designed to show them the destiny which awaited them, and that if they would not hear Moses and the Prophets, there was no way for them to escape the impending vengeance. They would not believe on Him, who had come to fulfil the things spoken in the Law and the Prophets. "What miracle then do you, that seeing it, we may believe you?" "What do you perform?" said they, "greater than those witnessed by our fathers." As if Jesus had replied, "if I were to perform a greater, you would not believe, nor would you reform the evil of your ways." If one were to arise from hades to assure you of your "coming destiny you would not repent; for if you believe not the writings of Moses in whom you trust, neither would you believe his words." Or, in the language of the parable, If you hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will you be persuaded though one should arise from the dead.

Such I conceive is the obvious, as well as the hidden or spiritual meaning of this parable. It could not have been to terrify the Jews, or to correct their views, concerning the state of the condition, in which the dead are immediately after their decease; for, as it is conceded, all the circumstances expressed in the fable coincided with their opinions, subsequent to the Macedonian conquest. If things, then, are exactly as we believe we need neither correction nor instruction in relation to them. This, therefore, could not have been the design of the parable.

But a lax interpretation has converted the literal expressions into the spiritual meaning of the parable, and has risen to the most palpable absurdities. It says, "Lazarus died, and was conveyed, by messengers, to heaven; and, 'I am dead;' this means, say divines, that the soul of Lazarus was carried up to heaven on angels wings, and that he will

one figure means another figure, between which there is nothing real. It says, the poor man was conveyed to Abraham's bosom. But divines have constructed a certain theory concerning death, spirits, heaven, and hell; and can see, therefore, nothing in these parabolic expressions but their own traditions. The meaning of the phrase to me seems to be this—Lazarus died, was unostentatiously buried, and numbered with Abraham and others, who died in faith not having received the promises. The word in the original is *angeloon*, which signifies *messengers* of any kind, whether celestial or terrestrial. It applies equally to persons sent to carry the dead to their graves, as to Gabriel sent to carry a message from God to Zacharias. When a *righteous* Jew was carried to his temporary resting place in the grave, he was conveyed by messengers to Abraham's bosom; and thus, it is supposed to have happened with the poor and ulcerated Lazarus.

Again, in the second scene, which opens in hades by *anticipation*, Abraham and the rich man are represented at a great distance apart, being separated by a *huge gulph*, yet they talk as easily together as if they were within a few feet. Now if the laws of sound are the same in the invisible as in the visible state, this is a violation of God's natural law, and unless miraculous, is absurd.

Again, the rich man's request was absurd, if taken literally. What use would as much water as could be conveyed on the tip of the finger have been in cooling his burning tongue? And he must have known, that it was impossible for Abraham to send Lazarus among the living again, to carry a message from the tormented to their relations above ground. Is it a huge gulph of water by which heaven is divided from hell; and if so, why cannot the wicked cool themselves by plunging therein? Is there so much disinterestedness, so much of humanity left among the damned, that they should desire rather to suffer in solitude than to have the company of their former associates in their misery?

Again, Abraham's bosom is said to be heaven. Suppose we grant it. Then the messengers carried Lazarus, all ulcerated and ragged as he was into heaven; which is impossible, for nothing unclean can enter there. It would appear too that Abraham is the person in heaven to whom the tormented apply for pity! These are some of the impossibles, the improbables, and the absurdities suggested to our mind by this lax interpretation. "Divines," and not our Lord, are responsible for these. His wisdom is free from the slightest imputation; for it is incidental to parables to represent that *as a truth which is only imagined*—conversations between trees, birds, and beasts, to wit. These considerations show

that the phraseology of this parable is figurative or symbolical, and not to be understood literally, but according to the explanation put upon it by the ancient Jews alone. (To be continued.)

QUERIES.

The following interrogatories are from a correspondent in King and Queen county, Virginia. If we rightly divine, he is not a Christian; but, as will appear from the questions he asks, and the references he has made, he is an inquirer after truth, and a student of the sacred writings. For the convenience of reply we have separated the queries from the other parts of his letter. His epistolary observations are as follow.

"DEAR SIR,—I beg leave to propound to you the subjoined inquiries. No matter how simple they may be, or how shallow a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures they may evince, still to see them answered would afford the writer, and possibly some others of your subscribers considerable satisfaction and information. They are *casués isolés*; and are written irrespective of the context. You can either receive or reject them at your pleasure. To each one I have appended the location in which it may be found: so that you may experience no obstacle in giving them a prompt answer. I trust you will notice them, and devote a moment of your time to their consideration. By refusing you might discourage research. For this incommode, however, I must desire your pardon.

"I am, sir, with profound respect, your obedient servant,

1. What good deed could those who presented *babes* to Jesus expect to be conferred upon them by his royal touch? Luke xviii. 15.

2. What is the meaning of Messiah's saying—"permit the children to come to me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven?" v. 16.

The design of Jesus in this place was obviously to teach his hearers a lesson of humility. The *precept* is contained in the fourteenth verse: *Whoever exalleth himself shall be humbled; but whoever humbles himself shall be exalted.* When thus discoursing, certain persons presented themselves to him, that he might touch them. What good deed these men expected Jesus to confer upon them, I cannot tell; because the text saith not. If I were to conjecture, I should say, that having been accustomed to behold such wonderful effects result from his healing of diseases, they expected that some virtue might be communicated to their babes by the same means, which might be of service to them in future life. The disciples, not wishing to be interrupted in his discourse by such a trivial affair, were very forward. But Jesus took occasion to turn this *trivial* into an *emphatic* of his great and important *precept*. He said he, *to come to me, and forbid them not*; and he opened his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them. This *action* directed the attention of the spectators to them *as the types* of the *disposition* required in those who would enter the kingdom of God—of the

like to) *suck* (babes) said he, *is the kingdom of God* (composed.) And he added with emphasis, "Whoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child, shall never enter it"—i. e. unless a man receive the doctrine of the reign with the docile and humble disposition of a little child he shall never partake of its blessings. But few enter the kingdom of heaven here; fewer will enter the kingdom of God hereafter: and for this reason, because very few have the humility to begin their discipleship as learners, being too proud, self-conceited, and indocile to be taught. Hence, you meet with thousands who, having borne the name of disciples for years (of course I refer to immersed persons only, all the unimmersed having no scriptural pretension to the name) are as ignorant of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, as when they assumed their religion. But these are "barren and unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ"—they are "blind, and cannot see afar off;" and are those unchild-like persons, who will not be permitted to share in the resurrection of the just, and so to enter into the kingdom of God.

You will observe, that Jesus says not that the kingdom of God is composed of babes; but that babes in their teachable, diffident, and knowledge-seeking disposition, are the types of the spirits or dispositions of the citizens of that institution. There is no scripture doctrine founded upon the saying, "Suffer little children to come unto me." It signifies nothing more nor less than, "cease, my disciples, to rebuke those who would bring them to me to touch; let them approach, and prevent them not!" They drew near; he touched them, and so satisfied their friends, and there the matter ended.

3. How do you reconcile Peter's means of salvation as declared in his Pentecostian address, and Paul's means as announced to the Jailor? Acts ii. 38; xvi. 31.

4. Does the word *saved* in the latter place allude to salvation from temporal punishment, i. e. the punishment that would have been due him, had the prisoners effected their escape, or does it allude to salvation by an introduction to the Christian kingdom?

There is no discrepancy between the two Apostles to reconcile. You must recollect the persons to whom each of them replied. They were *believers* who asked Peter what they should do; but he a *pagan* that put the question to Paul. Now to 3,000 persons, in whom Peter, speaking by the Holy Spirit, operated a belief of the truth concerning Jesus, he said—*Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins*; but to the pagan jailor, who had scarcely heard of such a person, Paul said—*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you and your house shall be saved*. It would have been absurd for Peter to have told believing Jews to believe; and equally unscriptural and irrational for Paul to have told a pagan to repent and be baptized, in whom, as yet, he had wrought no faith or conviction of the truth concerning Christ. Now as a *command* to believe cannot produce faith, Paul and Silas proceeded to announce to him, and to all in the jailor's house, the Word of (or concerning) the Lord Having heard this word, *confirmed* as it was by the *miraculous* shaking of the prison, the opening its doors, and the unloosing the chains of the prisoners, he believed, for the first time in his life, in the one only living and true God. Nor was he alone in this, for all the members of his family believed too. *Fixed*, says Paul, in the letter to the Romans, *comes by hearing the word*

of God; and here we have an illustration and proof of this in the case of a whole family of idolators. The next thing Peter after telling us that the word was spoken to them, is that this man being washed the stripes of Paul and Silas, was immediately saved both himself and family. Hence, it is obvious, that the order of things was the same at Jerusalem and Philippi. The Pentecostian Jews heard, then believed, then were commanded to repent and be baptized, so the Philippians first heard the word, then believed it, and were afterwards baptized. Now the result was the same in both cases. The disciples of Peter partook of their refreshment with joy and gladness of heart; praising God; and those of Paul and Silas believing were transported with joy. The Pentecostian Jews and the Philippians, all believed and were baptized and consequently saved from the liability to punishment to which all the world is exposed on account of sin. Now where is the irreconcilableness of Peter and Paul's clamation?

The word *saved* was used first by the jailor, and then by Paul and Silas. Manifestly the heathen man must have used it in one sense, and Paul in another. The first impulse of the pagan was to kill Peter, supposing that the prisoners were fled. The escape of Peter from prison cost the jailors thereof their lives (Acts xii;) and, it is likely, that the escape of Paul and Silas would have been fatal to the Philippian. Knowing the certainty of this, he was about to anticipate his fate by taking his own life. But Paul cried out to him with a loud voice, *do thyself no harm for we are all here.* Such, however, was his fright, that though diverted from his purpose, he sprang into the prison in great terror, and prostrated himself before Paul and Silas. Having brought them out of the prison he exclaimed with much anxiety, "O sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Saved from what? I suspect the man was too much the creature of his error at the time, to have specified whether he would be saved from the shaking prison, the liberated prisoners, or the generals of the army. As the scripture saith not, I leave you to determine according to the known laws of human nature. As he had not yet been convinced of sin, as an idolator, manifest it is, his inquiry had no reference to salvation from sin. But not so the reply of Paul and Silas. Had the prisoners effected their escape, belief in the Lord Jesus Christ would not have saved him from the consequences he was apprehending. Paul knew this, and therefore, his reply to the Jailor must have had that salvation in view which comes by faith in Jesus. The form of the Jailor's question suggested the phraseology of the reply. What must I do to be saved? *Do this, and thou shalt be saved,* was a mode of speech familiar to the Jews, and to the Gentiles without binding the replicant to the thing, with reference to which the question was proposed. I conclude, then, that the Jailor had no reference to salvation by an introduction to the Christian kingdom, or, for the best of all reasons, that he was ignorant of such an institution.

5. If "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains; and shall flow unto it"—if there be such affairs of this kind and the church—if there be an inherent principle in the human mind which directs him involuntarily in conformity to the dictates of the word of truth—what is the result?—the glorying, and the advantage of religious education.

The mountain of the Lord signifies the temple.

mountain of the Lord's house, the empire of Jehovah upon the earth. When it says that this mountain is to be established on the top of the mountains, it means, that the empire of Jehovah upon the earth is to have the supremacy over all other terrestrial empires. These phrases belong to a prediction concerning Judah and Jerusalem; for so the Prophet says in the first verse of chapter 2. The mountain of the Lord's house, then, is that empire of Jehovah upon the earth, that has the house or temple of Jerusalem in Judea, for its centre. The fulfilment of this prediction is yet future; for it is to be at period when the nations shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall cease to lift up sword against nation; and they shall learn war no more. That period every one knows has not yet arrived; when it has, then the tide of nations will flow unto it, and not before. Till then we must obey the exhortation of the Apostle, and contend earnestly for the faith formerly delivered to the saints. The period of the Christian war is from the first to the second advent of Jesus. He began, and he alone can end the war. The weapons of our warfare, however, are not carnal, i. e. they do not consist of rifles, swords, and spears; but of argument, of scripture, of patient endurance, &c. There is now, indeed, no temple in Jerusalem; but we are assured by Ezekiel that there will be. This is the temple to which the nations are to come; and their coming up to worship, or to do homage to the Lord at Jerusalem will be the antitype of the Jewish feast of tabernacles.

29. God has ordained thy strength, O Israel!

Show forth thy might, O God, thou who hast wrought for us!

29. Because of thy Temple in Jerusalem

Shall kings bring presents to thee.

30. Rebuke the wild beast of the reeds,

The multitude of bulls, with the calves of the nations,

So that they shall cast themselves down (do homage) with masses of silver;

Scatter thou the nations that delight in war!

31. Princes shall come from Egypt;

Ethiopia shall hasten with outstretched hands to God.

Psalm 68.

All this will be the result, not of any affinity or inherent principle in man involuntarily leading him to a conformity to the word of truth, but of sheer conquest. Read Isaiah xxxiv, which relates to the kindling of the wrath of God against all the nations. That it will be the result of judgment also appears from this the song of Moses and the Lamb—

Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty!

Just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints;

Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name?

For thou only art Holy:

For all nations shall come and do homage before thee;

For thy judgments are made manifest.

Rev. xv. 4.

The use of preaching is to call the attention of the people to the word of God, that some of them at least may, by its testimony, be induced to fly from the vengeance of Jehovah, which is fast coming upon all who obey not the gospel. The advantage of controversy is that it elicits truth. The religion of Christ was established by controversy, and has been maintained in the world by controversy ever since: and let all the advocates of a false peace remember, that there will be no peace between

the church and the world until the king of Israel comes and there will be no peace in the church either until light or darkness be supreme. Truth and error, knowledge and ignorance, purity and impurity can never harmonize together. Where the darkness prevails the peace is false; but where the light of knowledge prevails the peace is the peace of God that passes all estimation.

8. What do you conceive to be the scriptural meaning of the words hades and hell? Does it simply signify the place of perpetual punishment to which the wicked are sent? or does it mean the place of perpetual punishment to which the just? Jon. ii. 2; Rev. xx. 14.

This query will be answered in our concluding article on the Resurrection and Lazarus. As used in Jonah the word *hell* means the "belly of the fish" in which he was entombed. It was Jonah's grave for three days and nights. The phrase, *and death and hell were cast into the sea*, is figurative. The word *hell* here is hades in the original. It is literally, that death and the abode of its victims will from that time forth be separated to be. This is called the second death, or the death of death, and it corresponds with what is written in Hosea xiii. 14, O death! I will be thy plagues: *O grave (or hades) I will be thy destruction; and thou shalt not be able to hold: for thou shalt be broken down, and thou shalt be broken down, and thou shalt be broken down.* xxi. 4, "and there shall be *no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.*"

The six queries which remain shall be answered in our next issue.

EDITH

MATTER AND MANNER,

OR SPIRITUALISM AS DEFENDED BY BROTHER ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

As to the matter and manner of the ten pages and a half of typography, published in the last Millennial Harbinger concerning me, I have, this month, time only to observe, that never did one poor mortal more egregiously misrepresent the sentiments of another than has Brother Campbell mine in that portion of his paper. I do not intend to insinuate that he has *wilfully* misrepresented me; I merely state the fact: and I take this opportunity of disclaiming *his inferences*, and the version he has given of my sentiments. Those who read my paper, and his, well know that his version and my views themselves are not one and the same; those who read his exclusively are incapable of giving a correct judgement in the matter. As to the manner in which our worthy brother has treated me, it is obvious to more than myself, that it is not done brotherly, but unfriendly, and calculated to place me in an odious and ridiculous light before *his* readers, which is an entirely false position. Till now, we had supposed that in "this reformation" was concerned, *opinions* were to be given; we were free to discuss all principles to whatever subject they might appertain. But we discover that Brother C. says no! And has assumed the unbecoming position of a mediator as to what may and may not be discussed, and is taught and not taught in the words; as to what is and what not. But Brother C. may thank himself for the trouble brought upon him by me and many others.

taught us to call no man master, and has directed us to search the scriptures independently for ourselves. He has given an impulse to our minds (and we thank him for it) which neither he, nor any other man, however superior to us in age, experience, character, learning or renown, can control. I have always studied to treat Bro. C. with respect; the least return I expected was that he would use me civilly. If he has called me a stripling, I took it in good part, supposing I was so named in the spirit of good humor; and, in the same spirit, I took up the allusion, and named him the giant. The primary allusion was his, not mine. I do not wish to deprecate our brother's opposition to what we have published. It is public property, and as such he may do with it as he please. As opposing counsel we court the antagonism (since he is opposed) of all his superior talent (and we most readily admit his superiority;) but we decidedly object to him as a *judge* in the case at issue. The brethren must judge between us; and give their verdict, according to the evidence as set forth in *the Advocate* as well as in the *Millenial Harbinger*. To enable his readers to do this, Bro. C. must cease to substitute his versions and inferences for my own connected essays. He must either (to do me justice) forbear to oppose, or concede me the same privilege (not to say right) that he has granted to aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Our brother has devoted whole pages of his work to the republication of the speculations of a Waterman; of Brougham, a worldly philosopher; and of the abusive declamation of a Meredith and others. If I am worthy of being opposed, am I not, as a brother, worthy of equal privileges with them? Why should our brother conduct himself with more impartiality to aliens than to me whom he recognizes as a brother. Let him remember the royal precept—*Do unto others as you would they should do to you*. Had I attacked Bro. C. as he has me, I would have republished all he had said that I intended to controvert. Would Bro. C. like me to treat him in this respect as he has treated me? I think not. But enough for the present.

We would now introduce to the notice of the reader the following conversation from the pen of a brother, who needs no commendation from us, being well approved where best known. The conversation was sent to Bethany, from whence, it was hoped, it would have issued unmutated by Father Goodal and his sagacious friends. I have forborne to publish it for a considerable time, fondly expecting, that the liberality and independence of our brother of the *Harbinger* would have obtained for it an insertion in that influential paper. But in this we have been disappointed. I have, therefore, at this juncture, determined to insert it in the *Advocate* in my own defence, and by way of gentle admonition to my worthy, but somewhat too authoritative, opponent brother.

EDITOR.

Liberty Hall, Amelia, Va., Sept. 5th, 1836.

CONVERSATION

IN FATHER GOODAL'S FAMILY CIRCLE AT PATRICK'S

Mr. Payne. I feel highly gratified that the company met around my own fireside; for, after having enjoyed the company of others, I always rejoice when occasion offers to reciprocate kindness and attention. I promise myself a great deal of happiness on this occasion, in witnessing the joy and gratification of my friends.

Mrs. Reed. Thank you, Mr. Payne, make yourself perfectly at home to my comfort; for I never felt more at home, or more pleased than at present.

Mr. Wickliffe. As Mr. Payne seems to be engaged just now with the permission of Father Goodal look a little more into the matter I see here whose views were the subject of a late conversation with Goodal's.

Father Goodal. With all my heart, for I am persuaded that I have not done him justice. Indeed at the conversation alluded to by Mr. Wickliffe, I fell into an error which has occasioned me no little uneasiness, and I wish to embrace the first opportunity to remove the cause of my disquietude.

Mr. Wickliffe. It is certainly the most noble part a person can take when he finds himself in error, to acknowledge and forsake it; but I thought Father Goodal possessed so great a share of prudence and experience that it was next to impossible for him to fall into any error, especially after he had presided so long in the family circle with so much prudence and ability.

Mrs. Reed. The wisest and best among us are sometimes overtaken by faults; and I have thought it often serves as a test of our characters, to prove whether we are what we sincerely profess to be. But, Father Goodal, I am impatient to hear you give an account of that error; for I trust we shall be able to rectify the whole matter, and thereby give peace to your mind.

Father Goodal. I am a little surprised that so close an observer as Mrs. Reed should not have discovered the error when it occurred, and now be able not only to point out the error itself, but the occasion and consequences of it also; I am sure Mr. Payne recollects it, for I remember he gave me a very courteous reproof at the time.

Mr. Payne. We should always adhere to candor and duty, and not be constrained, on this occasion, to say, that I thought Father Goodal had committed an error when he got into a passion upon Mr. Wickliffe's reading a passage from the volume which I introduced at that conversation at Father Goodal's, to which Mr. Wickliffe has referred.

Father Goodal. You are right, Mr. Payne. I was greatly displeas'd when I virtually ordered the lips of your author to be seal'd, and when I, from him of profanity, questioned his piety, and pass'd sentence upon him from Christian company upon him; and since we are all here present on that occasion, I deem it proper to inform you that the company were some how to blame in this matter. In the first place Mr. Payne introduced his author in such a way as to excite doubts and suspicions against him, by calling him a shrewd philosopher, and by presenting at popular notions, and by representing his writings as being thus making the first impression that he is rather a good Christian. Then Mrs. Reed went a step farther, and by her expressions of hope of the Christian, or the hope of a suppos'd Christian, and by calling it tally ill-founded, as too sacred a thing to be in question, and by making the climax, Mr. Wickliffe having first inquired of the author,

author was a Christian or an infidel, and being informed that he was a learned preacher, &c. proceeded to class him among the wits and the wags, the Paines and the Voltaires laughing at the truth of the Bible. Thus the prejudices and suspicions of all the company being excited we were very illy prepared to do justice to Mr. Paine's author; hence, so soon as Mr. Wickliffe had read one short sentence, I very abruptly and uncourteously commanded the book to be shut, and refused to hear any thing farther from that author, till I had first pronounced sentence upon him.

All the Company at once. We all stand corrected, and will hereafter endeavor to be more particular in regard to our Christian manners.

Father Goodal. I hope if any one has communicated the matter and manner of that conversation to any who were not present, he or she will seize the first opportunity to put things right again, by giving the same publicity to *this* that was given to *that* conversation; that the world may see how nobly Christians can act, by confessing their faults to each other, and by making the earliest reparation in their power of any injury they may have occasioned to any of their fellow-beings.

Mrs. Reed. I have several times spoken of the matter of that conversation, but not of the manner; for I must confess that when I had retired to my room, my reflections were not of the most agreeable kind—I kept thinking that our conversation had been more censorious and turned more on the strain of ridicule than we had been accustomed to. I was extremely sorry also, to see Father Goodal so much disquieted upon the reading of the sentence from Mr. Payne's author.

Mr. Payne. I mentioned to a few of my confidential friends, that some how or other, since that conversation, Father Goodal's character had not appeared to me *altogether* so amiable and so interesting as it had always done before; but I shall take the first opportunity to inform those friends that it is *now* by far more amiable and interesting than ever; because he has *now* given evidence that he possesses one of the brightest traits in the Christian character, that is, openly and frankly to confess one's faults and to do all in one's power to make amends for any injury resulting from those faults. I thank Father Goodal for the very courteous, yet necessary reproof in regard to the manner in which I introduced my author to the notice of the company—I trust it will profit me not a little.

Mr. Wickliffe. The company has left no comment for me to make—I heartily concur with Mr. Payne in the view he has taken of this whole matter, and have only to repeat that although the character of Father Goodal has ebbed and flowed, yet it has gained rather than lost, in my estimation, for it now stands *above* high water-mark.

A. B. WALTHALL.

Paineville, Amelia, Va., June 4, 1836.

VISIT TO LUNENBURG.

My visit to this county has been one of labor, fatigue and sickness. I left Richmond on August 1st, having been requested by the brethren to attend their annual meeting at the Fork of Meherrin. Our operations began on the Saturday before the first Lord's day, and continued three days. The audiences were large and very attentive on each day. Brethren Anderson, and Walthal and myself addressed them. The fatigue consequent upon a journey of a hundred miles on a rough trotting

horse, and an exposure to the sun and rain, somewhat impaired my native energy of constitution. Never before, out on the first and second days till quite exhausted, owing to the necessity of taking to-bed, where, with the exception of a few hours, I was confined twenty-one days with a fever. I have thought it proper to mention this, as it is a subject of interest to my subscribers for the late appearance of the present issue of our paper.

The subject matter of illustration on these occasions is found in that magnificent portion of the testimony concerning the Messiah, in the sixty-eighth Psalm. We can only allude to this place at the topics therein presented. The psalm divides itself into *eight* parts. *First*, the poem or prophecy contained in the first three verses; the *second* part is contained in the next three; the *third* part in the succeeding three; the *fourth* part in the 16th inclusive; the 17th and 18th verses form the *fifth* part; the *sixth* is included within the 19th and 20th; the *seventh* within the 24th and 27th; the next four verses constitute the *eighth*; and the *ninth* part consists of the remainder of the psalm.

The *first* announces the perdition of the wicked, and the salvation of the righteous, as the consequence of "strengthening of power" being given to God's people Israel. The *second* part contains a predictive command parallel to that found in Isaiah xl. 3, and cited as fulfilled in the case of Jesus and his Fore-runner. Mat. iii. 3.—"The desert" or wilderness of Judaea; "Jehovah is his name," or Jesus, which signifies Jehovah the Saviour; with a description of this benign personage. The *third* part carries the reader back to the giving of the law from Sinai, when the mountain "trembled at the presence of God the God of Israel." From the wilderness of Arabia, the Holy Spirit introduces us to the land of Canaan. "The song of victory" which the Lord gave, or inspired the minstrels with, and which for its beauty deserves citation;

"The kings with their armies have fled—have fled!
And the matron at home divides the spoil.
Ye may repose yourselves in the stalls,
Like the wings of a dove covered with silver,
And her feathers with shining gold."

The plain prose of which appears to be this—the kings with their armies have fled! And the Israelites divide their spoil in peace at home. Ye may rest from the fatigues of war, and repose yourselves with your flocks and herds in the glory and splendour of a peaceful and peaceful nation. The slaughter of the wicked is immense; for

When the Most High destroyed the kings,
It was white with their bones like snow.

The north-eastern mountains of Canaan are personified and interrogatively addressed. They are supposed to frown with displeasure upon Moriah, because Jehovah had chosen that place of Abraham's trial for his Temple or Dwelling place on earth in preference to the lofty hills of Bashan. The 16th verse develops the reason why the Holy Spirit transfers the mind of the reader from the period of Jehovah's appearance in the desert of Judea to that of the journey of the Israelites from Sinai to the mountain of Zion; namely, to announce that Zion, the Hill of his Holiness, is

—the hill in which God is pleased to dwell,
In which Jehovah will dwell for ever!

An interruption of residence does not operate against a palace being the residence or dwelling-place of a king; although, he may not have resided in it for many years: neither does the circumstance of Mount Zion not having been the residence of Jehovah, since the symbol of his presence departed from between the Cherubim just preceding the Babylonish captivity, operate against this prophecy, that *Jehovah*, by his glory, the Ark of the New Testament, the Messiah, *will dwell for ever* on Zion, his Holy Mountain.

The *fourth* part speaks of the Messiah under the divine title —*God*. "In that day," says Zechariah, "the house of David shall be as God, as the Angel of the Lord before (the inhabitants of Jerusalem.) xii. 8. That God here means the Messiah, is obvious from the address of the Holy Spirit to him, ver. 18, which, Paul, in Ephes. iv. applies to Jesus. The 17th verse announces the power of Jesus, and the glory of the Father, reigning on Zion in the midst of his myriads of chariots, in the glorious temple. This part also contains a prediction of Messiah's ascension to heaven; his triumph over vanquished death; his reception of spiritual gifts for Jews and Gentiles; and a reiteration that the Lord God (Messiah) will dwell on Zion.

The *fifth* part contains a prediction of the resurrection, ver. 20; the restoration of Israel [Ezek. xxxvii. 19, 20] from Bashan, or the countries north-east of Jerusalem, and from the Deep, or Mediterranean Sea, or countries of the western world, ver. 22; the *immediate* purpose of their restoration is declared—"that thy dogs," O Messiah—or the Gentiles (see Ezek. xxviii. 8—12) "may drink the blood of thine enemies" who pierced thee. The consequence to the restored Israel of the Gentile dogs drinking their blood will be, that two-thirds of them will perish by the sword; but the third part of them will be left in the land of Judea. For, says Jehovah by the prophet Zechariah

And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord,
Two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third part shall be left therein.

And I will bring the third part through the fire,
(And will refine them as silver is refined; and will try them as gold is tried.—*Chap. xiii. 8, 9.*

The sixth part announces the triumphant return of the King, Messiah, to his Temple, amidst the shouting of the hosts of the tribes that are left after the destruction of the fire of Jehovah's indignation. This part corresponds in time to that glorious period, when the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall receive him whom once they rejected, with the shout saying, "BLESSED IS HE WHO COMES IN THE NAME OF JEHOVAH." Matt. xxiii.; Ps. cxviii. 26.

The seventh part announces that the Kingdom has been restored to Israel.

God has ordained thy strength, O Israel!

The Apostles were perfectly right and scriptural in expecting the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel, they made it possible only in "the times and seasons" when that restoration was to take place. They naturally supposed no time could be more appropriate than when the Messiah, by his resurrection, had eluded the malice, and proved his superior power over his enemies who had put him to death. In reply to their question, Jesus did not deny that the kingdom, or ascendancy over the nations, would be restored to Israel, but told them that it was not for them to know *the times or the seasons* when that great event, which Paul terms, *the fulness of Israel*, "the receiving of them," the grafting again of the natural branches into their own olive—(Rom. xi.)—should happen. This part, verse 29, declares to God, Messiah—

Because of thy Temple in Jerusalem
Shall kings bring presents to thee.

Verse 30 predicts the vassalage of the nations to their conqueror and the entire dispersion of national armies—Isaiah ii. 4; Ethiopia and Egypt are especially mentioned as submitting themselves with readiness to God, Messiah.

In view of the whole, the Holy Spirit in the eighth, and last part of this beautiful ode, calls upon the kingdoms of the world to sing praises to Jehovah. And well they may! "Now, O ye Gentiles, glorify ye in the Lord, who has said of the Jews, 'The diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles: And how shall they increase *more their fulness?*'" Again, "if the casting of them shall be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, *but life (to the world) from the dead?*" Yes, "the kingdoms of the earth" are called upon to praise Jehovah.

Whose majesty is in Israel, and whose might is in Jerusalem.

Then all things will be put under Messiah, and the Lord God shall give him the throne of David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and his kingdom never end." Isaiah ix. 6, 7; Luke i. 32, 33. "The mortal kings, and princes, and presidents, and rulers, shall be utterly abolished forever; for these have no copartnership with him."

reign of Christ. But we, who are the heirs of the promise made to Abraham, will reign with him, immortal kings and priests to God, even the Father, through all the ages of coming time.

Concerning this ode Dr. Adam Clarke has the following note—“The composition of this ode is sublime above all comparison, it is constructed with an art truly admirable; it possesses all the dignity of the sacred language; none but David could have composed it; and, *at this lapse of time*, it would require no small influence of the Spirit that was upon him, to give its true interpretation.” We showed that the very difficulty presented by Clarke, namely, the lapse of time, was a circumstance that facilitated its interpretation; for all predictions are more easy of interpretation the nearer we approach their accomplishment, though that event may indeed be 2,000 years remote from the period when it was given. The prophecy in this ode was delivered 2,400 years ago, and has not yet received its entire fulfilment. We exposed the fatal tendency of a dogma, that taught the necessity of inspiration to understand the prophets, and exhorted the people to exercise the good understandings with which they were endowed, and to search the writings of the apostles and prophets for themselves, irrespective of the theological pretensions of commentators or “reverend divines.”

Having laid much testimony before them concerning the Messiah, and having shown its applicability to Jesus of Nazareth, we exhorted them to submit to the government of the Son of David and of God, who would sooner or later rule in Zion as monarch of the world. And with many more words Brother Anderson and myself addressed them, urging them to abandon the seductions and blandishments of a deceitful present for the eternal realities of a rapidly approaching future. But, though we have good ground to believe, that several men of sterling minds were arrested by the considerations presented to them, we have it not in our power to record that any came forward to enlist under the banners of the Great King. This does not, however, discourage us; for there must always be a sowing, and growing, as well as a reaping time, if any *permanent* good is to be effected. We have but little taste for that fruit which is yielded from an almost simultaneous sowing, growing, and ingathering.

Before we commenced operations on the second day, we were informed that a Methodist clergyman was present who would, if an opportunity were offered, address the audience in refutation of our heresy. Ever ready for public inquiry, we gave a general invitation to clergy or laity, as they are called, to rise and refute, if possible, what they had heard fall from our lips, either on that or the preceding day. No one, however, rose up; and we concluded that no exception could be taken. We

then stated the reason why we gave the invitation. The invitation caused a young man, just fresh plucked from the tree, known among spiritual botanists by the name of K. M. Macon, to rise up in the midst; for he was the youth who boasted aforesaid what great things he would do. We took care we should not be ignorant that he had been some time a member of a "polemical" institution; but notwithstanding all his polemicality, nothing, he declared should draw us into a debate! To our astonishment, he drew forth a copy of the Advocate and called the attention of his hearers to an article "abstracted," said he, from a western Methodist paper and headed "Methodistic Sanctification" &c. He exposed the fanaticism of his denomination to the ridicule of the people reading it to them! The reason of his doing so, we learned was to justify himself for an expression he had used concerning me at Rehoboth Meetinghouse, but of which in fact I was ignorant till he made the confession. After inserting the article I observed, such is the gospel according to Fletcher, Clarke, and Wesley; in saying which, he said, it was as false as I was infamous. After commenting on the fanatical woman's grammar and ignorance of Blair(!), he concluded by spouting four Latin words—*voce, voce, ratione, ratione!!!!* known to few of the ladies and farmers there; but which, in connexion, was intended to signify, that the preaching of the Methodist was not a matter of sound, but of reason! An assumption, which, if expressed in simple English, would have excited the risibility and contempt of the people, whose experience of Methodist meetings has taught them far different.

We rose, and ironically complimented the reverend gentleman for his politeness in proclaiming to his hearers at Rehoboth our infamous liarship. In the spirit of Job to his three friends we granted the wonderful antitheses he presented to us, as the most truth-telling gentleman of the age! We explained the use of the term gospel in the passage alluded to; we did not use it in the Methodist sense of that term; but as simply import the good news, and that the Editor of the Western paper had unquestionably treated his readers with an illustration of the good news concerning Methodistic sanctification according to Wesley, Clarke, and Fletcher. But we have since learned that the divine was so sensitive on this subject because he had previously been the subject of "sanctification." We were informed, that at a Methodist revival he was prostrated in the spirit, we forbear to name it, upon the floor of the meeting perfectly enwrapt for an hour. A certain person asked, what was the matter with him? O, let him alone, for his trust in the ministrant has gone to his God!

We have to apologize to our readers for the length of the man's feats at all; but the truth is, an hour is a long time.

many minds, that in reading the extract from the pages of the *Advocate*, he was really reading an account of what had happened at one of our meetings, and that I had reported it with approbation! How such a strange notion could have entered any man's head, I cannot tell; I need hardly say to my readers that it was an account of what took place at a Methodist Camp-meeting, published in a Methodist paper, which was forwarded me by a brother in Nashville, Tennessee. I extracted it, and republished it, with comments, in my own pages. As to replying to what had been laid before the people, he studiously avoided it, knowing well his incompetency to do so; though, we have been informed, he right valiantly drove his spiritual shafts at some of our observations, when we were far away.

At the annual meeting held at Flat-Rock, in this county, last year, the churches were recommended to make the Meherrin Association null and void. This was accordingly carried into effect at the Fork Meeting. The brethren thereat assembled also determined that in future two semi-annual meetings should be held during the next twelve months; the one at Oak Grove, Lunenburg, on the 1st Lord's day in May, and the other at Goode's, in Charlotte on the last Lord's day in September, 1837.

Lunenburg, Va., August 29, 1836.

EDITOR.

ABSTRACT SPIRIT.

Jamestown, Ohio, 9th August, 1836.

BELOVED BROTHER THOMAS,—In the last number of the "*Advocate*," I see that you complain of Brother Campbell, for not publishing what you have written at sundry times relative to *re-immersion*, and relative to *abstract spirits*, &c. I am not now about to condemn you and favor him; but I must speak to you as a brother, and one whom I highly esteem, because of your independent spirit, and say that Bro. Campbell is not so much to blame, when you coolly consider, that you spoke of him as *Goliath of Gath*, and of yourself as *David with his sling*, just going, as it were, to strike a death blow at the giant.

The *figures* chosen by you were not such as should be used among brethren when discussing any subject for the purpose of arriving at the truth.

But we are all fallible beings, and carry much of *ourselves* about us, so that the old and experienced, are caused to err, as well as the young; thus Brother Campbell also erred in that "*Goodul conversation*." In it, he speculated as much as you did, (for I conceive that you both got out into that unbounded ocean.) When I read that conversation I could not help writing to him about it, and he called what I wrote *Sadduceism* in a letter which he wrote me just before he left home; so that I am in the scrape as well as you.

I conclude that the want of a distinction between *spirits* and *spiritual bodies* has led to much disputing. The disciples of

Jesus supposed they saw a spirit, there was nothing more than a spiritual body. Jesus said that spirits had not flesh and bones as they saw him have; but was that saying that spirits were without substance?

For my part I cannot tell how *spiritual bodies* will be distinguished from *naked spirits*, if the members of the body are all present. And if *spirits* have all the members of the body, there can be no such thing as an *abstract spirit*.

But I have said enough upon this abstract subject, and will hasten back to the shore again, lest I get bewildered.

In haste, your fellow-laborer,

M. WINANS.

REMARKS.

I am well pleased with this letter; because it is impartial; and aims at the development of truth, without placing me or Brother A. Campbell beyond the pale of Christian society on account of difference in opinion or an injudicious use of words. It is the letter of a brother, who has brotherly feeling for us both; I, therefore, for one, though he slays with argument, will kiss the hand that smites me; because of the Christian and brotherly style in which he presents my alleged errors in theory and practice to the brotherhood and the world.

But as I have said elsewhere, Brother Winans, is mistaken in saying that "the figures (stripling and giant) were chosen by me." Among many of the titles, *humorously* (I will suppose) bestowed upon me, Bro. C chose that of a *stripling*. I was tickled at the conceit, and forthwith adopted the name. I know of but one person in scripture called a *stripling*, and that is *David*. Bro. C. has frequently, *in effect*, when speaking of my inferiority to himself and others, inquired in the language of *Saul*, *Whose son is this stripling?* Bro. C. put me in the position of *David*, not I myself. Although, I returned the compliment, and conceded to him the powers of a *giant*, I by no means intended to liken him to the uncircumcised Philistine. His giantship was *christianly* and *literary*; not *physical* and *profane*. I agree with Brother Winans, that we had neither of us any right to write of each other in such terms, and whatever Bro. C may resolve, I shall endeavor to avoid the practice in future. But, if I had bestowed on Bro. C. as many titular compliments as were assumed by Christ's pretended Vicar, the Pope, that would not have excused him, for not permitting me to speak for myself in his papers.

In many things, says an Apostle, *we all offend*. If an Apostle errs in many things, what Christian could be so vain as to consider himself "infallible." I pretend not to have any thing to boast of, but what God in his wisdom has made me. My failings are chargeable on my own account; and, *self-praise being no commendation*, if I should pretend to be superior to another in age, experience, character, talents, or wisdom, I shall leave others to find it out at their own leisure.

Richmond, September 11, 1836.

ELECTION OF ELDERS.

MR. EDITOR,—Being detained in the hospital, I have determined to write you a few lines, and to send you a piece from your pen on the Election of Elders.

vocate of the present month. I do not feel competent to debate that or any other subject with you, being little accustomed to writing, and not at all to speaking in public. But I write with the hope of drawing the attention of more gifted brethren to a subject which I think needs some discussion at this time. In the piece alluded to above you say, "That in all the New Testament there is no instance to be found in which the disciples at large elected and ordained the Elders or Rulers of the churches." You also say that Matthias was an Elder, and that you take his election for a precedent. For the sake of argument, let us suppose that Matthias was an Elder, (which I do not admit) and that his election is a precedent for us to follow. Where is the evidence that there was no voting in his election. By whom were the two candidates selected? Were they not by the 120 disciples? I should suppose so from the context. But in what manner the will of the 120 was ascertained, I know not; neither do I think it necessary that I should know. It is sufficient for me to know that the will of the 120 was ascertained in some way. And what is voting but the ascertaining of the will of the voters? If their will can be ascertained in a different and more convenient way I object not to it. But you say that in the election of Matthias "two lots were provided, and upon the one would be written 'for Apostle,' the other would be blank. Having been put into some receptacle and shaken; each candidate would draw; and he that drew forth the lot inscribed 'for Apostle' would be the Lord's choice; because chosen by an ordinance of divine institution." That Matthias was thus chosen I have some doubts—for Luke says they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias. From which expression I am not sure that each of the 118 did not give his vote by putting into some receptacle prepared for the occasion, the name of that candidate which he thought most suitable, written on something which they called *αληπος*, which word is twice in the same chapter translated part. But waiving this, I cannot think that we ought to pursue the plan you mention, unless we had irrefragable proof that it is the Lord's will that we should so do. For were we to put into a receptacle the names of six persons, and it should so happen that three of them had the requisite qualifications and the others had them only in appearance—and were, in fact, hypocrites—and the Lord should not interfere, would not the hypocrites be as apt to be appointed as the others? Or if, through our ignorance of men's hearts, the whole six were improper persons for the office, would not three necessarily be chosen by the plan you suggest? And if such should be chosen, what could we do? For, if we considered them appointed by the Lord, how could we displace them?

a part of you, that I may not lay a load on you all. Sufficient for such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the majority." 2 Cor. ii. "Also, brethren, if a man be surprised into any fault, you the spiritual men set such a one right again in the spirit of meekness." Gal. vi.

Please give the above a place in your paper, and oblige
May 31st, 1836.

NON NEMO.

REFORMATION IN SPAIN.

The *Gazette de Madrid* of the 10th publishes the following Royal Decree, given by the Queen on the 9th instant, and countersigned by M. Mendizabal:—"Art. 1. All the monasteries, convents, colleges, congregations, and other houses of the community, or religious institutions of monks, comprising those of the Secular, and of the Four Military Orders, and of St. John of Jerusalem, existing in the Peninsula, the isles adjacent, and the Spanish possessions in Africa, are suppressed.—2. The following are excepted from the preceding article:—'1st. The Colleges of Missionaries for the provinces of Asia, of Valledolid, of Ochana, and Monteagudo; 2d. The houses of clerks of pious schools, and the convents of the hospitallers of Saint Jean de Dieu, which are at present actually open.' The Government reserves to itself the privilege of fixing the residence of the missionaries and of the hospitallers in the manner which may prove most opportune for attaining the object of their institution. 5. The convents of religious females shall be reduced to the number indispensable for containing commodiously those who wish to remain in them. The nuns belonging to suppressed convents shall be distributed through the convents of the same order which are maintained. No convent shall remain open having fewer than 20 professed nuns, and there shall not be in the same district two or more convents of the same order. 27. The monks belonging to the institutions not suppressed shall receive a pension of five reals per diem for priests, and three reals for others who are professed. The hospitallers who, according to the rule of their institution, cannot aspire to the sacred office, shall also receive five reals per diem. 30. The sisters who shall continue to devote themselves to giving instruction and to the service of the hospitals, shall receive five reals per diem. 34. The individuals of either sex who have acquired, or who shall acquire the means of subsistence deemed sufficient by the Committees who shall pronounce on the subject, shall receive no pension whatever. The 36th article determines the revenues which shall be appropriated for the payment of those pensions; and the 39th article enumerates the places which may be held by pensioned priests."

A WORD TO THE READERS

As we have said, sickness has been one reason why the number did not make its appearance at the appointed time. When delays occur in future our readers may judge for themselves, that they happen not from negligence, but from unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances. It is true that the October number will appear in company with the November. This delay is referable to the accumulation of business upon my hands that must be attended to before I am about to take up my residence in Amelia county some thirty-eight miles from Richmond. The chief reason of this delay is, that *the business of interpreting the scriptures to a people in remote places is incompatible with the practice of the medical profession in a city.* I have therefore purchased a farm, which I am engaged in building, in order that I may procure a maintenance for myself and family, more dependant on Providence indeed, but less dependent on human caprice. Riches are not the object of my desire. If I am enabled to live so as to die in the love and owing no one any thing but love, let my surviving member, that I die more wealthy than the ancient Egyptians. The riches I desire here are, liberty of speech, of action, and of opinion; the enjoyment of the right of free discussion in relation to things past, present, and to come. I desire food and raiment, and that with these I may be content. I desire to participate in the rich luxury of emancipating the human mind from the dogmata and traditions of men. The liberty I desire is, that liberty which is chastened by the law of Christ. This liberty I cannot enjoy in a city and in the practice of a profession, that depends upon the caprice of this singular world. In teaching the truth, which is opposed to the dearest opinions of the erring, and to the malpractice of the worldling, and to the hypocrisy of the formalist, who thinks he can serve both God and Mammon—all these regard it more or less to themselves, and thus regard you therefore may because you tell them the truth; and if they happen to be your patients you risk an immediate discharge. It remains then for me but one of two things—either I stay here wink at what I believe to be wrong, or I seek for bread, or I must derive my support elsewhere. I have no resources for the preservation of my Christian liberty more to me than temporal life. There is much meaning in the words of William Penn—"Choose God's trade." The trades of men: Adam was a gardener, Cain a ploughman, and Abel a shepherd or grazier. When Cain became a farmer he became a builder of cities and quitted the earth.

As to the continuance of the *Advocate*, it is dependent upon the liberality of our friends.

these parts, who are anxious that a free and independent press should be established among them, I shall be enabled shortly to purchase a press and types, and to continue the publication of our paper on my farm. It is our intention to enlarge the Advocate for the accommodation of respectable passengers. But of this, more hereafter.

I have thought it necessary to say this much concerning our affairs in order to prevent misconstruction, which is but too current among this one sided generation of men.

Richmond, September 14, 1836.

EDITOR.

William & Mary College a "Religious House" for Four Sects.

A "Baptist Divine," named Scervant Jones, has been coquetting, in the most hounded language, with "the old and much loved College" of William & Mary. It is astonishing how amorous "the Church" can be when she courts the favor of the world! And what "pleasure" too the world can express in serving the church when it thinks to turn "an honest penny" by the intrigue! "I cannot," says this Divine Oracle of a Baptist Church in Williamsburg, Va. "withhold the expression of my warmest thanks to the Professors of William & Mary College, for their kindness in having afforded, at my instance, their scientific courses, free of charge, to brethren Jacob T. Tinsley and Elias Dodson, during the late course—nor can I sufficiently express the indebtedness which personally I feel towards the same Professors, in consideration of their having offered the same advantages to any and all professed candidates for the gospel ministry." The world loves its own, and is well pleased therewith. Hence writes Mr. T. Dew, the organ of the Faculty of a worldly institution, to the aforesaid exuberantly graceful personage, "In answer to your inquiry, whether, during the ensuing session the same privilege will be extended to them, and to others who may be studying for the ministry? I take great pleasure in saying, that we shall be happy in receiving them within our walls upon the same terms, as long as they may desire to receive our instruction, and that the Faculty have unanimously resolved to offer their institution gratuitously to all ministers of the gospel, and to those who may be preparing themselves for the ministry, in any of the four leading denominations of the State."

These four are the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. These are the privileged sects, who divide the masses between them—who are all combined with the world, in proscribing "the ministries" of all other sects. The Unitarians, Universalists, Romanists, "Christians," Swedenborgians, &c. &c. are all excluded as unworthy of the same privilege. But there is policy in this; the four leading sects hate the rest, therefore, it would not do for the Faculty to give equal favors to them. A hue and cry would soon be raised, that William & Mary had become a College for heretical and jesuitical priests; this would be succeeded by empty theatres, and empty professorial pockets. But what is William & Mary now? It is a religious house for the education of beneficiary and sectarian monks! It would recompense the Faculty according to its deserts, if all other sectarists and infidels, who would doubtless outnumber the rest, would leave the "classic halls" of Williamsburg, and repair to some more liberal Alma Mater.

EDITOR.

THE
APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE
AND
PROPHETIC INTERPRETER

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D. not D.D.

Vol. 3. RICHMOND, Va. OCTOBER 1, 1836. No. 10

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—Ephes. ii. 20.

Shut up. O Daniel, the words, and seal the book *to the time of the end*; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. . . . Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but *the wise shall understand*.—Dan. xii. 4, 10.

CONSTITUTIONS, HUMAN AND DIVINE—THEIR SOVEREIGNTY—THE VOTES OF MAJORITIES

CONSTITUTION is a word derived from the verb *to constitute*, which signifies *to set up, to make any thing what it is, to appoint*.—A constitution in a political sense, is,—a document which exactly defines the form of the government. This deed obtains in all well regulated countries, though, it may exist, even where anarchy reigns. In the former instance, it is esteemed as "*living and powerful*;" but in the latter, as a mere "*dead letter*." In all intelligent communities, the obvious meaning of their constitutions is the arbiter of all controversy.—the ultimate appeal. The Constitution of a State is the Interpreter of the Laws; for no laws are binding, which are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution. The supremacy of a Constitution in this country, is derived from the sovereignty of the People, established by a successful resistance to the sovereignty of the King of England; it is founded therefore, in *might*, not in a right derived from God. The vote of a majority of persons, to whom the authority of the people was delegated for the specific purpose made the Government of Virginia what it is, in other words *constituted* it. They appointed a Governorship, a Council, a legislative Body, a Judiciary, &c., defined their official duties, and set bounds to the liberties of the people. Had these persons been self-elected, their constitution of things would have been a mere *dead letter*, spirit, dead indeed, and by no means binding upon the people. But, on the contrary, being elected by the people, their acts and deeds were the people's acts and deeds, and their words the words of their constitutional deed, holding forth the power in the political world. In these persons, therefore, in giving the liberties of the people, the people were

themselves ; for all government is predicated on a surrender of personal liberty, to a certain extent, for the benefit of the whole. Hence the Constitution of Virginia deprives the people of all executive, advisory, legislative and judicial authority. It sets up the principle of right against the law of might. Hence, it limits the people to the elective franchise in their "primary assemblies." In these assemblies the people can neither make, nor execute laws, in conformity with the Constitution. A legislative or executive act, done by the people in their primary capacity, is a rebellious, and therefore criminal action ; and constitutionally obnoxious to executive infliction. Their business is to *vote in the appointment* of the authorities they have constituted, and then to *obey* them, so far as they make and administer laws according to the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

The Constitution of the State authorizes the House of Assembly to make Laws. This House, even if unanimous, cannot make what laws it pleases, its enactments must be according to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, or they are no more binding on the people than if enacted by a self-elected body of men. This document has prescribed the manner in which bills may become laws. It is by *a vote of the majority* only that such documents can pass the House. But the people, whatever their numbers, might, or intelligence—whatever their desire—cannot, so long as the Constitution is respected, add their votes to that of the majority or minority of the House. For them to do so, would be treason against the Constitution. Neither can the House of Assembly *execute* the laws they have made ; they can neither administer nor apply them by *a vote of the majority* or otherwise. The House is a legislative not an executive body ; the constitution gives to them no executive power beyond the doors of their own house ; an executive act on their part would be usurpation and high treason against the State.

And so of the Executive of the country. Where is the Virginian, who, understanding the Constitution, would obey laws made by the Governor in Council ? Orders in Council are not laws. Or, what intelligent men would regard a law passed by a vote of the majority of the people, in concert with the Governor, to the exclusion of the House of Assembly ? Or, what assembly of magistrates, however large or respectable, by a vote of the majority of their number would be tolerated if they first made a law to meet the criminal case, and then by another vote of the majority applied it ? Or, if a criminal were placed at the judicial bar, could the court constitutionally call the people together and determine his guilt by a vote of the majority ; and, if voted guilty, adjudge him to suffer death by another vote of the majority ? Would not such an executive be arraigned at the bar of the country, and tried for treason against the Constitution ?

The state of the case then in relation to this Republic is thus:

1. The sovereignty of the people is based upon a successful resistance to monarchical power. Hence, they have the right of might to do every thing necessary for their own well being.

2. They surrendered this sovereignty to the Constitution when they ratified at the poles the literary labors of those whom they had delegated the power of framing a new order of things.

3. From this ratification, the Constitution ascended the Throne, having the affections of the people and their vow of implicit obedience to all its prescriptions and requirements.

4. The Constitution prescribes to its Executive, administrative duties; to its Legislature its specific functions, &c.—and to the people, its voluntary subjects, it prescribes the solitary duty of appointing some of the constituted authorities by a vote of the majority.

5. Having appointed these, the people's vote is powerless until the constitutional period returns for the exercise of the elective franchise. Their sole concern, between the elective periods, is *implicitly to obey the laws*, under penalty of legal retribution if disobedient.

6. The invasion of the Legislature or Executive by the People, or the rights of the citizens by the former, or of the Legislature by the Executive, or of the Executive by the Legislature, is, in all and every case high treason against the sovereign Constitution.

Upon what has gone before and is yet to follow, I would submit the following proposition—*That, even upon republican principles, neither the evidence to sustain a case, nor the administration of the Laws of the Kingdom of Heaven, can be resolved by a vote of the majority of the citizens of that Kingdom, without treason against its Constitution.*

The difference between Monarchism and Republicanism does not consist in enacting and executing the laws by the vote of majorities. Under both forms of Government the laws are made by the majority of the legislature, and under both they are administered upon the same principles. The grand difference between the two Institutions consists in the sovereignty. Monarchists say, or have said, that the sovereignty is in Kings by *divine right*; Republicans deny this, and affirm that the supremacy is in the people by *divine right*; for *vox POPULI VOX DEI*—*the voice of the people is the voice of God*—which, by the by, is one of the greatest liberties ever put into the mouth of man. If we admit the right of Kings to govern themselves, then the Republicans are wrong; if the contrary should appear, the sovereignty resides neither in the people nor in Kings, but in God.

The pretended sovereignty of the People is a mere

one of might, not of right. Their power is based on a successful revolution. God *permits* them to exercise this power for a limited time only; the power is of right his, but they have usurped it, and do persist in refusing to submit to his government. The sovereignty or supremacy over all mankind he has committed to Jesus, whom he has constituted universal Lord; and of whom he has said, let every knee bow down to him. If King Jesus were universally acknowledged and obeyed, every form of human government would become extinct. All monarchies, whether absolute or constitutional, and all republics would necessarily cease to be.

Though for a time all the world lies under the power of the wicked one, by God's permission, and is parcelled out into Monarchies and Republics, he has not left himself entirely without witness. He has caused a Kingdom to be set up, which, though a little one, is destined to crush all the rest, and to expel them from the community of man. It differs from the Republic of Virginia in this, that its Constitution derives its sovereignty from Jehovah, whereas Virginia's comes from the people; its sovereignty, therefore, is as far superior to that of this Republic, as the Majesty of Jehovah is to that of fallible mortal men. The Kingdom of Heaven, as this little Monarchy is called, has a King, a Constitution, a Legislature, an Executive, subjects and laws. Its *Monarch* is the King eternal, immortal, and, *as yet*, invisible; its *Constitution* indicates his *subjects*, as those who believe and are immersed; its *Legislature*, as the Apostles; and its *Executive*, as consisting of those whom they may appoint. *There is no instance, in all the New Testament, of the Executive of the Kingdom being appointed, of evidence in criminal cases being approved, or of delinquents being expelled, by a vote of the majority of the citizens.* The seven deacons were elected by the multitude. In what manner is not said. It is presumable in the same way as the eleven did Mathias. This was the Jewish custom. The Apostles and Evangelists in the name, and by the power of the Lord Jesus, appointed the Executive in every congregation. By the Executive, I mean faithful men, able to teach others and to rule the Church of Christ, called Rulers, Overseers, Shepherds, &c., of whom there was a plurality in every congregation. Hence, every church consisted of public and private citizens of heaven. It cannot be shown that the latter had any thing to do by vote or voice, in ruling the body or in executing the laws. The Holy Spirit, not the people, made the Public citizens Overseers. Hence the propriety of the caution, the former, although they had the power, not to abuse it by lording it over God's heritage or clergy, the private members; and of the exhortation to the latter, to obey those who have the rule over them. Had the private citizens rose up and told the public men, that no evidence should be received in a case, unless

pronounced satisfactory by a vote of the majority of the church; they would, in effect, have given the lie to the Holy Spirit, who says, that "by the mouth of two or three witnesses every matter shall be established." Or, had they done that no criminal should be expelled, under any circumstances, except by a vote of the majority of the whole, they would have been doing the same thing, as if the citizens of this Republic should declare, that no murderer or other criminal person should be punished, unless he should be adjudged to such a vote of the majority of the whole people. They would be interposing the authority of their vote, and thus be setting themselves in traitorous opposition to the King, the Constitution, and the Laws.

It appears to me, that had things continued as the Apostles left them, the presbytery, executive, or eldership of the church would have filled up the vacancies among them, as they did at Antioch, in the same way as the Eleven instrumentally appointed Matthias. We see this traditionally handed down in a certain form, by the Church of Rome. All that the private citizens had to do, was to look out for men among them of an approved character, whom the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, appointed to their respective trusts. When it says, "the multitude elected Stephen, &c.—it answers to the command "look out" they did look out, and the result was, that they elected or found among themselves, men answering to the qualifications required whom they (the multitude) presented before the apostles to dispose of them according to the necessity of the case. I say then, that in Apostolic times, the officials of the congregations were not appointed by the vote of the majority. If they were, what did Paul mean when he said to the Ephesian Elders— "take heed to the whole flock over which the Holy Spirit has constituted you Overseers;" or, when he told Timothy, an inspired or spiritual man, 'to commit the things he had learned in trust to faithful men, who should be fit also to teach others;' or, when he says that he left Titus, another spiritual or inspired man, in Crete, that he not a majority of the Cretans, that he might set in order the things left unfinished, and that he might ordain elders in every city, as Paul commands him; if they might ordain such men to the Overseer's office as a consequence of their unofficial character to the description he has given of them to him and to Timothy. If then the vote of the majority did not appoint elders in those days, shall we say that the congregations were ruled by majority voting? If so, how can we obtain, then certain passages ought to read thus: "I have committed the whole flock over which the vote of the majority has constituted you overseers" — "by the vote of the majority every matter be established! Sufficient for such a purpose is the commandment, which was inflicted by a vote of the majority."

'despise the vote of the majority, let him be to you as a pagan
'or a publican'!

Hence, then, it appears, that those who refuse to submit to them who have the rule over them, because, they cannot any longer be permitted to carry on affairs by the voting of majorities, are, in very deed, acting contrary to those republican principles upon which they pride themselves so much. For my own part, I cannot but admire the wisdom of that arrangement which puts it beyond the power of corrupt and unenlightened majorities to vote into office men as ignorant and corrupt as themselves. This was the case in apostolic times. Some well-meaning brethren are excessively sensitive upon the subject of voting; they profess great alarm at the idea of a plurality of elders ruling the church independently of the voters of majorities. They talk about their liberties, and reputations, &c. being at stake, or at the mercy of a few. For myself, and I speak from observation, I would rather that my liberty and christian rights were in the keeping of a plurality of Overseers, though few, if the members of the plurality were such as answered the description of the Apostle to Timothy, than at the hazard of a vote of a majority. There is no no congregation with which I am acquainted, upon the vote of whose majority I should choose to risk my reputation for charitableness. And why not? Simply, because the majority are unenlightened on the subject. We shall resume this topic hereafter.

To conclude. If the constitution of Virginia is the Supreme Arbiter of all political controversy, and claims the reverence and absolute obedience of the people—the Constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven is infallibly so; and demands the unre-served submission of the faithful. Its sovereignty is supreme over all supremacy. If the Constitution of this republic restricts the people to the election of representatives, that of the Kingdom of Jesus, restricts the citizens of heaven to the nomination of their officials; the lot indicated the choice of Matthias by the King—the Inspired or Spiritual men, as Agents of the Holy Spirit, such as Apostles, Evangelists, &c., appointed the Elders and Deacons to their trusts. Under the constitution of Virginia, twelve men in the audience of the Court and Spectators (not the majority of the people) decide on the sufficiency of the evidence to convict the accused; so, under that of the Kingdom of Heaven, a plurality of Elders, in the audience of the congregation, determines the innocence or guilt of the party on the testimony of two or three witnesses. In this Republic, the Judges pronounce the sentence of the Law; hence it is the Law, not the Judges, which condemns a murderer to death; so, in the Kingdom, the Rulers pronounce the sentence of the Law, made and provided by the King and his apostolic Legislature; hence it is the latter, and not the former, who punish the guilty.

EDITOR.

(From the Gospel Advocate.)

DR. JOHN THOMAS OF THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE, A FACTIONIST.

We are informed that this restless, ambitious individual, whose course we have long considered exceedingly reprehensible, has actually been the occasion of a division of the congregation that met at the Sycamore M. H. Richmond, Va. It has been suspected that Dr. Thomas was aspiring to head a religious party in this country. It is now confirmed, at least to the satisfaction of many very intelligent brethren. We cannot look upon him in any other light than as a FACTIONIST. He has taken a party off with him in his wild speculations on the subject of materialism, anabaptism, etc. There was much more of infidelity than christianity in his thirty-four questions that appeared in the Dec No. of the Apostolic Advocate, 1833. A brother of more than ordinary intelligence, and who is well acquainted with the intricacies of scepticism, after reading those questions, said, the writer would be an avowed infidel in less than twelve months. I expressed a hope that it would not be so; but I confess I begin to entertain some fears, for not much more than half the time is elapsed, and the Dr. is certainly fully half gone.

Will the friends of the reformation sustain an individual who is striking at the very foundation of our religion—a factionist, who is sowing the seeds of discord among us, and leading off a party after him—who never has had any respect for the feelings of friends or opponents—and who, to say the least, has done us as much harm as Alexander, the coppersmith, did Paul?

Should we not rather disclaim all connexion with him, and let the world know that he is no longer one of us? I consider that he has gone from us, and as he is no longer identified with us, we hope that his semi-infidel speculations will not be charged upon this reformation.

Should the Dr. demur to this notice, we hope he will assign his reasons for doing so. He must prove that he and we are advocating the same cause. If he will convince me of that, I will acknowledge my mistake, and pursue a different course in the future.

Remarks.

In the *anonymous* effusion which precedes this, an unknown accuser, charged with certain heinous crimes, trusts, my beloved reader, whoever you are, to condemn me to the fires of a protestant purgatory, because I venture to speculate on the subject of *Plain Dealing*; and presumes to show you the other side of the question, that, though accused and

condemned, I have nevertheless done nothing worthy of death or of bonds.

Well, then, I would that Mr. Plain Dealing would first take the splinter out of his own eye, being persuaded, that he would be the better able to see to take the mote out of mine. He would do well, or at least better than he has done, if, when he attacks an individual, he would put his name to his effusions, that the accused might know the hand that wounds to disable or to kill. In the case before me, I know not who it is that strikes. I cannot believe, unless upon strong testimony, that brethren Johnson & Hall, the Editors of the Gospel Advocate, could be so ——, (I will not characterize the act, for I have such a horror at attacking a person in the dark,) as to be guilty of such a thing; still, however, until they publish the writer's name, I can do no less than hold them responsible for the sentiments set forth by Mr. Plain Dealing in their paper. I should not have noticed the attack, but for its appearing where it did. There is not a word of truth in it, from first to last, as far as concerns me; and this I shall show in brief.

First, then, as to the alleged facts; and secondly, as to the opinions. *I have caused no division of the congregation that meets at the Sycamore Meeting House, Richmond, Va.* This is Monday on which I write. Until last Lord's day week, I was one of the Elders of said congregation, and then voluntarily resigned on account of changing my residence from the city to Amelia county, in this State. I am still a member of the congregation, and harmless of any just accusation. What becomes then of the charge of Factionism? That I am a Factionist, "Plain Dealing" says, *is confirmed*. Woe be to the perpetuity of the Gospel, if its confirmation rests upon no better ground than the confirmation of this charge against me. This statement which can be confirmed by hundreds, will preclude the necessity of further remarks under this count.

A brother of more than ordinary intelligence, well acquainted with sceptical intricacies, after reading the 34 questions, prophesied that I should become an avowed infidel in twelve months!! And Mr. Plain Dealing adds to his prophecy, that I am fully half gone, i. e. *in his opinion!* As to the brother, however intelligent he may be, this is certain, that he is neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; the Lord, I know, has not spoken by him; for my faith, in what the scriptures teach, has much increased within the last six months; the more I study the sacred writings, the more firmly I believe what I first embraced, which was *the faith of the gospel*, and not the faith of "this" or that "reformation." The nearer I arrive at the end of said twelve months, the surer I am that said brother's prediction will not come to pass; and that he is most assuredly a false prophet. Alas for his acquaintance with the intricacies of

scepticism! Alas, too, for the sagacity of his Gehaz Plain Dealing.

The Gospel Advocate calls upon *the reformation* to disclaim all connexion with me. I am said to have left the reformation which he calls us, and to be striking at the very foundation of the religion of *us*, which he calls *our religion*. And what is "the reformation"? When I was baptised by my worthy and beloved christian brother Scott, I was baptised into the doctrine of the burial, and resurrection of Jesus, whom I confessed to be the Christ, being convinced then as now, that he is so from scripture testimony. I was not immersed into "this reformation" of that denomination, but into Christ. "The Reformation" disclaim me as soon as it pleases; but how is "the reformation" to speak? There are many churches fellowshipped by "the reformation" that will not disclaim me till they are convinced by something more weighty than assertion from evidence. I have denied *the faith* and thus become *worse than an infidel*. Will "the reformation" disclaim those Churches with which Mr. Plain Dealing may; but is he "the reformation"? I belong to no *ation*, and trust I never shall. I belong to the church of Christ, some of whose members meet in a meeting-house called Sycamore in this city. Those who are most alive to the interests of the faith here; whose conduct is unimpeachable—these are they of said congregation, who are my warmest, firmest, and beloved friends. I am ready to fellowship *all who have obeyed, and continue to obey the truth*, of whatever particular congregation they may constitute a part. I know no man as a *reformer*. If I fellowship an individual, it is because I suppose him to be a *Christian*. Experience has taught me that the terms Christian and Reformer are not equivalent. There are degrees in love, if I may so say; he that loves the truth most, though he differ from me in opinion, I love best; he has my whole heart, a totality which some have charitably denied me the possession of.

The Gospel Advocate calls me a *restless, ambitious individual*. I am restless; and shall so continue to be until I reach that rest which remains for the people of God; I am ambitious, and my ambition will be satisfied with nothing short of immortality, and a portion of the undefiled, and undecaying inheritance, in which I hope eternally to dwell. Shall I be rounded as I am by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, the pride of life, both in the church and in the world? Shall I cease to aim at the disenthralment of the human mind from traditions both of Romish and Protestant? Shall I cease to plead for what I honestly believe to be the truth of Holy Scripture, because men, as liable to error, are displeased to call it speculative and untaught? Shall I cease to benefit mankind, though that effort may not be approved by the views of Mr. Plain Dealing, or the opinions of the

"the Reformation." Has "the Reformation" all wisdom and knowledge? Is it infallible? Is it susceptible of no increase in knowledge? No improvement in practice? Is "this Reformation" in the person of Editors and writers to brand as speculators, materialists, anabaptists, and infidels, christian men who have the independence to think and act for themselves according to their own understanding of what God says to them in his word? If this despotism is to be established, the sooner it explodes the better. But I cannot persuade myself, that at this day, such a system will be tolerated by the lovers of civil and religious liberty and eternal truth. I am not an infidel, unless unbelief in human dogmas is to constitute me such. I believe, *upon testimony*, in one God, and one Mediator between God and man—the Man, Christ Jesus; I believe that all men are born into a state of sin, and are, therefore, sinners, be they called actual transgressors or not; that birth is at the one end and death at the other of this state; that though men cannot help being born in sin, they can help dying in sin, *provided they have been made acquainted with the means*; but that on the contrary, men can no more help dying in sin than they could being born in sin, *if the means by which they may escape such catastrophe have not been made known to them*; I believe that Jesus Christ alone is the way, the truth, and the life; and that they only are in a state of favor, under this dispensation, who have made him their friend by doing whatever he commands them; that to believe on Jesus, in order to obedience, is to be convinced of righteousness; and that all who do not obey, be they physically or intellectually incapacitated, matters not, do not, whatever else may become of them, attain to an eternal existence, which comes only as a gift through Jesus to the obedient believers. I believe in the resurrection of the *material body*, called "the adoption." There are many other things I believe, too numerous to mention now; things, no doubt, staggering to Mr. Plain Dealing, but not the less true on that account.

As to desiring to be the head of a religious party in this country, I scorn the position as unworthy a christian man. When I reflect upon who have been the heads of the religious parties in the world, I feel that I should be degraded were I to be added to their *coterie*. A man can attain to no higher honor in this state, than to that of being an heir of God and a joint heir with Christ of the promise made to Abraham. The head of a sect! Contemptible! I leave such vanities to them whose empty heads are best pleased therewith; they have no charms for me.

I should like these remarks to appear in the Gospel Advocate for the sake, not of "Plain Dealing," for I know not who or what he is, but of the readers of that paper. I believe the Messrs. Editors are just enough, if their paper become the ve-

hicle of inerration, to afford their subscribers an opportunity of judging for themselves, by affording the accused an opportunity of defence. I shall not, therefore, trouble myself further under this head. As for being like Alexander, the Copper-smith, I suppose I need not concern myself much about the matter being in, what even "Plain Dealing" will not deny, good company; for I believe brother Alexander Campbell has been likened to that celebrated character more than once.

That God may defend the just, and protect us all from the waywardness of ourselves and friends, is the confidence and prayer of

THE EDITOR.

Richmond, Oct. 3, 1836.

LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

24 Penton Place, Kennington Road, London,

July 6th, 1836.

MY DEAR SON: Whether the intermediate state be one of consciousness or otherwise, it will be a "sleep in Jesus," which will be of no ordinary kind, and assures the "dead that die in the Lord," that "they shall rest from their labors." There is something yawning, gloomy and terrific, in the sound of the word *Hades*, but, "if I am found in Jesus' hands, my life can ne'er be lost." It is a curious fact, that many years ago, Dr. John Pye Smith, Professor of Divinity, at Homerton College, in the parish of Hackney, near London, a divine of great classical attainments, and eminent in the literary world as a writer and polemic, expressed opinions similar to your own on the doctrine of an intermediate state, and thereby gave great offence; but he subsequently, as I have understood, returned to his previous opinions. Did it never occur to you, that in 2 Cor. v. 4, a clothing for the "disembodied spirit," distinct from the body at the resurrection, seems to be implied. This is a mere passing thought, but we are not quite Sadduceans yet. However, I am glad these matters are likely to be sifted to the bottom; for though I am of opinion that little that is novel can be adduced, discussion will exhaust the subject, and leave every one in quiet possession of his own convictions. I think I am correct in saying that the Reformers of Popery generally denied the doctrine of an intermediate state, in order to get rid of purgatory; and if you had been in Dr. Smith's predicament, I suspect you would have been hard pressed to admit the doctrine of an intermediate state in order to get quit of that kind of *Protestant Purgatory*. I presume that Mr. Campbell is meant for Mr. Campbell. How the Devil came out of the *Body of Moses*, in distinction from *the Body of Moses himself*, (which I presume he never left, unless Moses himself was separated from his body,) is a very difficult for us, on this side of the Atlantic, to understand.

though the resurrection of a body to die no more before the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is what I never did believe. The Lord has many ways of *clothing* spirit without being confined to corruption, and if Moses died—of which there seems to be no doubt—a *covering* could easily be found for him. At all events, *the impropriety of prejudging new opinions by old ones, is so indelibly impressed on my mind from my experience in America, that I am determined henceforth to judge neither opinions nor their propagators hastily*; and I do, (I trust not presumptuously) think that one of the ends of divine Providence to be in THE INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICA, is that the abuses, civil, ecclesiastical, and political, of the Old World may be corrected in the New; and how can this be done without (*always temperate*) freedom of discussion. I think you have decidedly the advantage of Mr. Ryland; for, assuredly, Saul's washing went *before* the washing away of his sins, as much as his name, Saul, did before that of his name, Paul. The cure of Hezekiah by a plaister of figs did not take the power of healing from God, as the *efficient* cause, but without the figs, as the *instrumental* cause, no cure could have been effected. Naman may have been dipped into a cure, but without the dipping he would have retained his Leprosy. But what is it men will not compass rather than surrender a popular opinion? Who that will not analyze his early associations of idea with scripture phrases, can ever see otherwise than his creed teaches him? Until this is done, unless terms be defined it is preposterous to expect agreement. Either I am utterly ignorant of the true sense of scripture or the word *grace, therein*, no more means what Calvinists understand by it, than fatalism means favor. I say the same of the expressions "the gift, the gift of God, the free gift, the gift by grace," and of the words influence, sovereign principle—which by the by, are not in scripture—but if we pertinaciously refuse to settle these points scripturally, differences of opinion must be interminable with regard to *re-immersion*. I have a strong feeling, but only a slight opinion on the subject. The principle on which the Ancient Gospel is *based* seems to sanction re-immersion; for that, if I am correct, is a recurrence to divine Institutions and first principles, agreeably to Apostolic practice and Apostolic testimony; and as the Baptism of the Baptist denomination has confessedly (by "reformers" I believe) deviated from the *import* and *obligation* of the Baptism of the Christian dispensation, consistency seems to require that Reformers should begin where Apostles began, and proceed as Apostles proceeded, and, without casting any reflection on others, put honor on a divine Institution; but when I recollect that in a case extra-Apostolic the opinion of Paul was asked, by the Corinthians, he was so diffident of his own judgment, that he qualified what he said by observing, "And I think that I have the Spirit of God." I

will say nothing positive on the subject: One may find-
 ing by experience—though experience is mingled up with
 constitutional temperament that the experience of one person
 scarcely be a rule to a second—that without uniformity of view
 on the general topics of the scriptures, touching the Apostolic
 sense of what have been denominated the five points, there
 cannot be corporate unanimity. I, for instance, could not hear
 Unitarianism; that is, a doctrine which asserts the efficacy
 of repentance alone to salvation: I cannot hear the Calvinism
 of those who maintain particular redemption, reprobation, or
 the jargon of a previous principle: I regard John Calvin as a *baleful*
misinterpreter of the Faith, and am disgusted with the dog-
 matism of many Calvinistic Teachers. Some are the excel-
 lent of the earth—maugre all your scepticism to the contrary.
 A sect, therefore, among other “christian” sects, every distinct
 body of professing christians—thanks to the Apostasy—must
 be; for, unless we are indifferent to what we hear, we must
 unitesly agree in what we deem *sense*, that we may not be per-
 tered with *nonsense*. My experience with our venerable bro-
 ther ———, has convinced me, that I could not unite in heart
 be the plea of union ever so speciously liberal, with a Calvin-
 istic coadjutor. Heaven and earth are scarcely more distinct
 than (in my judgment,) the New Testament is from the five
 points of Calvinism. *Re-immersion, therefore, in this view,*
is, at all events, expedient. Do you see no difference in na-
 ture, or degree, or conformity, between infidelity towards baptism
alone, and infidelity towards Christ and baptism together? In
 the Apostolic age, Jews and Pagans, who refused baptism, were
 infidels to Christ and to God. Their infidelity did not relate to
 baptism *in itself*, or as not being in being, or as not a something
 required by Christ, but they renounced the one, Christ, and the
 other, God, altogether, and therefore *refused* baptism. Is this
 the case with either Pædobaptists or baptists? How can you
 then confound them both as one? Do you think it unnecessary
 to discriminate Reformers from Apostles? Are we Apostles?
 Have we seen the Lord Christ? Are we invested with mira-
 culous powers? Then why do we confound the ancient Gos-
 pel in its *present revival* with the ancient Gospel in its *primiti-*
ve administration? The persons and credentials of the
 Apostles gave that authority to the latter which, it would be
 presumption to claim for the former, and stamped the rejection
 of baptism with unexcusableness, which cannot be predicated
 subsequently? But did the Apostles shelter themselves behind
sheer evidence as a plea for dictation? Never! *Manner* of
 evidence in order to persuasion, as much as *matter* is required
 in order to conviction; and without an unassuming manner
 would never have made converts. But if this doctrine
 be scriptural, and I attach no importance to it in the
 spect, there is a *circumstantial difference* in its

&c., both with regard to the positive institutions of the New Testament, and persons relatively to them now, to what there was originally. In other words, that which would have been contumacious then, is mere error in judgment now; and do not the scriptures draw a broad line of distinction between the two? Suppose, for example, the question were as to the manner in which our Lord broke the bread and poured out the wine at the supper, would they who saw it done possess no advantage over those who 1700 years subsequently to the apostacy only began to dispute about how it was done? The record is better explained by the exemplification of contemporaneous practice, than it can be by subsequent criticism; and though it may be to us as plain as a pike staff, they who think differently, cannot, supposing them to be wrong, be convicted of the same obliquity they would have been, had they first seen the manner and then contradicted it: the latter, therefore, are not to be denounced as might have been the former. Nor be it forgotten that the times themselves, gave demonstration of sincerity in the baptized then, which cannot be given by baptism now: for it was, prospectively, baptism for the dead, or confession even to martyrdom. It was, because, followed by the visible gift of the Holy Spirit; and, therefore, to attach equal infidelity to the rejection of baptism now that was done then—considering baptism abstractedly from this circumstantial difference—is I think, borne out neither by scripture, providence, nor emphatically by apocalyptic prophecy.

I shall be happy in the completion of your paraphrase of the psalms; for Calvinism is not merely played off from the pulpit, but from the singing desk also.

P. S. Dr. Cox has published his Visit to the Baptist Churches in America. I have not seen it. Thompson is haranguing every where on American Slavery and Tea-Totalism. Poor Dr. Cox is abused from all quarters. Thompson challenged him to a public disputation, which was declined by the Dr. Mr. or Dr. Breckenridge, has challenged Thompson to a debate on the conduct of American christians, as affecting Slavery at Glasgow, which has been held: particulars have been published in the Patriot. Being cut off from every vehicle of public communication, I have studied Hebrew, and am completely master of it so as to be able to read it, understand its construction, and pursue in it a biblical criticism. I have simplified Parkhurst's Grammar in MS., and completely analyzed in MS. the 1st. ch. of Genesis. I have completed and simplified a complete system of Classical Geography, and the use of the Terraqueous Globe, and am now completing in the same manner a system of Astronomy and the use of the Celestial Globe. I have prepared an Arabic, a Persian, and a Samaritan Alphabet. I purpose proceeding to Navigation, &c. &c. If it were not for this indomitable, unextinguishable thirst for

information, what would have become of me; isolated from "the church" and the world! Farewell.

From your affectionate Father,

JOHN THOMAS

Remarks.

It appears, that the destiny of man, and his journey to that interesting climax of his being, are subjects, which, when submitted to a free and open scrutiny, have in all countries and in all ages given "great offence." Jesus gave "great offence" to the Sadducees when he put them to silence, in the audience of the people, on the question of marriage at the resurrection, showing, as he did, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are dead, unconscious individuals, but that, though dead, in the strictest sense, lying in corruption, they will live again at the resurrection: and that, because they will live hereafter, and because too, events future are always present to him, he is called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob—the God, not of the dead, who are never to rise again—but the God of the living, or of those who are to live forever. Paul gave "great offence" to Messrs. Hymeneus and Philetus with their associates, when he insisted that the resurrection of the material body, then and thereafter sleeping in the dust, would hereafter be. So also "the Reverend Doctors," Martin Luther and Company gave "great offence" to the orthodox and godly Pope Leo X. to all their "Excellencies" the Cardinals of Rome—and to all the devout and pious believers in the purifying flames of purgatory, who composed the Mother of All the Churches in the 16th Century; because they denied the existence of a state of living for the mass of human beings, between death and the resurrection from the dead. Dr. John Pye Smith, too, it appears, gave "great offence" to his contemporaries, and jeopardised his orthodoxy—yes, and his professional honors and *perquisites* likewise, because he ventured to question the scripturality of the traditional speculations of the old wives and priests of the dark ages on this subject. Being a diligent student of the word, *not of man*, but of God, I, too, have come to "heretical" conclusions, and have ventured to talk without readers upon the things I have learned from the Book of Knowledge; and for this, my "presumption," I also have given "great offence," and in eschewing the speculative mysteries of *spiritualism*, I have unexpectedly slipped into as hot water as the "Reverend Doctor." Our cases, however, differ, in that he "admitted," for the sake of gain, the spirit of the "intermediate state;" I am contented to stand upon the rock of material truth, and shall admit nothing, and shall not be convinced, be the consequences what they may, of "the various categories," (their name is *legion*; for there are many) of the terrors for me.

In the above communication, this question addresses itself to the consideration of my readers. *Do you see no difference in nature, or degree, or enormity, between infidelity towards Baptism alone and infidelity towards Christ and Baptism together?* As it appears to me, though there seems to be a difference, yet scripturally, the diversity is not sufficient to make a real difference in the destiny of the two classes of infidels. The following is the decree recorded against infidels of every grade in relation to THE GOSPEL, in Paul's letter to the persecuted disciples at Thessalonica; and you afflicted brethren rest with us (Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy,) "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, with his mighty messengers, in flaming fire, inflicting a just retribution on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall suffer a just punishment—(even) an everlasting destruction (which shall proceed) from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Such is the irrevocable fiat against those, without exception, who know not God, and obey not the gospel. Mark! reader, it does not say any thing about circumstantial differences; the rule is absolute, and here there is no room for qualification. It is certainly one thing to reject baptism, and another to deny that Jesus is the Christ and also to refuse baptism; it is also one thing to believe the gospel from ocular proofs of God's power, and another to believe it by examining written testimony; yet, the blessings which flow through obedience to the gospel are equally accessible to the ancient and modern obedient believers; so, if to be immersed into Christ is to obey the gospel, the just punishment, which is an "everlasting destruction"—will come equally upon both classes of infidels, who, from whatever cause, refuse to be baptized. The reason that the infidelity of Jews and Pagans did not relate to baptism *in itself*, but to a rejection of Jesus as the Christ, and to the one only living and true God, was, because baptism was only enjoined on Jews and Pagans *after* they had believed in Jesus and in God, and not as too frequently happens now, *before* a conviction has been wrought in the minds of the hearers, that Jesus is the person through whom remission of sins is offered to men. Baptism for remission of sins, is offered to believers in Jesus, not to infidels; if believers in him refused to be immersed into Jesus, they in effect, as positively reject the Christ, as the Pharisees did the counsel of God against themselves in refusing to be baptized by John. Pseudobaptists and vast numbers of modern Baptists, are as infidel of the obedience required to the gospel by the scriptures, as the ancients were of Jesus and of God. Their state, therefore, in relation to Christ is the same, though arrived at in a different way. There are more ways than one of arriving at the same calamity, while there is but one way of arriving at eternal life.

Convinced from experience that "reformers" and "apostles" are not equivocal terms, I admit fully the necessity of distinguishing between Reformers, however eminent, and Apostles. If we are not Apostles, we have not seen the Lord Christ, nor are we invested with miraculous powers: hence we are neither Apostles, nor the successors thereof. Neither would I confound the revival of the Ancient Gospel with its primitive administration; but I would claim for *the* gospel one and the same audience, whether in its revival or origination. The gospel is still the gospel, whether remembered or forgotten; whether contemplated at the beginning or the ending of the Christian Dispensation. The sin of the world consists now of their not believing on Jesus. This greatest of all sins develops itself in various ways. In some it consists in wilfully doing what Jesus commands us not to do; in others, in rejecting what he does; in others again, in not doing the things he requires us to do, &c., &c.; still, though in a different way, they all equally reject him, and are all equally inexcusable.

There is, indeed, a difference between contumaciousness and error in judgment. Hence *error in judgment* pertains to "times of ignorance," while *contumacity* belongs to times of knowledge. Nations, communities, and individuals, are accountable for contumacy in times of knowledge; but God "winks" at errors of ignorance. "The times of this ignorance God has winked at, but now (in a time of knowledge) she makes proclamation to all men, every where, to reform," &c. When knowledge is revealed to men, it makes them responsible for a continuance in ignorance; whether, however, they be contumacious or ignorant, this is certain from scripture, that where God is they never can go. The only way of entering his presence acceptably is by an introduction through Jesus Christ; and to this august presence, he will introduce only his friends, and none are his friends but they who do *whatever* he commands them, whether it be to believe, or to be baptized, or to do any other thing great or small.

I have judged it necessary to say thus much, because of the queries contained in my good father's epistle; as well as to assist the reader somewhat in his reflections.

LEXICOGRAPHIA.

"Irony thinks otherwise than what the words denote."

Abstinence, total,	to abstain publicly, but privately.
Analogy of Faith,	the agreement of the Christian and his people.
Apostle,	favorite term of the clergyman.
Apostolic Fathers,	writers of the New Testament, Christ himself.

Atonement,	the reconciliation of a vindictive God:
Arminianism,	the doctrine taught by the Apostle James.
Baptism,	a sprinkling of water on the face by a priest, and signing the forehead with the sign of the cross. Neither faith nor confession by the subject is necessary in this case. Without this, baptism regenerates the innocent, inducts into Christ, and qualifies for interment in consecrated ground, as the road to heaven.
Baptists, <i>modern</i> ,	Christians of the most immaculate kind.
Baptistery,	a pint basin.
Believers,	assentients to the traditions of their grandmothers.
Bible,	a book second to none <i>but</i> the Mass Book, Canon of the council of Trent, thirty-nine articles, Augsburg, Westminster, and Philadelphia Confessions, Methodist Book of Discipline, &c. In its use, it is a "nose of wax" made to be pulled and twisted by every speculator in religion.
Bigotry,	an obstinate and perverse attachment to the truth.
Bishop,	a political and ecclesiastical legislator.
Blasphemy,	detraction from human dogmas—such as the physical operations of the "Ghost of the Sects;" the word of God a "dead letter," reconciling God to man, &c.; which, if a man do not believe, he will "be damned" by the Orthodox.
Bitterness,	an emphatic and energetic statement of truth correctly applied.
Call,	an invitation to preach one or more "sermons" a week for so many dollars a year.
Call, <i>special</i> ,	the difference in dollars over and above the "call." Thus, if a priest have \$1000 per annum for two sermons a week, and he be called thence to some other flock, which

- will be given, \$1500.
 calls the difference between
 and \$1000. The urgency of
 call is according to the magnitude
 of the difference.
- Calling,
 an internal feeling by which a sin-
 ner is called to Christ, and assured
 that his sins are pardoned.
- Call to the Ministry,
 an internal feeling of the satisfac-
 tion to be derived from living with-
 out manual labor, and of getting
 wealth and power by preaching
 the dogmata of a sect.
- Calvinism,
*The doctrine taught by the Ap-
 tle Paul.*
- Candor,
 A shelter for sectarian absurdity,
 scepticism, ignorance, immorality,
 and irreligion.
- Catholicism,
*the doctrine taught by the Ap-
 tle Peter.*
- Charity,
 the "grand theological grace" of
 permitting your neighbors to go
 to perdition, under the idea that
 they are going to eternal bliss; pro-
 vided they will grant you the same
 privilege. By this kind of charity,
 religious controversy is quashed.
- Christ,
 an ideal being, having as many
 heads, bodies and spirits as there
 are sects in Christendom.
- Christendom,
 the kingdom of Christ, in which
 the subjects do the things which
 please them best.
- Christian,
 a religious chameleon.
- Christianity,
 a system of religion, composed
 of Judaism, Paganism, Platonic
 and a few truths promulgated by
 Jesus and his Apostles.
- Church,
 an ideal conception.
- Clergy,
 the peculiar and favorite burning
 of God; and the greatest and most
 merciful benefactors of our race.
- Commentary,
 A compilation of human wisdom,
 more sacred and authoritative than
 the Bible itself.
- Communion,
 disunion; as "the communion of
 saints" in Christendom.
- Concord,
 discord; as the concord of the
 with Hell, the Church, and the
 and State.

Confession with the mouth,	a thought in the heart; as, when a man is supposed to believe without a declaration of the fact.
Conscience,	the truth teller of Christendom, Mahometdom, and Pagandom.
Consecration,	the act of making things holy by an unholy and polluted agency.
Convert, <i>Christian</i> ,	a disciple of every name but that of Christ.
Conversion,	a feeling.
Conviction,	an impression.
Credulity,	faith.
Custom	an ordinance supreme over Christian Law and Gospel by divine appointment.

THE REV. R. RYLAND TO THE EDITOR.

UNIVERSITY OF VA., April 25, 1836.

DR. THOMAS:

Dear Sir—A few days ago the last number of the Apostolic Advocate was put into my hands, and I saw a letter from Charlottesville giving some account of a sermon preached by myself on Acts ii. 38. Permit me to say, that this letter misrepresents (not designedly I trust) the sermon to which it alludes. By using inverted commas, it quotes language not found in the discourse, and which, in several instances, materially changes the sense. There is no possibility of my being mistaken in this assertion, as the sermon was written, and is still in my possession.

Very respectfully,

R. RYLAND.

REPLY.

Richmond, Va., May 8th, 1836.

DEAR SIR:

On referring to the letter from Charlottesville, I find as you say, some sentences inclosed in inverted commas. These are of two kinds; first, quotations of the scriptures, and secondly, expressions alleged to be yours as to the sentiments either original or adopted. Of the latter, the following are—"into"—"*repent and be baptized into a confession of forgiveness, or into the doctrine of remission*"; "*though my mind is not made up on this text*" (except a man be born of water)—"faith alone"—(a doctrine *confessedly* adopted by you)—"what will become of the good and pious who have not been baptized"! This last, you will observe, being between *two* inverted commas instead of *four* indicates that the sentiment is yours though perhaps not the exact words. The phrase "*a mere bodily act*" is not given literally as yours, but is quoted as one notoriously

expressive of what Andrew Broaddus has reduced the original Institution to; and as expressive likewise of the substance of the sermon you made it.

Now, if I may be allowed to conjecture, the misrepresentation (though, if there be any, I am sure unintended) may be found in the sentence "repent and be baptized," &c. If this fails to express the doctrine you taught on the occasion alluded to, send me your own *explicit* rendering of the passage in *language that cannot be mistaken*, and it shall appear as an erratum upon the above.

We conjecture here that you are attacking us under the feigned signature of "Neaniskos" who 'hails from' Albemarle. I hope we do not do you injustice. A word of advice, however, if you be that writer—*never be ashamed of your own name, especially when you attack others*. No doubt many things in the articles of Real Reformation with which "Campbellites" and "Reformers" are charged are true. We deplore it; and exceedingly regret, that we are hampered by persons who assume the name of Reformer without the least pretension to the thing. Go on, sir, if you be "Neaniskos" and spare us not. But remember if we were as bad as you make some of us to be this does not excuse you Baptists. Real Reformation. Who among you can effect it? Try the experiment, and see if the mass of iniquity which crowds your community will not quickly expel you. Did you ever read of a corrupt body purifying itself?

You must "come out of" Babylon, if you would be purified and saved, for Babylon will not reform itself—her sentence is passed (Rev.) her perdition is sealed; and all who remain in her will receive of her plagues!

As for ourselves, we are reforming. But my good sir, what a farce it is for your Herald—which is the organ of your sect in Va.—to be talking about "real reformation," while it denies those whom it attacks the *right* of defending themselves. This is most unrighteous conduct. It is cowardly—it is base. But, I restrain the expression of my horror at such injustice. And you, "Neaniskos," sanction this. You can write on Real Reformation, and yet permit those who differ from you to be condemned unheard! Why you are worse than the meanest Pharisees! But I trust that Robert Ryland is not Neaniskos.

I have done, and subscribe myself, dear sir,

Respectfully yours,

J. THOMAS.

MR. R. RYLAND.

To this Mr. Ryland replied by a note which in his opinion he says is not designed for publication. We therefore, do not insert it. We are not interdicted from inserting our readers its contents. He says that his note is intended as an erratum, although no particular error is

out. The reason of this unreasonable erratum was, that he did not desire at present to be drawn into controversy through the medium of the Advocate. If he were disposed to enter the lists he would enter another arena. The Herald, we presume, where he could have it all to himself, knowing that his opponent would be denied the right of reply. As to surmises and suspicions, he says they may pass by unnoticed; and that if we declined publishing his erratum, he would thank us to return it by mail. We have not declined; but have published the note: and there ends the matter as far as we know.

EDITOR.

IMPORTANT NOTICES.

N. B. The following notices are important in relation to our affairs. It is requested, that in future all Letters be addressed to *John Thomas, Editor of the Advocate*, OFFICE TAVERN POST OFFICE, AMELIA, VIRGINIA; and, it is especially recommended, in order to save the trouble of writing to no purpose, that they be POST PAID.

. Subscribers from different parts of the country, who may visit Richmond, having any business to transact with the Editor of a pecuniary nature, will find a worthy and faithful substitute in brother Wm. Bootwright of that city. He is our agent in general, and fully authorized to settle all accounts of whatever kind due to us.

¶ Hereafter, the Advocate will be sent to the Richmond Post Office, where subscribers in the city may obtain their papers upon application. They will be punctually mailed from time to time; so that the obtaining them will depend on the subscribers and the postmaster. We are particular in naming this, inasmuch as many Harbingers arrive at this Office, which, though received, are either not applied for, or when demanded from some cause or other, not delivered. It may be so with our papers; but we hope not.

¶ The sixth number of the Advocate is now issued, yet many of our subscribers have still to forward us their dues, which, according to agreement, ought always to be settled on receiving the first number of every volume. Generally speaking we need not complain; but, a desire to meet our engagements, prompts us to give this *hint* to the wise, which is always enough.

¶ In our last we mentioned, that certain brethren had subscribed to the purchase of an office for the printing of the Advocate on a larger scale, and independently of those establishments, which are under the control of sectarian influence, &c. We have realized the necessity of this. The office at which our

paper has been hitherto printed owed its being to the Address. It has recently passed into the hands of a High Church Episcopal Clergyman—"the Reverend Mr." Lee of the "South Churchman." This "divine" of the Southern Church has strong sectional prejudices. He knows his utter imbecility of argument; hence he has deemed it expedient to embarrass our operations by refusing to print our paper at his office. Thus the typographic progeny has recoiled upon its parent, whom it has pettishly turned out of doors. This is the second time we have been rejected by official sectarianism; which some may deem a happy and triumphant event—an honor, however, attended only by a temporary inconvenience as regards ourselves.

The brethren who have subscribed for the purpose aforesaid will perceive from this incident, the necessity of forwarding their subscriptions without delay, either to me at the *Old Tavern Post Office, Amelia, Va.*, or to brother Thomas Henly, *Walkerton, King & Queen, Va.*, who will forthwith communicate with me. I have obtained a patent lever press for which I pay about 200 dollars. I have yet to procure type, stands, cases, &c., &c., which will be two or three hundred more. The brethren, therefore, who have subscribed, and shall yet do so to make up the deficiency (about 150 dollars more wanted) will see the necessity of furnishing the supplies to meet the coming demands. I have thought it best to give this notice in this form, as it will save time and letter writing, which is at present important.

RECEIPTS FOR VOL. III.

Whittle's Mills, M. Va., C. May, J. Curtis. *Crichton's Store, M. Va.*, J. Smith. *Canady's, B. Va.*, J. B. Jeter. *Wattsboro, L. Va.*, C. Tisdale, W. Wilson, J. J. Boswell, D. Petty, J. A. Smithson, W. H. Harwood. *Savannah, Geo.*, Mrs. Love, Mrs. Arms, Mrs. Adams, M. Surgover, \$1 over, and S. C. Dunning, \$5. *Lynchburg Va.*, W. Dean. *Bowling Green, Car., Va.*, W. Maury, \$20. *King Wm. Courthouse Va.*, H. Lipscomb, R. Littlepage, J. H. King, A. White, J. Hooper, P. Johnson, W. C. Pemberton, W. E. Neale, J. Hooper, D. S. Robins, A. Acree, J. B. Edwards, B. Walker. *New Kent Courthouse, Va.*, W. Ratcliffe. *Hallsboro, Ch. Va.*, C. M. Day, \$3, V. Winfree, \$2, P. D. Porter, J. P. Spence. *Dover Mills, G. Va.*, L. Ellis. *Enfield, K. Va.*, J. W. Venport, W. Nunns. *Sublett's, P. Va.*, J. C. West. *Found Mill, H. Va.*, W. Barlow. *Columbia, S. C.*, Mack. *Franklin, Tenn.*, H. Cook, P. Shelburne. *Walkerton, K. & Q. Va.*, Mr. Broache, M. Kenly, \$2. *Tappahannock, E. Va.*, W. Broache, E. Carter, L. Heply. *Walkerton, K. & Q. Va.*, J. M. Higgins, C. Enslo. *Gallatin, S. C.*, J. M. Anderson, J. Branham, T. J. Hubbard.

Va., A. H. Johnson. *Cuckooville, Va.*, Dr. F. Jonsson. *Shannon Hill, G. Va.*, J. Poindexter. *Locust Creek, L. Va.*, T. A. Hope. *Miller's, E. Va.*, R. H. Covinton, H. H. Cauthorn, R. D. Covington. *Bowlers, E. Va.*, P. J. Derieux, \$2, J. H. Smith, J. Richards, V. Lorimer. *Berlin, M. Tenn.*, G. Fox, J. Hardison. *Chapel Hill, B. Tenn.*, Harby. *Union Level, M. Va.*, G. Hoimes. *Lombardy Grove, L. Va.*, P. Lett. *Mill Grove, M. Va.*, B. Wallace, P. Boothe. *Barry Bridge, L. Va.*, W. A. Stone. *Columbia Grove, L. Va.*, C. Gee. *Pleasant Grove, L. Va.*, P. H. Hart. *Laurel Hill, L. Va.*, J. Bolling, F. N. Robertson. *Oak Grove, L. Va.*, J. Parish. *Edmonson Store, B. Va.*, C. J. Bishop, and \$2 from brother A. A., for some one else. *Clarkston, K. & Q., Va.*, V. Coleman. *Dunsville, E. Va.*, A. Hundley, P. Treble, J. P. Tompkins, M. Garnett, Mr. Murrel, and Mrs. Burnett. *Hanover, Va.*, E. Talley for self. W. Smith, J. Milston, G. Bootwright, J. Gibson. *Jeffries' Store, N. Va.*, J. Hatchett, A. D. Doswell, \$2. J. Taylor, M. C. Williams. *Sandy River Church, P. E. Va.*, R. H. Degernette for self. Iac. McGehee, S. H. Wootton. *Oxford, B. Ohio*, W. B. Bowney, H. Osborne, W. Williams, H. Birdsill. *Nottoway, Va.*, T. H. Fowkes, \$5 for self, J. C. Hardy, J. E. Cole, J. R. Powell, B. Bridgeforth. *Strasburg, S. Va.*, D. Stickley, J. Watson. *Beaver Dam, G. Va.*, E. Woodson, J. W. Carnohan, J. Witt, J. Robertson, S. Cocke, A. Mitchell. *Goochland Courthouse, Va.*, Miss Royster. *Little Plymouth, K. & Q. Va.*, Miss E. Christian, \$2. *Brockport, N. Y.*, J. M. Yearnshaw. *Montague's, E. Va.*, J. C. Clopton. *Lanerville, K. W., Va.*, R. Lipscomb. *Mangohick, K. W. Va.*, W. Taliaferro, \$5. *Rushville, Ill.*, H. A. Cyrus. *Brydie's Store, L. Va.*, B. Bennett. *Abbeville, H. Ala.*, T. Doswell. *Double Bridges, L. Va.*, W. Irvin. *Hedge Grove, L. Va.*, B. E. Smith. *Halifax Courthouse, Va.*, J. T. Wootton. *Brunswick Courthouse, Va.*, W. Brown. *Horse Pasture, H. Va.* J. T. Wootton, \$11. *Wyliesburg, C. Va.*, J. C. Ingram, W. Elam, S. Elam, J. E. Smith, H. M. Cargo. *Stonesville, C. Va.*, W. Hunkins, W. T. Roberts, J. T. Morris, W. Hailey. *Charlotte C. H. Va.*, W. Davidson, G. J. Roberts. *Cicero, O. N. York*, H. Joslin, \$2. *Brewerton, N. Y.*, A. Emmons. *Ebensburg, C. Pa.*, E. Davis \$5 in full. *Henderson, Ky.* W. L. Stone, Capt. J. A. Hatchett, W. Green. *Bellevernon, Pa.*, L. Johnston. *Boonville, C. Mo.*, J. Quarles. *Scottsville, H. Va.*, B. Sammons. *Richmond, Va.*, E. Carter, \$5, J. B. Bragg, W. Booth, \$5, T. J. Glenn, Mrs. Glenn, A. Johnson, J. Griffin, C. H. Hyde, T. D. Quarles, \$5, J. McKildoe, F. Mathews, D. Parker, A. Morris, Mr. McCrery, W. Marsh, B. Hubbard, N. McCurdy, \$2, A. King, \$2, J. Pierce, M. Henly, R. Lipscomb, Capt. White. *Rising Sun, D. Ja.*, J. B. Craft. *Washington, Pa.*, A. Reynolds. *Lebanon, W. Tenn.*, W. H. Willeford, \$15. *Locust Creek, L. Va.*, Jo. Bowles, L. Turner. *Cuckooville L. Va.*, N. Walton.

THE
APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE
AND
PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D. not D.D.

Vol. 3. RICHMOND, Va. NOVEMBER 1, 1896. No. 7

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

THE REIGN OF LAW.

A law is a rule of action. Without law there can be no order. The absence of order is disorder, and where disorder is, there confusion reigns. Law regards the moral, as well as the material universe. It has respect to persons, communities of persons, and to things. Law implies a lawgiver, and the legislator subordinates, as the subjects of legislation, no being or thing within the range of human conception, is above law. Even God is subject to his own laws. So that from the plan to the elephant, from the grain of sand to the mountain, and from these to Jehovah, every thing acknowledges law. A deviation from law is the result either of God's own intervention, or of rebellion to his authority. Whatever aberration cannot be traced to a Divine Command, though not mentally premeditated, is rebellion in deed, because contrary to the rule of action he has set forth. It is not intention but action, which constitutes rebellion; hence it is, that man is to be judged according to his works, whether they shall be good or evil, in agreement or disagreement, with that rule of action which God has given him for his moral governance. How far rebellion may mitigate the rebellion of one, who had voluntarily submitted to God's moral government, made known through the Holy Spirit and Faith, it is not for us to say; but this we are taught, that obedience cannot supersede the necessity of obedience, and obedience will alone entitle us to his favorable regard.

Law framed with a regard to possibility, if it is arbitrary, is the tyranny of a despot. All God's laws are framed with a due regard to that possibility, and therefore, if they are so constructed, as to take into consideration the nature of every animate and inanimate object, and the

imposed. What wisdom must that Great Being possess, who can adapt laws to the natures and qualities of every component of his boundless empire! How beneficent is God! And yet, what a tyrant would some make him, who announce him as giving laws to man, which he knew he could not obey!

Law, it will be observed, may be either *physical* or *moral*. Physical law regards *mere matter*; moral law has respect to intellect exclusively. Obedience to physical law is *physical action*; obedience to moral law is *moral action*. The *subjects* of physical law are as manifold as the objects of nature; and, therefore, it applies to every thing which exists, either in relation to the globe we inhabit, or to the countless worlds, revolving through the immensity of space. The subjects of moral law are all rational intelligences; known to us as angels and men—as angels, or inhabitants of surrounding globes—as men, or those of this nether world. Of *moral law*, as applicable to the citizens of other orbs, we are ignorant; all we know is, that the *basis* or principles of this law in relation to them are the immutable attributes of Jehovah made known to us, as the basis of his legislation to mankind. Of the moral law as applicable to the citizens of earth, we may be well informed, if we take the trouble to examine the bible—the statute book of God in relation to us—with only half the diligence and circumspection customary among men in the analysis and digest of the laws of nations.

Man is said to be a *compound* being; that is, a being composed of an *immortal soul*, and a *mortal body*. The former is said to inhabit the latter, as the kernel inhabits a shell. This composition is said to distinguish him from the inferior animals. In what part of the bible such doctrine is taught I am entirely ignorant. It is for those who maintain it to show. I prefer to say, that man is the perfection of animal organization, as it now exists, under the preliminary arrangements of time. He is a being susceptible of moral obligations, because capable of the obedience of moral law. This susceptibility the "*animal man*" is alone capable of; and this, because his organization is more perfect than that of brutes. Hence, then, he is the only being on the earth, whom God has placed under moral law. This law regards him as a gregarious being; and therefore notifies to him, how God expects him to demean himself in relation to his companions. But it also regards him as a created, and therefore dependent, being—as a being, unlike the brutes who are subordinated to man, owing no allegiance but to him by whom he exists.

Man's moral actions, then, are all resolvable into two relations—into his duty to God, and his duty to his neighbor. Every "*animal man*," therefore, who fulfils these relations acceptably to God, that is, as approved by the moral law, written in the book of God, will be rewarded, at a time appointed, with

a life that never ends. Thus in obeying God, and doing good to his neighbor, he is in fact substantially benefitting himself. An observation entirely in accordance with holy writ, which says—"he who looks narrowly into the perfect law of liberty, and continues, he not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer of its work, (or required obedience,) shall, in so doing, be happy."

Man's animal race has been the subject of legislative enactments for 400 years. God's moral law has not all been made known, in its details, at one and the same time. Its basis, as we have said, has been unchangeable; the *developments*, however, of the principles, constituting that basis, have varied. Hence man has been placed under a Patriarchal, and a portion of his race under a Jewish, and a Christian development of moral law. One development yet remains, which, like the patriarchal, will relate to the *whole* race of man. This development will last 1000 years, and has, therefore, been termed the MILLENIUM.

All these developments may be found in the bible. To *hear* and *do*, have been characteristic of all their requirements. It is the same God, who has enacted them all. He will as rigidly require obedience to the Law of Christ, as to the law of Moses; for they are both only two chapters of the same Book of Laws. *Intention* did not protect a man from death under the Law of Moses; nor will it under the Law of Christ. Take the case of Uzzah, 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7, by way of illustration. Nay, but says Paul—"if the word spoken by messengers (the Law of Moses) was firm, and every transgression and disobedience received a just retribution, how shall we (christians) escape if we neglect so great salvation?"—The very fact, then, of an uncompromising obedience, to the very letter and spirit, being required under the Law of Moses, which was an institution subordinate to the Christian, ought to be an argument with us for greater sedulousness, and conformity to the Law of Christ. It is often urged that God will not be so strict with us, as with the Jews—but who told these objectors so? It is true, we are under a milder system; that is, we have not a burdensome ritual to observe as they had. But this does not effect the question. It bears upon one case only to show, that we are less excusable than the Jews; fewer observances being required of us than of them. What is required of us, will be as rigidly expected; and our delinquencies, if reformed, will be visited with a more awful chastisement than theirs: for, if the disobedience of Moses' Law, was punished with death, a continued and unreformed transgression of the Law of Christ will be recompensed by a *perpetual* punishment eternally enduring.

That all the varieties of the human race, which have, at some time or other, been placed under the same

ments of God's moral law, is demonstrable from the fact, that all nations have an idea of God, of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, &c., among them; although, indeed, these ideas have been sadly perverted from their original distinctiveness and purity. Still the ideas are among them, *and must have been communicated*, seeing that man can combine, analyse and compare ideas, but cannot originate them; being born into the world idealess, and ignorant of every thing antecedent to observation.

When we recognize the truth, that "*order is Heaven's first law*"—and with this as our chart, compass and polar star, circumnavigate the globe, visiting the nations thereof, and observing their political, commercial and ecclesiastical institutions in their workings among the people—how odious must be the 'confusion worse confounded' in the sight of the pure eyes of the God of order and of peace! But when we visit the Institution of Jesus Christ, who was obedient to death, even the death of the cross—of Jesus, whose meat it was to do the will of him that sent him—I say, when we visit his Institution which he caused to be established for the grand end of making order reign triumphant over this province of God's universal Monarchy—when we see this in a state of confusion, of disgraceful disorder; where, where, I say, shall we look for peace, for holiness, for purity amidst the turmoil of the world? Where shall we find the proof—the practical demonstration—that God's moral law exists among men? If God be the God of order, what estimation must he hold that society in, which calls itself by the name of Christ, and denies in practice those laws, which in theory it professes to obey? We say that such a community must be like putrid fish in a stinking river (Exod. vii. 18)—most offensive in the nostrils of Jehovah!

These observations have been suggested to us by reading a well-conceived article, in many respects, on "*Church Discipline*," in the last number but one of the "*GOSPEL ADVOCATE*," from the pen of brother B. F. Hall. The subject of which he treats is one of vast importance. A church may have the most perfect theory of the gospel and christian religion, that can be deduced from the sacred scriptures; yea though it speak with the languages of men and of angels, have the gift of prophecy, know all secrets, and all knowledge, and have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not that *love* to God, which is *developed* by obedience to his laws, it is nothing: its acquirements are mere sounding brass, or a noisy cymbal. The laws of Jesus Christ must be *implicitly* obeyed; for sooner or later, he will make them victorious. They must be as authoritative with the members of reforming communities as the Laws of Virginia or Kentucky are, with the best and most enlightened friends of order and true liberty in those States. I say, they must be more so; for if the laws of these States require us to

do that which the Laws of Christ condemn, we must do it for it is a part of the Law of Heaven to obey God rather than men. Human, must never be brought into competition with the Divine Law. It is better to suffer death than to sin against God; for he that loses his life, shall gain it if he suffer for a principle. The principle of the Christian Institution is not a Republicanism. No Republicanism must be introduced there. Republicanism is excellent in its place; but it is disorganizing and demoralizing when mixed up with the Discipline of the Church. The Laws of Jesus are absolute; and the vote of a majority cannot annul, suspend, or set them aside. The Church is not an appointee, the Elders are the paternal magistrates, the Law is Supreme, and King Jesus only reigns in that community where his laws are implicitly obeyed. The victory of law must first be celebrated in the Institution of Christ, before the nations can be expected to obey it. The following is an extract from brother Hall's article.

From the Gospel Advocate.

"CHURCH DISCIPLINE."

Transgressions of the law of Christ are of two kinds, being either *public* or *private*; and differ in degree, being either *venial* or *capital*. In the writings of the Evangelists and apostles of Christ, there is information given concerning every species of crime, and upon each I will make some observations.

1 *Trespases* or *private offences* are committed against an individual member, such as fraud or extortion, or over-reaching a brother in a contract. It may be done by *concealing* the truth or *stating* a falsehood. Our Lord, in Math. xviii. 15-17, gives instructions concerning the course to be pursued by the injured or aggrieved brother, in such cases. "If your brother trespass against you, go and expostulate with him, when you and he are alone together, &c."

How different is the conduct of most professors. When one considers himself aggrieved, his first step is to give public notice to the difficulty, and excite as much prejudice as possible against the offender.

Injuries may be done to the *person*, *reputation*, or *property* of an individual. The word *trespass* has more immediately reference to the last, but may, I think, without violence be applied to the other two. Then the phrase, "If he will hear thee, thou shalt have thy brother again," is to be understood according to the nature and extent of the injury.

If the injury be done to the property, the phrase implies the making up the amount of loss, or the restoring or compensating the brother for the injury done. If done to the reputation, the phrase implies the removing as far as possible the injury made concerning the injured brother. In the case of a

done to the person, we are to understand the phrase, "hear you" as an acknowledgment, and as far as possible, a reparation of the injury done.

"If he refuse to hear you"—if he refuse to restore the property fraudulently taken, to correct the slanderous report he put in circulation, or to acknowledge his error for the injury he has done your person, why then take with you one or two brethren to expostulate with him, and in case of his obstinacy, to be witnesses before the church, where it is next to be taken. Let the church* say what he shall do, and if he refuse to comply with the decision of the church, then what? call in helps? take it to the conference? to the Presbytery? or to the association? No: from the decision of the church, there is no appeal to a higher tribunal on earth. The church is the supreme ecclesiastical court. Its decision is final.

2. *Public offences.*—This class includes all violations of the law of Christ, that are not embraced under the former division; and we may say them also, when committed in a way to offend or injure the feelings of the church, or to wound the cause of christianity. I say, trespasses may become public offences, when committed in an open, unconcealed manner, or when by the additional impropriety of the offender, or by a wrong step of the injured party, publicity is given to the transgression. But under this denomination, are more especially included flagrant violations of the law of Christ, such as drunkenness, murder, theft, &c.

All crimes are either *venial* or *capital*. By venial crimes, I mean those which are pardonable on professions of repentance. This class the Apostle mentions in Gal. vi, 1, called, being "overtaken in a fault," or *surprised* into it. We can readily conceive that the best man may, in the sudden moment of strong temptation—in the hour of unguarded attack—in the flutter and trepidation of unexpected alarm, be surprised into almost any sin; and when satisfactory evidence is given that such is the case, the brethren should, on his reformation, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness.

There is a great difference, if I may so express myself, between a man's being overtaken in a fault and *his overtaking it*, or running unguardedly into the practice of evil. If an individual have in fact been overtaken, he will carefully avoid the snare. He will mark the place; he will turn from it and flee away.

* There is, I apprehend, but one way in which the church can examine witnesses, speak, and decide upon matters brought before it, *namely*, by its Eldership; composed of brethren having the qualifications required by the Apostle, constituted its authority by the whole or the major part; and ruling, in all good conscience, according to the Laws of Jesus and his Apostles.

There are two circumstances which may be regarded as pretty good evidence, that the individual was overboard. He will generally embrace the earliest opportunity to confess his crime, even without being waited on by the Elders of the congregation. 2. He is very certain not to be guilty of the offence a second time.

No violation of the law of Christ should be overlooked or passed by unnoticed—no offence is to be considered so trivial as to be connived at or excused, or forgiven without evidence of reformation.

In his first epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul gave a list of what I have denominated *capital crimes*. They are such as merit excision, or separation from the body of Christ. Pardon or exclusion is mentioned as the end of discipline. *Suspension*, as practised by some, is unauthorized in the scriptures.

Let us hear the apostle on the subject of flagrant crimes or heinous offences. He is speaking of incest.

"In the name (by the authority) of our Lord Jesus Christ when *you* (the church of God in Corinth,) come together."

We are informed elsewhere, that it was their custom to come together on the first day of the week.

"Deliver this person up to satan."† What I understand by

† 'To deliver up to satan,' is a singular, but remarkably expressive phrase. It signifies to *inflict bodily disease upon a person*. This will appear from the following considerations. 1. The introduction of disease and death into the world is referable to the transgression of the Progenitors of our race at the instigation of Satan. The ancient Hebrews, who were very little versed in the study of natural philosophy, and not much accustomed to recur to physical causes, and consult physicians when they were sick, imputed their diseases generally to evil spirits, the executioners of divine vengeance. Leprosies, which were so common among the Jews, were treated as diseases sent by God; hence the priests and not physicians were the persons who judged of the nature and quality of this evil, shut up the diseased, and declared they were defiled or had their leprosy upon them; and after their recovery they offered sacrifices as it were, to expiate for their fault. In the New Testament the cause of many diseases is ascribed to Satan; and as a consequence of sin. There is an instance of Abraham who had had an issue of blood, is said to have been bound by it of Satan for eighteen years. The issue is also called a *spirit of infirmity*. It is also said to be cast out of the Evil Spirit through sin. The pharisees were remarkable in this respect. The other cause of disease is Satan as cause and effect. "Behold," says the Lord, "I have healed 33 years. "you are cured; sin no more, lest something (or

delivering the transgressor up to *satan*, is this: (the observations of McKnight and others, notwithstanding.) There are but two kingdoms, that of Jesus Christ and that of the Devil. If an individual be excluded from the kingdom of Christ, he

some disease) worse befall you." Again, "his disciples asked him, saying, Rabbi, who sinned; this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" And whenever Christ, or his Apostles had a mind to cure the diseased, they began with casting out the devils; and the cure immediately followed. Paul attributes the death and diseases of many of the Corinthian disciples to their communicating unworthily—"for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep;" i. e. are dead. He also ascribes the infirmities with which he was afflicted to an evil messenger—"there was given me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me." There are a great number of diseases, or Satanic inflictions, recorded in Scripture, which were sent by God in the way of punishment for sin. "To be delivered to Satan," then, is to be buffeted or punished with disease, and sometimes to suffer death. We have apostolic examples of the delivery up of persons to Satan as a punishment for sin. The first that occurs after Pentecost is the case of Ananias and Sapphira, for lying to God. Peter and John, &c., who were Elders and Pillars in the church, delivered such persons up to Satan irremediably, as grand examples of the power they possessed of punishing evil-doers, as well as of rewarding them that do well, by alleviating their corporeal frailties. Another case was that of Elymas the Magician, by Paul in the presence of Sergius Paulus. He also tells us in his first letter to Timothy, that he had delivered Hymeneus and Alexander up to Satan, that they might be taught by chastisement, not to blaspheme. Having then ascertained the meaning of this phrase, we pass on to consider the exercise of this power in the primitive congregations. And here I would observe, that during the age of spiritual gifts, the Discipline of the Church involved in it the issues of life and death: a fact which speaks volumes as to the estimation in which discipline is held by the Great Head of the Mystical Body. "Not by speech but by power is the Kingdom of God established."

The Corinthian congregation came behind in no gift; hence it possessed the power of inflicting disease as well as of curing it; that offenders might be taught not to defame, &c. These are termed "powers" and "gifts of healing;" and follow in order after Apostles, prophets and teachers. "To each" (of the Eldership, I take it; for they were given "for the adapting of these saints to the work of the service, for the building up of the body of Christ")—to each the Holy Spirit distributed his proper gifts as he pleased. In this congregation, then, constituted with a powerful, not a mere nominal, eldership, a case

goes into that of satan. I am strengthened in this view by the 13th verse, where the idea is expressed by *putting from among them* that wicked person. By the "*flesh*," we are to understand the appetites, the inclinations, the desires of the flesh.

of incest occurred. This was communicated, as it would appear, by some of the family of Chloe, to the Apostle. It would also seem, to the aggravation of the Apostle's grief, that a party had arisen in favor of the criminal, for some of them instead of bewailing the offence, were puffed up, and endeavored to prevent his separation. This party, however, appears to have been a factious *minority* only of the congregation; for, in the second letter, he contrasts "*a part of you*" with "*the majority*" or *the many*, who, upon receiving Paul's first letter, expressed great indignation at the offence, clearing of themselves and sorrow; a sorrow, in which the Apostle rejoiced, because it produced reformation, by an expurgation of the leaven from among them that they might become a new lump. In this state of things, twelve months before he wrote the second letter, he determined to put their allegiance to him as the Apostle of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, to the test; for, in addition to the case of the incestuous persons, his apostleship had been questioned by certain among them who were puffed up on account of favorite teachers. "For this end also I wrote, that I might know the proof of you, whether you be obedient in all things." He therefore sent them an order, commanding them to "deliver this very person up to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus;" that they were "not to associate, not even to eat, with such a character"—"therefore," says he "put away from among yourselves the wicked person." Notwithstanding their divisions, a majority (and the majority constitutes the church in fact) adhered to the Apostle, and did his bidding. They assembled, and, at their meeting, and by the sanction of their presence, "in the name, or by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, with the *power* (of infliction) of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the hands of them of the Eldership, to whom the Holy Spirit had distributed "*powers*," they delivered the incestuous person up as a prey to a disease, by which his flesh was consumed. The disease appears to have been lingering; for, in the letter a year after, he exhorts them "to forgive and comfort him, lest he should be swallowed up by excessive grief; for this is the most effectual way of doing this was by curing the disease, and so releasing him from the bondage of Satan." How was this done? We shall consult another apostle, and shall be instructed. "Is any one," says James, "sick? Let him send for the elders of the congregation, and let them pray over him, having anointed him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith will save (the sick person)." (James v. 14.)

But incest is not the only capital offence. The apostle mentions several others, in v. 11—fornication, covetousness, idolatry, railing, drunkenness, extortion. In Gal. v. 19, 21, he gives a longer catalogue—fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,

person, and so the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." There were some cases, however, in which they were forbidden to pray; for John says, "this is the confidence we have with him (the Son of God,) that if we ask any thing according to his will, he hearkens to us. And if we know that he hearkens to us concerning whatever we ask, we know that we shall obtain the petitions which we have asked from him. If any one see his brother sinning a sin, (i. e. transgressing some law,) not to death (i. e. not punishable with death,) let him ask, and he (the Son of God) will grant to him life (i. e. he will not punish him with a fatal disease) for those who sin not to death. There is a sin to death (i. e. punishable with death.) I do not say concerning it, that you should ask. All unrighteousness is sin: but there is a sin, not to death." I Ep. v. 14-17.

It is obvious, then, from what has been advanced, and from things as they exist, that life and death were, but are not now in hands of the Eldership; *because* the Gifts of the Spirit are not now imparted to them as anciently. It is clear, however, that whatever power the Eldership may have possessed was, as it ought to be now, as a terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well. All responsibility resides with them who are in authority; where there is no power, there is no responsibility in relation thereto. The Eldership, under the sanction of a majority of the church cannot now deliver a person up to Satan for the destruction of the flesh; and God forbid that they should possess such a power unless it were accompanied by other gifts of the spirit to regulate it. But that Church is responsible to God, and fearfully so too, if it throws obstacles in the way of its Eldership in the attempt to purge out the old leaven that it may be a new lump. No practice can be a correct one that prevents the fulfilment of an apostolic command.

Some imagine that to deliver a person over to Satan is to turn him out of the Kingdom. This cannot possibly be the fact; unless it can be shown, that there is another way of entering the Kingdom besides by "being born of water and the spirit." The excluding a person from the congregation does not, therefore, exclude him from the Kingdom. None but God could appoint the way of entrance; none but God can cast out. By way of illustration; a Spaniard may become an American citizen according to law; he may forfeit his rights, privileges, and immunities by crime, and so become the tenant of a gaol: but no power, save that which made the law of naturalization,

sorcery, enmities, strifes, emulations, wraths, brawlings, sects, envyings, murders, intoxications, revellings, and like; and adds, that they "who practice such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Jesus Christ has vested the subjects of his kingdom with judicial authority, and they are required as in all secular courts to be governed by law and testimony, in all matters that come before them. Suppose a congregation of Christ properly organized, and in all things obeying the King. Let a case of discipline come before them—how do they act? The president for the day takes the chair. The members of the church sit as jurors.† The charge, accusation or indictment is pre-

can make him an alien again. The law may put him to death, but without a new or special enactment, he dies a citizen, though a vile one. The incestuous Corinthian citizen of heaven was excluded; but he was received again. Was he naturalized, then denaturalized, and afterwards naturalized again? Exclusion from the Body of Christ declares unfitness for Christian fellowship, and deprives of the privileges of God's House—which are "all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus"—one of the heaviest calamities that can befall a man this side of the grave.

Ed. Ap. An.

† One of the greatest of the errors of past ages has been that of assimilating the Church of Jesus Christ to a court of ecclesiastical Law. Hence all those odious Institutions of iniquity, the Inquisition, Star Chambers, Bishops' Courts, General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, Conferences, and Monthly Church Meetings, or ecclesiastical debating Societies, as they ought rather to be called. The Church of Jesus Christ is not a Court of Law, in which indictments are to be tried, witnesses subpoenaed, defences, and special pleadings to be made, juries to give verdicts, &c., &c. with a display of all those exciting circumstances which generally accompanies such proceedings, to the serious disquietude of all devout worshippers. The Church of Jesus Christ on the contrary, is a family of adopted sons and daughters. The individuals of it stand to them in the relation of parents, who have brought many of them to Christ by the gospel. They are not clothed with the authority of magistrates indeed, but with the solemn disposition of parents. As a good father would naturally, so ought the elders to rule the family of God. It is to be Paul's view when he says that "they that are heads of the church, who rules well his own house, having his children in subjection to him with all gravity; for if one know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?"—To convert the church into a jury, and to have a Jury—voting by majorities, is to open the door to all kinds of

sented in writing to the president. He reads it in the hearing of all concerned. The witnesses are called for, and depose. The accused, if disposed, makes his defence. (It is always to be wished that the accused should be present; if on due notice he should not, his absence will not stop the process.) *The only question the church has to determine is, whether from the testimony, they believe the accused is guilty of the charge alleged.* The law of the King specifies the punishment. The President pronounces the sentence according to the decision of the church. That is, if the crime be capital, he is excluded. *No one has a right to say he shall not be expelled.* It is not the province of a jury to say a man shall not be hanged, when they have decided according to law and testimony, that he is guilty of murder in the first degree. So the church only determines concerning the innocence or guilt of an individual member. The president pronounces the sentence of the law.

This is a wise provision. It prevents the interference of all partialities, and at once obviates all difficulties that might appear.

Nothing is more necessary in a christian congregation, than the enforcement of discipline. It is beneficial both to delinquents and the whole church. "Those who sin," says an apostle, "rebuke before all, that the others also may be afraid." I Tim. v. 20. The church cannot be kept united and pure, without promptness and decision upon the part of the Eldership, in relation to discipline and all other matters. No case should be permitted to pass unnoticed one Lord's day, if it can possibly be attended to. Difficulties will multiply in number, and increase in magnitude, as long as such cases are neglected.

B. F. HALL.

THE EDITORS OF THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

In our last number was this paragraph concerning these Brethren—"In the case before me, I know not who it is that strikes. I cannot believe, unless upon strong testimony, that brethren Johnson & Hall, the Editors of the Gospel Advocate,

disorder and corruption. In numerous, nay, in this age of the apostacy, nearly all the majorities of existing churches may be made up of novices and cold-hearted professors, who could vote out all the virtue in the Kingdom. If the majority of a church be corrupt, how on the popular system, is such a body to purge out the old leaven that it may be a new lump? The power of the majority is scripturally vested in the Eldership, which shows the imperative necessity of a scriptural selection of Elders; and condemns the common practice of choosing a brother for an Elder because forsooth he can make a speech.

ED. AP. AD.

could be so ———, as to be guilty of such a thing still, however, till they publish the writer's name, I can do no less than hold them responsible for the sentiments set forth by Mr. Plain Dealing in their paper." After this was put to press, I received the following letter from brother J. T. Johnson, disclaiming any participation in the publication of "Plain Dealing's" false and slanderous attack upon me. I doubt not, before the issue of our next paper, we shall have equal pleasure in receiving from brother Hall his disclaimer too; till then, the responsibility before God and man rests with him. No Editor, however influential, gifted or revered, is at liberty to publish attacks upon brethren founded upon mere report. This is not the first or second time that I have been the object of a kind of scribbleo-fulmination, more dangerous indeed to the little thunderers than hurtful to me. I would advise my brethren of the quill, if they will condescend to take advice from "a youth," to communicate with me privately and learn from myself, if the charge they hold against me be true or not. If they would do this before they publish me to the brotherhood and the world, as a "scandalizer of this reformation," an "infidel," or as "unfit for christian society," &c., &c., &c., they would save me some trouble, and themselves no little discredit.

ED. AP. AD.

GEORGE TOWN, Oct. 4th, 1836.

My dear brother Thomas:

I now make amends for my negligence, and send you five dollars for the 5 Nos. of the Ap. Ad., which you will credit. I have brother Scott with me. What an amiable christian he is! Noble soul! We have just returned from Leesburg, a three days' meeting. We had a most glorious refreshing. Bro. John A. Gaud was with us. Nine made confession for immersion, and several others united with the congregation. We have had most delightful times near and in Richmond, Ky., where we are going again in a day or two. Upwards of fifty have united with us there in the course of a few weeks. During the spring and summer, near about 300 have united with us about Warsaw, Ghent, and New Liberty, Ky.

Now I desire to say that the Gos. Advocate is published in Lexington, 11 miles off, and I have had no inspection of the matter to refer to it for many months. I disapprove of the piece in reference to yourself, by whosoever published or written. I have for you the kindest feelings, and hope ever to cherish them.

I do not know whether the other subscribers desire to continue another year. At all events, I shall ———

May the Lord bless, protect, and smile upon you.

Most affectionately,
J. T. JOHNSON

SEEING AND HEARING WITHOUT EYES OR EARS.

JAMESTOWN, Oct. 4th, 1836.

Brother Thomas :

Bro. Campbell has been a little severe on what he calls your "*materialism*," but his design was good. He supposed that what you wrote would give the adversary an opportunity of charging *that heresy* upon this reformation, and prevent men from hearing; therefore, his love and zeal for the prosperity and spread of the doctrines taught by this reformation, induced him to censure you, and charge "*materialism*" and "*Sadduceeism*" upon you.

We may all believe as did the Pharisees, that there are *spirits* and *angels*, and that the *dead will raise*; yet we may differ about these things. I for one suppose that the resurrection of the dead does not simply mean a resurrection of the *spirits* of the dead, abstract from their bodies; nor do I think it means a resurrection of their bodies, abstract from their spirits. I am simple enough to think that the whole man will be raised from the dead. Therefore, when one has been thus resurrected, I am not willing that he should be considered nothing more than a naked spirit, nor a body without a spirit. While he remains dead, his body is destitute of spirit; but before he dies, and after he is brought back to life again, his body and spirit are so closely connected as to make but one. We know that the body cannot act without the spirit, but whether the spirit can act without the body or not, is a different question, and hard to be decided. Those who suppose it does not act without the body, are called "*materialists*" or "*Sadducees*"; while those who suppose it acts by itself without the body, I suppose should be called, "*Pharisees*." The *seeing* or *hearing* of spirits that have neither substance nor form, is a little beyond my *ken*. When spirits speak by men, I can *hear* and understand them; and when they appear in the shape of men, with heads, and arms, and legs, &c., then I think it probable that I could see them. If any have been *seen* or *heard* by men, *abstract* from bodies, I am willing to acknowledge that those who *saw* and *heard* them, had the senses of seeing and hearing more perfect than I have. This is all I have to say about the matter.

As ever, yours,

M. WINANS.

DIALOGUE WITH "FATHER GOODAL."

Secundus. I am happy, "Father Goodal," in finding you at home, and so well engaged in your books. What is the subject of study?

Father Goodal. As usual, dear "Secundus," I am perusing the testimony—the law of my Lord; for, as I advance in years, the more do I love it, and the less taste I have for the specula-

tions and opinions of men. Opinions may be true or false, but I find that while we diligently seek to prove or disprove opinions, we might, by improving that precious time, be growing in knowledge and heavenly mindedness. How does religion progress with you?

Secundus. In some parts of the country, the churches are doing pretty well; in others, not so well. But in all places they do well, who know what they have done, and what they are doing, i. e. they who know that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the Saviour of sinners, and who have obeyed his commandments, and who continue to keep his commandments. But, "Father Goodal," I understand you and several others were in company at "Mr. Payne's," lately, at which time you were criticising the "Apostolic Advocate." Was it so?

Father Goodal. O, yes, we spent a very agreeable time indeed. The Editor of the "Apostolic Advocate" must be a singular man. Mr. Reed read some extracts from his second volume, which gave me quite an unfavorable idea of the work. Are you personally acquainted with him, Secundus?

Secundus. I am, and can assure you that he is a worthy brother. That there is an unfortunate stiffness in his writings I am well aware; and that he does not varnish his periods is most evident; and that he writes candidly and openly, all must allow; and I am willing to acknowledge, that some things he has written imprudently, and some erroneously. And what fallible author is free from errors and imprudences?

Father Goodal. I know of none. But dear brother, the spirit with which he writes is so extremely bitter, that I am sure he has no occasion to expect any good to result from it. He might speak the truth—the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and still convince the people at least, that he loved them. I see no reason for all these hard sayings.

Secundus. Neither do I. But the truth is made up of hard sayings to those who despise God and his government; and when a man is bold enough to lay the testimony before such people, they are apt to think ill of the man as if he was dealing out his own spirit, or his own wishes, as if, because he told them the truth, he did not wish them well. I know that all that brother says and does, is done with the best wishes for the people.

Father Goodal. I know that truth is often very severely recollect, when the Christian Baptist was first published. It was too severe, too sarcastic; that its Editor had bad spirit. Few, very few, among the sects, would allow he was a christian, because he so unceremoniously told what these great, and good, and learned men did. They could not think any man a christian who called infant baptism their "little idol," and their "sources of discord" and pregnant with...

would endeavor to ridicule their idea of the "work of the Holy Spirit" in regeneration, &c.

Secundus. I recollect the time very well; but the moon has been waxing and waning since then, and as long as sun and moon endure changes will take place. The sects now begin to say, that what they predicted is coming to pass; that he would see the error of his way. For his main offence was his want of charity for the unimmersed; but since, he has begun to lampoon Bro. Thomas so lustily on this very account, they take it for granted he has repented; and his change being so very evident, they do not even ask for a public recantation.

Father Goodal. Do not suffer prejudice to enter your bosom, *Secundus.* The Editor of that work has not changed his views either of the sects or the truth; but he has witnessed with sorrow the impudent rallies of a few pugnacious spirits who have disgusted their hearers by their witty performances. A man can please a few people by his jests and sarcastic sayings; but while he amuses a few, he injures the many. And besides, a preacher's theme should be salvation: glad tidings of great joy; preachers are advocates or pleaders, and the hearers fill the station of judges or jurors, to decide according to evidence.

Secundus. I thank you for the word of caution you have given me. But let me say it would take a good deal to prejudice me against that beloved brother. I know him and have seen him at his own home, and have often wished that his accusers could witness his personal devotion, his meekness and simplicity. I go for "principles, not men," and I endeavor to close my eyes and hold the balances, so that I may do justice to all. O, how hard the task! If man is not partial to others, he is too often to himself. O, Lord, may thy servants do right. Your last remarks have suggested many thoughts to my mind. It is not the province of an advocate to pass sentence, but of the judges. His is to plead, reason, and present the evidence; theirs is to decide, and to pass sentence according to that decision.

Father Goodal. I feel some curiosity to know something more of the Editor of the Advocate. Have you heard him preach lately?

Secundus. Yes, we have been at two large meetings together this summer, and I can assure you he did not 'then preach as if he had been taking lessons in a school where they teach their pupils to "stand in a solemn attitude of heroic defiance; and with a triumphant air hold up on the point of their metaphysical swords, the ghosts of mighty chiefs untimely slain." (Alas, for the judgment when the imagination takes the sway.) No, Father Goodall, he preached the word in an humble and unassuming manner; however, I must be careful, for I recollect seeing a very curious remark in the last Harbinger—

one indeed I never expected to have seen there, and is as follows: "in which he unceremoniously contradicted some of his own sayings." Mark it if you please, "some of my own sayings."

Father Goodal. Be careful now, or you will not do justice to the writer. You can, I am aware draw a conclusion unfavorable to the Editor by emphasising on the wrong word or phrase. For instance, emphasise on the word "contradicted," and it would appear as if he thought it presumption for any one to do so; but lay the stress upon the word "unceremoniously," and the Editor only takes exceptions to the manner in which it was done. Besides, it is evident, that the novel sentiments of the Advocate furnish our opponents with a new series of objections to the reformation; and therefore, as brother Campbell says, he is determined to wipe off from the escutcheons of this reformation all show of countenance of these new doctrines.

Secundus. It is always best to judge in love, and then (till we know better) we shall always judge favorable. I wish you would ask him, when you see him, whether that was his meaning. If it was, I shall be much gratified, as well as many others. I am not so well pleased either, with what you last told me, "wipe off from the escutcheons of this reformation." Why is it so, that the Editor can, when he pleases, "wipe off" what he does not like. I am entirely mistaken in the character of this reformation if one, one hundred, or one thousand men can control it. It has no sectarian confederation of powers which concentrate in one, nor one hundred men. Indeed, strictly speaking, it is wrong to suppose a general body; when we consider that all the churches are independent one of another. Many churches, and one master, (Jesus) not one church and many masters. Love and sympathy we have for all the various bodies; but there is not one general territory or pasturage for all who bear the name "reformers." I wish, for the enemy's sake, he had not written that, lest they should say he acts and talks like a leader.

Father Goodal. He has many times to adopt the "common-lingo," as our Richmond brother said. The people consider him the founder of the reformation, and therefore, they hold him responsible for all the doctrines advanced. So when they want to become acquainted with our views, they ask him if he hold that infants and idiots will be annihilated; whether man has no more soul than a horse, (and you know if the soul of a horse has no more blood he has not so much,) whether he dies at death, body and spirit, &c., &c. All I suppose he meant was, just as you know that those unprofitable speculations did not form a part of our characteristic views. I like the idea you speak of about the churches. All the churches have the same God, and no human leader.

Secundus. We have spent the evening about the same

not conversed about what we were upon when I was here before; but as it is now late, I propose that we defer any remarks on those subjects until we meet again.

Father Goodal. Why, it is a hard matter to refrain from talking about that which is in every body's mouth. I hope nothing serious will grow out of this controversy. Although I always remarked it, that brethren are remarkably tender as to what their brethren think and say about them. And it very often causes many disputes to slumber.

Secundus. You are right. Wherever I go I am asked what I think about the controversy. Some ask me if I do not think brother Campbell is right; and others brother Thomas. And some think the reformation will come to naught in consequence of it. But I tell them, sometimes one is right, and sometimes the other, and vice versa—that the best way is, not to take sides but let them dispute until they are tired. And as to the reformation coming to naught in consequence of their controversy, it is impossible it should *if it is built upon the Apostles and Prophets*. I have no doubt that many will take offence at it, being tired of the yoke of Christ. I recommend all to the good word, and to hear what the brethren have to say, and to judge without partiality.

Father Goodal. Party spirit is the ruin of genuine christianity, and I do trust that these brethren will not go too far in controverting one another's opinions. I hope the Editor of the Advocate will see the propriety of turping from those unprofitable speculations, and in all love and sincerity preach the truth as it is in Jesus.

Secundus. He, no doubt, will; indeed I have it from good authority, that those questions, about which so much noise has been made, were only proposed to set the brethren to reading and reflecting: not to be taken as "a new theory of man" at all, or as "dogmas concerning man." And besides, Father Goodal, he is amenable to his readers and to the Lord for what he writes, and not to any other Editor or teacher in the world. It is true his written sentiments are public property, and any one may review them; but he who reviews them should suffer him (if he wishes it) to make his defence, whether right or wrong. However, it is now quite late. I bid you a respectful adieu.

JAMES HENSHALL.

Sept. 16th, 1836.

THE SATIRIST.

Demas Anthropareskos to the Advocate wisheth health.

The cry all over the earth is, "Reform! Reform!" It is the most universal hue of the day; for it echoes through every nation of the world. It is fashionable—it is popular; and therefore, I am a "Reformer" too. Now, this is certainly a good rea-

soon; for, "what all the world says, must be true." I dare say the call for "reform" in the religious world is necessary in the estimation of many ardent, and well-meaning persons; though I candidly confess, I'm not so thoroughly convinced of it as they; and I'll just whisper into *your* ear the reason—*reformers themselves acknowledge, that people who are not reformers go to heaven; and among these people, not a few Pagans, Mahommedans, and of the sects called christian, if they are according to the light they have!* Now, it has occurred to me if men and women can go to heaven without being reformed with a reformer's reformation, why disturb the world by such ceaseless agitation? No doubt the earth is in a bad state, being filled with licentiousness, violence and discord; but then it has been so through all ages; and yet "millions of happy spirits are in glory now." I'm not blind to its deformity; but I think, my dear Advocate, you make it worse than it is. Why do you, in the impetuosity of your "youth" cut and slash as you do? I know myriads of sectarians who are as honest and industrious as reformers. The applause of the honest world proves their honesty, and the neatness and comfort of their possessions their industrious habits; the only difference is in their opinions; and even this is of no great consequence, if they are only sincere. Do not, therefore, be so "severe;" you are too "sanguine": the world is in a far better state than you're aware of, in the 19th century—pray don't then, "for mercy's sake, cut so sorely!" If what you believe be really true, as true as eternal truth, you must declare it; unless indeed you are prepared for reproach on account of "bitterness," "sarcasm," "personality," "severity," "want of a christian spirit," &c., which we, in common with our sectarian "*brethren*," shall not be tardy in inflicting upon you. O! if you did but know how you shock my poor nerves at times! You forget that I was born at Charity Hall, Orthodox County, Babylon. Your scrutiny is too rigid, when you set about unveiling the sins of this generation; or as you unpolitely term them, "*the abominations of the earth.*" When you go on at this work, I almost think at times you're aiming your shafts at me. Now, although I'm a reformer, I'm a moderate one; and would not therefore, have you reform too closely. It's inexpedient; the people will be offended; our numbers will fall off; we shall become unpopular; and therefore, "it will do harm"! It's true, Jehovah commanded us to "*cry aloud; spare not: like a trumpet lift up your voice, and declare unto my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sin,*"—and there was much to be said in reproach, taunt, in his conclamation too; but it is undeniable, that Paul says, "the Cretans are *lazy bodies*;" on account of which, he ordered them to be rebuked sharply, that they may be healthy in the faith; which cannot be denied, but that he was very sarcastic in his manner.

and some may think cruel to one who endeavored to "pervert the right ways of the Lord" in the presence of Sergius Paulus, calling him a "child of the Devil; enemy of all righteousness, &c,"—but then the Jews were very coarse and stubborn people; and the Cretans, luxurious Greeks; and Elymas, a magician; and Paul an Apostle: now we are christians, and though, perhaps, slothful, barren and unfruitful enough, not Jews nor Cretans; and though it may be true that we "pervert the right ways of the Lord" a good deal; yet we are not magicians; and then Paul was an Apostle and you are not; besides, their nerves, like their stomachs, were not so delicate as ours; neither were they so polished. We, too, are ladies and gentlemen, more accustomed to good breeding, and better acquainted with the maxims and *haut ton* of the *beau monde*; you are not, therefore, to address us as if we were a nation of barbarous and apostate Jews. I cry you mercy then, and beseech you to spare us a little; for, though God meant what he said to Cretans, Greeks and Jews, he is not so strict now; therefore you ought not to be so strict neither!

There's quite a hue and cry against you in these parts. I know this does not detract from a man's reputation in the sight of God; for a great hue and cry was raised against Christ and his Apostles throughout the Empire of Rome, i. e. of Satan. I know, too, that nothing will start a hue and cry against a man so soon as his taking a firm and bold stand for truth; because it is the inherent disposition of the world to love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil; any one then, who will have the hardihood to unmask its own deformity to the world's eye, must lay his account with "hues and cries," and its most cordial detestation. "*The world hates them who are not of the world, even as Jesus is not of the world;*" "*in the world you will have tribulation*"—"if you were of the world, the world would love you." All this I know, but then, my dear Advocate have you yet counted the cost of bearding the world? Do you not know, that it is by the world you live, and are permitted to move, and exist, while you ungratefully belabor it with sarcasm, and reproof? How reckless of you then, to castigate the vices of a body, without whose suffrages you must perish! Now this body, which you call the church of Antichrist, has, in its wisdom, chosen to appoint a class of its members or citizens, divided and subdivided into orders and subaltern ranks, as buriers of the dead, christeners of infants, solemnizers of marriages, readers of prayers, preachers of sermons, agents for societies, collectors of charities, conductors of fasts, chaplains of legislators, navies, armies, hospitals and penitentiaries, weekly orators, administrators of "the sacrament," absolvers of sin, door-keepers of purgatory, teachers of theology, chorallists, ruralists and pluralists—they are, it is confessed, a numerous and formidable host in all countries; very meek, amiable, mild, in-

telligent, lamb-like, learned, humane, unblameable, improvable and philanthropical; especially in Spain, Portugal, Ireland, &c—all this may be true; and yet you have, in the face of the world, whom they serve, the unblushing effrontery to say, that they are not the "successors of the Apostles," but that they are the "transformed ministers of Satan" spoken of by Paul. Nay you have the audacity even to denounce these "great and good men" by name; so that your readers shall be under no mistake concerning whom you speak. You may be very correct in saying, that they "pervert the right ways of the Lord," and bring the christian institution into contempt by their practice—but then, do you not know, that they are the men of the sovereign people's choice; that the people, by whom you live, move, and exist, as already affirmed, have called, qualified and chosen them, to teach smooth things, and to cry, peace, peace!—that they are in great repute with their own body; in whose esteem, they are the very pink of propriety and christian perfection, in all they do and teach? They are the people's prophets, their own anointed ones; see, therefore, that you do them no harm; nor mention their names, but with humility, veneration and respect!—I grant you, indeed, that Paul was personal. He mentioned the names of Phygellus and Hermogenes, whose ingratitude he has handed down for the execration of posterity; of Hymeneus and Alexander, whom he delivered to Satan for their impiety; of Philetus, the knowledge of whose heresy he has perpetuated; and of Demas, my namesake, whose worldly mindedness he has recorded—but then these were not the gods of the people; they were nothing more than poor, foolish, "laymen" such as you and I; therefore, they form no precedent for you. I tell you, you must in nowise mention the names of the "gentlemen of the cloth." Although, by their perversion of the truth, "the way of truth may be evil spoken of;" personify them at your peril; for they are "Reverend Divines;" at least, so the people call them, and so they claim to be. Besides, to individualize them, is a violation of the customs of the world, and therefore, should not be done; at all events, the people think so; and "the voice of the people" being "the voice of God," their opinion must be deferred to, for the sake of charity, popularity, and peace!

Again, there is a charge against you of doing "harm." You may not know exactly, what is meant, in these parts of the phrase "do harm;" I will, therefore, define it for you. HARM, is to prove that my opinions are unfounded, my faith is credulity and my practice unscriptural. It is to nullify my theory and convict me of inconsistency. It is to maintain the truth, if that should make me unpopular. It is to be too strict, too rigidly apostolical, if that should diminish our ranks, and not add multitudes to my denomination.

To do harm, I grant is a relative term, and depends very much for its definition upon the standard of *doing good*. To do harm, in the estimation of a Catholic, would be to do good in the estimation of a Baptist; and to do good in that of a Baptist, would be to do harm in that of Christ and his Apostles. But I define it, according to its acceptation at Charity Hall. To be candid with you, I really think, that they are the most afraid of others doing harm, who know least about doing good themselves. This, however, is an item, not to be proclaimed from the house top, lest we should be said to do *much* harm, i. e. speak the truth too plainly; and so become obnoxious to the charge of lording it over "God's heritage!"

Now, you act upon a principle calculated, it is thought, to do harm. You say a little reformation in govermental affairs, is better than none; but that moderate reform, will go for nothing at the great day; especially, as there are fewer obstacles to a complete, radical, and thorough reformation now than there were in the times of the Apostles. Now, my dear Advocate, you and I are at issue here. I am for moderate reform; and you for a radical reformation, and nothing less than an uncompromising return to first principles and practices. Really, I think your object is utopian! Why nothing but an absolute disorganization of religious society can effect what you propose; for my own part, I expect only a moderate reform this side of heaven. Indeed, where is the urgency of any thing now? Are there not Christians in all sects; is it not on all hands agreed that there are as many ways to heaven as there are christian sects; and where is the reformer quixotic enough to avow, whatever he may believe, that there is but one "straight gate and narrow way," and that there are but few who go in thereat—that this is the only way and no other? All that can be effected by a reformation is, to procure a union of all *Christians among* the sects! The times of the Apostles were barbarous; but now the world is more polished, civilized, enlightened; reformation to them was more necessary, and the Apostolical Reformations more suitable than to us. Men now don't need so much reformation. The Apostolic Reformation was too personal, too rigid, too bluff, too severe. A reformation destitute of these attributes, and having more of the milk of *human* kindness, would be far better adapted to the polished society, and to the spirit of the age. Talk then about the odiousness of vice as much as you please; but be careful how you particularize it; never attempt to point it out, lest you should hurt some one's (and perhaps a brother's) feelings. We go for numbers; if then you would pull with us, you must go for numbers too. The quantity and not the quality of the converts must be the object of your concern. Pray give up that crude, old-fashioned notion of yours, that five intelligent disciples are of more efficiency and value to the Christian Institution, than 500 of the

vernacular caste. What matters increasing in wisdom and knowledge of the scriptures, if we don't increase in numbers? we shall never get popular in that way. And what's a system of religion worth that has'n't the hallelugahs of the people? Think of these things, and do'n't take such high ground as you are accustomed to. It wo'n't do; besides in searching our foundation, you may come too near; and it's very dangerous to dig too near foundations, every one says; and what every one says must be true; and not only so, but if some of our foundations should prove sandy, what becomes of all our past sayings and doings? Why all gone, to be sure! like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind! No, no, this must never be.

You may attack sin in the general, but beware of doing so in detail. You may denounce conformity to the world, but take care how you define it, lest you become personal. As for us moderate, or as you would say, no-reformers-at-all, we do'n't ask you to point out our defects; let them alone! Away with that silly notion, that reformers generally begin at the wrong end; and that they should reform themselves first, and then set about curing their neighbors; why, foolish and blind man! at that rate the world would never hear the cry of reform, much less be itself reformed! Whoever you touch, do'n't disturb us; we feel much more comfortable when we think we are right, however wrong we may be. Do'n't, therefore, practice upon us, or we shall be apt to make you suffer for; for, though you were to write with the pen of an Angel, unless you content yourself just to re-echo our sentiments, and to do our bidding, your descent into the abyss of literary perdition will be inevitable. Be careful how you touch sectarianism; for, by so doing you will render us obnoxious and unpopular; and you know, we may as well put our heads under a bushel as be unpopular; besides, the sects wo'n't fraternize, nor deal with us, so that we shall lose our custom. Beware then, what you do in this respect, for conscience is never so tender, and a hue and cry is never so soon raised, as when the pocket of the milliner is touched.

I can't think what you mean by not acknowledging the Baptists indiscriminately as brethren. Surely they are brethren; if it's true they are in Babylon, but then so am I, for it is in my native state I live; yea, and was born too. They are God's people, though they are in Babylon. But you say, 'they are not known to God, as his people, until they come out of Babylon; and that if they die in Babylon, they will never see the resurrection of the just! Now, did any body ever die like that! What are we moderate reformers but Babylonians? we have not been immersed into the same sea, do we know as much about the scriptures as many of us, are they as diligent as we; do they not pay their debts as promptly,

for the same heaven. and fear the same hell; are we not as fond of preaching; do they not sing the same sentiments, and pray the same prayers with as much meaning and understanding as we, and we as they; are they not as good citizens; in short, do numbers among us meet oftener than we can get a preacher to entertain us; do we not agree in nearly all practices, but in hiring clergy, and in maintaining "the benevolent institutions of the day," which we find too inconvenient, because of the expense? I say, then, you ought to be lenient, and more charitable towards them and their "beloved pastors;" and not satirize their peccadilloes too severely; lest you cut too deeply, and scratch us. To be candid with you, many say that they pervert the truth egregiously; but as I have a great regard for you, and would advise you for your worldly interest's sake, allow me to observe, that the truth is not always to be told. The people love error better than truth; and hence, if you would please them, increase the circulation of your paper, and render us popular and respectable in the eyes of the world, you must ponder to their taste, yield to their peculiarities, and indulge their foibles! Adieu; peace and applause be with you as far and as long as you please the people—the fount of all honor, power, glory, and subsistence!!

"THE ESCUTCHEONS OF THE REFORMATION."

As the reader is already informed, I am at present much engaged in settling my family in a new abode. The setting up of a printing establishment in addition to this consumes much additional time. I am, therefore, prevented, for the time being, giving that attention to things published concerning me and my views, which the respect due to the writer, if not to his sayings, demands. My regard for brother Campbell as a man and a brother, is undiminished, notwithstanding his proceedings against me. He has done, and is doing himself more harm than me. The only impression his pieces have made upon my mind, is to make me indifferent to his hard speeches hereafter. I was at first a little sensitive; but sensitiveness has yielded to indifference. He has denounced me as "unfit for Christian Society." He can do no worse. The hardest speech hereafter is oil and balsam compared to this. If I have hurt his feelings, in self-defence, I am sorry for it, and sincerely regret it. The injury has been done unintentionally. My feelings are hurt only by the truth contained in the sayings against me. He has not hurt my feelings, though some may think his remarks severe. They may be in the estimation of our friends; but I can assure them, I am still whole, skin, wind, and limb. If they think me tortured, let them bear me witness that I bear it patiently.

These remarks are elicited, by way of notice, by the last Harbinger. Brother C. is still monstrous busy 'wiping the Escutcheons of the Reformation.' Somehow or other they seem to have become wonderfully unclean; for the wiping process seems to take a mighty long time. When he has done, they will no doubt be singularly pure from all material contamination. We shall not hereafter interrupt his labors until he has finished; when we shall inspect his work, and see of what excellency it is.

Will some King at Arms be pleased to describe to us these heraldic devices. What are these Escutcheons of the Reformation? We should like to know.

THE
APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE,
AND
PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Vol. 3. AMELIA Co. Va. DECEMBER, 1836. No. 3

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20,*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. * * * Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

DOXOLOGIES OF THE APOCALYPSE.

FIRST SERIES

(COMMENCING WITH THE EVENTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY, AND ENDING WITH THE BEGINNING OF CHRIST'S PERSONAL REIGN ON EARTH.)

And the four living creatures rest not day nor night, saying,

O holy, holy, holy thou,
Lord God Almighty art,—
O thou, who wast, and dost exist,
And art again to come!

And while the living creatures are giving glory and honor and thanks to him who sits upon the throne, the twenty-four elders fall down before him, and worship him, and cast their crowns before the throne; saying,

Worthy art thou, O Lord, to have
All glory, honor, pow'r;
For all things thou hast made, and for
Thy will they are, and were.

And he came and took the scroll out of the right hand of him who set upon the throne. And when he received the scroll the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb. And they sung a new song, saying,

Worthy art thou to take the scroll,
And to unloose its seals;
For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed
Us by thy blood to God.

Thou'st sav'd us out of every tribe
And nation, speech, and race;
And made us kings and priests to God,
And we shall reign on earth.

And I heard the voice of many Angels round about the throne,
and of the Living Creatures, and of the Elders, saying with a
loud voice,

Worthy is the Lamb that was slain—
Pow'r, riches, wisdom, might,
And honor, yea, and glory too,
And blessing to receive!

And every creature I heard, saying,

To him who sits upon the throne,
And to the Lamb be paid,
All blessing, honor, glory, strength,
For ever, and for aye.

Rev. iv. v

And I saw a great multitude out of every nation, tribe,
people and language, standing before the throne, and before
the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands, and
they cry with a loud voice, saying,

To God who sits upon the throne
Salvation be ascrib'd—
And to the Lamb that once was slain,
To him redemption be!

And the Angels or Messengers stood round about the throne,
and about the Elders and the four living creatures; and they
fell down on their faces, before the throne, and worshipped
God, saying,

The blessing, glory, wisdom, thanks,
The honor, and the pow'r,
The strength be also to our God,
Forever more, Amen.

Ch vi.

And the seventh Angel sounded, and there were great voices
in heaven, saying,

The kingdoms of the world are now,
The kingdoms of our Lord,
And of his Christ; and he shall reign
For ever and for aye.

And the twenty-four Elders who sat before God on their
thrones, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying,

O thou who art, and wast, to thee,
Lord God Almighty, we
Give thanks, because thou'rt ta'en thy pow'r,
And hast commenc'd thy reign.

Wroth the nations were; thy wrath came,
And of the dead the time
When judgment and reward should be
Unto thy servants giv'n.

To them who prophets were, and saints,—
To them that fear thy name;
And when thou shouldst destroy all those
That do destroy the earth.

Ch. xi.

The foregoing verses may be said or sung to common metre; if said,
they are to be read as a good reader would read prose.

OBSERVATIONS

It will be observed that these Apocalyptic Ascriptions of Praise are resolved into two series. This is the arrangement of the Holy Spirit; and an admirable one: it is. John wrote the Apocalypse in the latter end of the first or very early in the beginning of the second century. Hence the Doxologies it contains must relate to events present and to come subsequently to John's writing; for he tells us, that the symbolic personage he saw in vision, directed him to "write the things which he saw, even those which *are*, and the things which *shall be hereafter*:" and again, he says, in the beginning of this first chapter, that the time of the things written in the book was at hand in his day. How much then must have happened during the seventeen hundred years, which have elapsed since that time! The doxologies relating to "the things which are," are such as celebrate the holiness and eternal existence of the Almighty, his worthiness of glory, honor, and power, because he made all things for his own will and pleasure; the worthiness of the Lamb to be praised by the faithful, because he had been slain, and had redeemed them by his blood, and made them kings and priests; and to receive power, riches, wisdom, might, honor, glory, and blessing from every being. The doxologies referring to "the things which shall be hereafter" *from the date of the book*, are such as celebrate the downfall of Paganism as the established superstition of the Roman World: the overthrow of the Governments of the earth; the destruction of the Apostacy; the setting up the everlasting, and universal terrestrial monarchy of Jehovah's Anointed King in the stead of the existing dynasties; the resurrection of the righteous dead, when the servants of God shall be rewarded, and the Tyrants of the earth shall be destroyed; the marriage of the Lamb; when the living believers *who have prepared themselves*, will be changed into immortals, and the taking up of God's residence with men upon the earth in the sense in which he dwelt with Adam before he fell, when there will be no more tears, death, grief, crying nor pain, but when all terrestrial things will be so renovated as to constitute a renewed "a new heaven and a new earth."

We have said, there are two series of apocalyptic doxologies. The first three chapters containing ascriptions, because the subjects treated of in them will not admit of rejoicing, there is no room for joy where the light of the Holy Spirit has departed from seven celebrated Christian communities, and is more a subject of lamentation. And it is to be observed, that the laments in this book are recorded for the friends of the Apostacy; the lamentation of the world at the overthrow of Babylon, to wit, all the nations; of joy are on the part of the Christian on account of what has been said.

beautiful. They commence in the fourth chapter. And mark the intelligences engaged therein. John was invited into a symbolical apartment called heaven and answering to the Most Holy Place in the Mosaic tabernacle, where he saw a throne, and One sitting upon it; besides this he saw twenty-four other thrones and as many persons upon them termed Elders or Ancients, having crowns of Gold upon their heads. Before the single throne were seven lamps of fire, signifying the seven Spirits of God; and in the middle of the circle about the throne four full-eyed living creatures, for they were "full of eyes, before and behind." These *untiring* living ones for "they rest not day nor night" begin the celebrations of this book of the Revelation. The one upon the throne, John tells us was the Lord God Almighty, who was, and is, and is to come. While the Living Creatures were giving glory, honor, and thanks to the Eternal King, the twenty-four Elders joined them acknowledging the enthroned one as the Creator of all things.

After this John discovers a scroll at the right hand of the Almighty. He then hears the inquiry "Who is worthy to open the scroll and to loose its seals?" Neither the four living creatures, nor the twenty-four elders were worthy to do it. He then perceives in the middle space (the precise situation for a Mediator) between the throne and the four living creatures, and in the middle of the Elders, a Lamb, which seemed as if it had been slain. It had seven horns, and seven eyes, which signify the same thing as the seven lamps of fire before the throne, with this difference, that the seven lamps were stationary, whereas these were "sent forth into all the earth." This Lamb in the middle space, one of the symbolical characters told John was the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David, and that he had prevailed to open the scroll. The symbolic Lamb then took the scroll out of the hand of the Almighty. Upon this the living creatures and the Elders prostrated themselves before the Lamb, and with the accompaniment of their harps, sang a new song, in the midst of perfumes issuing from the golden vials, symbolical of the prayers of the saints.

And here let us inquire, who are these Living Creatures and twenty-four Elders? We rejoin that they are symbolical of *the resurrected Church of Christ*. If it be inquired why we believe them to be the children of the resurrection, we reply, because they are represented in company with the Lamb in the very precise chamber of the Almighty; and there are but two ways for *terrestrial* beings to enter that apartment, viz. *either by a translation or by a resurrection*. Jesus entered the Chamber of the Throne by a resurrection, and so must his younger brethren. He has led the way, and the saved must follow in his footsteps. If it be further asked, Why we think these characters symbolical of the saved, we answer because they declare themselves to be so. For say they, "thou hast re-

deemed us to God by thy blood out of every tribe, and language, and people, and nation; and hast made us to our God, kings and priests." Both the four living creatures and the Elders are symbolical of the redeemed, for say they, "Thou hast redeemed us." Now who are God's kings and priests but the faithful? Does not Peter say in addressing the Christians of his day, that they were a "royal priesthood;" and does not John testify, that it was Jesus Christ had made them kings and priests to his God and Father, by washing them in his blood? There can be no doubt, then, but that these symbols signify the Church of Jesus Christ in an immortal or resurrected state. The attributes of the Living Creatures and the twenty-four Elders are representative of the attributes of this resurrected assembly of redeemed immortals. The Eye is the symbol of light or knowledge; the living creatures being full of eyes, before and behind, indicates that the Resurrected Body will be full of knowledge as to the future and the past. Their untiring and ceaseless activity in connexion with humanity, belongs only to the immortal condition of man. When resurrected he will need neither rest nor sleep, for he will be incapable of painful impressions; and night will be a stranger to the place of his incorruptible abode. There being twenty-four Elders is another item in favor of the Body they represent being a resurrected Assembly. Were the Elders the type only of the Church living on earth, their number would scarcely exceed twelve; which would imply that they typified an assembly founded upon the twelve apostles of the Lamb; but there being twenty-four shows, that the Body they represent is based upon the twelve natural and twelve spiritual patriarchs of the true Israel of God; and that it is composed of the faithful of all ages, who have attained to the adoption of the body. They are crowned, which is another proof that they typify the resurrected, for Peter instructs us that the unfading crown of glory is received when the Chief Shepherd shall appear; and Paul says, I have finished the race; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge, will deliver to me at that day; and not to me only, but to all them who love his appearing: and again, Peter says, wherefore, having the loins of your mind girded, being vigilant, constantly hope for the gift to be brought to you, *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.* This gift is the crown of glory, even the life which is eternal.

Furthermore, consider the great dignity of this symbolical Lamb. Not only does he receive the homage of, them whom he has redeemed by his blood, but even the Angels of God who do his will, "myriads of myriads, and thousands of thousands" of them, who, needing no redemption, owe him no personal obligation on that account, even these sinless creatures hymn the praises of the Lamb, and pronounce him worthy to receive power, riches, and wisdom; might, honor, and glory.

Blessing. How beautifully the doctrine of Scripture agrees in all its parts! This excellency of the Lamb is much insisted on by Paul. He is exalted, says he, as far above the angels, as the name (son) he has inherited, is more excellent than theirs (angel). When, continues he, God brings again the first-born into the world, he says, "Let all the angels of God worship him." Here, then, in this fifth chapter of the Apocalypse, we find the Lamb receiving the homage of the Angels of God from around his symbolical throne.

But the climax of acknowledged excellency is yet to come. Every thing in creation is represented as doing homage to him. Not only do the redeemed and the angels pronounce him blessed; but every creature in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, even all things that are in them are represented as ascribing blessing, and honor, and glory, and strength for ever and ever to him that sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb. And well may they bless their Creator, and the Lamb, through whom the curse which came upon them on account of man's transgression, is removed.— "The creature" says Paul, was subjected to frailty (not of its own choice) (man was) "but by him who has subjected it,) in hope, that it may be liberated, from the bondage of a perishing state, and brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God." This "glorious liberty" is a liberation from the law of death. When all the sons of God, then, are "liberated from the bondage of a perishing state," the inferior animals will cease to suffer the pains and penalties of mortality. God appointed vegetable food as the diet of man and animals before the fall. The animal race was sustained by the vegetable; consequently man did not prey on them, nor they on one another. But when the curse came the ferocity of the savage invaded the disposition or spirit of man and the inferior creatures. The history of the sufferings of both from that time is a tale of woe. But the Lamb is the great Deliverer of the Animal Race;—The great Restorer of Primitive blessedness. Through him "every curse will cease." Man will no more fear the jaws of the lion, nor the leopard's paw; nor will they fly from the habitations of man as from the face of an enemy; for, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fating together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play upon the hole of the asp; and the weaned child shall put his hand upon the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt, nor destroy in all my holy mountain (Empire:) for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." *Is. xi. 6-9.* This chapter of Isaiah is descriptive of the Root of Jesse—the Messiah;—

the benignant character of his reign, &c., and corresponds in time of fulfillment with the doxology which concludes the first series. Under the benign reign of the Son of God it is that the four Living Creatures, the twenty-four Elders, the Angels and the Creatures of the air, the earth, and the sea, ascribe blessing, and honor, and glory, and strength, forever and ever.

Thus concludes the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse. What a splendid manifestation! If Paul beheld in vision any thing of the *third* heaven surpassing this, human language the most philosophical and refined, to say nothing of the common language of the world, must, indeed, have been too feeble to give utterance to what he saw. Here John had a vision of the *second* heaven, or the real Holiest of All, and yet he can give us only a faint idea of its glories, by a group of symbols the most ingeniously constructed and arranged. I have never yet heard or read a satisfactory explanation of these 4th and 5th chap. of the Apoc. Indeed, I see not how one can be given, seeing that interpreters invariably bring their abstract spiritualism to bear upon them. Their contents cannot be correctly explained or understood, if the Expositor be a disciple of Plato's doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul instantly the body dies. We have heard the spiritualizer descant on these passages in the most imaginative and rhapsodical manner, much to the bewilderment of the devout, and to the amusement of the laughing sceptic. We have avoided this, and endeavored to adhere to what is written. I know that what I have here penned is new to multitudes; and they will call it speculative and untaught; but, let such remember that their acquirements, however great and various, are yet susceptible of increase and improvement; and that it would be well for them to be more diffident and reserved in pronouncing sentence in these matters. The scriptures teach a great deal more than any of us know. Let us, then, hereafter, leave it to God to limit the teaching of his Holy Word.

The reception of the scroll from the right hand of the Almighty, and these ascriptions of power to the Lamb, remind me of what he said to his Apostles before his ascension—"All power is given to me in heaven and upon the earth." This was absolutely necessary, when we consider the work he had to do, namely, *to prepare the earth as a permanent and immutable abode, for himself, his Apostles, and the redeemed.* "In my Father's house," said he to his disciples, "are many mansions.—I go to prepare a place for you, and when I shall have gone and prepared a place for you, I will come again, and take you with me." The Lamb, then, left the earth to prepare a place for himself and disciples. He had been engaged in this work of preparation for the last eighteen hundred years; and has he been operating in secret; for he has told us that he has

plainly as symbolical language can declare it, what he intended to do, and is doing. If it be asked then *how* the Lamb is preparing a place for the redeemed, it is replied that the whole work of preparation is set forth from the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse to the end of the book. Behold him then commencing a specific work by the opening of the scroll, and the unloosing of its seals. The history of nations from the days of John to the present time is the epitome of what is written on the scroll and is contained in its seals. Every human event, whether pertaining to the secular, ecclesiastical, commercial, literary, philosophical, or warlike affairs of nations, are part of a grand whole in the work of extirpating every noxious person from the family of man; and of peopling the earth with a race who shall be all righteous.

On the sounding of the seventh trumpet, John heard great voices in the symbolical heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of the world, are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." The seventh trumpet contains seven vials, which are revealed in the sixteenth chapter. The seventh vial, *which is now pouring out*, is the seventh and last blast of the seventh trumpet; the concluding effect of which is, the consummation proclaimed by the great voices in the symbolical heaven. The last note of this trumpet is the return of the Lamb to deliver his disciples from death; and to take them with him, "that where he is they may be also"—reigning with him on the earth, which will then be prepared for the exercise of their royal and priestly functions, by the overthrow of the governments of the world. Well may the redeemed, in view of this, "give thanks to thee, O Lord God Almighty, who art, and who wast,"—mark, reader, it does not say here, "and who is to come;" for he is come, and commenced his reign; which is the cause of their rejoicing. Thus concludes the first series of these apocalyptic ascriptions to him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb—a conclusion, which brings us down to the conclusion of the times of the Gentiles; whose institutions will forever give place to the Universal monarchy of Jehovah's Anointed King.

EDITOR.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

"Salute," says Paul, "the brethren in Laodicea; and Nymphas, and the congregation in his house. And when this epistle has been read to you, cause that it be read in the congregations of the Laodiceans; and that you also read the one from Laodicea." Col. iv. 16. In reading this passage, I had often wished that I also could be favored with the perusal of the letter thus recommended to the attention of the brethren at Co-

losse. That there was such a document as the *Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans* the apostle himself affirms; but, whether the one extant bearing that inscription be really the one he wrote is chiefly to be determined by the letter itself. It is the opinion of several learned men that it is genuine. **Sextus Senensis** mentions two MSS., the one in the **Sorbonne Library** at Paris, which is a very ancient copy, and the other in the **Library of Johannes a Viridario** at Padua which he transcribed and published. The Quakers may printed a translation, and plead for it; though it may even be that be counterfeit seeing that they have printed and pleaded for innumerable absurdities. There is nothing in it discordant with the doctrine taught by the Apostle in the rest of his epistles. The *morale* of it is excellent, and its exhortations are worthy of all reception. The style too is simple and apostolic, and bespeaks an unvarnished honesty of purpose. Its exordium reminds us of his Epistle to the Galatians, in which he says he is "an Apostle not of men, neither by man;" and of those to the brethren at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse, &c. in which also he is careful to claim divine authority for his apostleship.

There is a passage in the Epistle to the Laodiceans which gives the precise view which I have taken of a similar one in the letter to the Philippians. What we refer to is this—"Christ will be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain, &c."—yea, saith the Spirit, "because his 'bold ghost' will go to paradise." But the apostle simply means in the language of the Epistle to Laodicea—"I know that this shall turn to my salvation forever—yea, for to me to die for to me to live shall be a life to Christ, for to me to die shall be— And why would death be gain or joy to the Apostle? Because he would then be delivered from the bodily sufferings of which he was the subject in the days of the Lord Jesus. "Henceforth, blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; yea, says the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." Such is the joy or gain in death to the Apostle in common with all the faithful.

I need not say that I am inclined to receive this Epistle as genuine, let not however my opinion bias the reader; in all things that I have, or had hereafter, write, he must judge for himself, for in renouncing the authority of others I claim none for myself. The authority of the following translation is the MS of **Johannes a Viridario**, of Padua. Besides this, there is a very old translation of this Epistle in the **British Museum**, among the **Harleian MSS**, Cod. 1212.

EDROM

"PAUL an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, to the brethren which are at Laodicea. Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ."

thank Christ in every prayer of mine, that ye continue and persevere in good works, looking for that which is promised in the day of judgment. Let not the vain speeches of any trouble you, who pervert the truth, that they may draw you aside from the truth of the gospel which I have preached. And now may God grant, that my converts may attain to a perfect knowledge of the truth of the gospel, be beneficent, and doing good works which accompany salvation. And now my bonds, which I suffer in Christ, are manifest, in which I rejoice and am glad. For I know that this shall turn to my salvation for ever, which shall be through your prayer, and the supply of the Holy Spirit. Whether I live or die; to me to live shall be a life to Christ, to die will be joy. And our Lord will grant us his mercy, that ye may have the same love and be like-minded. Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have heard of the coming of the Lord, so think and act in fear, and it shall be to you life eternal; for it is God, who worketh in you; and do all without sin. And what is best, my beloved, rejoice in the Lord Jesus Christ, and avoid all filthy lucre. Let all your requests be made known to God, and be steady in the doctrine of Christ. And whatsoever things are sound, and true, and of good report, and chaste, and just, and lovely, these things do. Those things which ye have heard, and received, think on these things, and peace shall be with you. All the saints salute you. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen. Cause this Epistle to be read to the Colossians and the Epistle of the Colossians to be read among you.

PLAIN DEALING PLAINLY DEALT WITH.

Essex Co. Va. Dec. 26th, 1836.

Beloved Brother Thomas,

In the October number of the Advocate you extract a piece from the Gospel Advocate, having for its signature "Plain Dealing," which for its spirit of domination excels every thing that has yet appeared among us, I am glad to see your reply to it tempered with moderation, and a Christian spirit; excellencies of which, it appears, many think you destitute. Unfortunately, misunderstanding to a great extent prevail; in reference to you, and therefore, on your part, it will be necessary to exercise all patience and long suffering. In reference to your opinions you have been misunderstood, and misrepresented, and even here; let not this, however, excite in you a murmur. On many subjects you have been *too well* understood, and a great deal that has been said against you, reminds me of what King Leonidas said to one who discoursed at an improper time about affairs of some concern. "*My friend you should not talk so much to the purpose.*" OF WHAT IT IS NOT TO THE PURPOSE TO TALK You will no doubt distinguish between opposition to your opinions, and opposition to the commandments of the

Lord. If you were endeavoring to convince the brethren of the necessity of attending to some neglected institution of the Lord's house, I would say the brethren would be culpable in opposing you. But as in general your laudable zeal has led you to endeavor to teach them matters having reference to the mind; to its elevation, and the necessity of its being well stored with knowledge, &c., you will no doubt have found by this time that you cannot teach people *faster nor farther* than they are willing to *learn*. And that appears to be very slowly!—It has been the boast of this reformation, that opinions were private property; and I am sure a man may do what he will with his own; yet because you have been liberal in bestowing this acknowledged private property, to others, there has been as much to do, as if opinions were *bonds of union!!* So hard is it to keep up consistency between what we *say* and what we *do*.—The brethren of the editorial fraternity have bestowed on you considerable trouble to marshal you into order; and even this is evidence of the respect they have for you. Brother Campbell says in his last notice of you, that kindness caused him not to publish your pieces; alleging that the less the people see of your writings the better they will think of you. And here, I confess to you, I am mortified, at such a cheapening expression. Is it kind? Is it generous? I am constrained to say it is neither; and I dare not give it a name at present. I will sleep on it a few more times. Haste is lacking in consideration, and consideration needs time. The brother who is so "plain" in his "dealing" perhaps may be somewhat excused if we consider all the circumstances. Likely he once belonged to an association, and you know churches deal with members, and the association with churches.—It is clear that he had his eye upon this associational *dealing*, for of all other kinds of *dealing* theirs has always been most *plain* with *factionists*." The Dover Association *dealt* very *plainly* with some of our brethren in these parts when it called them "disorganizers and demoralizers." These must have been "restless ambitious individuals" indeed. In all religious communities there are tribunals of various grades, to which one and all are amenable. The creed, or discipline is the law:—the "Synod," the "Conference," or the "Association" the tribunals. A small man is brought before a small tribunal; a great man before a great tribunal. All men reason as to our practices from their own false principles; and thus involve themselves in their own monstrous and improper conclusions concerning us. Many have asked me, "If you have no creed, what will you do with an offender? To whom I have generally replied, "try him by the New Testament, as you do by your creed." I have often been asked to "What will you do with a church which countenances false doctrine?" To whom I generally answer, "Use all the means in our power, in teaching, exhorting, and persuading." But

is again asked "suppose all these means fail, what will you do then?" Ans. Leave them to their own ways, and to settle the matter with the "head of Church," at his appearing and glory. The querist, however, had his eye upon the explosion of the great gun of excommunication, of church excommunication!!! The old saying has some truth in it, "what is bred in the bone is hard to beat out of the flesh." At present there is no general excommunicative power among us. It may not be long before there is, we hope there never may be any. As to what constitutes a factionist in the scriptural sense, we may remark, that every man who disturbs a church, or a people, is not a factionist. If he is laboring to bring the church into all the commandments of the Lord; he is no factionist; but if he seeks to pervert the right way, and to disturb and divide the flock contrary to the truth, he is a factionist. In these matters care must be taken or we may be led widely astray. For instance, in reference to a church, wherein is an individual dissatisfied with her order, if said church cannot be convinced by him; she, because she has the power, can cut off such an one as a factionist. But in this case, if the individual only asked for a return to primitive practice, the church, then, is criminal before the Lord, and the individual clean. And there is no question in my mind, but there are many churches which have incurred this condemnation, in the present age. Too many think that "might is right," and therefore if they have power to do a thing, it is right that thing should be done. There is a great difference between an *ecclesiastical* and a *divine* right. By the first all sectarians act; by the last should all who call themselves "reformers" act. Thus dear brother, I have spoken freely, but affectionately. Let us "walk by faith and not by sight" nor by "feeling." Let us lay aside every weight "and run with *patience* the race set before us, and we shall be able to bear and forbear; and above all things "let brotherly love continue."

Affectionately yours,
JAMES HENSHALL.

[From the *Gospel Advocate*.]
BETHANY, Sept. 29th, 1836.

Dear brethren Hall and Johnson:—

Permit me to say to you, with all kindness and affection, that I exceedingly regret the appearance of an article on pages 123 and 124 of the current vol. of the *Gospel Advocate*—a work which is usually so replete with useful and interesting matter.

The piece in question has for its epigraph, "Dr. John Thomas of the *Apostolic Advocate*, a Factionist," and the writer, who signs himself "Plain Dealing," proceeds to denounce brother Thomas as a "restless ambitious individual," as "aspiring to head a religious party in this country;" as having occasioned a division of the church at Richmond; as being "fully

half gone" in infidelity, &c., and recommends that he be cut off
all connexion with him."

These, alas, are serious accusations! and most serious decisions. But I would ask "Plain Dealing" for the grounds on which they are to be justified. Has he any evidence to produce against them? Has he possessed himself of the power of the spirits? or has the throne of judgment been vacated by his half? For my part, I have not as yet seen any thing to justify such epithets and imputations; nor has any testimony been presented to prove that the division of the church at Richmond was at all occasioned by Dr. Thomas. On the contrary, I feel confident that these allegations are unfounded—that they do great injury to Brother Thomas, and that they have been made without sufficient evidence or proper consideration.

If, however, they were even true, is it proper that the press should be made the medium of their first announcement? Do they not belong to the church of which Brother Thomas is a member, to take cognizance of such matters, and give to them the publicity which circumstances may require? And are not the brethren whom Dr. Thomas lives, most favorably situated to obtain the truth with regard to these charges? and are they not the only legitimate tribunal which can decide upon them? Now, the simple fact that they have neither accused nor condemned him, is positive evidence that there is no just foundation for such charges; and we have every reason to believe them false, from the consideration that Dr. Thomas is greatly esteemed by those who are acquainted with him, and that the most intelligent and devoted brethren in eastern Virginia have the highest confidence in his piety, and the greatest respect for his character.

To be sure, Brother Thomas entertains peculiar opinions upon certain subjects not distinctly taught in the Scriptures, and never proposed as matters of faith or duty; and he has an undoubted right to entertain whatever opinions or theories he may think most agreeable to him upon these subjects. His error lies not in that he placed an undue degree of importance upon them, but in much so as to bring them before the public, and become acquainted with the brethren with questions that gender strife, and promote true piety, and give occasion to those who are not well-reproach us. In combatting these opinions, we are not to suppose that we doubt all erred, both in matter and manner, but that there is only a controversy about opinions; however, when it becomes necessary when brethren are lifted up by their opinions, their minds by them, and divided from each other, it is our duty to let them know, however we may, that we are not content with their opinions, and not content that they should be so. We have ventured to open the box of Pandora.

We all know that it is contrary to the spirit of the

the Christian Religion, that any one should be wrongfully accused; and above all, that a brother should be thus wounded in the house of his friends. And shall the principles which have thus far aided us in restoring primitive Christianity be so far forgotten as to permit any one to be proscribed for a difference of opinion! Shall one who earnestly contends for the one Faith, one Lord, and one Baptism, and obeys from the heart the apostolic mould of doctrine, be styled a "factionist," because he does not happen to agree with others in matters of theory and speculation, or because he has been so unfortunate as to bring these before the public? Or shall one who condemns without evidence, and proposes a separation without sufficient cause, be regarded as a friend of union, harmony and love?

But I remember that when all the evils had issued from the box of Pandora, HOPE was found at the bottom. May we not therefore *hope* that the undue harshness which our Brother Thomas has experienced may be in some measure overlooked, and the error in some degree extenuated by him when he reflects that those who have been so long and so ardently engaged in a cause so dear to them as the restoration of the gospel of peace, and the promotion of peace on earth and good will towards men, are naturally very sensitive to the introduction of matters which tend to produce schism and frustrate the dearest aspirations of their hearts; and that they cannot be insensible to the additional obloquy and misrepresentation which has lately thus means brought upon the cause of the Ancient Gospel? And may we not *hope* on the other hand, that "Plain Dealing" will see the exceeding impropriety of his remarks, and that under the influence of christian and gentlemanly feelings, he will render to Brother Thomas the justice of an apology? I trust he will take these suggestions and remarks in the spirit of kindness in which they are tendered, and pay to them that attention which the case demands; for we may rest assured that if *faction* be bad, *fiction* is worse.

Yours in the Gospel

R. RICHARDSON.

KING & QUEEN, Va. October 24, 1836.

Beloved Brother Thomas,

You know I have not agreed with you in all your views; nevertheless, I am mortified at the piece in Johnson and Hall's "Gospel Advocate." I shall write them to know who is the author of that slander, and let them know we will not withdraw our fellowship from you, nor our support of you while you maintain a Christian spirit, and character—that we will sustain you in exposing our errors, and presenting *gospel duties to us, so long as it is done in a Christian spirit.* We are all pleased at the good spirit you write with towards Brother Campbell.—He has injured himself with many of his old and best friends

in this section of country (eastern Virginia) writing to him on this subject often more and then in silence. I beseech you to be calm under your trials. Our teacher says—"in your patient's possess ye your souls am opposed to all manner of proscription for an *hostility of opinion*. But this spirit is now getting into the "Gospel Advocate" of Kentucky.

I am in great haste or I would say more—*when convenient—*

Yours truly

T. M.

BAPTISM PHRENOLOGICALLY ILLUSTRATED.

1. What is *Baptism*?

It is the "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water—Heb. x. 22."

2. *What is meant by the heart in this connexion?*

The heart here signifies the *Moral Sentiments*, which is susceptible of being used or abused.

3. What are the *Moral Sentiments*?

They may be either inferior or of a superior kind, but all excellent in the use of them. The *inferior* Moral Sentiments are Self-Esteem; Love of Approbation; Cautiousness and Benevolence;—the *superior* are Veneration; Firmness; Conscientiousness; Hope; Wonder; Ideality; Wit and Imitation.

4. What is a *Conscience*?

That which in common speech is termed Conscience, is the decision of the Moral Sentiments. The actions to which they urge a man, either in word or deed, reveal the conscience of the man.

5. What is an *EVIL Conscience*?

It is the *abuse* of the Moral Sentiments. For instance, it is good to worship, adore, venerate, or respect, whatever is truly great and good; but a senseless respect for unworthy objects, consecrated by time or situation, love of antiquated customs, abject subserviency to persons in authority, superstitions, though they proceed from the exercise of one and the same sentiment, viz. VENERATION—are bad or *evil*. So also of the abuse of the other sentiments we have enumerated.

6. By What standard is the abuse of the Moral Sentiments, or "an evil conscience," determined?

The *Holy Scriptures* are the only true and inflexible standard of good and evil—of right and wrong. Human opinions are fallible in their decisions. *Human opinions* are often at variance with them, and must not be regarded as such. We desire to arrive at a true definition of the nature of an evil conscience. This is what we mean by an evil conscience. This is what we mean by an evil conscience. "—I give thanks to God, who has enabled me to serve with a pure (or clear) conscience."—

some parts of the globe, approbates the worship of idols; in other parts obedience to the Pope; in others determines the *sincerity* of a man's belief, whatever that belief may be, to be good; but the Holy Scriptures pronounce all these things to be bad:—"little children," say they, "keep yourselves from idols;" again, "the Lord Jesus will consume that lawless one the man of sin, or (the Pope) by the spirit of his mouth, and with the brightness of his coming he will, indeed, utterly destroy him" and those who obey him (see 1 & 2 chaps. 2 Thess.); and to the lovers and sincere believers of error, they say, "no lie (or error) is of the truth;" and "without the city are dogs and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolators, and every one who loves or invents a lie."—To do good is to do as the Scriptures teach, to do evil, though the doing is sincerely done, is to do unscripturally, or according to the traditions of men. The man so doing, may have a clear but an evil conscience.

7. What is it to *sprinkle* the heart or Moral Sentiments?

It is to affect, or operate upon, the Moral Sentiments through the *Intellectual Faculties*. These faculties are of four different kinds—first, the *external senses*, by which man is brought into communication with external objects, and enabled to enjoy them; secondly, *those which perceive existence*; thirdly, *those which perceive the relations of external objects*; and fourthly, *those which compare, judge, and discriminate*. Hence, to operate on the Moral Sentiments of the Apostles they were brought into communication with the things said and done by Jesus; which things were addressed to their senses of seeing, hearing, tasting and touching, i. e. they saw the miracles, heard his discourses, tasted the water made wine, and handled him after he rose from the dead;—they perceived the facts—remembered the events—discovered the point of his similitudes, and traced the effects to the Great First Cause, dwelling in Jesus, and by him doing the works. What did this effect upon their hearts or moral sentiments? Did it not purify their lives? Did it not fill them with the benevolence of their master? with Veneration, with Firmness, with Conscientiousness, with Hope, with a Love of Approbation, &c. &c.?

The process by which the moral sentiments or hearts of men are affected in these days, is precisely similar to that by which the hearts of the Apostles were influenced in the days of Jesus. All they saw and heard, was evidence addressed to their hearts, through their intellectual faculties; so all that men see and hear now, in and from the holy scriptures, is evidence, or testimony, addressed to their hearts through their intellects.

The reason of this affection of the moral sentiments through the intellect being termed a *sprinkling* is owing to the subject matter of the evidence. The testimony of God is, that "the blood of sprinkling," as Paul terms, "the blood of Jesus Christ his

son, cleanses from all sins" 1 Jno. 1. 7.—The subject matter of the testimony is "the blood of sprinkling." Now the question is to sustain the sin-cleansing property of this blood. God has submitted to mens' intellectual faculties that they may examine it and believe. The Intellect having determined that the evidence fully sustains the declaration, the moral sentiments are brought into play. They discover that they have been abused; and resolve to regain their rightful sovereignty by alliance with intellect over the animal feelings. The mind thus reformed and sentiments and faculties are so affected proceeds forthwith to reform his life and to be quit of all future consciousness of guilt and this he begins to do, by having "*his body washed in pure water.*"

8. What is the *body*?

It is a thing that can be seen and felt. It is composed of many parts, such as the head, face, trunk, superior and inferior extremities. The face is no more the body, than a part is the whole. It is a part of the body.

9. What is it to have the *body washed*?

It is to bring *all* the parts of the body into contact with some fluid. The most approved and convenient way is by dipping the body into the fluid.

10. What is *water*?

It is a fluid accessible to man in every part of the habitable globe. It is a compound consisting of two gases—Oxygen and Hydrogen, in a state of chemical union. It is a most indispensable article of animal life. It is detergent or cleansing to a great extent.

11. What is it to wash the body in water?

It is to dip the individual in that fluid.

12. What is *pure water*?

It is that described in the answer to the tenth question, when it holds no extraneous particles in solution; such as distilled water.

13. What is "*pure water*" in the sense of Hebrews 10:22?

It is purifying water, or water that cleanses from guilt, which the purest distilled water cannot do. *It is the ingredients put into the water that makes it purifying.* When a man's heart or moral sentiments, are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, as already described, he goes into the water with his sprinkled heart. He does not leave his sprinkled faculties on the bank to drink while his body is being washed. This is done not only by the water being made purifying, by the ingredients put into it, but

If the man does not carry a sprinkled heart into the water, the water is not purifying. Some persons can see nothing in this. Hence, they contend that an immersed person is not purified, as if a person unspiritual and unrepentant, could be purified by water.

14. Is sprinkling water in the face of an infant, washing the body with water?

If the face be the body, and if sprinkling be washing, it is; but if the face be not the body, but only a part of it; and if sprinkling be not washing, then sprinkling the face of an infant is not washing its body. And further, even if it were, the water cannot be purifying to the infant, inasmuch as it is physically, morally and intellectually incapable of having its moral sentiments or heart sprinkled. Its sentiments have been neither used nor abused, being competent to neither good nor evil; how then can its heart be sprinkled from an "evil conscience?" All which is humbly submitted to the scrutiny of the spiritualist, the paidorhantist, and the inquirers of every name by the

EDITOR.

The Harbinger of the Millennium on "Materialism."

No. 1.

Now this is the testimony, that God has given to us (Christians) eternal life: and this life is in his Son.—He who has the Son, has this life; he who has not the Son of God, has not this life.—1 Jno. c. v. 11, 12.

The close of the year has at length arrived; and, with its demise, The Harbinger has finished his work of washing, scouring and wiping "the escutcheon" of "the present reformation" from the foul stain with which The Advocate has sought to offuscate and contaminate it! The clogs are at length disengaged that "oppressed" it, and caused its chariot wheels heavily to drive! How fair, how beautiful, how clean must "the present reformation" appear, in the eyes of its patron, now that its heraldic "quarterns" stand "in bold relief," upon an *atherial* "field," without a "material" speck or spot! *All spirit no substance*, then, is the wretched motto of "reform!" If true, so let it be; but if, perchance, hereafter it appear, that body, substance, matter, be the substratum of all God's Institutions, then, adieu the dogmas of our friend, God's will and way are best.

"Materialism!" So The Harbinger terms the doctrine, that *he only who has the Son hath eternal life*; in other words, that man is not naturally and therefore necessarily immortal; but that the immortality of his life is a gift of God to that portion of the race, *who obey his Institutions*. This is the true point at issue; a proposition, which the Harbinger in all the thirty pages of typography he has appropriated to "Materialism," has not ventured to encounter. If immortality be *conditional*, which The Advocate affirms, then the dogma of abstract human spirits or ghosts vanishes into air, thin air! If it be *unconditional*, as the abstract spiritualist maintains, then eternal life and immortality or incorruptibility is not the gift of God by Jesus Christ; for abstract spiritualism maintains, that man ever since his creation, has possessed an immortal spirit or soul, capable of existence separately and independently of his matter or body.

The Advocate calls upon The Harbinger to meet this intelligible proposition, or all his labor of "wiping off the escutcheon of the present reformation" will be lost, irretrievably lost.

But, what a singular course has The Harbinger taken in maintaining his own traditions, and in opposing the "dogmatism," of The Advocate! How unlike his wonted cautiousness and sagacity—how unlike himself! What politician would think of encountering an opponent before he had the subject at issue fairly and fully before him? And who would dream of confronting the heretic by arguing against the traditions of another entirely differ-

ent one! And yet, such has been the unfortunate tactics of The Harbinger in combatting what he terms "materialism." Would it be fair to say that so dexterous a polemic has been for many moons past, practising cut-throats of literary warfare against The Advocate, by attacking Doctor Priestly and the materialism taught by him? The Advocate studiously avoided the consultation of the work of any author upon "materialism," in order that what he believed on *the Constitution of Man, of the external world, and on the ultimate destiny of both*, might be the result of an unbiased study of the book of Revelation.* He has affirmed this again and again, yet The Harbinger waywardly bent on his own policy, continued his pursuit of a phantom, as if determined to listen to nothing tending to disenchant his cerebrum of the gratifying hallucination!

The opinion of The Advocate on a review of all the articles penned by The Harbinger on "Materialism" is, that they have done more damage to his reputation as a defender of the faith, than all the attacks he has had to sustain from the most practised and skilful opponents in the ranks of the Apostacy. The labor of confutation will be light to the "dogmatical" Advocate, inasmuch as the dogmata of The Harbinger, in the estimation of the discerning wayfarer, are amply sufficient to confute themselves. Instead of reasoning with The Advocate, as Paul did with the Jews, "out of the Scriptures,"⁷ he has carped at him out of the vain and speculative philosophy of Ex-Chancellor Brougham, and of the author of the "Natural History of Enthusiasm;" as if the opinions of these gigantic aliens were anything but vanity, when the conditionality or unconditionality of eternal life was the subject in debate! Look at their practice, and what are their opinions worth of the question before us? They have neither wisdom nor knowledge enough to take the first step to immortality. They are of the gods of this world whose minds are blinded by the Master of Evil. And yet such are the aids brought into the help of The Harbinger against "a stripling," and "a very young man!" Mighty are the powers brought to bear against a feeble object truly! Unworthy allies of a worthy man.

The Advocate considers that a serenum reply to The Harbinger is irrelevant and uncalled for. Indeed were he to follow the advice of many friends to both parties, he would pass over the whole matter unnoticed. This he would do, but from certain considerations. Misrepresentation must be corrected, justice must be vindicated, and perversions of scripture exposed.—And thus The Advocate will do, time and opportunity fitting. It is irrelevant, and would be uncalled for, were he to enter upon a defence of Priestlyism. He cannot defend the Doctor being ignorant of his doctrine, knowing neither his strong nor his weak points. The Harbinger seems to know all about the matter:—he will, therefore, leave "the bold ghost" of Priestly to defend his, her, or its (I know not the gender of a ghost) opinions against The Harbinger, or his abstract spirit, when they shall both meet in the doubtful "region prepared for abstract spirits, good or evil."

When The Advocate penned his first article, having allusion to the matter debated, he had a controversy with no individual. The Harbinger being the voluntary champion of the human opinions he opposed, a thing of the mighty kind; and doubtless much to the gratification of all his readers. Could Plato's ghost but re-enter its mortal tenement, it would doubtless move a vote of thanks to The Harbinger for his able, mysterious, and

* From a similarity of views, a friend and brother supposed that I had been studying "Combe on the Constitution of Man," and that if he had seen that work; to which he replied he had not seen it, but had, and recommended it warmly to his countrymen. The Advocate determined to obtain it; which he did in the month of October, since which time he has read it occasionally. He has observed that Combe's work is based on the materialism of Priestly.

this cannot be. However to proceed. The Advocate neither desires, nor labors, to add any doctrines to "present reformation." The Harbinger affirms that this is his desire—page 399, vol. 7. It is a mistake. He labors for no denomination; it is for the truth as he believes it, independent of all sects or parties, he pleads, whether by writing, speaking or acting. The party he belongs to is a church of Christ composed of but few persons, who assemble every first day of the week in a little village in Virginia, that they may worship God in spirit and in truth according to his word, and not according to the dogmas of this or that reformation or denomination. Can an advocate for the truth, upon such independent principles as these be sustained, by those who profess to acknowledge no Lord but Jesus, and no sect or party but his? The experiment is making, we have yet to see.

Well, then, The Advocate labors, according to the light he has, to show to his readers what the Scriptures teach; he desires neither to add to, nor to take from the things they reveal. His labors may not please contemporary laborers; but he cannot help it. He does not wish wantonly to offend them. They labor according to their opinions of what is right; but he would observe, that their opinions may be a rule for them, but not for him. The Advocate must judge for himself, and leave others to do as they please.

The Advocate wishes to lay before his readers, what he believes to be *the Constitution of Man, and the constitution of the things, to which he stands related here, and hereafter, as God has constituted him and them; and as he thinks he has made their constitution known in the Book of Revelation.*—He was incited to to this, primarily, by the necessity he was under of replying to certain queries bearing on the topics embraced in this design; as well as by the difficulties presenting themselves to his own mind when reading the Scriptures. Not having then arrived at conclusions, he determined to seek the aid of others. This information he sought for under the caption of "Information Wanted;" which consisted of the thirty-four questions, that appeared December 1835. He published these, in the hope, that some one or more of intelligence and independence might try and throw some light upon them. He little thought then what a spirit of denunciation and proscription was latent in "the present reformation," so vaunted as it has been for liberty of opinion and free discussion—a spirit, which seems to have slumbered only for want of a fit occasion to show itself. Not being, however, the creature of fear, or of expediency, this evil spirit still finds him undismayed; and prepared to withstand its unhallowed assaults with the firmness and fortitude of a soldier of Christ.

Instead, however of some one condescending to instruct him, and to impart the information sought, he was forthwith beset on every side. A correspondent arose putting certain questions to him. The letter containing these obliged him to investigate the subject alluded to more closely, and, unlike the course adopted towards him, he honestly and frankly replied to said correspondent, according to the light he had. Then began the din of war. The artillery of "the present reformation," began to play from the heights of Bethany. The Goodals began to gar-

ship. He was charged with levity by one who has treated him with singular lightness! His Christian character was traduced; he was classed with "the wits and the wags, the Paines, and the Voltaires, and all that herd," &c, &c, &c. Discharges of small arms were levelled at him from diverse points; and discontinuances came in from various quarters, because he had the presumption to ask for information, few had the courage to give him. But notwithstanding this railing, he still lives at the service of his friends and readers. A woman will writhe under the foot that treads it down. The Advocate ventured to defend himself, and that in as jocose a humour as circumstances would admit. With this view he published a conversation between three friends upon the sayings and doings of the "family circle." This if he mistake not, gave rise to The Harbinger's four essays on Dr. Priestly's materialism; the last of which has just come to hand. Thus the matter stands as far as its history is concerned. At a convenient season The Advocate will resume the case, to the edification of his readers, he trusts, and to the vindication of truth.

December, 1836.

TO THE READER.

Some time ago we translated the following articles from an Italian Author of the 17th or 18th centuries. Imagining their contents to be appropriate at the present crisis, we have brought them forth from the obscurity of our portfolio; and present them to the consideration of our readers for their edification and improvement.—Let us never forget, that *Truth is of more value than Opinion.*

EDITOR.

PLUS VALET QUOD IN VERTTATE EST, QUAM QUOD IN OPINIONE.

In times past, Truth was maintained, and defended by the wisest philosophers, as a solid foundation of faith among men. The Romans ordered their children to wear its image suspended upon their breasts. Homer says, that he only is his enemy who loves not the truth. Sophocles calls it the true ornament and grace of man. Pythagoras says, that the greatest endowments of the mind, conferred by the Gods, were Truth. Plato calls it the origin of every good. Aristotle loved it, and used to say;—*Amicus Plato, Amicus Socrates, Amici omnes, sed magis amica Veritas.*—Plato, Socrates, Socrates, and other philosophers, after their death, are more glorious to their memory, than their friends and defenders of Truth; for without Truth, Justice is not, and when Justice is not, Iniquity prevails.

combated by Opinion, than Truth. The innumerable quantity of books of which there are rooms full, are all opinions, and commentaries, which oppose and confound Truth. For the insane World, with speculations, and cavillings, some from interest, some from ambition, and some from revenge, endeavours to oppress, and bury it. So that the saying above cited, expressed a sentiment quite contrary to the practice in many places. Therefore it will be better to consider the Author as cancelling or changing it, thus, *plus valet quod in opinione est, quam quod in Veritate*, opinion is of more value than truth. This is seen in some tribunals where the judges surrounded by Lawyers, who clamour and contend with hands and feet destroying poor truth which never appears, they hold it well concealed and guarded, that they may sell it to the enchantment of a golden fee.

VERITAS MULTIS NON EGET VERBIS

Truth needs few words

Good Philosophers had always in view—the common interest, and they proceeded as much by their sayings, as by their actions, the diminution of the vices of the world, speaking and writing briefly with truth, and doing justice. Nevertheless they encountered hatred and opposition, whence arose the saying, *veritas odium parit*, Truth begets aversion; a circumstance which obtains now in every place. But that *Veritas multis non eget verbis*, is most incorrect; and this there is no difficulty in proving, by reflecting on the preceding discourse where we have spoken of the advocates and proctors. Here no other reason will be adduced, as the question is not the vast quantity of law books, which are full of words to prove the Truth, and how can it be said that non eget verbis, there is no need of words? It will then be better to say, *Veritas sine nummis, ver. irrita omnia facit*,—truth without money, makes all things vain.

HAVE HUMAN GHOSTS IN A SEPARATE STATE A POWER OF ACTION ;
IF THEY HAVE, ARE THEY TO BE JUDGED ACCORDING TO THE
DEEDS DONE OUT OF THE BODY AS WELL AS IN IT ?

Brother Thomas,

You will notice that Brother Campbell is combatting materialism with as much zeal as if the salvation of men depended upon the belief that spirits exist in hades abstract from the body, or that they enjoy happiness or undergo misery in that separate state. He seems to think that to doubt upon this subject, is almost, if not quite equivalent to denying the faith.

If it were admitted that spirits exist abstract from bodies, still it would be hard to determine whether they possess the

powers of action or not, and if they do, then we should begin to inquire whether they were held accountable for their actions in this separate state. We are not told that they shall give an account of the deeds done out of the body, or whether any are done or not. If there be nothing done by separate or abstract spirits, then we are at a loss to know the use of their existence; and thus we are puzzled and perplexed with this mysterious matter.

Then immediately after this follows another difficulty, if spirits abstract from the body are susceptible of pleasure and pain, and in this separate state enjoy the pleasure of Heaven, and undergo the pains of Hell, we are at loss to know the use of a resurrection at all. Will they do more than this after the resurrection?

Affectionately yours,

(From our Portfolio.)

ILLUSTRATION OF THE APOCALYPSE!

BY ELDER W. K. SMITH "A BAPTIST DIVINE."

(Condensed from the R. Herald.)

"Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth."—*Rev.* 17, 5.

"First, I shall give my views of the ancient Babylon, *how* she was the mistress of the whole earth, and sat upon all nations, people, and tongues."—The *how*, he accounts for by saying that Nebuchadnezzar caused a herald to proclaim with a loud voice universal obeisance to the Golden Image he had set up in the plain of Dura!

"Secondly, I purpose," says he, "giving my views of what this Babylon, by way of mystery, is." He has no doubt but the rise, progress, and the downfall of popery was in the view of the *revelator*, but his mind led him in search of something that more nearly concerned him and his hearers, "and," says he, "I discovered that there was an Imp hatched out of the spawn of Popery, called *ardent spirits*, which in the place of a Golden Image has set up a number of *copper images*, which are so common in our land, that we scarcely get clear of the *stink* of one till we are in the *smell* of another!" "Drunkenness," this learned Divine says, "represents the *second beast* to whom the *dragon* gave his power, who executed all the power of the *first beast*, and sat on all the nations, &c."

"I shall now proceed to show *how* she is the Mother of Harlots."—This second *how* is accomplished by training the human family from their infancy "by *sweetening* and *paring* this bane, until their appetite is fond of it, and when they come nearer to the point he has "noticed that, when *drunken frolicking*, and *carousing* are most practised, that

males are the most liable to accidents," and thus Babylon becomes the Mother of Harlots!!!!

"Third, I shall now show *how* it is the abomination of the earth." This *third how* is made evident from the fact, "that of all the horrid crimes committed, a great number of them are through the influence of ardent spirits."—"It is," says he, "the abomination that causes desolation, and sheds the blood of saints and martyrs of Jesus."—"But it has pleased God to judge the Whore this year, by sending a frost that has nearly taken all the fruit, and a great part of the rye of which ardent spirit is made; and the time may not be far distant when God will take out of his kingdom all things that offend, and among them drunkards, and devils, and hurl them from his presence into an awful hell, and every saint will say amen, aHeluia, and the smoke of their torment will ascend up for ever and ever!!!"

There reads like that as a specimen of the manner in which these pretended successors of the apostles make void the word of God by their traditions. The author of the quotation text is acknowledged to mean one thing, but this Elder Smith racks his brain to discover another, and thus he tortures part of a prediction relating to the overthrow of the Apostacy, into a text for his ridiculous effusion, called a Sermon on Temperance.—The *enlightened* Editor of the Herald, too, inserts it into his "leaves for the hearing of the nations" approvingly, as we suppose, for there are no marks of disapprobation about it. Either Mr. Sands' light is darkness made visible, or he has inserted the sermon as a satire on his Brother Smith. If we give Mr. Sands' credit however, for that "piety" he pretends to, we cannot suppose the latter; our only alternative, therefore, is, that Sands' and Smith are brethren indeed—"in full communion" with the darkness, imbecility, and ignorance of a world at enmity against God, and prostrate in the chains of an absurd and frantic superstition. Alas! for this age because of offences. How are the pure words of God despised, His Majesty insulted and mankind befooled!!!

March 6, 1835.

EDITOR.

NOTICES.

The present number is the first issue from our new office.— We have had to labor under many inconveniences in commencing operations in the country, which have caused a delay in the publication of the paper. Our Printer is doing his best to make up lost time so as to issue the work by the first of every month. We will yet, all things concurring, regain a hold of the forelock of Time.

✍ All letters for the Editor, to be addressed (post paid) to THE CLERK'S OFFICE, AMELIA COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Printed and published by John Thomas, Amelia County, Virginia.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

AND

PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Vol. 3. AMELIA Co. Va. JANUARY, 1837. No. 1

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. . . . Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

DOXOLOGIES OF THE APOCALYPSE.

SECOND SERIES

(COMMENCING WITH THE EVENTS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, AND ENDING WITH THE REVELATION, OR THE INTRODUCTION, OF THE "THIRD TRUMPET," OR ETERNAL DAY.)

And I heard a great voice saying in heaven,

Now the deliverance is come,
God's pow'r, and kingdom too,
And also the authority,
Of his Anointed One;

Because th' accuser of our friends
Is now cast out of pow'r,
Who did in th' presence of our God
Accuse them night and day.

And they have overcome him by
The Lamb's most precious blood,
Together with the word of truth;
Nor lov'd they life to death.

Therefore, rejoice you heavens, and
You who inhabit them.
But wo to the inhabitants
Of the wide earth and sea;

For th' Devil is come down to you
Possessing fury great,
Because he knows that he has but
A little time to be.

And I heard the voice of harpers playing on their harps,
And they sang a new song before the throne, and before the
four and twenty elders, saying, who are redeemed from the earth. For this
is the true and righteous record.

And I saw, as it were, a sea of glass mingled with fire; and those who overcame the beast, and its image, and its mark, and the number of its name, standing by the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sang the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb; saying,

Thy works are great and wonderful
O Lord Almighty God;
Yea true and righteous are thy ways
O glorious King of Saints.

Who should not thee revere, O Lord,
And glorify thy name?
For thou alone art wholly free
Of every defect.

All nations surely shall come up
And homage do to thee,
Because thy righteous judgments are
Made fully manifest.

Ch xv

And the third Angel poured out his vial upon the rivers, and on the fountains of waters, and they became blood. And I heard the Angel of the waters saying,

Righteous art thou, who art, and wast—
Yea, thou, who perfect art;
Because, thou thus hast judged these.
For they have poured forth

The blood of saints, and prophets too,
And thou hast given them
To drink of their own flowing blood.—
Which richly they've deserv'd

And I heard a voice from the altar, saying

Yea, verily they worthy are;
O Lord Almighty God
Thy judgments dire, in deed and truth,
Both true and righteous are.

Ch xv

And I heard the voice of a great multitude, in heaven saying,

Praise ye the Lord! Salvation, and
Glory, and power be
Unto the Lord our God; because
His deeds are just and true;
For he has the Great Harlot judg'd
Who did the earth corrupt
With whoredom; and aveng'd the blood
She of his servants shed.

And a voice came out from the throne, which said.

All ye his servants, praise our God,
Even you who fear the Lord,
Who are of an inferior rank,
And you of high degree.

And I heard a sound which was as the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and like the peal of mighty thunders, saying,

Praise ye Jehovah's name! Because
The Lord, All pow'ful, reigns!
We joy, and greatly do exult,
And glory give to him.

Because the marriage of the Lamb
Is now at length arriv'd—
His wife resplendent, yea, and pure;
Herself, has ready made.

And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying,

Behold God's tabernacle is
With men, and he shall pitch
His tent with them, and surely they
His people then shall be.

And God himself shall be with them—
Their God. And he shall wipe
From every weeping eye its tears;
And death shall be no more.

Nor sorrow, yea nor crying there;
Nor shall there be more pain:
For th' former things are pass'd away.
And all things now are new.

Ch. xii.

OBSERVATIONS.

The doxology contained in the last paragraph of the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse concludes the first series, and synchronizes, or corresponds in time, with the era of the great voice from the throne, which says, "It is done."—ch. xvi. 17. The doxology, which commences the second series, celebrates the downfall of paganism in the days of Constantine, surnamed "the Great" by Romanists; and the deliverance of the Church from the fell and murderous attacks of its merciless enemies. We have explained this chapter, at some length, in the first volume of our paper, numbers 9, 10, 11, 12. "The Devil and Satan," in the passage, symbolize the visible head of the pagan institutions of the Roman world; the "casting of him out of the earth" was his expulsion from the throne of the Caesars; and "his angels," who "were cast out with him," were the subalterns, who held power and authority under him. A short time before this event, the tenth persecution was inflicted upon the Christians. This was the severest of all their sufferings, and had well nigh exterminated them from the empire. The doxology here introduced, then, is exceedingly appropriate. This ascription, is termed by John, "the voice speaking in heaven." It was introduced as symbolizing the joy that would supervene upon the ascendancy of the Christian over the Pagan party in the Roman Empire. The next song of praise that was sung, was sung before the throne of the Lord, in the presence of the four living creatures, and before the resurrected assembly of the saints.

was sung by the symbolical one hundred and forty-four thousand; for "none could learn the song" but these. They represent those who will be the personal attendants, or as we should say of mortal kings, "the body-guard" of the King immortal; for "they follow the Lamb, whithersoever he goes."—The *terrestrial* throne of the Eternal, in the fourteenth chapter, is made visible to mortal eyes, standing on the Mount of Zion; where once was placed "the throne of David," Messiah's ancestor and father. This period when the new song is to be sung synchronizes with the prediction of Zechariah ch. xiv. 4, where it says,—“And his (the Lord's) feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; &c.—“And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one; v. 9.—It also synchronizes with the fulfilment of the prophecy of the "two men in white raiment" who said to the disciples, "Gallileans, why do ye stand gazing up to heaven? This Jesus who is taken up from you into heaven, shall also come in the same manner as you have seen him going to heaven"—Acts i. 11; and Paul says, "he shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels"—2 Thess. i. 8. Here then, John presents the reader with a symbolical fulfilment of this "revelation of the Lord Jesus" foretold in so many places in the Old and New Testament. The new song being sung in the presence of the four living creatures, and of the elders, shows that the celebration of the subjects of this unwritten doxology will take place after "the first resurrection."

Synchronously, or subsequently to the singing of the new song, the gospel of the everlasting age is proclaimed. The proclamation of this good news will be of greater extent, than that of the gospel proclaimed on Pentecost. The latter was announced to the inhabitants of the Roman world only—a world whose dimensions did not exceed two thousand miles in breadth, and three thousand in length. But the everlasting Gospel is to be made known "to every nation, tribe, tongue, and people."

And whom does "the angel flying through heaven" represent or by whose agency is this gospel to be made known to the nations? The answer to this query is contained in Isaiah lxvi. 19; which see. This proclamation is followed by the announcement of the actual overthrow of Rome—the spiritual, or figurative Babylon. A third angel proclaims to every one, who has upheld the Mystery of Iniquity, emanating from this sink of evil, that he shall be "tormented with fire and sulphur, in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."—This is what Paul terms, "the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, inflicting a just retribution on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall suffer a just

punishment even an everlasting destruction from (or proceeding from) the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i. 8-9.

After this the dead who die in the Lord are pronounced blessed; that they may rest from their labors; being followed by their works.

Two angels with sharp sickles are then introduced. The former of them gathers in the harvest, and the latter lops off the clusters of the vine of the earth, and throws them into the great wine press of the wrath of God. For an illustration of the work of the first angel, see Matt. xiii. 24-30;—and 38-43. The labor of the second angel synchronizes with the "treading of the wine press of the indignation and wrath of Almighty God" in the nineteenth chapter, v. 15.

The treading of the wine press of wrath is the consummation of the pouring out of the seven vials in chap. xvi. by which the "wrath of God is to be completed." In anticipation of this glorious climax of human affairs, John introduces a number of persons, whom he describes, standing by a sea of glass mingled with fire, and singing "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb"—ch. xv.

Who that speculates intelligently upon the works of God can withhold his assent to the sentiments of this ascription—"Great and wonderful are thy works, Lord God Almighty; righteous and true are thy ways, O thou King of saints."—Will any one of superior intellect venerate such a being as God; can any one of ordinary capacity fail to adore him, and glorify in him?—Will any one not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify in thee?—Will any one not admire and foal!—"for thou alone art perfect!—All nations shall come and worship before thee, because thy righteous judgments are made manifest." This ascription is its fulfilment in the kingdoms of the world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Anointed One; ch. xi. 15.—and in the events consequent upon the descent of the Messenger from heaven (the Messiah) "who enlighteneth every man with his glory;" ch. xviii. 1.—and upon the binding of the devil, by the same angel, for a thousand years; ch. xv. 1.

To what place shall all nations come to worship before the Lord? Let Zechariah answer this question for us, and in his own way.—"And it shall come to pass," says he, "that every one that is left of all the nations that come against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King;" in a subsequent verse, he says, the place to which they shall go is "unto Jerusalem to worship the King;" ch. xiv. 4.—How shall they worship, or do homage?—By keeping "the feast of tabernacles" v. 16.—of which the Jewish feast was but a type. How shall the nations go thither? As the multitude of the

ish families went up from all parts of the earth—by deputation.

The sixteenth chapter commences with the pouring out of the first vial, or the beginning of "the third woe," or the terrific events of the reign of Terror; which afflicted not only the natives of France but all the continental nations. The first vial, the beginning of the third woe, and the Reign of Terror have all reference to one and the same period. The third woe is made up of the seventh trumpet, which contains the seven vials. This chapter ends with the termination of the third woe or last loud blast of the seventh trumpet. The consummation of the woe, the trumpet, and the vials will be the opening of the temple of God in heaven, and the appearance of the Ark of his covenant therein. Ch. xi. 19. Compare this passage with chap. xvi. 18-21.

I have said somewhere, that the seventh and last vial is now pouring out. Let it be observed, that the seven vials pour out not only consecutively, but collaterally. That is, the first is poured out, and then the second and so forth: but, the pouring out of the second does not tarry for the entire exhaustion of the first; nor the third for that of the second, and so forth: but the second begins while the first is pouring, and the third while the second, &c; like so many streams from different fountains, all running into a larger and common stream, until they constitute an overwhelming and devastating torrent, sweeping all before it.

Now, with this explication before our minds, we say that the seventh vial is pouring out. The first, second, third, fourth, and fifth have produced effects, that are now working in the world. In the days of Napoleon the fountain of the sixth was opened; and under Mehemet Ali, the present sultan of Egypt, it continued to flow with increasing impetus. It still continues its onward course, afflicting the several parts of the Turkish Empire. It will result in two grand events; viz. *the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, and *the invasion of Judea by Russia for the conquest of the country, as a primary step to the subjugation of British India*. This is still future; but before its exhaustion, the seventh has begun.

The word *air* in the 17th verse is symbolical of human governments. To pour out a vial upon the air is to destroy the governments of the world, which is signified when it says "the kingdoms, or governments, of the world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."—Now having ascertained the meaning of the symbols, look at the existing state of the governments of the world, and then say if they are not fast hurrying on to irremediable disruption and destruction. There is not a government in the Old and New worlds but what is shaking and tottering to its foundations. Every nation has within it the elements of the downfall of its own institutions.

When they fall, the Great Harlot sinks into perdition. Her overthrow elicits the acclamations, loud as the voice of a great multitude, with which John opens the nineteenth chapter. The acclaim commences with a Hallelujah, or praise to God; and so rapturous is the joy, that after the dominion "a second time they shout, Hallelujah!" The resurrected assembly of the Sons of God, then prostrate themselves before his terrestrial throne, and worshipping him, exclaim, "Amen, Hallelujah!"—So let it be! Unto our God be praise! A voice then issued from the throne commanding all that fear God, of every grade, to praise him. Upon this a replicating voice is heard by John, which he compares to "the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and like the peal of mighty thunderings."—Magnificent similitude! And what may be the subject of this thundering applause?—It is the reign of the Omnipotent Lord God—the marriage of the Lamb—and the preparation of the church of God—the *cara sposa* of the Lamb.

"Hallelujah! for the Lord God, the Omnipotent, reigns!" The period of this doxology synchronizes with that of ch. x. v. 17, where it says, "We give thanks to thee, O Lord God Almighty, who art and who wast, because thou hast taken thy great power, and hast commenced thy reign."—Be it observed then, that the reign of God has yet to begin. I say this, in view of all that has been said and written about the reign of God, or the kingdom of heaven, having commenced on Pentecost. The latter is merely provisional or temporary; and is to be superseded, by the "Everlasting Kingdom." Hence Peter exhorts the citizens of the kingdom of heaven, or church, then visible, earnestly to endeavor to make their calling and election sure; for doing these things, you shall never fall; and thus there shall be richly ministered to you, an entrance into the Everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 2 Pet. i. 10. This everlasting kingdom is that for which Jesus taught his apostles to pray, what is termed the Lord's prayer. He taught them to pray for that reign, under which the will of the Father would be done upon the earth as it is done in heaven. Some say, that the praying of this prayer after the day of Pentecost is inappropriate; because, say they, his reign commenced on that day. For myself, I see nothing in the prayer, which is not as appropriate now as when it was first delivered. In it, we pray that the name of the Father be glorified and hallowed; surely the blasphemy against God, and against his kingdom, and even among "Christians," who blaspheme the name of God on every trivial occasion, warrants this prayer. Surely we may pray for the reign of God, and that his will be done in a world like this, which is full of "vile abominations, and evil things, which shall be done, in which every one appears to do that which is right."

eyes! Surely we may ask God for our daily bread; that we may not be led into trial; and that we may be preserved from evil now! And is it less incumbent on us to pray for the obliteration of our offences against God and one another now, than it was for others of former times?—I conclude, then, that the sentiments of the Lord's prayer are as appropriate now as in the days of Jesus; and may therefore, be scripturally used.

The servants of God, in the doxology before us, "rejoice and exult and give glory to him, because the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife has prepared herself;"—The marriage of the Lamb is the subject of illustration in many of our Lord's discourses. See the parable of the Ten Virgins, for instance. It is likewise celebrated in prophetic strains in Psal. xlv.—Messiah's Queen, or wife, is there described, as a king's daughter standing on his right hand, arrayed in the gold of Ophir.

"All glorious," sings the prophetic bard, "is the king's daughter in her apartment:

Her robe is embroidered with gold.

In variegated garments shall she be led to the King;

The virgin companions that follow her, shall be brought unto thee (O God, or King, Messiah.)

With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought;

They shall enter the king's palace."

And John testifies the same thing, though in different words. He describes her wedding garment as "pure and resplendent;" and pronounces her virgin companions, who enter the king's palace, where "the marriage supper is prepared, as "happy."—"And it was given to her, that she should be clothed in fine linen, pure and resplendent."—"Happy are they, who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb!"—But best we should inquire, in a subsequent part of her "embroidered," "variegated," "pure and resplendent" robe, "as the righteous acts of the saints;" who are "glorified by a "wife" or "queen."

"His wife has prepared herself."—Let us pause on the preparation of the Lamb's wife. If his wife at the epoch of this doxology, has prepared, or made herself ready, a period, antecedent to her readiness must have elapsed *in the work of preparation*. The time of this work answers to the era when John heard a voice from the symbolical heavens saying, "come out from her (Babylon,) my people, that you may not be partakers with her in her sins, and that you may not partake of her plagues"—ch. xviii. 4. The completion of the work, and of the coming out, synchronize with the giving of judgment and reward to the righteous dead, and to them that venerate the name of God of every degree—ch. xi. 18. The *beginning of The Cry*, and of THE PREPARATION, is synchronical with the infusion of "the breath of life from God" into the two Witnesses—ch. xi. 11. Here, then, is a definite period allotted by the Omnipotent, for the trimming of the lamps of the wise.

It began with the commencement of the French Revolution at the close of the 18th century or about the year 1790, and will end at the pre-millennial period, when the "First Resurrection" will ensue.

But in what does this preparation consist?—It consists in men "purifying their lives by obeying the truth." This obedience to the truth will lead them to come out of whatever sectarian, or Babylonish, institutions they may belong to; and to be cast into that mould of doctrine delivered by the Apostles in the New Testament. It will induce them to continue in the truth, so that by perseverance in well doing they may attain to glory, honor, and immortality. Obedience to the truth will bring them together into congregations of Christ, walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the written admonitions of the Holy Spirit. It will lead them to add to their faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly-kindness and love. In so doing, they will clothe themselves, individually and collectively, with the "fine linen, pure and resplendent, which is the righteous actions of the saints."

If ours be the genuine labors of preparation, then is the Baptist denomination part and parcel of the symbolic Babylonish Empire. Hundreds, perhaps thousands have come out of that sect and joined the "present reformation." In so doing, they have candidly acknowledged, that Babylon is the place of their nativity. Let these, then, and we say it with the spirit of benevolence, consider, whether the Lord God Almighty will acknowledge their birth in Antichrist, as a being born of water and of the Spirit into the kingdom of Heaven. I cannot persuade myself, that a mere change of views, and of our house of worship, can be what the spirit means by coming out of Babylon. I fear that the greater part of this generation of "reformers" will pass away to the region of death spell-bound by a spirit of self-deception. "The present reformation," in my opinion, cannot attain to the attributes of the "pure and resplendent wife," until its constituents have purified themselves *ab origine* by obeying the truth. Let it not be forgotten that the Master will not recognize all, by many, as his disciples, who call him Lord. The inhabitants of the New Jerusalem must be based upon the twelve apostles of the Lamb; for these are they, whose names are inscribed on the twelve foundations of that holy City. My opinion is, that the United States of America are the arena on which, THE PREPARATION will be effected. The climax of this preparation will be the TRANSFORMATION, or changing of those who are prepared. See 1 Cor. xv. 51; Phil. ii. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 14-18.

John sees "heaven opened." That is, that which is concealed in heaven from mortal eyes made visible to him. This same opening of heaven is spoken of in the Revelation which was seen in the latter was the Ark of God.

John saw the same in chap. xix. which he calls *The Word of God*. The Ark and The Word both signify The Messiah, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords. He is accompanied by a host; and by "lightning and voices, and thunders, and an earthquake, and great hail"—ch. xi. 19; xvi. 21; Ps. xviii. 7-15; 37-45; Isa. lxiii. 1-4; lxvi. 15, 16; Ezek. xxxviii. 18-23. Preparatory to the slaughter about to ensue, John sees a symbol—"a single angel standing in the sun;" who calls the birds of prey to devour the flesh of those who are about to be slain. Ezek. xxxix. 1, 5. This slaughter is the battle of Armageddon, to which, the vial pouring out on the Turkish Empire will bring the Rus-o-Tartar host; or the Gog and Magog of Ezekiel. The warning under the sixth vial—"Behold, I come as a thief"—is here illustrated in chap. xix. The Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven taking vengeance on the world!

Now is fulfilled the declaration, that every knee shall bow to him. Hitherto, Jesus has sat at the right hand of the majesty on high, waiting until his foes shall be made the footstool of his feet; (read Ps. cx.)—but now, in chap. xx. he descends from heaven, from whence he poured down his dreadful fury, and binds the Devil for a thousand years. The binding of the Devil, though a figurative expression, in its effects, real. In Spain, the Devil roams at large in this country, he is restrained; but, as yet, he is no where bound. This may illustrate what the binding of the Devil means. The consequence of this binding will be that "the nations shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation: neither shall they learn war any more." Isa. ii. 4—the heathen will become the inheritance, and kingdoms of the world, the possession of Jehovah's Anointed King; Ps. lxxv. 7—"Oppression and tyranny will cease throughout the world: because the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea; &c.

This happy state of things will continue to the end of one thousand years. During this long period, called the Everlasting Age, from its permanency, the globe will be governed by One Monarch. He will have many kings under him; hence, he is styled King of Kings. These his associate kings will be immortals; for, we are instructed, that the saints, or kings and priests elect, who had been raised from the dead, "reigned with Christ a thousand years." At this time, however, Jesus is not only the Monarch, but the High Priest of the world, and his vice-regal saints, "the priests of God and of Christ."—**What an astonishing age will this be, of which Messiah is the Father! Isa. xi. 6.—The King Immortal, and Immortal Kings, ruling the Mortals of the World! Magnificent! Who would not suffer the loss of all things that he might win Christ!**

The Everlasting age having passed away, Satan is permitted to go forth, and test the fidelity of the nations. They have been conquered by Messiah's arms; is their allegiance from love or fear? Alas for the honor of our race! The mild, the merciful, the benignant government of Jesus is to them a trial of iron! They deem it insupportable, and rebel! Their confederacy takes its name from the Gog and Magog destroyed by The Word of God when the thousand years was about to dawn. I think, too, they are so named, because the chief of the rebels will invade Judea from the countries now peopled by the Russians and Tartar Tribes, who are the descendants of Magog, Meshech, Tubal, &c. grandsons of Noah. "And they went up over the breadth of the land (not earth) and surrounded the camp of the saints, and the beloved city (Jerusalem :) and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." The career of the Devil ends with their destruction. Whoever personates him in this grand defection, is cast into the lake of fire and sulphur, there to be tormented for ages of ages.

And now the judgment sits. The second Resurrection has arrived. The Constitution of the Everlasting age is broken up; for, earth and heaven flee away from the face of him, who sits upon the great white throne of judgment. Books are produced; and besides these, The Book of Life. Out of the things written in the Books, the resurrected are judged. Their works are tried by what is therein writ. What may these symbolical Books be? I imagine they signify the several Constitutions of things, under which those about to be tried, lived when on earth before; such as the Adamic, Noachic, Mosaic, Christian, and Millennial Constitutions. An antediluvian would not be tried by Millennial Law, neither would a Jew by the Law of Christ. Whoever shall be tried at this assize will be tried for his life. None of the wicked who died before Messiah's return, were raised at the First Resurrection. It was reserved to them to be raised to suffer punishment at the end of the age. But, among the number of those who live again at the Second Resurrection, will be many who shall have died after the First. Some of these, perhaps a greater number, will be righteous persons, so judged by Millennial Law. These are they whose names will be found on the pages of the Book of Life. The condign punishment of the wicked is called THE SECOND DEATH.

This Death is called the Second, because the wicked had experienced death before. Death is either natural, or punishment, or eternal with it. Natural death is both just and unjust. There have been many exceptions. The natural death of the righteous is of shorter duration than that of the alienated. The wealth of Israel. Natural death is as just a punishment, as the vitality we enjoy is the result of ingestion. "Death

thou art and unto dust thou shalt return" was the decree passed upon the common ancestor of men. A return to dust is the climax of the inheritance we have received from him. Mortality is the heirloom of his progeny. They have received from the First Man not a spark of vitality beyond the present life. They are hereditarily, necessarily, absolutely, and eternally mortal; and had, no divine interposition ensued subsequently to the decree of death, the race would have expired without a hope. Some say, we are immortal because we are men. With all deference to their "superiority," we would ask them this question—*Do men inherit immortality or death from the one man Adam?*—To maintain, that we derive immortality from Adam, appears to me, a contradiction of Holy Writ; which teaches, that death came upon all men in consequence of his transgression. And, it is argued, that as death came by the First, so Life Eternal comes by the Second Adam. But if we derived an "immortal soul" from Adam, then both death and life eternal come by him, which is a contradiction, and Jesus, the Second Head of the Human Race, is thrust out of the question altogether. As Adam is the Head of the Mortal, so Christ Jesus is the Head of the Immortal Race of Man; and, they, who have no other genealogy to adduce, than a descent from Adam, will be consigned to unending death. Eternal Death *with punishment* is consequent upon a man's own offences; death naturally eternal on the offence of another. The latter, no son of Adam to whom the terms of life have not been offered, can help the former, every one, to whom God has revealed his will, may certainly eschew.

Natural death becomes eternal without punishment to all those nations to whom God has not made known his will. They lie under the ban of the decree without a reprieve. Dust they are and to dust they return; and in the dust they for ever remain. "As by Adam all die (naturally) so also by Christ shall all be made alive" (spiritually or with spiritual, and therefore undying bodies.) Who are the all here? They are indicated in the context. "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S," when shall they be made alive? AT HIS COMING." 1 Cor. xv. 23. It is not all the descendants of Adam then, as many suppose.

The Second Death is likewise the extinction of Death and Hades i. e. men shall die and be buried no more. The Second Death with punishment is more dreadful, according to the symbols used to express it, than the human imagination can conceive. The Holy Spirit loves not wantonly to expatiate upon the miseries of man; hence, it is but concisely expressed, that all raised at the Second Resurrection, whose names were not found written in the Book of Life, were cast with their late jailors, and prison-keepers—Death and Hades—into the Lake of Fire.

A new era in human affairs now bursts forth upon the world.

of John. "And I saw," says he (ch. xxi.) "a new heaven and a new earth; for the former heaven and the former earth were passed away; and the sea was no more."

In Scripture, we read of a plurality of "heavens" and "earths," all "new" when first established, and old, or "former ones," as they are termed, when about to be removed. The phrase "new heavens and new earth" occurs three times in the Sacred Books, namely, in Isaiah c. lxxv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 13: Rev. xxi. 1. The phrase, in Isaiah and Peter, corresponds to the Millennial Constitution of things on earth. That in the Apocalypse, regards that of Isaiah and Peter as old, or a "former heaven and a former earth." That they are not identical is obvious from the circumstance, that under the "new heavens and new earth," of Isaiah, death and sin continue; whereas, under that of the Apocalypse, it is declared "Death shall be no more," and "ever, curse shall cease." In Isaiah, the constitution of human affairs under which the Jews existed he calls "the former ones" in relation to those he is about to describe. He says, that these "heavens and earths shall not be remembered, neither shall they be brought to mind any more." Thus he says to the Jews, whose present and past condition—since their last dispersion he portrays from the eleventh to the fifteenth verse inclusive.

"A new heavens and a new earth," then, is a new constitution of things upon the earth among men. The necessity of this, at the crisis we are considering, will be obvious, when it is remembered, that after The Judgment, there will be no sin, and consequently, not a man of the human family subject to death. And be it observed, that the time has now arrived, termed "the end, when Jesus shall resign the kingdom to God," by which time, "he will have abolished all government, and all authority, and power;" 1 Cor. xv. 24. This he will have done, when he shall have destroyed the rebellion at the end of the thousand years; and have extinguished Death and Hades: "for he must reign till he has put all the enemies under his feet. The last enemy Death shall be destroyed."

Why is it necessary, that Jesus should resign the kingdom? The reason is obvious. *The kingdom of Jesus is a priestly or mediatorial Institution.* A priest, or mediator, is one who stands, as a middle person, between a sinless Being, as God, and sinful creatures, as men.—"Every high priest taken from among men," says Paul, is appointed to perform for men things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts, and sacrifices for sins: being able to have a right measure of compassion, on the ignorant and erring: because he himself also is surrounded by infirmity."—Heb. v. 1. Hence, the continuance on the earth of a priestly institution where no sin would be a violation of all propriety. When death is no more, and every curse is removed, there will be no need of

and sacrifices for sins;" for then, the sin of the world will have been thoroughly extirpated. Men then, will no longer be "ignorant and erring" creatures, they will be "full of eyes," or of knowledge, and strictly obedient to the will of God. There will then be need of no "days-man" between Him and them. There was no Mediator, nor mediatorial institution, between God and Adam, before he sinned; neither will there be when all things are created new. This resignation will be no degradation to Jesus; but the rather augment his glory and consideration among the saved inhabitants of the new world. He will always, and in all things, have the pre-eminence through the endless ages of eternity.

From the fact, that the sea will disappear, it would seem, that this planet is to undergo considerable transformation at this era. The disappearance of such a huge body of water will have vast influence in the reconstitution of the air and earth. It would be a very interesting "speculation" to determine philosophically the changes of climate, fertility of soil, effect upon human life and health, &c, consequent upon there being "no more sea." Suffice it, however, to say; that the changes, resulting therefrom, will be highly pleasurable and in the strictest harmony with the then Incorruptible Constitution of Man.

Correctly speaking, the voice out of heaven, which John heard at this epoch is not a doxology, though I have placed it under that head. No one, however, who reads it can forbear to ascribe praise "to him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb," for the gracious communications it reveals. "Behold," said this great voice, "the habitation of God is with men, and he shall pitch his tent among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be among them—their God. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor grief, nor crying; nor shall there be any more pain, for the former things" (in which there were all these) "are passed away."

Thus is ushered in The Third Heaven or Eternal Age.— This is The Paradise of God, in which are The Tree and The River of the Water of Life. Of this, it was that Paul had a revelation, when *in vision* he was conveyed away to the Third Heaven. The people of this Age of enduring glory and felicity, John styles, "the bride, the Lamb's wife"—"the city, the Holy Jerusalem." It would seem that the removal of the sea, and the process of creating all things new, required the temporary abduction of the redeemed inhabitants from the earth; for John sees them, under the symbol of a city, "coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God." This new Society of Immortals is upon twelve foundations—"the Apostles of the Lamb." They are the genuine Israelitish Nation, being the descendants of Abraham, through Christ, by the

Adoption. Hence, the inlets, or gates, of their common habitation have inscribed upon them, "the names of the Twelve Tribes of the sons of Israel." Among them, there will be no earthly temple; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, who are among them, are their temple. Where Light is, and God is, light, there can be no darkness at all; hence, they will see neither sun nor moon, for the glory of the Lord, and the Lamb will give them light in their habitation.

When Paul saw in vision, the glories of this Age, he found human speech too impotent to describe them; and John can only give a faint outline by means of symbols the most glowing. He has grouped together gems, and crystals, and pure and transparent gold, and pearl, and light, and a tree ever-bearing fruit, and a river of water of life; and yet, our conceptions of the things are faint indeed. These lights of the world having failed, I will not presume any further to tell of the inestimable provisions of God's bounty in reserve for those who shall attain to a citizenship in the Eternal World. Thus much I leave with the Christian reader for his admiration and delight.

This, then, concludes the observations I have to offer, at present, on the doxologies of the Apocalypse. In these remarks upon this second series, the reader may learn the things which form the subject matter of my "materialism," as it is "deemed" "expedient" to style my views. He may term them semi-infidel speculations if he pleases; and he may devote thirty more pages of super-royal typography for the purpose of 'wiping off from the escutcheons of the present reformation,' these "new doctrine," with which I am said to be "seeking to oppress it." A writer, in a reformation paper, calls upon me to prove that I am advocating the same cause as he and other reformers like himself. This I cannot do. It is very likely, that we advocate very different causes; at least, I trust, I do not recommend the same course as he. The things I have here set forth, I doubt not, are new doctrines to a great many; all things are new to ignorance: but the ignorance of the ignorant is most conspicuous in their rejecting as new, most ancient things, because most new to them; as if their ignorance were to be the ground of every thing! There is no sin in ignorance. Ignorance is not a sin, when it refuses to be enlightened. Let all men all seek after the light; and not fall out by the way, because they may see clearer, or perhaps not so clear as another.

When religion takes up its habitation in a man, it is generally a tenant for life, and seldom travels to another man to teach his moral sentiments.

THE HARBINGER ON "MATERIALISM."

No. 2.

By education most have been misled,
So they believe, because they so were bred;
The priest continues what the nurse began,
And thus the child imposes on the man!

Some men are wise according to what is written; others are wise above what is written; others again, are not so wise in what is written as they might be; and others some, are wise in their own conceit. To which of these classes the writer of the following citation belongs, we leave our readers to determine. "My education to the contrary notwithstanding," says The Harbinger, "in my comparative boyish days I had meditated out just such a theory. Of course my theory was of easy intelligence, for I had it; but then I could never believe it, not I could, it was incomprehensible, but because it was incredible. It wanted testimony. It was a mere reverie—a waking dream—a tremble of imagination—an excursion of fancy. It gave me no trouble, and I never troubled any person with it. It lived for a few years, it died and returned to its ancestors, and there it has slept for years. When I became a man I put away childish things."

The theory to which he alludes is a phantom of his own imagination, which The Harbinger has palmed upon The Advocate. He calls it a "New Theory of Man." In this case, it is presumed, that old things have become new, for he tells us, it has been sleeping for years with its ancestors, to whom it returned after an ephemeral viviscence in his boyish imagination! What a singular coincidence, that The Harbinger and The Advocate should have stumbled upon the same incredible thing. The Constitution of Man, as revealed by God in nature and revelation, to which The Harbinger would set forth his greater, time and opportunity serving. That the Harbinger occasionally disports himself with "reveries, waking dreams," "tumbles of the imagination, and excursions of delirancy," is as true now, as in the days of his comparative boyhood. "Woe's bred in the bone," says the proverb, 'is hard to beat out of the flesh.' Of the discipline, to which the child and embryo priest is subjected, too often causes it to impose upon the man, though he may, in his waking dreams, imagine that he has "put away childish things." Were it necessary to give evidence in proof of this, it would be sufficient, to cite the "Conversion of Father Goodell's, the essays on Materialism, and a sermon of speculation, on "the Riches of Christ," in the Christian Preacher.

But the boyism of The Harbinger is as incomprehensible to us as his theory was incredible to him. A natural boy, a presbyterian boy, a clerical boy, and a Christian boy. In which of these boyhoods did The Harbinger make his incredible theory; and in which of these manhoods did he put away the things of his boyish days? If he put them away when he became a man in sectarianism, what did he do with his manly things when he became a babe or boy in Christ? If he put away the things of his Christian childhood when he became, as he supposes, a man in Christ, does he not involve himself in the guilt of having left the first principles of Christian doctrine?—But The Advocate will not press him farther on this head, supposing that the whole passage he has quoted was one of those mere reveries or waking dreams in which The Harbinger unconsciously delights.

"He," that is The Advocate, says the Harbinger, "complains of my not re-publishing almost the last volume of the Apostolic Advocate on the pages of the Harbinger. * * * This is censuring me for my kindness—for my not injuring him!—I positively affirm that I was actuated by kindness and personal esteem for him, as much as by a due regard to the edification of my readers, in not transferring his speculations to my pages,

and obtruding them on the attention of those who were comparatively uninterested, and never to be edified by them, and who in my opinion, would think more of the author the less they read of his writings."

About the beginning of the 16th century, there lived a man, whom the scriptures term "The Man of Sin," but whose name, on this page of history, is recorded as Leo X. He was considered in the estimation of his friends as "superior in age, learning, character, and general attainments" to all the world. Contemporary with him, there lived a monk, named Martin; more notorious, albeit, by the name of Luther. He was a mere "stripling" and "a very young man," in the Catholic life compared to "his Holiness;" who is said to be the great father of the faithful: Father Leo had a wonderful affection for his son Martin, who of all the sons of his mother the Church turned out to be a very naughty and unruly boy. As he grew apace, the insubordinate and rebellious Martin, had the presumption among other things equally wicked, to deny the existence of purgatory and its pains, or as protestants term it, *an intermediate state*. Father Leo, or as we would call him, Father Goodall, for he professes to be good to all, believed all these things and pleaded for them very sincerely, by opinionate assertion, perversion of scripture, and ecclesiastical authorities. These were all brought to bear upon poor Martin out of "kindness" to him; in order to preserve him from the pains of the purgatory he denied, and the worse ordeal of fire and brimstone reserved for all heretical sons, who persist in living and dying contumacious. Father Leo invited him to Rome. But Martin refused to go. Finding that all the inducements he could offer failed in bringing him thither, he determined to proscribe him as unworthy of Christian society, being almost, if not altogether, worse than an infidel. Now, Martin, had written a good many things, which Father Leo thought ought not to have been written, inasmuch as he conceived them calculated "to unsettle the minds of the brethren," who "were comparatively uninterested and never to be edified by them." Accordingly, out of great "kindness and personal esteem" for Martin, as well as out of a "due regard to the edification" of the faithful, he determined to prevent "his speculations" being "obtruded on their attention;" being also convinced in his own mind, that all good and orthodox Catholics "would think more" of son Martin and himself, "the less they read of his writings." To this end, he prohibited the reading of his books, as The Harbinger has, in effect done (most of his "dogmatical" friend The Advocate.

It will be remembered by the readers of The Harbinger, that in one of its replies to Mr. Jones of London, it styled The Advocate "a chosen vessel." Down to this period, nothing, we believe, had appeared in the Advocate, which the Harbinger calls "re-baptism" and "materialism." It was not then his opinion, that people would "think more of the author the less they read of his writings." Why was The Advocate at that time: "a chosen vessel?"—Was it, because he was thought to be the echo only of his voice that issued from Bethany, and reverberate among its hills? But it since been discovered, that man worship is no trait in his character; and that though he may respect a brother, he will obey, none, however learned or accomplished, as a master! If this be not the reason of the change in The Harbinger's opinion, we are at a loss to conceive the cause; for that "The Advocate is the same now that it was then. It is conceded that it is an independent examination of truth, and a free discussion of the why and wherefore's of scripture topics, if that examination, and discussion transcend the bounds prescribed by The Harbinger, is dogmatism, and if practiced, obnoxious to his ecclesiastical thunder."—The VIII said of the Pope and himself, "verily he hath this world in his hand, and he will give it to whomsoever he will." Be it known to The Harbinger, that if no approval of "Materialism" or "Materialism," or any other subject, and he would not lose his earned reputation and influence—and he determines to employ his pen, he must be less personal and vituperative—employ his pen, and use arguments to the point more to the point.

to argue with Satan, he would not attempt to expose his errors by calling him nicknames, as The Harbinger has The Advocate. The Advocate, as he has often said, asks no favors—he supplicates his opponents in argument for no verbal demonstrations of “kindness and personal esteem.” Let it be forgotten who the writer is; and if what he writes be ridiculous or heretical, let these properties be displayed for the benefit of the reader. But, if The Harbinger in designating The Advocate a chosen vessel, be admitted to have had the gift of discerning spirits and to have spoken truly—may not The Advocate in having written so much on “rebaptism” and “materialism,” be doing the very work his “earthen vessel” was “chosen” to do? Let the Harbinger ponder well on this singular illustration of his own vaticination!

The Advocate has and does complain heavily, that The Harbinger has not made impartial extracts from his writings. He has acted unjustly in this matter. He has made extracts to suit his own views of “expediency,” in which he seems to be an adept. It may have been “expedient” to excite a prejudice against The Advocate. The Harbinger is not ignorant of human nature, knowing its blind and weak side as well as any man. It is to this side of his readers he has addressed himself, and for whom he has made the insulated quotations from The Advocate which have appeared on his pages. But human nature has two sides, and it is to the other, or enlightened side, that The Advocate looks for justice. In all this matter The Advocate views the acts of the Harbinger as those of an Editor and writer, not as the doings of a brother. A brother, instead of selecting the faults and least defensible expressions of a brother, and revelling in them, would have thrown a veil over them, and fixed attention on things of sterner import. But the Harbinger has acted as the Editor and writer of a party and hence, as a politician his doings are now under review. His literary kindness is quite of an anomalous type! He says, that strictures on his refusal publish, is ‘censuring him for his kindness!’—Kindness is of two kinds.—There is a kindness that warms the heart and enlivens the affections; and there is a kindness that kills. The Harbinger’s attentions have tended to kill The Advocate with kindness; though happily, and thanks to the sons of liberty, who sustain him, he has as yet signally failed. Let him for the future be the subject rather of his undisguised hostility than of his killing kindness. The Advocate seeks no honor from The Harbinger, neither does he fear his frowns. He desires to cultivate all friendly relations with him, but he beseeches the Harbinger that he would be less personal, though it may be out of “kindness and esteem”—let him be less kindly magisterial and proscriptive, and more sternly to the point at issue. The Advocate asks fewer professions of friendship, and kindness of a less verbal and more practical nature.

The Advocate did not say, nor does he intend to affirm, that he is much more competent than any other person to enlighten the public, because he had been for several years a student of the mens' bodies, and had never been indoctrinated into modern and ancient theology. The Harbinger knows well that the language of The Advocate will not bear this construction. What was said, was an answer to the question, why there is so much difference between them on so many topics. The Advocate, however, would here observe that education does not enlighten the mind. Hence it is exceedingly probable that The Harbinger's mind was biased by his sectarian education. Which class of disciples learn the Christian doctrine most honestly and best—those who were formerly sectarians, or those who were infidels? It is the latter, because they have but little to unlearn, while the former are spending their precious time in unlearning the dogmas and traditions of men. Of this class, The Harbinger is himself an illustration, though much credit is assuredly due to one, who was not only a sectarian but a clergyman, for the progress he has made. Let him not be offended at a "very young man," as he sarcastically terms The Advocate, telling him this "in all faithfulness" as he phrases it—truth is truth, whether spoken by Christian or heretic, the old or young; and it is as well for great old men as for 'very young ones' to hear the truth sometimes.

The Harbinger informs his readers of a certain school with which he seems very intimately acquainted; whose 'indisputable axiomata' are

1. Popular theology is radically, essentially, and in all its parts—in every item of faith and opinion wrong, and only wrong, and that continually.

2. Popularity of character or opinion is, of all the marks of the beast, the only sure and infallible one.

To which, says he, they have appended these two infallible corollaries;—

1. Whatever is popular in theology must be abjured and exterminated by any one professing to be a Christian.

2. The contrary of each and every popular opinion is, on that account, naturally, necessarily, and eternally true.

These 'axiomata' and 'corollaries' seem to have been conceived as he once conceived a theory of man, without believing it. Surely he cannot believe that any of his readers are such simpletons as to believe all this rigmangled terminology 'axiomata' and 'corollaries.' And yet he stigmatises The Advocate as one of the disciples of this school. He does not stigmatise the school as Christians; but that of Christ's enemies. The Harbinger, called 'The School of the Disciples,' cannot indeed, endorse for the 'axiomata' and 'corollaries' broached in the sermons of said institution. He may have had something preached in the same manner.

ence, as critic in chief, before his mind when he penned these 'indisputable axiomata,' and 'corrollaries.'—all we know is that The Advocate has nothing at all to do with the concern. We shall resume hereafter.

January, 1837.

EPISTOLARY EXTRAITS.

"My readers . . . in my opinion, would think more of the author (of the Ap. Adv.) the less they read of his writings"—*an opinion of The Harb.*

The true version of this is, the less readers consult the writings of the Advocate, the less trouble they will give me in replying to "inexpedient" queries; and the more profound will be their convictions of the infallible correctness of my own speculations. The expression of such an opinion by one Editor upon the writings of another, to say the least of it, is indecent: but that the opinion of The Harbinger is not an universal opinion, the following extracts from the letters of correspondents, who read his paper as well as ours, will sufficiently testify.

Yazoo County, Mississippi, Jan. 2, 1837

Dear Brother Thomas,

Enclosed you will receive five dollars, which you will place to my credit as subscriber to your paper. I have neglected this longer than is consistent with my desire, that your paper should be sustained. I have derived much instruction from this department of your paper for the restoration of genuine christianity; and should greatly deplore the loss which this cause would sustain in the event that you should not receive sufficient encouragement to continue you in the continuance of your paper.

J. W. ANDERSON.

Gloucester County, Va.

Doctor Thomas,—Sir,

I acknowledge candidly your "materialism" is rather hard to be understood and those, who are unstable, may, like other things, wrest it unto their own destruction. As I view the doctrine, I think it, at least, harmless, and by no means merits the caustic animadversions I have both heard and read on the subject. By many things in your Advocate I have been instructed; by others entertained; and, I trust, in nothing been injured. I lead a very busy life, yet, if I can command leisure for the purpose, you shall hear from me on the subject of "Materialism." Wishing you success both as a physician and a reformer, for there is much to reform,

I subscribe myself very respectfully your friend

F. F. HIGGINS.

Dear Brother Thomas,

Some of our brethren, you are aware, are opposed to our aiding you in getting a press, but as we are not the slaves of any priest, we shall do as we believe best to restore the purity and simplicity of the gospel of Christ.

I see, Brother Campbell has received my letter, and given an unsatisfactory answer. I regret he has expressed himself unguardedly. How did he know his readers were "never to be edified by your writings?" And that they would think more of the author the less they read of them? This is undertaking to judge for other men. You must try and look over the errors of Brother C's. Your readers see them, at least many of them with us do, and hope you will take little or no notice of them: but sustain your-self by reasoning to demonstration, or by scriptural evidence. His remarks about "Plain Dealing" slanders are rather equivocal, and leads me strongly to suspect — is the author of "Plain Dealing." I wrote a severe stricture upon Plain Dealing, and dealt very plainly with him, supposing him to have been one of the factious men from ——. I have received an answer from Brother Johnson, disclaiming any knowledge of the piece or its author, and condemning the writer. He has sent my piece to——. If he does not give it a place in his Advocate, I shall stop his paper, as I cannot feel justified in condemning the Sectarian Editors for their one-sided course, and encourage a one-sided paper among us.

Yours sincerely,

We have no injunction to suppress the name of this brother from whose letter we have extracted the above. We have done it, however, from considerations we do not feel at liberty to express. We shall certainly "look over Brother C's errors" as far as a vindication of truth, justice, and scripture will permit. It is these, not we, that have suffered by his extraordinary course.

H. A. A.

Emmaus, Indiana; Jan. 1, 1837.

Dear Brother Thomas,

Judging from the notices which I have seen of you and your works, during the last year, in the M. Harbinger, I must conclude that you have been rather naughty "stripling;" but as the December number intimates that you have promised to reform, and I now find myself situated that I can take the *Apostolic Advocate*, I have concluded to order it. Please send it to me there, and when it returns I will send you "*The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness*," the Prospectus of which you may have seen.

I sent a copy to Bethany, with a letter, and a prospectus of its publication in the Harbinger between Bro. R. and Bro. H.

3 and 4 to me, on the 6th of November ultimo. My last letter to Bro. R. is dated Dec. 25th, 1836, from the copy of which, now lying before me, I give you the following extract:

—"I did hope that the numerous readers of the Harbinger, might and would be informed, that I had taken some notice of your Review, and that they, or the inquisition among them, might ascertain where to find that notice, if they could not be permitted to see it in that publication: but I am disappointed. And yet I must not complain—No, it would be ingratitude in me to complain. For, my replication, no doubt, was suppressed by you, out of pure benevolence to me—for the same reasons that Brother Campbell did not publish more from the Apostolic Advocate for Brother Thomas. You thought it would injure me to let the public see from my own pen, in my own way, what I had to offer against your six reasons of pugning the six of my discourse! As he said, you could say, "I made liberal extracts and have not, intentionally, misled any person on the whole premise." But after all Brother Thomas would have liked it better had Brother Campbell been still more liberal to him; and I am sure I would, had you published my replication to your review."

In the kingdom and patience of the Lord Jesus, yours

F. W. EMMONS.

Wattsboro, Lunenburg, Va,

Dear Brother Thomas,

We are anxious to see your work going on regularly; your subscribers in this section are very desirous to see it prosper—

Yours Affectionatly,

GIL. W. WATTS.

THE ADVOCATE

FOR THE

TESTIMONY OF GOD

AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOKS OF

NATURE AND REVELATION.

The invisible attributes of God, even his eternal power and divinity, since the creation of the world, are very evident; being known by his works.—*Paul.*

All scripture given by divine inspiration, is profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect—completely fitted for every good work.—*Paul.*

Such is the title, by which this work will be designated, on the publication of the Fourth Volume. "*The Advocate*" is

its present name, and will continue so to be. The rest of the title is expletive of the subject-matter for which it pleads. **THE TESTIMONY OF GOD.** The grand divisions of this testimony are twofold—first the evidence he has given of his Eternal Power, and Divinity in what is termed Nature; and, secondly, that which is contained in the Historical Books and the Law of Moses, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Apostolic Writings. The First, or Natural division of the Testimony of God, contains all, and infinitely more, than can be found in the Encyclopædia of human discoveries:—hence, the principles and facts, which have resulted from the observations and experiments of accurate observers, will arrest the attention of **THE ADVOCATE** from time to time. Our design in doing this, is, that the works of God may be brought to bear illustratively on his word; for, we are convinced, that nothing is better calculated to break the shackles of prejudice and superstition, than an enlightened acquaintance with the objects and “*laws* of Nature,” as God’s natural institutions are termed. The second division of the Testimony of God, relates equally to Man and the External World of Nature, only that it reveals the ultimate destiny of both; and the extraordinary arrangements, by which they are to be carried onward to that glorious result; which the inaudible, though expressive, (see ps. xix.) works of God do not.—**THE ADVOCATE** will, therefore, exercise himself to the best of his ability and judgment, in setting forth the manifold wisdom of God as inscribed on the brilliant pages of those two interesting volumes.

Many persons having regretted the smallness of our paper as it now exists, we have determined to increase the number of its pages, to meet if possible their wishes. To enable us to compass this, a few friends, well-wishers to liberty of speech and free discussion, have contributed somewhat to the purchase of a press and types; without which, indeed, from the many inconveniences by which we should have been surrounded in the country, we must necessarily have closed our editorial labors with the present volume. To these brethren, then, our readers are indebted for any gratification that may accrue to them from the continued visits of **THE ADVOCATE**.

His capacity will be increased to *thirty-six pages* of the present form. He will commence his journeys to all parts of The Union about the beginning of every month; and, that he may present as respectable an appearance at last as at first, he will be neatly enclosed in colored paper. This will enable us to give circulation to divers prospectus, which have been forwarded, and to acknowledge receipts without trespassing upon the pages of the work; two things which we have found it difficult to do under the present constitution of our affairs.

We will not say, that **The Advocate** will be cheaper than any other paper countenanced by reformers. A body of

pages, printed with gold on leaves of satin, at 25 cents, would be dear, if, upon the reading, neither our faith, knowledge, love, nor hope were aught increased. It is much instruction in a small compass, that stamps a value on a work, though its paper, types, ink, and execution be all indifferent. We aim at much in little; and trust that our present readers will deem ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, which will be the subscription fee, not too much of a charge for the volume of our fourth year.

We hope we shall be able to introduce to our readers articles from the pens of divers intelligent brethren, that shall be worthy of their perusal and profound consideration. We shall not be so anxious to tell them of the great number of proselytes making at protracted meetings, as of the progress in faith, knowledge, and purity of those who have already obeyed the truth. And this we will do, as far as our information shall extend.

We shall continue to send the Fourth Volume (which begins in May) to our present subscribers, who have not certified their wish to discontinue: supposing that the trifling increase of *fifty cents* per volume will be no obstacle to their continued patronage.

Our friends will greatly facilitate our operations by paying their subscriptions in advance; as, being in the country, it will be necessary to lay in a stock of paper for several months; and for which we must pay the cash.

✍ All letters for the Editor, to be addressed (post paid) to THE CLERK'S OFFICE, AMELIA COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Any exertion to increase the circulation of *The Advocate* will be appreciated as a grateful stimulus to redoubled efforts in the cause of gospel liberty, by

THE EDITOR.

Select Sayings and Maxims of Ancient Pagans.

We should never remember the benefits we have conferred, nor forget the favors received.—*Chilo*.

The eye strays not while under the guidance of reason.—*Publius Syrus*.

If you pursue good with labor, the labor passes away, and the good remains; but if you pursue pleasure with evil, the pleasure passes away, and the evil remains.—*Cicero*.

The judge must be condemned when he absolves the guilty.—*Publius Syrus*.

By other's vices, wise men amend their own.—*Pub. Syrus*.
Trust no secrets to a friend which, if reported, would bring infamy.—*Thales*.

It is a noble satisfaction to be ill spoken of, when we are conscious of doing right.—*Alexander, King of Macedonia*.

Printed and published by John Thomas, Amelia County, Virginia

THE
APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE
AND
PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Vol. 3. AMELIA Co. Va. FEBRUARY, 1837. No. 10

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. . . . Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION OF MAN.

And the Lord God formed Man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul.—MOSES.

This is a concise and very satisfactory account of the origin and formation of Man—the Head of the Animal Races of the Earth. The observation of nature teaches us that organized terrestrial beings, all return in process of time, to certain elementary principles. But, how could Adam, for instance, have discovered, prior to experience, that the dust of the ground or the earth, on which he trod, was the mother from whom he received his being. Such a discovery was impossible; hence it was revealed to him that he was dust;—"dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."

The Books of Nature and Revelation, then, inform us, that Man is but organized and living dust. The plastic hand of the Omniscient tempered the dust into cohesiveness and moulded it into the form of man. The creation of man is obviously divisible into two processes—first, *the organization of the dust*; and secondly, *the communication of life to the inanimate form*. This is indicated by the citation from Genesis. First, "The Lord God formed Man from the dust of the ground;" secondly, "and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and the result was, that Man became "an animal body," "a living soul," which signifies the same thing.

Among other things, it was designed, that Man should be the reflector on earth of the attributes of the Divine Being.—"And God said, let us make man in our own image and likeness;"—"So God created man in his own image."

the creation of Man, there is a wonderful illustration of the power and wisdom of God. What rational being can but admire the admirable ingenuity of the Creator, in constructing from the dust a reflector of his attributes! From the dust, he has created a *brain* to design and a *hand* to execute! From the dust, he has created a being capable of developing and of imitating what its own creator is, and what he has made!—This is certainly a reflector of exquisite powers!

It belongs to the science of Anatomy to unfold the wonders of which the organized dust of man is composed; and it is the property of Physiology and Phrenology to display the *uses* of its several constituents. He who knows most of these sciences, knows most of the constitution and true theory of man—a constitution, indeed, to which the external world of nature and revelation is admirably adapted.

But, it is not my intention, in this place, to go into minute anatomical, physiological, or phrenological *details*, it may be sufficient here to observe, that the systems or organs, composing the constitution of man, are an assemblage of arteries, veins, absorbents, nerves, &c., and a connecting tissue *peculiar* to each organ. All these, with the blood contained in its vessels, may be decomposed, and resolved into four invisible "spirits" or gases, namely, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon; leaving only a residuum,—ashes, earth, or dust, by which hardness is imparted to the bones. I say, that the vessels, &c., are connected by tissues peculiar to the individual organs through which they are distributed. In this, contrivance is manifested; for, had all the organs been composed of a uniform tissue, they would have been uniform in structure, and therefore uniform in their operations; that is, had the substance of the liver been the same as that of the brain, man would have reasoned with his liver as he now does with his brain; or had the brain been composed of a like substance with the liver, then bile would have been secreted from the vessels of the brain as it is now from those of the liver. The law imposed upon all organized dust, whether of man the superior, or of beasts the inferior of the animal races of the earth, is, that wherever different results are designed, the organs by which those results are produced, must differ in structure, each being peculiar to itself. Most of the organs of man are factories or laboratories within themselves; in which *the blood*, which is the raw material of the system, is subjected to different processes according to the divers products to be obtained. The brain, the eye, the ear, the heart, and the lungs are the exceptions to this; nevertheless, without the stimulus of living blood, and the repair of their own waste from that fluid, they could not continue their several labors. Thus, for the brain to think, the eye to see, the ear to hear, the heart to beat and the lungs to breathe, a due quantity of arterial, or living blood, neither too much nor too

little, must be freely circulated through their structures. The brain does not secrete thought from the blood, though without blood, objects may be presented to the eye, and sounds to the ear, but the brain remains as unimpressed as Adam's, before God breathed into his lungs through his nostrils the breath of life. The brain secretes thought, if I may so express myself, by the faculty it possesses of comparing the images or ideas conveyed to it through the five senses from the external world. What a wonderful organ is the brain; and how admirable the Creator who organized the dust of the ground so exquisitely as to enable it to perceive, compare, judge, and discriminate, and to enjoy the beauties of the surrounding universe.

Without "spirit" the blood is dead to all the purposes for which it was designed. This spirit is the air breathed by animals. No terrestrial organized being having lungs, can live without the atmospheric air; hence it is called "the breath of life" or "the vital air." This air so important to life of every kind, was constituted by the Creator before he made the animal races. This was the work of the second day. "And God said let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." These waters were the Clouds above and the Seas below. And it was so—and God called the firmament (or atmosphere) Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day."—Had Moses told us that animal and vegetable life were brought into being before the air or heaven was made, we should have doubted very much the accuracy of his relation; but, he is perfectly philosophical in his story—entirely in accordance with nature, and therefore worthy of all belief. He tells us in effect that the Lord God made the air, the seas and the dry land and clothed it with verdure as food for animals, and then created living creatures capable of living therein with comfort and delight.

The "Spirit" by which man lives is remarkably simple in its constitution. It is compound, that is, it is composed of two simple "spirits" æthers, airs, or gases. These are termed *oxygen* and *nitrogen* or *azote*. It is conjectured that even these *simple* airs, as they are called, may be solids as to their base, though gaseous by virtue of their being combined with caloric, whose property is to give fluidity to solid matter. Oxygen and Azote are as opposite in their attributes as the poles of the earth. The one sustains life while the other extinguishes it instantaneously; hence, its name *azote*—the extinguisher of life. Oxygen, though eminently a supporter of life, is naturally exciting, that were the animals of the earth to breathe pure or unmixed, their lives would be a burning fever of short duration, because quickly fatal. Were the firmament nothing but unmixed oxygen, and all the animals were to remain as they are, a spark would kindle a fire.

eral conflagration that would consume in a very short time, the vegetable and animal races, and melt the solid rocks themselves. But it is "in God we live;" and he has providently adjusted and maintained the air, or heaven, he has formed, in such felicitous and safe proportions, that we can burn our fires, and breathe "the breath of life" without the fear of such a terrible event. But, suppose, the firmament were to become unmixed azote, what then would be the consequence? A gloom profound would pervade the universal earth. All life would cease to be. Death over all would reign.

Well, of these two dissimilar agents did the Lord God constitute the firmament, atmospheric air, or heaven on the second day. He mixed them, as chemists would say, "mechanically;" that is, he did not unite them chemically, or they would have become a firmament of nitrous acid vapour; which would have been equally destructive to life with simple azote.

Having ascertained the composition of "the breath of life" or "spirit" by which man lives; let us next inquire *how* he is sustained by it; in other words, *how the air becomes life to him*. In order to do this satisfactorily, we must premise a few things on the respiratory and circulatory systems or organs, and on the blood which flows through them.

Physiology divides the blood into arterial or scarlet, and venous or purple. All blood is purple before it becomes scarlet. The purple blood is called venous chiefly because it is peculiar to the veins; and the scarlet is termed arterial, because it is contained alone in the arteries one instance only excepted. In relation to the purpose of sustaining life, there is as much difference between these two kinds of blood, as there is between the oxygen and azote of the air. The scarlet blood is eminently a supporter of life; the purple an extinguisher thereof. Were nothing to circulate through the arteries and veins but scarlet blood, life would become a short lived fever; and, on the contrary, were purple the only blood of the system, man would soon die in a state of stupor.

Now to obviate either of these catastrophies, the dust of the ground was originally so formed as to bring all the blood of the bodies of men and animals, into mediate communication with the air of heaven. Hence a *heart* and *lungs* were organized. The heart which is seated towards the left breast, and attached by its vessels to the back-bone, is an organ consisting of four chambers or cavities—two large and two small. From the two large cavities, two large tubes, called the aorta and pulmonary artery, issue forth—the aorta as the root of all the arteries, and the pulmonary tube, to the lungs, as its name pulmonary implies. From the capillary, or hair-like, extremities of the arteries the *veins* arise. These, after passing through the several organs of the body, all terminate in two large venous trunks, or tubes, called the superior and inferior subclavian veins. The

superior is so called because it conveys the blood from the head, neck, upper extremities, and superior region of the chest, and under *clavicula* the clavicle or collar bone to the right *small* cavity or auricle of the heart. The other is called *inferior*, because it brings the blood of the trunk and lower extremities to the same cavity.

The pulmonary artery, which issues from the right large ventricle or hollow of the heart, is distributed by an immense number of branches to the lungs. These branches at their terminations are fine as hairs. They terminate on the air vesicles, or little bladders, of the lungs. Here they become the origin of the pulmonary veins, which, retracing their course, terminate by four considerable tubes in the left small cavity, or auricle of the heart.

The *lungs* are two spongy, cellular, expansible organs, destined to produce changes upon the air and blood which penetrate into them, on which is essentially founded the act of respiration or of breathing. Their organization is made up essentially of prolongations and successive branchings of the two tubes, or bronchi, into which the wind-pipe is divided, and the arteries and veins, which adhere together in all their divisions, and are sustained by a very fine cellular tissue, or tissue full of little cells so as to constitute a series of little clusters, which are covered and united by membranes, and interspersed with nerves, vessels, and lymphatic ganglia. The air tubes begin with the windpipe and end in thousands of little membranous bubbles, termed vesicles, upon which the blood-vessels spread themselves. So much for the anatomy of the organs of the chest for sustaining the life of man. We proceed now to a concise view of their physiology or *use*.

The blood, which was also formed from the dust of the ground, was already prepared, for the life-giving breath of heaven to start it in its circulatory career through the newly-created organization of man. The first dilation of the human heart received the first current of arterial or living blood from the lungs by means of the four pulmonary tubes; and the first systole, or contractile beat, impelled it through the Aorta to the remotest parts of his organization. In performing the purposes for which it was distributed, it had now become changed in color from scarlet to purple, and became loaded with deleterious carbon. To purify it from this noxious gas, it was returned from all parts of his body to the right small cavity of the heart by the two great subclavian tubes. From hence, it passed by the inferior vena cava into the right-large cavity; where, through the pulmonary artery, it was distributed to the surfaces of the air tubes in the lungs. Now, mark the changes that take place here. We have brought the black or deep-purple blood, which had been in communication with the breath-air, or spirit of the atmosphere, into communication with the breath-air, or spirit of the atmosphere. Here are blood loaded with carbon.

azote to operate upon. By the expansion of the lungs, *which is caused by the air breathing through the nostrils into their cavities*, they become filled with vital air or "the breath of life." By a chemical process, the carbon of the blood unites with the oxygen of the air, forming carbonic acid gas; this is proved by respiring through a tube into a glass of lime water, which causes a precipitate of carbonate of lime or chalk, formed by the union of the carbonic acid from the lungs with the lime of the water, to be thrown down. The effect of this new combination is, the vitalization, and augmentation of the warmth by two degrees; of the blood, or the changing of it from deep purple to scarlet; and the disturbance of the proportions previously existing between the oxygen and azote of the air inspired. Instead of containing pure atmospheric air within their tubes, the lungs are charged with a vaporous and noxious breath, composed of water, carbonic acid gas, azote and but very little of the oxygen or life giving principle of the atmosphere. This stimulates the lungs to contract so as to expel these offensive and life destroying principles. This contraction is called respiration, which signifies to breathe out what has been previously inhaled; after this is done, the lungs then take in another supply for the same purpose as before.

The blood being now rendered fit to sustain life it is returned to the left small cavity of the heart by the four pulmonary veins. This cavity contracting, propels it through an opening provided in the left large hollow or ventricle. From hence it is forced through the Aorta, by whose ramifications it is distributed to all parts of the system as before.

Now observation teaches, that without scarlet or living blood and the oxygen, or life-giving principle of the air, man and animals cannot live under the present Constitution of the External World—or Nature. Oxygenated blood and oxygen, are a *sine qua non* to animal life.—"The body without the spirit," says James, "is dead."—That is, the body deprived of "the breath of life"—or oxygen of the air, cannot exist. No, it is as impossible, as for fish to swim without fluid. *The organic functions of man, so exquisitely designed and perfected by the Creator, have become the basis of language with respect to man in particular, and mankind in general.* All forms of speech expressive of ideas concerning him, are founded on the organization of his dust, and the actions chiefly essential to its existence. The roots of all words relating to him, derive their vitality or expressiveness, from the things most immediately necessary to the vivescence of his constitution. I say, the roots, or primary import, of phrases and terms concerning man are to be found there. I do not, nor did I ever, say, these words or terms had but one or two significations, which were invariable. The meaning of words founded on the constitution or organization of man, are manifold and to be

precisely determined only by the contexts to which they may stand related. How wilful the misrepresentation to affirm and publish to the world, that I restrict the signification of "soul" and "spirit" to blood, breath, and disposition.—I say, that the roots, or primary and incontextual import of these words, is blood and breath; but that they have other meanings according to the context of the passages where they are used, I have said generally, on another occasion, *that the signification of words is to be determined by the context without exception.* What injustice then has The Harbinger done me, in restricting my definitions: for no other reason, that I can divine, but just to suit his own views of "expediency."

By the light of the truths, here set forth, and legibly recorded in the anatomical, physiological, and chemical chapters of the Book of Nature, we are prepared to consider, secondly, how God "breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life."

All things that exist God made; hence all their operations are His doings. God made the ocean and the wind; if now, the latter becomes stormy, and causes the ocean waves to collect in mountain masses, which, by bursting over a fragile bark, send it to the bottom: it is God who wrecks the ship, because it is done according to the constitution of the natural world, which he originally constituted and made. "This may assist our conceptions of the text by way of illustration.

Vacua, or cavities containing no air, may be made, contrary to the supposition of the vain philosophy of the ancient world. A vacuum does exist in the lungs of every infant before its birth. Its lungs, however, are in a state of collapse or contraction, never having been distended. Now it is the property of the atmospheric air to fill all hollows or cavities; and, if the sides of the receiver of an air-pump, for instance, in an exhausted state, or having a vacuum or no air under it, be not strong, the superincumbent weight of air will crush it with a loud report. The reason of this is, that there is no air under the glass to resist the pressure of the air without. The air presses upon all bodies on the surface of the earth upon a level with the sea, with a pressure of 14 and a half pounds to every square foot of surface. The pressure of the atmosphere upon the body of a middle sized human being (reckoning its surface equal to 12 square feet) is 25,056 pounds, or upwards of eleven tons. Suppose then, that the surface of the adult lungs be equal to one twelfth of the superficies of the body, the pressure of the air upon them, when distended, would be equal to 2089 pounds. Now, if we assume, that the lungs of an infant have one twelfth the square of an adult's, then the air will press upon them with force equal to 174 pounds. Every child is born with its blood in its vessels, which it has derived from its mother. It is therefore, fully prepared the instant it be born, to receive the "breath of life" for the continuance of its existence.

form. As soon as its head is born, and before the sides of the chest can dilate owing to the constriction with which it is bound, the collapsed lungs yield unresistingly to the pressure of the air, which for the first time rushes through its nostrils into the air cells of the lungs, and so comes into mediate communication with the blood. All this is in accordance with the institutions of nature, and therefore, God does it. There is not a child, or animal of any kind, torn into the world, but God "breathes into its nostrils the breath of life," precisely in the same way that he breathed into the nostrils of the first man. The answer to the question, then,—how did God breathe into Adam the breath of life, is—by the pressure of the atmosphere, which passed through his nostrils, and distended his lungs. And what was the consequence of this inflation?—"Man became a living soul."

We have already observed that the phrases "animal body" and "living soul," signify the same thing. This will appear from Paul's reasoning in the fifth of the first of Corinthians. His proposition in verse 45 is this—"there is an animal body, and a spiritual body." This he undertakes to prove by an appeal to what is written:—"For," says he, "thus it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul—the last Adam, a vivifying spirit," v. 46. It is obvious then, that the Apostle considered the phrase "living soul" as the same thing with "animal body;" and "vivifying spirit" as of the same signification with "spiritual body"—if this is denied, then, the "thus it is written" adduced by Paul is no proof at all. This passage then in Genesis would read in the language of the New Testament, if not in that of The Harbinger,— "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became an animal body." The "living soul" the Apostle terms "earthly," "flesh and blood," "corruption," "mortal body," "corruptible body;" he compares it to "naked grain," which when sown "dies," but does not always "perish." The death of the "living soul" (I mean the "living soul" of Holy Writ, not the "living soul" of Scotch Divinity and Pagan Philosophy)—Paul terms a 'sowing in corruption,' 'a sowing in dishonor,' 'a sowing in weakness'—all which are attributes of the living soul or animal body he is discoursing about.

Before I understood the Constitution of Man, as revealed in the scriptures, I had views very different from what are set forth in this article. About seven years ago an essay on "The Materiality of the Mind, the Immateriality of the Soul, and the Vital Principle" appeared in the London Lancet from the pen of a Mr. Dermott, professor of Anatomy in that city. He supposed, that the brain was one and the same thing as the mind, that it is common to all animals only more perfectly developed in man than in the lower animals; and that the only essential difference between them and man, is, that man has attached to

his existence" a principle termed "the soul," which is unconscious during this life, but starts into consciousness at death and thus becomes the continuation of the same individual existence.

These doctrines, I conceived to be at variance with revelation, I determined, therefore, albeit blinded as I was by the darkness of a world lying under the wicked one, to controvert these unsustainable traditions. Accordingly I wrote an essay "on the Immateriality of the Mind and its identity with the Vital Principle; and on the Constitution of the Soul." This was inserted in *The Lancet*. I have the satisfaction in recurring to what I then wrote to find, that, although I could not now sustain the theory I published in that periodical, yet I have the testimony of Mr. Dermott himself, in his replication to me—that, unlike a certain "Christian Divine of the Church of England" who also opposed his theory, I had combined with my reasonings, a quality highly necessary in fair and unalloyed argument—*TOLERATION*;" which I am sorry to testify has not been extended towards me by some of those who style me brother.

I then thought, that the mind and vital principle were one and the same thing; that these in man differed from those in the brutes; so that the first I called the Immortal Human Principle, and the latter, the perishable Brute Principle; that this Human Principle could not exist separate from Deity, unclothed by, or independent of, matter; that it was not the soul, but a constituent of what would hereafter form an incorrupt and immortal soul; that this vital spirit was to be the quickening spirit of a new and glorious body after death; that the soul was the incorruptible and spiritual body discoursed of by Paul—an immortal creature, endowed with the properties of matter, imimitably beautiful, and the perfection of the Creators works. I supposed, that the cause of the difference between the mind of animals and that of man, was the two dissimilar sources from which they were derived, and not the difference of organization alone, as Mr. Dermott imagined. In proof of this I referred to Moses' account of the formation of the lower animals and man, and laid much stress upon the very text we have been illustrating throughout. I said, that the mind of man must be immortal, because God breathed it into him at his creation—that it was, as the Pagans, supposed, "divine particles"—*a particle of his divine essence*. I vainly conceived that Adam was a part of the Deity embodied in a pure and unblemished receptacle; that, after the Fall, man was the spirit of God in an impure casket; and that the spirit of man was the like particle re-embodied in purity at the resurrection. I was then "the speculations and untought observations of my comparatively boyish days," but since I have seen the world, man, though but "a very young man," has

away childish things." I erred, not knowing the scriptures. I have since studied them closely, and they, aided by the lights of nature, have taught me the true Constitution of Man, of the External World; and of the ultimate destiny of both.

Thus, I have illustrated in as familiar a manner as the subject will admit of, the origin and formation of Man, as revealed in the Books of Nature and Revelation, which always go hand in hand. I have among my readers several who have made the sciences referred to in this paper their especial study. I appeal to them, whether the principles and facts stated, are not correct. A mere "theologian" is not a judge in this matter; for these persons rarely know more of nature or of man, whose moral infirmities they undertake to cure, than they can pick from the dry bones of an attenuated and gasping divinity. It was to be characteristic of the latter day, that many were to run to and fro, and knowledge was to be increased—a knowledge of God and of his institutions, whether of nature or revelation. Look, then, O Christian Reader, into the things around you. See how men of the world are devoted to the study of the works of God; and behold what astonishing progress they are making in the discovery of the laws and principles by which he rules the world, and upon which he has based its foundations. And will you be content to remain in ignorance of his marvellous doings? The ancient world might have eschewed idolatry had they but regarded the evidence of a Great First Cause, which the heaven, and the earth, and the sea afford. Will you fold your arms in indolence, and be content to echo the presumptuous veto of others upon every thing new to them and you, as "a speculation" "an untaught question?" How are you to add to your faith knowledge, if you refuse to inquire into things you have not known before. If others chose to be ignorant still; if they chose to dwell among the sepulchres; to wallow in the mire of the divinity of the dark ages; to waste their energies upon the theories of Pagan mysteries; and for ever to rest among the first principles, the a, b, c, of the doctrine of Christ—they have an undoubted right to do so; but do you not follow their example. "Leave the first principles" but do not forget them, "and let us go on towards maturity." Let us not be hovering, without advance, about the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and the breaking of the loaf on the First Day of the Week; contend indeed earnestly, unflinchingly, and without compromise for these things, but forget you not the glories which were and are yet to follow the sufferings of Christ. I fear we all of us are somewhat like the Hebrews—"dull of apprehension. For when by this time we ought to be teachers, we have need of some one to teach us again the first elements of the oracles of God; and have become such as need milk, rather than solid food. Now every one that uses milk, is unskilled in the word

of righteousness, for he is a babe, but solid food is for those of mature age, whose faculties have been habituated by long practice to discriminate both good and evil."

Now, do not reject the interpretation I have given you of the passage at the head of this article, because it has never been so explained before. If you can give a better and more convincing exposition of it, do; send it me, and I will publish it for the benefit of your fellow readers. If you cannot, and are yet not satisfied of its correctness, let me know your objections, and they shall be duly considered. Do not be so simple as to reject it because some one may call it "materialism;" let them call it what ism they please, their so doing will not make it false if true, or wrong if right. Do you look at *things*. A rose will smell as sweet by whatever *name* it may be called. Call it "materialism" if you please—matter is the substratum of all God's institutions from the beginning to the end of the Bible. Man is material; the earth is material; and it is man and the earth, that God designs to carry on to perfection. Can God not make a perfect man and a perfect earth for him to dwell on? He can. Can he not do it out of the *materials* already in being? He can. Man is not yet perfect nor yet the earth. But God declares they shall both be renovated—"Behold," says he, "I create all (terrestrial) things new;" and this grand conception he will effectuate, when "the sea," and death shall be no more."

EDITHA.

QUERIES.

1. Ought the Elders, or disciples to suffer any man, who has been charged with telling falsehoods, and defrauding his neighbour out of his property to partake of the loaf and cup, after being cited before the Elders, and did not appear when the witnesses were present and then came among them when the witnesses, and some of the Elders were absent, and wished to partake of the loaf with them, when they have the evidence from the witnesses in writing that he is guilty?—Would you break the loaf with a man of such a character under such circumstances if you knew it, he being a public speaker.

2. Is there any authority from the word of God to prohibit any man known to be in disorder from partaking of the loaf and cup before he is excluded, for the want of the witnesses' attendance or any other unavoidable cause of his not having a trial?

Please give the above a place in *The Advocate*, and your views on scripture evidence, as may be best calculated to do good to the congregation.

King and Queen, Va. }
Jan. 12, 1837, }

Answers.

In answer to the first question, we would object to the man partaking of the loaf and cup, if he had not such conduct on the part of the accused, as to appear before the Elders, the witnesses, and the congregation at large, and

think, a rebuke before all. One would suppose that, if innocent, nothing but sickness would prevent a man, from seizing the opportunity of attending such a summons by which he would have an occasion of clearing his character from such imputations. His absence, if no valid excuse can be adduced, was a setting at nought the authority of Christ, by refusing to submit himself to them who had the rule over him in the Lord. This is a great, though we regret to say it, a very common sin among those who profess the faith of Christ. Now Paul says, "those who sin, rebuke before all, that others also may be afraid."—We say then, that whether guilty or not of the specific charge, he deserves a sharp rebuke before the congregation, that he may become healthy in the faith, and as a warning to others not to do the same thing.

If two or three competent and credible witnesses had fully established his guilt in the estimation of the Eldership, who it is presumed had acted towards him according to Matt. xviii, his neglecting to appear before them could not scripturally interrupt the course of the Law, or of Justice. It was for them to have carried the matter before the congregation, and to have ascertained if he had then, and there likewise absented himself. Having done this, they should have laid the case before the assembly, with *the evidence*, which would convince the brethren of his guilt. By his inexcusable absence, he refuses to hear the congregation, and, in effect, acknowledges his offences, without contrition. The Eldership should then carry into effect the sentence of Christ, and separate him from the congregation as "a heathen man and a publican." Had this been done he could not have had the effrontery, nor would the faithful brethren have permitted him, to partake of the symbols of Christ, whose authority he had despised.

We apprehend, there can be no question as to the propriety of excluding such a criminal from the Body of Christ. A liar and a thief—repentant of both offences, is declared by the scriptures unfit for the Kingdom of God—"You injure and defraud; and that, too, your brethren." Do you not know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God?" 1 Cor. vi. 8-10—"But as for all liars—their part shall be in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." 2. v. xv. 8.

If the Elders had not taken the proper steps, as above recited, I should be compelled by their error, to "break the loaf with a man of such character;" though I knew him to be such, and "a public speaker" too. Shall I because such a man has eluded the law by their omission, refuse to break bread with them and the rest of the disciples? For on refusing to break the loaf with the criminal I entirely exclude myself from the honor and privilege of showing forth the sufferings of Christ. But on the contrary, if the Elders and congregation refuse to exclude him, though manifestly guilty, they themselves become partakers in his guilt. Under these circumstances, the sooner the true disciples come out of such a Babylon the better. The individual described ought not to be suffered to join in the spiritual exercises of a holy and royal priesthood.

In answer to the second query, I conceive, that the faithful are under the painful necessity of fellowshipping the disorderly, until the Rulers of the congregation shall adopt the *lawful* means of relieving them from the embarrassment by putting the disorderly out of the fellowship or community, according to law. In this view of the case, I am unacquainted with the authority sought for.

EDITOR.

A certain writer says—"As all mankind live in masquerade, whoever presumes to come among them barefaced, must expect to be abused by the whole assembly."

THE HARBINGER ON "MATERIALISM"

No. 3.

"The wages of sin, is death; but the gracious gift of God, is life by Christ Jesus our Lord."—Paul.

Notwithstanding all that has been said and done by The Harbinger in relation to "Anabaptism" and "Materialism," he has presented us to his readers, and handed us down his *Confession of Fidelity*, under phases the most ridiculous, forbidding, and absurd; yea, though he has proscribed us and our writings—yet will we not forget, that it is a brother who gives life to The Harbinger; that brethren are bound by a royal law "to love one another, not in word only, but in deed and in truth;" and that, as love covers a multitude of sins, an obligation rests upon us, in view of all these considerations, to return good for evil; and to mantle with the cloak of charity, as many of the peccadilloes of our friend and brother as may comport with the interests of the truth, equally revered, though not equally understood, by all.

We shall, therefore, pass over a number of things contained in the Conversations and Essays, which if true would cause us much regret. To comment upon them would only be to scarify the feelings of a brother. This we have no wish to do. We shall therefore, leave them in that oblivion which they so richly deserve. We will demonstrate our "kindness and personal esteem" for our brother, not by amplifying protestations, but by action, in passing over his most vulnerable points. The opinions of some persons are said to be a part of themselves; lest this should be the case with our friend, we will not be too severe upon them, lest he should mistake us, and deem our disaffection to them as want of esteem for him. As for us, we esteem self far more than the opinions of self. We are ready to divorce all our opinions if it shall appear that they have been playing the harlot with the Man of Sin. We want to know, believe, and maintain the truth, the *whole* truth, and nothing but the truth; even if it should place us in opposition to the opinion of the whole church and world.

We wish our readers, if they can, to discriminate between the opposition of The Advocate and The Harbinger to one another, and a misunderstanding between Alexander Campbell and John Thomas. The opposition between The Advocate and The Harbinger is a conflict between two different views of what is the truth in relation to certain matters, and J. T.—, as far as we know, are as good friends as ever, and intend to continue so. They spar a bit occasionally, then, it is only as Editors, and all in good humor. We advise the readers of both papers to pay no attention to what is said than to who the persons are that say it; and to be nothing who tells the truth so that the truth may be known, signify who originates an error. Let us not quarrel with

ble, or respectable, because it may issue from the brain of an accomplished man. Error is error, by whomsoever broached, and, as such, has no claims on the reverence, or forbearance of the inquirers after the truth. This doubtless is our friend's view, only he has made a mistake in attacking the reputation of a brother instead of his alleged heretical speculations. Having premised these few things, we shall permit The Advocate and The Harbinger to resume their encounter.

The Harbinger observes—"I think all his (the Advocate's) reasonings on other points of the theory of the human system, and of the intermediate state, which he has imbibed, just as defenceless as the translation of Moses. But unless he gives up this point, I would never reason with him on another, for this alone subverts his theory; and if he will resist this, he will resist any fact or proof which you can allege."—p. 411, Vol. 7.

As to the case of Moses, The Advocate rejoins, that, if he admitted that there was nothing uncommon in the death of Moses, that in fact, he died and was buried like other men, still not a shadow of proof is derived from the admission of his unfigurative death and burial, to show that it was not Moses, but only his ghost that appeared on the Mount of Transfiguration. God might have raised Moses from the dead without any prejudice to the pre-eminence of Jesus as "the first-born," or "first of a resurrection from the dead." Numerically considered, Jesus was not the *first*, who rose from the dead. In eminence, he was the first or *chief*. The first of a resurrection is the Chief; and that Chief is Jesus the Captain of our Salvation.

The Advocate prefers the testimony of scripture to that of Josephus, the Rabbins, or the Harbinger; and he would rather interpret the testimony of Moses by that of the New Testament, than by the opinion of them all conjoined. Had the New Testament said nothing about Moses, he would have had no difficulty as to his case as it stands in Deuteronomy. He would then say with The Harbinger, that there was nothing uncommon in the death and burial of the Mediator of the Jewish Economy. If he should agree to this, and The Advocate is not tenacious of the point, having evidence enough without it, it is nevertheless his opinion that he was substantially translated from earth to the heavens. He may have died, been buried, preserved from corruption, raised from the dead, and translated. The Harbinger is dissatisfied with The Advocate's interpretation of the passage, in Jude. He has ridiculed and misrepresented his exposition both of this and that in Deuteronomy. Ridicule is no argument, and misrepresentation is discreditable; but let these pass with this word—if The Harbinger can give a better and more satisfactory one let him do it, The Advocate would delight to know what is meant in Jude.

Remember Mr. Harbinger you have said, that it was the spirit of Moses and not his glorified body that was seen on Calvary. Now this is purely a "speculation," a "waking dream," intruded by you on the attention of your readers; why have you affirmed what is not written, while you taunt others so much for doing the same thing. The Harbinger says, he is certain it was not the glorified body of Moses that was seen, because his apparition was anterior to the death, resurrection and glorification of Jesus. Now will the Harbinger affirm that there were no glorified human bodies before the glorification of Jesus? He cannot; for Enoch and Elijah stare him out of countenance and if two mortals might be glorified before Jesus was glorified and that, too, without detriment to Him as "The Resurrection and the Life," why may not a third—and that third be Moses?

The Harbinger greatly demurs to The Advocate having denominated the sects of Christendom, in the aggregate, The Synagogue of Satan. This he considers shockingly uncharitable. The reader may refer to p. 408 of the Harbinger for the many notes of astonishment on this subject. We would here observe that The Harbinger manifests much unscriptural sympathy for Protestantism. Protestantism has been useful in shaking the Kingdom of the Beast; and so has Sectarianism in breaking up Protestantism. Nevertheless, Protestantism is but a grand section of the Apostacy—one of the Horns of the Two-Horned Beast of the Apocalypse. "I stand here," says The Harbinger, "as the defendant of Protestantism, and not as the assailant of Catholicism. I wish to exonerate myself from such an imputation." Christ. Preach. p. 43, Vol. 2. Well may the Harbinger be indignant at The Advocate terming Protestantism, as a whole, The Synagogue of Satan! Much, very much, do we regret the attitude assumed by The Harbinger before the citizens of Cincinnati. The defender of Protestantism! We would that he had maintained consistency with the word of God and stood forth as the defender of the Christian Religion against the Ecclesiastical Beast and its Romish and Protestant Horns. Why so anxious to exonerate himself from the imputation of being the assailant of Catholicism? Would that he had assailed both it and all its apostate progeny. He might not have been so popular with the clerical sons of Anti-Christ in "the Queen of the West," though he would have added another leaf to his laurel crown.

The Harbinger asks The Advocate (p. 401) to explain chemically and philosophically how *breath* can be a third part of man. "Is the air inhaled a third part (constituent) of man?" In answer to this request we refer The Harbinger to the article in the present number on the Origin of the Human Body of Man. He will there find much to correct his own notions, he has published on what he terms the *Origin of the New Theory of Man*.

The Harbinger p. 226, has made a wonderful discovery, which it would be quite unseemly for the reader to term a speculation or untaught question. He has discovered, that Jesus rose with the same body that was put to death, namely, an animal, and consequently a mortal body, and that it was not changed into a spiritual body until the instant of his ascension. Let the reader peruse for himself the reasoning by which he arrives at this inference. Suffice it to say, that the discovery is entirely at variance with the doctrine taught by Paul in Cor. xv. 44—It is sown in corruption—it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour—it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness—it is raised in power: *it is sown an animal body—it is raised a spiritual body*:—no, no saith The Harbinger, the body of Jesus was sown an animal body, it was raised an animal body, and after forty days changed into a spiritual body at the instant of its ascension; and all this that it might be the model of the raised dead, and the changed living. Although, reader, this is not taught in the scriptures, you must not call it untaught, or speculative, for the Harbinger says it is so, and that ought to be enough for you! Though it denies the doctrine of the Apostle, you must not deem it anti apostolic, for The Harbinger saith, “theory apart, it does appear most reasonable and compatible with all that is written, that the Saviour rose in the same (“animal”) body in which he died.” p. 227. But lest we should have mistaken him read thou for thyself the whole lucubration, as it is written in the Conversation at Goodal’s pp. 224 227.

It would be an interminable business to follow The Harbinger in all the sophistical details of his Conversations and Essays. We have neither the time nor inclination (for we are weary of perusing his unphilosophical and unscriptural tortuosities) to take them up seriatim. The plan we shall pursue after one more article, which will be devoted to his misinterpretations of certain scripture passages, will be to write at our leisure, essays on the Origin and Constitution of Human Speech; the case of the Thief on the Cross; conclude that of Lazarus; the Mental Constitution of Man; the relation of the Earth and its inhabitants to the Eternal Age; Death. Eternal Life, &c., &c.—which will afford us abundant opportunity of disabusing the public of erroneous statements which it has been thought expedient to circulate abundantly, concerning ourselves and our views of truth. Many of The Harbinger’s mis-statements will be found corrected, without expressly naming them, in our observations on the first and second series of the Doxologies of the Revelation; as well as in the first article of this number. We shall pursue the even tenor of our way in effectuating our grand design, which is, *The Development of the Hope set before us in The Gospel of Christ*. We shall take but slight and passing notice of any personalities,

that may hereafter be vented at us. Respectable arguments will fairly claim attention. The Hope of the Gospel of Christ will necessarily come into sharp collision with the Hope of the Gospel of Antichrist; which is but another name for the abstractions and idealities of a mystic Protestantism: and in which The Harbinger has publicly avowed himself The Defendant. We are equally opposed to Protestantism and to Romanism. Of two sore evils Protestantism is the least, but they are both inimical, and hostile to the Ancient Gospel set forth by the Apostles in the primitive age; and as such may expect to be assailed, when necessary, without giving or demanding quarter. We shall take Romanism, Protestantism, and Sectarianism under review at some future period. For the present we bid them all adieu with their friends, champions, and disciples.

EDITOR.

(Re-published by request from "the Gospel Advocate.")

PLAIN DEALING.

The following letter is inserted with pleasure. We say with pleasure because it acquits brother Thomas of some very serious charges, which would have given us pain to have accredited. The piece having been published before I became connected with the Advocate, I have no means of ascertaining the author. One of the *then* editors, it will be seen, disclaims all knowledge of it, and the other is absent; it must therefore remain in *statu quo* until his return. Brother Thomas' remarks will appear in our next. They would have appeared in this, but the No. which contained them only reached us a few days ago.

Versailles, Nov. 30, 1836.

W. HUNTER.

Brother Hunter:—I enclose you the letter of brother Henly for publication. I approve of his remarks in reference to Plain Dealing, as well as the remarks of brother Thomas in the Advocate, which I hope you will likewise publish.

I desire to remark further, that I know nothing of the piece signed Plain Dealing until I read it in the Gospel Advocate. I never would have consented to such a publication. I do not know the author, and therefore cannot give his name. Be pleased to publish this with the other pieces.

Yours, truly,

J. T. JOHNSON.

17th Nov. 1836.

Walkerton, Va. Oct. 28th, 1836.

Brethren Johnson and Hall:—In your Advocate for August last, I have just read, as it recently came to hand, a piece signed "Plain Dealing." The caption and contents, I must be allowed to say, are false; and I am surprised that you should permit an anonymous writer to stand in the name of a devoted disciple of Jesus Christ in your "Gospel Advocate." If such are to be the principles carried out in this reformation, I shall not be surprised to see a similar dissent.

We can bear with a writer that calls himself a disciple, and writes upon gospel facts or duties in disguise; but, while he attacks any set of men in disguise, he comes not up to the standard of one who obeys the truth—that is to the light, that is to the truth. If his actions are agreeable to God. The very principles of the

ing his name ought to carry suspicion to the mind of every reader; he is one that "does evil, hates the light, and shuns it, lest his deeds should be detected." I repeat it, if your paper is to become a vehicle of slander, in disguise, please discontinue it to me. I cannot nor will not sustain any editor that suffers his paper to be made such a vehicle; and I now ask you to give to the public the proper name of "*Plain Dealing*."

I know, as well as any man in old Virginia, the circumstances respecting the Sycamore congregation in Richmond. My having heard both sides, enables me to say, that "*Plain Dealing*" has slandered Dr. Thomas—First, by charging him with being a "factionist." Secondly, as "aspiring to head a religious party in this country." It is false that "he has taken a party off with him in his wild speculations on the subject of materialism and anabaptism, etc." Permit me to say, from an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Thomas, I have greater fears of such a man as "*Plain Dealing*," becoming "an avowed infidel in less than twelvemonths," than Dr. Thomas.

The question asked, "Will the friends of the reformation sustain an individual who is sinking at the very foundation of our religion?" I answer, we will sustain him, in overturning the religion of every man and every sect; but not in overturning the religion of Jesus Christ. This writer proves himself "a factionist, who is sowing the seeds of discord among us, and leading a party after him, who has no respect for the feelings of friends or opponents, and who, to say the least, (if he succeeds) will do as much harm as Alexander the coppermith."

As evidence of the above, look at this—"Should we not rather disclaim all connexion with him, and let the world know that he is no longer one of us." This surely must be some lordling clergyman, like the one that has bought up the press in Richmond, and will not suffer the Apostolic Advocate any longer to be printed there. This high churchman has thus triumphed over Dr. Thomas like "*Plain Dealing*" would if he could. But vain man! force and slander never triumph long. A press will be furnished Dr. Thomas, and we will say to him, go on and point out our errors and "*our religion*," and show to us that it is not the religion of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and we will acknowledge it, and embrace that religion Jesus and his Apostles taught. I hold it as an article of my "*creed*" that error cannot ultimately profit any being in Heaven, Earth or Hell. Dr. Thomas has as much right to his opinions as "*Plain Dealing*," or any other son of darkness; and we will never forsake a man because he has the independence to examine and point out to us that the religion we profess is "*our religion*," and not the religion of Jesus Christ.

I differ with Dr. Thomas in many of his opinions; but I am not so vain as to profess myself a reformer, and yet wear the mantle of the Pope, and say to Dr. Thomas, "hitherto shall thou go and no farther—here shall thy proud billows be stayed, or I will anathematize you." Such would be the conduct of "*Plain Dealing*," if he could find enough to sustain his holiness in his recommendation.

I would be pleased to see *Plain Dealing* come into contact in any argument upon any topic with Dr. Thomas. I venture to say he would never afterward deal so plainly in slandering one that maintains the truth at every point with sound arguments and scripture evidence. His almost unexampled devotion to truth and unblemished character, with his noble and independent spirit, will find, so long as he maintains them with a christian spirit, the friends of this reformation sustaining him, at least in old Virginia. To charge him with materialism and anabaptism is unjust and illiberal, when he has publicly disclaimed against holding any such sentiments.

* We likewise reiterate our call on brother B. F. Hall to come forward with the name of *Plain Dealing*. Brother Johnson and Hunter are fully regenerated;—this double and evil dealing now lies at his door.

ED: AF. ADV,

You will, in justice to Dr. Thomas and those who are advocating the gospel of Jesus Christ, and not "our religion," give this a place in the Gospel Advocate, or please erase my name, as a subscriber, to a paper which would have a name, but bears not its fame.

Yours in the Gospel of Christ,

THOMAS M. KIMBLE

DIALOGUE WITH "FATHER GOODAL."

Secundus. I am happy in meeting with you this morning, Father Goodal and more especially because I find you well employed in visiting our good brother Stephanas and his christian family.

Father Goodal. The happiest moments of my life are those which I spend on the social hearth administering christian comfort and consolation to the young disciples. Our brother Stephanas is a young convert to the Lord, and of course needs his mind directed into the duties of a disciple, of a father, and of a husband; as well as of the head of a family.

Secundus. What a happy employment is yours; nothing more nor less than pointing the way to eternal glory. And how necessary to the babe in Christ, who is just starting in the christian race. With what difficulty, too, a man re-models his habits in his family. Has, for instance, the man been a worldly moral man, all his habits are formed, and when he becomes a christian what a warfare there is between the "flesh" and the "spirit," and unless conscience and duty overcome inclination there will be no sensible change in his conduct.

Father Goodal. Your remarks are just. It is one thing to put on Christ, and another to walk in him. Such a moral man as you mention is too apt to think he needs no change of conduct; but this I consider a grand mistake. A strictly moral man is a good man, but he is good only to the community in which he lives. A religious moral man is a good man in the full sense of the term, because he fills up the obligations laid upon him both by heaven and earth.

Secundus. By a "religious" man I suppose you mean a christian.

Father Goodal. Yes, of course, one who worships God through Jesus Christ.

Secundus. If this be so, how many are living under a daily delusion? trusting to their own uprightness, honesty and benevolence for acceptance with God.

Father Goodal. The case I know is lamentable; but such is the indifference with which the subject of religion is treated by the mass of the community, that it looks at best only like a pastime. Our brother Stephanas has been known in the community as a very upright, amiable man. It has been said of him that religion could not make him better, and I have said of him now, to show whether the christian religion is a mere thing to the most finished moralist.

Secundus. And even here I question whether brother Stephanas has not been indebted to christianity for his morality. Brother Stephanas have you not been under the influence of the fear of God in your general conduct?

Stephanas. Since I arrived at manhood I have been constantly under the influence of religious impressions. I received a religious education, that is, I was taught by my parents to respect religion and to fear God, I was, too, particularly partial to reading the scriptures; and although the preachers told us the word was a dead letter I constantly found while conducting my business that the precepts and admonitions were safeguards to me.

Father Goodal. I am glad Secundus, that you asked that question, because it shows how excellent it is to set good examples before our children. By it, too, you may see what mistakes many have made by supposing they were indebted to religion for nothing. Religion is interwoven in our country, with every thing. Infidels themselves gain the advantage of a religious education; have their manners formed for them; and learn from the bible all they know about God, providence, and a future state, and then turn round, and speculate about man in a state of nature, and boldly conclude that they need no information on the subject of religion.

Secundus. As a man reads he thinks, and as he thinks he speaks, I fear we shall lose sight of what we were talking about. Our brother Stephanas says, that while he conducted his business he found the precepts and admonitions of the bible as safeguards to him, although it was said by the preachers that the word was a "dead letter." Now Father Goodal which was the dead letter in this case the word of the preachers or the word of God?

Father Goodal. The word of the preacher of course, for the word of God acted on the mind of brother Stephanas and therefore could not be dead. That which can act is not dead. There have been many mistakes in the world on that subject. The word of God contains facts all of which are true, but facts have no power where they are not known; neither have they power where they are known but not believed. Let me explain. It is a fact that there is a country called Texas, concerning which many reports have been in circulation relative to the advantage of emigrating. To many persons these reports are unknown, therefore to them they are dead. To many they are known but not believed, and are therefore dead. But to many they are known and believed, and therefore upon the belief of these reports they change their old habitations for a new country.

Secundus. Since our ancestress made the mistake of eating the fruit "which makes one wise," the world has been full of mistakes, but we must take care how we say so, for the

world is so in love with fashionable flatteries, that, though you may learn from the scriptures a good deal which the world does not know, yet if by stating it you convict the people of ignorance they will bring you to the literary rack immediately.

Father Goodal. All people are not of this cast or it would be a useless waste of time to write any thing for the public. Some there are who read to learn, and, for the benefit of such I write. I am far from charging the people generally with crime on account of their scanty knowledge. It is often the result of the circumstances in which they are placed. I consider it an entirely wrong treatment, to charge the people with darkness and ignorance, because it raises feelings in them unfavorable to their being enlightened. On the contrary, when you go on to teach without remarking on the light or darkness of your audience, or of the age, if indeed you have a matter of teaching, they will appreciate your labor, and feel keenly enough, by contrast, their own uninformed state.

Secundus. These remarks comport with my own observation. If you wish to reform a bad man you must never call him a rogue, but speak of the excellence of virtue, and, rather let him look at himself in the *mirror* you hold before him than by painting his deformities cause him to abhor the *painter* and not himself. To reform a man from lying, the best method is to show him the beauty of truth and the advantage of always speaking it and so of all other vices.

Father Goodal. We must not forget in all our generalizing our particular subject was how a young disciple might conform to the government of Jesus Christ.

Secundus. Thank you Father Goodal my mind is rather formed upon the centrifugal plan, disposed to fly off, and my imagination is equally active in furnishing sweetmeats to entice my powers from the point; and my reflecting powers soon kick and suggest the propriety of quitting the subject altogether. I hope our brother Stephanas will have us excused.

Stephanas. No excuse is necessary, for I am very much interested indeed, in the last part of your conversation.

Father Goodal. To resume our subject then, it is all important that a young disciple begin the worship of God in his family as soon as he confesses the name of Jesus, especially if his partner is a disciple; because it often happens that as the man starts, so he runs the race. Many disciples are deficient in this, and excuse themselves on various grounds. Some say they have no gift, and argue *eloquently* that they lack *word*. I wish such did not lack *inclination*; others urge their *inwardness* and extreme timidity, as if their own *modesty* were the reason why they should not do their duty.

Secundus. I am inclined to think that a *modesty* of the whole subject is too often the reason of all this.

ishness. When I was a boy at home I found a difference between speaking to my father alone, and in company. When he was alone I could speak to him familiarly, but when he was in company, I was in a tremor for fear of making blunders, because the company heard me. So it is with prayers. Too often they are made to the people and not to God. It is a very different thing to make a religious prayer, and to pray to God. The first is made to suit the time and taste of the people, the last is an unfeigned expression of our wants to God, containing adoration, praise, and thanksgiving. As to the rule, the state of the mind, and the extent of the knowledge of the word of God will be the guide on all occasions.

Father Goodal. Few words dictated by the heart in the fear of God are always best. God searches the heart, and knows what is the mind of the spirit, therefore we ought always to avoid parade and "much speaking." I will relate an anecdote. A clergyman once urged one of his parishioners to learn a prayer for morning and evening worship. Which he did, and on being asked how he had succeeded, replied that he had utterly failed. He stated that having memorised the prayer he called his family together, and that when all were on their knees he forgot his prayer. The clergyman then asked how he proceeded, he replied, I said, O Lord I have forgotten my prayer, I pray thee to forgive me for I am a poor weak creature, and bless my family for without thee we can do nothing, have mercy upon us for Christ sake, amen. The clergyman told him that was the best prayer he could have prayed.

Secundus. Hints are all we can give on this subject. For prayer, at last, is a matter between God and the individual. Business calls me away for the present. Brother Stephanas I hope to meet you and Father Goodal again before long. Farewell.

JAMES HENSHALL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Jamestown Ohio, Feb. 14, 1837,
Beloved Brother Thomas,

I do hope that the recent debate between Brother Campbell and Bishop Purcell, will bring Protestants back to the Scriptures* as their warrant for the say-

* It is impossible for a sect to return to a thing it never practised. The scriptures never were the warrant of Protestants for all their sayings and doings. Chillingworth, a double-minded champion of the Reformation of Popery, says, that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants"—an assertion as false as Protestantism itself. Protestants made considerable use of the Bible in the propagation of a Modified Popery, but never acknowledged it alone as the rule of their faith and practice. Had they done so, we should have heard nothing of National Protestant churches; military and lordly protestant Bishops; wars for the maintenance of Protestant Ascendancy; Protestant Clergymen extorting tithes from an impoverished peo-

ing and doing of every thing pertaining to godliness. For they too, as well as Catholics have many traditions among them.

Where is the Protestant church that believes the scriptures contain all the authority necessary to authorize men to preach and to baptize, and to minister the Lord's supper? Almost all the Protestant churches with which I am acquainted have a tradition that the Holy Spirit by some other means than the scriptures, authorizes men to preach and minister the ordinances. This doctrine is very near of kin to Catholicism.

But the original protestant doctrine was this. The scripture of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule of faith and practice for Christians. If this doctrine be true, it follows of course that every thing practised by Christians should be authorized in the scriptures. If a man were asked from whence he had authority to preach, &c., he, if a Protestant, will answer from the scriptures—and that he who cannot find authority there, cannot find it any where else.—He that is designated as a preacher, in the scriptures, is *divinely* designated—and he who lacks the qualifications there pointed out, is not *divinely* called. God's words are found in the scriptures, and no where else. Therefore, if any are authorized of God to preach &c. the authority will be found in the scriptures for God has there made known his will.

These things being so, men may be tried, to see whether they are of God or not. "Beloved believe not every spirit but try the spirits, whether they are of God, for many false prophets have gone forth into the world."

This direction of the beloved Apostle John would be entirely useless, were there no rule given to try them by. But John gives the rule, as well as the directions, "We (Apostles) are of God, he that heareth us, is of God, and he that heareth us not, is not of God." This is a very plain rule. But where will the Apostles words be found? Ans. In the scriptures and no where else. He then, that learns from the scriptures, learns from the Apostles and what he learns and preaches is of God. And if he learn of any body else, or from any other source he is not of God.

Affectionately yours,

M. WILSON

TITHES.

A certain woman found by the way side a lamb perishing with cold and hunger. She had pity upon the lamb, and took it to her house and nursed it, and brought it to her house. And it came to pass, that the lamb grew up and became a strong

man, and he was found at the head of troops of dragons, and he was leaving orphans and widows to bewail their loss.

ewe, and had a large fleece. And the poor woman sheared the ewe; when, lo! the priest came to the woman and said, "The first fruits of every thing belong to the Lord—and I must have the wool." The woman said, "It is hard;" the priest said "It is written"—and so he took the wool. And it came to pass, that soon after the ewe yeaned and brought forth a lamb; when, lo! the chief priest came again to the woman and said, "The firstling of every flock belongs to the Lord—I must have the lamb." The woman said, "It is hard;" the priest said, "It is written"—and he took the lamb. And when it came to pass that the woman found she could make no profit from the ewe, she killed and dressed it; when lo! the chief priest came again to her, and took a leg, a loin, and a shoulder, for a burnt offering. And it came to pass that the woman was exceeding wroth because of the robbery; and she said to the chief priest, "Curse on the ewe! Oh! that I had never meddled therewith!" And the chief priest straightway said to her, "Whatever is cursed belongs to the Lord"—so he took the remainder of the mutton, which he and the Levites ate for their supper.

Plain Truth.

The fate of Reformers.

They who discover, and they who establish truths, of any kind soever, have a singular destiny. They are, at first, accused of being visionary, foolish, or seditious; they are blamed for saying that which has never before been said, and thus threatening every thing that exists; they are exclaimed against for creating innovation, confusion and a contempt of the past. When, in spite of this outcry, the truths which they proclaim triumph, the tune is changed; they are no longer innovators, they are plagiarists; what they now say has been said a hundred times before; all the world has long been of the like opinion, and they have usurped the honor of the discovery.—*From the French of M. Benjamin Constant.*

NOTICE.

There will be a Meeting at Smyrna, King and Queen, commencing on the Saturday before the 4th Lord's day in March, and continuing the day following. I have been requested to attend, but am unable; having previously engaged, all things concurring, to be at Springfield, Lunenburg County, on the same day.

EDITHA.

The volumes of *The Advocate* commence in the successive months of May.

It is a pity that Christians can be found to come forward as the public defenders of such a system of iniquity.

EDITOR A. F. ADY.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

AND

PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Vol. 3. AMELIA Co. Va. MARCH, 1837.

No. 1.

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone. — *Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. . . . Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand. — *Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

TRUTH.

"Truth," says Mr. Locke, "scarce ever yet carried it by vote any where, at its first appearance. New opinions are always suspected, and usually opposed without any other reason, than because they are not common. But truth, like gold, is not the less so, for being newly brought out of the mine. The trial and examination must give it price; and not antique fashion; and, though it be not yet current by the public stamp, yet it may, for all that, be as old as nature, and is certainly not the less genuine."

This testimony is true. The article which follows is also true, and worthy of all reception. It may be classed under the head of 'new opinions because it is uncommon,' yet, 'though it be not yet current by the public stamp,' its principles are as old as the revelation of the Most High. It was not till a few days since that it met our eye in a periodical edited by Elias Smith in the year 1808. We have learned our lesson upon the subject of which it treats, from the same primer as Mr. Smith. In respect to Immortality being conditional, and the gift of God through Jesus Christ alone, we are both agreed. I can assure the reader I have not plagiarized on Mr. S. in regard to the doctrine I have set forth, any more than my worthy brother in the Harbinger has in relation to Baptism for the Remission of Sins, which Mr. S. also taught, though not so clearly and emphatically, about the same period. His words are these:

"When the Apostles preached the death and resurrection of Christ, all who believed their preaching were immediately baptized, to show their submission to Christ's commandments. They heartily believed in the Resurrection of his body, and when he said the disciples had stolen away. When Paul

Christ's death and resurrection, to the multitude, on the Day of Pentecost, and proved from the scriptures, that he was risen; they were pricked in the heart, and said, men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter said, repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.—Baptism is designed to show the believers death to sin and resurrection to newness of life. This is mentioned in Rom. vi. 3, 4. Every person who reads this chapter, must see, that the Apostle understood baptism to be a sign of the believers death to sin, and resurrection to newness of life.—The waters of baptism are intended as a deluge to drown sin, and save the believer, who by faith is separated both from the world and from his sins; so it sinks and he is saved.”—*Her. of Gosp. Lib. pp. 36-46.*

The fact, we say, of Elias Smith having taught the same doctrine twenty-nine years ago on Baptism as Brother C.; and on Immortality as we do; shows, that when individuals of different periods, and remote places, learn from the same book, they will, in so far as they take it for their preceptor, all speak the same thing. The contrary of this is also true, namely, that where they give heed to mere human traditions, though, “current by the public stamp,” their views will clash with the most discordant din. Brother Campbell then is acquitted of plagiarizing the writings of Elias Smith on Baptism for Remission, and so am I on Immortality to those only who obey the truth.

EDITOR.

Immortality.

MUCH is said in the world concerning IMMORTALITY; and many know not what they affirm. IMMORTALITY is spoken of in general as referring to some part of mortal man.
 Multitudes speak of the immortal soul, not enquiring whether it is so or not; but from general opinion they suppose they speak truth.

When speaking or writing upon IMMORTALITY, I do not mean what is commonly understood by it, or what Philosophers think; but what is meant by the word in the scriptures of truth. Whatever is not found there, I consider as false; all said on the subject there, I believe. What is not expressed is not meant.

The word IMMORTAL, is mentioned but once in the whole Bible. The word IMMORTALITY is mentioned five times.

This word signifies that which is durable; or not subject to any decay whatever; remaining eternally the same.

This being the meaning of the word, the reader will now be shown how it is used in the scriptures.

1st. The word is applied to the Eternal God; 1 Timothy, i.

17. "Now unto the King Eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the only wise God, be honor, and glory, forever and ever, Amen.—Chap. vi. 16. "Who only hath IMMORTALITY, dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen."

Here is the fountain of IMMORTALITY; the king Eternal, IMMORTAL, and invisible. I once thought these verses referred to Christ; but he was once mortal, or he could not have died; since he rose from the dead, he is immortal, to live forever, for, "God raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory." In one place God is called *incorruptible*, which means the same as IMMORTAL: Rom. i. 23. "And changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man."

2d. The word IMMORTALITY, is mentioned where we are told how mortal man could become IMMORTAL, or this mortal put on IMMORTALITY. 2 Tim. i. 10. "But now is made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death; and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

In this verse we are told that Jesus Christ the MEDIATOR between God and men, has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel: he said, "God is a spirit." He told men of eternal life, and that those who obey him, shall be raised IMMORTAL at the resurrection of the just.

Many wished they might live again; but Jesus Christ, *God's Elect*, told us plainly of it, when he preached the gospel to the poor, and proclaimed liberty to the captives. It is to him we look for the words of eternal life.

3d. The word, IMMORTALITY, is mentioned where we are told who will be sharers in it.—Rom. ii. 7. "To them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and IMMORTALITY; eternal life."

Many people think that all will be raised IMMORTAL at the resurrection. If they are, they will all be equal to the angels, having eternal life. IMMORTALITY is one of the glorious blessings of the gospel, PROMISED ONLY TO THEM WHO OBEY THE GOSPEL. *There is not a single promise of IMMORTALITY to those who die in their sins, in all the scriptures of truth.* It is mentioned in the following verses, that the contentious and disobedient shall *perish* in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel: Paul preached to the world.

4th. The word is used to show what will be IMMORTALITY. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. "For this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on IMMORTALITY; then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY."

These are the only places where the word IMMORTALITY

IMMORTALITY are used. Here we may learn from Christ and the Apostles *what* it means, *where* it is, *who* shall share in it, *what* will be IMMORTAL, and the glorious time when it shall take place—when the followers of the Lamb, shall be raised incorruptible, bearing the image of the heavenly. Then the body sown in corruption, shall be raised in incorruption—sown in dishonor, shall be raised in power—sown a natural, shall be raised a spiritual body. For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

Surely here is enough to encourage every rational creature on earth to seek for glory, honor, IMMORTALITY and eternal life. To such as seek for it the promise of eternal life is made, and shall be fulfilled. So be it.

THE PROTESTANT BISHOPS OF ENGLAND.

The following article is taken from the Extraordinary Black Book, which is an exposition of the abuses in the Church and State of England. Its publication at this time is peculiarly appropriate; since Protestantism of which the Bishops of England are the lights, ornaments, and pillars, is now growing into such high favor with the disciples of Jesus, of whose religion Protestantism is an ill-executed counterfeit. State Religion and state-religionists, are things incompatible with the religion of Christ. Protestantism is constituted of State Religions, and their modifications; and as Protestantism without protestants would cease to be, so they are responsible for its abominations, and obnoxious to the scripture anathemas upon all apostates; if, indeed, they can be call apostates, who have never known or obeyed the truth. The article subjoined is a faithful picture. We have ourselves seen what it depicts.—The things exposed are a fair illustration of the unhallowed workings of the doctrines, faith, and principles of a disgusting ecclesiastical tyranny.

Sinecurism.

“Sinecurism abounds more in our ecclesiastical than civil establishment. In the church almost every thing is done by deputy,—a consequence naturally resulting from her great wealth; for where large salaries are annexed, great duties are seldom discharged. Those with large incomes have various reasons for not burthening themselves with official toil. First, they can afford to pay for a deputy; secondly, they can purchase or influence the connivance of others for neglect of their own duties; thirdly, they have the means for indulgence and

recreation, which, consuming much time, leave little leisure for more serious avocations. Hence has arisen sinecurism in both Church and State; presenting the singular spectacle of one class receiving the pay, and another, born under less favorable auspices, doing the work for which the pay is received.

Among the different orders of our ecclesiastical polity, there are none, with the exception of the curates, and a few benefited clergy, who reside and do the duties of their parishes; the remainder being clerical sinecurists, filled with the Holy Ghost, to share in the rich endowments of the church. The bishops are most amply remunerated, and as is usual in such cases perform the least service. They employ archdeacons to visit for them; rural deans and others to preach for them; and a vicar-general to issue licenses, hold courts, and perform other drudgery; if otherwise engaged, they employ a brother bishop to ordain for them. They have their own chaplains, commissaries, and secretaries; in short, their work must be light, and chiefly consists in keeping an eye to the next translation, and the falling in of rich livings. In the Ordination Service, however, they are enjoined strict and abstemious duties. It is there said a bishop must be "blameless," they are admonished diligently to preach the word, and be conspicuous examples of various Christian virtues." They are now chiefly known among the people by their grotesque attire.— They are the only *men* (save *exquisite*s) who continue to dress in imitation of the female sex, or take pains to disguise themselves under uncouth habiliments. The *shovel*, or *coal-scuttle* hat is particularly distinguishable. It is the remains of the old hat worn by Roman Catholic priests in their days of splendour, and still to be seen on the Continent. Under this chapeau is a bush of false hair, plastered and twisted into a most unnatural size and ridiculous shape, resembling any thing but what we may suppose to have been the fashion among the apostles. To these distinctions may be added the long gaiters and "lady's maid apron," from the hips to the knees only, so that the gaiters may not be concealed. These gaiters are of vast importance, importing that the wearers are meek and *lowly*, and constantly *walking about doing good*. Nevertheless they often ride in dashing style through the streets attended by grooms in purple liveries, and some of them are very Nimrods in the country."

HERESY EXPLAINED, No. 1.

THIS word has been used by almost all denominations; from their conduct it is understood by only a few; and in every shape which *fancy*, *pride*, *envy*, *jealousy*, &c. will could put it, and it is still used by many who are innocent appear odious.

The original meaning of the word *Heresy*, is *opinion*, or a man's own judgment of a matter, without any dependence on another. What Paul calls an *heretic*, appears to be one who follows his own judgment or fancy, instead of what God has commanded; for opinion means a judgment without positive evidence.

The word *Heresy* is mentioned once in the New Testament. Acts xxiv. 14, "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call HERESY, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things written in the law and the prophets." The word HERESIES, is mentioned three times; 1 Cor. xi. 19, "For there must be also HERESIES among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you. Gal v. 20' "Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, *Heresies*." 2 Pet. iii. 1, "Who privily shall bring in damnable *heresies*, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." The word *Heretic* is mentioned but once. Titus iii. 10, 11, "A man that is an HERETIC, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."

From all these places, it appears, first, that among the Jews a man who believed all the prophets; believed in Christ; believed in the *resurrection* of the just and unjust; and exercised himself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and man, and did not believe in obedience to the law of Moses as did the persecuting Jews, that such a man by the Jews was considered a HERETIC. The Jews considered Paul a *Heretic* on this account. There are many in our day who consider an humble follower of Christ a *Heretic*, barely because he does not say, as they wish him to say.

Second, it appears that some opinions or *Heresies* are not so bad, as to prove a man an enemy to Christ and religion.

Third, there are some heresies which are damnable, which consist in "denying the Lord that bought them." "They deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Such are *Heretics* which are subverted, and ought to be rejected; and *no others*. The difficulty at the present day as it respects *Heretics* is this; *who are heretics?* The fact is, almost every company who are governed by human rules, called *articles, creeds, covenants, &c.*, consider all *Heretics* who do not submit to the will of the minister and standing committee who often think themselves above all law.

Every community who call themselves *the Church*, have had their law concerning *Heretics*. And what is called *Heresy*, in one church, is called ORTHODOXY in another; and almost every denomination in their turn, have called the others *Heretics*, and should we judge of them all by their different Testimonies; we must conclude that they are all guilty of *Heresy* in a greater or less degree.

"No person who in the spirit of candor and charity adheres to that which to the best of his Judgment is right, though in this opinion he should be mistaken, is in the scripture sense either *Schismatic* or *Heretic*; and he on contrary, whatever sect he belongs to, is more entitled to those odious appellations who is most apt to throw the imputation on others."—*Dr. George Campbell.*

THE HARBINGER ON "MATERIALISM."

No. 4.

As many as were disposed for eternal life believed—*Acts, xiii. 48.*

The Advocate most respectfully and earnestly requests The Harbinger not to slight the proposition already advanced, *viz.* THAT ETERNAL LIFE IS CONDITIONAL. The Advocate declares himself open to conviction; now, if The Harbinger can demonstrate from the scriptures, to the satisfaction of the writer's mind, namely, that *Immortality, Incorruptibility, or Eternal Life is unconditional*, The Advocate will admit the probability of The Harbinger's system of Abstract Spiritualism being true; though he confesses it is to his mind incomprehensible, and irreconcilable with the doctrine or "words of eternal life" promulgated by Jesus and his Apostles.

Now, if *eternal life be conditional*, as I believe and teach, then all those passages of Sacred Writ, which, in the estimation of the Harbinger, seem to prove beyond a doubt, the existence of "the ghosts" of men, whether "bold," or of any other good or evil attribute, during the period which elapses between death and the judgment,—must be interpreted in conformity to the doctrine of Eternal Life. That is, for example, if such a passage as Hebrews xii. 9, should seem to favor the idea of men in general possessing indestructible spirits, it must be, and can be scripturally, explained, only by the doctrine, that if men obey God, and seek after "glory, honor, and immortality" by persevering in doing well, he will be to them a Father, and, at the resurrection of the just, raise them spiritual, incorruptible, or immortal men. He is then, upon these conditions, the Father of their spiritual existence here, and of their incorruptible, or spiritual, being hereafter;—But, if *eternal life be unconditional*, then all said passages must be interpreted according to the doctrine of unconditionality. The text quoted from Hebrews would then read to this effect—*we have had fathers of our bodies, which are mere flesh, who chastised us, and we gave them reverence. Shall we not much rather be in subjection to God, who is the Father of "Ghosts", which he has shut up in tabernacles of flesh, and when the flesh dies in Hades or Purgatory, and when that is extinct in the presence of God, and so live in a remote somewhere?*

But what does Paul mean by "the Father of our spirits?"

There are three remarkable human events called Births in scripture. 1st. The birth of the Animal Body or Living Soul; 2nd, the birth of this creature into "the congregation of the First-Born" or "Kingdom of Heaven;" and only, his birth into "the Everlasting Kingdom." A "Living Soul" derives his first birth from his natural father, and is animal or flesh; for "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh;"—He derives his second birth from God, and is spiritual; for "that, (and that only) which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" and the land, likewise, he derives from God. The *medium* of his first birth is his animal mother; of his second, the Bath of Water; of his third, The Grave. *How does God become the Father of men as contrasted with their animal parent?*—By begetting them again with "incorruptible seed" which is "the word of the living God," or "gospel" proclaimed by the Apostles. See 1. Pet. i. 23-25.—The animal, or "corruptible seed" is sown in the flesh, but in what is *the Word*, the Incorruptible or Spiritual, seed of God sown, when he begets children among the sons of men? *Ans.*—*In the hearts, or moral sentiments, of men, through their Intellects.* See the parable of the sower in illustration of this. Matt. xiii. 18. With the heart men believe unto righteousness; when then, a living soul, or an animal man, believes The Gospel of God, and obeys it, he is begotten or born of God—that is, God becomes the Father of his new life, which, if persisted in, leads to incorruptible existence—by a resurrection from the dead. In this sense it is, that God is "the Father of our Spirits," that is, of the Believers *morale* or Spirit; for, not being the Spiritual Father of the wicked, for the Devil is their Father, of course the "spirits" spoken of must refer exclusively to the faithful. We thank The Harbinger for quoting this text against us; he says, that *it is one of his witnesses in evidence that man is not all flesh, blood, and breath.* In reply to this, The Advocate wants no stronger evidence in behalf of the positions he maintains.—Paul, says the Harbinger, *was deeply penetrated with the idea of spiritual existence.* So is The Advocate, with this qualification only, that he is deeply penetrated with Paul's idea of spiritual existence, but not at all with the Harbinger's conception of Paul's idea.

The Harbinger has not attempted to explain this text. He has merely italicised and small-capped some few words of it; and delivered himself of a few thoughts or assertions without a shadow of proof. The exposition given will show, that *breath* and *temper* are not the only significations we attach to the word *spirit*. We define a word *according to its context*, and not by mere abstractions. "The infidels of the City of Boston," where the Harbinger was when he penned "*Materia-
lism, No. 2,*" we are told, "say there is no spirit in the uni-
verse."—The Advocate has been styled a Sadducee, because

he is said, to affirm there is "no spirit." But though *inferentially* and positively classed with these characters, he is neither an infidel nor a Sadducee; for he believes in angels, spirits, and the resurrection of the just and unjust. He does not believe in the Harbinger's definition of spirits. God is a spirit; and The Advocate believes in God: ancient Jews were possessed by evil spirits, which Jesus cast out; The Advocate believes there were such possessions, because credible eye-witnesses affirm it, though he cannot comprehend all the cases on record; he believes in a resurrection of the just and of the unjust, in the way, and according to the times appointed by God in Sacred Writ. The obloquies, therefore, heaped upon him, because he differs from the Harbinger's *views* of these things, are unmerited; and will sooner or later recoil on those who have lavished them so freely.

"Materialism—No. 2" of the Harbinger is upon the whole a very amusing article. We would advise the reader to peruse it; he will there see how very light and trifling the Harbinger can be at times, even though he condemns levity on such themes as unbecoming a Christian. We need not say to the unbiassed, that his "syllogisms" are perversions of our meaning. They are too ridiculous for a serious refutation; we pass over them in silence, concluding that they were written in a moment of irritability, and would not have seen the light under a calmer dispensation of spirit.

"A spirit has not flesh and bones as you see me have."—Luke xxiv. 39.—So affirmed Jesus and so I believe," says the Harbinger. And so says The Advocate too. Why then dispute about it?—Because the Advocate does not believe, that The Harbinger has given it its correct signification. The Harbinger argues from this negative quality of a spirit, that is, from its having neither flesh nor bones, "that it has no breath." It is not breath nor breathing; it is however, a positive being a real existence. Whether a spirit breathes or not, we neither affirm nor deny, having no data to go upon. That "spirits" do exist we doubt not; but as to what constitutes "a spirit" we do not know. If we did, we might define God. We can tell many things about him, though we are entirely ignorant of his essence. God unveiled no man has seen at any time, and so of spirits, as far as we know. Because Spirits exist, because they have neither flesh nor bones, and because they are not breath nor breathing,—"therefore we believe," says the Harbinger. "that there is a spirit in man, which spirit can exist without the body—without flesh and bones."—What astounding logic!!! If the essence and constitution of a Spirit were demonstrated as clearly as the sun at noon day; this would be no proof of their being a spirit in man, indestructible and capable of existing in a disembodied state. What has the existence of spirits in the general to do with the

existence of a spirit in man? We might as well say, that there is a Pope in the Moon, because there are Popes upon the earth. This truly is "beating the air"—and this is the doctrine, to which The Harbinger desires to "reclaim his brother," The Advocate; who in maintaining the conditionality of eternal life and its consequents, is said to hold "a very useless and pernicious sectarian speculation!" But to the text.

Upon a certain occasion, Jesus, after his resurrection, stood in the midst of his disciples when they least expected him, and said, 'Peace be to you.' But they were amazed and affrighted, and without taking time for reflection, *imagined* that they saw a spirit; it does not say a spirit of a man, but a spirit. For this, Jesus rebuked them, saying, "wherefore do *suspicious* arise in your hearts" "*It is I myself*," said he.—This *I myself*, he describes as having hands and feet, and flesh and bones; therefore, he directed them to handle him and be convinced, for "a spirit" is not "*I myself*," having neither flesh nor bones as "*I myself*" has. Notwithstanding this evidence of the materiality of *I myself*, joy and amazement hindered their belief. Hence he gave them greater assurance of its reality by eating a piece of broiled fish, and of a honey comb in their presence. This seems to have satisfied them, and to have given them full assurance of faith, for we hear no more of their incredulity after this. See 1 John, i. 1, 2.—Such, then, is the signification of the text, and the kind of evidence Jesus presented to his disciples in proof of the real existence of "*I myself*." *I myself* is a being whose existence can be demonstrated to the senses of thousands; but the *I myself*—the "*I*" of metaphysical philosophy, is reduced to the *I am because I think*. The metaphysical Harbinger proves his *I*-identity in a very different way to Jesus. He brings in Lord Ex-Chancellor Brougham to his aid, who says that the evidence of the independent existence of mind (the thinking *I*) is more strong and more conclusive than that for the existence of matter. "We know," continues he, "the existence of mind by our own consciousness of, or reflection on what passes within us."—"I think," says The Harbinger, "and this *thinking I* is different from I seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, or feeling. If I can discriminate between a sight and seeing, then I can discern a difference between a thought and thinking; and therefore, I can form as good an idea of mind or spirit as of many other objects of thought. I judge of it not by color, weight, or dimensions, but by its various acts and feelings—by what it does and by what it suffers. But if I cannot explain, I can believe that I have a spirit from God, a spirit of which he is truly Father, in a way and manner which I can no more explain than how a bone is formed from the same substance of which an eye, an ear, or a nerve is fashioned."* All this may

* If The Harbinger cannot explain how God is the Father of our, or of

be proof convincing to Messrs Harbinger and Brougham; but it is none to me of their existence. My senses have seen, heard, and handled Mr. Harbinger; they have seen my Lord Ex-Chancellor, but upon their own showing, there is much doubt of the fact; "for, if we doubt the existence of either, it would be far more reasonable to doubt that matter exists than that mind exists;" in other words, one's senses may deceive us as to the qualities of matter, but consciousness never! These metaphysicians can doubt the existence of rocks, of which they have every means of assuring themselves, while they have not the shadow of a doubt that "the spirit of man" exists independent of matter altogether; though they are at a loss to comprehend it in any of its independent relations. So much for metaphysics.

"It is worthy of observation" says the late President of the Phrenological Society of Edinburg, "that the popular notions of the independence of the mind on the body are modern, and the offspring of philosophical theories that have sprung up chiefly since the days of Locke—the fact that the mental phenomena of which we are conscious are the result of mind and brain acting together, is farther established by the effects of swooning, of compression of the brain, and of sleep. In profound sleep, consciousness is entirely suspended; this fact is explicable on the principle of the organ of the mind or brain, being in a state of repose; but altogether inconsistent with the idea of the immaterial principle, or mind itself, being capable of acting independently of the brain, for if this were the case, thinking would never be interrupted by any material cause.—In a swoon, blood is rapidly withdrawn from the brain, and consciousness is for the moment obliterated; again, where part of the brain has been laid bare by an injury inflicted upon the skull, it has been found that consciousness could be suspended at the pleasure of the surgeon, by merely pressing on the brain with his fingers, and that it could be restored by withdrawing the pressure.—The principle, that we are not conscious of the existence and functions of the organs by which the mind acts, explains the source of the metaphysical notion which has affected modern language, that we know the mind as an entity by itself. The acts which really result from the combined action of the mind and its organs, appear, previous to anatomical and pathological investigations to be produced by the mind exclusively: and hence have arisen the neglect and contempt with which the organs have been treated, and the ridicule cast upon those who have endeavored to speak of them as important to the philosophy of mind. — — — The mind has been studied by one set of philosophers, with too little reference to the

his Spirit, he must concede that we have scripturally seen that the senses he is unable to do. — See p. 247.

body ; and the laws of thought have been expounded with as much neglect of organization as if we had already "shuffled off the mortal coil." From this erroneous practice of many distinguished authors, such as Locke, Hume, Reid, Stewart, and Brown, a prejudice has arisen against the physiology of mind, as if the mind were degraded by contemplating it in connexion with matter ; but man is the work of the Creator of the world, and no part of his constitution can be unworthy of regard and admiration.—If, however, we enquire what progress has been made by metaphysicians in ascertaining the primitive mental powers, and rendering the philosophy of man interesting and practically useful to men of ordinary understanding, we shall find a lamentable deficiency indeed. From the days of Aristotle to the present time, the most powerful intellects have been directed with the most persevering industry, to this department of knowledge,—and system after system has flourished, fallen, and been forgotten, in rapid and melancholy succession. To confine our attention to modern times, Dr. Reid overturned the philosophy of Locke and Hume, Mr. Stewart while he illustrated Reid, yet differed from him in many important particulars ; and recently Dr. Thomas Brown has attacked, with powerful eloquence and philosophical profundity, the fabric of Stewart, and it already totters to its fall. The very existence of the most common and familiar faculties of the mind is still in debate among these philosophers. Thus after the lapse and labor of more than 2000 years, philosophers are not yet agreed concerning the existence of many of the most important principles of action, and intellectual powers of man. While the philosophy of mind shall remain in this uncertain condition, it will be impossible to give to morals and natural religion a scientific foundation ; and until these shall assume the stableness and precision of sciences, education, political economy, and legislation, must continue empirical in their principles and application. If, therefore, Phrenology (the philosophy of the Human mind) could introduce into the Philosophy of Mind even a portion of the certainty and precision which attend physical investigation, it would confer no small benefit on this interesting department of science ; and that it is fully competent to do so, shall be shown, after we have attended to a few preliminary points requiring consideration."

Combe's System of Phrenology.

The Harbinger adduces 2 Cor. iv. 16, as further proof, in his opinion, of abstract spiritualism. One would suppose from the silence of The Harbinger that this passage had received no attention from The Advocate ; the contrary, however, is the fact. We have given our view of it with its full context in number 2, vol. 3, p. 32, 33. Let The Harbinger publish this exposition, and then interpret it more scripturally if he can. As to his criticism on Rom. vii. 22, The Advocate would ob-

serve, that the terms "inward man," "hidden man," "hidden man of the heart" have reference to the Moral Sentiments of Man. Paul, as one born of God, not only intellectually approved, but sentimentally delighted in the law of God: The Sentiments and Intellectual Faculties, are very properly styled "the inward man" or "hidden man of the heart" as contrasted with the outward or visible man. The former, no one can discern, except by overt acts, it is concealed from observation: but the latter is ostensible to all.

Lastly, if *prototokoon* does not refer to Christ in Heb. xii. 23, but to Christians in Hades, will the Harbinger show what constitutes a birth into that "Intermediate State?"—Is not the congregation of first-borns, and the congregation of the First-Born, one and the same. Does the term "first-borns" necessarily imply that such persons are in Hades?—Are they not as much first-borns in the present kingdom of heaven on earth, as in the imaginary Hades of metaphysicians? If they are born in any other sense than of water and spirit, it must be from the grave. Will The Harbinger say that there is a birth between that into the kingdom here, and that from the grave at the resurrection; if there is none, then the phrase first-borns is strictly applicable to Christians here.

We were in hopes of being able to conclude our notices on 'The Harbinger's "materialism" or rather spiritualism, with this number. But we cannot. We shall, therefore, continue our strictures in the number to come.

EDITOR.

"NO-SOUL-SYSTEM."

We are informed, that a certain preacher, in a county not far hence, and of whom we once hoped better things, is strenuously, perhaps conscientiously, exerting his influence to render us as obnoxious as possible. In this "holy effort" he has succeeded a little, but chiefly, and we believe exclusively, with those, who give themselves small concern as to the true state of affairs. His misrepresentations have so far operated upon two or three as to induce them to discontinue our paper. This is a matter, however, of little account; for where we lose three, or thirty, we doubt not we shall double their number by new patrons, when the period of re-action shall arrive: for we have too much confidence in the justice of the public mind to suppose, that slander and misrepresentation will be permitted finally to extinguish liberty of speech and free discussion by whomsoever practiced.

Our worthy opponent declares that the principles, and the ends, are more dangerous, and calculated to do more harm, than those of Thomas Paine, or of Voltaire. No, doubt, he is right; and of course has a right to express his opinions.

would ask him, if those principles can really be more dangerous in their tendency than Paineism, which are based on the death, burial and resurrection of Christ; on the full admission of the authority of the Old and New Testaments; on the unqualified acknowledgment of the world's need of a Saviour; on the deliverance from sins by belief of, and obedience to, the genuine gospel of Christ; on the unwavering confidence of a resurrection of the just and unjust; on the certain expectation of the speedy return of Jesus to assume the government of the universal world;—can principles based upon such things be dangerous?—yes, indeed, they may be dangerous to sin, to Antichrist, and to the spurious gospels of the sectarian world; but to the wholesome doctrine of Christ, which is according to godliness and truth, no harm can happen from their propagation or belief. But why does our friend denounce our principles as more heinous than those of infidelity? Is it because the key-note has been struck by authority? Is it because of certain innate misgivings as to the identity of the traditions he obeyed with those delivered by the Apostles of Christ? Is his faith in the oneness of Baptistism and the gospel of Christ eclipsed; or does he begin to discover that the intelligence of the people in the doctrine of God is out-running his own? Let conscience pronounce the sentence.

We learn, that our indefatigable friend, is industriously circulating the notion, that we deny the existence of a soul—and this he is pleased to style “the *no-soul-system*.” There are some people who receive reports as they take up their religion—without examination. Such is the case in the instance before us. There are those who are credulous enough to believe the report upon mere assertion. We doubt very much if such persons will give us credit when we say, that the report is slanderous and untrue. We believe in “body, soul, and spirit, the whole person.” What more do they want?—That we should believe their opinions about “body, soul and spirit?” They must first prove that these opinions are true. Let us have the evidence, and let this testimony agree in all its parts; and with the scriptures too. Deny the existence of souls! Why Luke declares that “3000 souls” obeyed the gospel on the day of Pentecost.—These are the kind of “souls” I believe in! though I am free to confess I believe them by no means identical with the metaphysical souls of our friend, the preacher, and his credulous admirers.

EDITOR.

QUERIES.

Amelia, Va; March 3d. 1837.

Dear Brother Thomas,

Seeing, or thinking I see, on the part of some of our heavenly Master's disciples, more itching for

political distinction and official honors—more meddling with earthly governments, than I conceive to be warranted by an appeal to the Christian's constitution, and to the history of primitive Christianity I must beg you to favor, the readers of the Advocate, with such notice of the following interrogatories, as you may deem suitable. Provided, however, it may not take up a space which may be better filled.

Your brother in the hope of eternal life,

JOHN H. JACKSON.

1. Our Saviour says, "My kingdom is not of this world."—Whether He spoke this of the everlasting kingdom, or the state into which one is introduced when he is born of water and the Spirit, in either case, would you, or would you not, conceive its *affairs* of such moment as to *engross* the time and labors of its citizens in fact, or elect, to the exclusion of all intermeddling with earthly kingdoms, in the capacity of legislators and rulers?

2. John heard a voice from heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of the world have become the kingdoms of our Lord." Whence we learn that all human governments—kingly and republican, upon the face of the globe, must have an end.—With all this in view, does it, or not, become his disciples, to aspire to, or accept when offered, offices high or low in these earthly establishments.

A. B.

Answer.

1. I believe, that when Jesus said "My kingdom is not of this world," he spoke concerning its derivation; for, in the conclusion of his remark, he said, "but now is my kingdom not from hence." By this, he contrasted the derivation of his kingdom with that of the kingdoms of the world. These are derived "from hence" by human efforts; though indeed, it be true, that God setteth up one king and pulleth down others; yet, it is by the agency of the sword in the hands of men, and not by miraculous interference. The kingdom of Jesus, which is not of this world, is emphatically derived from heaven; for, it will be ushered in with all the circus-stance of Divine Interposition. He will descend from heaven, accompanied with a multitude of angels; and with the awful sublimities of the thunder, the lightning, the earthquake, and the great hail. At this epoch, the deafening shout is heard,

The kingdoms of this world are become
The kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ
And he shall reign for ever and ever.

This, the kingdom of the kingdoms, over which Jesus shall reign for ever, is the institution to which he referreth.

conversing with Pontius Pilate. Napoleon Bonaparte was king of the kings of continental Europe, but think of Jesus, who is to be the Immortal Monarch of the universal world.—The sway of Napoleon's sceptre was brief and limited compared with his; for the sceptre of the Son of God will be acknowledged for 1000 years, by Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia.

Now, my dear friend, what honors, think you, can the kingdoms and republics of the world possess worthy the aspirations of a christian man? In my estimation, if a Christian were elected President of these States, and were to accept the office; it would be a condescension; if then, I view the highest office in the nation thus, what think you, is the estimate I put on all subordinate benefices?—I can assure you, for my own part, I esteem them very cheaply. If ambition be my failing, let that ambition be of honors that never fade; of glory, whose splendor never dies away. When I perceive the minds of men absorbed in the petty affairs of this perishing state, I infer one of two things; *either they do not believe in the hope of the gospel; or they do not understand what it is.* The affections of a man must be set on something; and that thing is generally what he thinks most valuable. The men of the world think, that wealth is the chief good, and hence you see their energies directed to its acquisition. Others who have riches seek after the honors of the world; and so on. I wish I could say that Christians did not do so too. But their conduct is too palpable to be mistaken. Some of them like to figure, as they think, at the head of a volunteer company; others, at the elections, and in political affairs; others, again, aspire at being the great this, and the great that! But if they could only see themselves in the mirror of God's word, how little, how groveling would they discover themselves to be! I consider that the citizens of heaven, if their time is scripturally and rationally employed, will have no leisure for the puerile affairs of kingdoms and republics; whose rotten and crazy institutions are very soon to pass away into utter and well merited forgetfulness.

2. From these premises, I conclude, that it is unbecoming a disciple of Jesus to aspire to, or accept when offered, places high or low, in these earthly establishments: and further, that it indicates a want of intelligence in, or affection to, the things of righteousness, sobriety, and the hope which is to endure for ever.

EDITOR.

THE BODY OF MOSES.

Jamestown, Ohio, 22d Nov. 1836.

Beloved Brother Thomas,

Dont mind the pushes that are made at you from different quarters because of your odd notions rela-

tive to the inhabitants of "Hades," you suppose them to be dead, while others suppose them to be alive, all however agree, that there will be a future resurrection and judgment, but you are so odd as to suppose that the living are not the proper subjects of a resurrection, you confine the resurrection entirely to the dead, hence you suppose that if spirits be resurrected at all, they must be dead ones.

While those who oppose your odd notions, call the spirits the man, and have him alive in *hades*, and then they have some difficulty in applying the resurrection to a live man. I was a little puzzled by your Father's observations relative to the dispute about the *Body* of Moses. I was at a loss to know what the devil wanted with Moses' body after Moses had left it.— Surely none will contend that the body goes to the Devil, and the spirit to God. We might puzzle our brains a long time before we could tell what Michael wanted with Moses' body after Moses left it; surely he did not want to take it to heaven before the resurrection; for that would be contrary to the law, no corrupt thing can go there. And if the body of Moses was changed to an incorruptible body, then Jesus was not the first that arose incorruptible, as he is declared to be.

If the dispute was not about Moses himself, (and your Father thinks the Devil was not audacious enough to dispute about him) I am at a loss to know what either of the disputants wanted with the corrupt body. Some have supposed that the Devil wanted to make a God of it, and set the Jews to worshipping it—and that Michael wanted to hide it so that the Devil could not find it to deceive the Jews with. This speculation is perhaps as good as any others; Jude has not told us what the disputants wanted to do with the *Body*, therefore we are left to guess about that matter. But he has distinctly taught us that we should not rail in our disputes. *Let us keep that in mind.*

There are some who belong to the church of God, who will not throw you away, merely because you have some odd notions, as long as you adhere to *The Faith*.

But let us keep in mind that if there be no resurrection of the *body* our faith is useless, even if we should all believe in the separate existence of the spirit. This latter belief will not save us—nor will the disbelief of it prevent it, if it be so.— Hence our belief or disbelief about that matter, will not alter it.—Therefore if we dispute about it at all—let us do it without calling each other ugly names, such as *Infidel*, *Sceptic*, *Visionary*, &c., &c.

As ever, yours
A. W. C.

NB. Some seem to have an abhorrence to speculation, whereas I would not give a fig for a mind that was not prone to contemplation, or speculation. I go for all the *Hows*, and the

ways, and the *wherefores* that seem to belong to the subject. If I am told that a medicine will operate on the system, I want to know how; whether as an emetic, cathartic, diaphoretic, or diuretic. And when I am told the Holy Spirit operates on men, I want to know how; whether physically or morally, &c.

M. W.

A

NEW TRANSLATION.
OF THE
PSALMS OF DAVID.

RENDERED INTO METRE

BY

John Thomas, M. D.

Let the testimony concerning The Anointed One dwell in you richly, and with all wisdom teach and admonish each other, by psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs; singing with gratitude in your hearts to the Lord.—*Paul.*

All the things which are written concerning me in the Psalms must be accomplished.—*Jesus.*

PROSPECTUS.

Such is the title of a volume I now offer to the notice of the Public. It is a new translation of the "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" of David, from the Original Hebrew by Mr. Noyes of Massachussetts; and almost literally rendered into English verse, of various metres, by myself. In a few instances, his translation has been modified upon the authority of Adam Clark and other Oriental Scholars; but never upon my own: my humble effort having been restricted to analysis, annotation, and the transposition of the language. These modifications, or corrections, have never been adopted where there was the least doubt as to the evidence in favor of them. We have found some renderings of words, which by a comparison with the Apostolic Writings were obviously incorrect; in this case, we have preferred the Apostolic exposition to Mr. Noyes' translation. For example, in psalm cx, 3; Mr. N. expresses it, *thy people shall be ready, when thou musterest thy forces, in holy splendor*; Adam Clark, *thy princely nation, shall be ready, when thou musterest thy forces, in the splendid gar-*

ments of holiness :—I prefer the latter, because it agrees better with the subject as represented by John in the Apocalypse, where he depicts the garments of the princely nation, or wife of Messiah, as pure and resplendent."—Again, *thou art a priest for ever*; Clark renders it, *through all time*; which agreeing with the nature of the priestly office, I have preferred: for, when time shall end, sin, death, and the grave will cease to be, and consequently priests will be no more required—the priestly kingdom of Messiah will be then given up to the Father, that God may be all and in all.—As an example of an apostolic correction the following may serve.

Why do the *heathen* rage,
And the *nations* meditate a vain thing?
Why do the *kings* of the *earth* rise up, &c. Ps. ii. 1.

Here "heathen" and "nations" refer to the world at large; and "Kings of the Earth" to their oppressors. Thus the mind of the reader is sent all over the earth and through all the Nations, to find out the fulfilment of the prediction, if indeed he admit its prophetic character. If, however, it be corrected by Luke, our minds will be concentrated on Judea as the theatre of this conspiracy against Jehovah's Anointed King. The word *nations* should be rendered *people*, which Israel was in contradistinction to the Gentiles, who, Peter declares, were, antecedent to their reception into the Christian Kingdom, "not a people."—*Kings of the Earth* should be *Kings of the Land*, for Herod and Pontius Pilate, the vice-kings of Judea, were the kings, who, with the rulers or princes of the Sanhedrim, the heathen Romans, and the Jews, raged, meditated a vain thing, and combined against Jesus. See Acts, iv. 23-28. I have, therefore, rendered it thus—

Why do the *heathen* rage,
And the *people* meditate a vain thing?
Why do the *kings* of the *land* rise up, &c.

In rendering this translation into verse, I have constructed it in accordance with the several metres commonly in use. *If any one be merry let him sing psalms*, says James; this he will be enabled to do with much profit by the volume proposed. He will be able to commit them to memory with greater facility than in a prose form; and in spending time for this purpose he will be amply compensated. The themes are noble and magnificent; and well calculated to enlighten the eyes of his understanding as to the blaze of glory that is destined to burst forth upon an astonished world.

Terms.

The volume will be of the same size, type and paper as the Advocate; and will contain about 200 pages. Each psalm, hymn, or spiritual song, where necessary, will be prefaced by

an analysis of its contents, and have appended to it notes explanatory of obscure phrases, and allusions.

The work shall be put to press as soon as sufficient subscribers shall be obtained to enable us to *pay cash* for the paper. That we may be able to do this, the price, which will be ONE DOLLAR a copy, must be forwarded with the orders.

All letters containing orders must be post paid. This is an essential part of our terms. Direct to the Editor of the Advocate, Office Tavern, Amelia, Va.

Subscribers who may wish their copies to be transmitted by mail, will receive them *in sheets*; others, who shall indicate a different channel, can, *if they desire it*, have them neatly bound in sheep at 25 cents extra per copy.

It is respectfully requested, that all orders be explicitly and legibly written, containing the place or post office, county and State, to which copies are to be sent.

Any individual, well disposed to the undertaking, is authorized to act as agent. As less than five dollars cannot be sent by mail, five subscribers, or five copies, *at least*, should be ordered by each agent. More would quicken our operations;—but not less than five should be ordered from a distance.

Our agents in this matter will be each entitled to one copy for their trouble.

We present the following as an example of the arrangement and execution of this volume of Hebrew Melodies.

PSALM II.—C. M

ANALYSIS.

Prediction of the conspiracy of the Jews and Gentiles against Messiah.—The degree of his resurrection, ultimate extent of his dominion, and final conquest of his enemies. A most noble prophecy, as yet fulfilled only in part. Compare Acts iv. 26; xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5; v. 6.

1. Why rage the heathen? A vain thing
Why do the people mind?
Kings of the land why rise they up—
The Rulers why combine—
2. Against Jehováh, and his King
Anointed? Saying thus,
*Assumer let us burst their bands;
And cast their cords from us.*
3. He that in heaven sits shall laugh;
The Lord shall them deride.
Then shall he speak to them in wrath,
And in fierce anger chide.

Jehov. "Yet will I set my king upon
My Zion's holy hill."

He unto me hath said :

5. *My son thou art ; this self-same day
Have I begotten thee.
Ask, and the nations I will give
For thine inheritance—*
6. *And for possession thou shalt have
The Earth's remotest bounds.
And with an iron rod thou shalt
Completely break them down ;*
7. *Yea, as a potter's sherd, thou shalt
In pieces dash them all.
O, then, ye kings be wise ! be warn'd
Ye Rulers of the land !*
8. *With awe be subject to the Lord,
With trembling fear ye, too,
Kiss ye the Son, lest angry he
Upon you ruin bring ;*
9. *For soon his hot displeasure shall
Against his foes enflame.
But blest are they who put their trust,
And refuge seek in him !*

NOTES.

V. 1. *The Heathen*, i. e. the Gentiles; *the People*, i. e. Israel. This distinction between Israel and the Nations of the Earth is kept up throughout the Scriptures. See 1 Pet ii. 10. *Kings of the Land*, i. e. the secular governors of Judea. *The Rulers*, i. e. the Ecclesiastical chiefs.—V. 4. *Ye will I, &c.*—Jehovah speaks. *King*, i. e. Messiah. *Zion's Holy Hill*, i. e. Mount Zion in Judea. *I will declare*—Messiah speaks.—V. 5. His resurrection and inheritance foretold and indicated.

Lunenburg, Co. Va; March 22d, 1837.

Dear Brother Thomas,

The Apostle in the beginning of the 5th of 2d Cor., appears to fix our attention upon the eternal state. "For we know, that if the earthy house of this our tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, everlasting in the heavens." The word everlasting appears to show that this building of God is not a transient mansion between death and the resurrection, but a permanent one belonging to eternity. Compare the sentence, "For indeed, in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be invested with an heavenly mansion;" with "we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the resurrection."

namely, the redemption of our body." Do not these two groanings, groan after the same object of hope? Also compare, "And surely, being thus invested, we shall not be found naked. For, indeed, we who are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not that we desire to be divested, but invested; that mortality may be swallowed up of life;" with, "Now when this corruptible body shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal body shall have put on immortality, then that saying of scripture shall be accomplished, 'death is swallowed up forever.'" Don't these two reach to the same consummation of hope? If correct in the premises, are we not also in the conclusion, namely, that to be present with the Lord, is to be accomplished, when by our resurrected bodies, we shall be conformed to the image of the Son, that he may be the first-born amongst many brethren? Paul appears to me to look beyond the shadow of death, as a vale too narrow to obstruct his view to the eternal state, lighted up with the full light of the Lord God Almighty, and of the Lamb. It was the contemplation of this light of glory, great beyond expression, that enabled him not to regard as burdensome the afflictions and persecutions of the present time. I long to see a love commensurate with the high and holy consideration of divine truth, increasingly pervading the christian brotherhood. A course of conduct, *humble*. A *dignified, mild, yet firm*, tender yet candid, uncompromisingly speaking the truth, yet speaking it in love, and in all respects divinely approved, is, beloved brother, what we much need. May Almighty God undertake for all his people, for the great Redeemer's sake, is the prayer of yours in gospel bonds,

ALBERT ANDERSON.

THE ADVOCATE

FOR THE

TESTIMONY OF GOD

AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOKS OF

NATURE AND REVELATION.

The invisible attributes of God, even his eternal power and divinity, since the creation of the world, are very evident; being known by his works.—*Paul*.

All scripture given by divine inspiration, is profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect—completely fitted for every good work.—*Paul*.

Such is the title, by which this work will be designated, on the publication of the Fourth Volume. "*The Advocate*" is

its present name, and will continue so to be. The present title is expletive of the subject-matter for which it pleases. **THE TESTIMONY OF GOD.** The grand divisions of this volume are twofold—first the evidence he has given of his Eternal Power, and Divinity in what is termed Nature; and, secondly that which is contained in the Historical Books and the Law of Moses, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Apostolic Writings. The First, or Natural division of the Testimony of God, contains all, and infinitely more, than can be found in the Encyclopædia of human discoveries:—hence, the principles and facts, which have resulted from the observations and experiments of accurate observers, will arrest the attention of **THE ADVOCATE** from time to time. Our design in doing this, is, that the works of God may be brought to bear illustratively on his word; for, we are convinced, that nothing is better calculated to break the shackles of prejudice and superstition, than an enlightened acquaintance with the objects and “*laws* of Nature,” as God’s natural institutions are termed. The second division of the Testimony of God, relates equally to Man and the External World of Nature, only that it reveals the ultimate destiny of both; and the extraordinary arrangements, by which they are to be carried onward to that glorious result; which the inaudible, though expressive, (see ps. xix.) works of God do not.—**THE ADVOCATE** will, therefore, exercise himself to the best of his ability and judgment, in setting forth the manifold wisdom of God as inscribed on the brilliant pages of those two interesting volumes.

Many persons having regretted the smallness of our paper as it now exists, we have determined to increase the number of its pages, to meet if possible their wishes. To enable us to compass this, a few friends, well-wishers to liberty of speech and free discussion, have contributed somewhat to the purchase of a press and types; without which, indeed, from the many inconveniences by which we should have been surrounded in the country, we must necessarily have closed our editorial labors with the present volume. To these brethren, then, our readers are indebted for any gratification that may accrue to them from the continued visits of **THE ADVOCATE**.

His capacity will be increased to *thirty-six pages* of the present form. He will commence his journeys to all parts of the Union about the beginning of every month; and, that he may present as respectable an appearance at last as at first, he will be neatly enclosed in colored paper. This will enable us to increase our circulation to divers prospectus, which have been forwarded, and to acknowledge receipts without trespassing upon the pages of the work; two things which we have found it difficult to do under the present constitution of our affairs.

We will not say, that **The Advocate** will be supported by any other paper countenanced by its friends.

pages, printed with gold on leaves of satin, at 25 cents, would be dear, if, upon the reading, neither our faith, knowledge, love, nor hope were aught increased. It is much instruction in a small compass, that stamps a value on a work, though its paper, types, ink, and execution be all indifferent. We aim at much in little; and trust that our present readers will deem ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, which will be the subscription fee, not too much of a charge for the volume of our fourth year.

We hope we shall be able to introduce to our readers articles from the pens of divers intelligent brethren, that shall be worthy of their perusal and profound consideration. We shall not be so anxious to tell them of the great number of proselytes making at protracted meetings, as of the progress in faith, knowledge, and purity of those who have already obeyed the truth. And this we will do, as far as our information shall extend.

We shall continue to send the Fourth Volume (which begins in May) to our present subscribers, who have not certified their wish to discontinue; supposing that the trifling increase of *fifty cents* per volume will be no obstacle to their continued patronage.

Our friends will greatly facilitate our operations by paying their subscriptions in advance; as, being in the country, it will be necessary to lay in a stock of paper for several months; and for which we must pay the cash.

✉ All letters for the Editor, to be addressed (post paid) to THE OFFICE TAVERN, AMELIA COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Any exertion to increase the circulation of *The Advocate* will be appreciated as a grateful stimulus to redoubled efforts in the cause of gospel liberty by

THE EDITOR.

“Mr. Tronchin, the Physician of the Duke of Orleans, being sent for to attend Voltaire in his illness at Paris, Voltaire said to him, “Sir, I desire you, would save my life, I will give you the half of my fortune, if you lengthen out my days only for six months; if not, I shall go to the devil, and shall carry you along with me.”—*Fletcher's Letters*.

How different is the language of Paul, when the day of his death was near. “I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.” “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.” “Having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.” The first (*Voltaire*) was a Deist;—the last (*Paul*) was a Christian.

THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE

AND

PROPHETIC INTERPRETER.

EDITED BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

Vol. 3. AMELIA Co. Va. APRIL, 1837. No. 1

Built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone.—*Ephes. ii. 20.*

Shut up, O Daniel, the words and seal the book to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. . . . Many shall be purified and made white, and tried, but the wicked shall do wickedly; but none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.—*Dan. xii. 4, 10.*

MOMENTOUS TIDINGS FROM THE EAST.

Many can bear us witness, that we have urged, from the testimony of prophets and Apostles the near approach of the restoration of the Kings from the East to their own Land. That these Kings are the Israelites appears from their birth-place, and their Divine Constitution. The land of their nativity is The East: they are of the East and from the East, myriads of them dispersed over the western world. They were a nation of Kings and Priests; for it is written, "if ye will obey my voice indeed," says Jehovah, "and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." *Exod. xix. 5, 6.* But they refused Him who spoke the words which Jehovah commanded Him to speak to them; they rejected Jesus, and God rejected them; and took to himself by the Gospel a new race of Kings and Priests—as it is written, "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people"—*1 Pet. ii. 9.* The Jewish Kingdom of Priests in relation to the Nations of the Earth was a political institution; but the Christian Kingdom of Priests, in relation to unbelieving Jews and Gentiles, is a spiritual institution. The passage of the Apocalypse, when the phrase KINGS OF THE EAST is found, regards those of the political kingdom of priests; for the return of the Kings of the East here spoken of, relates to the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel; that is, to their becoming again an independent community among the Kingdoms of the world.

We are, and, indeed, have been a slave community, political, ecclesiastical, and commercial among the Kingdoms and republics of the world. I well remember the

gret in leaving Europe was my apprehension, that, in the back woods of America, I should be cut off from a knowledge of the stirring events then happening, and about to occur in relation to the prophetic earth—Europe, Africa, and Asia. But through the kind attention of friends in England, I am periodically supplied with some of the Leading Journals of that Country; which chronicle not only the incidents of that little island of the sea, but of the great world at large. By these I am enabled to read the passing history of Nations, and to interpret, by facts themselves, the prophetic signs of the Times.—Thus, when the Lord comes, should I be alive, I shall not be taken unawares;—my anxious solicitude is, that the genuine disciples of Christ may be likewise ready.

Believing, with faith unfeigned, that God rules the World,—when I beheld Mehemet Ali expelling the Euphratean Horsemen, or Turks, from the land of Canaan, and driving them from Syria over the Taurian Mountains;—when I saw England and Russia interdicting his advance upon Constantinople;—when I reflected on the healing of the wounds of Egypt then and now in progress; when I behold the extreme anxiety of Russia to stretch her borders to the Persian Gulph; and the acute sensibility of England to check her ambition in that direction;—when I see the commercial enterprise of the English opening a highway to India along the Euphrates and Red Sea by steam, and thus aiming to restore the commerce of the western world with India to its ancient route as in the days of David and Solomon; when I see the empire of the Euphratean Turks breaking up on every side; when I contemplate the warlike operations of the French upon the old African province of Ancient Rome, subduing the piratical Arabs, Turks, and Moors of the Mediterranean shores, and thus rendering the maritime and continental communications with Canaan safe, and when I read in the Apocalypse that,—“the sixth angel poured forth his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and its waters were dried up, that a way might be prepared for the kings of the east”—when I reflect upon these things, I say, I cannot believe, that the mere aggrandizement of Mehemet Ali; the gratification of national jealousies; the mere extension of territorial limits; the satiety of commercial lust; the mere substitution of one tyranny for another, or the simple addition of a colony to a kingdom of Europe;—are the sole and ultimate designs of the Almighty in permitting these interesting and notable events. No; I verily believe, as I have often said, that the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, is about to strike the Image of Nebuchadnezzar upon the toes; that the 2300 years of Daniel are on the eve of their demise; that the cleansing of the sanctuary is at hand; that the Jews will be soon restored to their political integrity, not from any love borne them by the governments of the world,

but from motives of policy and expediency, these things are so we doubt not, will be demonstrated in a few years to the astonishment of a panic-stricken and quaking world. For the Restoration of Israel will be consummated in a glorious crisis upon all nations.

It will be seen from the letter subjoined, that Jehu answered the cries of Israel, who have for many years suffered under the oppression of the Turks, by sending them "a saviour and a vindicator, that he might deliver them" in the person of Mehemet Ali; the present king of Egypt. Isaiah predicted that he would do this in his "Oracle concerning Egypt" (Isaiah xix. 20) about 2400 years ago. In the same Oracle, Jehu says, "he will smite Egypt, smiting and healing her." He has smitten her for many centuries, but is now healing her, and will show hereafter. This letter informs us that Mehemet Ibrahim his son, and Generallissimo, has made it safe to travel, in peace and security in the land of Palestine. It says the letter, "*there is peace within our borders—no destruction within our roads—no lamenting, but peace and security in our land.*" How changed is Palestine within the last six years!—"The unhappy condition of the people under the unsteady yoke of the Turks remains unchanged." The agriculturist is continually pillaged by the authorised robberies of the pasha, and the predatory attacks of the Arabs. The traveller can only have his choice of different bands of robbers for his escort. Art and industry languish for want of vigour and information. Commerce exposed to arbitrary vexation, is confined to timid bargains, or consigned to all the risks of caravans. Such is the deplorable condition of a country, rich in its soil, important in its local position, and which might, by a new crusade, be easily wrested from the grasp of its barbarous oppressors."—*Malte Brun* p. 352. This deliverance Mehemet has achieved,

"The decree of the King of Egypt" says the letter, "has come to us." By this decree the Rabbis at Jerusalem consider, that the crown of Judah is about to return to its true possessors. They tell us that by virtue of this edict, they have established a House of Devotion, and a House of Public Instruction; they have received a dispensation from paying the bills unsecured on land which have been in the hands of oppressors for many years; the debtors have been discharged, and their obligations cancelled.

They hope soon to be favored by the rebuilding of the Temple; which, however will not be effected until they have taken possession of the Temple Mount, in the presence of many witnesses; and they have appointed gentlemen to oversee the workmen, in the rebuilding of the breaches to dwell in. They expect to be invited to Britain, to use his influence with the British Government.

mighty, in behalf of their Nation, of Jerusalem, and of Palestine, their inheritance; that they may be enabled to build a magnificent House of Holy Assemblies on the ancient ruin.— They describe the decree as very great. We hope we shall be able at some future period to make it known to our readers. At present we can only lay before them the documents which have come to hand.

EDITOR.

From The Morning Herald, Jan. 12, 1837

“ Most Interesting Letter from Jerusalem ”

Since the publication of Cyrus's decree to build and to restore Jerusalem, we understand its inhabitants have not been so delighted with a Gentile Government as they were with Mehemet Ali's on the day to which a reference is made in the following translation of a letter from five of the principal Rabbis to a Hebrew merchant of London, who visited them a few years since, and keeps up a correspondence with them:—

“ With God's assistance, Monday, the 8th of Tishri, 5597 (Sept. 19, 1836.) Here, in the Holy City of Jerusalem, to the famous city of London. Peace and long life, to honor and glory, in the splendor of the well known Master, who acts well with those who are good, the honored name of *****
***, and all who belong to him. Thou, God, keep them for ever.

“ As it happens that the way of the gentleman leads him to your high honor, we let you know that there is peace within our borders—no destruction within our roads, no lamenting, but peace and security in our land. May God continue to let us hear of the peace of our brethren in exile, and to redeem us in mercy a second time, with a perfect redemption. Amen. May it be His will. This is a day of announcing to acquaint the congregation of Israel that God has comforted Zion, comforted its ruins. That which ourselves have hoped, and our holy fathers have hoped for, we have found and seen. The decree of the King of Egypt has come to us. About the reign of our Rabbi Jehuda, the most religious (his soul in Eden,) our ancestors gave themselves much trouble unsuccessfully; and now God, by his many mercies for us, has thought of his people and their inheritance, and in our low estate he has thought of us to return the crown to its former possessors. Our fathers left us a place to be enclosed, and so let us say “ Holy, holy,” as there has been established a house of devotion, and a house of public instruction. When the people heard of the powerful command, they became astonished, and were unable to find their hands or feet. We brought out of the offices the letters which contained a dispensation from paying all the bills which

for many years had been in the hands of the mighty of the land, by reason of former violence and spoil. All the bills were discharged, and all their obligations are now destroyed like a broken shard, (a piece of an earthen pot.) When the holders of the bills saw the command of the King and the Minister, whose name is Shah Aslam, that every debt of 100 years' standing, and more particularly those which were about 100 years, and unsecured on land, should be cancelled, and when they beheld the judges tearing the securities in presence of the public, a great number of the mighty of the land brought the bills of which they were the holders, and gave them to our hands for any present which we were pleased to give them. Let the mountain of Zion rejoice, and the daughters of Judah be glad. Be rejoiced, O inhabitant of Zion, because the Holy ONE of Israel is great in thee. To the Jews has been light and joy, as there is still help of God in our land, to raise up and revive, and to bring us back to our inheritance. Thus may He favor us to be rejoiced to see the rebuilding of the house of our holiness. May it be His will. How glorious and tremendous was the holiness of the day, Thursday, the 19th of Elul (the 1st of Sept.) The Jews, our brethren, and ourselves, entered into the ruins to take possession of them, in the presence of all those who came into the gate of this city. Hallowed let Him be who caused us to glorify His name in public. We have removed the dust from the houses which are standing. There is one large house and enclosure, with many other houses, and a cistern adjoining, but all required to be repaired. We have, therefore, engaged some worthy gentlemen to oversee the working people, and they perform it with faithfulness: we hope in the ETERNAL to have, in the lapse of two or three weeks, a beautiful house of study, sacred to the Holy Name. We were obliged to borrow certain sums for strengthening and repairing the old buildings. And now be powerful to awake among the mighty for our nation, and for the city of our God, and the inheritance of our ancestors (as the decree, if fulfilled in its proper time, is very great,) to lay the foundation in the mountain of Zion. May they separate some portion from their riches in honor of their CREATOR, to build a house of holy assemblies in that ruin. The eyes of Israel have been longing and hoping for the time in which this great deed would come into their hands that they might be able to fulfill it, and as it has now come to them, they will not be negligent in it. May the hands of him be in truth to follow up the work with
 * * * * *
 They should not rest nor be quiet: Redeem Zion. It is not unknown to you the promise which is fulfilled by rebuilding the ruin of Jerusalem; and according to his promise from the

kind with us, will arise to assist us, and every where his hand and arm will strengthen him, to increase and so bring near & benefit for it. According to the donations will our inheritance be enlarged. Now, as the ETERNAL thought upon the days of misery of Jerusalem for a good purpose and blessing, it is the duty of every man of Israel who has only breath in his nostril, to have compassion on Jerusalem; and we have confidence in God that he will send mercy. May their peace be as powerful as the light, and according to the desire of those who sign their names, and are wishing for the glory of Zion, the city of the holy festivals, and for Jerusalem, the house of our ornament.

“We who are rejoiced by the rebuilding of our city, President, Directors, and Overseers of the German Congregation of the Holy City Jerusalem.”

COPY OF A LETTER ADDRESSED, IN 1832, TO HIS HIGHNESS MEHEMET ALI, THE PACHA OF EGYPT, AND SINCE TRANSLATED INTO HEBREW, FRENCH, AND ARABIC:—

“God is merciful.

“Annadale Cottage, Dublin.

“May HE, who long looked down with favorable eyes on Zion, and who caused a lover of his people to be remembered kindly before Pharaoh, give to this short appeal, and to my future letters, a good acceptance with your Highness.

“Since God alone confers true faith on men, those who believe they are most highly favored by Him should be ever tolerant and generous to others for His sake; yet the attentive reader of impartial history must too frequently discover the powerful, the pious, and the learned, engaged in unrelenting warfare upon weak or passive individuals, who could not conscientiously unite with them in either creed or worship; and I, who am a firm believer in the Christian tenets, could point to many a record of the cruel persecutions which the Hebrew people have experienced from the followers of HIM, who was, as I believe, a most beneficent and peaceful Legislator; who went about continually doing good himself, and commanding His disciples to return good for evil.

“Had the enemies of Israel read the sacred writings duly, they doubtless would have found that blessings had been promised to the benefactors of that people, as well as chastisements on all who should insult or injure them.

“Although the Jews have frequently experienced the considerate kindness of the Sultans and their Vicerovs, yet in the vast extent of the Mahometan dominions, they have been exposed occasionally to severe afflictions. Attached to Palestine by the tenderest associations, its very stones and soil were still most precious in their sight. Numbers have removed from

every portion of the earth, to deposit their remains with the bones of the prophets, priests, and kings : and to terminate their wanderings near the ruins of their city. There, studious of their own safety, and lamenting the transgressions of their nation, they are the best sympathies of those who do not favor their religion. For all those venerable beings I would most humbly beseech the sovereign protection of your Highness. To other portions of the earth, a Jew may be attached by the tender ties of marriage, blood or friendship ; by the profits upon commerce, or the seductive luxuries of life ; but to Jerusalem, which is not only surrounded by a land flowing with milk and honey, he is drawn by piety to God, or by that patriotic ardour which we only find existing in the bosoms of the worthy.

“ For the Catholic, the Greek, and the Protestant institutions in the Holy Land ; for the pilgrims and travellers who may visit Palestine or Egypt, and for all who may be anxious now to settle in your empire, I also humbly ask your Highness’s beneficent protection.

“ The piety, the patriotism, and the beneficence of princes, embalmed by the historians of all ages and all climes, are justly held in reverence by succeeding generations ; and that the recording angel may associate the names of your Highness, your family, your councillors, and your subjects, with those three virtues in the book of life, is now my fervent prayer to the holy God of Abraham, who was the favored sire of Isaac and Ismael. He alone can make, destroy, and renovate. He gives, withdraws, and re-assigns at pleasure. Blessed be God, his names, and attributes for ever.

“ I shall use the freedom of addressing other letters to your Highness on the origin of the pyramids, the preservation of those monumental relics which are coveted by curious Europeans, and other interesting subjects.—I have the honor to subscribe myself, with due respect for your Highness, the servant of the friends of Israel and Judah.

“ JOSEPH HAMILTON.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. HAMILTON’S LETTER TO THE COMMANDER OF THE EUFRATES EXPEDITION, UPON THE 13TH OF FEB., 1835.

“ I shall send you by the mail this evening a portion of my writings, including a copy of my letter to the Pacha of Egypt, which has been translated into French and Hebrew, and which I wish to have translated into the Persian, Arabic, and Turkish languages. That letter was written in 1832, and when, in January, 1833, the Envoys from Constantinople and from London were so wisely cultivating European friendships, I was fully reminded both our Sovereign and his Ministers, that the time was come when Musselmien might be more friendly towards Jews and Christians in the East.

“ At present a peaceful, just, and generous policy pervades more Cabinets than those of Christendom. The Courts of Constantinople, Teheran, and Cairo, will no longer wait for a remonstrance from the European Sovereigns, to avenge the oppression of a Christian or a Jew, by any petty tyrant in their States. A Peter need not now preach up crusades through Christendom; nor an Exmouth be despatched for ‘captive exiles’ to Algiers; for powerful individuals who are not constant readers of our Scriptures are acquainted with some very wholesome truths which they contain. They know that ‘the liberal man deviseth liberal things, and it is by liberal things he shall be established.’

“ A similar spirit will speedily, I trust, diffuse itself throughout the whole of the Mahometan dominions. He who sincerely reverences Mecca and its tomb will pity the venerable Hebrew watchman, who weeps upon the walls of Zion, and the pious Christian at the Sepulchre of CHRIST. It is perhaps, but barely justice to remark that, if the Christians suffered formerly, for conscience sake, in States where their religion was deemed worse than foolish, unfortunately they, with no excuse at all for persecuting zeal, have, in their turn, oppressed the Jew and Saracen. With a meek and merciful REDEEMER for their guide, the sword was their continual companion, and ‘*Dro duce, et ferro committante*’ has too often been their motto. They had a zeal which was not in accordance with true knowledge or sincere devotion, and it might be justly said to them, as to the sons of Zebedee before Samaria, ‘Ye know not what spirit ye are of.’

“ A few days’ voyage in a well-appointed steamer will soon accommodate the English, Scotch, and Irish Jew, who wishes to observe his feast or fast within the Holy City; Christians of every sect, and travellers from every country, will avail themselves of comfortable, cheap, and quick conveyances to the most interesting portions of the globe; the interests of the Mahometan will be promoted greatly; his hospitality, charity, and justice, will be the general theme of Christian panegyric; the prejudices of all parties will be gradually corrected, and a preparation will be made for the fulfilment of Isaiah xix., in which we are assured that there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of Egypt, and a monument of the Lord at the borders thereof, for a sign and for a testimony; that the Egyptians shall make vows to the Lord, and perform them; that Israel shall be third to the Egyptian and the Assyrian, a blessing in the midst of the land which the LORD of Hosts *Yehovah Tzabaoth* hath blessed, saying, ‘Blessed be my people of Egypt, and the work of my hands to the Assyrian; but Israel is my inheritance.’

"Please send to the chief Rabbi, and the Christian, pastors in Jerusalem, the document which I address to you for them, and proceed upon your voyage with a thousand benedictions confiding in the sacred name which I have written in the Hebrew character.

"When you pass through the waters may they not cover you. May you be preserved through every peril, by that Omnipotent appellation of the GOD of Jacob, for the glory of which my DIVINE REDEEMER was especially solicitous; in which he kept his own disciples safe, and implored his FATHER to preserve them still. May that PRINCE of Princes, pastors, patriots, and prophets rebuke each adverse wind and wave which you encounter, and may he do unto you all as unto Ephraim and Manasses."

THE HARBINGER ON "MATERIALISM."

No. 5.

Ye do search the Scriptures; because in them ye think ye have eternal life—*Jesus to the Jews.*

If you would enter into eternal life, keep the commandments—*Jesus to a Rich Man*

The Jews believed in a life which should be eternal; and they believed that all that was to be known about it was to be found in the Old Testament Writings; and for this reason it was that many of them *searched* the scriptures diligently.—They believed in a resurrection of the dead, which is termed "THE HOPE OF ISRAEL"—for which hope the Apostle of the Gentiles was bound with chains;—a hope which is likewise styled, THE HOPE OF THE PROMISE MADE OF GOD TO THE FATHERS—even to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob:—a hope for which Paul the accused of the Jews, stood and was judged at Cæsar's bar:—a hope, unto which the Twelve Tribes worshipping continually, night and day, hoped to attain; and for this same hope of the promise unpolled by metaphysical subtleties, it is, that we plead and are held up to the pious horror of the faithful as a Priestleyan Materialist! Be it so. Who would not bear reproach for the true doctrine concerning such a hope?—The Master, who brought to light *the means* by which an interest in this "promise of life" might be attained, was, in the cause of this same hope, misrepresented and maligned; he was despised as a Samaritan diabolically possessed; yet the truth remained, and his labors were accepted of God. Well then, indulgent reader, let us thank God and take courage. We will suffer shame, yea and loss, if needful, for the sake of some and scriptural doctrine of eternal life. Let power, influence, authority, or ecclesiastical censures, be brought upon us for our "speculative and untaught questions."

ters not ; we know we have the truth, and the truth, as we honestly believe it, we will unflinchingly maintain.

We come now to the seventh "argument" for a metaphysical interpretation of the word *spirit*. This is supposed to be discovered in Heb. xii. 23, which speaks of "*the spirits of just men made perfect.*" We have, in the second volume, page 220, given what we believed to be the correct meaning of the passage. We have not read anything in the Harbinger, to convince us of the metaphysics of the text. The Advocate does not make Paul say, as he is said to do,—'you justified Hebrews are, in the Church, associated with justified Hebrews. This is not "in short metre, his understanding of the matter." It may be the Harbinger's *opinion* that this is our view of it ; but "in short metre," we would rejoin, that he is mistaken. We consider, that Paul was reasoning with the Christians of the Hebrew nation, and laying before them motives to perseverance in the faith of Christ ; from which some of their fellow countrymen, who still adhered to the law of Moses, sought to seduce them. Paul, in v. 17, warned them by the fate of Esau, against the sin of Apostacy. If they sinned wilfully by renouncing the Christ, there was, as in his case, no room for repentance though they might earnestly seek it with tears ; but to them, there remained only a dreadful expectation of judgment, and of fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries : as all apostates are esteemed. 'Now,' as if he had said, 'to what would your persecutors seduce you? To an Institution based upon the Law, which was promulgated from the Mountain of Sinai—a tangible, a material mountain? Would they bring you back to the terrific sublimities of that terrible appearance—to the blackness, the darkness, the tempest, the trumpet's blast, and to the voice of threatening words? Is it to such a covenant, ye just men made perfect, by a *perfect remission*, which the Law of Moses could not accord you, is it to such, I say, that those who afflict you would bring you back? You were, indeed, once under the law ; but could perfection of spirit be attained by the sprinkling of its sacrificial blood? It is true you were esteemed just men ; but the justification, or righteousness, you were then the subjects of, was imperfect ; enduring only for a year. You, my brethren, the offerers of the sacrifices under the Law, were purified with an imperfect purification. Your conscience was imperfect, for it was continually from year to year, burdened with the weight of its sins. How could it indeed be otherwise? Your consciences were sprinkled only with the blood of bulls and of goats ; and you know, that it is impossible for the blood of these animals to take away sins, so as there shall be no more a remembrance of sins. Such are the things to which you were subject under the Law ; but, come now, let me suggest to your remembrance some cheering considerations. Contrast

these two Institutions, and see if there are not greater inducements to a continuance in the faith of Christ, than to a return to the Institution of Sinai. Contrast the events connected with Sinai's burning mountain, with those associated with Mount Zion. The Institution based upon these, is The City of the Living God; the Heavenly Jerusalem. It is the Holy Jerusalem, whose citizens are far more numerous and privileged than those of Mount Sinai's Covenant. They are honored as the angels or messengers of peace and joyful tidings to the inhabitants of Earth. The natural Israel to which you once belonged, was a *particular* assembly; but, in embracing the faith of Jesus, you are now come to an assembly which is *general*; composed not of Jews only, but of converts from among all the Nations of the Roman World—to an assembly, indeed, constituted of individuals first-born of water and the Spirit, who will be born a second time, by a second spiritual birth, by a resurrection from the dead. These first-borns are enrolled in heaven; their names are registered in the Book of Life. To the company of this mixed, or general assembly, and to God, who is the judge of all, both Jew and Gentile, you have come. Contrast the spirit or *consciences* of these first-borns, with those of men in bondage under the Law. Their consciences were imperfect, being but incompletely purified; but the citizens of the heavenly Institution, with which you have become associated, have *perfect* consciences, being perfectly and completely purified by the blood of the Mediator of this New Institution, thus speaking in language the most eloquent to the ears of your understandings better things than can be spoken in connexion with the blood of bulls or of goats, or even of Abel himself, the protomartyr of the world. Take care then, with all these superlative advantages of the New Institution over the Old before you, that you refuse not God, who, in these last days, speaks to us by his Son: for if the rebel Israelites did not escape, who refused to listen to Moses, much more we Christians shall not escape, if we turn away or apostatize from him who thus speaks from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth; but now—even in this our day—he has promised, saying, "Yet once. I shake not the earth only, but also the heavens"—even the political and ecclesiastical heavens of the Mosaic kingdom. Now, this speech, "yet once," signifies the removing of the things of the Law, which were constituted, that the things of the New Institution, which are not to be shaken, may remain. Wherefore, we having received such an Institution, even the Kingdom of Heaven, the dominion of a King, whose empire cannot be shaken, let us have gratitude, by which we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and religiousness.

Such, we conceive, is the true meaning of this beautiful prediction of the Word of God. We are well pleased, that the marks in The Harbinger have induced us to re-consider

We are strengthened in the general view we gave of it on a former occasion. We have adopted the term *first-borns* instead of *first-born* as suggested. The Harbinger has dwelt upon the criticism as evidence against our interpretation; but it has happily assisted us in seeing more clearly the misapplicability of his conceptions.

From the doctrine taught in the letter to the Hebrews we learn, that "*spirits made perfect*" are consciences, or moral dispositions, perfected, so as to have no more conscience of sins; a perfection, which is *developed* by perfect moral actions, or a keeping of the commandments of God as delivered by Christ Jesus, our Lord, and his Apostles. As to the word *perfect*, its signification depends on the context to which the passage stands related in which it is found. Noah is said to have been perfect, Gen. vi. 9; and God commanded him to be perfect, which he would not have done, had there been no sense in which he could be perfect. Job says, "God will not cast away a *perfect* man, which implies the existence of perfect men on the earth, whom He could cast away if he pleased. "Be ye perfect," says Jesus to his hearers, even as your Father is perfect." Perfection then, in the estimation of Jesus, and in the sense of this passage, is possible. "We speak wisdom," say Paul and Sosthenes to the Corinthian disciples, "among *THE perfect*." Who are these called The Perfect? The Living Believers among whom Paul and Sosthenes spoke the wisdom of God; which until the days of the Apostles, was a mystery, being concealed from the view of those who put his Son to death. "Begun in the Spirit," or New Institution, says Paul to the Living Believers in Galatia, "*are ye made perfect by the Flesh*," or Old Institution whose circumcision pertained to the flesh? This passage shews, that Paul considered the Galatians as made perfect by the Gospel. "Let us then," says he to the Phillippians, "as many as would be perfect, be likeminded." Would be perfect when? Now or hereafter? We answer in accordance with The Harbinger hereafter. The word perfect in this passage, refers to the prize about which Paul was discoursing; a prize, which consists, not in metaphysical abstractions, but in the having our *humbled* bodies transformed into a like form with his glorious body, when the Lord Jesus Christ shall appear among men. "For the law made no one perfect," says Paul; that is, its priests; for in this connexion he is reasoning about the Jewish and Christian Priesthoods. This implies, that the New Institution does confer perfection on its Priesthood. And who are the priests of the New Institution? Jesus the High Priest, and his Disciples, who are kings and priests to God. The Gospel then does make its adherents *perfect*, which no other institution, however adored among men, can. This same doctrine of per-

fection is taught in Heb. x. But the climax of our proof, the perfect is applicable to genuine disciples of Christ, as contrasted with those under the law, is this,—“By which will (or institution) we (believers) are sanctified (or constituted holy,) through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once*. Wherefore by one offering he has perfected for ever the sanctified.” Now this perfection of the sanctified consists in a perfect and complete forgetfulness of their former sins; “for, says Paul, speaking of the perfecting institution, “their sins and iniquities will God remember no more.”

From these premises we learn, that perfection, in a certain sense, in this life can be attained;—that the true and genuine believers of the Gospel are the sole subjects of that perfection which is recognized by God—they are **THE PERFECT**; that, perfection is either moral or physical, that the perfect become morally or spiritually perfect when they become the subjects of the New Institution, and that they become physically or materially perfect when they shall attain to the resurrection of the dead. This is the Mark for the Prize of the High Calling. It was that he might attain to this prize that Paul was laid hold on by Christ Jesus. The resurrection was the mark upon which the Apostle's eye was fixed. His ardent longings were not after a state of metaphysical abstraction, but he was willing to suffer anything that by any means he might attain to the Resurrection of the dead, which is the door by which we must, and can alone enter, unless alive at the coming of the Lord into the presence Chamber of the Almighty.

Moral or spiritual perfection is an indispensable preliminary to physical or corporal. He that does not become a *perfect spirit* in this life will not be raised a *perfect body*, for the enjoyment of that which is to come. To become a perfect spirit one must be born of the Spirit, and then he will be morally perfect, for it is written, *that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*. Now, he that is morally and physically perfect must be spiritual and perfect indeed. He will then be just as perfect as he can, or need, be. Seeing then, that the perfection of believers is not entire until they rise from the dead, the phrase, *the spirit of a just man* is precise and emphatic. *The spirit of a just man*, is a Genuine and Living Believer. That is, one who has had his heart sprinkled from an evil conscience and his body washed in purifying water. The assembly composed generally of the first-borns of the spirit, was composed of such persons; these were individuals who were perfected by the Blood, the Water, and the Spirit, of the Gospel Institution; a perfection acknowledged and accepted of God, which the Institution of Moses could not confer.

Such are the impressions which the Word of God leaves upon “the *carte blanche* mind of the confident and true Advocate” as to the significations of these phrases.

learned them neither from Calvin, Wesley nor Priestley. Ecclesiastical thunder may be hurled against them as "speculative and untaught;" but we remain tranquil amidst the storm; confident that the electricity of its heavens cannot materially affect us, insulated as we are upon the testimony of God—a conductor which makes its subjects safe and renders powerless the intended bolt.

With this and much beside before his mind, what reader can continue to believe, as The Harbinger represents, that by "justified spirit" we meant or understood "justified breath made perfect," or "justified temper made perfect."—We can forgive and forget "the TONE, TEMPER, and MANNER" in which an opponent of our views may treat us; but perversion, which bears the mark of intention, is too bad, too bad: and the sayings we are now considering look very much like it—but we will not judge of motive, but let the matter pass.

A metaphysical divinity gives the following summary view of the passage we have paraphrased.—"The apostle told Christians in the flesh, Christians dwelling in mortal bodies, in their earthly tabernacles, that under Christ they were associated with all in heaven, as well as with all that is excellent on the earth; that they were under that New Institution called Mount Zion—the City of the Living God—the heavenly Jerusalem—and consequently were all communicants in the following privileges—viz. the Society of,

1. Myriads of angels, the joyful assembly.
2. The congregation of the first-borns—the ancients long since dead, but enrolled in heaven.
3. God the judge of the Living and the Dead, who dwells in this city.
4. The spirits of just men made perfect; those translated to heaven in their bodies, and those raised from the dead after Christ's resurrection.
5. Jesus the Mediator of the everlasting Institution, with its everlasting peace through his blood. These are the privileges of the justified Jews and Gentiles under Christ. Here is no tautology—no display for effect."—Harb. p. 456, v. vii.

We would ask of human tradition, how do you know that the *angels* mentioned here are the inhabitants of other planets, and not the *inspired messengers of God* employed in bearing the glad tidings of remission of sins and eternal life to the nations of the Roman World?—How do you make *general assembly* mean "*joyful assembly*?"—What constituted the "*ancient*" Antediluvians, Patriarchs, and Israelites the first-borns—of what were they born? Were they ever born of the spirit? If they were, how, or after what manner was their birth?—Have they to your certain knowledge been generally born from the grave? If they have been born neither spiritually nor physically, how can they have been born at all? And if not born,

is not the Christian race constituted of the true first-born. Cannot a man be "enrolled in heaven" without being in heaven remote from the earth; can he not be living here and his name recorded on the rolls there; and cannot he be even dead in the grave—that is, personally absent, and yet "enrolled" there?—How does God dwell in the New Institutions? Where is the evidence to prove, that the spirits of the just made perfect are the translated and raised? Where is the testimony to prove that those who came out of their graves after Christ rose, ascended to heaven?—These are a few of the questions we should like to see scripture answers to before we can receive the aforesaid metaphysical interpretation of the text. We agree this passage is sublime, but we exceedingly demur to the interpretation put upon it in the Harbinger. It appears, that the Editor has some years since given it the same rendering in a sermon "on the fulness of Gospel blessings." We should like to know if this sermon was preached before or after he obeyed the Gospel: if before, then of course we expect but little else than what we have before us; if after, we looked for better things. Though pronounced a "materialist," our exposition is set forth as an *airy speculation*. Now this is remarkably inconsistent. A materialist deal in *airy speculations*! This is singular indeed.

The "8th Argument" is selected from Matt. x. "Fear not them who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; but rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell."—Now then, says the Metaphysician we have you hard and fast.—What can you short-sighted "materialists" do with the text. Is not this sufficient to prove you semi-Infidels, and unworthy of toleration in Christian Society? Justly may you be classed with the Paine's, and the Voltaire's, and all that herd!—But hold, not so fast; let us examine the passage, and see what it means.

The soul in this place, says the Spiritualist, means "the indestructible part of man"—which is *divine particula aurea* a particle of the Divine Essence. Very well; but question here;—what are we to understand by *this destroying the indestructible part of man*; or by this God's ability to, destroy a particle of his own Divine Essence?—This is making God destroy himself! We must do the Harbinger justice by saying, that he considers the soul indestructible only in relation to human power. Well we live in a system of relations; so that in some sort we must deal lightly with his *destructible* *destructible soul*. Metaphysics is very credulous: it can swallow at gnats, but can swallow a drove of camels. This unfortunate passage has thrown it into a quandary, where to leave it to get out at its leisure. But in doing this we do not shirk the question ourselves. Well then, *Eternity* *conditional*. This doctrine is true, and though

cannot be disproved. As we have said before, so we affirm again with equal confidence, that if true, then all passages in relation to the destiny of soul and body must be interpreted in conformity with the doctrine of Eternal Life. This passage then comes under this rule.

Jesus said on another occasion—*He who believes on the Son has life eternal; HE WHO REJECTS THE SON, SHALL NOT SEE LIFE;*” but the vengeance of God awaits him.—Jno. iii. 36.—The vengeance of God awaiting one who shall not see eternal life is equivalent to destroying both soul and body in hell. The signification of Matt. x. 28 is paraphrastically this—Fear not them who shall persecute you, though they can deprive you of animal life, but cannot take from you your spiritual or eternal being; but rather fear him, even God, who can deprive you both of the life which now is and of that which is to come. In this passage, I understand by the word *sooma* body, the animal life, and by the word *psuchee* eternal life.—The Harbinger cannot object to this: for, the passage which reads thus in the common version—*what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?* he has sanctioned by adopting the translation of the word as rendered by Dr. George Campbell in the new version; which reads thus—“what would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world with the forfeit of his (*psuchee*) life? Or what will a man give in ransom for his life?”—The word *psuchee* be it remembered is the word used in Matt. x. and in Mark viii. In Matthew the New Version translates it *soul*, and in Mark, *life*; and furthermore, in the original it is *psuchee* in verses 35, 36, & 37, of Mark viii; yet in the Old Version the translators have rendered it *life* in the 35th, but *soul* in the 36th & 37th: The New Version is consistent in Mark where it renders *psuchee* life throughout: though at variance with Matt. x. as collated with other places. That *psuchee*, in the passages referred to, signifies *eternal life* is obvious from the connexion in which our Lord uses it; for he uses the word when discoursing with the Jews and his disciples on the subject of eternal life. “Whosoever” says he, “would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, shall save it.”—Here, *the life lost, and the life saved* are opposites. The former is the life that now is, which men can take from us; the latter is the life to come, which God alone can deprive us of. He that loses the life that is, and the life which is to be, suffers annihilation, which God alone can effect. Here again, “the eighth argument” which was to destroy both the soul and body of our “materialism;” forsakes the metaphysicians, and gives testimony in behalf of the doctrine for which we plead. Lastly, here; if God be life as it is written; and *psuchee* and *pneuma* be life, as they are

in fact, then every thing when it dies surrenders its life to the Master of Life while its body moulders away. In this sense "the spirit (or life) returns to God who gave it;" and as men die in hope of eternal life, they commit their life to God, which is the meaning of the *spirit of a man going upward*; but, as the inferior animals die without a hope of a future life, their spirit is said to go downward; the life of the former is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life, and not some destructible indestructible spirit shall appear, then shall the saved appear with him in glory, and not an instant before. Col. iii.

The "ninth argument" is easily disposed of. It is in the words of Paul,— "there is a spiritual body." This we believe is as true as that Jesus rose from the dead a spiritual body.— The Harbinger asks a question in connexion with this text and says,— "will it not strike the attention of all, that a spiritual body is—only a *body* and not a *spirit*?"— We answer no, it does not so strike us. The great difference between a spiritual body and an animal body, as the apostle teaches, consists in the intrinsic attributes of each. That the contrast may the better appear we present it in the following way.

That which is Animal is first, and then that which is Spiritual. "Just so is the resurrection of the dead" body—

1. <i>The Animal Body</i>	2. <i>The Spiritual Body</i>
It is composed of flesh and blood and bones;	It is composed of flesh and bones;
It is corruptible;	It is incorruptible;
It is dishonored;	It is glorious;
It is weak;	It is powerful;
It is a living soul;	It is a life-enduring spirit;
It is the image of the earthy Adam;	It is the image of the heavenly Adam;
It is mortal;	It is immortal;
It is the victim of Death.	It is the fruit of victory.

The "tenth argument" we have already noticed page 221, vol. i. We shall therefore pass on to "Materialism No. 4."— The "eleventh argument" is 2 Cor. xii. 2-5. The Harbinger imagines that Paul really "made a flight to Paradise and back again." This is what Mohammedans say of Mohammed; but the Apostle does not affirm this of himself. He tells us that the whole matter was a *vision and revelation*. Must a man fly away to Paradise to have a vision or to receive a revelation? John could have visions and revelations of events, and future glories for centuries upon centuries to come, and yet he was on the shore of Patmos' Isle; and shall we say that he was transported to some remote province of infinitude that he might have a vision and revelation of the Eternal State? He does not deal thus with men in his communications.

pers his revelations in their ears, and presents pictures to their visual organs. The Lord is said to have whispered in the ear of Samuel; and the Apostles were commanded to proclaim upon the housetops what should be whispered in their ears. The things revealed are recorded in the Bible as far as they can be conveyed in the at best but feeble speech of men. Paul was in an extacy, as was Peter when he saw the vision of the great sheet. Peter left not the housetop although he saw it take up into heaven; he did not go into heaven to see it arrive there. "To boast indeed," says Paul, "is not profitable to me. Yet I will proceed (to tell of) visions and revelations of (or from) the Lord." Of the many visions and transcendent revelations he had received from the Lord he cites one instance in particular, in which about fourteen years before the time he was then relating it, he was suddenly conveyed away in vision, i. e. he was enraptured in a view of THE THIRD HEAVEN, which he likewise terms PARADISE. Accompanying this extatic vision, or view of the superlative glories of Eternity, he heard unspeakable things, i. e. he heard revelations of things which he could not narrate to the Corinthians, because, their language was too feeble to express them. See p. 206, of this volume. Or it may be he was commanded not to reveal them to others. The whole scenery, he describes as so transcendent that at the time he witnessed it he was unconscious of his animal existence—"whether in the body, or out of the body. I do not know." Such honor as he boasted of was calculated to exalt a man of the strongest mind above measure. He might imagine himself to be something more than he appeared to be in the eyes of ordinary men; that this should not be Paul's case, the Lord determined to give him a thorn in the flesh, that he might not forget that as yet he was but flesh and blood animal man. In this passage, Paradise is synonymous with the Third Heaven, and both are equivalent to the New Jerusalem *Ægæ*, which is Eternal. The commencement of these does not ensue until after the Second Resurrection; as yet they exist only in the anticipations of prophecy, vision, or revelation. Paul then could not have been personally in Paradise, but rather had an extatic view of the glorious state in which he was to be at the appointed time.

Next comes the "twelfth argument," as untenable as the rest. "To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." As we have said elsewhere, we shall make this text the subject of a separate illustration. For the present, we shall briefly remark upon the genuineness of the reading. Griesbach, a celebrated critic, and a great authority with Dr. George Campbell, as well as with the Harbinger says, that in some manuscripts there is a different reading, which is omitted by some critics, but which in his judgment ought not to be left out—his words are "notat omissa a nonnullis, sed, nostro consilio, non omittenda." The reading which Griesbach approves but which I recollect right, is not inserted in the text, is as follow — Kai

and elge the robber said too Iesou to Jesus: Mneenthou mou, kurie, remember me, Lord, hotan when elthees thou comest, en tee heemera in the day tees eleuseoos sou of thy coming. Kai and ho Iesous Jesus eipen said autoo to him: soi to thee legos I say ameen so be it, soi seemeron this day itself (that is, the day of his coming) esce thou shalt be met emou with me en too Paradeisoo in the garden of delights. To read the English connectedly it is literally thus—*And he said to Jesus; remember me, Lord, when thou comest in the day of thy coming. And Jesus said to him,—to thee I say so be it; this day itself thou shalt be with me in the garden of delights.*—In the new version, the thief appoints the same time when he desires to be remembered: he did not ask Jesus to remember him on that day on which he was crucified; but that he would remember him ‘when he should come to his kingdom.’ By making *soi seemeron* mean the day of the crucifixion the request of the robber was evaded. Parkhurst says concerning this word, that *semeron* denotes either the artificial or natural day. And, according to a rule which cannot be set aside, that *the signification of a word depends upon its context*, it is obvious, that *semeron* refers to an artificial and not to a natural day. In other words it refers to the day when Jesus shall descend from heaven to his kingdom and take up his great power and reign; and not to the day of the entombment of his animal body. But more of this hereafter. Then, on this very day, of his descent, shall the dead who have died in the lawful hope of a resurrection to eternal life, hear the voice of Jesus, and come forth, not from Paradise, but from the grave, that they may enter the garden of delight; and among these children of the resurrection will be this notorious, but pardoned culprit; and thus the promise of Jesus will be redeemed. Lastly, we would observe, that this interpretation is all in conformity with the prophetic and apostolic doctrine of the Kingdom, and with the conditionality of eternal life.—Astonishing, that a man of such acuteness as Brother Campbell should be so unperceiving in these self-evident affairs!

The Thief and Jesus himself being with us, we shall leave No. 12, and pass on. Scripture being always consistent with itself, and having met fairly the strongest positions of the Spiritualist, we shall claim exemption, now at all events, from the necessity of noticing every text of scripture in the Bible perverted to the support of human tradition. Our exposition of the 4th and 5th 2d Cor. will show our view of Phil. 1. 23-24, which is the basis of “Argument 13” “Lord Jesus receive my spirit” is adduced as “Argument 14.” We have shown, p. 245, v. 2, the signification of this. We refer the reader to the place. The Harbinger has not attempted to explain it, but says he, “to explain this, is to illustrate sun-light by moon-light.” So he thinks. I have however attempted to interpret

The text. The reader can do with the interpretation as seems best to him. Argument 15 is based upon the text—"God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Let us see if we cannot give the true signification of this. First then to the context.

From this it appears, that the Jews and Samaritans did not agree on the subject of acceptable worship to God. The Samaritans with whom the Jews would have no dealings, contended that the Temple of Samaria on Mount Gerizzim was the acceptable place of worship. The Jews denied it, and insisted that God had placed his throne in Jerusalem and that the temple of Mount Moriah was the place where men ought to worship. But Jesus steps in and gives the controversy a new direction: for he tells a Samaritan woman, that the time was approaching when Jews and Samaritans should neither come to Samaria, nor go to Jerusalem, to worship the Father. This has been literally fulfilled in the destruction of the two cities and the wide expatriation of the ancient inhabitants of Palestine. You Samaritans *know* not what you worship, said Jesus; your religion is a compound of idolatry and Judaism (2 Kings xviii.;) but, we Jews *know* what we worship; for (hee sooteeria) the salvation is from among the Jews. But the time comes, or rather is come, when the true worshippers, who will be neither Jews nor Samaritans, but constituting a new race, shall worship the Father (eu) according to spirit, and to truth; for such are the worshippers, who worship him in purity and intelligence, whom the Father requires.—God is spirit;—he is pure and holy,—and they that would worship him acceptably must worship him in spirit, in purity and holiness, and in truth according to his appointments. The woman replied, I know that Messiah, who is the salvation you speak of comes, when he himself comes, he will declare all things plainly. And Jesus replied, I who speak to you, am he. Such is the paraphrastic rendering of this instructive conversation. *En pneumati kai aletheia*, according to spirit and truth, I prefer to in spirit and truth. The translation of *en* by *according to* is sustained in 1 Tim. i. 18, where Paul exhorts his son Timothy to carry on the good warfare *en autais according to them*—the *propheteias*—prophecies—which went before concerning him. *En pneumati* and *en autais*, though of different numbers, are both of the dative case. No exception, therefore, can be taken to the syntax of our rendering. Would any body but a metaphysician think of finding proof of the existence of abstract human spirits in such a passage as this?—But it is astonishing how the eyes of men's understandings are blinded by human tradition. If men take up with a system of opinions they can see nothing in nature or revelation but the spectres of their own imagination. We trust, we may not fall into the same evil we deprecate in others. Amen!